



King's sister, queen of dissent: Marguerite of Navarre (1492-1549)and her evangelical network

Item type	text; Dissertation-Reproduction (electronic)
Authors	Reid, Jonathan Andrew
Publisher	The University of Arizona.
Rights	Copyright © is held by the author. Digital access to this material is made possible by the University Libraries, University of Arizona. Further transmission, reproduction or presentation (such as public display or performance) of protected items is prohibited except with permission of the author.
Downloaded	7-Dec-2015 21:24:57
Link to item	http://hdl.handle.net/10150/289749

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

KING'S SISTER – QUEEN OF DISSENT
MARGUERITE OF NAVARRE (1492-1549) AND HER EVANGELICAL NETWORK

by

Jonathan Andrew Reid

Copyright © Jonathan Andrew Reid 2001

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2001

UMI Number: 3033623

Copyright 2001 by
Reid, Jonathan Andrew

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3033623

Copyright 2002 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA ©
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have
read the dissertation prepared by JONATHAN ANDREW REID
entitled KING'S SISTER -- QUEEN OF DISSENT: MARGUERITE OF NAVARRE
(1492-1549) AND HER EVANGELICAL NETWORK

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation
requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Heiko A. Oberman
Heiko A. Oberman

4/18/01
Date

Alan Bernstein
Alan Bernstein

4/18/01
Date

Donald Weinstein
Donald Weinstein

4/18/01
Date

Susan C. Karant-Nunn
Susan C. Karant-Nunn

4/18/01
Date

4/18/01
Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon
the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the
Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my
direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation
requirement.

Heiko A. Oberman
Dissertation Director
Heiko A. Oberman

4/18/01
Date

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: _____

Jonathan A Reid

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study of Marguerite and her network owes its existence to the support of many institutions and people. Generous fellowships from the Fulbright Commission, Bourse Châteaubriand, and Division for Late Medieval and Reformation Studies at the University of Arizona, permitted me to conduct four years of research in Europe, principally Paris. For opportunities to present my findings and the profitable reactions I received, I am grateful to: Francis Higman and the *Institut d'Histoire de la Réformation*, Geneva; Marianne Carbonnier-Burkhard, Bernard Cottret and the *Institut de recherches sur les civilisations de l'Occident moderne*, Paris; as well as the University of Montreal and the *Société canadienne d'études de la Renaissance*. Routledge Press kindly granted me permission to use as chapter 1 a revised version of my article "France," in *The Reformation World*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (2000).

Many people have helped me along the way. Warm thanks go to my family for morale support, especially my father, Prof. Malcolm Reid, and wife, Laura Williamson, for their outsiders' insight and copy editing. Doctors Paul Ayris and Reinhard Bodenmann, and Professors André Godin, James Carley, Philippe Chareyre, James K. Farge, and Thomas A. Brady, Jr. kindly provided source materials and good advice. Prof. Robert Albrow introduced me to network theory. Three scholars have been especially generous mentors. My hearty thanks go to Dr. William Kemp for his guiding collaboration on French vernacular books, to Prof. Andrew Pettegree for many fruitful discussions and scholarly opportunities in the *Reformation Studies Institute*, University of St. Andrews, and to Bernard Roussel, *Directeur d'Études* at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études*, Paris, for accompanying my research with enthusiasm, care, and intelligence.

In Tucson, Prof. Heiko A. Oberman's Division for Late Medieval and Reformation Studies has been a richly nurturing scholarly home. Fond thanks go to Luise Betterton, Administrative Director, for being a steadfast guide and encouraging friend. Spirited thanks go to all my colleagues in Professor Oberman's graduate seminar for years of stimulating exchanges, in particular to Mike Bruening and John Frymire for their perceptive comments on several chapters. I am also very grateful to the members of my dissertation committee, Prof. Susan Karant-Nunn, Alan Bernstein, and Donald Weinstein, for their excellent examples as scholars and teachers, insightful comments, and suggestions that improved the quality of my writing. In trying circumstances before the defense, their sacrificial efforts exceeded even the highest professional standards.

Greatest and hardest to express is my debt to my doctoral advisor, Professor Heiko A. Oberman. His scholarly excitement and integrity, his penetrating comments and vast knowledge, his humor and encouragement, his belief in the value of historical studies, and ultimately his example as a man, have shaped this study and me as a scholar in every way. Shortly after presiding over the successful defense of this dissertation, Professor Oberman passed away. I wish to express to Mrs. Oberman my deepest condolences and shared sense of loss, my tremendous gratitude for all that he gave to me, and my great happiness at having been one of his students.

In memoriam

Matthew Scott Mason

(6 June 1967 – 10 September 1989)

David Huston

(20 November 1968 – 8 March 1991)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	10
Abstract.....	11
Resolving a Riddle: Marguerite of Navarre and the Early French Reformation.....	13
I. A Two-Fold Riddle.....	13
II. French Reformation Historiography: The “Magnificent Anarchy”	17
<i>Marguerite and French Evangelicals</i>	17
<i>An Incoherent Answer to a Badly Put Question</i>	20
<i>From the Early French Reformation to the Calvinist Ascendancy</i>	25
III. Structure of Study.....	27
1. The Early Reformation in France.....	30
I. Evangelical Growth	31
II. The Crisis of Evangelism	39
III. The Reformed Ascendancy.....	45
2. Mapping The Navarrian Network.....	53
I. Contemporary Signposts.....	57
<i>External Image</i>	57
<i>Self Identity</i>	65
II. Sources for Reconstructing the Navarrian Network	68
<i>Correspondence</i>	70
<i>Serial Sources</i>	74
<i>Chronicles and Histories</i>	75
<i>Literary Sources</i>	76
III. Dramatis Personae	80
<i>The Evangelicals’ Champion</i>	80
<i>Official Powers and Personal Sway</i>	80
<i>Religion and Books</i>	88
<i>The Network</i>	91
<i>Evangelical Enlightenment</i>	95
<i>The Navarrian Program</i>	99
<i>The Members in situ</i>	100
3. The Valois Trinity Takes Power: New Regime and Church Reform (1515–1521)....	123
I. The Royal Trinity	123
II. Marguerite: The Trinity’s Minor Partner and Her New Powers.....	126
III. Marguerite’s Support of Francis’ Rule: Foreign Affairs and the Concordat.....	139
IV. The Royal Family’s Religion and Late Medieval Reform.	146
V. Leading Characteristics of Marguerite’s Religion.....	152

TABLE OF CONTENTS – *Continued*

4. The Fabrist Background to the Navarrian Network	163
I. “ <i>Ante illustrationem Evangelii</i> .” Evangelical Self-awareness	164
II. The Fabrists’ Career	169
III. From “Barbarian Captivity” to the “Babylonian Captivity”: The Restoration of Learning.	172
IV. Before Meaux: A Season of Growth and Strife	176
<i>Biblical Studies</i>	176
<i>Bolstering Monastic and Clerical Renewal</i>	180
<i>Controversy</i>	184
V. Prepared but not Destined for Meaux	191
5. The Meaux Experiment I: From Clerical Reform to Evangelical Renewal (1518–1523)	205
I. Clerical Reform to 1521	208
<i>The Ideal of Episcopal Reform</i>	208
<i>A Test Case of the New Model Bishop: Luigi Canossa</i>	213
<i>Briçonnet’s Reform Program to 1521</i>	216
II. Evangelical Renewal 1521–1523	226
6. The Meaux Experiment II: Model for National Reform (1521–1523)	242
I. Briçonnet’s ‘Band’ and ‘Captain’ Marguerite	248
<i>The Council of Sens (March 1522): Reform Stalemate</i>	256
II. A Reform Program Rebuffed: Fall 1522	259
<i>A Possible Reform Program</i>	264
<i>The Meaux Articles Tested: The Election of Artus Fillon</i>	277
III. The Cold War Blazes Hot: May – December 1523	280
<i>The Conservative Party’s Attack</i>	281
<i>Defensive Maneuvers and Battle Results</i>	288
<i>Battling in Public, Battling for the Public</i>	296
<i>White-Washing the Taint of Heresy</i>	305
IV. The Bourges Breakout: November 1523 – February 1524	310
7. From Meaux to Madrid: The Network Knits Together (1524–1526)	318
I. Birth of the Network	324
II. An International “Fraternal Alliance”	325
III. Project France and the German Connection	332
<i>Preaching at Meaux, Bourges, and Beyond</i>	334
<i>Appropriating the German Reformation</i>	342
IV. The Invention of the French Evangelical Press circa 1525	349
V. Leadership and Strategy – Doctrine and Purpose	371

TABLE OF CONTENTS – *Continued*

8. Resurrecting King and Reform (1525-1530).....	396
I. The King in Captivity and Reform in Exile (1525-1526).....	396
<i>Marguerite's Diplomatic Role</i>	402
<i>Charles d'Alençon in 'Hell' at Lyon</i>	409
<i>Francis I in Purgatory at Madrid</i>	414
<i>Safe Havens and Home</i>	427
II. Reform Held Hostage (1526-1530)	431
<i>Arrested Reform – Sequestered Evangelicals</i>	432
<i>A Parting of Ways: Briçonnet and Farel</i>	438
<i>The Evangelical Network Underground</i>	444
<i>Reknitting the Network</i>	445
<i>The Clandestine Evangelical Press</i>	456
<i>The Advent of Protestant Politics</i>	464
9. Legitimizing the Evangelical Movement (1531–1539).....	472
I. The Evangelical Breakout: Paris 1533-1534.....	474
II. The Improbable Religious Concord 1533-1536.....	482
<i>Marguerite and England</i>	483
<i>The Appeal to the German Protestants</i>	487
10. Secret Diplomacy and Religious Dissimulation (1540–1549).....	492
I. “The Emperor is Hypocrisy and the Pope the Devil”: Evangelical Diplomacy at the Court of Francis I, 1540-1547	492
<i>The End of the Road: Insurmountable Obstacles 1540-1547</i>	497
<i>Marguerite and Cleves Marriage Scheme, 1540-1543</i>	498
<i>The Last Gasp of Evangelical Diplomacy, 1545-1547</i>	501
<i>Failed Diplomacy and Domestic Damage Control</i>	510
II. Building Evangelical Institutions: Claude Baduel and Gérard Roussel	512
<i>Marguerite, Claude Baduel, and the University of Nîmes</i>	512
<i>Bishop Gérard Roussel's Evangelical Reform at Mid-Century</i>	516
<i>The Béarn of Henri d'Albret, King of Navarre</i>	519
<i>Roussel's Reform Program: Theory and Impact</i>	523
<i>The Evangelical Eucharist: Sacrament of Unity, Source of Difference</i>	533
<i>Roussel's Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood</i>	535
<i>Interpreting Roussel's Confessional Stripes</i>	545
III. The Dynamics of Separation: The Navarrian Network and Calvin.....	552
<i>Calvin's Attack against French Nicodemites</i>	553
<i>Calvin against Marguerite's Network</i>	556
Towards the Wars of Religion.....	570

TABLE OF CONTENTS – *Continued*

Appendix A. Additions and Corrections to the <i>Répertoire de la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre</i>	581
Appendix A: Index 1. Changes to Jourda's Repertory Numbers	618
Appendix B: Books Related to the Navarrian Network	621
Appendix B I: A Checklist of Books Related to the Navarrian Network	623
Appendix B II. Manuscript Books of the Navarrian Network	675
Appendix B III. The Navarrian Network's Reading List 1524	680
References A. Abbreviations and Short Titles	683
References B. Manuscript Sources	687
References C. The Correspondence of Marguerite of Navarre: Printed Sources	690
References D. Printed Primary Sources and Secondary Literature	697
I. Dictionaries, Encyclopedias, and Research Tools	697
II. Bibliographies	698
III. Printed Primary Sources	699
IV. Secondary Studies	706

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Royal Family Household Accounts.....	130
Table 2. Chronological Grouping of Marguerite's Correspondence with Briçonnet	246
Table 3. Calvin's Controversialist Works to 1550	554

ABSTRACT

This study reconstructs the previously unknown history of the most important dissident group within France before the French Reformed Church formed during the 1550s. From edited and unpublished literary, institutional, diplomatic, and epistolary sources from across Europe, the dissertation demonstrates that King Francis I's sister, Marguerite of Navarre (1492-1549), and a network of more than two hundred nobles, royal officers, humanists, literary writers, and prelates collaborated to promote a reformation of the French church based on their evangelical views. To this end, they attempted to steer Francis I into alliances with Henry VIII, the Protestant powers of the Empire and Switzerland, as well as, for a time, the Pope that favored the adoption of their reform agenda. Within France they strove to disseminate their beliefs by exploiting their administrative powers, sponsoring evangelical preaching, and publishing hundreds of vernacular books, including many adaptations of German Reformation tracts. An opposing conservative party stymied these efforts, yet Marguerite and her network managed, in turn, to prevent it from unleashing full-scale persecution, thereby enabling a broad dissenting movement to grow. Meanwhile, French reformers in exile, led by Guillaume Farel and John Calvin, former members of Marguerite's network, became critical of their erstwhile colleagues and called on French evangelicals to reject the "papal" church. After Marguerite's death, members of her network and their heirs joined two successor parties during the Wars of Religion (1562-1598): the irenic royalists and the

unyielding Calvinist Huguenots. Ultimately, the confessional historiographies of the Calvinist and Catholic 'victors' effaced the record of Marguerite and her network' campaign for moderate evangelical renewal.

This account revises the received interpretations of Marguerite and the early Reformation in France. Although Marguerite is well-known as a literary figure with heterodox beliefs, her leadership of a dynamic evangelical network has never been seen or reconstructed. This network's actions reveal, moreover, that early sixteenth-century France was not, as it is universally portrayed, a period of "magnificent religious anarchy." These evangelicals were not divergent in their beliefs, disunified, and hence hopelessly ineffective. Amidst growing persecution they failed to secure the adoption of their beliefs, but they did disseminate them and obtain a foothold for religious dissent without which the Reformed churches could not have emerged.

Resolving a Riddle: Marguerite of Navarre and the Early French Reformation

Individualism is the first law of our Reformation from its very beginning.¹

—Pierre Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme* (1914)

A long period of magnificent religious anarchy preceded the age of servitude.²

—Lucien Febvre, “Une question mal posée: les origines de la Réforme française et le problème des causes de la Réforme,” (1929)

The first trait one should insist on: her uncertainty, ... Marguerite could only have presented a consistent character to herself from her entry into the world until her death if she had been endowed with a masculine vitality, which she did not have, or which she had rarely; brief flare-ups of resolution that burned out as quickly as they were sparked. She never knew how to ground herself, to fix on a line of conduct and stick to it.³

—Pierre Jourda, *Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse d'Alençon, reine de Navarre* (1930)

I. A Two-Fold Riddle

France had a renaissance before the middle of the Sixteenth Century, but did it have a reformation?⁴ Judging by the standard of the German, Danish, Swedish, Swiss, or

¹ “L’individualisme est d’abord la loi de notre Réforme à ses débuts.” Imbart de la Tour, *Origines* 3, 416.

² Speaking of the pre-confessional era of the reformation before “un catholicisme” confronted “deux ou trois ‘protestantismes,’” Lucien Febvre wrote famously, “une longue période de magnifique anarchie religieuse a précédé les temps de servitude.” “Une question mal posée: les origines de la Réforme Française et le problème des causes de la Réforme,” *Revue historique*; reprint as chapter in, *Au cœur religieux du XVI^e siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1983 [1951]), 7-95; 91.

³ “Premier trait sur lequel il convient d’insister: l’incertitude, l’incapacité à se fixer ... elle n’eût présenté un caractère identique à soi-même, de son entrée dans le monde à sa mort, qu’à la condition d’être pourvue d’une énergie masculine qu’elle n’avait pas, ou qu’elle eut rarement, brèves flambées de la volonté aussi vite éteintes qu’allumées. Elle n’a jamais su se fixer, adopter une ligne de conduite et s’y tenir.” Pierre Jourda, “Conclusion: Le caractère et les idées de Marguerite de Navarre,” *Marguerite* 2, 1007-1082; 1007.

⁴ A substantial literature exists on the Renaissance in France. For its literary side, see Marc Fumaroli, *L’âge de l’éloquence: rhétorique et “res literaria” de la renaissance au seuil de l’époque classique* (Geneva: Droz, 1980; paperback reprint, Paris, Albin Michel, 1994); and Gilbert Gadoffre, *La*

English Reformations, which succeeded in establishing “protestant” churches and polities by that date, the answer is no. The period before the “Second [Calvinist] Reformation” came to France generates interest only as a period of origins or genesis leading up to Calvin and the dynamic French Reformed movement of mid-century. If so, then ironically both John Calvin and Ignatius Loyola, the two great leaders of the second generation reformation conflict, would seem therefore to have begun their careers in the land where the “First Reformation” made little impact.

The life of Marguerite of Navarre and the history of the French reformation before John Calvin, as they have been told, remain unsolved riddles. Because she protected many religious dissenters, including Calvin for a time, those riddles are entwined; so too will be their resolution. Those who have written the foremost studies on Marguerite’s life, such as Pierre Jourda, and on the ‘origins’ of the French Reformation, such as Imbart de la Tour and Lucien Febvre, have either left their subjects as they claim to have found them, a muddle of contradictions, or credited them with a coherence that amounts to their irreducible individual singularity. Measuring against the clear visions of the magisterial reformers and the well-structured religious programs of the confessional age, historians have made “formlessness” in doctrine and a resulting “inconsistency” in action the leitmotifs of their accounts of these two subjects.

This study will attempt to address the supposed contradiction, at least in its classic formulation by Pierre Jourda, of Marguerite’s deep engagement with protestant doctrine

and failure to promote it in a concerted reform program. Most scholars have concentrated on ferreting out Marguerite's religious identity by analyzing doctrinal propositions in her poetry and prose. Interpreters have come to widely divergent conclusions. In 1930, Pierre Jourda attempted to settle the debate by adding the study of her deeds to the inquiry into her writings. As will be argued below, he managed to muddy the picture so completely that he projected his incomprehension onto her as her "inconsistency" resulting from a lack of "masculine vitality." Jourda was nevertheless on the right track: the solution to the riddle of her religion lies in retracing her steps, which, in doing so much to recover, he frequently trampled over or completely miss-interpreted.

When reexamining Marguerite's dossier, it quickly becomes apparent that Jourda had a highly selective reading of the sources about her life. There is clear evidence that she was far more than, as most scholars bill her, a kind-hearted 'protectress' of heterodox individuals. She shows signs of having been an active leader in a broad network of evangelicals working for the religious renewal of France.⁵ When one turns to any history of this period, one finds her connected to all the major evangelical figures—such as Lefèvre d'Étaples, Clément Marot, and François Rabelais—who are credited with marking their age. In their day, they were recognized as the leading proponents of a vision of religious renewal that dissented from the established doctrine, practices, and reform programs of the late medieval church. However, their *collective* endeavor has been largely forgotten.⁶ Indeed, scholars deny that the French reformation prior to Calvin

⁵ See chapter 2, notes 1 and 65, for definitions of the terms network and evangelical.

⁶ Fortunately, they have not been completely forgotten. Many of the poets for whom one may file

had an identity, unity, or leadership. Rather, Marguerite and these others have been seen as the early French Reformation in microcosm: the diversity of their 'religious sensibilities' reflected the general state of religious 'anarchy,' and, furthermore, their mystical self-absorption or timidity prevented them from giving dissent a clear voice or organizing it against the church. Recovering and interpreting the deeds and beliefs⁷ of Marguerite as well as those of her network is a principal goal of this study, because therein lies the solution to the two-fold riddle of Marguerite's religion and the early reformation in France.

By refocusing on Marguerite and her network's collective activity, this study hopes to determine whether she pursued a reform agenda corresponding to the heterodox views scholars have detected in her literary works. Her network's deeds, in this sense, were her deeds. Given her closeness to the crown, it will also be important to assess

'membership cards' in Marguerite's network, have already been included by Gérard Defaux in a network of 'sons of Apollo' who engaged in a common agenda of promoting evangelical doctrine: "... F[rançois] Juste et F[rançois] Rabelais sont en relations constantes avec Marot, et que celui-ci fait publier à Lyon non seulement ce qu'il juge utile à la cause de l'évangélisme et à la lutte contre la Sorbonne, mais aussi toutes ces pièces compromettantes qu'il lui est impossible de faire paraître à Paris, sous les yeux mêmes de la censure théologique et du Parlement. *On ne comprends rien à ce phénomène appelé "évangélisme" et "réforme" si l'on n'accepte pas le fait qu'il a fonctionné à partir de réseaux et de complicités multiples, réseaux dans lesquels les imprimeurs – A. Augereau, Simon Du Bois, P. de Vingle, F. Juste, plus tard E. Dolet, etc. – jouent un rôle capital.*" [Emphasis added]. Clément Marot, *Oeuvres poétiques I*, ed. Gérard Defaux (Garnier), 808, citing his own article in *Études Rabelaisiennes* 9 (1971), 1-28. Defaux has edited the proceedings of two recent conferences devoted to Marot and the literary network connected with him: Gérard Defaux and Michel Simonin, *Clément Marot "Prince des poètes français", 1496-1996: Actes du colloque international de Cahors en Quercy (21-25 mai 1996)* (Paris, Honoré Champion Éditeur, 1997), and Gérard Defaux, ed., *La génération Marot: Poètes français et néo-latins (1515-1550). Actes du colloque international de Baltimore, 5-7 décembre 1996*, Colloque, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance 11 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997).

⁷ Abel Lefranc wrote about Marguerite's ideas (*idées*). Lucien Febvre preferred the term "*sensibilités religieuses*," which translates inelegantly as 'religious sensibility' or perhaps 'sentiment' even 'feeling.' With this term Febvre was trying to get beyond mere tenets of doctrine to the personal, psychological, and affective dimensions of religion. For our part, we prefer 'beliefs' since this term more closely reflects Marguerite and her group's constant use of the verb "*croire*" (to believe), especially in

whether their collective action shaped the religious and political policies of Francis I. Furthermore, one must inquire how their activities related to the development of the reformed movement and the later Wars of Religion. To frame this inquiry, it is necessary first to spell out the keen insights, half answers, as well as the several false alternatives offered by scholars that have served as this study's point of departure.

II. French Reformation Historiography: The "Magnificent Anarchy"

Marguerite and French Evangelicals

In the conclusion to his rich study of Marguerite's life and literary works, Pierre Jourda had to account for what appeared to him as the disjunction between her deeds and beliefs (see the third epigraph prefacing the introduction).⁸ To the riddle of her life he offered what has remained a minority solution, asserting that Marguerite dabbled with religious dissenters because of her deep religious longings, curiosity, and compassion, but that in the face of their contentious confusion, she reaffirmed her adherence to the Roman Catholic Church. Although he admits that there was a divergence between her seemingly 'protestant' writings and her catholic deeds, he blames this "embarrassing contradiction"—he meant embarrassing for those, like Abel Lefranc, who maintained her

opposition to "*cuidier*" (to believe falsely).

⁸ In the course of Jourda's presentation of her "character and ideas" he contradicts himself so many times that one cannot help concluding that his vision of Marguerite's inconsistency is just a reflection of his own confusion. Incomprehension is the first and natural reaction to her multifaceted career and literary corpus. Lucien Febvre would make Marguerite, who remained despite many biographies and studies, "une des plus irritantes énigmes de son siècle," the center of his penetrating study of sixteenth-century religion, *Amour sacré, amour profane: autour de l'Heptaméron* (Paris: Gallimard, 1944).

complete Protestantism—on her imprudent curiosity, her lack of manly strength, and her inconstancy as a weak, though generous-hearted, woman.⁹

In reading the pages of Jourda's biography of Marguerite, one quickly realizes that he ignores or is at pains to fend off the implications of her engagement with heterodox doctrines and active reformers. On many important occasions,¹⁰ his study, which is structured as a sort of commentated travelogue, simply notes in passing important examples of Marguerite's role in the political struggles and religious turmoil during her brother's reign, but fails to account for them.¹¹

Whereas, Jourda thought Marguerite lacked strength of character, Lucien Febvre credited her with a consistency rooted in her intense desire for self-abnegation in God and honesty to her own profound spiritual needs. When articulating the foundation of her

⁹ "... autant que les actes de la Reine ne concordent pas toujours avec les idées qu'elle développe, et qu'il y a là, (quoi qu'en dise A. Lefranc,) une contradiction embarrassante." Jourda, *Marguerite* 2, 1067. Based upon a reading of Marguerite's religious works, excluding the *Heptaméron*, Abel Lefranc declared her to have been one hundred percent protestant, indeed specifically Calvinist at the end of her life, see *Les idées religieuses de Marguerite de Navarre d'après son oeuvre poétique: Les marguerites et les dernières poésies* (Paris, 1898; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969). Jourda admitted that her ideas were heterodox but repeatedly emphasized that throughout her life she continued to support monastic foundations and to engage in traditional catholic practices such as retreating into female religious houses and lighting candles.

¹⁰ Jourda systematically ignores or downplays the evidence of Marguerite's deep engagement with evangelical reform in order to sustain his oft repeated thesis: "... rein n'autorise à croire pourtant que Marguerite ait voulu, en le [in this case d'Arande] défendant, rompre avec la stricte orthodoxie. Ses relations avec le groupe de Meaux ne l'empêchent nullement d'observer dans les plus humbles détails les rites catholiques." *Marguerite*, 81, see further 142, and 154.

¹¹ Our opinion agrees with that of Augustin Renaudet: "Aux défenseurs actuels de son orthodoxie le soin d'en montrer l'accord avec le catholicisme contemporain," in "Marguerite de Navarre: A propos d'une biographie," *Revue du Seizième Siècle* (1931) reprinted in Augustin Renaudet, *Humanisme et Renaissance*, (Geneva, 1958; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1981), 217–235; 224; and Henry Heller, see his note, in Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, 15, n. 3. Cf. Lucien Febvre's praise "L'étude d'ensemble [of the life and works of Marguerite] existe, excellente, depuis la publication des thèses de Pierre Jourda; elle n'aura pas besoin, d'ici longtemps, d'être refaite ou reprise en sous-main; et d'ailleurs, d'une telle réfection, s'il en était jamais besoin, un historien ne saurait être l'artisan qualifié." *Amour sacré*, 14. The present author does not pretend, however much "en sous-main," to replace Jourda's biography and survey of literary works, but to make intelligible her life and deeds, for which her literary works serve as sources, and even, in

psychological unity, her religion, Febvre asserted that none of the several influences on her epitomized its essence:

A Catholic Marguerite; an Evangelical Marguerite; a Protestant Marguerite; a Mystic Marguerite; a Lutheran Marguerite, a Calvinist Marguerite.... For us, here, we say simply: Marguerite was Marguerite, that's all and that's enough. Marguerite lived the religion of Marguerite, a religion that she made herself, for herself, little by little, with unceasing changes, transformations, retouches, and adaptations that modified the form of her ideas ... while keeping them in permanent accord with her profound nature.¹²

In effect, three interpretations have been advanced about Marguerite's religion. She was either completely protestant (Lefranc), a prodigal catholic (Jourda), or open-minded, non-confessional believer (Febvre). Since Lucien Febvre, most scholars have put her in the latter category. Henry Heller, Paula Sommers, Renja Salminen, and Gary Ferguson agree that she took on board the reformers' emphasis on sola fideist soteriology and emphasis on Scripture as the sole foundation of faith, that she combined these ideas in a form of unitive mysticism, and that all other influences were subordinated to these elements.¹³ They assert that the variety of the influences on her prevent placing her in any one confessional box.

their publication, as examples of her proselytizing deeds.

¹² "Marguerite catholique; Marguerite évangélique; Marguerite protestante; Marguerite luthérienne; Marguerite calviniste; ... Pour nous, ici, disons simplement: Marguerite a été Marguerite, c'est tout et c'est assez. Marguerite a vécu la religion de Marguerite, une religion qu'elle s'est faite elle-même, pour elle-même, petit à petit, avec des changements, des transformations, des retouches, des adaptations, incessantes, qui ont modifié la forme de ses idées... tout en les maintenant en accord permanent avec la nature profond ... d'une femme" Lucien Febvre, *Amour sacré, amour profane: autour de l'Heptaméron* (Gallimard, 1944), 194.

¹³ Henry Heller, "Marguerite of Navarre and the Reformers of Meaux," *BHR* 33 (1971), 279-310. Marguerite de Navarre, *Le miroir de l'âme pécheresse*, ed. Renja Salminen (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 31-84. Paula Sommers, *Celestial Ladders: Readings in Marguerite de Navarre's Poetry of Spiritual Ascent*, THR 203, (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1989). Gary Ferguson, *Mirroring Belief: Marguerite de Navarre's Devotional Poetry* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1992).

These scholars follow Febvre's vision of Marguerite as a believer beyond the confessions, or rather one living freely before the confessional age. This characterization leads to an easy explanation of the riddle of her life by denying that there could have been any contradictions. Rejecting the anachronistic confessional yardsticks of the victors, Tridentine Catholicism and Protestantism, Marguerite could not have adhered to, dissented from, or failed to have enacted what did not yet exist. Rather she absorbed many influences and brought them into an arrangement all her own, which defies categorization, but not exposition. This may explain why most scholars have not been interested in what she may or may not have done to actualize those beliefs, since they have, in effect, found no basis to believe that she would have sided exclusively with any one of the competing religious groups in the tumultuous age in which she lived.

The key point to grasp here is that, in effect, Marguerite is seen as doubly representative of religious dissent during her age as most scholars portray it. The plurality of influences on her reflects the surrounding religious diversity. Her final, irreducible synthesis bespeaks their mutual incompatibility.

An Incoherent Answer to a Badly Put Question

More widely recognized than his leading role in Marguerite studies, Lucien Febvre stands at the head of modern historiography of the early French reformation. In 1929, he put to rest a 'badly put question' about the origins and specificity of the French reformation, giving the palm to Luther for having sparked it all, while denying that either

he, Lefèvre, or anyone else put a definitive stamp on it.¹⁴ Febvre established a vision of the religious ferment of the period before the rise of the confessions that has become dominant among scholars of French Reformation history, namely that a ‘magnificent anarchy’ reigned until the ‘tyranny’ of the confessional age crushed the soaring souls of the many people who had been attempting to exercise their spiritual freedom.¹⁵

Whereas Febvre posited that there were dozens of different religious sensibilities during that period, most scholars divide the religious landscape before confessional lines hardened into a tripartite typology. The terms of this schema vary from scholar to scholar, so it may be helpful to turn to its classic formulation.¹⁶ Imbart de la Tour defined these three options as: conservative (non-reforming), evangelical or reformist (reforming but non-schismatic), and reformed (reforming and schismatic).¹⁷

¹⁴ See Robert Mandrou, “Le renouvellement de l’historiographie de la Réforme: Lucien Febvre et la Réforme,” in *Historiographie de la Réforme*, ed. Philippe Joutard, (Paris-Neuchâtel-Montreal: Delachaux & Niestlé S.A., 1977), 339-351. Febvre may have been inspired for the title of his seminal article from a note in Imbart de la Tour’s third volume, where he responds to the debate over the ‘German’ or ‘French’ origins of the French Reformation and Lefèvre’s role in it: “nous croyons que le problème a été mal posé.” 3, p. 426-427, n. 2. In his Febvre’s article “Une question mal posée...” he never cites Imbart de la Tour’s third volume, though it had been in print for 15 years when he wrote, mentioning only the first two volumes and citing Renaudet’s criticism of the arbitrariness of Imbart’s confessional periodization in his third volume. Except for Imbart, in the first two sections of Febvre’s essay he cites many of the same authors as Imbart. See *Au coeur religieux*, 7-35; esp. 35, n. 1; and further, 47 n. 2.

¹⁵ See the second epigraph at head of this introduction. Febvre further argues: “De tous ceux qui on vécu en ces temps troublés, ce sont les meilleurs, les plus généreux, le plus vivant qui on tenté un effort inouï pour se faire à eux-mêmes une foi bien adaptée à leurs besoins.” *Au coeur religieux*, 94ff. In 1944, he quoted his conclusion of 1529, and though dropping the word anarchy, reaffirmed, that the period 1490-1550, was a “temps de magnifique et prodigue floraison” for those curious souls of Marguerite’s generation who attempted “un effort presque désespéré pour briser les cadres étroits des Églises – et fonder, sur leurs ruines, la vivante variétés de libres croyances.” *Amour sacré*, 196.

¹⁶ For a prior tri-partite schema of the various opinion about Marguerite’s religion, see Abel Lefranc, *Idées religieuses*, 1-2, citing Henri Hauser for the schema’s broader application to the period as a whole.

¹⁷ Imbart de la Tour had a particular evolutionary model of the changes in the religious terrain, asserting that there were at first only the conservative and evangelical options, and that circa 1530, the early ‘evangelical’ group bifurcated into a catholic reformist wing, which, thankfully for France, preserved the yield of the Renaissance for the catholic church, and another radical branch which formed the root-stock of

Building on Imbart de la Tour's model, scholars have taken seriously Febvre's contention that there were no hard and fast confessional lines before mid-century. Debate revolves around describing the outer limits of the spectrum: How broad was the catholic fold before Trent? How diverse were the 'Protestants?' The answers to these two questions then become the standard for sorting all those who fall between the arch-conservative catholics identified with the Sorbonne and the uncompromising reformers who rejected the medieval church once and for all. Depending on the interpretive standard used, the two confessional camps fixed of the intransigents at the poles grow or shrink at the expense of the middle group.

When approaching the middle group, many scholars have accepted Febvre's vision of a broad pre-confessional religious diversity (anarchy), in which there were no leaders, structure, or essential coherence to the varieties of doctrines espoused. Others have concentrated on portioning out the middle ground into sub-sets. Whether these scholars see these middle groups as well-coordinated historical entities or merely as categories of analysis, they have located the touchstone of these groups' coherence in

the reformed movement. Within these stages and broad categories, Imbart de la Tour makes further subdivisions that need not concern us here. His work is fundamental for our understanding of the origins of the reformation in France. Based largely on primary sources, many of them archival, it is a monumental work of scholarship. Given the standard 'anarchical' picture of the early French reformation, his interpretation is all the more impressive because of the clear framework he brings to the subject. Moreover, he takes into account the full range of social, economic, political, and cultural conditions of the period beginning with an overview of their roots preceding the reign of Francis I from which he proceeds to the era of the "religious revolution." Imbart's work is a remarkable attempt at something approaching total history. Febvre seems—though it is impossible to say exactly since he studiously avoids confronting Imbart de la Tour's influential work—to have stated his 'anarchy' thesis as an antidote to Imbart de la Tour's neat compartmentalization of the religious options, their periodization, and assessment of their respective fates. See note 14.

either doctrinal positions or religious sentiments, which, differing sensibly from the catholic and protestant positions, were often as a cross-selection between the two.¹⁸

After the problem of religious classification come the important questions: why did the middle group(s) fail to bring about an alternate to the Catholic and Protestant reformations? Most scholars have felt that the individuality, timidity, and the heterogeneity of most dissenters during the early reformation in France prevented them from changing their world. According to Pierre Imbart de la Tour, evangelicals and reformists 'failed' to reform the church because they lacked unity or strength of character.¹⁹ His assessment has been widely accepted.²⁰

¹⁸ Thierry Waneffelen has recently offered one of the most thorough and chronologically wide-ranging reassessments of these coordinates, maintaining a particularly broad view of the catholic fold prior to Trent. He has many strongly argued views about the essential unifying points and dividing lines between the several groups, whom he finds caught between Rome and Geneva, see Thierry Waneffelen, *Des chrétiens entre Rome et Genève: Une histoire du choix religieux en France, vers 1520 -- vers 1610*, Typescript Dissertation Thesis (Université de Paris I, Panthéon-Sorbonne, 1994), now published as *Ni Rome ni Genève: Des fidèles entre deux chaires en France au XVI^e siècle* Bibliothèque Littéraire de la Renaissance 3rd series, vol. 36 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997).

¹⁹ When building up to his argument (quoted as the third epigraph at the head of this introduction) that individualism was the law of the early French Reformation, Imbart highlighted the ineffectual diversity of the early French reformation by comparing it to the German reformation: "Le mouvement religieux qui soulève l'Allemagne a eu, dès le premier jour, sa théologie comme ses chefs... Rien de pareil en France. Et c'est un des caractères de notre révolution religieuse que, jusqu'à Calvin, elle naisse, grandisse, se propage sans qu'un homme, un groupe, un système parviennent à la dominer. Elle n'a point encore de chef. Parmi ces premiers ouvriers de l'évangélisme, aucun, en effet, qui s'impose [Not Lambert, Meigret, Berquin, Le Court, or Farel]... Et avec un chef, ce qui manque encore à cette Réforme naissante, ce sont un symbole et une organisation. ... Aucun lien non plus qui rattache tous ses premiers groupes. Entre Meaux, Toulouse, Alençon, bientôt dispersés d'ailleurs, le fonds commun d'idées n'a pas créé la communauté de la discipline. L'individualisme est d'abord la loi de notre Réforme à ses débuts." *Origines* 3, 416.

²⁰ Others who agree that there was no essential doctrinal unity or effective leadership among evangelicals (indeed that their potential leaders refused to take the helm), and that, because of these faults, they failed to bring about a reformation, include: Donald R. Kelley, *The Beginning of Ideology: Consciousness and Society in the French Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), esp. 15-16 and 111; David Nicholls, "Social Change and Early Protestantism in France: Normandy, 1520-62" *European Studies Review* 10 (1980), 279-308, *idem*, "The Nature of Popular Heresy in France, 1520-1542," *The Historical Journal* 26 (1983), 261-275, *idem*, "France" in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, 120-141, ed. Andrew Pettegree (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), and most recently, *idem*, "Heresy and Protestantism, 1520-1542: Questions of Perception and Communication," *French History* 10 (1996), 182-205; and Mark Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, Historical Association Studies (Oxford:

Historians who follow Lucien Febvre's call to study the 'religious sentiments' of Marguerite and other evangelicals have not seriously delved into how they may have tried to put them into practice.²¹ For the Febvrists, there was no such thing as evangelicalism as a movement or entity (Imbart's middle group), merely evangelicals with their individual religious profiles. In his recent synthesis of scholarship, Denis Crouzet accurately reproduced and fully endorsed and that dominant tendency:

Rather than study the general phenomenon of evangelicalism after 1534, we have decided to present several notable figures. After all there was no such thing as evangelicalism, but only evangelicals, which stands to reason, since by their very approach, religion was individualized into a personal contact with God.²²

He goes on to discuss only the 'religious sentiments' of Gérard Roussel, Marguerite of Navarre, et François Rabelais. Thus, these evangelicals' historical role is reduced to serving as 'test cases' or exemplars of the variety of exotic fish swimming in the warm waters of Febvre's magnificent religious anarchy²³

Basil Blackwell, 1987), 1-20, esp. 19-20. Cf. Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 94 ff. All of these works are fine studies and have significant merits. They are cited here only to show the large scholarly consensus about the fragility of the evangelical movement within France.

²¹ When introducing his study of the psychology and ethics of Marguerite and her age, Febvre stresses his concern to go beyond mere history of the sources ("au lieu d'épuiser des inventaires ... besogne simple") to render intelligible their alien mental make-up, *Amour sacré*, 9-15. In his study, he rarely makes a sortie from literary sources to events and indeed ends up describing psyches without bodies; psyches *from* an alien past, but not *in* history.

²² "Plutôt que d'étudier globalement le fait de l'évangélisme d'après 1534, il a été ici procédé au choix de présenter quelques figures marquantes. Car il n'y a pas un évangélisme, mais des évangéliques, ce qui est logique, *parce qu'avec leurs démarches mêmes, la religion est individualisée en un rapport particulier à Dieu.*" [Emphasis added]. Denis Crouzet, *La genèse de la Réforme française, 1520-1562* (Paris: SEDES, 1996), 317. Crouzet maintains with other scholars that evangelicals occupied the middle position in a three part 'jeu historique.' He maintains that they were 'in the game' until 1562, *ibid.*, 344. Nevertheless, this group beggars description: "...il devient très difficile de caractériser les multiples parcours individuels qui se démarquent peu à peu. Les hommes vivaient alors entre deux époques entre le 'système' de l'unité religieuse et le système des fixations confessionnelles. Ils vivent, pour certains, dans un monde d'inventions théologiques, d'empirisme de la foi." *ibid.*, 124, and further 134-135.

²³ For Febvre's test cases, see "le cas Lefèvre" as in note 14, and "le cas Briçonnet" (*Au coeur*,

Limiting study to the evangelicals' religious sentiments, in effect, gives up the attempt to answer the riddle of the 'genesis of the French Reformation,' or rather simply ascribes that development to the truly monumental effort of the Reformed movement. Evangelicals and others in the confessional middle from the early period are absolved of all responsibility for what followed, leaving that on the plate of John Calvin and his colleagues.

From the Early French Reformation to the Calvinist Ascendancy

John Calvin and Geneva are credited with having shepherded the rise of Reformed Protestantism in France. Yet how they accomplished that feat remains largely unknown.²⁴ Most studies have centered on the attractive power of Calvin's thought, the

193-215); "Un cas désespéré?: Dolet" (*Au coeur*, 193-215); and, of course, "le cas Marguerite" in *Amour sacré*, esp. p. 20. For a discussion of Febvre's three model 'cases'—Luther, Erasmus, and Calvin—for the whole of this era's religious history, see, Mandrou, "Le renouvellement," 343-345.

It would be unwarranted, however, to imply that most authors necessarily follow Febvre's enthusiasm for seeing this period as a sort of pre-enlightenment paradise of free inquiry coming before the confessional age of rigid orthodoxies. "C'est par dizaines, en réalité, qu'on peut, qu'on doit recenser alors les traductions originales d'états d'âme aussi complexes que variés." *Au cour religieux*, 94; "De tous ceux qui ont vécu en ces temps troublés, ce sont les meilleurs, les plus généreux, les plus vivants qui ont tenté un effort inouï pour se faire à eux-mêmes une foi bien adaptée à leurs besoins. ... la drame qui en fait la grandeur véritable et qui mit aux prises, dans des milliers de consciences tourmentées de scrupules et partagées entre des obligations contradictoires, les nécessités de la discipline sociale et les libres aspirations de la conscience individuelle." *ibid.*, 95, see further 196. Crouzet does, however, echo Febvre's idea in his description of the age as one of "empirical faith." See the previous note.

²⁴ The best history of the reformation in France in English relates that: "All the signs are, in fact, that the birth of the Calvinist church in France was a rather messy affair which Geneva was not in a position to control or direct." Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, 40. See further, Crouzet, *Genèse*, 345-473, esp. 438-441. When Peter Blickle, the distinguished social historian of the German Reformation, discusses the French scene, he writes justly that based on the present state of scholarship: "There are no convincing explanations for Calvin's success in France." See Blickle's "The Popular Reformation," in *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, 2 vols., ed. Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994 and 1995), vol. 2, 161-192, 181-182, in which he cites Nicholls, "France," 132 as in note 20. Indeed, Nicholls has been a leading proponent of the 'In the beginning all was formless and void' thesis about the genesis of the French Reformation, which, for any interpreter then renders a second mystery all the more perplexing: how did Calvin do it (from scratch)?

increased availability of French 'protestant' books after 1540 from Geneva, and the institutions such as schools that served as conduits for the spread of heterodox ideas.²⁵

These are crucially important elements of the story but some very basic questions remain:

Where did all those underground evangelical or protestant conventicles come from prior to Calvin? What, in fact, were they? How many, when, and why did they join the Reformed fold? How unified were they with Geneva?

Henry Heller has offered a rich answer to how and why Calvinism gained a broad hearing from several segments of the French population. In his survey of seven representative provincial cities he attempts to show how Calvinism appealed to many French people because it addressed their broad aspirations for reform, including those motivated by their economic and social discontent. Moreover, he seeks to explain how people drawn from antagonistic social strata—artisans versus town notables—were able to link up to form new Reformed churches within the stratified social structures of the *ancien régime*. Given the size of the reformed movement, Heller only aimed at providing an explanatory model, not a complete history of the rise of Calvinism. In fact, apart from those scholars who look at the religious literature of the period (a rich but hardly overstudied field), Heller is one of the few seriously to broach the problem of the transition from the early evangelical movement to the Calvinist ascendancy, from, in round figures, 1530 to 1560.

From the vantage point of his deep knowledge about the later half of the sixteenth century and seventeenth century, Philip Benedict notes that the period before the rise of the reformed churches requires much more systematic study but he does not speak of anarchy. Philip Benedict, "Settlements: France," in *Handbook of European History 1400-1600*, vol. 2, 417-454; 426, cf. for the rise of the reformed churches, 427-429.

One key part of the riddle of the Reformed ascendancy is how Calvin and his colleagues operating from outside France succeeded in organizing and animating co-religionists within the realm. Some of the communities where reformed churches eventually formed as well as many leaders of the Huguenot movement had historical ties to Marguerite and others who traveled in her orbit. The fact that Calvin, Farel, and many of their less famous colleagues broke with the French evangelical circles connected to Marguerite, raises the question to what extent Calvin and his exiled colleagues 'created' the French protestant movement out of some formless mass of evangelical sentiment and to what extent they established control over, transformed, and build up an already existing community to which they had long-standing ties. Since Marguerite's network has never been posited as a historical actor, the question of a direct filiation from these evangelicals to the reformed churches has never been framed in this way.²⁶ This question forms the outer limit of this inquiry.

III. Structure of Study

This study will seek to explore the hypotheses that the Navarrian network existed, that its members articulated a set of coherent and consistent religious beliefs, and that they acted to see them adopted through politics and by rooting them in institutions. The first two chapters give broad overviews of the period to orient the closely argued

²⁵ See chapter 1 for an account of the Calvinist Ascendancy.

²⁶ There were clear connections between Marguerite and some of the leading Huguenot women of the next generation, beyond her daughter Jeanne d'Albret, as Nancy Lyman Roelker has established, see "The Appeal of Calvinism to French Noblewomen in the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2 (1972), 391–418. This is a fine start, which should be followed up on a network-wide scale. Again, tracing these types of familial religious filiation across the century has been done frequently for

chronological chapters that follow. Chapter one presents a survey of the early French reformation, as it is currently understood in scholarship, from its late medieval roots to the establishment of the first Reformed churches in the mid 1550s.²⁷ Chapter two seeks to demonstrate with key examples that Marguerite and an extensive network of collaborators did in fact exist and were working together to effect a reform of the church in France up to at least the end of Francis I's reign.

The chronological chapters that follow (3 through 10) do not aim to reconstruct the complete history of Marguerite and her network. Even with the lacunary sources available, that project would not be feasible given the numbers of people and discrete events involved. Rather, they aim to provide a compelling analysis of the key developments in the network's history to the end of Marguerite's life. These chapters have been framed according to the turning points in the 'political climate' that dictated the network's freedom of action. Chapter titles reflect the dominant feature of the network's efforts under those circumstances. Greater attention is given to exploring the beginning years of the network's existence in large part because the best available evidence comes from that period.

In this exploration of Marguerite's network, several themes are stressed throughout. First, Marguerite's economic and political power, which enabled her to serve as patron of the network, is assessed at difference junctures. Chapters 2 and 3, in particular, investigate Marguerite's territorial clout and position at court. This issue is

individuals or families but not collectively.

²⁷ This chapter appeared in, *The Reformation World*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (London: Routledge,

also reexamined in the course of chapters 7 through 10. Chapters 4 pursues the humanist studies of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and his circle from circa 1500 up to their involvement in the Meaux reform in 1521 in order to determine to what extent these prepared the way for their subsequent program of religious renewal. The beginnings of that experiment at Meaux is examined in Chapter 5 in light of its late medieval antecedent of episcopal reform. Chapters 6 through 8 trace how the network knitted together around the reformers at Meaux as well as Marguerite and her entourage at court from 1521 to 1530. Chapter 9 takes in a long period from 1531–1539, concentrating principally on the tumultuous and well known events of 1533–35: Roussel's sermons at the Louvre, Nicolas Cop's address to the University, the Affair of the Placards and its aftermath, as well as the ambitious effort by evangelicals at court to bring Henry VIII, Clement VII/Paul III, and the German Protestants into a dialogue with France for the purpose of reaching a religious settlement and political alliance against the Charles V. Chapter 10 caps this history by showing that well into the 1540s, long after Marguerite's influence is thought to have been extinguished and the evangelical movement to have dissipated, her network continued to strive, desperately, to implement their long-standing program both in foreign affairs as well as on the local level by building evangelical institutions. The conclusion offers an interim assessment about the impact of the network, raising questions about its legacy in helping to train up communities of believers and leaders who would enter the Huguenot and *moyenneur* camps during the Wars of Religion.

2000), 211–224. Here it is offered in slightly modified form and with added footnotes.

1. The Early Reformation in France

No Protestant churches were successfully established in France before 1555. Yet a minority Reformed Church sprang up during the next seven years that was strong enough to survive forty years of civil war and secure a place within Roman Catholic Europe's "Most Christian Kingdom." Preoccupation with the French Protestant movement's late, rapid growth has colored interpretation of its 'prehistory.' Theologians and church historians have long studied the Reformation as a revolt against the medieval Church prompted by 'new' doctrines. More recently social historians have explored how the Reformation altered the rhythms of everyday life and even peoples' world-views as protestants reinvented church structures, clergy, disciplining institutions, and rituals. Since French Huguenots fulfilled this double historical mission as religious revolutionaries and founders of new religious communities, whereas their predecessors did not, scholars have seen the early French Reformation era as the faltering prelude to their dynamic advent. Accounts of the early period concentrate on explaining to what extent Reformation doctrines penetrated France and why their adherents failed to alter France's religious makeup before mid-century.¹

¹ In this chapter, exact page citations will only be provided for direct quotations and arguments specifically attributed to their authors. Bibliographical references are provided in the notes to the field-defining studies upon which this overview is framed.

Mark Greengrass, *The Reformation in France* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987) is the best introduction in English covering the period prior to the Wars of Religion. For comprehensive coverage, Denis Crouzet, *La genèse de la Réforme française, 1520–1562*, (Paris: Sedes, 1996) provides an up-to-date synthesis framed around his innovative views, while Pierre Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme*, 4 vols. (Paris: Hachette, 1905–1944; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978), especially vol. 3, "l'Évangélisme (1521–1538)," offers a classic interpretation and evidence to which all modern studies refer.

Taking the earliest French reformers, “evangelicals,” on their own terms upsets this teleological, plot-line-driven interpretation. Although they held similar doctrines to German and Swiss Protestants, they did not believe that these required them to break with the established church. Rather, while enduring persecution they attempted to renew it from within. Only gradually after 1540 did what scholars regard as a classic Protestant movement come together under the influence of French reformers in exile, chiefly John Calvin, who offered a clear system of Reformed doctrine, a model church, and a firm demand to reject Catholicism.

I. Evangelical Growth

In France, as elsewhere in Europe, religious devotion was on the rise at the end of the fifteenth-century.² After the devastation of the Hundred Years War, confraternities multiplied, some 900 churches were rebuilt, many more were sumptuously decorated, the ranks of the secular clergy and mendicant orders swelled, and people embraced newly introduced devotional practices such as the rosary. Fiery mendicant preachers incited

For the political context and the crown's evolving response to religious dissent, see Robert Jean Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior and Patron: The Reign of Francis I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). For field-defining views about religious sensibilities, see Lucien Febvre, *Au coeur religieux du XVI^e siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 1983 [1957]).

² For an overview of religious life in France at the end of the Middle Ages by one of the field's finest historians, see Francis Rapp, “Caractères nationaux au sein de la Chrétienté, III. La France,” in *De la Réforme à la réformation (1450–1530)*, 341–367, vol. 7 of *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours*, ed. Marc Venard (Paris: Desclée, 1994). For the several currents of late-medieval reform and biblical humanism in Paris see Augustin Renaudet's magisterial, *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)* (2nd ed. Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953; 1st edition, Paris, 1916). On late-medieval preaching in France, see Hervé Martin, *Le métier de prédicateur en France septentrionale à la fin du moyen âge (1350–1520)* (Paris: Cerf, 1988). For the state of the episcopate, see Marilyn M. Edelstein, “Church Patronage in France on the Eve of the Reformation,” in *Renaissance Society and Culture: Essays in Honor of Eugene F. Rice, Jr.*, ed. John Monfasani and Roland G. Musto (New York: Italica Press, 1991), 33–49.

their listeners to deeper piety and excoriated the morally corrupt. Some scholars have interpreted the laity's intensifying zeal for buying indulgences and founding obit masses as betraying deep fears about the pains of purgatory, even doubts about the assurance of their salvation that were excited by the Church's doctrine of sin, but not fully assuaged by its economy of grace. Others counter that such enthusiasm shows plainly the vitality of the late medieval popular religion and the Church's success in fostering it.

Whatever the case (both assessments may well be true by turns), the Church's very success in cultivating lay piety and devotion made the people more likely to see the clergy's faults. Anticlerical sentiment grew stronger as the church failed repeatedly to reform itself fully in "head and members"—from the Pope through the clerical ranks—following the crisis of the fourteenth-century Great Schism. In the late fifteenth century, the tide of reformist sentiment rose again in France. A revived Observant movement had led to the restoration of some 'lax' Benedictine, Dominican, and Franciscan houses to strict obedience to their rules, but after 1510 it ebbed for lack of sustained royal support. Among the secular clergy, only a few bishops had been inspired to provide spiritual direction. Although newly improved training programs at the University of Paris were producing some able priests, by and large the vast ranks of the parish clergy remained woefully ill-equipped to pastor their flocks.

After 1500, Christian humanists—with Erasmus of Rotterdam in the vanguard—offered an inspiring way forward. Reviling clerical failings and superstitious devotions, they advocated that teaching the simple Gospel message purified of scholastic obscurantism would renew the faith. The leading French biblical humanist, Jacques

Lefèvre d'Étaples, gave this goal substantial support by editing and writing commentaries on the Latin Vulgate Bible that expounded the Scriptures' plain, "vivifying" meaning. Scholastic theologians in turn attacked humanists like Lefèvre, who was a mere master of the liberal arts, for questioning the authority of the Vulgate as well as the received doctrines of the church.³ Meanwhile, the Faculty of Theology (known as the "Sorbonne") and the Parlement of Paris fought desperately against the Concordat of Bologna (1516) agreed upon by Francis I (1515–47) and Pope Leo X (1513–1521), which stripped the 'Gallican Church' of its most important fiscal and administrative liberties.⁴

When the strife over Martin Luther's theses reached France in 1518, it heightened these doctrinal and ecclesiological tensions. Contemporary witnesses report that humanists, clerics, and even some Sorbonne theologians read Luther's books with enthusiasm. Lefèvre sent warm greetings to Luther in 1519.⁵ Then, in 1521 the Faculty of Theology at Paris followed the Pope in condemning the friar's doctrines as heretical and the Parlement of Paris outlawed books containing them. Thereafter, those inclined to heterodox doctrines—long condemned as Lutheran whatever their nature or origin—

³ For conservative Catholics' reaction to the religious ferment, see James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985).

⁴ "Gallican Church" denotes, technically, the hierarchy of clergy in France that culminated in the 110 or so bishops and archbishops of the realm, whose primate was the Archbishop of Lyon. "Gallicanism" refers to a loose body of thought about the French church's independence from Rome. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1443) accorded the French clergy the right of capitular election (i.e., popes and secular powers were not supposed thereafter to impose candidates on cathedral and monastic chapters) as well as freedom from annates (the tax, equivalent to one year's revenue, exacted by the Roman curia for conferring the title to a benefice). The Concordat of Bologna revoked both of these rights. The Parlement of Paris, which had similar pretensions to semi-autonomy vis-à-vis the king, supported French prelates in combating the king and pope's attempt to increase their control over the French Church.

⁵ A.-L. Herminjard, ed., *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*, 9 vols. (Geneva: H. Georg & Paris: Michel Levy, 1866–1897; reprint, Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1965), vol. 1,

could only explore such innovations under the threat of persecution. The telling questions for the spread of the Reformation in France would be how secular authorities, chiefly the king, would define true doctrine and to what degree they would enforce orthodoxy.

In 1518 Guillaume Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux near Paris, inaugurated a novel reform program, which quickly became a high-profile test ground for these questions. In 1521, having been exasperated by his clergy's resistance to his attempt to improve religious instruction, Briçonnet invited Lefèvre and his disciples from Paris to conduct an intensive preaching campaign. The group included Michel d'Arande, Gérard Roussel, Guillaume Farel, Pierre Caroli, Martial Mazurier, and François Vatable, all of whom were open to varying degrees to the new doctrines and would go on to play leading roles in the religious controversies of the next thirty years.

Lefèvre summarized their program in his 1522 Latin *Introductory Commentary on the Four Gospels* as "to know the Gospel, to follow the Gospel, and to proclaim the Gospel everywhere."⁶ While ministers preached the "pure Gospel" in the diocese's thirty-two preaching circuits, Lefèvre and his closest collaborators pursued a program of biblical scholarship and publishing in support of this pastoral reform. Intrigued by the religious ferment in Germany, they privately read the Protestant reformers' works, for which they had growing admiration. Inspired by the German reformers, they commenced

45.

⁶ "Et hoc sit cunctis unicum studium, solatium, desiderium, scire evangelium, sequi evangelium, ubique promovere evangelium," dedicatory epistle to "Christian readers" in *Commentarii initiatori in quatuor Evangelia*, in Eugene F. Rice, Jr., ed., *The Prefatory Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and Related Texts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), no. 134, 435.

translating the Bible into French and produced a vernacular preaching handbook.

Brignonnet distributed Lefèvre's Bible translations to the laity, who were then well-equipped to attend Roussel's daily lessons on Paul's letter to the Romans and on the Psalms for the more advanced.

Meanwhile, ministers associated with the Meaux group were promoting evangelical renewal elsewhere in the realm. After 1521, the king's sister, Marguerite of Angoulême (of Navarre after 1527), had d'Arande to preach regularly at court and circulated Brignonnet's letters of spiritual instruction as well as Lefèvre's translation of Paul's Epistles. During 1523–4 she had d'Arande preach in her territories at Alençon and Bourges, while promoting like efforts by Aimé Meigret and Pierre de Sébiville in Rouen, Lyon, and Grenoble.

Catholic conservatives detected Lutheran heresy at every turn. In 1522, the Faculty of Theology geared up for battle, having been alarmed by reports that d'Arande had preached privately at court that Luther was a saintly man and that if he had erred, it was no marvel since other saints had been mistaken too, such as Augustine, Jerome, and others.⁷ Joined by the Parlement of Paris in the summer of 1523, over the next two years the Paris doctors repeatedly sought to indict the Meaux preachers and other evangelicals in

⁷ For d'Arande's statement in 1522 at court, see chapter 6/7, note 58. In 1525, Mazurier was accused of preaching similarly at Meaux, "Où Luther a bien dit, homme n'a mieux dit, et où il a mal dit, homme n'a pis dit, comme dit S. Jerosme d'Origene," quoted in translation from the Latin by Michel Veissière, *L'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1470–1534): contribution à la connaissance de la Réforme catholique à la veille du Concile de Trente* (Provins: Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie, 1986), 333. In 1537, the regent of Agen similarly recommended to a notable of Bordeaux that he read "Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* adding that he should do so in order to absorb what was good in it while to be sure rejecting what was bad," Henry Heller, *The Conquest of Poverty: The Calvinist Revolt in Sixteenth Century France* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), 86.

Marguerite's orbit for the heretical crimes of criticizing the cult of the saints, devotion to Mary, purgatory, indulgences, and fees for masses. In the wake of the first wave of persecution, a few French people wholly committed to the new doctrines, such as Guillaume Farel, fled to the Empire and Switzerland. The laity quickly came to know about France's home-grown heretics. In 1524, a magistrate in Le Puy (Auvergne) blamed the preaching of d'Arande in Bourges and Meigret in Lyon against his town's miracle-working Black Virgin for reducing the number of pilgrims attending jubilee celebrations in her honor. That winter, people coined the term the "Lutherans of Meaux" after commoners there ripped down prayers to the Virgin and placards announcing a papal indulgence. When the German Peasants War spread to Lorraine in the spring of 1525, anxious Parisians panicked at the rumor of a Lutheran invasion.

Meanwhile, prompted by Marguerite, the royal court intervened to save members of the Meaux group and others from successive heresy indictments. In 1523, for example, Francis I ensured that the courtier, Louis de Berquin, received only a light reprimand after having been caught with works by Luther, some of which he had translated and intended to publish. Francis's capture at the Battle of Pavia (February 1525) brought matters to a head. The Parlement of Paris warned the regent, Louise of Savoy, that this disaster was God's judgment for, among other faults, the court's protection of heretics. During the king's captivity, she set conservatives free to take action against the 'heretics.' Lefèvre, Roussel, and d'Arande fled to Strasbourg, while Briçonnet, Berquin, Caroli, several other preachers, and ten commoners from Meaux stood trial. Returning in 1526, Francis I quashed these proceedings at his sister's request.

Recalling the exiles, Marguerite appointed Lefèvre as tutor to the royal children, obtained a bishopric for d'Arande, installed Caroli as curate of Alençon, and took Roussel as her personal minister.

From 1521 to 1526, though Reformation doctrines were understood by few, the Lutheran threat became a national issue. Persecution forced native reformers to make choices. Three camps emerged that would endure until the establishment of the Reformed Church. Reformist prelates attracted to the pedagogical promise of biblical humanism emulated Briçonnet, who backed away from evangelical reform when it proved to incite the people to radical acts and invite judicial inquiry. After 1526, though a conscientious bishop, he did not dare do anything more than repeat past injunctions against clerical abuses. Those who, following the German and Swiss reformers, became convinced that obeying the Gospel required rejecting the traditional church could either take Farel's route to permanent exile or stay and risk the consequences. The remaining group, "Evangelicals" like those succored by Marguerite, sought strategic positions from which they might promote reform from within. While attracted to Protestant doctrines, they aimed chiefly at fostering a "living faith" among the laity, but balked at casting-off the traditional church however deformed it may have appeared in the "pure light of the Gospel."

As contemporaries recognized, the king's decision would matter most in determining France's religious orientation. Catholic conservatives remained frustrated long after 1526 since Francis continued to patronize many writers who espoused the new doctrines. He had certainly sworn at his coronation, "to annihilate and drive out from the

land subject to my jurisdiction, all heretics pointed out and denounced by the Church.”⁸

Yet only after 1539 did he consistently back the pursuit of heretics. Until then a *modus vivendi* reigned: so long as dissenters did not openly attack the faith, the king ignored conservatives’ pleas for their eradication.

Often interpreted as hesitation, Francis’ stance balanced his interests. He could not accept the theologians’ definition of heresy since they lumped together without distinction followers of Erasmus, Lefèvre, and Luther as enemies of the faith. Francis, a enthusiastic patron of Renaissance letters, had previously invited Erasmus to enter his service and esteemed the internationally renowned Lefèvre. Moreover, the Faculty of Theology and the Parlement of Paris had used heresy charges against his *protégés* as a leverage in their attack on royal policies, such as increasing taxation, forcing the church to grant him ‘gifts,’ and interfering in the law courts when it suited him. Secure in his control over the French Church under the Concordat, Francis had little reason to heed conservatives’ denunciations, lest in acting he give them issues with which they could undermine his authority. It was only an accumulation of events such as the Placards in 1534 (see below) and the ascendancy of conservative advisors such as Chancellor Duprat, Anne de Montmorency, and François Tournon that gradually moved him to set the inquisitorial machinery in motion.

⁸ Quoted in translation by J.H. Shennan, *Government and Society in France 1461–1661* (New York: Barnes and Noble; London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969), 79.

II. The Crisis of Evangelism

Francis I's uncommitted stance left the impression that he might support a state-sponsored Reformation. Hopes for a royal reform were never higher than during the early 1530s. In 1533, Marguerite had Roussel preach Lenten sermons in Paris, which attracted 5,000 eager listeners. From rival pulpits, preachers sent out by the Sorbonne urged the people to rise up against Roussel since the king refused to act. When Francis I banished the chief conservative preachers for fomenting rebellion and forced the Faculty of Theology to retract its censure of Marguerite's recently published *Mirror of the Sinful Soul*, partisans of reform predicted imminent victory.

Seizing the moment, Nicolas Cop used his All Saints' Day address to the assembled University of Paris (1533) as a platform to condemn religious persecution and to advocate public preaching of the Gospel. Possibly co-authored by his young friend, John Calvin, the sermon expounded theological themes from Luther and Erasmus and concluded with a rousing call to action whatever the consequences, which in Cop's case required immediate flight:

The world and the wicked are wont to label as heretics, impostors, seducers and evil-speakers those who strive purely and sincerely to penetrate the minds of believers with the Gospel... But happy and blessed are they who endure all this with composure, giving thanks to God in the midst of affliction... Onward then, O Christians. With our every muscle let us strive to attain this great bliss.⁹

⁹ Appendix III, in John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1536 edition, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989 [1975]), 371.

Cop's bold words raised a storm of criticism and a number of his circle were forced to leave Paris temporarily. Evangelicals regained a public voice as Roussel preached again at Paris during Lent 1534 and their public battle with conservatives continued.

Then, on the night of 17-18 October 1534, a militant fringe of the evangelical movement posted violently worded Placards against "the horrible, great and insufferable papal Mass devised in direct opposition to the Last Supper" in Paris, several regional cities, and the royal bedchamber at Amboise. Their provocation played straight into the conservatives' hands. Attacking the Mass as a "blaspheme," priests as "charlatans, pests, and deceitful antichrists," and the doctrine of transubstantiation as "the doctrine of devils," the tract enraged authorities.¹⁰ Faced with an insufferable outrage against Christ's blood and what appeared to be organized sedition, the king backed a brutal repression. Twenty-four were executed, others imprisoned, and over seventy suspected heretics fled, including the famed court poet Clément Marot, Pierre Caroli, and Calvin.

Francis I ended this first wave of persecution 16 July 1535 with the Edict of Coucy, which opened the jails and offered amnesty to all exiles, excepting "Sacramentarians" (those who held the Zwinglian doctrine of the Eucharist articulated in the placards), provided that they would abjure their errors within six months. Francis intended most immediately to allay the anger of German Protestant princes with whom he was trying to cement a political alliance based on a proposed religious colloquy with

¹⁰ Complete document in translation in R.J. Knecht, *French Renaissance Monarchy: Francis I & Henry II* (London, 1984), document 11, 91-92.

Philip Melanchthon. Yet, even after these negotiations failed, he extended the pardon to Sacramentarians in 1536, thus re-establishing his regime's *modus vivendi*.

Roussel's sermons, Cop's address, and the Placards were explosive exceptions to the largely clandestine spread of evangelical and Protestant ideas during the early French Reformation. Persecution prevented any public leadership from forming, and policing was porous enough for the new doctrines to diffuse covertly. Occasionally from the parish pulpit, but more often in school rooms, nobles' courts, homes, and workshops, people encountered such ideas by word of mouth and in new, increasingly available religious books. Although, the full scope of this dissemination is far from clear, research done on heresy trial records and religious books have revealed much about its developing pace and content.

Among the centers of propagation to the elites, France's fifteen universities played a prominent role. The early enthusiasm for Luther at Paris was matched in Caen (1530) and Toulouse (1532), where authorities uncovered circles of professors discussing Protestant authors' works with town notables. At the same time in Bourges and Orleans, teaching masters expounded the new doctrines to students like Calvin, Theodore Beza (Calvin's successor at Geneva), and many others. As university students took up posts in society, they carried reformation ideas across France. Some became regents of France's multiplying municipal schools—at least thirty new *collèges* were established from 1530–

60. By one count, school masters are known to have taught suspect doctrines in twenty-five cities by 1550.¹¹

Communication lines to uneducated commoners were less structured. Pastors were one possible conduit. Remarkably, one third of accused heretics whose occupations were noted at Toulouse (1510–60) and Paris (1547–9) were in orders. Nevertheless, the first estate remained massively loyal to the traditional church. That contemporaries frequently complained about itinerant preachers propagating heresy highlights the extraordinary difficulty that curates who converted must have had proselytizing in their home parishes. In Meaux, as the evidence shows, commoners taught one another. Inspired by the more radical preachers there, a wool-comber, Jean Le Clerc, was condemned for proselytizing and defacing a statue of the Virgin and Child at Metz in 1525. His last words spoke for all those commoners inspired to proclaim the Gospel: “Ha!, my lords, do not be amazed if you see me here [i.e., a mere artisan], me, one who is going to die for the faith and for upholding the truth. ...God gave me a mouth so that I might speak and I pray Him to give me true faith.”¹² In the following decades, authorities arrested other artisans from Meaux for instructing their confreres in Champagne and

¹¹ Heller, *The Conquest of Poverty*, 77.

¹² “Ha! Messieurs, ne soïés de rien esbahis, si me voyés icy, moy qui m'en vais mourir pour la foy et pour soubtenir verité. ... Ha! messieurs vous ne me voulés laisser dire, pour ce que le cas vous touche: Dieu m'ait donné bouche pour parler, auquel je prie qu'il me donne vraye foy,” in J.-F. Huguenin, ed., *Les chroniques de la ville de Metz (900–1552)* (Metz: S. Lamort, 1838), 826, col. A. Jean's brother, Pierre, echoed these words when he went to the stake as a leader of the first Protestant church in France at Meaux in 1546, see Nathaniel Weiss, “Notes et documents sur la Réforme en Brie,” *BSHPF* 46 (1897), 642–643.

neighboring regions. A similar phenomenon occurred in Normandy, which gained a reputation by 1530 as a “little Germany.”¹³

In the absence of widespread preaching, religious books enabled Reformation ideas to spread on all levels. The Latin works of Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Zwingli, and other reformers circulated among the learned since censorship prevented only their domestic publication, not their distribution. Books in French reached a far broader audience, for although literacy rates were low, people habitually read aloud in groups.

Far fewer vernacular religious books circulated in France than in the Empire. By 1525 sermons and vernacular pamphlets (roughly three thousand editions totaling three million exemplars were in circulation) had already propelled the Reformation forward. French heterodox books only began to be produced in any number after that date. Yet, of the one thousand or so editions of French religious (totaling near one million copies) produced from then until 1550, a high proportion were evangelical or stridently protestant.¹⁴ In the absence of widespread preaching, these reached a large audience in the towns, where literacy was highest and the Reformation eventually penetrated deepest.

¹³ For the trial of Nicolas Boivin, a fuller from Meaux, who held many advanced evangelical views, see J.-M. Roger and Michel Veissière, “Le dossier du procès devant l’Officialité de Troyes de Nicolas Boivin, soupçonné d’hérésie luthérienne (9 août 1528 – 5 février 1529),” in *Le beau XVI^e siècle Troyen: aspects de la vie politique, économique, artistique, littéraire et religieuse à Troyes de 1480 à 1550*, 415–437, ed. P.-E. Leroy (Troyes: Centre Troyen de Recherche et d’Études Pierre et Nicolas Pithou, 1989). For Normandy, M.C. Oursel, “Notes pour servir à l’histoire de la Réforme en Normandie au temps de François I^{er}, principalement dans le diocèse de Rouen,” in *Mémoire de l’Académie Nationale des Sciences, Artes et Belles-Lettres de Caen* (1912), 103–256, separately paginated 1–156 at top of page; and Martin Bucer’s letter to Martin Luther, 25 August 1530, chapter 2, at note [14].

¹⁴ These figures are a conservative estimate, derived from Francis Higman’s extensive, though not exhaustive, bibliography of French religious books, *Piety and the People: Religious Printing in French 1511–1551* (Aldershot, 1996). His collected articles contain many important studies of their content and references to the extensive literature in this field, see *Lire et découvrir: la circulation des idées au temps de la Réforme* (Geneva: Droz, 1998).

People bought more Bible translations than any other text, despite a 1525 Parliamentary edict banning them. The Psalms, used as a prayer- and hymnbook, appeared in seventy-five editions, fifty-two in Clément Marot's censured verse renderings. Bibles and New Testaments were reprinted from Lefèvre's translation (thirty-eight editions) and after 1535 from Olivétan's popular Protestant rendering (thirty-nine editions), whose sales together far outstripped those of two traditional abridged versions (fourteen editions combined after 1521).

Until the mid-1530s, in addition to Bibles, evangelical authors and printers published short manuals of religious instruction. Simon Du Bois, an associate of the Meaux group, and other printers at Lyon, Basle, Strasbourg, and Antwerp offered to the laity devotional and catechetical texts by Erasmus, Luther, and other reformers that were designed to foster piety. Carefully avoiding outright attacks on the church or its doctrine, these tracts nevertheless highlighted the urgent need for reform. Translations of Luther's works figured prominently. Yet the reader never encountered the strident opponent of the papacy, but always an anonymous teacher, scriptural expositor, and spiritual counselor. Typical of the evangelicals' eclectic attempt to provide teaching texts, *The Book of True and Perfect Prayer* (1528), the most popular devotional work in French with fifteen reprints, offered portions of Luther's exposition of the Lord's Prayer and Creed together with texts by Farel and more traditional Catholic writers.¹⁵ The *Brief summation of the substance and foundation of evangelical doctrine* (Du Bois, 1525), epitomized the intent

¹⁵ *Le livre de vraye et parfaicte oraison*, (Paris, Simon du Bois for Chrestien Wechel, 1528). See Higman, *Piety*, L 97 – L 112, and *idem.*, "Luther et la piété de l'église gallicane: le *Livre de vraye et*

of such works. The unnamed author tells his “faithful readers” thirsting for “the Word of God” that since it was no longer possible to preach publicly, “it remains possible, at least, for us to continue nourishing your faith with books.” He warns them not to take vengeance against “persecutors of the truth,” but to pray for God to convert them as well as the king.¹⁶

Overtly Protestant literature appeared after 1533 when Farel succeeded in establishing the Reformation in French-speaking territories east of France. From Neuchâtel, he and his fellow exiles, Antoine Marcourt and the printer Pierre de Vingle, published polemics against Catholic doctrine and practice, of which the 1534 placard was a particularly inflammatory example. After 1536 this activity centered on Geneva, where Calvin would become the dominant voice of French Protestantism, having established his reputation with the first Latin edition of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536).¹⁷

III. The Reformed Ascendancy

Reformed Protestantism coalesced in France after 1540 largely due to the efforts of Calvin, Farel, their Swiss colleague, Pierre Viret, and their large circle of helpers. They succeeded in broadcasting a galvanizing “Reformed” Protestant doctrine from

parfaicte oraison,” *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* (1980), 91–111.

¹⁶ “Et certes nous aussi ausquelz est commise l’administration et dispensation dicelle parole ne desirons riens tant que la vous povoir annocer pure et nette, telle qu’il la nous donne puiser de ses fontaines. Mais pourtant que sommes empeschez de ce faire par ceulz aux ventres et a la gloire desquelz nuirait verité manifestée, affin que ne vous delaissons du tout, reste au moins que par escriptz ne cessons de aider vostre foi,” *Brief recueil de la substance et principal fondement de la doctrine evangelique* [Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1525], f. A2r–v. See further chapter 8.

¹⁷ *Christianae religionis institutio* (Basel, 1536).

abroad just as the French crown was launching a concerted campaign to extirpate heresy.¹⁸

Calvin's influence in France emerged clearly with the publication of the French edition of his *Institutes* (1541). The sensational impact of the work prompted a royal edict banning it in 1542, the same year in which a heretic at Rouen went to the stake quoting from it by heart to the assembled crowd. As evidence of heresy mounted, Francis I and Henry II (1547-1559) adopted successive measures against what was now seen as a clear threat to social order. Francis I asked the Faculty of Theology to draw up articles of faith, which he published as the law of the realm (1543), along with a list of condemned books (1544), on which Calvin's works figured prominently. Initially magistrates—some were sympathetic, others hostile, but most indifferent to the new doctrines—failed to enforce heresy laws effectively. In the Edict of Châteaubriand (27 June 1551), Henry II gave persecution real teeth by requiring magistrates to prove their orthodoxy and ordering regular searches in bookstalls and houses. Genevan records of refugees arriving between 1549–60 reveal the impact of these measures. French Protestants fled there in a growing stream, including in the early 1550s scholars, printers, and nobles such as Beza, Robert Estienne, and Laurant of Normandy, who contributed to the vast increase in Genevan

¹⁸ The literature is rich on the doctrines of these three figures and their careers at Geneva, Neufchatel, Lausanne, and environs. Their mission to and influence in France prior to the rise of the Reformed churches, receives treatment in the surveys of the period (see note 1), but there is not yet a monograph devoted to the subject. For a programmatic statement of Calvin's European-wide vision of reform and France's special place within it, see Heiko A. Oberman, *Initia Calvini: The Matrix of Calvin's Reformation* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1991), and *idem*, "Europa afflicta: The Reformation of the Refugees," *ARG* 83 (1992), 91–111. For a penetrating analysis of Calvin's influence in his homeland, see "Calvin and France: The Growth of Genevan Ascendancy: 1536–1550," chapter 4 in Heller, *The Conquest of Poverty*.

religious propaganda after 1550. Thus, persecution in France swelled Geneva with more leaders for the long revolt ahead.

As persecution grew, many factors contributed to Calvin's ascendancy over French Evangelicals: his forceful prose, his extensive network of friends and admirers, the inability of leaders in France to speak publicly, Geneva's proximity to Lyon—a hub of communications in France—and the spectacular output of the little city's many presses. Above all it was Calvin's teaching that persuaded. His *Institutes* offered the first clear systematic presentation of the new doctrines in French and contained a new vision of the Christian life and church. In the aftermath of the 1534 placards, his dedicatory epistle to Francis I at the head of the *Institutes* served as an apology for committed Protestants. He affirmed their obedience to secular authority, but warned that in religious matters they owed a higher allegiance to God. His polemical writings—*Reply to Sadolet*, *Treatise on Relics*, *Little Treatise on the Lord's Supper*, *Little Treatise Showing What a Faithful Man Should Do among the Papists*, *Apology to the Nicodemites*, *Against the Frenzied Sect of the Libertines*, *On Scandals*—attacked Catholics' "false" beliefs and practices as well as "faint-hearted" Evangelicals ("Nicodemites") who acquiesced to them or slid into the comforting "heresies" of the "Spiritual Libertines."¹⁹ Calvin exhorted true

¹⁹ Ordered chronologically by date of first edition, these were the *Epistolae duae* (1537) reworked into French as the *Petit traicté monstrant que doit faire un fidele entre les papistes* (1543, to Latin 1549, to French again 1554); *Responsio ad epistolam Sadoleti* (1539, French 1540); *Petit traicté de la saint cène* (1541, Latin 1545); *Traicté des reliques* (1543, Latin 1548), *Excuse aux M. les Nicodemites* (1544, Latin 1549); *Contre la furieuse secte des Libertins* (1545, Latin 1546); *De scandalis* (1550, French 1550). See Jean-François Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre imprimé* (Geneva: Droz, 1997), appendices III and V, 377–378, 381–384, and *passim* for discussion.

believers to adhere to God's truth without waiting for a royal reformation and without dissembling in the face of persecution.

Some Evangelicals found his demands too severe. In 1544, the Parliamentarian Antoine Fumée made a tortured appeal on behalf of French Evangelicals. He complained that Calvin required the ultimate sacrifice when demanding that believers abstain from the Mass. Although recognizing it as an abuse, they would have to emigrate or face death to comply. Calvin maintained his position affirming that to "honor God body and soul," flight or abstaining—whatever the consequences—were the only alternatives to "polluting" oneself.

Calvin's signal contribution to the rise of Protestantism was to give direction to the evangelical conventicles that had sprung up since the early 1520s. At such gatherings people read scripture or discussed religious tracts, prayed, and exhorted each other to live a holy life. The books of Calvin and his colleagues provided materials to enrich their meetings. Moreover, Calvin encouraged them to remain steadfast, sending consoling messages to prisoners and letters of advice to these embryonic Protestant communities. Commoners formed a church at Meaux in 1545 on the model of a refugee church in Strasbourg founded by Calvin, but the authorities crushed it by burning fourteen leaders at the stake. Their experiment was not repeated for another ten years.

In the face of harsh repression, Calvin drew such communities into a network centered on Geneva through correspondence and direct contacts with leaders who visited him. By 1550, Calvin had ties with believers in Paris, Orleans, Bourges, Poitiers, Angoulême, Rouen, Lyons, Agen, as well as the regions of Brie, Provence, Dauphiné, and

Languedoc. That year Claude Baduel, regent at Nîmes, proclaimed Calvin's guiding role in a report to Philip Melanchthon. He announced that after Marguerite of Navarre's death (December 1549), French believers' only solace came from the teaching of God's word, the Genevan church, and "John Calvin, who through that piety, sound teaching, and strength of soul that you know so well, consoles us in our deepest misfortune frequently and powerfully with his letters."²⁰

Just as Baduel's letter signals Calvin's ascendancy, so too it marks the decline of evangelical leadership in France. After the mid-1530s, Marguerite's influence on her brother diminished. Few figures of the first generation remained like Gérard Roussel, Bishop of Oloron since 1536, who continued efforts at reform. Though embattled, he attempted to transform the Mass and other rites in accordance with the Evangelicals' emphasis upon faith in Christ alone as the root of salvation, even borrowing from Calvin's writings to do so. Nor did French Evangelicals produce many new devotional works. Rather evangelism took a literary turn. In poems, plays, satires, and novellas the popular writers Marguerite of Navarre, François Rabelais, Clément Marot, Victor Brodeau, Nicholas de Bourbon, Étienne Dolet, and Charles de Ste.-Marthe expressed their profound faith. While heaping abuse on "Sorbonagres," corrupt clerics and monks, and, sometimes, the intransigence of Genevan reformers, they gave sophisticated cultural expression to the call for "living faith," but offered no clear program for renewal.

²⁰ See chapter 2, note [17] for Latin original, from BPF, ms. 186/2, fol. 93 v – 97 r. For a French translation and a presentation, see M.-J. Gaufres, *Claude Baduel et la réforme des études au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1880), 227–231; *idem*, "Lettre de Claude Baduel à Philip Melanchthon," *BSHPPF* 23 (1874), 575–548.

Who, then, were the clandestine Protestants turning to Calvin? To answer this question fully the evidential base remains frustratingly weak. The best information about the geographical distribution and social origins of French Protestants come from studies on the established Reformed churches after their rapid growth from 1555–62. Trial records from the preceding period and registers of arriving refugees kept at Geneva, while less accurate, reveal similar patterns. Brittany excepted, Protestant groups arose throughout France. Their subsequent heavy concentration south of the Loire is not much in evidence. Regional factors seem to have been less important than division between town and country: with important exceptions Protestantism was largely an urban phenomenon. Numerically, committed Protestants were probably far fewer than the 10 per cent of the population they would reach at their peak in the 1560s. Yet, those yearning for a reform based on the Gospel were certainly more numerous than those who would later join the minority Reformed Church. Which social groups were attracted?²¹ Trial records show a disproportionate number of elites indicted for heresy. This figure is likely inflated by the fact that accusers received a portion of the goods of those convicted. The Genevan records of religious refugees coming from France is a less biased sample which shows that no particular social group was more or less likely to produce Protestants. While artisans were by far the most numerous and nobles the least, each

²¹ For penetrating studies on the social history of the early French reformation, see Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 1975) and David J. Nicholls, "Social Change and Early Protestantism in France: Normandy, 1520–1562," *European Studies Review* 10 (1980), 279–308.

class was represented in numbers roughly equivalent to their normal proportions in the urban population.

What attracted these people to the new religion? On this thorny, perhaps insoluble, problem most scholars reject an older thesis that posited a correlation between a broadening socio-economic crisis among urban artisans and their attraction in large numbers to the reform. Even the leading modern proponent of this thesis, Henry Heller, stresses Calvin's multifaceted ability to appeal to artisans as well as the elites.²² Denis Crouzet has recently proposed that fervent expectation of the End Times and fascination with astrologers' predictions of calamity steadily fueled religious passions in the thirty years before the savage Wars of Religion.²³ Scholars have yet to assess this thesis' implications for the growth of Protestantism, but such insights reinforce the need to consider further all the political, economic, social, and mental coordinates by which contemporaries made their religious choices. Everyone saw the hands of God and Satan working in the world, but deciding whose were working behind the religious alternatives depended upon the complex interplay of reading the book of life and the Scriptures together.

Before 1555, it could hardly have been predicted that an independent Reformed Church would eventually survive without royal support. Evangelicals' hope for a state-

²² Henry Heller's socio-economic analysis is rich in detail and his argument more subtle than his critics often concede, see note 11.

²³ Denis Crouzet, *Les guerriers de dieu: La violence au temps des troubles de religion (vers 1525- vers 1610)* (Seysse: [XXX], 1990).

sponsored reformation was thwarted by events such as the defeat at Pavia, the Placards, and unfavorable international affairs. So their simple desire for another future, in which establishing the Gospel did not engender violence, gradually faded. Calvin and the example of Geneva convinced French believers not to accept the alternative.

Transforming an underground movement into a visible church, however, would require a radical change in circumstances. In 1555, just as Lutherans secured their future at Augsburg, Calvin's party won political ascendancy in Geneva, which allowed over 200 missionary pastors to be sent to France over the next few years. And that same year, the first enduring French Protestant church formed in Paris under a nobleman's protection, a presage of the key ingredient for the rise of the Reformed Church and the coming civil war: the armed support of the nobility for the new faith.

2. Mapping The Navarrian Network

The term “Navarrian network” does not yet exist in scholarship, nor can one find it in the sources, but the group it names did exist and no other title will serve as well.

Adversaries libeled its members with several discordant epithets: *hérétiques*, *luthériens*, *sacramentaires*, *nicodémites*, and *libertins spirituels*.¹ Members of this network

¹ For an excellent study of the confessional terminology used during the rise of the Reformed church in Switzerland and France, see Willy Richard, *Untersuchungen zur Genesis der reformierten Kirchenterminologie der Westschweiz und Frankreichs, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Namengebung*, Romanica Helvetica vol. 57 (Bern: A. Francke, 1959). Limiting its usefulness, this work only relates the terms used by the eventual confessional ‘winners’—the ‘Catholics’ and ‘Reformed’—to vilify the opposition and to identify themselves. Missing are the tags used to identify Marguerite’s network and other middle parties, such as “*nicodémites*” and “*libertins spirituels*.”

Among modern historians, Pierre Imbart de la Tour developed the first ‘scientific’ lexicon designed to go beyond the pejorative and confessional labels inherited from the reformation era, which historians had hitherto been using, see Imbart de la Tour, *Origines* 3, v-xi. Beyond the inescapable adjectives and nouns used to identify followers of major thinkers—*luthériens*, *zwingliens*, *érasmiens*, and *fabrists* (for followers of Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples from his Latin name *Faber Stapulensis*)—he employs a varied set of terms to classify the different religious personalities and movements in early reformation France: *évangélisme*—*évangéliques* (vi and *passim*, which in practice he further subdivides into *luthérien*, *érasmien*, and *fabrist* varieties), *réformisme*—*réformiste* (x and 274–22), *mystique(s)* (288–303), *le parti réacteur/intransigeant* (212–223, 246–255), and *le tiers parti* (505, 599, 612). Although, Imbart de la Tour largely succeeded in articulating a confessionally neutral, descriptive system of analytic terms, in practice, his use of them is often imprecise and conflicting.

For a clear presentation of the major confessional terms as they are commonly used by modern scholars in the French context, see Higman *La diffusion de la Réforme en France*, Publications de la Faculté de Théologie de l’Université de Genève 17 (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1992), 4–5. More broadly the ‘Glossaire,’ in John Miller, ed., *L’Europe protestante aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* (Belin – De Boeck & Larcier, 1997), 347–359. See also Marc Venard, “Réforme, pré réforme, contre-réforme... Étude de vocabulaire chez les historiens récents de langue française” in *Historiographie de la Réforme*, ed. Philippe Joutard (Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1977), 352–365, which provides a useful reflection on terms derived from the root ‘*reformare*’ used by historians since Imbart de la Tour as well as Gerald Strauss, “Ideas of *Reformatio* and *Renovatio* from the Middle Ages to the Reformation,” in *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, 2 vols., ed. Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994 and 1995), vol. 2, 2–30. The *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* proves unhelpful for the purposes of this study, leaving French evangelicals caught between the cracks. In the article “Evangelical Movements,” Thomas Kauffman claims that this term (he prefers the singular) should be used to describe the reforming impulse in Germany before the mid-1520s, after which time one should speak of Protestantism to describe the common traits shared by the variety of confessions that developed out of the early ‘evangelical movement.’ The French evangelicals, at least, continued to appeal to their German ‘brethren’ for help on the basis of their common commitment well after the beginnings of and with regret for the beginning of confessional separation. In her article “Evangelism,”

understood themselves to be promoters of the Gospel. They grounded their doctrine in and wished to live according to the Scriptures. Their approach to renewing belief and practice set them at odds with the established church at home and linked them to like-minded believers throughout Europe. Remarkably, in rare agreement, enemies and members recognized that French evangelicals had a preeminent champion: Marguerite of Navarre.

Modern confusion over the role of Marguerite and her network during her brother's thirty-two year reign (1515-1547) is more fundamental. We have far more than just a problem of nomenclature; we have lost track of the group completely. As prominent figures, Marguerite, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, and members of the Meaux circle all find their proper and prominent place in histories of early sixteenth-century France. The history of religious dissent during this period, however, has not progressed beyond analyzing the beliefs of heterodox individuals, recounting famous heresy cases, and describing the careers of a few evangelicals, of whom Marguerite, Lefèvre, and Meaux group are the most prominent examples.² As a result, their coordinated activity

Elisabeth G. Gleason cites Imbart de la Tour for the modern definition of the term (who coined it with respect to France) and then, inscrutably, only discusses its use by scholars of Italian religious movements. See *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand, vol. 2 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 80–83.

² See Mark Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, Historical Association Studies (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), 1, 9–20. Similarly, in the most recent survey of the French Reformation, Denis Crouzet epitomizes the broad sweep in historiography of this 'individualist,' atomizing approach to French evangelicals when he writes: "Plutôt que d'étudier globalement le fait de l'évangélisme d'après 1534, il a été ici procédé au choix de présenter quelques figures marquantes. Car il n'y a pas un évangélisme, mais des évangéliques, ce qui est logique, *parce qu'avec leurs démarches mêmes, la religion est individualisée en un rapport particulier à Dieu*," [emphasis added] *La genèse de la Réforme française, 1520–1562*, (Paris: Sedes, 1996), 317. He limits his discussion of French evangelicals after 1534, to biographical sketches of three major figures—Gérard Roussel, Marguerite of Navarre, et François Rabelais—whose heterogeneity he vastly exaggerates. In claiming them to be representative of the broader movement, he is

has been vastly underestimated in its range, consistency, and daring. Contemporaries testified, however, that an evangelical network, allied to Marguerite, was operating on a national scale thirty years before Calvin and Geneva helped to organize a separate reformed church within France. Prior to the Genevan ascendancy, French evangelicals had a focus for their hopes, an advocate for their petitions, and a champion for their cause: Marguerite, the king's sister. Their testimony invites us to explore behind the cases of individual French evangelicals in order to establish the personnel, intentions, actions, and impact of the broad network tied to Marguerite.

As for naming this group, none of the pejorative, often vague, labels that adversaries tacked on Marguerite and her associates can serve to describe the extensive cast of nobles, royal officers, humanist scholars, prelates, and writers that she helped spin into a cohesive web. Modern scholars rightly call many of them “evangelicals” since they themselves used the Gospel (*l'évangile*) substantively and adjectivally—*Evangelii precones, evangelici viri, doctrine evangelique*—to characterize their fellowship and faith.³ However, it must be remembered that “evangelical” applies to all such believers,

able to excuse himself from the task of presenting an analysis-defying “anarchy.” The latter is Lucien Febvre's term to summarize the religious profile of this period. Most modern interpreters accept his interpretation. See further, Lucien Febvre, *Au cœur religieux du XVI^e siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1983 [1951]); Émile G. Léonard, *Histoire général du protestantisme*, 3 vols., vol. 1, *La Réformation*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1980 [1961]; first ed. trans., *A History of Protestantism*, trans. Joyce M.H. Reid (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1968); David J. Nicholls, “France,” in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 120–141; Marc Venard, “Le foisonnement de la Réformation, IV. La filière française: de Meaux à Neuchâtel,” in *idem*, ed., *De la Réforme à la Réformation (1450–1530)*, vol. 7 in *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours* (Paris: Desclée, 1994), 830–841; Philip Benedict, “Settlements: France,” in *Handbook of European History, 1400–1600*, vol. 2, 417–454.

³ For the early and frequent use of “evangelique” by Marguerite and Guillaume Briçonnet, see Chapter 7, n. 72. Because of its broadness, most modern scholars follow Imbart de la Tour's definition:

among whom Marguerite's network was but one group, albeit the most strategically placed.

We remember Marguerite by her last, most exalted title: Queen of Navarre (r. 1527-1549). Her husband, Henri d'Albret (1503-1555), enjoyed his royal powers in Basse-Navarre, the amputated northern stub of a small kingdom straddling the Pyrenees. This realm barely sufficed to substantiate her title, nor did Marguerite spend much time there. Other qualities made her truly regal. Her authority over numerous French domains, her natural abilities, and her special relationship with the king enabled her to exercise a degree of influence at court that was rivaled by only a few other women close to Francis I (b. 1492, r. 1515-1547), including his mother, Louise of Savoy (1476-1531), and his mistress, Anne d'Etampes (1508-80), as well as a small circle of leading courtiers, such as Antoine Duprat (1464-1535), Anne de Montmorency (1493-1567), and Philip Chabot de Brion (1480-1543). Using her position to support the spread of the Gospel, Marguerite was the recognized political leader of the French evangelicals. Referring to far more than a geographically limited territory, Marguerite's title 'Navarre,' therefore, serves to mark symbolically the people she shepherded in France, whom

"*Évangélisme*. Entre, tous ces hommes...si diverse que soit leur origine, si troubles (*sic* for *troublées*) que se montrent leurs aspirations, s'est établi un principe commun: le retour à l'Évangile," *Origines* 3, vi. Higman follows closely: "évangélique: terme plus approprié pour l'ensemble des réformateurs, toutes tendances confondues: tous ceux qui se basent sur l'autorité primordiale de l'évangile," *La diffusion de la Réforme en France, 1520-1565*, 5. Michael A. Screech helpfully clarifies that turning to the Gospel did not carry as its necessary consequence rejecting the Church and embracing the Reformation: "What distinguished *Évangéliques* from other sixteenth-century Christians in France—both those who could accept schism and those who could not—was their personal knowledge of the Scriptures and their conception of what the Bible is and what it teaches. They were committed to Scriptural theology as a guide to life and worship." *Clément Marot: A Renaissance poet discovers the Gospel. Lutheranism, Fabrism and Calvinism in the Royal Courts of France and of Navarre and in the Ducal Court of Ferrara*, SMRT 54 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 6.

contemporaries maligned, scholars have failed to perceive, and we will investigate: the Navarrian network.

Having staked this claim to have recovered the existence of a lost kingdom within the old borders of France and French Reformation history, this chapter seeks to map its major features in preparation for the chronological chapters to follow, which will expound and prove this thesis in detail. First, in order to allay all doubts about their existence, we will demonstrate that adversaries and allies alike recognized the existence of Marguerite's network and considered them to be the carriers of evangelical reformation within France. This external reputation reflected the group's self-perception. Second, we will discuss the broad range of sources and integrative approach required to reconstruct their story. Third, we will survey the network's members, their animating ideas, and principal activities.

I. Contemporary Signposts

External Image

Beginning in the early 1520s, the Faculty of Theology and the Parlement in Paris—the conservative party⁴—were the first to identify and fight the Lutheran sect in

⁴ James K. Farge has carefully argued for, described, and richly documented this 'conservative party' in three works: *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology, 1500–1536*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, *Subsidia Mediaevalia* 10 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980); *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543*, SMRT 32 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985); *Le parti conservateur au XVIe Siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme* (Documents et inédits du Collège de France, 1992). In addition, he has edited two volumes of the *Registre des procès verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie*, which are essential sources for following the Faculty of Theology's actions. No comparable set of published sources is available for the Parlement of Paris.

France. To their great alarm, the doctors of Theology and jurists believed that in the heretics' vanguard members of the royal court and the circle of humanist scholars gathered round Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples were conspiring to undermine the church. Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet had invited the Fabrist circle⁵ to carry out an intense program of religious instruction in his diocese of Meaux.⁶ By August 1521, a few months after their arrival, theologians from Paris were accusing preachers from Meaux of broadcasting heretical doctrines. In 1523, Royal orders squashed the conservatives' pursuit of the Meaux group and, at the same time, forbade the sale of two anti-Luther books written by conservative theologians. These acts made it perfectly clear to the conservatives that certain *grands personnages* at court were protecting the heretics.⁷

By the early 1530s, the Faculty and many others had come to believe that it was Marguerite who was fostering the widespread plague of Lutheran heresy afflicting the land. In June 1533 a student reported that the Paris theologians felt so helpless against the evangelical preaching of her almoner, Gérard Roussel, for which she had mustered support at court, that they had “no other hope than in the death of the queen of Navarre, whose pregnancy is far along, or in a total and violent change of circumstances.”⁸ The doctors of theology certainly felt themselves embattled, but they were by no means defeated. In the following months, a few hardy doctors would attempt to censure

⁵For the term “Fabrists” see note 1.

⁶Michel Veissière, *L'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1470–1534): Contribution à la connaissance de la Réforme catholique à la veille du Concile de Trente* (Provins: Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie, 1986), 197–201.

⁷See Chapter 7 and Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 130–132.

⁸Farge translates this passage from a letter by Barthelemy Masson (Latomus), *Orthodoxy*, 203, quoted by Nathaniel Weiss and V.-L. Bourrilly in “Jean du Bellay, les protestants, et la Sorbonne,” *BSHPF*

Marguerite's *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*. On 1 October, students at the College of Navarre—one of the leading theology schools in Paris—lampooned Marguerite as a 'Bible-thumping' fanatic. According to John Calvin's vivid report, their school play opens with Marguerite peacefully spinning thread. Enter Gérard Roussel, her almoner. He grabs her and literally forces his doctrine on her in a violent wrestling match that drives her into a frenzy. She rises, takes the Gospels in hand, and like a "cruel tyrant" sets about tormenting innocent bystanders.⁹ In Bourges, one of Marguerite's domain territories and a strong center of evangelicalism, the guardian of the Franciscan house attacked Marguerite from the pulpit as a protector of heretics, saying that she deserved to be bound in a sack and thrown into the river.¹⁰

The reputation of members of Marguerite's network as heretics cost them heavily following the notorious Affair of the Placards. The simultaneous posting of such offensive texts on the night of 16-17 October 1534 on the street-corners of Paris and other major cities in the region bespoke a well-coordinated cabal. The Paris magistrates reacted immediately. They rounded up suspects and conducted speedy trials. Executions followed shortly. In January, the magistrates issued a most-wanted list of heretics who had escaped their grasp. Seventy-three names long, the roster contained many prominent figures, some of whom had previously been charged with heresy. It is clear that a few,

52 (1903), 209.

⁹ See Calvin's vivid report in Herminjard 3, no. 438, 107 [end of October, 1533].

¹⁰ The Franciscans at Bourges: "n'épargnèrent pas même la reine de Navarre, qu'ils regardaient comme la protectrice zélée des novateurs. Leur gardien, Toussaint Hémard, s'emporta jusqu'à dire en chaire qu'elle méritait qu'on l'enveloppât dans un sac et qu'on la jetât à la rivière," Louis-Hector Chandru de Raynal, *Histoire de Berry depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789*, 3 vols, (Bourges: Vermeil, 1844–1847), vol. 3, 344–345. For this undated event, Raynal cites cryptically "Bayle, V^o Junius," who, he

though by no means all, of the accused were responsible for the placarding. Notably, presumption and hard evidence had put the magistrates on the tracks of Marguerite's broad circle of contacts. Among those arrested, executed, or in flight were several of Marguerite's servants as well as members of an evangelical cell in Paris with whom she and her court were in direct contact.¹¹

Allied with the conservative theologians and jurists, Anne de Montmorency, Grand Master (1526) and then Constable of France (1538), and his faction led the attack against religious dissenters at court. There was thinly-veiled animosity between Montmorency and Marguerite from the 1530s onward. Faithful to this truth, if not, perhaps, to the exact events, the Abbot de Brantôme—one of the great gossips at the end of the century—recounted that when Montmorency became preeminent at court, he advised Francis that if he wanted to rid his kingdom of heresy, he had best start with his sister.¹²

By the mid-1520s, the image of the Navarrian network came into focus abroad as well. Ambassadors, merchants, humanist scholars, students, and refugees sent news of the simmering religious conflict in France. These witnesses—some hostile, some favorable—reported much the same information: Marguerite and her allies were championing the evangelical cause at court and in society at large. A comment by the

relates, in turn, cites, "Franciscus Junius, *In vita sua*, t. I. Oper."

¹¹ See Chapter 9 for a detailed exposition.

¹² Brantôme's account is credible since his grandmother and mother were members of Marguerite's court. See "Extraits de Brantôme," in Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaiglon, eds., *Heptaméron des nouvelles de très illustre princesse Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre*, 4 vols. (Paris: Eudes, 1880), vol. I, 133–34, citing, without page reference, Brantôme, *Dames célèbres*, in P. de Bourdeille, abbé de Brantôme, *Oeuvres complètes*, 11 vols., ed. L. Lalanne (Paris, 1864–82).

imperial ambassador in England, Chapuys, typifies Marguerite's reputation among Charles V's agents. At a loss to divine her purpose in sending a personal envoy to Henry VIII, he suggested ironically that "[Marguerite] is so good a Christian, and so well thought of by the University of Paris and other good people, that she wishes to receive the benediction of the catholic and canonical Pope of this country [i.e., Henry VIII]."¹³ Papal agents similarly doubted Marguerite's allegiance, for when she expressed loving support for Paul III in conversation with the Nuncio to France, he was greatly surprised.¹⁴

Among friends and allies abroad, Marguerite's reputation as champion of the evangelical cause in France grew through active collaboration with them. After 1530, when Reformation politics became a central factor in international affairs, Marguerite and her allies at court promoted a policy of political union with powers who had undertaken reforms and broken with Rome, since these powers' success abroad and France's political union with them were crucial factors for the success of the movement within France.¹⁵

¹³Chapuys to Granvelle, 13 December 1535, *Letters and Papers* 9, no. 965, 324–325. The passage quoted is the editors' English paraphrase of the original letter, for which they only give the reference "Vienna archives."

¹⁴ After an interview with Marguerite, the nuncio Dandino wrote to Cardinal Farnese from Melun (26–27 December 1540): "la quale [Marguerite of Navarre] mi raccolse tanto volentieri, et dimostrò di amare, osservare te odorare tanto Nostro Signore, et tanto esser gelosa che le cose sue passino bene, et con honore, ch'io per me restai con stupore grande di vedere tanta abbondantia d'amore," Lestocquoy 2, no. 5, 9.

¹⁵ In European international relations, "Reformation Politics" is the proper term for naming the external policy and occasionally coordinated action of England, the German princes and cities of the Empire, the Swiss cantons, and, as we will show, on important occasions, France. "Evangelical Politics" will not do, since these powers were more clearly united by their break or conflicts with Rome than by a similar understanding of 'evangelical doctrine' and its application to the 'reformation' of the church. Thomas A. Brady, Jr. has quite correctly restricted the term "Protestant Politics" to relations between the states within the Empire. See, Thomas A. Brady, Jr., *Protestant Politics: Jacob Sturm (1489–1553) and the German Reformation*, Studies in German Histories (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1995).

The episode occasioning Chapuy's scoffing remark about Marguerite seeking Henry VIII's benediction can stand as a foretaste of the Navarrians' extensive engagement with English affairs. An important letter to Luther from Bucer at the Diet of Augsburg, 25 August 1530, reveals an equally intensive Navarrian engagement with German evangelicals. Bucer reports that the German evangelicals were being urged by their brothers in France to settle their differences over the Eucharist. French evangelicals, he relates, believed that dissent in the Empire was obstructing the progress of the Gospel in France. Bucer stresses how promising the situation was in France since the king was not hostile to the Gospel and he was no longer so dependent on the good will of the Pope and Emperor now that his children had been released from captivity in Spain (July 1530). Bucer elaborates: "Next, that most Christian heroine, the king's sister, never fails in her duty. What is more, a great many of the nobles have found the path to truth." Significantly Bucer notes that the brothers in France had sent this information and were making this request at Marguerite's express order.¹⁶ In effect, Marguerite and the French evangelicals, according to what they told Bucer, believed that their success would depend

¹⁶ "Accepimus nuper literas à fratribus ex Galliis, qui scribunt admodum feliciter apud se Evangelium gliscere, sed ita cursui ejus obstare infelix hoc nostrum dissidium, ut, nisi componatur, haud sperent unquam futurum ut Galliæ Evangelium publicitus audiant. At si contingeret illud sedari, bona eis spes est brevi fore ut Christus publicum apud ipsos obtineat. Nam Rex à veritate alienus non est, et, jam recuperatis liberis, non adeò à Pontifice et Cæsare, hac quidem in causa, pendebit. Tum numquam suo officio deest Christianissima illa heroina Regis soror. Quin et procerum magnus numerus jam veritati accessit.... Hac ergo de causa, fratres qui illic sunt et redemptionem Israelis expectant persancte nos hortati sunt, idque jussu reginæ Navarræ, ut quam liceat diligentem operam demus, ut hoc tandem dissidium sopiatur, in quo certe ultrò currentibus calcar addiderunt." Herminjard 2, no. 305, 271–272. Cf. Bucer to Philip of Hesse, 27 August 1530, from Augsburg, with the same news in Max Lenz, ed., *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer*, 3 vols., Publicationen aus den Preußischen Staatsarchiven 5, 28, and 47 (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1965 [Leipzig, 1880–91]), vol. 1, no. 6, 21–25. Jourda buries this information in a note and does nothing with it, *Marguerite*, 161, note 153. Similarly, Imbart 3, 526 obfuscates the whole point of Bucer's letter to Luther.

in part upon their German brethren putting forward a united front by presenting a common confession of faith to the Emperor at Augsburg.

This communication between French and German evangelicals in 1530 was not the first, nor the most important. From the first notice of the ‘Lutheran affair’ in France (1519) to the Interim (1548), members of Marguerite’s network—students, scholars, and royal officials (often acting outside their assigned duties)—were in frequent, often furtive contact with evangelicals in the Empire. Unofficial contact between evangelical “brethren” across the border was a matter of both groups seeking to understand and to support one another. Less frequent, but of much greater potential effect, were the official diplomatic overtures to the Protestant powers of Germany, orchestrated by evangelicals at the French court, after the establishment of the Schmalkald League (1531). On several occasions, the faction to which Marguerite belonged at court attempted to create a durable alliance between France, the German Protestants, and England. Francis I’s ever unrequited desire to defeat Charles V and retake Milan, which necessitated a constant search for foreign mercenary troops and allies, provided the opportunity for this policy. As French evangelicals argued when promoting this alliance, it would address Francis’ military ambitions and impel him to favor their religious views.

Marguerite and her network’s relationship with evangelicals in the Swiss cantons was the most complex and decisive of all. Many of the Francophone reformers in Switzerland, most famously Guillaume Farel and John Calvin, had passed through French evangelical circles before seeking exile. Thereafter they maintained close ties with members of Marguerite’s network. Yet, after their initial intimate collaboration, the

exiles came increasingly to criticize their erstwhile companions' lack of zeal, and competed for influence over evangelicals in France. The story of their parting of ways, with tensions appearing as early as the years of the Meaux reform and escalating from the mid 1530s forward, is a central theme in the history of the Navarrian network.

Finally, Francis I, the chief arbiter of the Navarrians' fate in France, had no doubts about Marguerite's 'orthodoxy,' which he construed as unwavering loyalty to himself.¹⁷ Nevertheless, Francis I recognized that his sister harbored heterodox individuals who were likely targets of heresy accusations. In 1542, he ordered the Parlement of Bordeaux to transfer any future heresy cases brought against her servants in their courts to his privy council.¹⁸ Though Francis had by then decided to root out public heretics, he was not going to allow inquests to be used to diminish his beloved sister's honor and consequently his own majesty. The great challenge for Marguerite and her entourage was to convince Francis I that the only reformation that he would ever consider—a royal, Gallican one—should have at its heart the principles of their evangelical doctrine.

¹⁷ Such was Francis I's answer to Anne de Montmorency when the latter accused his sister of being a heretic. See Brantôme's report, cited in note 12.

¹⁸ "Le 30 décembre 1542, M. le président Brinon, retourné de la cour, a dit et déclaré qu'à son partir le président Montelon, garde des sceaux de France, lui avoit dit que le Roi entendoit que si aucuns personnages, serviteurs de la reine de Navarre, estoient chargés de crime d'hérésie que la cour n'en entreprist aucune cognoissance, mais qu'elle renvoiaست audit seigneur et a MM. de son Conseil privé," Jean de Métivier, *Chronique du Parlement de Bordeaux*, ed. Arthur de Brezet and Jules Delpit, 2 vols., Publications de la Société des Bibliophiles de Guyenne, (Bordeaux: Société des Bibliophiles, 1886–1887), 273. Francis had just given her, in effect, the ultimate level of immunity. Normally, cases evoked from the parlements went to his *Grand conseil*, a formal, royal high court, staffed with jurists, that met *ad hoc*, traveled with the court, and, generally, was an instrument of his will. His privy council was not a court, but rather his inner-most circle of hand-picked advisors.

Self Identity

When Claude Baduel, rector of the University of Nîmes, wrote to Philip Melanchthon in 1550, it was to announce the close of one era and the opening of another:

It happened that the queen's [Marguerite's] favor for me and my compatriots, though not completely withheld, was nevertheless lessened by certain wicked men, whose names you can guess, so that she no longer conducted herself as she had before. At last, not long ago, having been summoned by the Lord, she was snatched away from this our earthly life. Now, we here are plunged into the greatest confusion in all our affairs, especially in the matter of religion. In this regard, we have only so much solace as is brought to us by the teaching of God's word *or* the Genevan church, which is near by. That church's remarkable piety and well-being shines forth with its most clear light and splendor into our city to illuminate the pitch darkness in which we have been enveloped. In truth, John Chambard [Calvin] whom I knew previously at Strasbourg when with Bucer, through that piety, sound teaching, and strength of soul that you know so well, consoles us in our deepest misfortune frequently and powerfully with his letters.¹⁹

Claude Baduel was announcing to the German Protestant world that, in effect, the Navarrian network's functional life had died with Marguerite. Facing the persecutions unleashed by the new king, Henry II, Baduel felt that no worldly hope was left to French evangelicals except in the 'shining' example of Calvin and Geneva. Indeed, the next year he himself would emigrate there.

¹⁹ "Accessit etiam quod voluntas reginae non illa quidem a me aut meis civibus fuit alienata sed tamen a quibusdam impiis hominibus quos tu intelligere potes ita immutata ut ea non amplius esset quae ante fuerat ea tandem nobis erepta est nuper ex hac vita a domino [95 v.] evocata. Nunc iis in locis summa in confusione rerum omnium versamur praecipue religionis in qua quidem tantum solatiis habemus quantum aut doctrina verbi dei aut ecclesia Gebenensis a nobis non ita remota nobis affert cujus ecclesiae insignis pietas et sanitas in ea civitate ita elucet ut durissimas tenebras quibus hic sumus circumfusi clarissimo lumine suo splendoreque illustret.

Ioannis quidem Chambardus quem Argentinae apud Bucerum aliquando cognovi ea pietate doctrina spiritus virtute quam tu nosti nos in maximis calamitatibus suis literis frequenter graviterque consolatur. Cum dico nos intelligo etiam alios bonos ac pios homines quorum in utroque genere tum virorum tum mulierum non exiguus est numerus sed praecipue pauperum quorum semper fides in evangelio maximopere floruit et praestitit. Haec virorum communio ac conjunctio in tanta ecclesiae dissipatione nos ita confirmat ut adhuc stare in gratia domini et consolatione cordis satis bene videamur." BPF, ms. 186/2, f.

Until his departure Baduel was an important member of the network. In the same letter, he recalls how Melancthon's recommendation some sixteen years earlier had convinced Marguerite to finance his education for seven years and, subsequently, to select him as the first Rector of the new University of Nîmes. Despite his assertion to Melancthon that Marguerite's zeal had recently diminished, when he wrote to a colleague the previous year (1549), Baduel had still been able to claim that she would support his application for a teaching post at the Protestant academy of Lausanne.²⁰

Thirty years earlier the network had knit together and its group consciousness had come to life. The letters from Marguerite, Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Gérard Roussel, and others from the Meaux group to each other, Guillaume Farel, as well as their brethren in Southern Germany and the Swiss Cantons leave no doubt about their collective action and sense of solidarity with an international evangelical movement.

In an otherwise critical report to Farel in 1524, one of the lesser lights among the Meaux group, Nicolas Le Sueur, lauds Marguerite's leadership. Deploring that persecution had kept the more enlightened among them chained to the "Pharisaical yoke," he relates, "But above all, one person, the most Christian and most illustrious Duchess, sticks with us; she secures for us the king's favor. Her faith has been preserved, which, as James declares, is known through deeds [cf. James 2:14-24]."²¹ Two years later, after

93v-97r.: [number 105 in the original Avignon manuscript of Baduel's letters].

²⁰ Baduel to Reginaldo (Renaud d'Alen) [1549] on his plans to go to Lausanne: "Ea in re me etiam Regina Navarrae sua autoritate et commendatione iuvaret," BPF, ms. 186/1, f. 18r-19r: [Avignon ms, no. 21].

²¹ "Qui sunt ex nostris illuminatiores, adhuc pharisiaco jugo subduntur....Una pre ceteris nobis

the Meaux group had returned from their exile during the king's captivity, Pierre Toussain—formerly a disciple of Erasmus, at that time an outspoken evangelical at the French court, and subsequently a reformed pastor in Switzerland—reported to Écolampadius in a similar vein that while Briçonnet, Lefèvre, and Roussel lacked spirit, Marguerite was filled with zeal for the Gospel: “I have spoken frequently with the Duchess of Alençon. ... We have often discussed how to promote the Gospel of Christ. Spreading the Gospel is her explicit wish, but not just hers, it is the King's desire as well; nor does their mother [Louise of Savoy] oppose their efforts.”²² Marguerite herself acknowledged early on that she and those whom she was protecting were “united in the same spirit and same faith” with those in Strasbourg and further afield who sought to disseminate “the word of truth.”²³

Members of the network made similar declarations during the thirty years between their heady beginnings at Meaux to Baduel's announcement of its dark hour after Marguerite's death. The Navarrians' sense of common purpose, of solidarity with foreign evangelicals, and of fervent but nervous, often disappointed hopes for the propagation of the Gospel, “the word of truth,” is vivid. In keeping with the Apostle James' dictum,

relicta et christianissima et serenissima duce, quæ nobis regium conciliet favorem; apud quam istec reposita fides quam testatur Jacobus ex operibus notam.” 15 May [1524], Herminjard 1, no. 102, 217–218.

²² “Clarissimam Alenconia Ducem sum sæpe alloquutus. ... Multum sumus confabulati de promovendo Christi Evangelio, quod solum est illi in votis, nec illi solum verum etiam Regi ipsi, nec horum conatibus refragatur mater.” 26 July [1526], Herminjard 1, no. 181, 446.

²³ In her letter to Sigismund von Hohenlohe, 6 March 1526, Marguerite describes the Meaux group whom he had supported at Strasbourg as “ceux qu'unissent un même esprit et une même foi” and voices the hope, “... qu'avec votre secours la parole de vérité sera entendue.” Herminjard 1, no. 171, 421. In a similar vein, Roussel, speaking as a representative of the Meaux group specifically and French evangelicals generally, had expressed their solidarity with evangelical goals of Écolampadius and other reformers outside France, (24 August 1524), Herminjard 1, no. 118, 274–278.

invoked by Le Sueur, the principal task in the chapters to follow will be to assess what all this amounted to in deeds.

II. Sources for Reconstructing the Navarrian Network

Reconstituting a network whose members came from many segments of French society presents special difficulties. Unlike the conservative party led by the Faculty of Theology and Parlement at Paris, the Navarrian network had no institutional structure and thus left no corporate records. To find the network we must start by assembling the known evidence about Marguerite and other major figures like the du Bellay brothers and Gérard Roussel. By tracing the connections between these leaders and a host of less well known figures and events, we can measure the broad extent of this evangelical network.

The primary sources available for reconstructing their history are a varied, intriguing, and problematic body of documents. Letters, financial registers, notarial records, marriage contracts, wills, journals, heresy trial minutes, royal edicts, and, not least, religious books provide differing but complementary information. Royal edicts, account books, and legal documents allow us to establish the fiscal and administrative powers that Marguerite, chief among others, exercised. Letters, book dedications, and even the humble payment receipt exhibit the ties of authority, patronage, or fraternity that connected Navarrians. More importantly, letters and dedications may reveal their views, the inner workings of their projects, as well as conflicts with adversaries. Books attest to their doctrines as well as deeds, for given the laws against heterodox works, their publishing of evangelical ones was, to coin a phrase, “to commit a book.” In France,

many an author, printer, bookseller, or reader in France suffered death for trading in illegal ideas. Mere ownership of heretical books was damning enough evidence to send one to the stake. Writing and publishing evangelical treatises were thus a dangerous acts that necessarily constituted bold overtures in the public battle over religion. In this way, books are evidence of the deeds as well as the ideas of evangelicals.

As rich as these sources are, when we try to recount the events and locate the actors of the network as a continuous narrative, we are often reduced to silence. Significant gaps in the records block our access to those years. However, there is enough evidence to piece together several important “action sequences”²⁴ from the beginning of the Meaux experiment (1521-1525) to the early years of Henry II reign (1547-1559). While each sequence only describes a short segment of the network’s total action, they allow us to calculate trajectories to other events and actors attested in sources, which in turn permits an assessment of whether these strands of evidence fit the pattern of the Navarrian network’s doctrine and deeds. When combined and compared, these reconstructed action sequences allow us to approximate the group’s total activity.

²⁴ I borrow this term from the sociologist Robert Wuthnow, “*Action sequences* ... refer to the behavior of culture producers and consumers and the decisions of patrons, censors, political leaders, and others who affect the behavior of culture producers and their audiences. These actions often remain shrouded in the historical record, or are too idiosyncratic to be amenable to systematization. Yet the very concept of action sequences serves as an important placeholder: it reminds us of the importance of human agency, even if that agency occurs within the constraints of institutional structures, and it reminds us that cultural innovations do not emerge full-blown all at once but are the result of years and decades, and for this reason have a sequential effect on their own development.” *Communities of Discourse: Ideology and Social Structure in the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and European Socialism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 7.

For the purpose of this study, an action sequence is an episode or a discrete set of events that we can reconstruct from primary sources. In them, one observes members of the Navarrian network articulating their ‘cultural ideas’ or evangelical ‘discourse’ as well as attempting to implement them in order to reshape the social and political order. Pace Wuthnow, they are amenable to interpretative analysis if not

Correspondence

Marguerite of Navarre's correspondence is one of the richest resources for this study.²⁵ Relatively abundant—over 1450 letters are known, of which roughly half are extant—it is a revealing record, yet most often in roundabout ways. It has survived very unevenly, with a great proportion of the extant letters pertaining to administrative matters, a pattern easily explained. Marguerite regularly asked recipients to burn missives from her and consigned ones she received to the flames when they concerned the sensitive topics.²⁶ While contemporaries worried mainly about the privacy of their messages in transit, Marguerite had the additional concern of ensuring that written evidence did not fall into the wrong hands after reception.²⁷ So it is no surprise that Marguerite's letters

to "systematization." In turn, they serve as the strings of evidence or stories for weaving a larger history.

²⁵ The introduction to appendix A presents an overview of the survival rate of her correspondence and discusses its complicated editing situation. There follows a list of addition and corrections to the *Répertoire de la correspondance de Marguerite d'Angoulême* by Pierre Jourda and V.-L. Saulnier. Appendices B contains transcriptions of over [80] unpublished letters and quotations from primary sources that mention over [40] more lost ones.

²⁶ Three examples of Marguerite's efforts to cover her tracks survive: 1) Marguerite of Navarre to Francis I [Argentan or Alençon, February 1521], "Ennattendant set heur de vous povoyr voyr et parler a vous syre le desir que jenne me presse de tres humblemant vous supplier que sy ce ne vous est ennuy le me ferre dire par ce porteur ... sy vous plet ensevelir mes lettres au feu et la parolle en silense aultrement vous renderyes: 'Pis que morte ma doloureuse vie/ Vivant en vous de la seule esperance./ Dont le savour me couse l'assurance./ Sans que james de vous je me deffie....'" Génin 2, 26; (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. ??). 2) Marguerite of Navarre to Jehan de Frotté, [7 April 1540], Mont-de-Marsan: "Frotte. J'ay receu la lecture que du xxvi^e jour de mars m'avez escripte avecques la billet qui estoit dedans qui m'a esté bien grant plaisir. et apres l'avoir lue je lay mis au feu." In Pierre Bruyère, "Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre," *Société historique et archéologique de l'Orne* 112 (1993) 146–147; (uncatalogued). 3) Marguerite of Navarre to Guillaume Feau, sr. d'Izernay, 30 December [1542], "P.S. J'ay bruslé vostre lettre." Génin 1, 375–379, 379; (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 912).

²⁷ This may be one reason why we have, with one important exception, no dossiers of letters received by Marguerite and none of her secretaries' minute books or copies of outgoing correspondence. The one telling exception is BnF ms. f.fr. 11.495 which is a faircopy of her epistolary exchange with Guillaume Briçonnet. No other copies of these letters are known, though there were other copies made and circulated at the time. Marguerite wanted their exchange for future reference. See Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, 2–3, and chapters 7 for further discussion.

Portions of Marguerite's correspondence may also have been destroyed through misfortune. Some of Marguerite's papers may have perished in the same fires, which likely took Gérard Roussel's papers at

functioned as bills of credence asking the recipient to trust its bearer who would deliver her message orally. Many important communications thus flew from the lips of couriers or tongues of flame into the dumb air. In the letters that do survive much of what remains are but veiled allusions to the substantive issues.

This deliberate obfuscation requires us to infer meanings and intentions—an admittedly dangerous procedure—by comparing her letters with the extant reports of those to whom she opened her mind. Her secrecy is itself testimony to the pressures she faced in the battles over church and state. Moreover, it is fully comprehensible when one counts up the dozens whom she supported who were harassed, jailed, fined, chased abroad, banished, or executed on charges of heresy.²⁸

Despite these limitations, we can use her correspondence in several ways. The list of her correspondents and people mentioned in the letters points to the circles with whom she worked. Analysis of her relationship with these people allows us to locate the core members of her active network. Even so, this list is not all inclusive. Some important figures, known from other sources, are never named in her extant letters. The letters also reveal in a general way her network's activities, although Marguerite and her correspondents rarely discuss in them their plans or principles in matters of state and

Pau (1716) and at Lescar (1787), which "destroyed most of the records pertaining to the religious history of [Béarn]. Only a few archival documents survive today," as Paul J. Landa relates in "The reformed theology of Gerard Roussel, Bishop of Oloron (1536–1555), based upon a critical edition of his 'Familiere exposition du simbole, de la loy et oraison dominical en forme d Colloque' and his 'Forme de visite de diocese (c. 1548),' " Ph.D. Thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1976, (Ann Arbor: University Microfilm, 1977), 53, note 2.

Almost all the papers of her last secretary, Jean de Frotté, were destroyed during the French Revolution. See Le Comte H. de La Ferrière-Percy, *Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François I^{er}. Son livre de dépenses (1540–1549), Étude sur ses dernières années*, (Paris: Aubry, 1862; reprint Calmann-

religion. Only in her exchange of letters with Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet (1521-1524), does Marguerite broach such matters with relative freedom. Apart from that exchange, we have to piece together from other sources her extensive projects to promote a religio-political agenda. The reports of diplomats and reformers to others reveal her repeated attempts to cooperate with German Protestants and the English during the 1530s and 1540s, yet in the few dozen letters surviving between her and them, they never discuss these projects openly.

Similarly, the correspondence of the members of the Navarrian network is meager. Most curiously, there are hardly any letters extant from the Meaux group after their return to France in 1526. From after that date, only four letters to Roussel, three from Caroli, one from d'Arande, and none from Lefèvre survive. Indeed, most of the letters that remain from the Meaux group prior to 1527 come from the papers of Farel and other erstwhile colleagues in Switzerland and Strasbourg. A.J. Herminjard drew upon such collections to establish his rich *Correspondance des réformateurs* (1509-1546). So monumental was the scholarship of these nine volumes that they have come to dominate our picture of the early reformation in France. And yet, this has been a barrier to further progress. Skewed as these sources are to Swiss developments, especially to the work of Farel, Calvin, and Viret, they are less helpful for understanding the situation in France in the 1530s and 1540s, when French and Swiss evangelicals increasingly diverged over doctrine and tactics for implementing reform.

Lévy, 1891), 2–3.

²⁸ The casualty list is extensive and will become apparent in the course of this study.

Our evidence about the Navarrian network after 1526 comes from further afield. The letters of agents such as Pierre Toussain, Jean and René du Bellay, Claude Baduel, and Jean Boyssoné, provide illuminating, but irregular information. Given Marguerite's patronage of poets and scholars, their correspondence has proved disappointing. Indeed, the letters of French literary figures do not seem to have survived in great numbers, nor have they been edited assiduously²⁹ when compared with the monumental editions devoted to humanists and reformers, even of the second tier, of other nations.³⁰ Thus, even at second hand, the correspondence of Erasmus, Luther, Bucer, Melanchthon, Farel, Calvin, Zwingli and others provide important evidence about the situation in France and the role of Marguerite and her agents.

The edited correspondence of ambassadors and major political figures offers the most abundant information about the Navarrian network.³¹ The *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*, the *Correspondance des nonces en France*, and the dispatches of ambassadors Marillac, Jean and Guillaume du Bellay, Guillaume Pellicier, and François Tournon are the only sources that allow us to follow the network's activities with any continuity.³²

²⁹ For the first half of the Sixteenth Century, few major literary figures, apart from Guillaume Budé, François Rabelais, Étienne Dolet, and Jean de Boyssoné have had their correspondence inventoried or published.

³⁰ The list is long, including not just Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Zwingli, Calvin, and Beza, but also Œcolampadius, Farel, the brothers Blaurer, Julius Pflug, Beatus Rhenanus, Amerbach, Wolfgang Capito, Vadian, Hubert Languet, Sleidan, and many more.

³¹ Two crucial lacunae among the diplomatic sources for the reign of Francis I are his own letters and those of Anne de Montmorency. Editing their correspondence, which is readily available at the BnF and Musée de Condé, Chantilly, has evidently been too daunting a task. Francis Decrue drew upon these letters extensively for his study, *Anne de Montmorency*, 2 vols. (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1885–89; reprint, vol. 1, Geneva: Mégariotis Reprints, 1978).

³² Jourda consulted these edited sources to establish his *Répertoire* of Marguerite's letters, but he

Serial Sources

This rubric covers a multitude of official and institutional documents. Some of Marguerite's household accounts have been edited, providing employment information on members of her court, which was one branch of the network.

The official records of heresy trials, book seizures, and other police actions—however much tainted by the views of the official accusers—are among the few sources that reveal what doctrines French evangelicals taught and how their listeners received them. This study relies upon several such documents published or analyzed in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*.

Also indispensable are the collections of the official acts of Francis I's reign. The *Catalogue des actes de François Premier* presents a quasi-complete listing of the edicts, personnel, itinerary, spending, and extraordinary taxes of Francis' government. It offers information on many of Marguerite's appointees to royal office. The full texts of a selection of Francis' official *actes* through 1539 can be found in the *Ordonnances de François Premier*. Regrettably, body of records survive from the nerve-centers of Francis I's regime: his high court (*grand conseil*) and privy council.³³ For the records of the several Parlements we have to rely on what has been culled from the archives in the secondary literature since no editions have been devoted to the registers of their various judicial or executive activities. The registers of the Faculty of Theology in Paris have

only partially exploited their content in writing his biography, often ignoring material about her diplomatic activities that did not fit his thesis.

³³Noël [Joseph-Marie] Valois, *Étude historique sur le conseil du roi, introduction à l'inventaire des arrêtes du conseil d'État*, (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1886), cxxxi, cxi–cxlii.

been edited by Duplessis d'Argentré, A. Clerval, Léopold Delisle, and James K. Farge.

Along with Farge's studies of its doctors, these editions provide a thorough record of this pillar of Gallican orthodoxy.

Chronicles and Histories

The journals of Louise of Savoy, Nicolas Versoris, Pierre Driart, and the 'Bourgeois of Paris' are exceptional sources, offering vivid accounts of events. Most importantly, even though their authors were members of the elite, they open up the world of public opinion. The people's views on war, increased taxes, heavenly portents, deaths, births, marriages, miracles, public processions, festivals, royal entries, acts of iconoclasm, executions, plague, famine and fire, all figure prominently in their entries. Indeed, these highly charged accounts reflect how the public experienced the increasing burden of royal government and the growth of religious dissent. Notably, these journals testify that Parisians were particularly disturbed by the threat of heresy. The great battles between conservatives and evangelicals were in large part fought to gain public opinion.

Before the sixteenth century was out, the confessional victors—the Catholics and Calvinists—battled to retell and interpret the events of Francis' reign in histories, memoirs, and biographies. Brantôme's several collective biographies, Jean Sleidan's *Histoire de l'estat de la religion*, Jean Crespin's *Histoire des martyrs*, Theodore de Beza's *Life of Calvin (Ioannis Calvinii vita)* and *Icones*, the *Histoire ecclésiastique* (written at Geneva, attributed to Beza), and Florimond de Raemonde's response to the latter, *Histoire de la naissance ... de l'hérésie de ce siècle*, are but the most prominent

examples. Marguerite and her immediate circle are discussed in many of these works from their different perspectives. On the other hand, though we might expect 'insider' source histories like *Mémoires* of Guillaume and Martin du Bellay or the *Histoire de Béarn et Navarre (1517-1572)* by Jeanne d'Albret's court historiographer, Nicholas de Bordinave,³⁴ would provide vital information, they contain no substantive mention of Marguerite, Gérard Roussel, or the efforts of the du Bellays to bring about a concord with the German Protestants. All these Protestant and Catholic historians, in one way or another, appropriated, framed, and thus obscured the story of French evangelicals' unsuccessful reforming project to suit the collective memory of the confessional 'winners.'

Four hundred years later, Lucien Febvre demanded that historians throw off the blinders of confessional historiography.³⁵ Since, however, we cannot avoid consulting such partisan accounts, we must establish an index of their reliability by comparing their treatments of events with primary sources.

Literary Sources

A large body of religious writing was published in French during Francis I's reign. Much of it was evangelical and constitutes an important basis for this study. Rare and often anonymous, the numbers, content, and importance of the heterodox books in this

³⁴ The *Histoire de la Navarre* is wholly devoid of interest for this study. Composed at the order of Queen Jeanne d'Albret and attributed to Nicolas Bordenave, her former court historiographer, who completed it circa 1591, it remained in manuscript until it was edited by Paul Raymond, *Société de l'Histoire de France* (Paris: Renouard, 1873).

³⁵ Lucien Febvre, "Une question mal posée: les origines de la Réforme française et le problème des causes de la Réforme," chapter in, *Au cœur religieux du XVI^e siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris: École Pratique des

corpus have long remained obscure. Over one hundred years of bibliographical scholarship has begun to clear up this picture by establishing the printer and in some cases the author of many clandestine works.³⁶

A significant portion of evangelical writings were penned or published by members of the Navarrian network, including Marguerite herself.³⁷ This study aims to show that these books constituted a coherent body of literature through which Navarrians intended to promote their political and religious agenda. Beyond an extensive number of biblical translations (69 editions), upwards of 200 titles in some 450 editions—most of them between eight and eighty pages—originated within the Navarrian network.³⁸ This literary corpus is significant in four regards.

First, several works were polemical, interpreting current events in order to bend popular opinion to the Navarrian position. The *Sentence de frere Jehan Guibert* (Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1527) advertised that this publicly known companion of the Meaux group had been acquitted of heresy charges. Conservatives responded with *La grande Irrision des Lutheriens de Meaulx* (1528). Polemical tracts like these, as is well known, played a major role in forming public opinion during the German Reformation and later

Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1983 [1951]), 90–95; reprinted from, *Revue historique* 161 (1929).

³⁶ Until Francis Higman's landmark 1996 bibliography, *Piety and the People: Religious Printing in French, 1511–1551*, which brings together the fruits of this scholarship, including his own extensive contribution, the extent of this literature had never been measured.

³⁷ See Appendix B for a reference list of these works and a discussion of the criteria used for classifying a work as 'Navarrian'. Essentially, manuscripts and printed works are included for which there exists substantial evidence that they were published, translated, or written by printers and authors otherwise identifiable as members of the network.

³⁸ These figures are derived from an analysis of appendix B 1: "The Books of the Navarrian Network." See chapter 7 for discussion of the beginnings of Navarrian network's vernacular publishing campaign.

during the French wars of religion.³⁹ The Navarrian network's attempt to use pamphlets as a tool for shaping public opinion will be taken up in due course.

Second, the Navarrian network helped introduce French people to the religious ideas that was stirring German lands. Nathaniel Weiss, W.G. Moore, Francis Higman, and others have established that 21 works by Luther (in 44 editions) reached France in translation before 1551.⁴⁰ The focus of this study allows us to see that 16 of these translations were first published by printers in the Navarrian network. Their publication of this 'anonymous' Luther formed a considerable segment of their publishing program.

Third, two dozen of the Navarrian books are catechetical guides explaining basic Christian belief and practice for the laity. Notably, these tracts engage the issues for which evangelical preachers were most often accused of heresy: the sacraments, indulgences, the cult of the saints and Mary. Since the Navarrians never published a formal creed, surveying these works allow us to establish the major tenants of their doctrines as well as assess the disputed question of the consistency of their religious thought.

Fourth, while many of these tracts propound social and political doctrines, in chief obedience to religious and secular authorities, trial records reveal that the lay audiences of the network's preachers and books sometimes took violent action over religious issues

³⁹ For the latter see Robert O. Lindsay and John Neu, *French Political Pamphlets 1547–1648: A Catalog of Major Collections in American Libraries* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).

⁴⁰ Higman, *Piety*, nos. L 79 – L 122. Anonymous translated excerpts of Luther appeared in over a dozen other texts noted by Higman.

despite such admonitions. Close analysis of these texts in their social context provides illuminating evidence about the reception of the Navarrian message.

In addition to printed books, a few manuscripts provide significant information about Navarrian doctrine and goals. The first, BnF ms. fond français 419, contains the *Familière Exposition* and the *Somme de visite de diocèse* of Marguerite's almoner, Bishop Gérard Roussel.⁴¹ Although they never made it to print as intended, they are our best evidence about the episcopal reform program he implemented in the diocese of Oloron. When compared with the few traces of his preaching at Meaux and Paris, Roussel is seen to have adopted a strong and consistent approach to the issues of liturgical reform and catechesis and the practical problems of implementation.

A second manuscript, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal réserve 5096, offers an inside look at the views of the circle immediately around Marguerite. This beautifully illuminated work contains an anonymous translation of two catechisms by the Lutheran Johannes Brenz along with an evangelical treatise on confession compiled for her (circa 1529). Roussel and Simon Du Bois are thought to have been involved in its creation. Indeed, the tenor of these texts and the additions to the texts by Brenz exhibit strong similarities with Roussel's texts from the late 1540s.⁴²

⁴¹ Paul J. Landa edited these texts as a principal part of his dissertation, see note 27.

⁴² The first of its three parts, a catechism by Johannes Brenz in translation, has been edited by Marc Venard, "Un catéchisme offert à Marguerite de Navarre," *BSHPF* 142 (1996), 5–32. The second section contains a second, larger catechism by Brenz and the third an important evangelical tract on auricular confession to laymen and to priests. See chapter 8.

In sum, the Navarrians' books, both printed and in manuscript, show the hitherto unrecognized public face of their program for the renewal of the faith, their socially conservative ideology, and their forceful apologetics.

III. Dramatis Personae

To establish a credible profile of Marguerite and her network, we need to answer some elementary questions: What qualities enabled Marguerite to become a leader of this network? What in her religious views and character prompted her to support evangelicals? Who were the members of the network? What platform did they share?

The Evangelicals' Champion

Official Powers and Personal Sway

Marguerite's *curriculum vitae* centers on one fact: she was the sole sibling of Francis I, King of France from 1515 to 1547. As Francis' beloved sister, she enjoyed a explicit powers and much implicit authority. Yet her kinship with the king does not fully explain the considerable influence she exerted during her adult life. In addition, she was intelligent, well-educated, a gifted writer, and an able negotiator of court politics and foreign relations. Moreover she had, if not blazing charisma, a warmth that won her the trust and respect of many people.⁴³ Most important was her love for her brother. She filled her letters to him with declarations of her absolute devotion. After his death, she

⁴³ See the glowing reports of Marguerite's abilities and greatness of soul by the Duke of Norfolk, *Letters and Papers* 15, no. 223, 79–80; Pierre Toussain, as in note 58; and the aforementioned papal Nuncio, as in note 14.

expressed an extreme sense of loss in her *La navire ou consolation du Roi François Ier à sa soeur Marguerite*.⁴⁴ During their lifetime, Marguerite and Francis were linked by bonds of affection that made her a potent advocate at court.

Birth, marriage, and royal favor bestowed prodigious powers on Marguerite. She was born 11 April 1492 to Louise of Savoy and Charles, Count of Angoulême in the Château of Angoulême.⁴⁵ From her brother's birth two years later until the time she died as Queen of Navarre on 21 December 1549 at the Château d'Odos in the County of Bigorre, bordering the Pyrenees, her fortune was linked to Francis.⁴⁶ Before her brother came to power, Marguerite's political worth was determined by French crown's control over and policy towards cadet branches of the royal line and the most powerful noble families. French kings had long sought to graft collateral, princely bloodlines into the royal house through marriage. From the time of Charles VIII to Henry IV, there were four major houses (*races*) of princes of the royal blood. In order of closeness to the crown, they were the Orléans (whose Louis succeeded his cousin Charles VIII), Angoulême, Alençon, and Bourbon. A further strategy for augmenting royal power was to marry into the royal house heirs to the several still independent seigneuries in the kingdom. At the turn of the sixteenth century, five families controlled these territories: Brittany, Angoulême, Alençon, Bourbon, and Albret.

⁴⁴ Ed. Robert Marichal (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1956).

⁴⁵ Jourda, *Marguerite* 1, 3.

⁴⁶ As recorded in the Bible of Claude Régis, Marguerite's master of requests and subsequently Bishop of Oloron, copied in BnF ms. ff. 2751, f. 2.

With the accession of Louis XII in 1498, Marguerite's status rose together with her brother's. Francis stood next in line for the throne should Louis XII die without a legitimate son. Recognizing that likelihood, in 1514 Louis married Francis to his eldest daughter, Claude, heiress to Brittany through her mother. Francis' accession the following year reunited his Angoulême and Valois to the crown. Claude's Brittany would later be incorporated through their son, Henry II. On 2 December 1509, while Francis was still only heir-apparent, Marguerite was married to Charles d'Alençon, second in line for the throne.⁴⁷ This duke was also the chief claimant to the independent county of Armagnac. The royal house, Angoulême, and Albret had also staked rival claims on this inheritance. With Marguerite's marriage to Charles, Francis gave up his own pretensions, and after his accession he quashed all other claims, thus securing the Alençons' right to Armagnac.

Marguerite and Charles, who died 11 April 1525, had no children.⁴⁸ Since he was the last legitimate male of his house, Alençon and Armagnac escheated to the crown, though Marguerite kept the usufruct of them during her life. When she married Henri d'Albret, King of Navarre in January 1527 she associated these two territories with his extensive holdings in the south.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Jourda, *Marguerite* 1, 34.

⁴⁸ Jourda, *Marguerite* 1, 105. A notarized copy of Charles' will is in BnF Clairambault 324, f. 283.

⁴⁹ The marriage contract of Marguerite and Henri d'Albret was signed 3 January 1527, see Jourda, *Marguerite* 1, 146. They had but one child, who survived to adulthood, Jeanne d'Albret. She would eventually marry Antoine de Bourbon, heir to the Bourbon line. After the extinction of the Valois line (Henry II's four sons, Francis II, Charles IX, Henry III, and the Duke d'Anjou all died without male heir), this couple bore the future Henry IV who brought with him to the crown, the independent seigneuries of Armagnac, Albret, and Bourbon, effectively uniting to the crown the remaining major seigneuries within

Thus, Marguerite came to share control over three of the four major independent seigneuries in the kingdom, Alençon, d'Armagnac, and d'Albret. Early in his reign, Francis gave her in *apanage*⁵⁰ the Duchy of Berry as well as the County and city of Bourges, which she ruled independently of her husbands. Francis I also gave important military commands in the provinces to her spouses, naming Charles d'Alençon governor of Normandy and Henri d'Albret governor of Aquitaine.

Marguerite exercised or participated with her husbands in the rule over a swath of lands in western France, starting in the north with Normandy (including Alençon), passing southeast through Bourges and Berry, then south and west from Rodez, Foix, Bigorre, Béarn, Basse-Navarre, Albret, and Armagnac, over which the military governorship of Aquitaine extended. Marguerite and her husbands had rights over the nomination of administrative officers, received income from rents and other seigniorial dues, and had extensive police powers. These powers brought with them prestige and authority to sway other corporations and judicial bodies.

Marguerite's proximity to the crown gave her access to other political roles. Contemporary poets highlighted her special place when they called Louise of Savoy, Francis I, and Marguerite, the "royal trinity" during the early years of 'their' reign. Reports by ambassadors reveal that this image corresponded to reality. In 1525 the trinity operated in spectacular fashion. While Louise ruled as regent, Marguerite led the

France. Alençon escheated to the crown after Marguerite's death.

⁵⁰ An *apanage* territory was a part of the royal domain whose title, administration, and usufruct were given by the king, typically, to a younger son. The gift was heritable, like royal blood, through the male line. If this ended, the territory then reverted to royal administration. When such lands were given to female relatives, they automatically returned to the crown at their death irrespective of husband or children.

delegation to Charles V in Spain to negotiate her brother's release after he had been captured at the battle of Pavia. Over the course of Francis' reign, she was a frequent participant in his privy council, whose membership circulated among a small group of leading courtiers. In this nerve-center of the monarchy, Francis' councilors had charge of all diplomatic correspondence and consulted him almost daily on all major matters of state. When Marguerite was 'in' at court, she had a voice in affairs and greater access to the lines of communication that sustained royal decision-making. Diplomats considered her to be able, informed, and, when close to her brother, very influential. In 1544, an Italian ambassador reported that he thought her the 'best woman in the world,' because of her charm, political tact, and her understanding of religion.⁵¹ Ambassadors whom she favored often took her advice about advancing their causes. Most remarkable was the case of England. After 1534, she regularly instructed English ambassadors how to strengthen relations between their two masters.

In domestic affairs, Marguerite helped to fill a large number of lucrative and powerful posts. These included Francis I's financial, military, and judicial officers, his household servants, and, not least, after the Concordat of Bologna, the prelacies of the realm.⁵² Marguerite's recommendation, especially for an office or prelacy within one of her domains, often ensured the candidate's selection. As the follow chapters will show in

⁵¹ Jourda, *Marguerite* 1, 285.

⁵² For a brief and by no means exhaustive account of her influence—compared, among others, with Louise of Savoy and Francis I's mistress, Anne d'Etampes—in the nomination of bishops, see Marilyn M. Edelstein, "Church Patronage in France on the Eve of the Reformation," in *Renaissance Society and Culture: Essays in Honor of Eugene F. Rice, Jr.*, ed. John Monfasani and Roland G. Musto (New York: Italica Press, 1991), 33–49.

more detail, her role as king's councilor and broker of patronage were central to the creation and operation of her network.

Beyond these overtly political functions, Marguerite had responsibilities and rights as a noblewoman. One might characterize them as 'domestic' roles since nobles—a socio-economic class from a modern perspective—regarded themselves as an extended family. Yet they fully recognized that every major life-event—birth, marriage, and death—had important political consequences. In Marguerite's case, family politics both limited her ability as well as provided her with opportunities to lead her network. What, then, was Marguerite's 'domestic' role in the dynastic politics of child-rearing and marriage-making?

In seventeen years of marriage, despite oft-repeated hopes, prayers, and pilgrimages, Marguerite did not have any children with Charles d'Alençon. Their childlessness, in its day, was an important political fact. Henry VIII's case shows in extreme form how important the failure to produce a male heir could be. Charles d'Alençon's house died out upon his death and his lands escheated to the crown. Contemporaries must have wondered why they could not have children. Was she barren? Was he infertile? No answers appear in the sources, but their failure to produce an heir certainly troubled Marguerite greatly.⁵³ However, within two years of her second marriage to Henri d'Albret, Marguerite gave birth to a daughter, Jeanne, on 16 November

⁵³ Louise of Savoy and Marguerite's inquiry about St. Anne, patroness of infertile women occasioned Lefèvre's reassessment of the legend of Mary's mother. See chapter 4.

1528.⁵⁴ Prior to this, whatever contemporaries may have known or thought they knew about her fertility, calculations based on her childlessness and the possibility of remaining so must have weighed heavily when judging her 'reproductive' political worth. This issue was fundamental for all involved when in 1516, Francis settled the *heritable* rights of Armagnac on the house of Alençon, and when in 1525, recently widowed, as part of the negotiations after Pavia Francis I considered offering her hand in marriage to Charles V, and when in December 1526 the young Henri d'Albret agreed to marry the thirty-four year old Marguerite.

The history of Marguerite's pregnancies after the birth of Jeanne is a succession of dashed hopes. 15 July 1530 their son Jean was born, but he died on Christmas Day 1530 at the age of five months, ten days.⁵⁵ Two advanced pregnancies miscarried, the second in 1543 when she was aged 51.⁵⁶ Several pregnancies spontaneously aborted at very early stages, often, she claimed, due to the physical stress of overland travel by litter.⁵⁷ With only one female heir Marguerite and Henri d'Albret's ability to pursue their dynastic interests through marriage of their offspring was limited, a problem that occasioned fierce struggles with Francis I and Henry II over Jeanne's two betrothals.

⁵⁴ Jourda, *Marguerite* 1, 153.

⁵⁵ Raymond Ritter, *Les solitudes de Marguerite de Navarre (1527–1549)* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1953), 17.

⁵⁶ Jourda, *Marguerite*, 2, 1014.

⁵⁷ M. de Bayonne [Jean du Bellay] wrote to M. le Grand Maistre [Anne de Montmorency], 12 Jan. [1531] from Alençon, that "...ladite Dame [Marguerite] soit grosse. Gauchier qui ce jour a esté icy, et Mr. Jehan Grymot sont de cest aduice et elle aussy, si ainsy est, c'est de tres peu de temps qu'il est apparent, veu l'experience qui autresfois s'en est veue en elle mesme, que le travail qu'elle prendra en chemin, mesmement estans les chemyns en ce pay tels qu'il ne se y peult reparer, gastera tout ce qui en elle est commence..." BnF Clairambault 313, f. 24.

As an extension of her matriarchal role, Marguerite had charge over the upbringing of numerous noble offspring. After Queen Claude died in 1524, she cared for Francis I's children. She also had custody of the orphaned Rohan boys, heirs to a large estate in Brittany. The children of her vassals enjoyed similar patronage. Marguerite championed Georges d'Armagnac, who was "like a son" to her, from the time she sent him as a youngster to Meaux for training until he gained the cardinal's hat through her efforts. She also supported the Italian prince Antonio Caracciolo helping him from an early age to rise to high ecclesiastical position in France.

To her list of domestic roles we should add that of matchmaker. Major courtiers were preoccupied with arranging the marriages of children from the royal family and the chief noble houses. Especially on the international level, this form of war by other means entailed calculating the territorial gains or concessions and alliances that were their *raison d'être*. Marguerite also took responsibility for facilitating and arranging the marriages of her less exalted relatives as well as the *demoiselles* of her personal court.

The importance of her roles as nurturer and matchmaker should not be underestimated. Through them she helped to shape the next generation of the nobility. The results of her efforts have not been fully measured, but some notable examples—including her own daughter who became a convinced Calvinist and mother of Henry IV—indicate that Marguerite prepared the way for portions of the nobility to become partisans of either the Royalist or Reformed parties during the Wars of Religion, both of which opposed conservative catholic coalition led by the Guise family. In an intermediary stage, shortly after conquering the Duchy of Luxembourg in 1543, Francis I's youngest son

Charles d'Angoulême wrote to the Protestant princes of the Schmalkald League offering to let the Gospel be preached there in exchange for entrance into their league. As a gauge of his sincerity he pointed out that he was raised by Marguerite and educated by Lefèvre d'Étaples. Whatever our speculations about the admixture of political motives involved in such cases, a number of Marguerite's friends and relatives came to support evangelicals and subsequently Calvinists. This influence seems to have been especially marked among women at court including Renée de France, the Baroness d'Entragues, and Anne Boleyn.⁵⁸

Religion and Books

What was Marguerite's religion? Most scholars have considered answering this question as the key to understanding her character and career.⁵⁹ To clarify this issue, they have inspected her many religious writings as a mirror of her soul.⁶⁰ Scholars agree that

⁵⁸ This short list is only to highlight several important women who were not on Marguerite's household roles. Nancy Lyman Roelker has substantiated the connection between Marguerite and many Protestant noblewomen of the next generation, many of whom had been members of her household, but has by no means exhausted this line of research. See, "The Appeal of Calvinism to French Noblewomen in the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2 (1972), 391–418; *idem*, "The Role of Noblewomen in the French Reformation," *ARG* 63 (1972), 168–195.

Marguerite's aunt, Philiberte de Savoie, with whom she shared Briçonnet's spiritual letters, was among the group of Marguerite's intimates in the early years, but she died in 1524. No information about her activities is known. Marguerite's younger "sister," Renée de France—who was the younger sister of Claude de France, Francis' first wife—led an embattled existence at court of her husband, the Duke of Ferrara, protecting French and Italian evangelicals in her entourage, including, famously, Marot and Calvin for a time in 1536. Anne Malet de Graville, "Mme d'Entragues," succored Caroli and Pierre Toussain at her castle. For Caroli's stay, see Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 371; for Toussain's stay, see Pierre Toussain to Johannes Œcolampadius, in Basel, 26 July [1526], *Herminjard* 1, no. 181, 445. Anne Boleyn spent some time as a young lady at the French court and is likely to have been influenced by the evangelism preached there at Marguerite's behest. For the renewing of their contact and collaboration in the early 1530s, see chapter 9.

⁵⁹ See the introduction, "Resolving the Riddle: Marguerite and the French Evangelical Movement," for a discussion of the state of scholarship on Marguerite's religion.

⁶⁰ Whence the title for a well-executed contribution to the debate by Gary Ferguson, *Mirroring*

she accepted major portions of the reformers' theology, particularly the central doctrines of justification by faith alone and scripture as the sole basis for doctrine. In addition, Guillaume Briçonnet's theology of mystical ascent to God, derived from the Pseudo-Dionysius, Nicolas of Cusa, and Hugh of St. Victor, has been seen as an enduring and structuring element in her thought.

Her writings are, however, limited platforms for understanding why she supported an extensive evangelical network. Many of her writings, including her first published work, the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (1531), outline paths for the Christian to draw (or rather be drawn) into closer relationship with God. They also contain strong criticisms of abuses and misleading doctrine, but lack prescriptive advice about how to reshape the cult or cure the ills of the church. Nor does she specify the links between belief and practical reform.

Marguerite's religious works were in this regard very different from those of the major Protestant reformers. Luther and Calvin not only articulated their theologies, showed how true religion had been corrupted and how it should be righted. They not only attacked the traditional church, they interpreted its failings in a religious-historical framework. Luther saw the papacy as the Antichrist and interpreted the corruption of doctrine and morals of the traditional church as signs that the end times were near. Calvin assimilated the struggle of the true church of the elect against the papacy trans-historically with the flight of the Jews from the idolatry of Egypt. Although Marguerite is reported to have expressed similar views about the church and papacy in private

conversation with English ambassadors, her literary works lack these religious-historical frameworks, do not set up clear lines of opposition, provide explanatory frameworks, or furnish imperatives for rejecting the old church.

Given the religious repression of the time, Marguerite may well have articulated in print much less than she wished and she certainly was bold in the views that she did express. The traditional prohibitions against women discussing or writing about theological topics still obtained, despite her rank.⁶¹ Moreover, the ideas to which she inclined were subject to censure by the Faculty of Theology. Indeed, several hardy doctors attempted to have her *Miroir* condemned in 1533, but backed down in the face of the king's wrath. The potentially detrimental effects of further controversy may have dissuaded her from publishing more religious writings until after the death of Francis I. When Henry II, who despised her, came to power and she had no influence left to lose, Marguerite's secretaries saw through the press her *Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses*, an extensive collection of poems, song, and plays no less religiously engaged than her previous works.⁶²

Most important for discerning her platform are the four works that she published in the early 1530s. Three of these, the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*, the *Discord étant en l'homme par la contrariété de l'esprit et de la chair*, and the *Oraison a Nostre Seigneur Jésus Christ*, were published together under the title of the *Miroir* (1531) and reprinted

⁶¹ Because of this, Charles de Ste.-Marthe, her secretary, was at some pains in his funeral oration to justify Marguerite's persistent and active interest in religious issues. See, "Oraison funèbre de la mort de l'incomparable Marguerite, Royne de Navarre..." reprinted in Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaiglon, eds., *Heptaméron des nouvelles de très illustre princesse Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre*, 4 vols. (Paris: Eudes, 1880), vol. 1, 23–130.

nine more times during her life.⁶³ A fourth work, the *Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne* (1533) appeared once.⁶⁴ These texts show that she held evangelical beliefs and could articulate them subtly. Yet, however much the content of these works may reflect her soul, in publishing them she was not letting fall a few autobiographical mirrors. Rather, she was presenting a carefully dressed display windows in which she exhibited for her readers what she considered to be essential truths of the faith. Her attempt to instruct via print complemented the efforts of preachers and authors, whom she sponsored, and formed part of their proselytizing efforts.

The Network

Despite Marguerite's status and efforts, the Navarrian network never grew into a broad or enduring organization. Its members never wrote or subscribed to a statement of faith. However, Navarrians were active in promoting, as they called it, the "cause of the Gospel," and they did articulate, publish, preach, teach, and attempt to transform the church according to a recognizable and commensurate set of doctrines. The Navarrian network, moreover, was not the sum total of the evangelical movement in France, which was much broader still, but a vector between it and the political powers that would decide the religious question. Not all the influential people with whom Marguerite cooperated were evangelical, yet her closest collaborators were committed to the evangelical cause and constituted the backbone of the network. They sought to promote the Gospel within

⁶² Higman, *Piety*, lists two editions of the *Marguerites* (items, M 32–33) from 1547 and 1549.

⁶³ These texts were published in eight editions of the *Miroir* (Higman, *Piety*, M 34–41) and included in the *Marguerites*.

the framework of a strong royal regime. We need first to outline the platform they shared and the principal activities by which they implemented it. Second, we will inventory the members of the network and where they operated.

To begin with, since it is not a common category of historical analysis, we should define what we mean by a “network.”⁶⁵ A network is an informal type of organization, one established and maintained through personal contacts. Members share interests or beliefs and tend to collaborate on related projects. Each member, in turn, has contacts, friends or collaborators, thus creating an extensive yet closely-knit web. Individuals, if you will the ‘knots’ in the net, are conscious of their ties via their immediate contacts to a larger group. However, unlike a family, political party, social class, branch of

⁶⁴ Higman, *Piety*, no. M 31.

⁶⁵ The hypothesis of a Navarrian network developed from recognizing in the sources common ideas and coordinated actions among a group linked personally to Marguerite. Though ‘network theory’ is relatively well developed among sociologists and anthropologist, it is not one of their major analytic concepts. Robert Wuthnow did not see fit to discuss it in his survey of their four dominant schools of sociology, *Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987). Nor did Peter Burke include this term in his presentation of the major sociological and anthropological concepts useful for historical research in his *History and Social Theory* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1993).

I have found the following discussion of ‘networks’ stimulating: J. Clyde Mitchell, “Social Networks,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3 (1974), 279–299; S.N. Eisenstadt, “Functional Analysis in Anthropology and Sociology: An Interpretative Essay,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 (1990), 243–60; K.S. Cook, and J. M. Whitmeyer, “Two approaches to Social Structure: Exchange Theory and Network Analysis,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 18 (1992), 109–127.

Still more recently, Alain Degenne and Michel Forsé have related that social scientists continue to develop network theory as a fruitful paradigm. They recommend it since it avoids the pitfalls of two major strands of social theory: either the determinism of structural analysis or ‘asocialization’ (atomization) of human actors by theorists who privilege the investigation of individuals. Placing network theory within the field of ‘structural interactionism’ (sometimes referred to as neostructuralism), they stress that studying people within the web of their social relations has the advantages of being inductive, giving due consideration to both the self-determining volition of individuals as well as the constraining influence on their decision-making of the social structures to which they belong. See *Les réseaux sociaux: Une analyse structurale en sociologie* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1994), 1–17. Their mathematical models of analysis are not, however, applicable to the subject or sources of this study. Nevertheless, this study does seek ‘via inductive methods’—non-quantitative ones—to reconstruct the membership, action, and dynamic interaction of the Navarrian network and their larger world.

government, army, or religious order, a network does not have a formal constitution, legal status, or a rule book that structures it as a recognizable institution. Indeed, a network connects individuals *within* and, more importantly, *from* different institutions. Thus, when studied in the course of events, a network appears inchoate, ragged at the edges, and in a state of flux. Yet over time, as its members act together, drawing upon their resources—be these executive powers, wealth, persuasive rhetoric, or patronage—to promote a common agenda, they may develop into a powerful movement. Acting together, they may or may not eventually coalesce to form a new social institution or transform an old one.

Both modern and sixteenth-century thought recognize the existence of networks. We speak commonly of ‘networking’ to get a job, to find potential customers, or to drum up support for a cause. ‘To network’ is to use preexisting webs of personal relationships as lines of communication to accomplish some goal. In the early-modern era, humanists formed active networks. Despite their differing national backgrounds or institutional affiliations, they recognized in one another a common commitment to the *artes humaniores*, took pride in the accomplishments of other *boni viri*, and promoted each other. They had immense cultural impact, yet they had no formal organization. As for the reformation in the Empire and Switzerland, before it began to take confessional shape with the adoption of Augsburg Confession, *Confessio tetrapolitana*, and Zwingli’s *Fidei ratio* (1530) and before its political lines were given direction by the formation of the Schmalkald League and the Second Kappel War (1531), there was a period of turbulent, unpredictable, rapid development. In the early 1520s, a broad evangelical movement,

involving people from all walks of life, sprang up in response to Luther's early writings and condemnation. Soon diverse political and religious leaders rose up articulating differing visions of church renewal based upon a return to the pure Gospel. Networks of theologians, humanists, priests, monks, scholars, city magistrates, and princes communicated, coordinated, and debated in order to define the content and limits of the reformation in theology, worship, and social order. By 1530 they had begun to establish the basic outlines of the different strains of 'Anabaptist,' 'Reformed,' and Lutheran confessions. The group that adhered to the "Lutheran" Augsburg confession was dominant but not alone in the Empire.

The Navarrian network never developed as extensively as it might have since its members were constantly battling from a defensive stance trying to assert their case while staving off accusations of heresy and their dire consequences. The following outline of its active participants—necessarily a partial one given the state of the sources—points to its extent.

Evangelical Enlightenment

Nous prions donc le Roi du ciel	We pray the king of heaven
Par sa bonté	That in his goodness
Qu'il nous envoie sa lumière	He would sent to us his light.
Et qu'il nous écrive au cœur	And that he would write on our heart
Par sa douceur	In his sweet kindness
Le contenu en l'Evangile.	The Gospel message.

— Anonymous Popular Song at Meaux, 1525

French evangelicals were hoping for the light to dawn, to break through the darkness of human reason, to shine through the shades of superstition. They were hoping for an 'evangelical enlightenment.'⁶⁶ Their letters and books are suffused with "Gospel light" as a metaphor for true doctrine.⁶⁷ The verses quoted above, sung by commoners at Meaux in 1525, faithfully capture that programmatic image.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Note that this title does not claim the evangelicals in the Navarrian network as forerunners of the Enlightenment, nor does it attempt a terminological back-borrowing like the application of "Renaissance" to the renewals of Carolingian and 12th century Europe. Rather, it calls attention to the fact that French evangelicals saw themselves as promoting *religious* 'enlightenment,' an illumination of souls and minds to be brought about by proclaiming the Gospel. See chapter 4 for their understanding that the "*illustratio evangelii*" had begun.

⁶⁷ As Philip Edgcumbe Hughes correctly relates, as early as Lefèvre's 1512 commentary on Paul's epistles "he insists on the futility of human reason apart from the illumination of divine grace. 'If human minds which do not experience divine enlightenment produce anything,' he writes, 'it usually does more harm than good and provides no vital nourishment for our minds,'" *Lefèvre: Pioneer of Ecclesiastical Renewal in France* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1984), 70. This lexicon of light and darkness, of God's illuminating grace and the darkness of human reason, is ubiquitous in evangelical writings. Baduel's letter to Melancthon mentioned above is structured around this biblical metaphor. Further examples taken at hazard: *illuminatores*, *divine lucis radium*, *veritas evangelicae*, employed by Nicolas Le Sueur to Farel, Herminjard 1, no. 102, 217; *tenebras* and *lux*, in Lefèvre's letter to Farel: Herminjard 1, no. 103; "Il fault que la lumière luyse et que les ténèbres aient fin," Farel to Étienne de la Forge, à Lyon, de Geneva, 25 April 1534, Herminjard 3, no. 462, 168. Catholic polemicists specifically assaulted evangelical pretensions to have a true bead on divine light, for example Jérôme de Hangest titled his response to the 1534 placard against the mass: *Contre les tenebrions, lumière evangelicque* (Paris: Guillaume de Bossozel and Jean Petit, 15 January 1535). See, Jean Babelon, *La bibliothèque de Fernand Colomb*, *Revue des Bibliothèques*, suppl. 10 (Paris: Champion, 1913), no. 86, 83; Higman, *Piety*, H 1.

⁶⁸ "Chanson nouvelle" (1525), last strophes, Henri-Léonard Bordier, *Le chansonnier huguenot du XVI^e siècle*, 2 vols., (Paris: Tross, 1870; reprint Geneva: Slatkine, 1969), vol. 1, xviii.

Their teachers, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Gérard Roussel, and the rest of the Meaux circle, as well as later evangelical writers, articulated a coherent vision of true doctrine.⁶⁹ Its grounding point was the belief that salvation comes through faith in Christ's solely meritorious sacrifice for human sin.⁷⁰ They shared with the Protestant reformers, whose works they read avidly,⁷¹ the same thorough-going emphasis on justification by faith alone and formulated similar criticisms of traditional church doctrine and practice. Yet, they did not draw the same conclusions as the reformers about how to end these abuses.

In their approach to renewing church practice, the evangelicals supported by Marguerite sought to transform the sacraments in form and content so as to rid them of abuses while recovering their essential cores. When Roussel outlined a new liturgy for the celebration of the Eucharist, he tried to conform closely to the rite as described in the New Testament, reinstating communion in both kinds.⁷² Evangelicals tried to retain as much of the liturgy and as many practices as were scriptural or at least innocuous to it. Thus while Roussel kept a form of auricular confession of sins to a minister and a place for the saints in religious devotion he stripped them of their instrumental roles in the Catholic economy of grace. Roussel and other evangelicals wanted believers to participate in the Eucharist by faith, not merely to watch the sacrifice of the Mass, to

⁶⁹ The following is intended as an orienting summary of the findings contained in chapters 6, 8, and 10 about evangelicals' doctrines and approach to renewing faith, based on the works of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Gérard Roussel, and other evangelicals texts emanating from the Navarrian network.

⁷⁰ For Lefèvre's soteriology, which informed many evangelicals' thought, see Hughes, *Lefèvre*, 74–92.

⁷¹ It should be remembered that the exchange was two way: Luther, Bucer, and Calvin had read Lefèvre's biblical commentaries.

⁷² Roussel's presentation of the Eucharist in his *Familiar exposition* closely follows Calvin's presentation in the *Institution de la religion chrétienne*. There is a striking parallel between their two

confess their sins freely and honestly to God and one another, not to inventory them in a priestly inquest of their misdeeds, and to hear the promise of the forgiveness, not to calculate a balance sheet of debts owed for the amendment of their sins. He further wanted them to emulate the saints' exemplary lives, not to venerate their remains or to solicit favors from them presumed intercessory powers. Ultimately, he thought believers should approach God directly and accept his grace, not curry his favor through intermediaries or works.

For these French evangelicals, the link from faith to concrete action was charity (*foi ouvrante par charité*).⁷³ Faith was belief the Gospel promise of forgiveness; preaching and print the means to teach it. The sacraments, suitably rehabilitated, were occasions for the administration of God's grace through which faith was given and strengthened. Charitable deeds were the lived expression of that faith. For Marguerite and her collaborators this meant publishing books of instruction, preaching true doctrine, financing schools, founding orphanages, reforming monastic houses, devising better systems for poor-relief, inspecting prisons to ensure humane treatment, succoring exiles, redacting legal codes, ensuring just trials, directing royal troops to combat brigand bands, forgiving enemies, and succoring the innocent. In short *just rule* was to be the expression of *true belief*.

presentations of how a model Eucharist should be celebrated in simple conformity to the rite outlined in I Corinthians 11. See chapter 10.

⁷³ Roussel uses this expression throughout the *Familiere exposition* to designate active faith; the connection between belief and practice. The roots of this concept go back at least to the Meaux year. For the Meaux group's understanding of faith, works, and charity, see a brief exposition in Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, et al., *Epistres et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an: Texte de l'édition Pierre de Vingle*, ed. Guy Bedouelle et Franco Giaccone, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), xlvii–xlviii.

Finally, it must be noted that Marguerite and her network were engaged, not simply in drawing up a collection of first principles about religion and social order, but in an overt power struggle to determine which doctrine and whose judgment would set the standard for France. Their religious views were contested vigorously by conservatives. Moreover, when their followers committed acts of religious sacrilege in over-enthusiastic response to their evangelical preaching, the criticisms of traditionalists became difficult to parry. Against this threat, the Navarrians, in their deeds and writings, stressed political and social stability as a rule of faith. This emphasis was not just the logical outcome of their belief that God, not revolutionaries in his name, would effect renewal, but also the very condition required for their continued survival and ability to preach that message.

To be sure, their specific measures to put this doctrine into practice were hardly distinctive. They fit the pattern of the most advanced efforts by early modern standards to foster godliness, law, order, and prosperity. Alençon, Berry, and the Béarn all underwent significant administrative renewal during Marguerite and Henry d'Albret's reigns. Members of her network having political authority conducted similar efforts in the regions they governed. Roussel granted his town of Clairac a liberal constitution of self-rule. In Turin, Guillaume du Bellay administered the king's newly conquered lands of Savoy and Piedmont with greater dexterity and popularity than French governors had ruled Milan in the past.

The Navarrian Program

Network members tried to disseminate their evangelical views and reform church and society according to them in six principal ways. Indeed, most members are known to us because they participated in these projects, which affected the most important areas of French public life.

1. In international diplomacy, they sought to establish a military alliance and confessional concord between France and the Protestant powers of Germany, Henry VIII of England, and the Pope against the Hapsburg Emperor, Charles V. By answering Francis I's dynastic ambitions and the aspirations of his would-be allies, this effort sought to create political conditions favorable to the ordered spread of evangelicalism in France and abroad.

2. In government, they maneuvered to advance their members to important royal and ecclesiastical offices in order to secure power that would help them to implement their program.

3. In the churches and schools, they promoted an 'evangelical' renewal of doctrine and practice through preaching, teaching, and book publication as the means to spread evangelical doctrine. Their efforts centered on catechesis and Bible teaching, starting with the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Credo, followed by the Psalms, Gospels, and Pauline letters. Ultimately, they expected that their teaching would purify customary practices, the liturgy, and the sacraments of the church, returning them to their primitive apostolic forms.

4. In the public forum, they published a variety of literature to disseminate their views about church and society including polemical tracts as well as treatises on history, political theory, and ecclesiology.

5. In the law courts, they used political pressure to preserve their brethren from attacks by conservatives whose adherents had preponderant control of the judiciary.

6. In their jurisdictions within the “most Christian realm,” they helped to increase royal control over justice, taxation, poor relief, and schools, which contributed to the state-building policies of the monarchy. They justified and sought to temper these activities with their doctrine’s basic principle of civic activity: charity. Brotherly love should be, they argued, the lived expression of faith, the core principle of Christian belief

These activities distinguished network members as a recognized religio-political coalition in France distinct from their conservative adversaries as well as from the nascent Reformed Protestant movement emanating from the Swiss cantons.

The Members in situ

The Navarrian network took shape during the early 1520s around the Meaux group before Francis’ capture at Pavia. In these years, Marguerite tried to disseminate their model of evangelical preaching first to the court, then throughout France. While her mother and brother protected this experiment—as they had certain traditional monastic reforms—they did not actively sponsor it.

From their beginnings at Meaux to their demise during the early years of Henry II’s reign, Marguerite and the evangelical reformers fought an uphill battle against the

growing perception that they were heretics. The first setback in their Sisyphean ascent came in 1523 when conservatives identified the Meaux group's teaching as "Lutheran." Next, during Francis' captivity (1525-1526), the Parlement of Paris demanded that heretics be pursued as their price for cooperating with Louise of Savoy's regency government. Since conservatives soon convinced French people that the "Lutheran" Peasants War (1525) and the rise of the "Lutheran" states in Germany and Switzerland threatened the kingdom, promoting church reform and evangelical preaching at home became more and more politicized and difficult. Every reform effort registered as an act in the larger struggles over both domestic policy and international relations. Ever menaced with persecution, evangelical writers and ministers depended on political figures in the network to secure them protection and opportunities to articulate their message. The rise of protestant powers abroad also presented opportunities for French evangelicals. In response, the Navarrian network developed international contacts and a diplomatic wing based at court, whose efforts complemented domestic efforts.

Thus depending on the level of Marguerite and her allies' political influence, there were five locales where the network functioned: 1) the royal court, 2) the Meaux circle 3) Marguerite's personal court and domain territories, 4) French territories where Marguerite did not have formal powers, and finally 5) protestant states outside France.

The Royal Court. Among Francis' top advisors and ambassadors, Marguerite's consistent allies were Guillaume du Bellay (1491-1543), seigneur de Langey, and his brother, the Bishop of Paris, Cardinal Jean du Bellay (1492-1560). They started working together in 1525, when they helped to negotiate Francis' ransom. By the late 1520s, their

letters indicate that they were collaborating at court. For the rest of Francis' reign, the du Bellay brothers—along with Anne de Montmorency and François Tournon (1489-1562)—were the most important architects of French foreign policy, both as active ambassadors in the field and as councilors at court. Guillaume and Jean virtually monopolized French missions to the Empire and undertook many embassies to Switzerland, England and Rome. They also held important military posts. Jean served as governor of l'Île de France during crucial war years. From 1538 to 1543 Guillaume was given charge of administering the newly conquered territories in Savoy and Piedmont.

In the latter half of Francis' reign, that is 1530 to 1547, Marguerite, Anne d'Etampes, the Admiral Philip Chabot de Brion, the du Bellay brothers, as well as two of the king's sons, Francis (1518-1536) and Charles (1522-45), formed a political faction at court with pro-evangelical, pro-English, and anti-Hapsburg tendencies. Opposed to them and dominant at court was a rival party including Anne de Montmorency, Cardinal Duprat who was the Chancellor until 1536, Cardinal of Lorraine (1498-1550), Queen Eleanor (1498-1558, r. 1530-1547), Chancellor Guillaume Poyet (1473-1548), and Francis' middle son, the future Henry II (1519-1559).⁷⁴

Serving Marguerite's faction were a number of royal officials, many of whom she had promoted from her personal court into the king's service. Jacques Colin (d. 1547), Abbot of St. Ambroise at Bourges and a noted humanist, was Marguerite's vice

⁷⁴ Knecht dates the rise of factional strife at court to 1536 when the *dauphin* Francis died leaving Henri and Charles as focal points for the two factions. See, *Renaissance Warrior*, p. 484. This date should be pushed back to around 1530, from which time there is ample evidence of infighting already over the religious issue and over foreign policy with regard to the growing Protestant presence in Europe.

chancellor in Armagnac and a royal councilor. Her chancellor of Alençon and president of the assize court (*grands jours*) in Berry, Jean Brinon (d. 1537) was also first President of the Parlement of Rouen as well as president of Louise of Savoy's personal council. François Olivier (1497-1560), Jean Brinon's successor as Chancellor of Alençon, rose through various royal posts to become Chancellor of France (1545-1550). Guillaume Feau, seigneur d'Izernay, in Marguerite's service from 1530 onwards, accumulated the offices of royal notary, secretary, and valet. He served as Marguerite's factor at court during the last years of Francis' reign when she was frequently absent. Nicolas de Bossut, seigneur de Longueval, a protégé of Mme d'Etampes, and the seigneur La Planche served as unofficial envoys from Marguerite and Mme d'Etampes to Henry VIII in the 1540s. Marguerite vouched for La Planche to the English, saying that he was "of her upbringing" (*nourriture*).⁷⁵ All of these men served on important diplomatic missions during Francis' reign.⁷⁶

Some nobles at the royal court, who did not owe their positions to Marguerite, also participated in the network. Mme d'Entragues, already mentioned, protected two evangelicals, Pierre Caroli and Pierre Toussain, from pursuit as heretics in 1525-26. In 1526, Robert II de La Marck, an ally of Francis I on the border of the kingdom, offered to hire Farel as his court preacher at the request of Gérard Roussel, Marguerite's

⁷⁵*Letters and Papers* 20, pt. 2, no. 942, 470. Notably, these discussions centered on building French-English relations upon the premise that Marguerite and Anne could get Francis to break with Rome if Henry would lent his support. See chapters 8 and 9.

⁷⁶All these figures served several times either as resident ambassadors or special envoys. Other important figures from Marguerite's household also doubled in the service of the king including two of her chief financial secretaries, Victor Brodeau (d. 1540), a noted humanist, and his successor Jean Frotté. See the lists of all the known diplomatic missions for Francis I's reign in *CAF* 9, 1ff.

almoner.⁷⁷ More famously, Louis de Berquin (d. 1529), who translated the works of Erasmus and Luther, enjoyed the support of Marguerite and the king in 1523, 1526, and for a final moment in 1529, though it arrived too late to save him from the stake.

On the other hand, although she expressed hatred for them behind closed doors Marguerite often worked at court with those of the pro-Imperial faction in order to maintain a hand in royal affairs.⁷⁸ Other courtiers slipped in and out of working relations with her as the constellations of power at court shifted. Guillaume Petit (c. 1470-1536), a Dominican doctor of theology and the king's confessor, protected Lefèvre in 1521 and published Marguerite's book of hours.⁷⁹ Yet in 1522, he also denounced Michel d'Arande, Marguerite's almoner and a member of the Meaux circle, before the Faculty of Theology for the sermons d'Arande preached at court. Cardinal Francis Tournon was another sometime ally, for whom Marguerite helped to secure the Archbishopric of Bourges (1526). In the 1540s, he helped to lead the anti-evangelical faction at court.

⁷⁷See Gérard Roussel at St.-Germain-en-Laye to Farel at Strasbourg, 7 Dec. 1526, Herminjard I, no. 184, 459-460.

⁷⁸For reports of Marguerite expressing in private her bitter dislike of her brother's top advisor, Anne de Montmorency, see: Norfolk to Henry VIII [23 June. 1533], *Letters and Papers* 6, no. 692, 308-310; and Norfolk to Cromwell, 21 February 1540, *Letters and Papers* 15, no. 240, 85. The sentiment was mutual. For a report from the French court on the pro-imperial faction's abhorrence of Henry VIII (and by extension the Navarrian faction at court who favored him) see Paget to Henry VIII, 13 June 1542, *Letters and Papers* 17, no. 400, 233.

⁷⁹Charles Schmidt mentions the *Heures de la royne Marguerite* (1533) in Gérard Roussel: *Prédicateur de la reine Marguerite de Navarre. Mémoire servant à l'histoire des premières tentatives faites pour introduire la Réform en France* (Strasbourg: Schmidt and Grukner, 1845; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), 96. This is probably the same as Guillaume Petit, *Tres devotes oraisons a l'honneur de la tressacree et glorieuse Vierge Marie mere de dieu, avec plusieurs aultres devotes chansons* (Paris, Simon de Colines, 1534?), see Higman, *Piety*, P 12.

The Du Bellay Entourage. The du Bellay brothers' diplomatic corps deserves special mention for its place in the wider Navarrian network.⁸⁰ Beyond the brother's formal duties as ambassadors, they managed a team of minor nobles and humanists who played an important role in maintaining informal communications between French evangelicals and their allies in the Empire and Switzerland. The du Bellays recruited a team of able German scholars and students studying in Paris to serve as diplomatic agents: Dr. Gervais Wain, Jean Sturm, Dr. Ulrich Geiger (Chelius), and Jean Sleidan. In turn, they drew on the services of French students in the Empire, such as Claude Baduel, Guillaume Bigot, and their kinsman, Barnabé de Voré, seigneur de la Fosse. These humanists served as effective operatives with the Protestant princes and reformers. In addition, at home and on mission in England, Rome, Switzerland, and the Empire, they had a corps of loyal relatives and close friends who seconded their efforts, such as Martin du Bellay, René du Bellay, Jean Morelet du Museau, Étienne de Laigues, seigneur de Beauvais, and Nicolas Raince. The du Bellay brothers were not only diplomats but humanists in their own right, and they patronized many others in their courts, including Paul Manuce, Salmon Macrin, Étienne Dolet, Jean Boyssoné, François Rabelais, and Joachim du Bellay.

The Meaux Circle. The members of the Meaux circle first linked Marguerite to the nascent world of evangelicalism.⁸¹ Marguerite was in close contact with them during

⁸⁰ Jean du Bellay has yet to receive a book length study. V.L. Bourrilly wrote several learned articles on the du Bellays' activities (see bibliography) as well as the standard monograph on Guillaume, from which the following information is drawn: *Guillaume du Bellay, seigneur de Langey, 1491–1543*, (Paris: Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition, 1905).

⁸¹ For the beginnings of Marguerite's relationship with the Fabrists before Meaux, see chapter 4,

their experiment in reform and protected its leading figures: Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Michel d'Arande, and Gérard Roussel.⁸² In turn, this group corresponded with a number of other evangelical individuals and local circles. In Paris, Pierre Caroli, a doctor of theology, preached to an evangelical cell and taught at the university in much the same vein as his fellows at Meaux. One of the era's great poets, Clément Marot, served in Marguerite's court from 1518 forward where he likely experienced his first exposure to the evangelical ideas that would become increasingly prevalent in his verse.⁸³ All of these figures were pursued for heresy during Francis I's captivity (1525-1526). The leaders of the Meaux group, Briçonnet aside, fled to Strasbourg, where they were joined by Guillaume Farel, a layman-scholar who had left his colleagues in 1523 and embarked on a preaching tour in southern France and the French-speaking regions across the western border. In the meantime, he had become the most important link between the Meaux group and the international evangelical movement. His correspondence with several members of the Meaux group reveals in detail that an extensive evangelical network had been established in France by the mid-1520s. After the return of Francis I, Marguerite was able to repatriate and find safe

and at Meaux chapter 6.

⁸² Veissière lists the key figures at Meaux in its two phases, naming: François Vatable, Martial Mazurier, Guillaume Farel, Jean Lecomte de la Croix, Jean Lange (Angelus), Jean Canaye, Jacques Pauvan, Matthieu Saunier, Jean Gadon, Nicolas Mangin, Nicolas de Neufchâteau, Jean Mesnil, Michel Bentin, Nicolas Le Sueur, Jean Le Clerc, Pierre Le Clerc, and associated with them, Jean Guibert, "l'Hermite de Livry." See, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 201ff and 223ff.

⁸³ Saulnier 1977, 17, discussing letter 27.2, a poem from Marot to Marguerite (October 1521), argues for the early influence of the Meaux circle on Marot's poetry. In Marot's description of the burning after the battle of Valenciennes, he uses a 'Briçonian' lexicon, speaking of "fumée causée de boys mortel ardent en feu (sans eau de grâce) inextinguible," and "l'eau de grâce (salvatrice)." In these passages, Saulnier sees evidence that Marguerite had been spreading Briçonian ideas to her friends at court. For Marot's evangelicalism and its development into a more thoroughgoing Lutheranism, see Screech, *Clément*

havens for the former members of the Meaux group. Lefèvre was put in charge of the king's library at Blois and became tutor to his children. Roussel became Marguerite's personal almoner. Accompanying her with the royal court in its travels, he continued to preach, but in a guarded fashion. Marguerite secured for d'Arande the bishopric of St.-Paul-trois-Chateau in the Dauphiné (1526).⁸⁴ Pierre Caroli received a pastorate in Marguerite's Alençon. Farel refused the post offered to him.⁸⁵

With regard to the diocese of Meaux itself, there is an impressive silence after its reformers returned from Strasbourg. Neither Marguerite nor the former members of the Meaux group seem to have maintained relations with Briçonnet or the underground evangelical cell there. However, they did fight a number of battles, such as making public the acquittal of Jean Guibert—one of their associates—of heresy charges, in order to rehabilitate the image of the Meaux group (1527).

Marguerite's Domains and Personal Court. Marguerite gathered, protected, and promoted an extensive number of evangelical ministers, teachers, humanists, and notables in places where she could shield them with her authority. From north to south the territories in which Marguerite had power produce the following profile.

Alençon. Pierre Caroli probably arrived before November 1525, at which time he was investigated for his preaching.⁸⁶ In 1529, the Printer Simon Du Bois moved from

Marot, esp. 9–39.

⁸⁴ Thereafter, we know very little about d'Arande's activities. Capito describes him as being scrupulous in performing his duties as bishop the dedication to Marguerite of his *In Hoseam prophetam*, dated 22 March 1528, Herminjard 2, no. 227, 120. See d'Arande's diffident response to Farel, who had chastised by him for Lefèvre-like timidity in promoting the Gospel, Herminjard 3, no. 544, 399–401.

⁸⁵ See above as in footnote 77.

⁸⁶ Jacques de Silly, Bishop of Sees, complained to the Faculty of Theology about the preaching of

Paris to Alençon after the execution of Louise de Berquin. He had printed at least three of Berquin's translations of Erasmus as well as other suspect books composed by members of the Meaux circle. At Alençon he continued to publish clandestinely a catalogue of even more "heretical" works until 1534.⁸⁷ He acted with Marguerite's knowledge and assent since many of these works were composed by members of the veterans of the Meaux reform, including Caroli, Lefèvre, and Roussel. Marguerite herself would publish her first religious poetry with Du Bois, the *Miroir* in 1531 and the *Discord* in 1533. Du Bois returned to Paris in 1534, when a heresy investigation in Alençon seems to have made life impossible for him there. At about the time the Placards were posted, he disappeared without leaving any clear trace. His name appeared along with Caroli's, who had fled to Switzerland, on the January 1535 list of those sought on charges of heresy.⁸⁸ His catalogue included some of the same titles and authors as the most important printer of French evangelical books outside France, Martin Lempereur of Antwerp (d. 1536). Books first published by these two printers were subsequently republished by a second generation of evangelical printers after 1535.

Berry and Bourges. In these territories Marguerite promoted a succession of influential evangelical minded preachers, educators, and officials.⁸⁹ Initially, she had

a certain *curé* in his diocese at this time. Farge believes that Caroli was likely the culprit, see *Orthodoxy*, 185, and further the article in Farge, *Biographical Register*, 65–71.

⁸⁷ For Simon Du Bois' publications in Paris and Alençon, see Higman, *Piety*, pp. 457 and 490.

⁸⁸ See R. Hari, "Les placards de 1534," in *Aspects de la propagande religieuse*, THR 28 (Geneva: Droz, 1957), 104–105.

⁸⁹ For the following information, see Le Vicomte de Brimont, *Le XVI^e siècle et les guerres de la réforme en Berry*, 2 vols. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1905), 113–182; Françoise Michaud-Fréjaville, "Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre, duchesse de Berry, 'laquelle a fort humainement traité ses sujets de Berry,'" in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492–1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*.

Michel d'Arande preach in Bourges 1523-24. In 1537, another of her almoners, Jean Michel, was condemned for preaching heretical doctrine. He returned to Bourges in 1539 and was burned as a recidivist. From 1529 onwards, Marguerite secured a succession of humanist jurists at the University of Bourges. All had evangelical leanings, and some taught their beliefs to their students and the general public. These scholars included Andrea Alciato, Melchior Wolmar, Jacques Amyot, and Pierre Rebuffe. After the affair of the Placards, several students fleeing persecution in Paris were given refuge at the University of Bourges.

Evidently important evangelical connections were maintained between the university community and the religious houses at Bourges. Jacques Colin's Abbey of St. Ambroise became a center of evangelicalism in the region by 1539. Pierre Bouquin, prior of the Carmelites of Bourges, took his doctorate in theology at the university before matriculating at the University of Basel in May 1541.⁹⁰ Later that year, after a trip to Wittenberg, Bouquin replaced Calvin as pastor of the French church at Strasbourg. Eventually he returned to Bourges to take the chair of Hebrew. He was protected by Marguerite, who gave him a pension and chose him to preach in the cathedral of Saint-Étienne. Pursued for his religious beliefs, he sought exile in 1555.

Calvin is reported, though the evidence is slight, to have preached at the Augustinian convent in Bourges in the early 1530s while he was studying law at the

ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 45-57; Louis-Hector Chandru de Raynal, *Histoire de Berry depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789*, 3 vols. [numbered 2-4] (Bourges: Vermeil, 1844-1847), vol. 3, 282-347, 366-380.

⁹⁰Eugénie Droz, "Les étudiants français de Bâle," *BHR* 20 (1958), 117.

university. Whether or not Calvin influenced his friends in Bourges, several Augustinians from that convent later broke with Rome. Augustin Marlorat, the prior, later served as a Protestant pastor in Rouen.⁹¹ Jean de l'Espine, an Augustinian of the same convent, joined Marlorat as one of the Protestant deputies to the colloquy of Poissy (1561). Two other Augustinians, Richard Vauville and Jean Loquet, also gave up their vows. The former lived in England for an extended period, serving as one of the first pastors of the London French Church, and died as minister of the French Reformed church at Frankfurt.⁹²

Aquitaine. At her southern court, usually at Nérac, Marguerite gathered poets and humanists who rank among the leaders of the French Renaissance: Nicolas de Bourbon, Victor Brodeau, Bonaventure Des Périers, and Charles de Sainte-Marthe. Together with Marguerite, they were closely connected with the world of humanist scholars, as can be seen in the dedications and collected poetic epigrams published from 1535 onwards at Lyon.⁹³ Their poems frequently contained programmatic statements about the nature of

⁹¹ Droz notes that François Landry (d. 1559), curate in Paris, was related by marriage to the Langelier brothers who published evangelical and reformist tracts at Paris from 1537 onward. His elder brother, after the death of Guillaume du Bellay, became the secretary to Martin du Bellay, governor of Normandy. He probably served as the go-between for Norman writers, "Jean Le Blond, curé et seigneur de Branville, de François Le Breton, magister de Coutances, et plus tard d'Augustin Marlorat, ministre des fidèles de Rouen." Droz, *Chemins* 1, 390–391.

⁹² For information on Vauville's subsequent career, see Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 49, 52–53. I am grateful to Prof. Pettegree for informing me of Vauville's important activities after his Bourges years. When John Lasco was appointed as superintendent over both the French and Dutch churches in London, he named Francis Perussel and Richard Vauville as the French Church's first ministers. Perussel was from Orléans, and had been converted to Protestantism at Paris in 1542. In 1545 he was accused of preaching heretical sermons at Paris. In 1546 he took refuge in Geneva.

⁹³ For instance Jean Visagier [dit Voulte or Vulteius] wrote laudatory epigrams, poems, and dedications to or on Marguerite, Roussel, Marot, Bishop Denis Briçonnet, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, and Jean Sturm. See, his *Epigrammatum libri III* (Lyon: Michel Parmentier and Jean Barbou, 1537).

their literary movement, including their pro-evangelical engagement with religious questions.

A key figure in the history of the Navarrian network is Gérard Roussel, who was habitually at Marguerite's side during her travels from 1526. He not only played an important role in directing the spiritual life of her court at Nérac, but also in the town of Clairac, over which he ruled as the commendatory abbot of the Benedictine monastery. In addition, after he took possession of the diocese of Oloron in the Béarn in 1539, he came to have significant political powers and religious responsibilities in Henry and Marguerite's largest sovereign territory, the Béarn.⁹⁴ During this late phase of the Navarrian network, he produced a catechism and diocesan reform manual that reflected his practice at Oloron. In these works he states clearly his understanding of the essential doctrinal issues that evangelicals in France and the Empire, their reformed counterparts in Switzerland, and Catholic traditionalists had been debating for thirty years: baptism, the Eucharist, confession, and the cult of the saints. These texts and the scattered evidence about his pastorate indicate that until his death in 1555 he sought to implement a reform program that was essentially consistent with the one that he and his colleagues had outlined at Meaux. Less substantial evidence from other evangelical bishops, such as Jean de Monluc at Valence, and other evangelical cells, notably the one gathered around Baduel at Nîmes, suggest the broad coherence of their reform aspirations. Despite the ever-changing, but never nurturing political climate, evangelicals in the network acted as best they knew how to effect their vision. Moreover, these efforts, Roussel's in

particular, help us understand the differences between the Navarrian network's reforming agenda and the later Calvinist, magisterial reformation that Marguerite's daughter Jeanne d'Albret and her husband Antoine de Bourbon would begin in 1560.

Toulouse. In this important city Marguerite had limited contacts and less extensive administrative power. Nevertheless, in the 1530s she was instrumental in the battle over the selection of two Dominican inquisitors, Amaud de Badet and Louis de Rochette, who successively occupied this important post as guardian of orthodoxy. They were so lax in their pursuit of heretics and so objectionable to Catholic conservatives that the first had to flee and the second was burned for heresy.⁹⁵ After Badet's departure, several jurists from the University of Toulouse were pursued in an early round of heresy-hunting, including Pierre Bunel, Étienne Dolet, Matthieu Pac, and Jean de Boyssoné. All of them fled Toulousan jurisdiction. The latter three would remain major figures among French humanists. Marguerite directly intervened on Boyssoné's behalf in 1536 and offered him a post at the University of Bourges. Dolet would appeal to her in the 1540s prior to being executed. Pac was later to find a place of honor at her court.

Bordeaux. In this provincial capital of Aquitaine, Marguerite and her network exerted their influence on several occasions. Her court was evidently connected with the evangelical teachers in the University and the Bordeaux region such as Marthurin Cordier and J.C. Scaliger. Illustrating their collaboration, one *cause célèbre* had an international

⁹⁴ Roussel's story will be examined extensively in chapter 10.

⁹⁵ Raymond A. Mentzer, Jr., *Heresy Proceedings in Languedoc, 1500–1560*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 74, part 5, 1984 (Philadelphia, PA: The American Philosophical Society, 1984), 15–34. For the cases of Badet and Rochette in the context of the Navarrians' general effort to protect evangelical preachers and teachers by manipulating the judiciary, see chapter 8.

profile. André Melanchthon, a school master in nearby Tonneins, had been imprisoned for heretical teaching at Bordeaux. He claimed to be the nephew of Philip Melanchthon. Indeed, Philip Melanchthon and the Duke of Saxony wrote to Marguerite on his behalf. Marguerite, along with the father of J.C. Scaliger, strove for two years to have him freed.⁹⁶ Of broader significance, Marguerite interceded with this Parlement repeatedly to mitigate the pursuit and punishment of heretics and attempted to install sympathetic jurists who would leniently interpret royal instructions for dealing with heresy. Marguerite also played a significant role in the early 1540s when the Rochellois revolted against increases in the salt tax (*gabelle*). Officials believed that their uprising was linked to the rising tide of heresy in the region. Though this revolt attracted Francis' wrath, which in a similar case would soon to prove fatal for the Vaudois (Waldensians) of Mérindol, Marguerite successfully persuaded her brother to be clement.

France at Large. In the regions where Marguerite's executive power did not extend formally she could only foster evangelical activity indirectly by interceding personally with Francis I or other powerful persons. There were some pockets where sympathetic nobles and notables held sway, but, in general, members of the evangelical sodality operated at greater risk beyond the territories under her sway.

Amiens. In this principal city of Picardy, Louise de Berquin evidently fostered the evangelical movement at an early date. During his trial of 1526 before the Parlement of

⁹⁶ See Amada López de Meneses. "André Mélanchthon et le Parlement de Bordeaux." *Revue historique de Bordeaux et du département de la Gironde* 33 (1940), 41–51; 34 (1941), 36–42. Saulnier 1971, no. 955.1.

Paris, he was accused of spreading Lutheranism there.⁹⁷ Later, in December 1533, Jean Morand, a doctor of theology from Paris, was accused of preaching heresy in his Advent sermons. Equally damning in their eyes, the investigators found in his possession letters that linked him to other heretics and ‘Geraldini,’ followers of Gérard Roussel, whose preaching had caused such a stir in Paris earlier that year.⁹⁸

Paris. The largest city in the realm and its quasi-official capital was also the site of the most important action in the battle to control the religious orientation of France. The Navarrian network conducted extensive and repeated efforts to inculcate evangelical doctrine there. Their first efforts date to the earliest days of the Meaux experiment. Lefèvre and his colleagues had left behind in Paris extensive contacts when they moved to Briçonnet’s diocese. During their time there, Pierre Caroli, Guillaume Farel, and, on occasion, Gerard Roussel, exported their experiment in preaching and Bible studies to Paris. Between 1526 and 1530, the network does not seem to have engaged in any public preaching in Paris. However, with the return of Francis’ children from captivity in 1530 and the establishment of an ally, Jean du Bellay, as bishop of Paris in 1532, Marguerite again promoted evangelical preaching there. Gérard Roussel led this effort. During Lent 1533, he was seconded by two Augustinians, Berault and Courault. The following October, Nicolas Cop championed the evangelical cause in his daring rector’s address to the University of Paris. Their sermons produced a season of religious ferment, which the

⁹⁷ See Parlement of Paris to Francis I, 9 April, [1526], BnF ms. Clairambault 324, f. 254r–255r.

⁹⁸ J. Dupèbe, “Un document sur les persécutions de l’hiver 1533–1534 à Paris,” *BHR* 48 (1986), 405–417.

Placard Affair ended by enraging the magistrates and the king, thus turning the political tide in favor of the traditionalists.

Though the Placards dealt a hard blow, the evangelical community at Paris survived. Centered on a committed core of laity, this evangelical cell included artisans, merchants and parlementarians. Étienne de la Forge, a rich merchant, and Christophe Hérault, a goldsmith, were leading members of this group and had extensive contacts with Farel and other confreres in Switzerland and in Antwerp as well as with Marguerite. In the wake of the Placards, La Forge was executed and Hérault remained an exile in the Low Countries where he had fled in the months prior to their posting. In the following years, Jean du Bellay and Marguerite protected and nurtured the remaining group. François Landry (d. 1559), the curate of Sainte-Croix and almoner of the *Enfants Rouge*—an orphanage established by Marguerite—was a principal figure directing the evangelical community in Paris. Largely due to Jean du Bellay's intervention, he survived imprisonment for heresy in 1542 by retracting his errors, after which time he regained his parish and remained untouched.⁹⁹

Throughout Francis I's reign, there were a series of printers and booksellers in Paris associated with the network. They provided crucial contacts with the larger evangelical world and supplied the written material for disseminating the evangelical message in Paris and the rest of France. In addition to Simon Du Bois until disappearing in 1534, Simon de Colines until 1525, Conrad Resch until returning to Basel in 1526,

⁹⁹ See note 91 for reference to his connection with Marlorat at Rouen and evangelical printers in Paris.

Antoine Augereau until his execution in 1533, and Robert Estienne until his flight to Geneva, published works by members of the Navarrian network.

Lyon. Situated on the Rhone at a key juncture, the city was a clearing-house for goods, money, and ideas. It was also the command center for Francis I's Italian campaigns. From the early 1520s Marguerite promoted preaching in and around Lyon. She sponsored Aimé Meigret's preaching in 1524 at Lyon and Grenoble.¹⁰⁰ Michel d'Arande accompanied her when the court settled in Lyon in the fall of 1524. We know from a letter by a member of the king's *grand conseil*, or royal appeals court, Antoine Papillon, to Zwingli that d'Arande and Marguerite were in contact with a whole circle of humanists from Lyon and Grenoble who were evangelizing the region and establishing familiar relations with the German reformers.¹⁰¹ In addition to Meigret and Papillon, this group included Anémonde de Coct, François Lambert, Pierre Sébiville, and Claude de Tauro. Significantly, in parallel with the Meaux group, they attempted to bring German reformers' works to the French market. Papillon translated Luther's *De votis monasticis* for Marguerite. In recompense, she secured him a position in the Dauphin's court.¹⁰²

Later, among the many humanists and scholars in Lyon, Charles de Sainte-Marthe, Du Vergier, and Claude Bigottier were pursued for teaching evangelical biblical

¹⁰⁰ See Jean [Bruno] de Niedbruck's letter to N. [at Strasbourg] from Metz, [18 February 1526] in Jean Rott and Olivier Millet "Miettes historiques strasbourgeoises," in Pierre Bartuel, Remy Scheurer, and Richard Stauffer, eds., *Actes du colloque Guillaume Farel: Neuchâtel, 29 septembre – 1^{er} octobre 1980*, 2 vols, Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 9, 1 & 2 (1983) (Geneva: Revue de la Théologie et de Philosophie, 1983), 253–277, 255–257.

¹⁰¹ The letter, dated 7 October 1524, is in ZW 8, no. 346, 221–225; see also Zwingli to Pierre Sébiville, 13 December 1523, *ibid.*, no. 325, 142–147.

¹⁰² Papillon's translation is not extant. See, Herminjard I, no. 125, 294–297; no. 132, 312–316; and CAF 7, p. 418. Papillon and Delonius are mentioned by Erasmus in a letter to Berquin as examples of

lessons in the *collège*.¹⁰³ After the Placards, the center of evangelical publication within France moved from Paris to Lyon. An interconnected circle of printers, anchored by Étienne Dolet, François Juste, and Jean de Tournes, published extensive numbers of works, both reprints and new titles, that issued from the Navarrian network, including Marguerite's last works, the *Marguerites* (1547) and, after her death, the *Heptaméron*.

Nîmes. Even before Marguerite helped to found the University of Nîmes, she had employed local officials to help staff her government in Armagnac. When she helped create the University of Nîmes (1539) she secured the rectorship for her protégé and the city's native son, Claude Baduel (1540).¹⁰⁴ Soon thereafter, at her behest, Guillaume Bigot, a client of Guillaume du Bellay, was hired as professor of philosophy.

Remarkably, given their similar background, the two scholars quarreled and exchanged formal accusations of heresy. This key episode reveals the fraying of connections in the network during the 1540s. While Bigot eventually departed, Baduel remained and maintained contact with an extensive number of evangelical cells in Montpellier, Toulouse, and other communities in the southern of France, including Marguerite's court in Nérac. He was also in regular contact during the late 1540s with John Calvin in Geneva to whom he and many evangelicals in his circle were turning for guidance.

Foreign Contacts. Outside France, Marguerite and her agents worked with several groups sympathetic to their agenda. This collaboration with other evangelical

two evangelicals who had died for being too hardy in their views. A warning that Berquin would not heed. See Allen 6, no. 1599, 150–151. On Papillon's "translation," see chapter 9.

¹⁰³ Heller, *The Conquest of Poverty*, 75.

¹⁰⁴ See M.-J. Gaufrès, *Claude Baduel et la réforme des études au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1880), 22–38.

networks needs to be distinguished from the foreign diplomacy that preoccupied Marguerite, the du Bellays, and their agents. Common interests led them to collaborate even when they had no specific charge from their sovereign lords.

The Swiss cantons. In the upper Rhine region, Marguerite and her group attempted to work with Germanophone reformers and exiled French evangelicals, many of whom had been part of the network in France, for a number of reasons. First, they solicited havens for French evangelicals fleeing persecution in France. Second, the Navarrians read the exiles' books, which nurtured their own reform efforts. Marguerite and Gérard Roussel studied works by Calvin and other authors published in Geneva well into the late 1540s. Third, Marguerite and the du Bellays recruited the exiles' help when Francis I' foreign political maneuvers required it, just as, in turn, the exiles sought protection for their family and friends in France. These occasional helpmates included Guillaume Farel, John Calvin, Matthieu Malingre, Marturin Cordier, and Pierre Toussain.

Basel. Further afield, this German-speaking city provided significant aid to the evangelical movement in France at an early stage. The theologian Écolampadius, with whom the Navarrian evangelicals corresponded in the 1520s, influenced the movement through his writings. From Basel's presses appeared some of the earliest evangelical literature in French. When Evangelicals in France took over this effort, they even borrowed typographical materials from this printing center. In the 1530s and early 1540s, the du Bellay brothers based some of their diplomatic operatives in Basel and Strasbourg, using these cities as important listening posts and staging grounds for their negotiations in the empire.

Strasbourg. This imperial city provided the first significant place of refuge as well as a training ground for French and Francophone evangelicals, some of whom would go on to reform Geneva and the Pays de Vaud. Farel, the Meaux group, Simon Robert and Marie Dentièrre from Tournai, and Calvin, among many others, all spent formative periods there. The Navarrian network also looked to its theologians and activists—Wolfgang Capito, Martin Bucer, and Sigismund von Hohenlohe—for solid doctrine and for support in international affairs. As revealed in Marguerite’s letters to Sigismund von Hohenlohe (1525-26), Bucer’s letter to Luther (1530), Marguerite was in contact with German Protestants from an early date. In the mid-1530s, in addition to Melancthon and Caspar Hedio, the du Bellay brothers looked to Bucer to support their overtures for a religious concord. In the early 1540s, a member of Marguerite’s court, the “Spiritualist” Pocque, visited Bucer in Strasbourg and Calvin in Geneva for reasons unknown. Both reformers had previously criticized the “Libertine” sect, and would continue to warn Marguerite about them thereafter.¹⁰⁵

England and the Protestant Princes. Marguerite, the du Bellays, and their agents carried on their most important political activities with Henry VIII and the Protestant Princes in the 1530s and 1540s in order to secure a confessional concord—intended to include the Pope—to end the schism and, consequently, allow for evangelical reform to go ahead in France. Francis I’s support for this scheme waxed and waned as his anger with the Emperor mounted or subsided and as he oscillated between his anti- and pro-

¹⁰⁵ See, George Hunston Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 3rd edition, Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies 15 (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992 [1962]), 907.

imperial councilors. Yet, even when the political winds were blowing against them, the Navarrians maintained significant unofficial contact with England and the Protestants, which is a mark of their commitment to the international evangelical cause.

Though an important figure in diplomacy with England from the start of her brother's reign, Marguerite only became a pillar of English interests at the French court after Henry married Anne Boleyn and broke with Rome. Presumably, this development had something to do with Marguerite and Anne's evident mutual regard, similar religious leanings, and early contact in France. Notably, during this same period England was becoming a haven for French evangelicals. Within days of the placarding of October 1534, a printer fled to London as did one of the King's musicians, Petit Robert. That same year, Nicolas de Bourbon and his secretary were freed from a French prison at the request of Anne Boleyn, and by May 1535 they had found refuge with her. In late 1535, a mysterious figure titling himself the "bailli d'Amboise" came to England on a mission from Marguerite outside of the normal diplomatic channels.¹⁰⁶ Even after Anne's execution in 1536, Marguerite was, at times, even more heavily preoccupied with English affairs. This was particularly true when marriage was proposed between Marguerite's daughter and the Duke of Cleves, a near kinsman of the Protestant Elector of Saxony and solidly allied to Henry VIII despite Henry's annulment of his marriage to the Duke's sister after a few months of marriage in 1540. This particular union, which promised to cement a three-way alliance between England, France, and the German Protestant princes,

¹⁰⁶ For the account of this mysterious event, which appears to have been another episode in the Navarrians' efforts to keep the 1535 concord talks going, see chapter 9.

never succeeded. Despite this and other setbacks, Marguerite and her court allies doggedly pursued this alliance scheme until Francis I's death.

Italy. In the land of Francis' dynastic ambitions, Marguerite had one principal ally, Renée de France, who had left France as the bride of Ercole d'Este, son of the Duke of Ferrara in 1528. To their court, Marguerite directed evangelicals on the run, most famously Clément Marot and John Calvin, as well as several of her less well known servants who became members of Renée's court. In the rest of Italy, Marguerite had a wide reputation for religious fervor, for having insight and influence in French foreign affairs, as well as for admiring Italian culture. She was thus often the target—a willing one—of petitions from humanists, exiled Florentine republicans, and even the Pope. All the same, if we strip away the cases where the *quid pro quo* of cultural patronage or mercenary motives in political schemes operated, Marguerite had few contacts in Italy with whom she actively collaborated in promoting religious reform. Aside from Renée, she exchanged messages of good will and wishes for greater cooperation with Vittoria Colonna and Cardinal Vergerio, two leading figures among Italian reformists, during the early 1540s, but no evidence exists that they shared much more than mutual regard.

If we take a bird's eye view of Europe, the Navarrian network's tracks can be seen criss-crossing France on into strongholds of evangelical sentiment abroad. The broad scope of their ambitions and efforts is impressive. Yet, we also see that they did not succeed in convincing Francis I to implement a magisterial reformation in France. The chapters that follow are therefore the story of a historical path not taken. Their

multifaceted efforts are, nevertheless, the main story of the reformation in France prior to the Reformed ascendancy and as such deserve a detailed retelling not as a prelude to those later events in France, but as an integral part of the early reformation in Europe.

3. The Valois Trinity Takes Power: New Regime and Church Reform (1515–1521)

Ung seul cueur en troys corps aujourd'huy voy en France,
 Régnant en doulx accords sans quelque différence,
 D'amour tant enlacez qu'il semble que Nature,
 Les formant, ayt chacez dissension, murmure,
 Pour nourrir sans discords amoureuse alliance.

Ung Pin, bien m'en records, en Savoye eut croissance,
 Si très beau que dès lors le Lys pour sa plaisance
 Fleurons y a entrez et mys par géniture
 Ung seul cueur en troys corps.

L'un est entre les fors nommé pour sa puissance,
 François, franc aux efforts, des François la fiance.
 Sa seur bien congnoissez, duchesse nette et pure,
 Bonne trop plus que assez. O noble norriture!
 Ung seul cueur en troys corps.

– Jehan Marot¹

I. The Royal Trinity

Early in Francis I's reign, a term was coined to celebrate the special relationship between him, his mother, Louise of Savoy, and his sister Marguerite, Duchess of Alençon: "the royal trinity." François Dumoulin de Rochefort, the king's tutor, had invented it, and poets and artists, such as Jehan Marot, quickly adopted it as one of the chief symbols for representing the new royal regime.² This surprising appropriation of a

¹ Jehan Marot, *Recueil des oeuvres*, TLF 501. ed. Gérard Defaux (Geneva: Droz, 1999), XXX–XXX.

² Citing Jehan Marot's poem, Ann-Marie Lecoq devotes a rich chapter to the metaphor of the royal trinity, which courtiers and the royal threesome itself employed early and frequently. See, "L'un des angles du 'parfait triangle,' chapter in *François I^r imaginaire: Symbolique et politique à l'aube de la Renaissance française* (Paris: Macula, 1987), 393–433.

Myra Orth relates that in François Du Moulin's translation of Psalm 26 (BnF ms. f.fr. 2088), dedicated to Louise and to Francis, he reprises the 'trinity' metaphor employing Marguerite's name as a synonym for union. Similarly, the anonymous "Livre de prières" (BnF n.a.lat. 83), an orthodox prayer book, is illustrated with miniatures of the life of Christ, Saint Martin, and the royal family depicted as a

divine metaphor points to a remarkable fact: Francis closely associated his mother and sister in his rule.

This sharing of power was a natural expression of their tightly-knit family relationship that had developed during the difficult years prior to Francis' succession. The Valois trinity took form in 1496, when Charles of Angoulême died leaving his twenty-year-old wife with two young children and significant titular rights but little protection. Although closely guarded by Louis XII, Louise single-mindedly managed the family so that Francis, who was a few fortuitous steps from the throne, would one day become a great lord, and, God willing, king. When Louis XII died on 1 January 1515, the crown passed to his first-cousin-once-removed, Francis, the twenty year old Count of Angoulême. Though Francis had an indisputable claim to the throne by Salic law, he had yet to discover if he could effectively exercise his royal power. Kinship, loyalty, or obligation bound few prelates, high nobles, and royal officials to him. Francis had not even been Louis' most powerful vassal; Charles of Bourbon had enjoyed this status.³ Additionally, some taint may have rested on the house of Angoulême since Francis' father had participated in The Foolish War (*la guerre folle*), a rebellion of nobles during

trinity. Other literary sources testify to the prevalence of this theme. See her "Manuscripts pour Marguerite," in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492–1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 85–105, esp. 87–89. In discussing this theme, Jourda notes a further poem on Marguerite's place in the royal trinity (BnF ms. f.fr. 2964, f. 27), *Marguerite*, 59. See also, Jean Jacquart, *François I^{er}* (Paris: Fayard, 1994), 411.

³The marriage of Charles and Susanne de Bourbon in 1500 unified a large collection of independent duchies and counties into a compact unit in the center of France. For further details and a map, see Léon and Albert Mirot, *Manuel de géographie historique de la France*, 2 parts, 2nd ed., (Paris: Picard 1947 & 1950; reprint in one volume Paris: Picard, 1980) 221, 229–231; for Charles de Bourbon's status as Francis I's most powerful vassal, his illustrious military reputation, his regalian powers in his territories, and the offices granted to him later by Francis I, see Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 42–43 and 200–206.

Charles VIII's minority that was quickly crushed.⁴ Nor had Francis established a significant reputation as a warrior. Before his coronation, his most notable exploit was to serve as lieutenant general during a failed campaign to retake Spanish Navarre in 1512, when he was scarcely past adolescence.⁵

Louis XII had feared that "this rude boy will spoil it all," and so he had carefully prepared to ensure a smooth transmission of power.⁶ As early as 1500 Louis made plans to marry his daughter, then one year old, to his presumptive heir, Francis, should he fail to have a son. After his wife gave birth to a still-born male in 1512 and narrowly escaped death, Louis finally gave Francis a prominent place in his household. In 1514, faced with his own failing health and the death of his wife, the king married his eldest daughter, Claude, to Francis.

With this link forged, there was no palace revolution or noble rebellion at Francis' succession. Aided by Louis XII's advisors, the young king took firm control of power in a rapid and well orchestrated flurry of activity.⁷ Francis immediately confirmed the rights of the Gallican church, religious orders, universities, parlements, towns, and guilds. In a season of public, royal theater, he took up the sacred mantel of kingship in the accustomed coronation ceremonies, holy pilgrimages, and splendid town-entries.

⁴ In fact, Charles d'Angoulême's marriage to Louise of Savoy was one of the prices he had to pay for his defeat. Charles Terrasse, *François I^{er}: Le roi & le règne*, vol. 1 (Paris: Grasset, 1943), 10. Cf. Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 1–3. Though an older work, Terrasse's study is valuable since he often provides additional details and more extensive quotations than Knecht does on issues that they treat in common. This merit is undermined, however, by a systematic lack of notes. Knecht study is without doubt a much finer work, being broader in scope and more penetrating in insight.

⁵ Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 15.

⁶ "Ce gros garçon gâtera tout," Terrasse, *François I^{er}* 1, 48.

⁷ Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 41–49; Terrasse, *François I^{er}* 1, 58–77 includes extensive

Employing his new royal powers, he distributed honors, wealth, and offices to placate powerful vassals, reward loyal courtiers, and exalt his family. We will first examine how much power Francis gave to Marguerite and then turn to see how she used it in foreign and religious affairs in the years prior to the out-break of the first Hapsburg war and her involvement with the Meaux reform.

II. Marguerite: The Trinity's Minor Partner and Her New Powers

Louise and Marguerite particularly benefited from Francis' accession. However, his largess was more than a mere loving gesture. His gifts equipped his mother and sister to serve as helpmates in implementing the projects that dominated the first six years of his reign: retaking Milan, augmenting the different branches of his royal government, strengthening his hold over the nomination of prelates under the Concordat of Bologna (1516), and establishing his power at home against his major vassals, chiefly the house of Bourbon, as well as abroad against his Hapsburg rivals, Maximillian and Charles of Burgundy.

In the Trinity there was a clear division of personas and roles. In her *Journal*, Louise of Savoy recorded the joy she felt when her beloved 'Caesar' was finally crowned:

On the feast of St. Paul's conversion 1515, my son was anointed and consecrated in the Cathedral of Reims. For this I am indebted and obligated to God's mercy, through which I have been abundantly rewarded for all the trials and tribulations that I suffered in childhood and the flower of my youth. Humility has kept me company and patience has never abandoned me.⁸

quotations from Francis I's coronation oaths.

⁸ "Le jour de la Conversion de saint Paul 1515, mon fils fut oint et sacré en l'église de Rheims.

Throughout her *Journal*, Louise speaks of herself as a sort of lightning-rod, attracting and transmitting divine blessings through her guiding moral force, that helped Francis come to power and rule effectively. She did not perceive this regime as a royal trinity, instead she saw Marguerite and other close advisors as circling in close orbit around Francis and herself.⁹ Indeed, ambassadorial reports confirm that in the Trinity Louise wielded a preponderant 'paternal' authority.¹⁰

Though Marguerite was the 'ghostly' member of the trinity, she nonetheless played a significant role in Francis's regime, more in line with the vision of Jehan Marot's poem than with that of Louise's *Journal*. A rough measure of Louise and Marguerite's relative power comes by comparing the gifts they received from Francis. At his accession, Francis granted to Louise the fees paid by towns, guilds, and other corporations for the confirmation of their rights, elevated her Angoulême to a duchy, and invested her with usufruct of yet another duchy, two counties, and a barony. Moreover,

Pour ce, suis-je bien tenue et obligée à la divine miséricorde, par laquelle j'ay esté amplement récompensée de toutes les adversités et inconvénients qui m'estoient advenues en mes premiers ans, et en la fleur de ma jeunesse. Humilité m'a tenu compagnie, et patience ne m'a jamais abandonnée." Louise of Savoy, "Journal de Louise de Savoye," in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, 1st ser., vol. 5, 83–93 (Paris, 1838), 89.

⁹ Other advisors mentioned by Louise include, Queen Claude, René 'le Bastard' de Savoie (Louise's half-brother), as well as the top officer in Louise's court, Guillaume of Montmorency. See Louise of Savoy, *Journal*, 89–91, esp. dates: 28 August 1514; 30 June 1515; 8 April 1516; 17 January 1517; 1 October 1517; 19 February 1519; and 16 October 1519. If Francis had been an only son, one can easily imagine that Louise would have welcomed the 'Madonna and Child' as a metaphor for their rule.

¹⁰ Louise was mentioned frequently in ambassadors' dispatches, because, as Suffolk, West, and Sir Richard Wingfield noted to Henry VIII, in February 1515, the Duchess of Angoulême, "hath a great stroke in all matters with the King her son," *Letters and Papers* 2, no. 105. During the period before 1521, ambassadors only mention Marguerite about a tenth as often as Louise and Francis. Nevertheless, they described the royal family as a 'trinity,' albeit an imbalanced one, around which orbited Queen Claude and other top courtiers, see *Letters and Papers* 2, no. 4675; and *Letters and Papers* 3, nos. 38, 142, 145, and 869.

on 15 July 1515 before leading his army on campaign to retake Milan, he made her Regent.¹¹

For their part, Marguerite and her husband, Charles of Alençon, obtained the right to name for each profession in every town one new guild masters, who, it was implied, would pay for their titles.¹² Francis settled the rights of the hotly-contested the Duchy of Armagnac on them.¹³ In addition, Francis recognized Charles as the second person of the realm, first ‘prince of the blood’, that is, his successor should he die without legitimate sons, and appointed him Lieutenant-General of Normandy.¹⁴ Two years later, Francis endowed Marguerite exclusively with the Duchy of Berry and bestowed on her an annual pension of 24,000 *livres tournois*.¹⁵ These gifts to Louise, Marguerite, and Charles of Alençon were considerably larger than those given to other courtiers at the time.¹⁶ More importantly, they equipped Louise and Marguerite with concrete powers that made them mighty territorial lords.

A further indication of the scope and importance of Louise and Marguerite’s new powers can be obtained by comparing the sizes and rates of increase of their households

¹¹ Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 71.

¹² CAF 1, no. 52, 9.

¹³ For the history of this disputed succession and a full bibliography see Jourda, *Marguerite*, 44–45, 52; and for Marguerite’s territories and revenues (Le Comte) H. de la Ferrière-Percy, *Marguerite d’Angoulême, soeur de François I^{er}: Son livre de dépenses (1540–1549). Étude sur ses dernières années* (Paris: Aubry, 1862; reprint Calmann-Lévy, 1891), 11 ff.

¹⁴ He was made governor of Normandy 6 February 1515, CAF 5, no. 15758, 212.

¹⁵ 16 January 1518: “Mandement à Jean Sapin, receveur général de Languedoil et Guyenne, de payer à Marguerite de France, duchesse d’Alençon, sœur unique du roi, la somme de 24,000 livres tournois, à titre de pension. Amboise, 16 janvier 1517 [1518 n.s.].” CAF 5, no. 16551, 362.

¹⁶ For instance, Francis bestowed upon his most powerful vassal, Charles de Bourbon, the office of Constable and raised his county of Vendôme to the status of a Duchy. Others received less than Louise, Marguerite, and Bourbon in accordance with their rank and importance. Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 42–43.

with that of Francis himself. The king's household together with those of his relatives made up the core of his royal court. Among the several branches of royal government, Francis' personal court was an important locus of his power.¹⁷ Francis often employed his courtiers and their relatives in foreign affairs, domestic administration, and the church. During Francis' reign, his personal household grew markedly in number and total wages, far outstripping those of his predecessors. Louise and Marguerite, like all the great nobles, relied upon an extensive number of 'loyal servants' to exercise power and manage their affairs. In turn, they secured royal offices for their clients, effectively increasing their influence beyond their own territorial or administrative fiefdoms.

¹⁷ Knecht has skillfully described the relationship between the king's household and the several branches of royal administration see, chap. 6, "The king and his court," in *Renaissance Warrior*, 105–141, esp. 113–123.

Table 1.**Royal Family Household Accounts¹⁸**

Household	Year	No. of persons	Wages in livres	Remarks
Francis, duc d'Angoulême	1512	200		Larger in number than Louis XII's court of same year
Francis I	1517		65,915	
Francis I	1523	540		170% increase in personnel since 1512
Francis I	1535	622	214,918	211% increase in personnel since 1512 226% increase in wages since 1517
Louise of Savoy	1515	203	28,114	
Louise of Savoy	1522	314	40,259	54% increase in personnel since 1515 43% increase in wages since 1515
Alençon	1512	128	12,365	
Alençon	1517	189	21,266	47% increase in personnel since 1517 72% increase in wages since 1517
Alençon	1524	241	29,121	88% increase in personnel since 1512 136% increase in wages since 1512 28% increase in personnel since 1517 37% increase in wages since 1517

The figures in Table 1 allow us to make a few revealing comparisons.¹⁹ First, Louise and the Alençons clearly benefited materially from Francis' accession. After

¹⁸ Figures for Francis I gathered from Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 118 and 120; Terrasse, *François I^{er}*, 48. Figures for the households of Louise of Savoy and Charles and Marguerite of Alençon have been compiled from Abel Lefranc and Jacques Boulenger, eds., *Comptes de Louise de Savoie (1515, 1522) et de Marguerite d'Angoulême (1512, 1517, 1524, 1529, 1539)* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1905). Saulnier counts slightly higher wage totals for the Alençon household, putting them in 1517 at 23,000 *livres* and in 1524 at 33,000 *livres* in round figures, Saulnier 1977, p. 41. These figures have proved sufficient for our purpose. For a detailed study of Francis I's finances see Philippe Hamon, *L'argent du roi: Les finances sous François I^{er}* (Paris: Comité pour l'histoire économique et financière de la France, 1994).

¹⁹ The king's household and those of his children (240 persons in 1523) were supposed to be paid

Francis came to power their households expanded respectively 54% between 1515–1522 and 47% between 1512–1517, pointing to sizable development in their direct patronage.²⁰ These rates of increase were certainly less elevated than that of Francis' household, 170% between 1512–1523 compared with 88% for the Alençons between 1512–1524, but nevertheless they were very substantial. The combined total wages of Louise and the Alençons' household budgets (in 1515 and 1517 respectively) were roughly equal to three-quarters of Francis' in 1517. The accounts from 1522–1524 show that compared with Francis' rolls in 1524, Louise employed three-fifths as many servants in 1522 and the Alençons slightly under half as many in 1523. In those years, Louise and the Alençons combined households were more numerous than Francis' own house.²¹

Louise and Marguerite's disposable income probably increased even more sizably during this period. In 1524, the Alençons were spending only 7,855 *livres* more on personnel than they had in 1517, yet, in the meantime Marguerite had received Berry and her large annual pension (24,000 *livres*). Obviously, Marguerite had control over a large

out of the earnings from his royal demesne. This was hardly sufficient for these growing institutions. In 1521, Francis revoked all previous alienations of royal lands in order to restore his demesne income, which he had had to supplement from his 'extraordinary' fisc. The latter, raised from the *taille*, special grants, and the *gabelle* was supposed to cover war expenses. "War expenses" presumably included his pension budget, which he used to secure the good will of French nobles, mercenary captains, allies, and potential foes. In 1521, a war year, Francis paid royal pensions amounting to 419,570 *livres*, or roughly six times his personal household budget for 1517. See Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection Fontanieu, portefeuille 173–174: 4 July, "État des pensions payées par le roi." Cited by Ludovic Lalanne, ed., *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris*, Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris: Renouard, 1854; reprint New York, 1965), appendix, 472.

²⁰ Louise's household budget for 1515, the first year of Francis' reign, may already contain a sizable increase.

²¹ These rough statistics need to be adjusted for the fact that the different households often employed the same persons at the same time. See below.

fund that was outside her husband's control and did not go to household wages.²² Ready cash was an important source of power and patronage.

These comparisons run the danger of creating the false impression that the Valois court was neatly compartmentalized. An extensive prosopography would reveal the details, but it is evident that the royal Trinity's households were commingled.²³ The ruling family shared personnel—often the same person accumulated offices in two or more of these households—or hired from the same families. Briçonnet, Brinon, Frotté, Izernay, Montmorency, and Olivier are but a few of the surnames that their rolls had in common. This mingling was in fact physical. During Louise or Marguerite's frequent stays at court their retinues accompanied them.

What role did Marguerite and her husband play in Francis' regime during the period before the outbreak of the first Hapsburg war in 1521? Dynastic ambition, the desire to increase wealth, gain glory, and win honor for oneself and one's lineage, animated Francis I as much as it had any of his predecessors. Since the days of Hugues Capet (r. 987–996), French kings had sought to reestablish regalian power which had devolved into the hands of local lords in the ninth and ten centuries.²⁴ The obstacles to the

²² Quite possibly chunks of this supplemental revenue would have been spent on the cost of following Francis' court in its ceaseless migrations. While Francis' household wages in 1517 were 65,915 *livres*, in 1516 the actual cost of running his court was 622,899 *livres*, much of it was spent in feeding his numerous band, foddering their horses, and paying other transportation costs. It is not clear if Francis paid for the traveling costs of his relatives' entourages, but he certainly was not responsible for provisioning everyone as foreign 'resident' ambassadors bitterly complained. The court at full strength numbered near 10,000 and took 18,000 horses to move, see Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 123 and 131.

²³ Short of a full prosopography, a rough sketch of the situation could be drawn by comparing the names in Louise and Marguerite's rolls with the index from the *Catalogue des actes de François I^{er}* to determine how many had multiple appointments or successive ones in the different houses of the royal family.

²⁴ See Mirot, *Géographie historique*, 104–233, especially 104–111 and 224–233.

growth of monarchical power were both internal and external. Cadet branches of the royal house tended to develop their own identities and dynastic ambitions that opposed the expansion of monarchical power. The most important example is the house of Burgundy, whose Dukes created a veritable kingdom extending from the eastern border of France with the Empire north-westward into the Low Countries. Slowly and fitfully, French kings reestablished their lordship in France by military force or through marriage alliances.²⁵ Both methods were usually sealed with legal charters renewing and specifying the king's rights. In practice, administering the royal demesne and maintaining royal prerogatives in the seigneuries of the king's vassals was an unending problem.

In the face of these perennial problems, Francis employed Marguerite as a loyal *lieutenant*, to help him govern territories not tightly bound by royal control, such as the county of Armagnac. The rights to this seignury had been disputed since the late fifteenth century by the crown, the house of Angoulême, and the house of Alençon, who were the legal heirs according to the last count's will.²⁶ Some of the sharper differences were settled in 1509 when Francis, then Duke of Angoulême, renounced his claim in favor of Charles d'Alençon, who was marrying his sister. At that date, Louis XII had orchestrated this clause in the marriage agreement merely to manage the dynastic claims of the noble houses close to the throne, for he did not allow Charles and Marguerite to

²⁵ For a discussion of royal marriage policy towards cadet houses of the royal blood and major seigneurial houses over the *longue durée*, specifically with reference to Marguerite's role in that history, see chapter 2.

²⁶ For the complex history of the succession of Armagnac, see Mirot, *Géographie historique*, 201–203, 207, 209, 215, and especially 232–233.

take control in Armagnac. Royal administration of the county only ceased in favor of the Alençons when Francis became king.

In December 1515, Francis suppressed the royal *sénéchaussée* of Armagnac in favor of the Duke of Alençon and Marguerite, allowing them to appoint their own lieutenant, lawyers, procurators and other officers.²⁷ Francis justified his policy by stating that he desired to bestow upon Charles and Marguerite the same powers enjoyed by the last Duke of Armagnac, Jean V. By 1517, Marguerite and Charles were employing two new officers specifically charged with handling their affairs in Armagnac. The Bishop of Nîmes, Michel Briçonnet, received 375 *livres* in 1517, and an income worth 400 *livres* in 1524 as their “vice-chancellor of Armagnac.”²⁸ Berrangier Maynier, their master of requests in Armagnac, received 80 *livres* as a counselor in 1517, and 120 *livres* as a pensioner in 1524. These officials, employed as members of their household, were Marguerite and Charles’ most important representatives in the region.

Francis clearly trusted his sister and brother-in-law to govern effectively and ensure the county’s loyalty to the crown. From the perspective of royal government, a stable regime in Armagnac was desirable, since it would put an end to the jurisdictional turf wars, suits, and fragmented administration that appeared to have been making it a burden on, rather than a resource for, the royal fisc. For example, in March 1516, Francis streamlined the complex legal situation in which four jurisdictions—the Parlement of Bordeaux, the Parlement of Toulouse, the *sénéchaussée* of Agen, and the *sénéchaussée* of

²⁷ CAF 1, no. 579, 99.

²⁸ Neither of them appeared in this capacity in 1512. For these details see Lefranc, *Comptes*, 30.

Armagnac—had legal competence over different parts of the county by placing it under the Parlement of Toulouse.²⁹

Local officials resisted this settlement. During Louise's regency in 1515, they went so far as to revive the royal claim, which Francis had already abandoned, that the Duchy had escheated to the crown when Jean V's goods had been confiscated.³⁰ After his return from the conquest of Milan, Francis settled the matter with another edict. In the preamble, he notes that previously royal officials in the region had obstructed his will because they feared for their positions. Putting aside their complaints, Francis presents himself as a good monarch, who, by establishing the rights of his beloved sister and brother-in-law, wanted to increase the realm's security. He ordered that, "Lectore, which is one of the strongest and chief [cities] in Guyenne [Aquitaine], be guarded and maintained and that the subjects in the territory of Armagnac be preserved from every vexation and trouble."³¹

Local opposition to the new regime in Armagnac continued. In April 1518, Francis had a case brought by his sister and brother-in-law against a local lord transferred

39, 45, 54, and 56.

²⁹ This act unified the higher, appellate level of royal jurisdiction. It did not suppress the Alençon's rights of first justice. "Ordonnance remplaçant la sénéchaussée d'Armagnac dans le ressort du Parlement de Toulouse," *Ordonnances* 1, no. 81, 381–383.

³⁰ The unfortunate Jean V of Armagnac had had his lands stripped from him upon conviction for his manifest crimes, including incest with his sister, intrigues with the English, and rebellion against Louis XI.

³¹ "... ladite ville et cité de Lectore, qui est l'une des plus fortes et principales dudit pays de Guyenne, estre conservée et entretenue, et lesdicts subjects desdicts pays d'Armagnac estre preservés de toutes vexations et travaux." In "Ordonnance portant que la sénéchal d'Armagnac cessera d'être officier royal, sera nommé par le duc d'Alençon et rendra la justice au nom de ce dernier," *Ordonnances* 1, no. 100, 507–513, 511.

to the royal *grand conseil*, presumably to ensure a judgment in their favor.³² Again, in July 1519, Francis ordered that copies of the registers of seigniorial dues for Armagnac were to be kept in the local archives as well as with his financial ministers at the *Chambres de Comptes* at Paris and with his *Trésoriers de France*.³³ Evidently, Francis sought to prevent anyone in the county from contesting or escaping the payments now owed to Marguerite and Charles.

In sum, the Armagnac settlement offered Francis several benefits: it gratified a favorite, ended a situation in which locals could exploit a divided jurisdiction to resist the chain of command leading to the king, and entrusted a key region on the southern border to trustworthy hands.

Francis' grant of the Duchy of Berry, the County of Bourges, and several dependent seigneuries to Marguerite in 1517 achieved similar goals. By entrusting Marguerite with Berry Francis gained clear advantages without compromising his royal power. There was one major difference in this case: Marguerite's husband, Charles, was

³² 13 April 1518: "Lettres d'évocation au Grand conseil du procès du duc d'Alençon et de sa femme, Marguerite de Valois, contre Jean de Lévis, seigneur de Mirepoix, à l'occasion de la succession d'Armagnac." *CAF* I, no. 32303, 584. The nature of the case is not stated. However, it appears to be a dispute over local seigniorial rights. Mirepoix is in the département of Ariège, not far from the department of Gers, which is roughly equal in extent to former county of Armagnac. It seems that the successful resolution of their dispute came about much later with a marriage alliance. See Jourda *Répertoire*, no. 654. On 22 Jan. [1537], Marguerite suggested that "Mr. de Lévis" marry Mlle. Tournon, who was one of her 'Demoiselles' (See Lefranc, *Comptes*, for 1529). For Marguerite's subsequent involvement the marriages of the Mirepoix-Léran household in 1538–1541, see Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 783 and 853.

In a parallel case, Charles d'Alençon and Marguerite were at law with Henri d'Albret, who possessed neighboring territories in the region. See BnF ms. f.fr. 3920, f. 195, for a document relative to the d'Alençon's suit with Henri d'Albret.

³³ 27 July 1519: "Lettres concernant la tenue des comptes des terres et seigneuries de l'ancienne maison d'Armagnac, accordées par le roi à sa sœur Marguerite et au duc d'Alençon. Ils seront désormais tenus en trois expéditions: 1. pour les archives desdites terres; 2. pour la Chambre des Comptes de Paris; 3 pour les Trésoriers de France. Paris, 27 juillet 1519. Copie collationnée à l'original par un secrétaire du roi au Parl. de Toulouse. Arch. de Tarne-et-Garonne, fonds de la seigneurie de Caussade." *CAF* I, no. 1063,

excluded from the gift.³⁴ Likewise, he was excluded from the 24,000 *livres* pension that Francis bestowed upon Marguerite. The exclusion has been interpreted as an effort by Francis to give his sister a measure of independence from her husband, whom scholars usually depict as a kind, if rustic, feudal lord, a man entirely unworthy of his cultured and sensitive wife.³⁵ Marguerite seems to have had little affection for Charles. That no exchange of letters between Marguerite and Charles survives is not in itself proof of her estrangement. More telling is his effacement from her intensive and intimate exchange of letters with Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet (1521–24). Although she frequently discusses the health and activities of the rest of her family, Marguerite only mentioned Charles incidentally when speaking about her inability to have children with him, or about his young protégé, George d'Armagnac, whom they were sending to Meaux for education.

Even if Francis intended to lighten Marguerite's dependence on a husband whom she did not love, that would not account for the choice or the timing of his gift. Francis explains in the official act of donation that he desired "to have her [Marguerite] participate in the graces, honors, and goods that I have and have come to me [as king] ... and also that she be better able to provide for the honorable maintenance of her rank."³⁶

191.

³⁴ 11 Oct. 1517, "Don du duché de Berry à Marguerite de France, duchesse d'Alençon, sœur du roi. Argentan, 11 octobre 1517. Enreg. au Parl. de Paris, sous certaines réserves, le 4 février 1518 (n.s.)." *CAF* 1, no. 742, 128.

³⁵ Jourda, *Marguerite*, 52.

³⁶ "desirans de tout nostre cueur ... la [Marguerite] faire participante de partie des graces, honneurs et biens, que avons et qui nous sont advenuz...et aussi à ce qu'elle puisse mieulx fournier à l'entretienement honorable de son estat..." in "Don du Duché-Pairie de Berry à Marguerite de France, duchesse d'Alençon, sœur du Roi," *Ordonnances* 2, no. 139, 172–176, 172.

Again, Francis invokes his brotherly love and concern for her station, but there were evidently some additionally legal and strategic considerations that he does not mention.

During the fifteenth century Berry had been used as a royal *apanage*, a territory normally given to support one of the king's younger sons and their male successors until it would escheat to the crown with the extinction of that line. Prior to Francis' donation of Berry, Louis XII had bestowed this territory on his former wife, Jeanne de France, in compensation for agreeing to allow their marriage to be annulled so that he could marry Charles VIII's widow, Anne of Brittany. After this territory reverted to the crown early in Francis I's reign, he first intended to protect his northeastern border by offering Berry with the hand of his sister-in-law, Renée de France, to Charles of Hapsburg, heir to the Burgundian territories outside France and a claimant to the remainder within. By 1517 the proposed match no longer made political sense. Francis' powerful neighbor had become a threatening enemy: Charles was by then King of Spain and favored to succeed his grandfather, Maximilian of Hapsburg, as Holy Roman Emperor.

Although Francis could have kept Berry as part of crown lands, he bestowed it on Marguerite in 1517 along with several strategic castles in the region that Louis XII had kept from Jeanne de France. Over the next ten years Francis continued to augment Marguerite's powers and revenues in Berry.³⁷ These gifts illustrate again that Francis trusted his sister to secure loyalty and obedience in an important territory, preferring that she do it without giving her husband any legal hold over it. The strategy was sound, for

³⁷ See *CAF* 1: no. 742, 128; no. 2362, 447; *CAF* 2: no. 7268, 724; *CAF* 7: no. 25618, 448; no. 25912, 482; no. 26268, 512; and no. 26997, 567.

Marguerite and her husband managed to cow local nobles from Berry in the 1520s, when local lords, who were sympathetic to the treasonous Duke of Bourbon, resisted Francis I's requests to help pay his huge ransom to Charles V.³⁸

Marguerite, therefore, like her mother, had been materially equipped by Francis to help him rule. In augmenting their power and delegating to them responsibility over these territories, he was strengthening his control, even when this necessitated alienating crown lands. As further proof we note that in 1521 when Francis unilaterally rescinded all past alienations of crown lands (which had been mortgaged in order to raise ready cash at the expense of long term income), he exempted those seigneuries that he had granted to Louise, Marguerite, and his aunt, Philiberte de Savoie and her husband, Julien de Medicis, Pope Leo X's brother.³⁹

III. Marguerite's Support of Francis' Rule: Foreign Affairs and the Concordat

In the early years of Francis I's reign, the royal family worked together as a well-functioning team to solidify his rule. Marguerite's known actions prior to 1521 all formed part of her family's well-coordinated plans. Before 1521, Marguerite played a less independent role in her brother's foreign affairs than she would in later years. Nor

³⁸ For a well-rounded discussion of Marguerite's career as Duchess of Berry, see Françoise Michaud-Fréjaville, "Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre, duchesse de Berry, 'laquelle a fort humainement traité ses sujets de Berry'," in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 45-57.

³⁹ 11 August 1521, the king declared in favor of his mother, his aunt, and his sister, confirming them in their rights over their territories and exempting them from his general edict (July 1521) that reunited all alienated territories to the crown, see *CAF* 1, no. 1396, 256. For the full text of this edict see, *Ordonnances* 3, no. 294, 73-77. Additional notes in, "Arrêt d'enreg. au Parl. de Paris, le 7 septembre 1521. AN, X^{1a} 4868 (à la date); Copie du XVI^e siècle. BnF ms. f.fr. 5500, f. 312v," *CAF* 8, 325-6.

has evidence surfaced that she helped to raise troops, war materials, or money to pay for them as she would after that date. In those years, her chief diplomatic activities consisted of receiving foreign envoys and presiding over ceremonies of state. Yet a few ambassadors explicitly report that they were cultivating good relations with her as a possible means to influence royal policy.⁴⁰

When her personal intervention could make a difference, Marguerite worked to further Francis' policy. Such was the case when the royal family tried to regain its losses in the Duchy of Savoy. The lands of Louise of Savoy's half-brother, René, had been confiscated in this independent Duchy by their half-brother Duke Charles II. These losses were particularly grievous since Savoy lay on the road to Italy, the target of Francis' dynastic ambitions. In 1518, Francis I and his mother sent envoys to ask Charles to return the confiscated lands to René. Marguerite seconded this embassy with a letter to her uncle asking him to grant the royal family's wish. Suitably, their ambassador was Jean Calveau, Bishop of Senlis, a trusted servant, who served both the king and the Alençons as a counselor.⁴¹ Thus they kept this family affair, which was also an important matter of state, in house.

⁴⁰ For evidence about Marguerite's diplomatic role and importance at court in the early years of Francis' reign, see Jourda, *Marguerite* 1, 55–56; 2, 1087. In 1510, she received a ambassadors from Spain; 16 May 1515, English ambassador, the Duke of Suffolk, requested that Henry VIII write a letter to Marguerite since he thought her powerful at court; and in 1519, the Venetian ambassador paid an official visit to Marguerite, by which time, he noted, she was taking the place of the queen in public ceremonies.

⁴¹ For Marguerite's letter of credence, 4 March [1518], see Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 2. Jean Calveau is listed on the Alençon rolls as one of their three counselors in 1512 at 200 *livres* wages and in 1517 after his elevation as Bishop of Senlis as a master of requests at 140 *livres*, see Lefranc, *Comptes*, 29, 32, and 45.

René had just helped his nephew win a great domestic battle that would lay the baseline for Francis I's church-state policy during his entire reign, registering of the Concordat of Bologna.⁴² After the Concordat became law, Marguerite helped to augment Francis' power over the church and Parlement of Paris, which were hostile to the crown's hold over the Gallican church.

Francis I's victory at Marignano in 1515 had prepared the way for this royal victory over Gallicanism on the home front.⁴³ Shortly after the battle, the advisors of Pope Leo X and Francis met, in effect, to increase their mutual control over the French Church's riches. The Concordat gave the French king the right to nominate candidates to all the prelacies in the kingdom, excepting those few that enjoyed an explicit papal privilege to elect their superior. Hitherto independent election had been the center-piece of Gallican liberty, at least, in theory.⁴⁴ The parlements, universities, religious houses, and cathedral chapters resisted the registration and application of the Concordat to the point of open insubordination.⁴⁵

Facing threats of retaliation from the king, the Parlement finally registered the Concordat in May 1518 noting that it was done under duress. Thereafter, Marguerite

⁴² René de Savoie conveyed Francis I's direct order to the Parlement of Paris to register the Concordat and preside over its debates.

⁴³ For a full account of the Concordat negotiations, see, Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 93–104.

⁴⁴ Under the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438) the king had the right to present or recommend a candidate to the electors. Under guise of this procedure, the king used bribes and outright threats to secure, not without fail, his candidate's election. See (Abbé) Jules Thomas, *Le concordat de 1516: Ses origines, son histoire au XVI^e siècle*, 3 vols. (Paris: A. Picard, 1910) and Marilyn M. Edelstein, "Church Patronage in France on the Eve of the Reformation," in *Renaissance Society and Culture: Essays in Honor of Eugene F. Rice, Jr.*, ed. John Monfasani and Roland G. Musto, (New York Italica Press, 1991), 33–49.

⁴⁵ For the plays, placards, and Parliamentary rebellion against the registration of the Concordat as well as the resulting imprisonments, see Lalanne, *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris*, 63–64 and 69–70; Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 232–236.

helped to consolidate this victory and to extend royal control over the prelacies still exempt from royal nomination.⁴⁶ A year after its registration, the conflict between the crown and the Gallican party shifted to the remaining sees enjoying independent election. The first of several major battles took place in November 1519 when the Archbishopric of Bourges fell vacant.⁴⁷ In December, Marguerite, the secular lord in this territory, wrote letters along with the king, their mother, and, Lord Bonnavet, the Admiral of France to the cathedral chapter, recommending the king's candidate, his confessor, Guillaume Petit, Bishop of Troyes.⁴⁸ On 11 January 1520 the chapter elected a canon from a local noble family, François de Beuil, by a vote of 16 to 12. The royal party, including the Dean of the Cathedral, contested the election. Francis refused to recognize de Beuil and seized the episcopal *temporalia* claiming that the see remained vacant. Ironically, contravening the liberties of the Gallican church, which limited the papal curia's jurisdiction over benefice suits, de Beuil's supporters appealed to Rome. On 1 July 1521, Leo X decided in favor of the majority. Even so, Francis continued to refuse to recognize de Beuil.

⁴⁶ This effort would finally succeed in 1531, when Clement VII stripped the right of election from the remaining churches and religious houses that had enjoyed it, giving it to Francis I for his lifetime. See Thomas, *Le Concordat*, vol. 2, 75–77, and vol. 3, 100.

⁴⁷ Thomas, *Le Concordat*, vol. 3, 101.

⁴⁸ "Rég. Capit.. 19 décembre 1519: 'Hodie presentatis eisdem venerabilis dominis domini nostri regis Francie, dominarum ducissarum Angolisme matris et Biturie sororis ejusdem regis ac admiralis Fancie litteris missivis in papiro scriptis ipsorumque et suorum secretariorum signis signatis, per dominos de Vastan, Nançay, Neufby, Sallat et Ja. Leroy, regios oratores et legatos: dicti domini de Vastan, Nançay, Neufby et Sallat, jussu et mandato domini nostri regis ac ipsarum dominarum et admiralis, eosdem venerabiles, earumdem litterarum insequendo tenorem, rogarunt et obnixi precati sunt ut in eorum ecclesie futurum archiepiscopum et pastorem dominum episcopum Trecensem ipsius regis confessorem eligere seu unanimiter postulare vellent et dignarentur, se sic rem eisdem domino nostro regi, dominabus et admiralibus predictis gratam facturos pollicientes et asserentes. Locum tenens baillivi Biturie, Jo. Fradet, advocatus et procurator regii Bitur. ad hoc se onus a supradicto domino nostro rege et dominabus habere dicentes, id quod supradictum est precierunt et requisierunt. Sicque major et scabbini hujus ville et civitatis Bituricensis instantissime orarunt,'" in Louis-Hector Chandru de Raynal, *Histoire de Berry depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789*, 3 vols. (Bourges: Vermeil, 1844–1847), vol. 3, 285. Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 5.

When the new Archbishop de Beuil made his formal entry, the University of Bourges, a royal foundation, did not partake in the celebrations. Shortly thereafter, in an act of Gallican solidarity, the Parlement of Paris released his archiepiscopal property.

Two years later, Marguerite again fought a skirmish that furthered her own interests as well as those of the crown. In December 1520, Marguerite began the campaign to have the Parlement of Paris accept one of her servants, Philibert Le Masuyer, as a clerical counselor.⁴⁹ Notably, clerical counselors had formed the backbone of Gallican opposition in Parlement to the registration of the Concordat in 1518. The Parlement accepted Le Masuyer in January 1521—one of six new members for that year—after Marguerite had mustered support from the King and Chancellor Duprat in his favor.⁵⁰ Technically, Le Masuyer was not eligible for this position since he was married. Marguerite recognized this, but she claimed that since it was traditional practice to ignore the rule, they should exempt him from the regulation and pose no further obstacles to his reception. In exchange for accepting Le Masuyer, the Parlement begged the King, Duprat, and Marguerite that it be a last exception and that royal orders be issued to reaffirm the law barring laymen from holding seats designated for clerics.⁵¹

⁴⁹Some 200 strong, half of the Parlement's members were supposed to be in orders (*conseillers clercs*) Terrasse 1, 172.

⁵⁰For Marguerite's letters to the Parlement and an implied response see Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 12, 13, and 14. For further letters, not known to Jourda, from Marguerite and Antoine Duprat to the Parlement on the same issue, see Suzanne Clémencet and Michel François, eds., *Lettres reçues et envoyées par le Parlement de Paris 1376–1596: Inventaire analytique*, (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1961), nos. 1080 and 1073*ter*.

⁵¹For Le Masuyer's reception and the Parlement's several requests for an edict reserving clerical offices to celibate churchmen see CAF 7, no. 25974, 489 and Clémencet, *Lettres du Parlement de Paris* nos. 1426–28 citing AN X^{1A} 9324^A, nos. 71–73.

Le Masuyer was not the first laymen to hold a parliamentary post reserved for someone in orders. His predecessor, François Crespin, also a member of Marguerite's household, had been granted the dispensation for being married when he was received in April, 1518.⁵² In 1521, two more counselors were exempted from the regulation so that they could become *conseillers clercs*.⁵³ Francis and Marguerite's efforts to install their hand-picked laymen for such offices seems to have been an effort to stock the Parlement with members amenable to the royal will. Le Masuyer would sit on the bench until his death in 1542. Nor was he the last layman to hold such a clerical post with royal dispensation.⁵⁴

Recently, scholars have downplayed the importance of the Concordat, stressing that it simply legitimated *de facto* royal control over episcopal and monastic elections, at most, easing the application of royal will.⁵⁵ This view does not explain the near-rebellious opposition by universities, parlements, and cathedral chapters to its registration. Later in 1525, when Francis's capture at Pavia left France with a weak regency government, the Gallican party seized the opportunity to try to overturn the Concordat. In exchange for their support of her government and cooperation in raising

⁵² Marguerite intended Le Masuyer to replace Crespin, who had just been promoted within the Parlement. See her first letter to Parlement in Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 12, p. 6. See further on Crespin, *CAF* 7, nos. 25962 and 25963, 488.

⁵³ See *CAF* 7, nos. 25977 and 25982, 489.

⁵⁴ For another layman who was granted a dispensation from being in orders when taking a post as a *conseiller clerc*, see *CAF* 7, no. 26087, 498.

⁵⁵ Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 100–103. On the other hand, Edelstein concludes with good reason that the Concordat was intended to contribute significantly to the centralization of Francis I's power, though, as she recognizes, for lack of studies of the episcopacy during previous reigns it cannot be established whether Francis actually derived greater power from the church than had his predecessors, see "Church Patronage," 47–49.

Francis' ransom, the Parlement demanded first of all that the Regent, Louise of Savoy, reestablish the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges.⁵⁶

Money drove the conflict over the chief benefices. Members of the high bourgeoisie had a vested interest in the Gallican principle of election since it was their family members who, along with the high nobility, occupied the chairs in cathedral chapters and religious foundations. Only a few of their number were beholden to the royal family for their positions. Even if the principle of election did not guarantee the selection of a Gallican candidate against royal will, it gave enough power to the chapters to ensure that their members could exact some recompense in the horse-trading for votes.

Marguerite promised precisely this sort of reward in the Le Masuyer case. She offered to gratify the Parlement if they would accept her faithful servant. The Parlement asked Marguerite to pressure Francis to issue the edict reinforcing the law against laymen holding clerical councilorships. From the perspective of royal policy, this was out of the question. In her letter of thanks, Marguerite assured the Parlement that she and Le Masuyer had done their duty in presenting their request to the king, but warned that Chancellor Duprat's answer on his behalf was less than gratifying.⁵⁷

To see the Concordat as driven *only* by financial interest would be a mistake, but to deny its centrality would be to miss the point altogether. The medieval church, not least in France, had always been rich. Each ecclesiastical subdivision had come to have a

⁵⁶ After calling for prayers for Francis I and France, the Parlement of Paris' thirty-two item remonstrance to Louise, dated 10 April 1525, began with a demand that the Concordat be abolished and the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges restored. See BnF ms. Clairambault 324, f. 269r–273v for a copy of the original act. Knecht mentions the remonstrance but does not itemize its content, see *Renaissance Warrior*, 232–234, referring to the original act AN X^{1A} 1527, f. 321.

known value in gold florins (the money of account in the Papal chancery) based on its income from all sources, secular and religious.⁵⁸ In theory, prelates, namely the heads of religious orders, priors, abbots, bishops, and archbishops, to whom the lower clerical ranks owed obedience, received control over the worldly goods of their community. In practice, the elective principle saw to it that any successful candidate would have to share these goods among his electors. Even so, the lion's share went to ecclesiastical lords, who were frequently absent. These prelates in turn delegated a portion of their income to vicars who ran the institution. With the Concordat, the king was able to arbitrate more effectively, if not completely to control, the commerce in benefices. This increase in authority was essential. Now he was assured that his candidate would be chosen, avoiding long, sometimes losing struggles, as in the case of Guillaume Petit at Bourges. The new procedure freed up time and resources for other affairs. Moreover, the Concordat allowed the king to pay his loyal servants out of church revenues instead of the royal fisc. When in need, he could more easily request subsidies from bishops who were beholden to him.

IV. The Royal Family's Religion and Late Medieval Reform.

When Francis I ascended to the throne, the call for a reform of the church in head and members had been echoing throughout Europe for well over a century. Reform

⁵⁷ Jourda edited the letter, see *Répertoire*, no. 14.

⁵⁸ The value of each prelacy was readily found in these publications. Shortly after Francis I was granted full powers to nominate every new prelate in the realm, a handbook on the value of prelacies, the *Numerus et tituli cardinalium, ... Taxae et valor beneficiorum* (Paris, 1534), was published by the well-known printer of Marguerite's *Miroir*, Antoine Augereau. He burned at the stake in the wake of the 1534 Placards for trafficking in heretical books.

programs had been articulated and implemented in fits and starts but without sustained success. The ideology of French kingship had long honed the image of the monarch's spiritual qualities and duties. As the Most Christian King, his first responsibility was to defend the faith from attack by heretics and infidels as well as to respond to those resounding calls for reform. But did Francis I have a vision of reform when he came to the throne, and if so, what was it? Did Marguerite and the rest of his family share in it? In comparison with his predecessors, Francis and his advisors developed new methods of governing that pointed the way towards stronger central government. A key element of this development had been the establishment of the Concordat. Was Francis I's religious policy equally innovative and vigorous? Did he plan to make use of his augmented powers within the church for its reformation? Answering these questions for the early period will help us assess the king's religious policy after the Luther affair shook up every aspect of personal piety or corporate religion in Europe.

We cannot discuss the royal family's response to the call for reform without appreciating the role of religion in justifying monarchical power. The king's reputation and right to rule rested on his protection and promotion of the faith. Piety seemed to be not so much a prerequisite as an inherent quality of kingship that—at least in royal ideology—the French monarch received with his unction. After his sacral anointing with the holy oil, the king swore to the clergy, nobles, and corporations of the realm to uphold the faith and to defend the rights of the Gallican church. The monarch's popularity depended heavily on living up to this ideal. Louis XII was thought to be pious, earning him much good will in his day and despite his conflicts with the Pope fond memories

long after his death. Later in the century, Henry III's violation of this virtue by trafficking with his heretical heir apparent, Henry d'Albret, the future Henry IV, and by having the Duke of Guise and Cardinal of Lorraine assassinated, cost him his reputation and his life.

By the standards of their day, Louise, Francis, and Marguerite were ostensibly pious. Early in the reign, they seem to have left their subjects with few doubts about their religious devotion. Francis manifested a lively sense of his spiritual duty and of his powers as God's anointed. After his coronation, he went on foot to the shrine of St. Marcoul—the traditional post-coronation pilgrimage—to receive, or at least have reinforced, the royal touch against scrofula.⁵⁹ Early in his reign, he led a penitential procession after a courtier stole a monstrance, the vessel used to display a consecrated host.⁶⁰ Such public acts of piety by Francis and the rest of the court figure prominently among Louise's highly selective journal entries. In deed and written record, their pious acts justified his rule.

On the issue of church reform, the royals sought to reinvigorate the late-medieval Observant movement that had gained momentum in the early 1490s.⁶¹ Led by the Franciscan Olivier Maillard and John Standonck, rector of the College of Montaigne, the reformist party attempted to renew the religious orders by returning them to the rigor of

⁵⁹ Knecht discusses the differing views about whether the king received his power to heal during his coronation or upon making his visit to St. Marcoul, see *Renaissance Warrior*, 45–49. See further, Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973). [XXX Full French and English bibliographical information].

⁶⁰ Louise of Savoy, *Journal*, 92, col. 2.

⁶¹ Two classic works on these efforts provide the basis for the following account: Imbart de la Tour, vol. 2 “*L'église catholique: La crise et la Renaissance*,” esp. 486–536, and Augustin Renaudet, *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1981). Rich in detail and well argued, these

their original rules. Such reformers hoped that by restoring key monasteries, rekindled spiritual fires would spread through the rest of the church orders, in turn enflaming the people to greater piety.

This Observant movement was only partially successful during the last decade of the fifteenth century. Starting with the Benedictines and proceeding to the mendicant orders, the reformers attempted to return regulars to a life of prayer, devotion, and renunciation of worldly things, which so many of them had openly abandoned for a quasi-secular existence. The reformers' progress was retarded by stubborn resistance from the Conventual houses. Despite some well-meaning synods in the 1490s and Standonck's program for improving clerical education at the University of Paris, the reform of the secular clergy made even less headway.

After 1501 reform became a royal cause. The new king, Louis XII asked the Pope to grant his chief minister, Cardinal George d'Amboise, the right as Papal Legate to visit convents and correct abuses in religious houses throughout the realm. By 1510, Amboise had managed to force the reform, at least nominally, of most female religious houses across the kingdom.⁶² However he had no immediate successor as legate and no institution or royal office had been put in place to carry forward the reform. Indeed, the resistance provoked by Cardinal d'Amboise's heavy-handed program broke the movement's impetus after his death. For the rest of his reign, Louis XII contented himself with a piecemeal reform of individual convents.

works, however, overemphasize the 'crisis' in the late medieval church.

⁶² See Imbart 2, 507–513 for details on Cardinal d'Amboise's extensive ten year campaign (1501–

As in most other matters of state, Francis I followed the religious policy of his predecessor.⁶³ Francis I continued to support the Observant movement, signing orders for the reform of Bénisson-Dieu, Yerres, and Jarcy in 1515. In 1516, Saint-Père en Val, Alemesches, Saint-Calais, the convents of the order de Sainte-Croix à Paris, and Fontevrault; in 1518, the Carmelites of Toulouse; and in 1519, Saint-Germain in Auxerre, were reformed at royal order.

There is some evidence that Francis also sought to revive the d'Amboise model for a centralized reform of the religious orders. In 1516, Leo X gave the Cardinal of Luxembourg the right to visit monasteries in France as Papal Legate. The next year, the abbeys in the Norman dioceses of Rouen, Sées, and Bayeux were visited. In that same year Francis' confessor, Guillaume Petit authorized the Bishop of Meaux, Guillaume Briçonnet, to inspect the abbeys in that diocese. In 1518, the new Legate, Cardinal Boisy was granted papal powers to continue the reforms.

Marguerite seconded her brother's reform efforts using her status as a member of the royal family and her executive power as Duchess in Alençon and Berry. Remarkably, the majority of her fifteen known letters prior to June 1521, are concerned with reforming religious houses. On many occasions, her letter was but one in a volley of missives sent by the royal family and its councilors, the collective impact of which was meant to demonstrate the court's unity and monastic reform.

1510) to reform the religious houses of France.

⁶³ For his assessment and the following examples, see Imbart de la Tour, *Origines* 2, 514. Apart from Francis' Concordat with the Pope and attitude towards heresy, his early religious policy is not assessed as such (whether it existed explicitly or implicitly) in Knecht's biography. Terrasse merely mentions that the Concordat of Bologna included articles directed at removing abuses among the clergy and monks.

In the first of these letters, dated 23 August 1515, Marguerite requested that the Parlement of Paris support the reformed Dominicans in Le Mans against the Conventuals who were resisting being reformed.⁶⁴ This act placed her squarely behind the royal support for the Observant movement. Since late in the reign of Louis XII, the royal court had been supporting the Observant Dominicans, a wing of the Dutch congregation, against the French Conventuals who were backed by the Parlement of Paris. From Rome, Cardinal Cajetan and the Pope threw their weight behind the Observants.⁶⁵ Meanwhile, the Parlement protected the Conventuals in keeping with their traditional defense of Gallican liberties. Shortly before he died, Louis had eased Gallican opposition by convincing Leo X to detach the reformed Dominican houses from their Dutch superiors and to reorganize them into an autonomous French congregation. Louis then proceeded to hand over non-reformed, Conventual, houses to the Observants.

Marguerite also collaborated in the royal reform program directed at Benedictine houses. On 14 January 1516, Marguerite joined with Queen Claude and Louis of Savoy in asking the Parlement of Paris to aid the reform of the convent of Yerres.⁶⁶ This Benedictine convent was one of the latest scheduled for reform on the model of Fontevault, which Cardinal Amboise had first purified in 1501. Like the Cardinal before them, the royal family seemed particularly concerned to reform the houses near Paris as

⁶⁴ 23 August 1515, Amboise, "Lettre de Marguerite d'Angoulême demandant au Parlement de protéger les religieux Dominicains réformés du Mans contre les religieux non réformés qui cherchent à empêcher la réforme." Autograph signature, AN X^{1A} 9322, n. 75. Clémencet, no. 982, 170 (uncatalogued).

⁶⁵ See Renaudet, *Préréforme*, 574–75.

⁶⁶ For the text of Marguerite's letter, see Renaudet, *Préréforme*, 586–587, and 17 and 567 for context (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 1).

an example to the rest of kingdom.⁶⁷ Yerres was one of the last near the capital to be forcibly restored to order. In 1518, Marguerite promoted the reform initiated by Francis in 1516 of the Benedictine sisters of Alesmes in Alençon.⁶⁸ In December 1519, Leo X granted Marguerite permission to found a convent at Essai.⁶⁹ In September 1521, Marguerite added her voice to those of her mother and brother to support the reform of the Benedictine sisters of St. Andoche and St. John in Autun.⁷⁰ Her lively interest in monastic reform would be one of her abiding concerns.

V. Leading Characteristics of Marguerite's Religion

Marguerite's few surviving letters before 1521 reveal little about her early spiritual development. When recommending reforms she does not expose her reasons, rather her missives are administrative documents in which reform is presented as a self-evident good. The nature of Marguerite's engagement with matters of faith, piety, devotion, and good works lies mostly hidden. Evidence about the leading characteristics of her religious milieu, however, allow us to flesh out the clues in her letters.

⁶⁷ Imbart, vol. 2, 510–514.

⁶⁸ Jourda, *Marguerite*, 52.

⁶⁹ The convent was to be of the order of St. Augustine. Jourda does not indicate where this "Essai" may have been, see, *Répertoire*, no. 4. Evidently, it was in the Alençons' Norman territories, see January 1520: "Confirmation de la fondation faite à Essai par le duc d'Alençon et Marguerite d'Angoulême, sa femme, d'un couvent de pénitentes de l'ordre de Saint-Augustin. Poitiers, janvier 1519 [1520 n.s.]. *Imp. Gallia christiana* XI, Instr., col. 174," *CAF* 5 no. 17220, 494.

In another instance of supporting monastic reform, Marguerite thanked the Seigneur de Lafayette on 22 September [1520] for the favorable reception of six monks sent by Francis I to a monastery at Ardres (département Pas-de-Calais). There is no indication of the monks' origin, order, or purpose in being sent, but one assumes that they were sent to reform the foundation. This transfer fits the typical pattern of injecting observant monks into a 'corrupt' community to direct its renewal. See Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 8.

⁷⁰ Unpublished text in BnF ms. f.fr. 2971, f. 4 (Saulnier 1977, 24.1 [Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 23]).

Marguerite grew up in a family that had a strong preference for Franciscan spirituality. Louise of Savoy had named her son after Francis de Paule (Francesco da Paola), who was the latest incarnation of Francis of Assisi's spirit and founder of the Minimes, those less than the 'lesser brothers,' the Friars Minor. Francis de Paule had been called to France from Italy by Louis XI, and, enjoying royal patronage, had stayed on. Responding to Louise's request for spiritual aid in her desire for a son, Francis de Paule promised not just that she would not only bear a son but that he would someday become king.⁷¹ This was a daring prophecy since the house of Angoulême was at that time two uncertain steps from the throne. His prediction came true, and the mendicant seer received his reward posthumously. Louise of Savoy recorded in her *Journal*, "5 July 1519, brother François de Paule, of the evangelical mendicant brothers [Minimes] was canonized by me; in any case, I paid the fee."⁷² Louise also chose a Franciscan as tutor for her children, François Dumoulin de Rochefort, the same one who lauded the ruling family as a royal trinity. When Marguerite married into the Alençon family, she witnessed the piety of her mother-in-law, Marguerite de Lorraine. Late in life the senior Duchess of Alençon took orders in a Franciscan house, St. Claire in Argentan, leaving her wealth to be administered by her daughter-in-law.⁷³

A further mark of the royal family's predilection for Franciscan spirituality is their patronage of Boniface de Ceva. He was the provincial minister of the Reformed

⁷¹ Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 3; Terrasse, *François I^{er}* 1, 1.

⁷² "L'an 1519, le 5 juillet, frère François de Paule, des frères mendiants évangélistes, fut par moi canonisé; à tout le moins j'en ai payé la taxe." Louise de Savoie, *Journal*, 91.

⁷³ Jourda, *Marguerite*, 61; *idem*, *Répertoire*, no. 9.

Conventual (Observant *sub ministris*) Franciscans, who were fighting with two other Franciscan branches: the more rigorous Observants (*de familia* or *de bulla* or *sub vicariis*), whose latest champion was the fiery preacher Olivier Maillard, and, the 'lax' Conventuals who, though they had mitigated the original vow of poverty, descended in a direct line from Francis of Assisi.⁷⁴ The Observant—Conventual conflict had roots dating back to the final years of their founder, when his instructions to his followers on poverty in his testament were debated; but the divisive split had come in the fourteenth century. The French court, the Pope, and de Ceva himself had been anxious to end the division in France, by unifying all the reformed houses under the very same de Ceva. The exile of Olivier Maillard from Paris early in the legateship of Cardinal d'Amboise, along with Papal bulls and pressure from court had worked to this end. Yet the Observants continued to seek an uncompromising reform. Meanwhile, de Ceva and the Reformed Conventuals enjoyed the support of the royal court during their legal wrangling with the Observants. Signaling their strong support, Louise of Savoy and Marguerite had de Ceva preach Advent at court in Amboise during the first year of Francis's reign.⁷⁵ Thus Marguerite and the rest of the ruling family supported both the Franciscan and Dominican moderate reformed parties.

⁷⁴James K. Farge gives a clear presentation of the three families of Franciscans in *Orthodoxy*, 118–120. Renaudet calls the Reformed Conventuals, 'Conventuals' yet recognizes that they were reformed and competed with the Observants for the restoration of (confusingly) other 'Conventual' houses throughout France. For the basis of the following summary see his lengthy account of their conflict in *Préréforme*, 163, 194, 332–333, 556–558, 570–571, 590, 690–692.

⁷⁵De Ceva died the follow year (1516), and his Advent sermons *Sermones prenatalicii, sive de adventu*, were then published in 1518. See "Fichier Picot", BnF ms. occ., microfiche 18: "Marguerite d'Angoulême," (44) 5/10 & 6/10, #558. For the royal family's support for moderate mendicant reform, notably Boniface de Ceva, see Renaudet, *Préréforme*, 570–574.

A second characteristic of the royal family's religious life was its active participation in a vast panoply of traditional devotions. Louise had bought relics for her children, presumably to encourage their participation in the cult of the saints.⁷⁶ She recorded in her *Journal* the royal family's pilgrimages, participation in religious processions, celebration of feast days, financial aid in the canonization of François de Paule, as well as founding of "une service solennel" for her deceased husband Charles.⁷⁷ We may infer that this included obit masses for his soul.

For her part, Marguerite actively participated in such devotions with a serious if not uncritical appreciation for them. In a letter to her recently cloistered mother-in-law, Marguerite of Lorraine, she detailed how she would spend the 14,000 *livres* rent left to her in trust. She promised to use the first 7,000 for her mother-in-law's needs and the endowment of the convent as instructed. This included 2,000 *livres* for maintaining the property, 3,000 *livres* for the endowment, and 2,000 *livres* for Marguerite of Lorraine's 'board and other necessities'. Though the duchess dowager of Alençon had renounced personal possessions, neither she nor her spiritual sisters would be in danger of penury. With the remaining 7,000 at her discretion, Marguerite volunteered to join in the duchess' holy project in order to strengthen the convent's endowment:

As for the 7,000 *livres* that you left to me ... with the remainder [after paying pensions to her mother-in-law's former household servants] I promise in the name of the love that I have for you that I will pay for any purchases that you make for your foundations: both for the convent and for masses at Notre Dame of Alençon

⁷⁶ Jourda, *Marguerite*, 24.

⁷⁷ Louise of Savoy mentions in her *Journal* pilgrimages or other religious observances on 12 September 1515, 13 December 1515, 8 and 28 May 1516, and 24 November 1517, as well as a memorial service for Charles on 9 March 1520.

as well as for completing the buildings. ... Moreover, I will reserve 500 francs⁷⁸ for supplying decorations, reliquaries, and other items that the community has requested. I will also make sure that, should death cut short your life's journey, and so long as our Lord gives me life, your convent, its endowments and buildings will be well established, as I understand to be your holy intention, with at least 700 *livres* rent yearly, and the whole [convent] built, furnished, and fully fitted out. The [amount remaining] at my disposal will be used both to repair poor churches as well as for alms in the region.⁷⁹

Beyond the contractual terms governing the first half of the grant, Marguerite felt a moral obligation to her mother-in-law to spend the remaining funds on good works. One of these was to make sure the convents endowment was on firm enough footing to survive when their rich benefactor passed away. Furthermore, Marguerite promised to use these sums to pay for the works of devotion, such as masses, that Marguerite de Lorraine and her sisters commanded. Even so, some money would be left over. Marguerite earmarked it for rebuilding churches and giving alms in the region.

One might be tempted to see in this last decision, which was Marguerite's personal preference in the realm of fiscal piety, some divergence from her mother-in-law's choice of good works. There might seem to be a contrast between rebuilding poor churches and endowing a convent richly, or between giving alms in the region and furnishing those cloistered sisters with the sumptuous trappings of a rich cult. No firm

⁷⁸ A gold coin worth one *livre tournois*.

⁷⁹ "Quant est des sept mille qu'il vous plaît me laisser, ... je vous promets sur l'amour que je vous porte, que je l'en chargerai d'en payer les acquisitions que vous ferez pour vos fondations tant du couvent et des messes de Nôtre-Dame d'Alençon, que pour achever les bâtiments; de sorte que le trésorier emploiera tous les deniers; de quoi, une fois l'an me rendra compte. Mais je retiendrai cinq cents francs pour faire ornements, reliquaires et choses que la communauté nous avait demandées; m'obligeant que, si vous veniez par mort à abrégier le voyage de votre vie, tant que notre Seigneur me donnera de vie, je ferai parfaire votredit couvent, rente et édifice, selon que je connais votre saint dessein; et à tout le moins de 700 livres de rente, et le tout accompli, bâti, meublé. Ce que je jouirai sera pour employer tant en réparations de pauvres églises, que d'aumônes au pays." (Abbé) Eugène Laurent, *Histoire de Marguerite de Lorraine* (Argentan,

conclusions, however, can be drawn from Marguerite's stated intentions. Who were the poor, the deserving needy, to whom she would be giving? She does not say. What donations, if made for pious reasons, did 'giving alms' not include? In the preceding centuries, the endemic strife over the meaning of 'evangelical poverty'—notably among the Franciscans—had stretched the terms 'rich and poor' on the racks of spiritual allegory, uncoupling them from their nominal referents: the social and physical realities of opulence and privation. From the wealthy Benedictine abbeys to the destitute beggars in city streets, the world was filled with the 'poor,' all potentially deserving of alms depending on the giver's point of view. People of that era recognized Christ's earthly proxies in prosperous monks and hungry peasants alike. Thus the Poor Claires of Argentan would have magnificent sums to support their life of worldly renunciation, prayer, and good works. As for Marguerite's intentions, without further evidence from this early period we can not tell if she had already started her munificent campaign to succor students, prisoners, orphans, widows, and refugees, in which she engaged after her tutelage in the spiritual school of Guillaume Briçonnet, Lefèvre d'Étaples, and the other Fabrists at Meaux.⁸⁰

Marguerite exhibited another characteristic of her early religious development when she teased Guillaume de Montmorency about his failure to visit her mother-in-law in her new holy state:

1854), 257–258 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 9).

⁸⁰ Saulnier discusses at length Marguerite's alms giving in relation to Briçonnet's advice 5 February 1522 that she should pay "plus d'aulmosnes, moins d'aulmosniers," see Saulnier 1977, no. 54–1, referring to Briçonnet, *Correspondance* I, no. 28, 138–153; 145.

I showed your letter [in which he excuses his absence due to ill health] to Miss Marguerite de Lorraine, who has not forgotten in putting on her gray habit memories of times gone by. I assure you that she prays to God for you so much, that if all the women who have given you [their all?] would all have done as much, you would not have to lament a bit about your past, since they would have prayed you into heaven, where, after a long and happy life, I desire to see you.

Your good cousin and friend,

Marguerite.⁸¹

“Miss Marguerite” was an elderly, noble widow who had taken the veil, but she needed only a little reminder of a past dalliance or, at least, of a dandy whom she had known to spur her to fervent prayer for his and her own salvation. Reflecting on Marguerite’s *Heptaméron*, Lucien Febvre rightly observed that early sixteenth century people were capable of intermingling sacred and profane love without hypocrisy in ways that seem incongruous to modern interpreters.⁸² Clearly, at an early date Marguerite had a deep sense of the ironic conjunctures possible between earthly and heavenly love, yet she did not ridicule them either. Her teasing of Guillaume de Montmorency touched on two sensitive points. First, Marguerite flattered him with the idea that Marguerite of Lorraine could not forget him even in her new holy state, highlighting thereby the difficulty of training the spirit to the monastic life. The Observant movement, which Marguerite supported, had arisen, after all, precisely because many monastic houses had become

⁸¹ “J’ay monsté vostre lettre à la damoysele Marguerite de Lorraine, qui n’a laissé pour son gris habit à avoir souvenance du temps passé, et vos assure qu’elle s’acquitte sy bien à prier Dieu pour vous, que sy toutes les dames quy vous ont donné la tous en faisoient aultant, vous ne deveriés point avoir regret au temps passé, car leur oraisons vous metteroient en paradis, où après longue et bonne vie, désire, vous voir, Vostre bonne cousine et amye, MARGUERITE,” [1520?], Génin I, no. 4, 151 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 11). The underlined passage seems grammatically defective since *la* does not agree with *tous* [= le tout?] (it may be *là* an adverb of time, meaning *de temps*). In any case, as Génin and Jourda both recognize, the sense is clear, the *qui* are the women who have in some measure given in to Montmorency’s charms. Génin refers the reader to the fifty-seventh story of Marguerite’s *Heptaméron* for a discussion of his “*humeur galante*.”

havens for those who failed such spiritual tests. Second, Marguerite evoked a disputed gray area of medieval soteriology when she suggested playfully that if all Guillaume's former female friends or lovers (*amies*) would pray for him like Marguerite of Lorraine—especially if they had taken the veil—then he would not have to be contrite or pay the debt of sin to gain heaven: “you would not have to lament a bit about your past, since they would have prayed you into heaven.” In effect, those religious women would fulfill for Guillaume the last two parts of sacramental penance required beyond oral confession, namely, heartfelt contrition and penance (performing good works or devotions to remit the debt of sin). Marguerite leaves hanging the idea that this notion is as problematic as her mother-in-law's inability to detach her mind from past intimacies.

Despite her teasing, Marguerite's letter to Guillaume de Montmorency of 1520 points to a serious piety, which she shared with her Mother and went hand in hand with trenchant critiques of clergy and cult. Though by no means systematic, their critical questioning can be seen in the way they play with religious norms, metaphorically usurp religious terms, and attack specific clerics. For example, in 1522 Louise inveighed in her *Journal* against the hypocrisy of monks and mendicants as well as the uselessness of mumbled (*murmuratives*) prayers. Upon the death of her protégé, Cardinal Antoine Bohier, she criticized the popes because their “crazy ambition” had led, in her colorful phrase, to a “hashing up of abbeys.”⁸³ In other words, she did not appreciate papal interference in the court's distribution of benefices.

⁸² *Amour sacré, amour profane: autour de l'Heptaméron* (Paris: Gallimard, 1944).

⁸³ “Lors fut faict une fricassée d'abbayes, selon la folle ambition de plusieurs papes.” Louise,

For her part, Marguerite exhibited a taste for turning the normal sense of religious terms on their head. In another letter to Guillaume de Montmorency of 1519 she played with the meaning of the Lenten fast, reporting that she was recovering from an illness so well that “it will no be great penance (*pénitence*) for me to observe Lent.”⁸⁴ In a season when abstinence from fortifying foods is supposed to reinforce a deeper sense of repentance, even fulfill the penance imposed in confession, Marguerite recognized that, ironically, her improved bodily health, which she and Montmorency regard as a good in itself, will oppose her spiritual well being, since the Lenten fast will not cause her as much physical suffering. Again, in closing this letter, Marguerite plays with the normal sense of religious terms, saying that her mother, Queen Claude, and herself, the “poor hermits of St.-Germain,” (-en-Laye where they were staying) would pray for him if he wished. As in the appropriation of ‘trinity’ as a metaphor for the royal family, there is something highly incongruous, perhaps even disrespectful to religious solitaires, in calling three princesses lodged in a chateau “poor hermits.” Nevertheless, in claiming to be able to emulate the spiritual work of recluses, she exhibits a strong desire to participate in or emulate such religious life.

These few passing remarks in her letters offer but a glance at Marguerite’s religious attitudes on the eve of her collaboration with the Meaux group. In so far as they go their barometer reading points in an unsettled direction. Like her mother, Marguerite had a strong, often ironic appreciation for the striking differences between religious ideals

Journal, entry for November 1518.

⁸⁴ “...ma santé...se porte sy bien, que sy pis ne vient, ce ne me sera pas grant pénitence de passer

and practice. Their jokes, indignation, and expressions of piety are small, prosaic versions of the satire, measured critique, and spiritual ideals voiced by reformers and humanists during the late middle ages.

Summarizing our findings about Marguerite's powers and religious characteristics in the years immediately following her brother's advent to the throne, first we note that as a member of the royal trinity, she was fully integrated into the royal regime, working in tandem with Francis and his chief servants to effect major projects of state. Although we know of no independent network or agenda, her extensive household was the basis for one. Moreover, she evidently had some influence on Francis' policy decisions since ambassadors sought her favor. Ambassadors' reports and Louise of Savoy's *Journal* give ample testimony, however, that her influence was much inferior to her mother's. Second, our evidence shows that Marguerite used her powers to support the royal cause in the two great religious debates of the late 1510s: the struggle over the Concordat and the battle between Conventuals and Observants. Third, she promoted royal reform initiatives, which concentrated on the religious orders. King and court wanted to promote devout monks and nuns, who would serve as holy examples. We note that despite their augmented powers under the Concordat the royal family had little interest in reforming the regular clergy. Finally, Marguerite's humorous playing with religious themes in several of her early letters hints at her serious and critical engagement with religious matters. All these observations, however, hardly prepare us for her ensuing deep preoccupation with reforming the church, evangelizing the people, studying the

ce caresme," Génin I, no. 6, 152 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 3).

scriptures, and managing her brother's religious policy. All this became apparent to contemporaries, as it does for us in the sources, during her extensive engagement with the Meaux group.

4. The Fabrist Background to the Navarrian Network

An attentive observer in 1520 might well have expected that a new reform movement would soon develop in France, but could not have predicted its eventual orientation, role, or fate. One could have pointed to several trends that would have substantiated such an expectation: a strong current of Christian humanism enjoying royal support, the impressive and growing enthusiasm for Luther's ideas in learned circles, as well as serious concern for monastic and clerical reform among some prelates. In this confluence of reformist sentiment, Marguerite and the Fabrists coalesced at Meaux (1521) forming the center of a new French evangelical movement. At a very early date this group and the wider network that grew up around them had a remarkably strong conviction that a new age was at hand and a sense that they were called to bring it into being. First of all, it is necessary to establish when they came to the conclusion that a new era was dawning, for in this realization was the beginning of their self-identity and a basis for their collaboration. Second, we need to examine whether their perception of the changing times and of their new roles in it does not mask substantial continuities with their previous vocations. After all, since the turn of the century Lefèvre and his disciples had been leading the vanguard of Christian humanist studies and supporting varieties of late medieval reform. In order to understand their development as leaders of the evangelical movement at Meaux and beyond, we examine their long scholarly career at

Paris where their study of 'Christian letters' led through controversy to the threshold of an evolution in their thought and careers.

I. "Ante illustrationem Evangelii:" Evangelical Self-awareness

Writing from Meaux to Guillaume Farel at Basel in 1524, Gérard Roussel evoked their long-standing friendship, which stretched back before the Gospel began to shine, "*ante illustrationem Evangelii*." Until Farel's departure in 1523, they had been working together in Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet's reform of Meaux. Their friendship had started nearly twenty years earlier in the circle of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples at the College of Cardinal Lemoine.¹ In a startling comment on their academic careers, Roussel, an accomplished humanist, reminds Farel that long ago they had been brought together "through I do not know what regrettable studies" but now he hoped "[their friendship] would grow fuller and become more constant in that light of the Gospel, which is daily shining forth."² In short, Roussel was declaring that the basis of their allegiance had shifted from the pursuit of humanist letters to a new commitment to spreading the Gospel. By 1524, this common cause linked not only these two, but also evangelicals throughout France as well as several other Frenchmen abroad who, like Farel himself, were collaborating with Reformers at Wittenberg, Zurich, Basel, and Strasbourg.

¹ Farel probably arrived at Paris in 1509 and had among his teachers, Lefèvre and Roussel. See Herminjard 1, 178–180; CE 2, 11–13.

² "Ut aliquando finiam, in aliis alioqui occupator quam ut commentari tecum longius possim, abs te obnixe postulo, ut amor qui inter nos ante illustrationem Evangelii contractus est per nescio quae studia penitenda, in ipsa Evangelii luce indies se promente, amplius accrescat ac major assidue fiat," 6 July 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 104, 231–240, 239–240.

When did French evangelicals begin to believe that the Gospel light was shining anew? Asking this question, we set aside, for the moment, the inquiry into the origins and nature of their movement, and seek simply to fix the date when it dawned on them that the times had changed. The evidence points to circa 1520. In his 1512 *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, Lefèvre had predicted that the “signs of the times announce that renewal is near,” citing as evidence the conquests of the Portuguese and Spanish which were opening new avenues for preaching the Gospel.³ He hoped that God would also visit his Church in Europe and restore it. Between 1518 and 1520, as Lefèvre's critique of the cult of Mary Magdalene and St. Anne (the mother of Mary) and, more especially, the Luther affair stirred the European intellectual community, Lefèvre's associates began to believe that this renewal had commenced. By 1524 Lefèvre was fully convinced that the Gospel light had dawned. Writing to Guillaume Farel about the great consolation he received from the works of Æcolampadius, Pelikan, Hugwald, and other German reformers, he exclaimed:

Oh Good God, how greatly I rejoice when I see that the gracious gift of truly knowing Christ has now spread through a large part of Europe! I hope that Christ

³ “L'Église suit malheureusement l'exemple de ceux qui la gouvernent, et elle est bien loin de ce qu'elle devrait être. Cependant les signes du temps annoncent qu'un renouvellement est prochain, et, pendant que Dieu ouvre de nouvelles voies à la prédication de l'Évangile par les découvertes et les conquêtes des Portugais et des Espagnols dans toutes les parties du monde, il faut espérer qu'il visitera aussi son Église et qu'il la relèvera de l'abaissement dans lequel elle est tombée,” Herminjard 1, 5 note 2, quotes this passage in translation from Lefèvre's *Commentary on Paul's Epistles* without a page reference and directs the reader to Charles-Henri Graf, *Essai sur la vie et les écrits de Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples* (Strasbourg, 1842; Reprint Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), equally without page reference. On page 73, Graf refers to Lefèvre's hope for the coming renewal of the church based on the new world discoveries citing without further specification Lefèvre's commentary on 2 Co. 9:5ff and Ro. 11: 25ff as well as Ps 125 (126) in Lefèvre's *Quincuplex psalterium*.

will finally visit our French people with this blessing. May Christ grant these prayers and the Conqueror favor these beginnings everywhere!⁴

In a letter to Conrad Pelikan of February 1556, Farel recalled specifically that the spread of the reformation movement during the early 1520s convinced his French colleagues the Gospel would soon be victorious. He relates that previously, during the 1510s, when contemplating the church's ills Lefèvre had predicted, "Guillaume, the world must be transformed and you will witness it." Subsequently, when they were together at Strasbourg in 1525–1526, Farel proclaimed to his old master that the Gospel light was dawning: the time of renewal had come. Lefèvre agreed and urged Farel to continue preaching the Gospel.⁵ We can infer that, like Roussel, Farel, and Lefèvre, Marguerite also believed that a new era had begun at the time Luther's doctrines appeared on the French scene. On 16 January 1527, Noël Beda reported to the Faculty of Theology that Marguerite had specifically asked for a copy of all their decisions on matters of faith since the beginning of the Lutheran conflict, "*ab inicio Lutherane factionis.*"⁶

⁴"Quam consolationem Spiritus ex literis tuis, Æcolampadii, Pelycani, Hugaldi, et ex Germanicis libris concepi dicere haudquaquam possim, quia plane redolent Christianismum. O bone Deus, quanto exulto gaudio, cum percipio hanc pure agnoscendi Christum gratiam, jam bonam partem pervasisse Europae! Et spero Christum tandem nostras Gallias hac benedictione invisurum. Vota audiat Christus, et cœptis ubique victor adspiret!" 24 July 1524. Herminjard 1, no. 103, 219–228, 220.

⁵"... Pius senex, Jacobus Faber, quem tu novisit, ante annos plus minus quadraginta me manu apprehensum ita alloquebatur: 'Guilelme, oportet orbem immutari, et tu videbis,' dicebat. ... Tandem aliquid lucis coepit intueri; et quanta caligo adhuc restabat. Demum coactus Galliam deserere, Argentoratum descendit, ubi virum commonefeci eorum quae olim praedixerat, et jam tempus instare dicebam, quod et pius senex fatebatur, meque hortabatur, pergerem in annuntiatione sacris Evangelii," Farel to Pelikan, 16 February 1556, cited in Herminjard 1, 481, addition to page 5, note 2, citing "Joh. Henric. Hottingerus, *Historia ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti* (Tiguri, 1665), pars V, p. 18." See Quadroni, *Farel Corr.*, 83, no. 875 for the location of the original manuscript letter.

⁶Farge, *Registres* 1, p. 165, 188 B: "Deinde recitavit predictus honorandus syndicus Beda aulicum quemdam dixisse illi sese in mandatis habuisse ab illustrissima domina vidua defuncti domini ducs Alenconii, que soror est domini nostri regis, ut transcribi curaret omnes determinationes facultatis in causis fidei factas ab inicio Lutherane factionis, quoniam illas videre cupiebat ipsa domina...."

The French evangelicals' perception that a new era had commenced with the advent of the Lutheran affair was mirrored in the substantial changes that occurred in their soon-to-be chief enemy, the Sorbonne. The Faculty of Theology at Paris was transformed under the leadership of Noël Beda into a formidable watchdog against heresy largely in response to Luther, Lefèvre, and his colleagues.⁷ From 1505 to 1520 the Paris Faculty of Theology met on average twenty-one times per year (with little fluctuation) to deal with administrative matters and scholarly promotions. Only occasionally did they pronounce upon major doctrinal cases such as the quarrels between Observant and Conventual Franciscan orders (1514), the Reuchlin affair (1514–1515), Cardinal Cajetan's book on papal primacy (1516), and abuses in preaching indulgences (1518). In 1520 Beda revived and was elected to the position of Syndic (the officer who controlled the agenda of the Faculty's meetings) expressly to manage the Sorbonne's evaluation of Luther.⁸ In 1523, the Faculty met 104 times, five times more often than usual, largely to prosecute heresy charges against Luther, Martial Mazurier, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Josse Clichtove, Michel d'Arande, Aimé Meigret, Louise Berquin, Pierre Caroli, Erasmus, and Melanchthon.⁹

⁷ Imbart de la Tour argued that a highly motivated minority group of intransigents took over the Faculty through by manipulating its procedures, eventually forcing the rest of the regents to side with them in an all or nothing campaign against heresy, see *Origines de la Réforme* 3, 213 ff. James K. Farge sees a less radical transformation in the period 1521–1526 arguing that a vast majority within the Faculty (and Parlement as well) were conservatives united in the fight against heresy. However, as he recognizes, many of the era's prominent 'heretics' from Pierre Caroli and Martial Mazurier in 1523 to Anne du Bourg in 1559 had sat on the benches of these venerable institutions before being purged. See *Orthodoxy*, 37–38, 125–132, and, esp., 160–180. Both agree, however, that the Faculty substantially changed in its function.

⁸ Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 127.

⁹ 70 of their meetings occurred between June and October during a sustained campaign against Berquin, Lefèvre, Luther and others. See chapter 7. After Beda's election as Syndic the Faculty met more and more often, escalating from 32 sessions in 1521 and 38 in 1522. The Faculty's unprecedented 104

So too the careers of evangelicals changed direction during this the period. In 1520, Lefèvre withdrew from Paris because of the oppressive scrutiny occasioned by the Mary Magdalene controversy, but set no clear course for his future.¹⁰ Then, the next year, in a significant departure from their previous scholarly activity, he and many collaborators joined Guillaume Briçonnet's reform efforts. Breaking out of the confines of the University of Paris and the cloistered walls of St.-German-des-Près, they turned to address the laity directly for the first time and, in support of lay instruction, redirected their biblical scholarship from Latin, producing their first vernacular religious works. At this very time, Lefèvre's most important scholarly collaborator, the theologian Josse Clichtove, forsook the Fabrist circle to rally to the ranks of the Paris theologians in order to combat the new heretics. Marguerite too only becomes a significant evangelical figure after 1520 when she began to actively patronize the cause.¹¹

To understand how the Navarrian network originated, we need to look back to its antecedents, *ante illustrationem Evangelii*, when circles of Christian humanists and reforming bishops from whose ranks the evangelical network would draw together were attempting different sorts of renewal.

meetings in 1523 were also better attended than ever before. On 13 July 1523 largest number of doctors—80 *per juramentum*, double the average attendance of 40 out of some 120 doctors—appeared to hear “Lizet, expound on the dangers of Lutheranism.” The lowest recorded turnout for a meeting from 1500–1536 was 17 during the investigation of Erasmus' books in 1527, a period when conservatives were under the wrathful eye of Francis I. See Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 37–39, 160 and 169. Clerval's edition of the *Registres* is followed here for the number of sessions. Farge counts for 1521: 31; 1522: 41; and 1523: 101.

¹⁰ On Lefèvre's withdrawal from public 1519–1520 when he was being attacked during the Mary Magdalene controversy and being associated with Luther, see Guy Bedouelle, *Lefèvre d'Étaples et l'intelligence des Écritures*, THR 152 (Geneva: Droz, 1976), 90ff and below.

¹¹ Admittedly, Marguerite was an important political figure before 1520, but her close involvement with religious affairs thereafter augmented her importance. Her evangelical views, actions, and potential influence on her brother's response to the movement became the central themes of her life as is born out in

II. The Fabrists' Career

Although Lefèvre and his disciples had a wide range of intellectual pursuits, They pursued them as part of a coherent program. In his commentary on Aristotle's *Politics* (1506), Lefèvre articulated a plan of study, which can help us to understand his career as a teacher, commentator, and editor of texts. He describes a pyramid of studies that builds up from the seven liberal arts, through Aristotle's philosophy, especially his metaphysics, to the Scriptures. For each subject he names the most important works that should form the core of the syllabus. Emphasizing the need to study these texts in their entirety—rather than in the heavily glossed excerpts of most medieval textbooks—he nevertheless recommended a select group of commentators, both ancient and modern, as invaluable guides. For the apex of this program, the *libri sacri*, he advocated reading the church fathers as aids to understanding Scripture. He lauded Nicolas of Cusa and the Pseudo-Dionysius as guides to higher levels of contemplation, but left unmentioned the medieval theologians.¹² Lefèvre's plan of study fit comfortably within the broad humanist program for the renewal of learning, particularly in his choice texts for the liberal arts.¹³

Surveying the publications of Lefèvre and his disciples chronologically, we see that they

the abundant primary source material from after 1520, including her own religious writings.

¹² On the levels above the liberal arts in his model curriculum, Lefèvre writes, "Sed qui volet haec ad finem deducere superiorem feliciusque otium, preparetur in libris Aristotelis qui transmundanorum et metaphysicorum sunt, quique de prima supramundanaque philosophia nuncupantur. Hinc libri sacri sunt cum veneratione tractentur. Quibus assent comites Cyprianus, Hilarius, Origenes, Hieronymus, Augustinus, Athanasius, Nanzenanus, Damascenus et similes. In his autem mente purgata et sensibus exercitatis, actione vitae consentanea et morum honestate calcatis vitiis. Si mens generosior elevatiores contemplationes affectet, paulatim ex libris Cusae surgat et divini Dionysii; et si qui sunt similes, hanc procul dubio liberalem et ingenuam putaverim esse institutionem," *Politicorum libri Octo. Commentarij* (Paris: Henri Estienne, 1506), f. 123v–124r, quoted by Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 51.

¹³ Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 53–56.

divide into three phases corresponding roughly both to this hierarchy of study as well as to the three stages of Lefèvre's career.¹⁴

In a first period, from 1490–1508, while Lefèvre was a teacher at the College of Cardinal Lemoine, the majority of the Fabrists' publications related to the Aristotelian base of this pyramid. With his two prolific collaborators, Josse Clichtove and Charles de Bovelles, who had articulated similar plans of study to his own, along with other disciples—Gérard Roussel, Antoine Roussel, and François Vatable among others—Lefèvre provided purified texts and clear philologically oriented commentaries or summaries for each area of the liberal arts.¹⁵

In 1508 Lefèvre began a second phase when, having retired from active teaching, he with several followers took up residence in the Abbey of St.-Germain-des-Pres in Paris over which his former pupil and patron, Guillaume Briçonnet, had just become abbot (1507).¹⁶ In this, the second phase, while continuing to publish on the Aristotelian corpus, the Fabrists turned their attention more and more to the Bible, the church fathers, early church historians, and mystics. During this period, Lefèvre wrote only three new works relating to Aristotle or the liberal arts, though many of the twenty-eight he had

¹⁴John Woolman Brush argues that Lefèvre's three intellectual phases were chronologically Aristotelian, mystical, and biblical. His main concern is to show how, in comparison to Luther and Calvin, Lefèvre's mystical ideas were pervasive and "seal[ed] him off by himself." He is not concerned with Lefèvre's practical activities or impact as teacher, scholar, or reformer, which were hardly solitary or idiosyncratic. See, "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples: Three phases of his life and work," in *Reformation Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland Bainton*, ed. F.H. Little (Richmond, 1962), 117–128, 124.

¹⁵Rice's collection of *Prefatory Epistles* by Lefèvre, his disciples, and admirers offers abundant evidence about their collective effort. The membership of the extensive Fabrist circle could be established by systematically culling these prefaces and Rice's detailed notes. The Fabrist's works provided ample teaching and scholarly material for each of these domains of study. For Lefèvre, Clichtove, and Bovelles' extensive publications see the bibliographies found in Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, 535–568, Renaudet, *Préréforme*, LI–LVII, and Farge, *Biographical Register*, 94–104.

previously authored continued to be republished.¹⁷ While he had already edited seven mystical or patristic texts, including Hermes Trismegistus, the Pseudo-Dionysius, Ignatius & Polycarp, Ramón Lull, Clement, and John of Damascus,¹⁸ it was at St. Germain that he took his first steps, indeed landmark first steps by any northern humanist, in textual criticism of the Bible producing a *Five-fold Psalter* (*Quincuplex Psalterium*, 1509 and 1513) and a *Commentary on Paul's Epistles* (*Commentarii in Pauli epistolas* 1512, 2nd edition 1515).¹⁹ Both commentaries contained the vulgate text—in the case of the Psalms the old Latin version plus Jerome's three different translations—in parallel columns with a Latin text revised by Lefèvre according to his understanding of the original Hebrew and Greek. Lefèvre also provided summaries and commentaries for each psalm or chapter. These were his only two biblical works in this period.

In the final stage of his career, after moving to Meaux, Lefèvre worked on nothing but biblical texts. His last new works on philosophy, the mystics, and Patristics appeared between 1518 and 1520.²⁰ Thereafter, with the help of his disciples, he published Latin

¹⁶ Veissière, *Briçonnet*, 75–84.

¹⁷ Statistics compiled from Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, "Bibliography," 535–568.

¹⁸ See Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, "Bibliography," nos. XXXIX–XLII, p. 539; CLV–CLXVII, 549–551; CLXVIII–CLXXIV, p. 551; CLXXV–CLXXVII, p. 551–552; CXCIII, p. 553; CXCIV, p. 553; CCVII–CCXII, p. 554–555.

¹⁹ For the Psalms translation and commentary, see Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, *Quincuplex Psalterium*, Fac-similé de l'édition de 1513, ed. Guy-Thomas Bedouelle (Geneva: Droz, 1979) and Guy Bedouelle, *Le Quincuplex Psalterium de Lefèvre d'Étaples: Un guide de lecture* (Genève: Droz, 1979). No modern editions exist for Lefèvre's commentary on Paul: *Contenta. Epistola ad Rhomanos. Epistolas prima ad Corinthios...* (Paris: Henri Estienne, 1512) and *Contenta. Epistola ad Rhomanos...In hac secunda emissione obiter relegendo commentarios...* (Paris: Henri Estienne, 1515). See Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, "Bibliography," nos. CCXLV and CCXLVI, 558–559.

²⁰ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, xxii. However, it should be noted that in 1527 Erasmus forewarned Lefèvre that he had already completed work on a Latin translation of Chrysostom's commentaries on Acts, having heard that he and Gérard Roussel had been asked to do the same at the request of Francis I. See Allen 6, no. 1795, 479.

commentaries on the Gospels (1522) and the Catholic Epistles (written 1524, published 1527), translated the Bible into French in installments from 1523 to 1530, composed a preaching handbook, the *Epistres et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an* (1525), and wrote several short works on the Psalms. His extremely popular vernacular religious works, which only date from the Meaux period, ushered in the age of evangelical and Protestant religious literature in French intended chiefly for the laity.

III. From “Barbarian Captivity” to the “Babylonian Captivity”: The Restoration of Learning.

In 1503 Lefèvre d'Étaples explained that he had corrected the medieval vulgate Latin text of Aristotle's works on logic “[so] that no one can now be in doubt (I think) about the meaning, except perhaps a reader still miserably languishing in barbarian captivity.”²¹ Having made common cause with Erasmus and other humanists *antibarbari* in combating scholastic obscurantism, Lefèvre would later find himself, according to his young Swiss friend Glareanus, like many other scholars at Paris, in sympathy with the author of the *Babylonian Captivity*.²² Glareanus reported in 1521 that Lefèvre had left

²¹ Eugene F. Rice, Jr.'s elegant translation renders “Stilum ita temperavi, ut nullus de intelligentia (si non me mea fallit opinio) aut queri aut diffidere debeat, nisi forte qui in barbarorum castra deictus adhuc misera sub captivitate languet infirmus,” from Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, ed., *Libri Logicorum Ad archetypos recogniti* (Paris: Wolfgang Hopyl and Henri Estienne, 17 October 1503), a1v, in “Humanist Aristotelianism in France,” in *Humanism in France at the end of the Middle Ages and in the early Renaissance*, ed. A.H.T. Levi (Oxford: Manchester University Press; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970), 133 and 145, n. 6.

²² “Ego sane Lutheri pene nulla habeo opera, excepta unica ‘Captivitate Babylonica’, quae mihi tam impense placuit, ut illam ab initio ad finem usque ter magna admiratione legerim, ubi, deum testor, discernere nequeo, an eruditio illa summa animi istam libertatem, an ea ‘parresia’ [in Greek characters] iudicium vincat: ita ex aequo mihi certare videntur.... Faber Stapulensis ab urbe longe abest ad XX lapidem, neque ullam ob causam, quam quod convitia in Lutherum audire non potest, tametsi Quercinus ille theologus neque a Fabro neque ab Erasmo etiam temperat.” Glareanus to Ulrich Zwingli, from Paris, 4 July 1521, Herminjard 1, no. 38, 69–71 (excerpt), [specific page ref.]; ZW, 7, no. 183, 460–462. Bedouelle fails

Paris “for no other reason than that he can not bear hearing the abuse against Luther. Nor are Faber [Lefèvre d’Étaples] and Erasmus spared by that theologian ‘Oak-leaves.’”²³

Glareanus’ explanation why Lefèvre and his colleagues moved to Meaux may not be the full story, it certainly points to the significant appreciation Lefèvre had for Luther and the difficulty he faced as both their works were being condemned by Paris theologians in 1521.²⁴ Indeed, it is reasonable to surmise that Lefèvre read with approval the *De Captivitate Babylonica ecclesiae praeludium*, at which the Faculty of Theology’s April 1521 censure chiefly aimed.²⁵ These two captivities mark the poles of the development

to note or comment on this purported reason for Lefèvre’s retreat to Meaux though he quotes this letter from “Quercinus ...” forward, see his *Lefèvre*, 93. Cf. Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *Lefèvre: Pioneer of Ecclesiastical Renewal in France*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1984), 130.

²³ *Quercinus*, “Oak-leaves,” is the adjectival form of *Quercus*, Guillaume Duchesne’s last name in Latin. Glareanus’ renaming may be an ironic heroization of Duchesne. The Romans gave garlands of oak-leaves to soldiers who had saved the life of a citizen in battle. Glareanus may be referring to Duchesne’s ‘heroic’ public service in the condemnation of Luther. Duchesne, along with Noël Beda, was one of the principal doctors involved in the investigations against Reuchlin, Jacques Merlin, Lefèvre d’Étaples, Berquin, and Luther. See James K. Farge’s article in *CE* 1, 410.

²⁴ The Faculty condemned Luther’s doctrines 15 – 24 April 1521 and Lefèvre’s views on Mary Magdalene, which Josse Clichtove and Martial Mazurier had also upheld, on 9 November 1521 after two years of attacks on his views by conservative theologians from across Europe. See Clerval, *Registres*, 284–288, 299–301.

²⁵ One may not doubt that Lefèvre would have had knowledge of Luther’s works. On 9 April 1519 Lefèvre sent greeting from Paris via Beatus Rhenanus at Basel to “learned men of sound doctrine” there, including Michael Humelberg, Wolfgang Capito, Sapidus (Johann Witz) “et caeteros omnes, quos in Christi dilectione diligo, etiam Lutherum, si aliquando tibi occurret,” Herminjard 1, no. 20, 45; A. Horawitz and K. Hartfelder, eds., *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus* (Leipzig, 1882), no. 105, 152.

After 1519, Luther’s works were widely available and read in Paris. Aside from the Latin editions imported from Germany, circa 1521 ten reprints of Luther’s works were published at Paris, including an edition of *De captivitate Babylonica*. See Moreau III, nos. 170, 170 bis, 170 ter, 171, 171 bis, 171 ter, 172, 172 bis, 172 ter, and 173. If not from these sources, Lefèvre would have had access to *De captivitate Babylonica* from Glareanus, who was in close relations with Lefèvre since 1517 (Glareanus to Zwingli 29 August 1517, ZW 7, no. 26, 59–61) and displayed in his letters an intimate knowledge of Lefèvre’s writing project on the saints as well as movements during 1519: Glareanus to Zwingli, 13 January 1519, Herminjard 1, no. 19, 41–42 (excerpt)/ ZW, 7, no. 55, 126–129; Glareanus to Zwingli, 15 May 1519, ZW 7, no. 76, 168–170; Glareanus to Zwingli, 7 July 1519, ZW 7, no. 81, 179–180. Moreover Glareanus’ letter to Myconius 7 April 1521 would seem to corroborate that Lefèvre, whom he considered to be one of the most learned men at Paris, held Luther in high esteem: “De Luthero quid scribam, nihil habeo. Unum hoc scio doctissimos quosque et optimos de doctrina et viro sentire optime. Caeterum modum fortassis duriorum cepisse putant; verum id irritatoribus asscribunt.” Zurich, Staatsarchiv, E. II. 336, p. 13, cited in ZW 7, no.

we want to trace: from the Fabrists' engagement with the humanist project of restoring letters, including biblical texts, to their involvement in the Meaux reform as the Luther affair was breaking.

Prior to Meaux, what was the educational reform program of the Fabrists? What aspects of their scholarly pursuits in Paris either differed from or prepared the way for their efforts at Meaux?

These questions touch on that old debate about the origins and specificity of the French Reformation, which Lucien Febvre so famously decried and so eloquently put to rest.²⁶ The crux of that controversy was whether Lefèvre and his disciples contributed an autonomous (French!) spark to the ensuing Reformation conflict by anticipating the major reformers' ideas.²⁷ The present state of scholarship would lead us to agree with Febvre that Lefèvre's pre-Meaux works contain "a succession of ideas, whose development is not always easy to trace."²⁸ Moreover, we can agree that the premise of the debate—that merely Lefèvre's or, for that matter, any thinker's ideas could account for the ensuing

160, p. 362 note 9.

Lefèvre's appreciation for Luther is all the more remarkable since Luther had attacked Lefèvre's beloved Pseudo-Dionysius in *De captivitate Babylonica*. James K. Farge notes that the Faculty's censure of Luther concentrated principally on assertions in this work, including his attack on the Pseudo-Dionysius, rather than on the articles of the Leipzig disputation submitted to it, see *Orthodoxy*, 125–129, 166–167. Lefèvre's erstwhile collaborator, Josse Clichtove, would defend the legend of the Pseudo-Dionysius—which conflated Paul's disciple Dionysius, the author of the Pseudo-Dionysian corpus, and Denis, the first martyred bishop of Paris into one person—against the attacks by Valla, Erasmus, and Luther in his *Antilutherus* (Paris: Simon de Colines, 13 October 1524). See, Jean-Pierre Massaut, *Critique et tradition à la veille de la Réforme en France; étude suivie de textes inédits traduits et annotés* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1974), 179–187. In October 1523, Briçonnet would condemn Luther for attacking the authority of and legend of the Pseudo-Dionysius, see chapter 7.

²⁶ "Une question mal posée: Les origines de la Réforme française et le problème des cause de la Réforme," *Revue historique*, 141 (1929); reprint in Lucien Febvre, *Au cœur religieux du XVI^e siècle*, 2nd ed., (Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 1983 [1957]), 7–95; particularly 7–35.

²⁷ Febvre specifically denounced any nationalist motivations that might inspire this thesis.

²⁸ Febvre, *Au cœur religieux*, 34–35.

reformation conflict—is misguided because it neglects the social, and as Febvre would have it, the psychological context in which such ideas played themselves out. Extensive scholarship on Lefèvre’s multifaceted career has yet to elucidate the full scope of his thought as expressed in his numerous publications on philosophical, mystical, and biblical texts.²⁹ It is readily apparent, nevertheless, that prior to Meaux, Lucien Febvre’s “ambiguous Lefèvre” did not offer the galvanizing doctrine, trenchant critique, clear vision of the church’s ills, or remedy for them that ignited the subsequent conflict. In short, though Lefèvre had grave concern for the ills of the church, unlike Luther, he did not denounce them publicly. What matters here is to draw out those elements of his and his colleagues’ careers and thought that prepared the way for their participation in the explosive impact of the Meaux reform.

²⁹ The best introduction to Lefèvre’s life and work is Guy Bedouelle, *Lefèvre d’Étaples et l’intelligence des Écritures*, THR 152 (Geneva: Droz, 1976). Bedouelle concentrates on Lefèvre’s approach to interpreting the Scriptures, discussing several of Lefèvre’s doctrinal positions as examples of his method. The total scope of Lefèvre’s doctrine, however unsystematically articulated in his biblical commentaries of his editions of the Church Fathers and medieval mystics, needs further clarification. The late Philip Edgcumbe Hughes’ study of Lefèvre includes the most extensive extant survey of Lefèvre’s positions on justification by faith, faith and merit, grace, the Eucharist, and like theological subjects. He has consulted all of Lefèvre’s biblical commentaries and quotes them copiously in translation, though without the original Latin in the notes. It should be used with caution, however, for though he, an Episcopalian, concurs with Bedouelle, a Catholic, in eschewing any confessionally motivated attempt to claim Lefèvre as a “crypto-Protestant” or “Catholic with a bad conscience”, his short theological summaries are necessarily incomplete, and at times distorted by his Protestant preoccupations. See, for example, Hughes’ assessment of Lefèvre’s eucharistic thought, *Lefèvre: Pioneer of Ecclesiastical Renewal in France* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1984), 87–92.

Charles-Henri Graf offers a useful, though slimmer and less systematic inquest into Lefèvre’s thought using these same sources in his *Essai sur la vie et les écrits de Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples*. Henry Heller’s studies have many perceptive discussions on the development of Lefèvre’s thought during the Meaux years. See, “The Evangelicism of Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples, 1525.” *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972), 42–77; and “Nicholas of Cusa and early French evangelicism.” *ARG* 63 (1972) 6–21, esp. 13–16.

The most recent work on Lefèvre can be found in *Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples (1450?–1536): Actes du colloque d’Étaples les 7 et 8 novembre 1992*. Colloques, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance 5 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995). Essential studies on Lefèvre’s thought prior to Meaux is found in: Imbart, *Origines*, vols. 2 & 3; Renaudet, *Préréforme*, passim; and Jean-Pierre Massaut, *Critique et tradition*.

IV. Before Meaux: A Season of Growth and Strife

During the crucial period between 1508 and 1520, Lefèvre and his colleagues greatly expanded the scope and impact of their studies at Paris. Three dimensions are worth noting: first, their increasing preoccupation with religious texts; second, their engagement with monastic and clerical renewal; and, third, how the controversies that their new studies sparked fit within the growing European struggle between biblical humanists and scholastic theologians.

Biblical Studies

Having achieved notoriety across Europe for their work in philosophy, the Fabrists gained further renown as they refocused their studies on the apex of the educational hierarchy, the *libri sacri*: the Bible and religious texts. Ironically, their retirement to St.-Germain and heavy concentration on mystical texts, that realm of higher and happier reflection, has the semblance of a disengagement from the world. In 1491 Lefèvre had indeed been tempted to become a monk after reading Ramón Lull's *Contemplation*, but renounced this project, as he explained in 1505, contenting himself with publishing works "that shape souls in piety."³⁰ After 1508, when the Fabrists turned from Aristotle and philosophy to concentrate principally on editing mystical and patristic texts, they were not retreating from the world into mystical contemplation in the cloister.

³⁰ Lefèvre explains that having been detained in the world by illness and other preoccupations. "Quapropter ad priore artes revolutus ad emerendas sanctorum virorum preces, cum id in solitudine non possim, libenter emissioni librorum (qui ad pietatem formant animos) operam do," preface to *Primum columen Contemplationum Raemundi* (Paris: Guy Marchant for Jean Petit, 1505), Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 45, pp. 140–145, 142. See further Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 17–23; Hughes, *Lefèvre*, 11–13, 47–51.

Rather, as Lefèvre had outlined in his hierarchy of study, they edited such works in order to open up the meaning of the Bible and, above all, to inculcate true devotion. In light of later developments at Meaux, it is notable, however, that at Meaux Lefèvre and his colleagues never translated such texts for the unlettered.³¹

In his prefaces to the *Five-fold Psalter* and *Commentary on Paul's Epistles* Lefèvre articulated several principles that would subsequently underpin the Fabrists' decision to give the laity direct access to the Scriptures. Asserting that to understand the Bible rightly one has to read them for the meaning intended by the Holy Spirit, Lefèvre posited a two-fold literal sense of Scripture. The true 'literal' sense was the spiritual meaning that the Holy Spirit intended to impart through the words of Scripture. Any other reading, be it 'literalistic' or metaphorical, was deadly. This was his stance in the age-worn debate over the correct grounding point for interpreting the Scriptures, especially their many figurative passages.³² Most immediately Lefèvre was reacting to what he saw as the regrettable fact that people read Scripture without spiritual profit, notably monks whose life of devotion revolved around the Psalms.

How does one gain true understanding of Scripture, that is the Holy Spirit's intended meaning, and thereby acquire its spiritual riches? To this question, Lefèvre offers three complementary answers. First, in the preface to the Psalms commentary, he

³¹ Bishop Briçonnet's works are a notable exception. Not only did he fill his letters to Marguerite with long mystical expositions, he also translated a second part "*de vera patientia*" of the *Contemplationes Idiotae* for Marguerite's use by December 1521. See Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 127, 413; Briçonnet, *Correspondence* 1, no. 20, 102.

³² On the place of Lefèvre's two-fold literal sense in the history of biblical exegesis, notably the traditional four modes of interpreting Scripture, see Oberman, *Forerunners*, 281–296 with a translation of Lefèvre's prefatory epistles to these two works, 297–301; Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 181–185; and Hughes, 55–

stresses that Christ is the central subject of the Scriptures. Thus, David's songs are not historical documents about his own trials and faith, but prophetic utterances about Christ.³³ In his preface to the Pauline epistles, he reiterates this view: true knowledge only begins by believing Paul's assertion that it was not himself speaking, but the Spirit of Christ through him.³⁴ Correspondingly, scholars see Lefèvre's religious thought as christocentric. For him, just as Christ is the guiding focus for understanding Scripture, so too the whole goal of the Christian's pilgrimage to God is a quest for the union or indwelling of the believer in Christ and Christ in the believer (*christiformitas*).³⁵ Second, Lefèvre posits that the meaning of the Holy Spirit has been elucidated by divinely inspired expositors, such as the church fathers. He claims his commentaries are succinct

60.

³³ "I have tried to write a short exposition of the Psalms with the assistance of Christ, Who is the key to the understanding of David and about Whom David spoke, commissioned by the Holy Spirit, in the book of the Psalms." Lefèvre explains through five examples that "the Anointed One of the Lord," in the Psalms refers to Christ, not David. He concludes, "it is impossible for us to believe this one to be the literal sense which they call the literal sense, that which makes David a historian rather than a prophet. Instead, let us call that the literal sense which is in accord with the Spirit and is pointed out by the Spirit... Therefore the literal sense and the spiritual sense coincide. This true sense is not what is called the allegorical or tropological sense, but rather the sense the Holy Spirit intends as He speaks through the prophet." Oberman, *Forerunners*, 299–300. Lefèvre expressed this idea powerfully in his dedicatory epistle to *Psalterium David, argymentis fronti cuiuslibet psalmi adiectis, Hebraica & Chaldaica multis in locis iralatione illustratum* (Paris, Simon de Colines, 1524): "Christus dominus est totius scripturae spiritus. Et scriptura sine Christo scriptura sola est et littera quae occidit; Christus vero spiritus vivificans. ... Qui (attestante Paulo ad Corinthios) factus est nobis sapientia et iustitia et sanctificatio et redemptio." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, 476.

³⁴ "Qui intelligent has epistolas esse Dei donum et quod adiectum esse Dei donum proficient. t ii non ex se sed ex gratia proficient. At vero qui mundanum forte attendent artifice, immo qui Paulum ipsum qui iam supra mundum est, quasi hae epistolae sint eius opus et non superioris energiae in eo divinitus operatae, suo sensu ad lecturam accedentes, parum fructus inde sunt suscepturi; et inflati sensu carnis suae, multa extorte iudicantes, circa inania vanescent et tantundem mente aegrotabunt ... Assit Christus divinorum auctor munerum, omnibus gratiam donans, datamque conservans et augens conservatam, ut nullus suo sensu iudicet praesumatque iudicans. Nam Paulus solum instrumentum est. Experimentum (inquit) quaeritis in me loquentis Christi. [2 Cor. 13:3] Haec enim doctrina Christi est, non cuiusvis alterius." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, 297.

³⁵ Bedouelle and Hughes both highlight that the quest for *christiformitas* is the defining characteristic of Lefèvre's religious thought. See Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 227–230; Hughes, *Lefèvre*, 192–197.

expositions of the Church fathers' more elaborate treatments.³⁶ Ultimately, however, Lefèvre stresses that even with such aids, "sterile," "cursed" human minds are not able to gain true insight, only "those who understand these Epistles and the comments thereupon to be gifts of God shall profit from them. They owe such profit not to themselves but to grace."³⁷ Lefèvre assures his readers that if they approach the Scriptures devoutly, God will grant them understanding and a pious heart.³⁸

In these principles and, moreover, in his specific commentaries on key passages in Paul's epistles, scholars have seen similarities to later Protestant doctrines. Indeed, Lefèvre's understanding of the literal sense of Scripture influenced Luther.³⁹ Their common interpretive method led them to similar doctrines, yet there were also significant differences. In his exegesis of Paul's letters, Lefèvre emphasized God's free gift of grace and downplayed external works. For this reason, though Luther recognized that Erasmus had a firmer philological grasp on the New Testament, he preferred Lefèvre's doctrinal insights. Yet Lefèvre, in Luther's view, had not fully fathomed the doctrine of justification.⁴⁰ It is certainly true that Lefèvre did not fully prefigure Luther's

³⁶ Preface to the *Quincuplex Psalterium*, Oberman, *Forerunners*, 301.

³⁷ Translation of Latin text cited in note 34, Oberman, *Forerunners*, 304.

³⁸ "To those, therefore, who approach this reading piously, not Paul nor anyone else but Christ and His exceedingly good Spirit will be present so that the readers might grow in piety," Oberman, *Forerunners*, 304.

³⁹ For a clear overview and interpretation of Lefèvre's 'influence' on Luther, see Oberman, *Forerunners*, 288–294. For a brief comparison of Lefèvre and Luther with reference to the thought of Nicolas of Lyra, Jean Gerson, early sixteenth-century conservative Catholic exegetes, and Erasmus, see John C. Olin, *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola, Reform in the Church 1495–1540*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 107–110. For the homologies of Lefèvre's thought with Luther, Calvin, and other Protestants, see Hughes, *Lefèvre*, 96–99. Their notes cite further literature.

⁴⁰ After attacking Erasmus' notion of justification, Luther claims that Lefèvre, who otherwise lives the doctrine, does not correctly articulate it when interpreting Scriptures: "Nam et Stapulensi, viro alioqui (bone Deus) quam spirituali et syncerissimo, haec intelligentia deest in interpretando divinas literas, quae

understanding of *sola fides* when interpreting Paul in 1512/15. Nor did Lefèvre's views induce him to offer trenchant criticisms of the church's teachings about faith and works. Nevertheless, Lefèvre's exegetical method did undercut the authority of the Church and its approach to establishing the meaning of Scripture, correct doctrine, and true practice. Lefèvre would not have agreed with the assertion made by the early sixteenth-century papal apologist, Sylvester Prierias, that: "Whoever does not rely on the teaching of the Roman Church and the Roman Pontiff as the infallible rule of faith, from which also Holy Scripture draws its power and authority, is a heretic."⁴¹ Characteristically, Lefèvre did not care to debate this point publicly.⁴² Rather, he preferred concentrating on what was for him the essence of matter: increasing piety. Convinced that understanding and devotion were gifts of the Holy Spirit, Lefèvre at Meaux would come to see every reason to give the laity immediate access to the Giver and His gifts through the Scriptures in the vernacular.

Bolstering Monastic and Clerical Renewal

The Fabrists were not principally addressing the laity during the years 1508–1520. However, they dedicated a portion of their works to patrons who were attempting

tamen plenissime adest in propria vita agendo at aliena exhortando." Luther to Spalatin, from Wittenberg, 19 October 1516, *WABr* I, no. 27, p. 70, ll. 38–41.

⁴¹ Oberman, *Forerunners*, 292.

⁴² Bedouelle points out that Lefèvre is said to have argued that the church was "the mother of faith and mistress of the truth," but rightly questions what "church" he meant. He notes that Lefèvre did not much emphasize the "institutional church," its liturgy, or traditions when interpreting Scripture. For lack of a clear definition of the church by Lefèvre, Bedouelle prefers to suspend judgment since Lefèvre himself choose to remain silent, especially in the period after the condemnation of Luther. Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 120–135. We believe that he did give a clear indication of his position, despite its unacceptability to church authorities. See our conclusions to this section.

monastic and clerical reform. As Lefèvre explained in his preface to his Psalter, he wrote especially to ensure that monks would no longer become depressed by failing to understand the Psalms but rejoice in exploring their spiritual riches.⁴³ While Lefèvre was composing this work, his patron Guillaume Briçonnet was attempting to reform St.-Germain. Briçonnet was but one of several prelates, heirs of the spirit of Jean Gerson (1363–1429), Nicholas of Cusa (1401–1464), Jean Standonck (1443–1503), and Jean Raulin (1443–1515), who were seeking to reform both regular and secular clergy during the early Sixteenth Century.⁴⁴ Lefèvre and his collaborator edited several works that were particularly suited to nourishing monastic devotion. These were:⁴⁵

Richard of St. Victor, *De trinitate* (1510)

Jean Mombaer, *Rosetum exercitiorum spiritualium et sacrarum mediationum* (1510).

St. Aldhelm, *De virginitate carmen* (1512)

Jean Ruysbroeck, *Ioannis Rusberi de ornatu spiritualium nuptiarum* (1512)

The *Liber trium virorum et trium spiritualium virginum* (1513)

Nicolas of Cusa, *Opera* (1514)

Josse Clichtove, Commentary on the *Corpus Dionysiacum* (1515)

Ramón Lull, *Proverbia* and *Arbor philosophiae amoris* (1516)

The anonymous *Contemplationes Idiotae* (1519).

Les contemplations faictes a l'honneur et luenge de la tressacree vierge Marie (a translation of the second part of the *Contemplationes Idiotae*) (1519).

⁴³ Lefèvre dedicated his 1509 *Quincuplex psalterium* to Cardinal Guillaume Briçonnet, who son, Guillaume Briçonnet, Bishop of Lodève, had just taken over from him as abbot of St. Germain-des-Près. Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 66, 192–201. Lefèvre had similarly dedicated his 1505 edition of Lull's *Contemplation* to several novitiate monks, see Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 45, 140–145.

⁴⁴ For a brief overview of episcopal reform during the sixteenth century, particularly with reference to Gerson, Claude de Seyssel, Gaspard Contarini, and Guillaume Briçonnet, see Paul Broutin, *L'Évêque dans la tradition pastorale du XVI^e siècle: adaptation française de "Das Bishofsideal der katholischen Reformation" par Hubert Jedin* (Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer & Cie, 1953); a French translation with additional material of Hubert Jedin, "Das Bishofsideal der katholischen Reformation," in *Sacramentum ordinis: Festschrift zum 60. Priesterjubiläum des Kard. Bertram* (Breslau: E. Prisik und K. Kriss, 1942)], 11–20, 26–43, and 78–84. See further chapter 6.

⁴⁵ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, epistles nos. 74, 75, 90, 91, 99, 109, 111, 118, 126, and 127.

Early church mystics—the Pseudo-Dionysius and the Shepherd of Hermas (in the *Liber trium*)—were brought to light side by side with the great figures of the medieval traditions—Richard of St. Victor, Ruysbroeck, Cusa, and Lull—as well as other well-known visionaries—the anonymous author of the *Visio Wetini*, Robert of Uzès, Hildegard of Bingen, Elizabeth of Schönau, and Mechthild of Hackeborn (all in the *Liber trium*)—and the less well known, anonymous author of the *Contemplationes Idiotae*. The publication of the *Rosetum* by John Mombaer (d.1502), the sole contemporary author in this group, helped to popularize the Rosary in France. Mombaer had been an important figure in the circle of reformers active at the turn of the century having led the delegation of Windesheim canons called to France in 1496 by Jean Standonck. After serving in several religious communities around Paris he continued the reform of the important Abbey of Livry after Nicholas of Hacqueville's death in 1501.⁴⁶ Thus, publishing Mombaer's work was a tangible link to the previous generation of reformers, typified by Standonck and Raulin, who similarly had been inspired by the mystical authors whom the Fabrists were editing between 1508–1520.⁴⁷

Without wanting to draw a sharp distinction between works suited to the religious as opposed to the secular clergy, the following editions were particularly oriented to clerics:⁴⁸

⁴⁶ For the first missions of the Windesheim canons 1496–97 and Mombaer's subsequent work, see Renaudet, *Préréforme et Humanisme*, 217–229 and 302–303, 312, 330, and 341.

⁴⁷ Renaudet relates that the Observant movement had been halted by a succession of blows: the death of the reformist Primate of France, Georges d'Amboise (1510) as well as the French court and church's conflict with the Rome at the Council of Pisa (1511) and Lateran V (1512), *Préréforme et Humanisme*, 524–590, esp. 556–63.

⁴⁸ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, nos. 77, 98, 107, 108, 114, 121, and 123. Prior to 1508, only one of

Berno, *De officio missae* (1510)
 Jacopo Sannazaro, *Carmen de passione dominica* (1513).
 Marco Dandolo, *Preconium crucis* (1514)
 Claude de Seyssel, *Moralis explicatio Evangelii Lucae* (1514)
 Josse Clichtove, *Elucidatorium ecclesiasticum* (1516).
 Hugh [Richard] de St. Victor, *Allegoriae in Vetus et Novum Testamentum* (1517).
 Jean Gerson, *L'Instruction des curez pour instruire le simple peuple* (1518).

This list leaves out the Fabrists' many contributions to patristics and church history,⁴⁹ but does give a sense of their commitment to clerical renewal. They addressed their works—both those suited to monastic as well as to clerical reform—to several of the most influential churchmen in France, some of whom were themselves authors in the wider Fabrist circle, including Cardinal Guillaume Briçonnet, his sons Guillaume and Denis Briçonnet, cousin Michel Briçonnet, Louise Pinelle, Guillaume Petit, Claude de Seyssel, Jacques d'Amboise, Louis Guillard, and François du Moulin de Rochefort. The prefaces of these works announced a desire to reform cloister, clergy, and cult. Lauding Berno's treatise on the mass, Lefèvre recommended it to all priests so that they would properly understand the office,⁵⁰ noting that Berno instructed officiants how to celebrate the rite in its pristine, apostolic form.⁵¹ In his preface, Lefèvre glossed the principal Greek and Latin words used in the office, so that the priest would know their meaning

Lefèvre's publications would have been particularly useful for the secular clergy: The *Liber Clericorum* (1499) by Ramón Lull was "an elementary catechism for ignorant clerics dedicated to the 'venerable University of Paris, and principally to its Chancellor [Gerson], Rector, dean and other chief members.'" *Ibid.*, no. 22, p. 75.

⁴⁹ See Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, nos. 79, 85, 87, 92, 93, 97, 104, 105, 106 128, and 130 for patristic works and nos. 73, 81, 100, and 131 for editions relating to church history.

⁵⁰ "... librum commisi officinae, quo multis, maxime sacerdotibus, prosit. am is mihi sane visus est, qui dignus sit in manibus omnium sacerdotum versari, ne negligenter et inscie sanctum opus aggrediantur; cum etiam scriptum esse non nesciant, maledictum eum esse qui negligenter opus domini facit." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, 234–5.

when reciting them. Clichtove authored his *Elucidatorium ecclesiasticum* in an associated effort to instruct clerics about the meaning of liturgy.⁵² Similarly, Bishop Denis Briçonnet of St.-Malo edited Gerson's *Opus tripartitum* in Latin and French expressly for those of his clerics who were uneducated.⁵³ Gerson's pastoral handbook had already been used in twenty-two diocese by the time of his death in 1429 and many prelates besides Denis Briçonnet were reviving it in the early sixteenth century for the reform of their own clergy.

Controversy

It is hard to assess what spiritual profit from the Fabrists' Latin works, addressed to learned audiences, may have "trickled down" to the laity. In one famous instance, indeed the first instance in which Lefèvre was ever called upon explicitly to respond to the needs of the laity, the application of his principles to popular religion resulted in a raging controversy, the Mary Magdalene debate. This was to be an important step towards the next phase of the Fabrists career.

In 1518 François du Moulin de Rochefort asked Lefèvre for a study of one the royal family's favorite saints, Mary Magdalene.⁵⁴ Rochefort had been commissioned to

⁵¹"Ad quod quidem rite assequendum, ... occurrit mihi quidam libellus venerabilis viri Bernonis quondam abbatis Augiensis, circa divinorum priscas et apostolicas institutiones pervestigandas olim vigilantissimi, qui non parum utilis et accommodus huic rei mihi visus est." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, 234.

⁵² Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, 358–359.

⁵³ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, 395. See Moreau 2, nos. 1096 & 1831; Moreau 3, nos. 113 & 1213; and Moreau 4, no. 168, three of which can be added to the five early sixteenth-century editions tallied by Rice.

⁵⁴ There are the numerous studies of this controversy. For the exegetical and theological issues at stake, see Anselm Hufstadter, "Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Magdalen," *Studies in the Renaissance* 16 (1969), 31–60 and Massaut, *Critique et tradition*, 67–96. Massaut rightly includes discussions of two attendant

write her life by Louise de Savoy after the royal family had visited her shrine at Ste.-Baume in the south of France in 1516, where, pious legend had it, she had migrated and died in apostolic times.⁵⁵ Like St. Denis, she was a popular 'national' saint whose deeds endowed the church in the Most Christian Realm with quasi-apostolic origins.

In a tradition dating back to Gregory the Great, medieval hagiographers held that Mary Magdalene was one and the same as Mary, the sister of Martha, as well as the sinful woman mentioned in Luke 7:36–50. Lefèvre's inquiry led him to debunk this association of the three women since he found no grounds for it in Scripture and the early Greek fathers rejected it. Although Lefèvre was not pretending to offer definitive conclusions in publishing his views sparked a controversy that vented years of increasing acrimony between Europe's humanist exegetes and conservative theologians.⁵⁶ In over sixteen tracts, a diverse mix of major figures such as Marc de Grandval, Bishop John Fisher of Rochester, and Noël Beda (*contra*) and Josse Clichtove, Willibald Pirckheimer, and Symphorien Champier (*pro*) jumped into the debate.

issues. Appended to his work on Mary Magdalene, Lefèvre further refuted the legend that the Virgin Mary's mother, Anne, had three successive husbands and brought out a controversial explanation of the three days between Jesus' crucifixion on Friday and resurrection on Sunday.

⁵⁵ M. Holban provides a clear account about how Louise de Savoy's request resulted in Lefèvre's study Mary Magdalene via du Moulin, see "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," *Humanisme et Renaissance* II (1935), 26–43, 147–171.

⁵⁶ For the many tracts in the Magdalene controversy, see Hufstadter, "Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Magdalen." Massaut warns against seeing the Magdalene debate simplistically as a confrontation between humanists and scholastic theologians, pointing out that Erasmus had his reserves about Lefèvre's position and that John Fisher, who was generally sympathetic to humanist studies, wrote twice with much heat on the side of Beda and other conservatives, whereas John Mair, a scholastic theologian at Paris, supported Lefèvre's three Marys position. However, if lines of opposition were not already set, they were being clarified by such debates. The humanist ranks would subsequently split over the Reformation along lines already becoming apparent during the Magdalene debate, with Fisher and Erasmus deciding *contra*. See *Critique et tradition*, 67.

In 1514 Lefèvre had already sparred with the Paris Faculty of Theology over Johannes Reuchlin's studies of Hebrew and Jewish mysticism, since these had nourished his own biblical commentaries.⁵⁷ Across Europe, the Reuchlin case had served as a forum where, in addition to exchanging insults, humanists and scholastic theologians debated whether the study of the biblical languages was helpful, even necessary, for theological studies. Lefèvre's Magdalene treatise similarly drew into the fray the wider educated world over the use of the humanists' critical methods in assessing the Bible and church tradition. As importantly, it implicated the French court as the patrons of such humanists. The Magdalene debate thus resonated with the other disputes stemming from the works of Erasmus and Luther sounding through Europe between 1518 and 1520.

In a new preface to the fourth printing of the first edition of Luther's collected works (1520, first printing 1518), the anonymous editor proclaimed that "the German Daniel" and Lefèvre were brothers-in-arms. He praises Luther as a new prophet sent by Christ to refute the abuses in the church caused by medieval theologians such as Nicolas of Lyra, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus and singles out Lefèvre as the leader of those good men renewing biblical studies whom modern scholastic theologians were accusing of heresy.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ On the Reuchlin affair and Lefèvre's involvement in its unfolding at Paris, see Renaudet, *Préréforme et Humanisme*, 640–655, esp. 650–655.

⁵⁸ After proclaiming Luther's prophetic role, the editor expresses the wish that theologians would awaken and mend their ways: "Atque utinam omneis Theologos a lethargo tandem expergefieri contingat... ut non facile de cause, aut etiam non causa, bonos viros cum ipsis ineptire nolents haereticos pronunciare conentur, quosdam Parisiensi Scholae Theologos imitati, qui Jacobum Fabrum Stapulensem, eruditionis et integritatis columen, quod ineptam istam Novi Instrumenti versionem, adductis argumentis, esse Hieronymi negasset, haereseos damnare voluerunt, seipsos interim non citra academiae totius ignominiam, apud totum orbem, et omnem forsan posteritatem, imperitiae et invidiae atque malignitatis notantes! Sed cogitent

In the Magdalene affair, the issues went far deeper than the mere modification of a popular saint's legend. Conservatives saw Lefèvre's tract as the thin end of a wedge that would open the door to disbelief. They warned that scholars would be tempted by Lefèvre's example to reassess other saints' lives and practices of the church, thereby undermining the laity's trust in the church and destroying their faith.⁵⁹ Lefèvre may have exacerbated this perception since, in the second edition of his Magdalene treatise, he appended a discussion in which he denied the legend that St. Anne, the Virgin Mary's mother, had had three successive husbands and a daughter named Mary by each one. The Virgin Mary, he affirmed, was the only daughter of her one and only husband.⁶⁰

To accusations that he was fomenting dissent, Lefèvre responded that he had no intention of creating religious turmoil. Nor was he embarking on a project to undermine the cult of the saints, to which he himself was particularly devoted. However Lefèvre's critical methods did again call into question the validity of scholastic exegesis and the role of tradition in establishing religious practice. Perhaps it was because Lefèvre

Scholasticas opiniones nequaquam fieri debere Christianorum onera. Cogitent mundum, passim nunc emergentibus studiis, reipiscere, Laicos non tam crassos quam fuerunt olim. Christum et Paulum in primis ament, spirent, complectantur, et comperient quaedam secus habentia quam quaestionistae hactenus docuerunt. Itaque, fratres, tempus est nos à somno surgere." This was a new preface written for the fourth printing of Martin Luther, *Prima Pars Operum reverendi patris, ac sacrae Theologiae doctoris Martini Lutheri, Augustiniani Wittenbergensis* ([Basel: Andreas Cratander], March, 1520 [1518]) in Herminjard 1, no. 31, 62. Josef Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie: Verzeichnis der gedruckten Schriften Martin Luthers bis zu dessen Tod* (Baden-Baden: Heitz, 1966), p. 3, no. 6. Cf. Kurt Aland, *Hilfsbuch zum Lutherstudium*, 3rd rev. ed. (Witten, 1970), no. 638 for the first collected edition of Luther's works (1518), including the *Resolutiones disputationum de virtute indulgentia* and other texts.

⁵⁹ One of the first to respond to Lefèvre, John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, made these arguments, which were picked up by other adversaries. See Hufstadter, "Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Magdalen," 43–50.

⁶⁰ For Lefèvre's effort to 're-equilibrate' the number of biblical Marys (his found three 'Marys' in the one Magdalene but reduced St. Anne's three daughters of that name to only one 'Virgin' Mary), see Massaut, *Critique et tradition*, 75–80; Graf, *Essai*, 85–90.

himself came to understand the implications of his approach that he withdrew about this time from the field of combat.

In a median stage, during 1519, Lefèvre embarked on a project to purify the cult of the saints by bringing out new versions of their lives based upon the best historical sources. A prime target were the spurious stories, “*vel inepta vel suspecta*,” that had fastened onto their lives over the centuries and were repeated in works such as Jacobus de Voragine’s immensely popular *The Golden Legend*. In describing his contribution to this work in progress, Glareanus wrote to Zwingli:

Upon the advice of Lefèvre d’Étaples and with a few manuscripts, I have just written an account of Sts. Felix and Regula in simple prose so that those with a little Latin may understand it. I have taken care to put in the parts that most especially teach about Christ (*maxime Christo conformia*) and cut out those that are silly or even superstitious. The cunning displayed by the previous writers of this story is truly fabulous. It surpasses barbarity since they have completely muddled the central matter and have even made it absurd beyond measure.⁶¹

Glareanus does not specify what they were excising from the medieval collections of the saints’ lives, but one can well image that they may have started with the miracle accounts, like those in the Magdalene story relating how devotees to her had been saved

⁶¹ “Scripsi item his diebus consilio Fabri Stapulensis et codicibus aliquot adiutus divorum Felicis et Regulae historiam, humili stilo, ut a mediocriter doctis intelligi quiret. Caeterum cavi, ut maxime Christo conformia adicerem, resecarem, quae vel inepta vel suspecta. Mirum vero ingenium eius historiae scriptoribus, quod praeter barbariem, qua negotium maxime obscurarunt, etiam supra modum ineptierunt. Sed non prodibit in lucem, nisi tibi placuisse intelligam.” 15 May 1519, from Paris, ZW 7, no. 76, 168–170; 169. Lefèvre’s modifications would have had significant impact on those who grounded their local pride on the miraculous deeds of their patron saints. When Glareanus first outlined Lefèvre’s project and announced his enthusiastic participation in January 1519, he advertised to Zwingli his desire to swell Zurich’s honor, but failed to mention any desire to edify those somewhat learned “*mediocriter doctis*.” Others could well have been dishonored by their revisions. “Caeterum scripseram domino praeposito Tigurino, aliisque canonicis..., Iacobum Fabrum sanctorum martyrum historias e non vulgatis authoribus et hominibus doctis collecturum. Quare, ut divorum martyrum apud Tigunos historiam mitterent, oravi; ita enim futurum, ut collegio inde honor maximus oriretur.” 13 January 1519, from Paris, ZW 7, no. 55, 126–129; 128; cf.

by her aid from prison, blindness, drowning, or dying unshriven after a life of debauchery.⁶² It is essential to note here that the Magdalene miracle stories were exactly what had caught the interest of Louise de Savoy. Du Moulin explained to Louise that these were the least reliable part of her whole cult.⁶³

Having enlisted the help of talented minds around him, Lefèvre then abruptly abandoned his saints project after publishing the lives of the martyrs whose feast days fell in January.⁶⁴ Why did he stop? We have no testimony from Lefèvre. By mid-1519, the Magdalene controversy was becoming more heated and he may well have sensed that his further reassessment of the saints would likely create further turmoil. Lefèvre's devoted disciple, Farel, recounted long afterwards that more than fear of controversy, Lefèvre's 'critical wedge' had finally separated him from the traditional cult of the saints. Farel recalled that in a first stage, when Lefèvre was still wholly devoted to the saints, his

Herminjard 1, no. 19, 41–42 (excerpt).

⁶² Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. William Granger Ryan, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993) vol. 1, no. 96, 382–383.

⁶³ Du Moulin reminded Louise of her request: "La Magdalene a faict tant de miracle. Ne seroit il possible de les assembler et en faire ung livre?" He responded, "Je croy que non. Au moins qu'on en peust tirer foy certaine car en narration de miracle y a tant de mansongez que c'est pitie. Et la plupart diceulx sont invisibles quant a nous et n'an [n'en] pouvons avoir congnoissance." Du Moulin does not, however, go on to deny the utility of praying to her for intercession. See Holban, "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," 152.

⁶⁴ *Agones Martyrum Mensis Ianuarii* [Paris: Henri Estienne, 1519] 80 fols. Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. CCLXXV, p. 562. Despite Lefèvre abandoning this work, Glareanus later published his work dedicating it to Zwingli and other worthies of Zurich. See, ZW 7, no. 76, 168–170; 169, note 9: "Glareans Bearbeitung der Zürcher (sic Züricher) Legende ist abgedruckt bei Hottinger, hist eccles. VIII. 1061ff., unter der Überschrift: *Divorum Felicis, Regulae et Exuperantii Agon*, mit vorgesetztem Brief an Propst Felix Frei, aus Paris (ohne datum), worin der Verfasser sagt: 'Elaboravimus autem, ut ex veteribus scriptoribus, quantum fieri potuit, historia haec initium sumeret,' und am Schlusse: 'Sed haec tibi et universo collegio, viris humanissimis, deinde et Huldrico Zwinglio, propter summam in viris optimis eruditionem etiam insigni theologo, offero etc...'" Two years later, Glareanus' compatriot, Wilhelm Nesen, reworked a saint's life to rather different effect. He appended the 'Folly of St. Nicholas' to a work on the Luther controversy: *Epistola de magistris nostris Louaniensibus ... quibus debemus ... illam damnationem Lutherianam [et Sequitur Vita sancti Nicolai siue stultitiae exemplar]*. [Paris, Michel Lesclencher, c. 1521]. See Moreau 3,

master began the path towards repudiating the traditional cult when he realized that some people venerated them, Mary in particular, more than Christ and His true cross.⁶⁵ Farel claimed that, later, while writing his martyrology in 1519, Lefèvre took the next step. Having come to believe that the saints' legends perpetuated idolatry by inspiring people to pray to them as intercessors instead of Christ, he abandoned his work.⁶⁶ Ultimately, Lefèvre and many evangelicals came to believe that Christ is the sole mediator and intercessor before God to the exclusion of all other intermediaries. For them, the Saints would remain exemplary Christians, even divine choristers who added their voices to those of the heavenly hosts, but only in so far as they were incorporated into Christ and not as efficacious intercessors for the living.⁶⁷

no. 186bis.

⁶⁵ In chapter 56 of the *Du vrai usage de la croix* (1560), Farel recounts how even when Lefèvre was "en la Papauté," he had had a statue of Isis (the Virgin!), before which women had been prostrating themselves, replaced with a cross in order to remove the occasion of their false practice. He relates that Lefèvre's views later became those of the reformers: "... ce [the replacement of the statue of Mary with a cross] fut pourtant qu'il pensoit beaucoup mieux faire à cause qu'il n'entendoit pas encore pour lors, ce qu'il a bien entendu puis apres, touchant l'idolatrie qui a esté commise autour de la croix." Guillaume Farel, *Du vrai usage de la croix et autres traités*, ed. Edouard Urech (La Chaux-de-Fonds, Switzerland: Editions G. Saint-Clair, 1980), 104.

⁶⁶ In 1548, Farel wrote in his unpublished "Epistre à tous seigneurs et peuples et pasteurs a qui le Seigneur en a donné accès": "... ces legendes, après lesquelles ce bon Faber avoit travaillées et desjà deux mois de martirs estoyent imprimés, car il avoit délibéré de mettre tout ce qu'il en pouvoit trouver, et le jour et l'année de tous. Mais ayant entendu la grosse idolatrie qui estoit es prieres des Saints et que ces legendes y servent comme de soulfhre à allumer le feu, il laissa tout et se mit du tout après la Sainte Ecriture," quoted in Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, p. 73, note 19, from *Du vray usage de la croix de Jésus-Christ* (Geneva: Fick, 1965), 172. Cf. Quadroni, *Farel Corr.*, no. 1021, p. 95 with reference to L. Aubert, "Un opuscule de Farel." *Musée neuchâtelois* (1930), 167–179. Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, has found, contrary to Farel's statement, only one month of saints' lives published by Lefèvre. See note 64.

⁶⁷ Hughes, *Lefèvre*, 128, cites Lefèvre's 1522 Commentary on the Gospels for Lefèvre's assertion based on Luke 21:5 that: "if anyone who is praying places his confidence in the intercession of the blessed Virgin or of all the saints, whoever they may be, rather than in Jesus Christ alone, he is not praying as he ought." When discussing Lefèvre's evolving thought on purgatory, Bedouelle points out that he (and his colleagues) explicitly rejected the doctrine that the intercession of the saints or prayers for the dead had any effect, *Lefèvre*, 201–207, esp. 203–204. Bedouelle points to their homily on the story of the rich man in hell who cries out to Abraham asking that the beggar, Lazarus, whose needs he had neglect in life, be sent to quench his thirst [Luke 16:19–31]. Their interpretation reads: "En ce lieu là, il n'y a point d'aide, il fault

V. Prepared but not Destined for Meaux

The Magdalene affair had not reached its conclusion before Lefèvre and his disciples arrived at Meaux in the spring of 1521. Why they went to Meaux and there engaged in a novel endeavor to instruct the laity directly is mysterious. In chapter 5 we will consider the factors that attracted them to Meaux. By 1521, the Fabrists' great patron and ally, Guillaume Briçonnet, certainly needed their help. After three years, his attempts to reform his clergy and instruct his flock were foundering. To ameliorate such problems, the Fabrists, as experienced teachers and editors of what they believed to be the finest patristic and medieval works for training the clergy and inculcating piety, were magnificently equipped. However, as Glareanus' letter on Lefèvre's reasons for quitting Paris clearly indicates,⁶⁸ by 1521 the path leading from their studies *antibarbari* to sympathy with Luther, even after he published his strident attack on the *Babylonian Captivity* of the church, had brought them to a difficult crossroads. By 1521 Lefèvre had been forced to flee Paris but it was not clear, at least to his Swiss friend, that Meaux or

que la justice de Dieu se face [sans remede], qui est bien monstré, quant n'a peu obtenir pour priere, ne pour luy ne pour autrui, ne pour les mortz ne pour les vifz. Il [Lazarus] cuydoit estre exaulcé par Abraham, et que Abraham peust aucune chose, mais Abraham renvoye (non point pour le riche, car il estoit trop tard pour luy, mais pour ceulx qui encore estoient au monde) à la parole de Dieu. Car c'est là où il nous fault aller, c'est celle par laquelle en donnant foy, Dieu nous veult sauver non point [par esperitz ou] ceulx qui sont passéz de ce monde ... Nous avons ses [Christ's] prophets, les apostres, nous avons les anciens prophetes, oyons les, et ayons foy en leurs parolles, non point comme de eulx, mais de Dieu, et nous ne irons point en tormentz avec le riche, ambitieux, et voluptueux. Mais nous irons ... avec Jesuchrist au royaulme de Dieu, où est joye et gloire sans fin, à le louer avec Abraham, tous les anges, et tous les saintz eternellement." Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and his disciples, *Epistres et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an*, ed. Guy Bedouelle et Franco Giacone (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), 232–33. Bedouelle's analysis concurs with Henry Heller, who cites similar passages against the cult of the saints from this work as well as Lefèvre's 1526 work on the Psalter, "The Evangelicism of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, 1525." *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972), 42–77, esp. 71–72. See further our presentation of Gérard Roussel's recasting of the cult circa 1550 in chapter 10.

⁶⁸ See page 172, note 22.

the reform there had been his or his followers planned destination. Yet, the Fabrist circle at Meaux became the nursery of the French evangelical movement. Why?

By 1520, the Fabrists had manifestly entered the lists of those biblical humanists who would side with the German reformers in the ensuing conflict. The Magdalene affair was but one of the battles during which the likes of Lefèvre, Reuchlin, Beatus Rhenanus, Henry Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, Glareanus, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Luther, and others exchanged messages of mutual support and concern. The letters cited above by Lefèvre to Beatus Rhenanus, by Glareanus to Zwingli, and the bold association of Luther and Lefèvre as champions of the new doctrines by the editor of the Wittenberg theologian's collected works, are clear evidence of this international solidarity.

Erasmus' well-known report to Alexander Schweiss of March 1521—repeated to Louis Guillard in June with variations reflecting the Sorbonne's condemnation of Luther in April—epitomized the perceived common cause between biblical humanists and the nascent reformers. He related that a Carmelite/Dominican preaching before Francis I had announced that the Antichrist was at hand and that his four precursors had reared their heads: a certain Franciscan in Italy, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples in France, Reuchlin/Luther in Germany, and Erasmus in Brabant.⁶⁹ The chief enemy of this group, at least in

⁶⁹ In the midst of a long list of 'monks' who have been linking Erasmus to Luther and Lefèvre, he writes: "Apud Regem Galliae Carmelita quidam dixit in concione venturum Antichristum; iam quatuor esse praecursores, Minoritam nescio quem in Italia, Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem in Gallia, Reuchlinum in Germania, Erasmus in Brabantia." 13 March [1521], Allen 4, no. 1192, 453–454, ll. 24–29. Three months later, Erasmus reports that it is a Dominican who preached and now it is Luther, not Reuchlin, who is the Antichrist's precursor in Germany: "Ex amicorum literis didici monachum quendam apud Christianissimum Galliarum Regem in concione magis etiam insanisse: qui dixerit iam adventurum Antichristum, cum extiterint quatuor praecursores, Minorita nescio quis in Italia, Lutherus in Germania, Iacobus Faber in Gallia, Erasmus in Brabantia." 17 June 1521, Allen 4, no. 1212, 528, ll. 27–31. See Allen's notes to letter

France, Erasmus noted, was the Faculty of Theology led by Noël Beda and Guillaume Duchesne (Quercus).⁷⁰

Although the Fabrists were to support the Reformation, we should avoid exaggerating their unity as the *sorbonnagres* did so ham-fistedly during the early twenties, by disregarding the real differences between the Fabrists and followers of Erasmus, Luther, or Zwingli. It is nevertheless true that circa 1520 the Fabrists and the supporters of the latter three shared this sense of common cause, even if it was to be sorely tested and split by the Reformation.⁷¹ Their solidarity had roots dating back to the Reuchlin affair in 1514.⁷² By 1520, conflict had further galvanized their ranks, although they did not agree what should be done to prepare for the religious storm they realized was soon to break.

Lefèvre in particular exhibited a strong, principled aversion to open confrontation. This would be an ambiguous legacy for the evangelical movement, on one hand favoring their survival in a hostile climate, on the other hamstringing efforts to reach their goals.

no. 1192, 453, ll. 25–26 for a similar report to Agrippa von Nettesheim, 10 September 1521, in which Luther replaces the Franciscan in the foursome. Allen suggests Bernard Ochino as the probably identity of the Franciscan.

⁷⁰ See Erasmus report to Nicholas Evérard cited in note 82.

⁷¹ It is well known that Erasmus had already had a spat with Lefèvre from 1515 to 1517 over a point of translation and that by 1520 he was fending off charges of having spawned Luther. However, the common cause of men of good letters—linking all three scholars—was still the dominant impression and hope at the time. On this climate, see three further letters from Willibald Pirckheimer to Erasmus and the latter to Juan Luis Vives and Francesco Chiericati, Allen 4, no. 1095, 246–47, ll. 73–95; no. 1111, 283, ll. 282–283, ll. 71–89; and no. 1144, 347–348, ll. 20–34. The last letter is particularly revealing since, when preaching against Luther in Louvain, the Carmelite Egmondanus linked Erasmus and Lefèvre's names to Luther's even though he realized that their doctrines did not accord: "Nunquam," inquit, "convenit inter haereticos."

⁷² See Lefèvre's epistolary exchange with Reuchlin in 1513–14, Herminjard, vol. 1, nos. 2–4.

Documents showing the state of mind of Lefèvre and his disciples in 1520 are few, but Lefèvre's influential attitude is well in evidence. Surveying the scraps of evidence supports our impression that Lefèvre lacked a sense of direction in the face of the growing controversies. By the end of 1519 he abandoned his project on the saints in mid-stream and retreated from the arena of battle to wander in search of manuscripts, planning to be away from Paris the following year.⁷³ The eight surviving letters in his correspondence from 1519 (there are none for 1520) reveal his growing unease. He told Agrippa that he would have preferred if the debate over the Magdalene and St. Anne could have been restricted to learned circles.⁷⁴ But events were overtaking him. Scholars were now wrangling over the cult of the saints in full view of the laity.⁷⁵ If in defending Lefèvre's position in 1518, Clichtove had reassured critics that their views would not scandalize the people, Lefèvre had proof positive in 1519 that conservative opponents

⁷³ Lefèvre wrote to Agrippa von Nettesheim, 14 November 1519, from Paris "Sed per hos [menses?] divagatus sum, neque per annum ferme figam pedem Parisiis." Herminjard I, no. 30, 60. Hughes claims that "Lefèvre spent several months there [at Meaux] as Briçonnet's guest during the years 1518 and 1519." He cites no evidence for this assertion. Glareanus letter from July 1521, cited in note 22, however indicates that Lefèvre only arrived at Meaux between April and July 1521. See further, Bedouelle, *Lefèvre*, 90–91, Hughes, *Lefèvre*, 129, and Graf, *Essai*, 93–94. None of these three scholars has found precise evidence about his whereabouts during 1520.

⁷⁴ "Maluissem negotium de Anna sine contentione inter doctos versari. Quod si non potest, propter malignitatem temporis et perversa hominum ingenia, et tibi insidet animo contendere, vide ne hoc ullo pacto honoris mei zelo feceris, sed solum veritatis tutandae et devotionis in Deiparam Mariam et ejus matrem beatissimam Annam." 20 June [1519], Herminjard I, no. 25, 53.

⁷⁵ Agrippa reported from Metz, [April, 1519] that Lefèvre's many enemies were denouncing him to the people: "Quorum quidem multi sunt, sed homines improbi animi et miseri ingenii, qui omnibus bonis literis sunt hostes,—tamen qui scioli sunt apud rudem populum, et fidem sibi vendicant hypocrisi—ut difficile, imo non sine periculo, illis resistant. Neque tamen ob hoc deterreor ab officio." Herminjard I, no. 21, 47. He repeated this assertion to Lefèvre in November, saying that the theologians do not dare to battle with them in public but [among the learned and powerful] use devious ways and back-stabbing attacks, while insinuating in the minds of the gullible public that they hold heretical beliefs: "...qui [sophistae = theologians] cum aperto Marte contra nos nihil valeant, per cuniculos furtive adoriuntur, sagittantes in occulto, et apud imperitum credulumque vulgus nos erroris insimulant, deferentes nos tanquam de haeresi et insanis opinionibus." Herminjard I, no. 29, 58.

were stirring the people up against him and his colleagues.⁷⁶ In response, Lefèvre counseled his supporters to back down, arguing that error would fall of its own accord, or rather that the Holy Spirit would make the truth manifest in due time.⁷⁷

Here, perhaps more than anywhere, Lefèvre was at odds with the German reformers as typified by Luther's contemporary, refusal to retract his views before the Emperor at Worms. The difference between them lay not in obeying the dictates of conscience, but in the very decision whether to take a road that might lead to a confrontation like the one at Worms and, in Lefèvre's view, the hardening of hearts. As far as he speaks to the matter, Lefèvre indicates that controversy was not the price or occasion for proclaiming the Word, but an obstacle to the work of the Holy Spirit. It was a pacific view and not one that left much room for action in the face of persecution. For the Meaux reform to survive and the evangelical movement to develop, Lefèvre's hardier young disciples and his powerful patrons would have to offer more creative responses to this ever present threat.

⁷⁶ Clichtove had written in his prefatory epistle to the second printing addressed to François du Moulin de Rochefort: "At, populus scandalizabitur si tres audierit, cum semper ei unica praedicata fuerit. Veritas non scandalizat, sed falsitas. Veritatis autem lux illuminat animas et ad salutem aedificat. Et id falsum semper unicam annuntiatam fuisse. ... At dices, si populus non scandalizabitur, attamen si tres ponantur, eius devotio minuetur. Immo crescit!" Clichtove explains that a greater number of people would be able to identify with one or other of the three Marys than the one Magdalene. Prefatory Epistle to *De Maris Magdalena, Tridvo Christi, Et ex tribus una Maria, disceptatio: ad Clarissimum virum D. Franciscum Molinum, Christianissimi Francorum Regis Francisci Primi Magistrum* (Paris, Henri Estienne, [1518]), Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 124, 399–406, 403–404.

⁷⁷ Lefèvre asserted this to Agrippa twice: "Falsitas in seipsa marcescet, et nullo impugnatore tandem per seipsam cadet." 20 May 1519, Herminjard 1, no. 23, 49; "Attamen nullus accedere tibi potest honor cum iilis barbaris et infamationi aliorum ultro studentibus contendendo, neque nugas eorum et frigidas et insulas eorum ineptias refelli dignas censeo. Per se omnia ista cadent, et tandem agnoscetur veritas, et foelicius, si non contendatur, quam si contendatur, ut mea fert opinio." 20 June [1519], Herminjard 1, no. 25, 53.

By the spring of 1521, Lefèvre and his disciples had to move from Paris.

Partisans of the new ideas faced severe pressure there and little hope of seeing their views prevail. In the year leading up to the formal condemnation of Luther's doctrines by the Paris Faculty on 15 – 24 April 1521 an uneasy peace reigned. While new tracts against his Magdalene thesis appeared, attention had turned to the Faculty of Theology in anticipation of its decision on Luther. The theologians guarded their proceedings in secrecy. Their slowness in coming to a decision has been variously interpreted as reflecting dissension in their ranks, an unwillingness to preempt the Pope's decision, or an effort to maintain their independence over against the decisions of other authorities.⁷⁸

Ulrich von Hutten's announcement to Martin Bucer in 25 November 1520 that, "from France and Switzerland, the silence is astounding" attests to the strange calm before the storm.⁷⁹ A letter from Glareanus to Zwingli 1 November 1520 captures the confused, expectant mood in Paris. Despite a rumor that the Faculty of Theology would not judge Luther after the Pope's condemnation, Glareanus feared that soon all true Christians would be labeled heretics. He admitted that Luther's works were being read more avidly and more favorably than ever, "But," he warned, "the monks pose a steely barrier."⁸⁰

⁷⁸ See Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 127–129.

⁷⁹ "De Gallo et Heluetijs mirum est silentium." To Martin Bucer, *CMB* 1, no. 20, 124–127; 125.

⁸⁰ "Tu, mi Uldrice, hominem consiliis adiuva! potes namque et vides eo nunc redactam rem, ut statim heresios [!] crimine etiam innocentissimos ipsi ignavissimi insimulent. Nisi huic rabiei occurratur, huc tandem res devenient, ut sit Christianus, qui omnia adversus Christum agat; qui Christi decreta observet, sit haereticus. Nunc de Luthero audi nova. Universitas Parisiensis, quandoquidem ad eam ipsam disceptatio inter Geckium et Lutherum delata fuit, tanquam ad iudicem, posteaquam audivit, damnatum Lutherum a Pontifice Maximo, ipsa, quae quosdam articulos fotassis vellicatura erat, nunc iudicio supersedit. Nulli libri avidius emuntur. Audivi a bibliopola quodam, qui ait, sese Francivadi nuperis nundinis vendidisse exemplaria mille et quadringenta, quot nunquam antea alicuius auctoris. Passim bene dictitur Luthero. Verum monachorum longa est cathena." *ZW* 7, no. 160, 360–364; 362, Herminjard 1, no. 32, 62–63 (excerpt).

Meanwhile in Wittenberg, Martin Luther had received similarly misleading news from Paris. Even after the Pope's recent condemnation, he heard that the Faculty of Theology would only censure two of his views. This would have been a moral victory for his party,⁸¹ but by 15 April 1521, those hopes were dashed. A month before the condemnation, Erasmus saw that the battle had been engaged and he intimated that insidious measures were being taken to suppress Luther's supporters in France.⁸²

While these storm clouds were brewing, the key condition for the future survival of the Meaux group had been secured, strong favor at court. Although the royal family did not know Lefèvre personally or even by reputation before the Magdalene affair,⁸³ court familiars such as Guillaume Briçonnet, Guillaume Budé, Guillaume Petit, Jean Chapelain, and François Du Moulin, knew the little scholar from Étapes well and were clear supporters of the humanist movement.⁸⁴ In light of the growing controversy it is

⁸¹ "Scribit B. Adelmanus...se ex homine digno fide accepisse, Parrhisienses Theologos omnes articulos in bulla damnatos censuisse Christianissimos praeter duos, quos disputabiles haberent. Idem ex inferioribus partibus accepimus. Det Dominus ita esse & fore." Luther to Spalatin, 15 December 1520, *WABr* 2, no. 362, 235, ll. 9–15.

⁸² Erasmus made the sensational accusation that some of Luther's supporters at Paris had been poisoned. He suspected that Jerome Aleander, the papal nuncio, had resorted to this evil with the Pope's blessing: "Res, ut audio, nunc agitur venenis: Parisiis sublatis sunt aliquot, qui Lutherum manifeste defendebant. Fortassis hoc in mandatis est ut, quoniam aliter vinci non possunt hostes Sedis Romanae (sic enim illi vocant, qui harpyis illis non per omnia obsequuntur), veneno tollantur cum benedictione Pontificis. Hac arte valet Aleander. Is me Coloniae impensissime rogabat ad prandium; ego, quo magis ille instabat, hoc pertinacius excusavi. Aduersus condonationes hoc erit remedium, si nihil detur: donec dabitur melior occasio explodendi has impias cauponationes. Haec liberius apud te effudi, vir optime. Cavebis ne haec espistola aberret in manus multorum; nam Germani evulgant quidquid nacti fuerint." To Nicholas Éverard, [March, 1521], Allen 4, no. 1188, 446–448; Herminjard 1, no. 34, 64–65 (extract).

⁸³ Holban cites a passage from Du Moulin's *Vie de sainte Madeleine* (1517) (BN f.fr. 24955), that indicates Lefèvre was not, in fact, known to Louise or Marguerite prior to 1518. Du Moulin speaks of him, without naming him, as "ung homme moult sçavant" and "ung ancien homme que vous aimeriez bien Madame si vous aviez connaissance de ses vertus." See "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," 35.

⁸⁴ For example, Chapelain, Louise of Savoy's physician, had lent manuscripts to Lefèvre for his 1516 editions of Lull's *Book of Proverbs*. Thus, Marguerite could have had a significant introduction to

crucial to note that during the Mary Magdalene and St. Anne debates, the court became aware of the new biblical exegesis and its challenge to received tradition.

Patronage at court was indispensable to the ambitious plans of the Fabrists. The court's ensuing favor is all the more remarkable since Lefèvre's new views had thrown cold water on Louise and Marguerite's enthusiasm for the saints as intercessors, indeed, as the central focus of their devotional life. Lefèvre had probably been asked to reconsider the legend of St. Anne as a direct response to Marguerite's interest. In 1518, before Lefèvre turned to this subject, Du Moulin had dedicated a thoroughly traditional work, *La Messe de Sainte Anne*, to Marguerite because her barrenness made her particularly devoted to this patron saint of female fertility.⁸⁵ In a subsequent illuminated manuscript on St. Anne, *Petit livret faict a l'honneur de Madame Saincte Anne* (1518/1519), Du Moulin related Lefèvre's new findings, mentioning him by name for the first time, specifically with the intention of winning royal protection for the by then

mysticism from him well before her correspondence with Guillaume Briçonnet. See Rice, no. 118, 373–378, 377–378 n. 6. Chapelain was not Marguerite's doctor as asserted by Hughes, *Lefèvre*, 12. See Abel Lefranc and Jacques Boulenger, eds., *Comptes de Louise de Savoie (1515, 1522) et de Marguerite d'Angoulême (1512, 1517, 1524, 1529, 1539)* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1905), 14 where he is listed as Louise's physician for 1522.

⁸⁵ BnF ms f.fr. 1035. Myra Orth argues that in this early tract Du Moulin expresses the traditional views about St. Anne and betrays no knowledge of Lefèvre's views: "La stérilité de la jeune princesse explique sa dévotion a la sainte patronne de la fécondité et de la famille (f. 3v). La messe et l'office chantés (f. 6–16) sont précédés dans le manuscrit par une longue introduction alambiquée qui fait allusion aux trois mariages de sainte Anne et à sa lignée, qui préfigurait la 'sainte église militante.' (f. 2v)" Myra D. Orth, "Manuscrits pour Marguerite," in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492–1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, edited by Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 85–105; 89.

On the royal family's desire that Marguerite become pregnant, see further a prayer composed by Du Moulin for Louise in the *Vie de sainte Madeleine*, in which she is to say "Et ie suys sa [the Magdalene's] tres humble creature desirant paix et patience. Et que ma fille Claude soit grosse d'ung filz et ma fille Marguerite pareillement. Faictes donc que mon desir me soit ottroye pour le bien de la chose publique et pour le mien particulier affin que ie puyse vivre en amour fiable avecquez mes enfans." Cited in Holban, "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," 152–53, note 3.

embattled arts master.⁸⁶ While scholars were debating Lefèvre's Magdalene and St. Anne theses on the basis of exegetical principles and church tradition, Du Moulin portrayed the conflict in moral terms, depicting the friars and theologians opposing Lefèvre as scoundrels animated by greed, whereas Lefèvre was a simple man only interested in the truth. He also guaranteed Lefèvre's orthodoxy: "Faber says that the church is mother of the faith, while other stupid men want to make her a mistress of errors and lies."⁸⁷ Du Moulin advised Louise that she should have the Magdalene dispute submitted to the Pope for a decision and that Lefèvre would abide by it.⁸⁸ Despite Lefèvre's challenges to the legends of the favorite saints of the royal family, Du Moulin had evidently succeeded in

⁸⁶ Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (Paris), ms. 4009. As Holban shows amply, Du Moulin voiced severe criticisms against Lefèvre's opponents, calling them: "les theologians et les frères predicquaires," "papelards, asnes, hypocrites prescheurs, frères troteurs, envieux, faulx hipochrytes et herticques, calumpniateurs et faulx accusateurs, gros asnes hypochrytes et meschans hommes, aucuns ignorans, folastres." He denounces a specific adversary as a "barbouilleur theologiste, ... theologian chapronné,...caphart...," whom Holban identifies with Noël Beda. In Du Moulin's works we have a veritable lexicon of French anticlericalism. See Holban, "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," 155–166.

Du Moulin's anticlerical views were either reflecting or informing the royal family's opinions about a whole gamut of prelates, monks, friars, and theologians especially in the wake of their protests against the Concordat. Du Moulin attacks also served his own unabashed quest to secure benefices under the new system of royal election. See Gordon Griffiths, "Louise of Savoy and the Reformation of the Church," *SCJ* 10 (1979), 29–36; and Myra Dickman Orth, "François du Moulin and the *Journal* of Louise de Savoie," *SCJ* 13 (1982), 56–66.

⁸⁷ "Fabri dit que l'eglise est mere de foy, et aucuns ignorants hommes la veulent faire maistresse d'erreur et de mensonge, pource qu'ils sont si durs et si obstines qu'ils ne veulent riens approuver sinon ce qu'ils sçavent et leur semble que toutes choses sont bonnes si elles sont approuvees par long usage [en marge '*comme avez congneu par la cassation de la pragmatique*']." Arsenal ms. 4009, f. 61 v., cited in Holban, 162, note 1. The marginal comment on refers to clerical opposition to the Concordat that had revoked the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges: a bit of evidence well-calculated to convince Louise about the fallibility of church tradition.

⁸⁸ Du Moulin wrote to Louise: "Toutesfoiz de tout ce que nous avons faict ne peut sortir effect si nous qui en estez cause ny mettez la main. Et que faciez escrire le Roy a nostre saint pere pour y adviser. Et sil se treuve que Fabri ayt bien escript, ie requiers comme procureur de Fabri sans avoir procuration de luy que la celebration et solennité de la Magdalene soit changee. ... Si aussi il se treuve que la commune opinion de leglise soit bonne, que le livre de Fabri soit bruslé et que iamais n'en soit nouvelles. ... Car sans riens decider iusquez a ce que l'autorite du Pape soit intervenue par manière de disputation Fabri veut monstrier...[the arguments]." Cited in Holban, "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," 157, note 1.

convincing Louise of Lefèvre's orthodoxy, for the court would subsequently defend Lefèvre and his followers from condemnation by the Paris Faculty of Theology.

In Du Moulin's pledge on behalf of Lefèvre lay the beginnings of a crucial constructive misunderstanding between, Louise, Francis, and the evangelicals who Marguerite was to support. It is unlikely that circa 1520 Lefèvre and his disciples regarded the Pope's pronouncements as the touchstone of faith. If so, this would help to explain quite neatly why they subsequently disregarded the condemnation of Luther and maintained doctrines dissenting from the pope and church, but not, of course, why they did not publicize their views more openly. If, however, evangelicals like Lefèvre held the pope's authority in high regard, then this would explain why, despite their less than orthodox ideas, they never broke with the church, but not why they failed to embrace its rule of faith.

Jean-Pierre Massaut has noted that in the *De tribus et unica Magdalena disceptatio secunda* of 1519, the final version of Lefèvre's Magdalene treatise, Lefèvre said he was willing to submit his work to the Pope's judgment. If true this would validate Du Moulin's pledge to Louise. Massaut concludes from this that Lefèvre's thought "was no less theological, nor less ecclesiological" than his theologian friend Clichtove, who would become a leading opponent of Luther in France.⁸⁹ He cites as evidence what he calls Lefèvre's "magnificent profession of faith, whose every part must be retained!"⁹⁰

⁸⁹ "... n'en est pas moins théologique, ni même moins ecclésiastique," Massaut, *Critique et tradition*, 99.

⁹⁰ "... magnifique profession de foi, dont il ne faut isoler aucun élément!" Massaut, *Critique et tradition*, 98.

Without citing the Latin as he is careful to do elsewhere, Massaut characterizes Lefèvre's position in the following convoluted passage:

Nevertheless, Lefèvre submitted his work to the Pope's judgment. If the Pope should find that his views accord with the Gospel and piety towards Mary Magdalene, whatever should then happen, Lefèvre would be completely reassured. "Moreover, I [Lefèvre now being quoted] wish to hold to the positions of our mother, the holy Church, and not deviate from it by a hair's breadth. I know, in effect, through the testimony of Ireneus, ear-witness to Polycarp, who was a disciple of John the Evangelist, that 'Wherever the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; Wherever the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and every grace; Now the Spirit is truth.' If, therefore, I cling to the truth, I can in no way consider as an obstacle to truth—without contradicting the church—a different way of thinking, however long its use may have been suffered. For, wherever the Church is, there is the truth." In any case, Lefèvre adds, if I have erred in my theses (*disceptationes*), I will not have obstructed the truth, since I have not attempted to define or fix the truth of anything, leaving that to competent authorities. [Summary of and quotation from *De tribus et unica Magdalena disceptatio secunda*, f. 39v – 40r]⁹¹

Massaut implies that in this so-called profession of faith, with its complex equation of the church, the Spirit of God, and truth, Lefèvre affirms the church hierarchy and, ultimately, the Pope as the arbiters of doctrine and practice. Massaut introduces this passage with a "nevertheless" ("Cependant Lefèvre soumet son travail au pape....") in order to signal that it qualifies another statement by Lefèvre that would seem to refute this view. Again, without citing the original Latin, Massaut quotes Lefèvre:

⁹¹ "Cependant Lefèvre soumet son travail au pape. Si le pape le trouve conforme à la lumière de l'Évangile et à la piété envers sainte Marie, soeur de Marthe, Lefèvre, quoi qu'il advienne, sera tout à fait rassuré. 'Car, par ailleurs, je [Lefèvre now being quoted] veux m'en tenir aux positions de notre mère la sainte Église et ne m'en écarter pas même de la largeur d'un ongle. Je sais, en effet, par le témoignage d'Irénée, auditeur de Polycarpe, lui-même disciple de Jean l'Évangéliste, que "où est l'Église, là est l'Esprit de Dieu; où est l'Esprit de Dieu, là sont l'Église et toute grâce; or l'Esprit est vérité." Si donc je m'attache à la vérité, je ne puis en rien considérer comme un obstacle à la vérité, sans contredire l'Église, une façon différente de penser, depuis si longtemps qu'en ait été toléré l'usage. Car où est l'Église, là est la vérité.' De toute manière, ajoute Lefèvre, si j'avais tort dans mes *disceptationes*, je ne mettrais pas d'obstacles à la vérité, puisque je ne prétends rien définir, rien déterminer, laissant ce soin aux autorités compétentes."

Clearly, those authors [refuting my views] are influential and their audience is numerous. But the Gospel is stronger than an infinite number of authors. Old habits die hard, even when they are false, and especially when, though false, they claim the authority of the Church. But the truth is stronger still. After more than three thousand years of idolatrous cults, did not the spreading of the light and truth of the Gospel in one blow dispel this error, which was spread throughout the world? ... In the end, the truth is eternal and immutable. *De tribus et unica Magdalena disceptatio secunda*, f. 40r-v.⁹²

It should be noted here that has inverted the order in which Lefèvre developed these arguments, which is restored in the presentation above. Lefèvre's so-called profession of faith in the church is not a qualification of the view that the "the Gospel is stronger than an infinite number of authors," but rather itself qualified by the latter statement. In the second passage, Lefèvre clearly asserts that the Gospel or truth is stronger than any false tradition, even one that is backed by church authority. Lefèvre has left a degree of ambiguity in these statements about the touchstone of religious truth, perhaps intentionally, since he does not indicate whether he is speaking about the militant or the mystical church when affirming "wherever the church is, there is the truth." Yet, Lefèvre states plainly enough that the 'church' does not have authority over the Gospel; rather the Gospel, Holy Spirit, and truth are constitutive of it. Lefèvre affirms that the Gospel is the source of truth that will purge tradition of false beliefs, even ones sanctioned by the church or the pope.

Critique et tradition, 98. I have not been able to consult the Latin original.

⁹² "Certes les auteurs sont puissants, et nombreuse est la foule des auteurs [those opposing his views]. Mais l'Évangile est plus fort qu'une infinité d'auteurs. Puissante aussi est une vieille habitude, même si elle est fausse, et, d'ordinaire, bien que fausse, elle revendique l'autorité de l'Église. Mais la vérité est plus forte encore. Après plus de trois mille ans de culte idolâtrique, la diffusion de la lumière et la vérité de l'Évangile n'a-t-elle pas dissipé d'un coup l'erreur répandue dans le monde entier? ... Et puis, enfin, la vérité est éternelle et imprescriptible." Massaut, *Critique et tradition*, 98.

This interpretation of Lefèvre's understanding in 1519 of the relationship between the Gospel and church, in any event, accords better with the subsequent reluctance of Lefèvre and his disciples to speak about or to define the nature of the 'church militant.' In the 1525 *Epistres et Evangiles*, when the Fabrists discuss the church they define it in terms of the community of believers incorporated into Christ, "the body of Christ," not in terms of the existing hierarchy.⁹³

By 1521, Lefèvre and his disciples were ready for a new venture. The signs of the times announced that great change was on the way. With Lefèvre's treatises on Magdalene and St. Anne and his book of saints lives, he had turned to address the laity, whom he had never before directly engaged in print. The final step for the Fabrists into a new era was not doctrinal in the traditional sense. Their evangelical theology was already well in place, founded on *solus Christus*, Christ alone, without which, Scripture remained mere scripture (*sola scriptura*) and *sola fides* – *sola gratia* without referent.⁹⁴ But now they began to see not only that the Gospel was the truth but that it was their duty "to proclaim it to people everywhere."⁹⁵ This new conviction would entail a momentous reorientation of their careers.

By the time the Fabrists moved to Meaux and set about engaging the people directly from the pulpit and via the press, their European scholarly reputation, their solidarity with the soon-to-be German reformers, their close relationship with many

⁹³ Guy Bedouelle and Franco Giaccone's introduction to Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples et ses disciples, *Epistres et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), xlix–l.

⁹⁴ "...scriptura sine Christo scriptura sola est et littera

leading prelates, their growing favor at court, and the notoriety of the Magdalene controversy ensured that they would become the focus of religious tensions within France.

5. The Meaux Experiment I: From Clerical Reform to Evangelical Renewal (1518–1523)

The Meaux Reform (1521–1525) was the first and among the most important founding episodes of the French Reformation.¹ Testifying to its contemporary impact, the Faculty of Theology of Paris, journal writers, and foreign observers portrayed the Meaux group as influential, and therefore dangerous, banner carriers of the ‘Lutheran’ heresy. In contrast, for the same period the European movements of biblical humanism and the Luther affair, of which the Meaux experiment was an episode, have left little trace in France.² Most of the few French figures known to have been actively engaged with these movements, humanists in Paris, Poitiers, Lyon, Avignon, and Toulouse, had connections with the Meaux group. Thus while Lefèvre and his disciples created a sensation, there is little evidence that the reformation movement initially enjoyed much support in France.

¹ All histories of France and of the French Reformation for this period give the Meaux reform prominent coverage. For the best modern studies, see: Michel Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, a biography of the bishop of Meaux that provides an able reconstruction of events, but does not interpret them with great insight. Henry Heller interprets with great insight the evangelical beliefs of Briçonnet, Lefèvre d'Étaples, and Marguerite as well as their broader social impact at Meaux; see “Popular Roots of the Reformation: ‘Lutherans of Meaux’ (1525–1546),” chap. in *The Conquest of Poverty*; *idem*, “Marguerite of Navarre and the Reformers of Meaux,” *BHR* 33 (1971), 279–310; *idem*, “Nicholas of Cusa and early French evangelicalism,” *ARG* 63 (1972), 6–21; *idem*, “The Briçonnet Case reconsidered,” *Journal of Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* (1972), 223–258; *idem*, “The Evangelicalism of Lefèvre d'Étaples: 1525,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972), 42–77; *idem*, “Famine, Revolt and Heresy at Meaux: 1521–1525,” *ARG* 68 (1977) 133–157. These articles reprise the bulk of Heller's dissertation, *Reform and Reformers at Meaux, 1518–1525*, Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, New York, 1969 (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms). Lacking notes and therefore usefulness as a work of scholarship, but interesting as historical polemics, René-Jacques Lavy, a Protestant pastor, presents Meaux and more generally the Reformation as a missed chance for France religiously and politically, in *Les origines de la Réforme française: Meaux, 1518–1546*, (Paris: Librairie Protestante, 1959), especially, 15–17. The Meaux reform and the spread of the Reformation movement in France is a major subject in the third volume of Imbart de la Tour's rich *Les origines de la Réforme*, 158–272; *inter alia* for Meaux, pp. 150–153, 158–169, 185–189, 206–235, 239–241.

² During the early 1520s Lutheran books made a significant impact at Paris, Bordeaux, Avignon, Meaux, Grenoble, Bourges, and Rouen. For evidence from the municipal and episcopal archives, see Imbart de la Tour, *Origines* 3, 169–172. Nathaniel Weiss has studied a network of French adherents to the ‘Reformation’ that connected Meaux and other centers of evangelical belief in France with Strasbourg, Basel, Zurich and Wittenberg. For a suite of articles on this subject, see chapter 7, n. 13.

Over the next thirty years, however, members of the Meaux group would go on to lead a broad spectrum of French people seeking religious renewal.

The reform at Meaux initiated by Briçonnet and transformed by the Fabrists has been studied from a variety of perspectives, but we still have no full picture of their intentions. Nor can we adequately explain the relationship of the Meaux reform to the growth of a broader evangelical movement. Michel Veissière, Henry Heller, and René-Jacques Lovy have traced the development of the Reformation at Meaux after the departure of the Fabrists in 1525 to another major episode in the French Reformation: the ill-fated establishment there of the first reformed church on French soil in 1545.³ No major study has attempted to follow the careers of the Meaux group after 1525, tracing the development of a larger evangelical sodality around them. Most scholars point to the widely diverging trajectories over the following thirty years of a few notable ex-Meaux campaigners—from Farel, who becoming the leader of French Protestantism before Calvin, on one extreme to Mazurier, who become an early champion of the Jesuits, on the other—in order to demonstrate that no such thing as ‘an evangelical movement’ came into being. Rather, they assert that evangelicals were individualistic and disunited, who at best shared a confused longing for religious renewal but lacked a doctrinal core, social grounding, or powerful leaders.⁴ In his still unsurpassed 1845 biographical essay on Marguerite’s almoner, Gérard Roussel, Charles Schmidt came close to arguing for a post-

³ See note 1. Veissière only recounts the history of Meaux until end of Briçonnet’s episcopacy, 1534.

⁴ For a critical assessment of this historiographical consensus, see the introduction, “Resolving The Riddle: Marguerite of Navarre and the French Evangelical Movement.”

Meaux evangelical sodality.⁵ While evoking this broad horizon, his treatment was too limited to give more than a glimpse of the larger picture.

In order to trace the development of Marguerite's network around a core of ex-Meaux campaigners, we need to inspect those cradle years, when the Fabrists transformed Briçonnet's episcopal reform program by injecting it with a clear vision of evangelical renewal. We will also want to assess why in the early summer of 1521 Lefèvre and his disciples decided to join forces with Guillaume Briçonnet. Did they back into the reformation era or march forward to embrace it? Abundant sources, including some recently recovered documents, permit a comparison of Briçonnet's diocesan reform before and after the Fabrists' arrival.⁶ First, as the basis for the comparison, we will show that Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet's effort to regenerate his clergy prior to the arrival of the Fabrists (1517–1521) was itself on the developing edge of a well-established late medieval Episcopal reform campaign. Second, against this precedent and that of the Fabrists' educational reforms at Paris (studied in chapter 4), their program of religious instruction at Meaux can be seen as an self-conscious, innovative, coherent, and distinctly

⁵ Charles Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel: Prédicateur de la reine Marguerite de Navarre. Mémoire, servant à l'histoire des premières tentatives faites pour introduire la Réforme en France* (Strasbourg, 1845; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970).

⁶ The abundant sources relating to the Meaux reform are well known: 1) Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples several publications from these years: his *Latin Commentary on the Gospels* (1522); French translation of the New Testament (1523) and Psalms (1524); *Latin Commentary on the Catholic Epistles* (1527; written 1524–25). His programmatic prefaces to these works and those of his disciples in related treatise are edited in Rice, *Prefatory Epistles* and Herminjard I. 2) The Meaux group's *Epistres et Evangiles* (1525) have been ed. Bedouelle and Screech. 3) Briçonnet's synodal statutes and other records from Meaux, have been published by Toussaints du Plessis, Bretonneau, Herminjard, and Veissière. 4) Marguerite and Briçonnet's correspondence for (1521–1524), published by Martineau et al. 5) The letters of the Meaux group (1523–1526) in Herminjard I. 6) The registers and condemnations of the Faculty of Theology edited by d'Argentré, Clerval, and Farge. 7) Assorted gleanings from contemporary journals, court records, other serial sources, as well as the correspondence diplomats, reformers, and humanists. We have our own readings to bring from the first six groups of sources, particularly Marguerite's under-exploited correspondence, as well as material culled from those mentioned in item 7, which does not yet function in the literature. In addition, we will bring new material to bear from Luigi di Canossa's synodal statutes (1518) and several books published at this

'evangelical' development.

I. Clerical Reform to 1521

The Ideal of Episcopal Reform

After taking part in negotiating the Concordat of Bologna, in 1517 Guillaume Briçonnet took up residence in his diocese in order to attend to its pastoral care. This move was not unprecedented in his career, nor did his goals differ greatly from other contemporary forward-thinking prelates.⁷ Because of its notoriety and eventual failure, modern interpreters have seen the Meaux reform as a 'false starting point' for understanding the currents of Catholic reform permeating France both before and after.⁸ To an extent this contention is true. Briçonnet's first efforts closely resembled other late-medieval episcopal reform programs. So too, he ran into the same roadblocks of clerical intransigence and ignorance that had blocked past efforts. In the face of these obstacles, he adopted new practical measures and, eventually, engaged a fresh team of ministers, led by Lefèvre d'Étaples and his disciples, whose religious vision took episcopal reform in unprecedented directions.

time.

⁷ On Briçonnet's previous reforms at Lodève and St. Germain-des-Près, see Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 41–54 and 75–86.

⁸ Paul Broutin, *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale*, p. 78 (for reference, see chapter 4, note [44]). A view shared by Nicole Lemaître and Michel Veissière: "Après les tentatives de réforme sous l'autorité royale, par l'entremise des Amboise [1501–1510], et l'épisode du conciliabule de Pise, dans lequel nombre d'évêques français, comme François d'Estaing ont cru sincèrement lancer la réforme de l'église, après les incertitudes engendrées par le changement de règne et le concordat de 1516, les évêques, de retour dans leur diocèse décident bientôt, avec l'aval de la monarchie, de mettre en application les idées de réforme dans leur propre diocèse. *L'exemple le plus célèbre, celui du diocèse de Meaux, ressemble à un phare trop lumineux au premier abord ou à la partie émergée d'un iceberg qu'il faut chercher à reconnaître pour comprendre tout un système.*" [Emphasis added.] "Lefèvre d'Étaples, Marguerite de Navarre, et les évêques de leur temps," in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492–1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 109–134, 118.

At first, Briçonnet followed the blueprint of episcopal reform that had been drawn during the preceding two generations by leading figures, such as Jean Standonck, Olivier Maillard, Jean Raulin, and Claude de Seyssel.⁹ Having lost confidence in the leadership of Rome and the highest secular authorities, these reformers had singled out bishops as the ones who should be able to fulfill the ever-sidetracked, late-medieval quest to reform the church in head and members.¹⁰ Sobered by their experience, however, Maillard and Raulin, believed that few prelates matched their ideal. In their view, most bishops were as corrupt as the system by which they were selected. Since bishoprics were rich prizes, the King and powerful families colluded to control capitular elections. Chief among the latter were the dynasties of royal officials such as the Briçonnets. While decrying royal interference in the electoral system, which was increasing, these reformers mounted public pressure by voicing their vision of the true pastor.¹¹

The ideal bishop was a good shepherd (*bon pasteur*) whose duties were chiefly to nourish and to guard his flock. A hundred years earlier, Gerson had provided the basic

⁹ M. Piton, "L'idéal épiscopal selon les prédicateurs français de la fin du XV^e siècle et du début du XVI^e," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 61 (1966), 77–118, 393–423 provides a magisterial overview based on a survey of ten prominent reforming preachers. His argument for a widely-shared vision of the ideal bishop is particularly persuasive since, although this group was not united by any formal ties, they shared similar views on the subject, "une communauté de sentiments," p. 78. Paul Broutin presents a broad overview of episcopal reform from Jean Gerson to the Council of Trent in *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale*. John Olin offers further documentation for the view that a strong current of episcopal reform anticipated Trent's emphasis on diocesan renewal, see *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola: Reform in the Church 1495-1540* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), xiii. David Potter, "The Church and the Crown," in *A History of France, 1460–1560: The Emergence of a Nation State* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 219–231 surveys recent scholarship on the social origins, quality, and effectiveness of French bishops.

¹⁰ Raulin argued that without a reform of the episcopate, no reform was possible at all, Piton, "L'idéal épiscopal," 107–108.

¹¹ Judging by Piton's presentation, these reforming preachers would seem to have spent as much energy condemning corrupt episcopal elections as articulating their vision of the bishop's duties. Their attacks were not, however, mere Gallican *parti pris*. For lack of worthy prelates and priests, they blamed both royal nominations as well as capitular elections and *rota* system by which one third of prelacies were to go to university graduates. See Piton, "L'idéal épiscopal," [XXX].

guidelines, emphasizing above all that prelates must preach. Their lives should be holy examples, free from the taint of luxury and pomp, which were the normal trappings and failings of those occupying such well-endowed offices. As administrators, bishops should scrupulously monitor ecclesiastical courts so that abuses and excessive fines would not crush the laity. As overseers of the clergy, they should encourage and, if necessary, coerce them to fulfill their duties.

Writing to a newly appointed bishop, Gerson drew up a clear list of duties, usually associated with the Council of Trent: a bishop should: 1) test candidates for orders and prebends personally so as only to admit the worthy, 2) hold frequent synods in order to correct and instruct the clergy, 3) ensure that the people knew the basic articles of faith, and 4) provide priests with texts enabling them to perform the cure of souls effectively. With respect to educating the laity, he demanded schools for children and instruction during Sunday mass for adults.¹² For the clerics' own training, he prescribed a substantial list of books, including the New Testament, Ambrose's *Liber de officiis*, the *Regula pastoralis*, Gregory the Great's homilies, Lactantius, Cassian, Gratian's *Decretum*, Ludolphe of Saxony's *Vie du Christ*, Jacobus de Voragine's *Légende dorée*, Guy de Montrocher's *Manipulus curatorum*, Guillaume Peraudi's *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis*, Aquinas' ethics in the *Secunda secundae*, the equivalent articles in the *Catholicon*, Pierre d'Ailly's *Libellus sacramentalis*, as well as his own *Opus tripartitum*.¹³

Following Gerson's model, the reformers of Standonck's generation particularly

¹² Broutin, *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale*, 16–18.

¹³ Broutin, *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale*, 18–19.

emphasized the need for prelates to serve as shining examples.¹⁴ Claude de Seyssel formulated the bishop's five pastoral duties as: 1) residence, 2) conducting pastoral visitations, 3) spiritual direction of the faithful, 4) correction of dissidents, and 5) preaching.¹⁵ In essence, all these reformers longed for genuine pastors who would lead by their exemplary lives, enliven the laity with word and sacrament, and train clerics to follow their example.

Aside from Seyssel, several other prelates of Briçonnet's generation were striving to match this standard. Scholars have rightly called attention to their substantial numbers which included:¹⁶

François d'Estaing, Rodez (1501–1529)
 Étienne Poncher, *Paris (1503–1519) and *Sens (1519–1525)
 Hugues des Hazards, *Toul (1506–1517)
 Antoine d'Estaing, *Angoulême (1506–1524)
 Louis Pinelle, *Meaux (1511–1516)
 Louis Guillart, *Tournai (1513–1525) and *Chartres (1525–1553)
 Denis Briçonnet, *St.-Malo (1514–1535)
 Jacques Sadolet, *Carpentras (1517–1536)
 Guillaume Petit, Troyes (1519–1527) and Senlis (1527–1536)
 Artus Fillon, *Senlis (1522–1526)
 Robert Ceneau, Vence *(1522–1530), Riez (1530–1532), and *Avranches (1532–1561)

Although we have disappointingly few studies on the activities of French reforming bishops before Trent, it is readily apparent that this group shared a common

¹⁴ Piton, "L'idéal épiscopal," 78.

¹⁵ In his *Tractatus de triplici statu viatoris* (Paris-Turin, 1520). See, Broutin, *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale*, 27–34.

¹⁶ Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*; *idem*, "Compléments à ma biographie," in *Autour de Guillaume Briçonnet (1470–1534)*, (Provins: Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie, 1993), 35–47; and *idem*, "Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, et la réforme de son clergé," *RHE* 84 (1989), 671–672 with bibliographies for each figure. The asterisk in this list signals that there survive records of synodal statutes held during their episcopacies, see André Artonne, Louis Suizard and Odette Pontal, eds., *Répertoire des statuts synodaux des diocèses de l'ancienne France du XIIIe à la fin du XVIIIe siècle*, Documents, Études et Répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 8 (Paris:

vision of reform.¹⁷

The issue of mutual influence and interaction in this generation of prelates needs further exploration. Briçonnet's contemporaries of the 1510s and 1520s were certainly linked to the reformers of Standonck's generation in the 1490s through the persons of Jean Mombaer, Jean Rély, Guillaume Petit, Louis Pinelle, Josse Clichtove, Étienne Poncher, and the Amboise family.¹⁸ However complex such the patterns of influence may have been, one thing is clear: would-be reformers of Briçonnet's generation were more divided over the rights of the 'Gallican' church and the usefulness of biblical humanist scholarship than they were united by a shared ideal of episcopal reform. As Standonck had clashed with Guillaume Briçonnet, *père*, the Archbishop of Narbonne, so his successor Beda would fulminate against Guillaume, *fils*, but for different reasons. Whereas Standonck criticized the father as a worldly prelate, Beda later attacked his son for taking episcopal reform in new, 'heretical' directions under the influence of biblical humanists.¹⁹ Yet the young Briçonnet had fully adopted Standonck's ideal of the good

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1969).

¹⁷ Nicole Lemaître, one of the best informed scholars in this field, and Michel Veissière, Guillaume Briçonnet's biographer, make the very plausible claim for a fairly unified current of episcopal reform in France on the eve of the Reformation. Based on their assessment of 30 bishops connected to Briçonnet, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, and Marguerite of Navarre (they missed many others), Lemaître and Veissière assert that: "Malgré les limites actuelles de la documentation, il y a déjà matière suffisante pour parler de l'influence de Lefèvre sur l'épiscopat de son temps, à divers degrés: influence orale, par son enseignement, par son action au sein d'un groupe de disciples.... On peut affirmer avec certitude que tous ces hommes ont partagé vers 1518-1520 une conception commune de la réforme de l'Église. Les tentatives de réforme pastorale locales sont trop nombreuses, trop groupées dans le temps pour qu'elles soient sans lien," "Lefèvre d'Étaples, Marguerite de Navarre, et les évêques de leur temps," in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 109-134. For her substantial contribution to our understanding of late-medieval reforming bishops, see, Nicole Lemaître, *Le Rouergue flamboyant: Le clergé et les fidèles du diocèse de Rodez, 1417-1563* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).

¹⁸ Despite Piton's overly cautious proviso that the preachers whom he studied formed only "une communauté de sentiments," many biographical details he supplies about them, their disciples, and supporters point to an inter-linked and active 'network.' See "L'idéal épiscopal," 78, and *passim*.

¹⁹ Standonck had opposed the election of Guillaume Briçonnet, *père*, to the see of Reims. His son [Guillaume II, the future Bishop of Meaux] played a major role in fixing the vote. Though Standonck lamented at the

bishop. Like his father, however, he still stood firmly in the royalist camp against which Beda, Standonck's successor at the college of Montaigue, struggled to assert the Gallican rights (i.e., freedom from papal and royal interference) of the university and secular clergy.

A Test Case of the New Model Bishop: Luigi Canossa

In the years leading up to 1520, several other prelates, who like Seyssel and the Briçonnet brothers served in royal government, adopted the episcopal reform program of their long-time critics. The case of Luigi Canossa, Bishop of Bayeux (1516–1532), is a particularly instructive example of the confluence of episcopal reform, biblical humanism, and royal power because he too was intimately associated with Marguerite.

Canossa was one of the many able Italians attracted to France in the wake of the Italian Wars.²⁰ Together with the Briçonnet brothers, he rendered key service as a papal ambassador in negotiating the Concordat, for which Francis I rewarded him with the bishopric of Bayeux and other gifts worth some 12,000 *livres tournois*. Between 1523 and 1528, he served as the resident French ambassador in Venice. Well-educated and a patron of humanists, he employed the Greek scholar Jacques Toussaint in his diocese until Francis I hired him as one of the first *lecteurs royaux*. On becoming bishop in 1516, Canossa had the whimsy to offer Erasmus, who was rising to the apex of his fame, a

turn of the century that he could count but four or five good bishops in all of France's sees (some 115), ironically, by 1518–1520, he would have had to include Guillaume and his brother Denis, among a slowly growing number of such prelates. See, Piton, 411–417; cf. Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 56.

²⁰ For a thoughtful analysis of Canossa's episcopal career, see Pierre Bourdon, "Nouvelles recherches sur Lodovico Canossa, évêque de Bayeux, 1516–1531," *Bulletin historique et philologique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1911), 260–301.

position at his court in Bayeux. Promising 200 ducats, 2 horses, and 2 servants, the offer was more a generous compliment than a proposal enticing enough to lure away the Emperor's pensioner. While he was gratified by the mark of esteem, Erasmus declined the invitation.

Despite his busy career as bishop-diplomat and patron, Canossa took a lively interest in the religious health of his diocese. Measured against the standard of Gerson, Standonck, and Seyssel, his synodal statutes of 1518 were indeed those of a good bishop.²¹ He reaffirmed his immediate predecessor's statutes of 1515 regulating clerical residence, dress, morals, concubinage, tavern-keeping, special alms appeals (*quêtes*), education, and the administration of the sacraments. Strengthening the strictures on comportment and residency, he particularly emphasized the education of the parish clergy and laity. He required priests having the cure of souls to own and learn by heart a modest, up-dated list of pastoral handbooks, including Guy de Montrocher's *Manipulus curatorum*, Gerson's *L'Instruction des curés* (*Opus tripartitum*), which he had just had re-printed, Artus Fillon's *Speculum curatorum* (c. 1509), as well as Canossa's own synodal statutes.²² In turn, the clergy were to ensure that the laity memorize and explicitly believe in (*explicite credere*) the *Lord's Prayer* and *Credo*.²³

²¹ *Synodales Consitutiones* (13 April 1518) in *Patrologia Latina* 147, 235–240.

²² Statute 16, "... iniungimus singulis clericis, praecipue curatis et vicariis in ecclesiis ministrantibus, ut saepe vacent litteris, et sibi emant tractatum nuncupatum *Fillon*, et *Manipulum curatorum*, necnon praecepta synodalia a praedecessoribus nostris edita infra duos menses proxime futuros. Et in illis se instruant sub poena excommunicationis." Statute 23: "Item, iniungitur eisdem curatis ut habeant diligenter observare statuta synodalia tam per eundem dominum episcopum quam suos praedecessores pridem edita et promulgata; et ut quilibet eorum apud se habeat libellum nuncupatum *Fillon*, vel *Speculum curatorum*, et etiam alium librum nuper auctoritate eiusdem domini impressum, intitulatum: *L'instruction des curés*, eosque libellos in Kalendis exhibeant promotori eiusdem domini episcopi sub poena emendae arbitrariae." *PL* 147, 238–240.

²³ Statute 19: "Ex decretis sanctorum Patrum nostrorum manifestatur quod placere Deo sine fide non possumus. Et quia ad nostras deveni aures quamplurimos nostrae Bajocensis dioecesis parum in fide catholica

Although frequently absent in service to the king during the following years, Canossa still continued to guide his diocese, instructing his vicars by letter.²⁴ While in Venice he stayed in touch with Marguerite, calling upon her to help him sustain the religious life of his diocese.²⁵ Had he been in France during the early 1520s, another promising experiment in episcopal reform, like Briçonnet's at Meaux, could have evolved at Bayeux led by Canossa. As at Meaux, it would have drawn on the dual support of a humanist trained clergy and court favor: the two essentials for successful episcopal reform in France at that time.²⁶ In any case, Canossa's example points to the fact that as early as 1520, the court, Marguerite in particular, was favoring several prelates who wished to renew religious life, serve the king, and further humanist letters.

In co-opting the episcopal reform project, those prelates had broken with the reformist camp of Standonck and Beda by fitting it within the royal agenda to control the Gallican church and, equally threatening, by adopting humanist biblical scholarship and pedagogy to fulfill it. From this perspective, Guillaume Briçonnet's reform program was representative of a new direction in the pursuit of late-medieval reform, emerging just before the reformation movement developed. Reformist prelates like Briçonnet embraced

imbutos esse, cupientes salubriter providere, unde statuimus ut de caetero singuli curati seu eorum vicarii, diebus Dominicis in prona missarum parochialium alta et intelligibili voce proferre habeant, et distincte dicere orationem Dominicam *Pater noster*, et utrumque *Credo*, ut sic ignari, rudes, et imbecilles addiscere et retinere valeant, et explicite saltem credere non erubescant." *PL* 147, 240.

²⁴ Bourdon, "Nouvelles recherches sur Lodovico Canossa," 297–299.

²⁵ [1 June 1526] Canossa and Marguerite were in contact over his desire to regulate the transfer of nuns between two houses in Caen (Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 352 and 353) and had been in regular contact with her over the years, 11 September 1520 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 7); 5 May 1523 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 103), and June [1525] (Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 222 and 223).

²⁶ Canossa continued to count on Marguerite's support dedicating to her his, *De modo legendi hebraice dialogus*, (Paris, 1534), writing "Est haebraea tibi carissima lingua. [f. A2v]." See further, Richard Cooper, *Litterae in Tempore Belli: Etudes sur les relations littéraires italo-françaises pendant les guerres d'Italie*, THR 308 (Geneva: Droz, 1997), XXX.

two new trends, the growing power of royal government and the pedagogical promise of the humanist learning, to effect traditional goals.

Brignonnet's Reform Program to 1521

Like his predecessors at Meaux, Jean L'Hullier (1483–1500), Jean de Pierrepont (1500–1510), and Louis Pinelle, as well as his school master, Josse Clichtove, and his brother Denis at St.-Malo, Brignonnet shared Canossa's preoccupation with ameliorating the clergy.²⁷ While these prelates also expressed concern about the laity breaking divine and canon law—statutes against clandestine marriages and the purchase of unauthorized indulgences were repeated with particular insistence—they saw such abuses, however, as but the sour fruit of the church's wizened limbs. At root, it was the clergy that had failed its mission: because of their dereliction of duty the people neither knew nor loved the faith enough to live better lives. All commanded their charges to use Gerson's basic manual of instruction for clerics, the *Opus tripartitum*. Here was a French summary of the faith containing all the necessary ingredients, a commentary on the Ten Commandments, a guide to penance, and a treatise on the art of dying, together offering a rich handbook for the instruction to the laity.

Denis Brignonnet was therefore continuing a well established tradition in 1518 when he ordered his curates, who were unable to preach, to read a chapter during the

²⁷ For Brignonnet's predecessors, see Michel Veissière, "La vie chrétienne dans le diocèse de Meaux entre 1493 et 1526 d'après les synodes diocésains: Continuités et innovations," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France* 77 (1991), 71–81. I have not been able to consult, Michel Veissière, "Denis Brignonnet, évêque de St.-Malo (1513–1535)," *Annales de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Saint-Malo* (1992), 105–114.

early morning service for the servants as well as the high, parochial mass.²⁸ In order to accommodate this lengthy injection of teaching, Briçonnet authorized celebrants to shorten the customary liturgy with the explicit injunction not to celebrate the mass before reading his portion of Gerson “so that the people, who desperately need to hear such lessons, do not miss it by leave as soon as the mass has been said.”²⁹ To readers, he granted forty days pardon, twenty to auditors. Similar pardons were offered to curates, schoolmasters, parents or others capable of instructing children and the unlettered with Gerson’s manual.

The bishop of St.-Malo’s simple solution to religious ignorance, a *quid pro quo* of pardon for instruction, had already been tried by his brother’s predecessors at Meaux, but it had miserably failed because of a fundamental problem: the clergy were either absent or ignorant. Like Denis, Guillaume conducted a visitation of his diocese in 1518 and found that the parish clergy was composed largely of uneducated vicars.³⁰ The average benefice holder, who generally had some university education, spent most of his time far from his

²⁸ Denis Briçonnet’s prefatory epistle to the clergy of his diocese, [Before April 10, 1518], to Gerson’s *L’Instruction des curez*, in Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 123, 395–399. Briçonnet’s predecessor, Louise Pinelle, had instituted the same use of Gerson’s *Opus tripartitum* during Sunday services, see Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 130–131. With the addition of Canossa noted above, it is clear that reformist bishops relied heavily on Gerson’s pastoral handbook, for Denis Briçonnet’s detailed instructions closely follow those outlined in 1508 by François de Rohan, Archbishop of Lyon and Bishop of Angers. See Rohan’s preface, dated Paris, 20 February 1507 [1508 n.s.], to the edition he had published: Jean Gerson, *L’instruction des curez (Opus tripartitum)*. [Lyon?, 1508]. BM Lyon Rés. Inc. 586.

²⁹ “...affin que par leur messe le peuple qui doyt ouir ladicte lecture ne s’envoye,” Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 123, 398.

³⁰ The sources detailing Briçonnet’s reforming efforts 1518–1520 are his synodal sermons of 1519, 1520, as well as a retrospective account of his efforts that prefaces his 1526 synodal statutes. For the texts of his 1519 and 1520 synodal sermon, see Michel Veissière, “Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet. Meldensis Episocopi (1519 et 1520),” *Humanistica Lovaniensia: Journal of Neo-Latin Studies* 27 (1978), 86–127; and French translations of these in Henri Tardif and Michel Veissière, “Un discours synodal de Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux (13 octobre 1519),” *Revue d’Histoire Ecclésiastique* 71 (1976), 91–108, and *idem*, “Un autre discours synodal de Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux (octobre 1520),” *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 60 (1976), 419–445. For the 1526 summary, see Dom Micheal Chretien Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l’église de Meaux: avec des notes ou dissertations; et les pièces justificatives*, 2 vols. (Paris: Juillien-Michel Gandouin, 1731), 2, 565–567. For a

parish, often indeed to teach or study in Paris. He discovered that as a result no part of his diocese enjoyed sustained preaching or instruction. For this reason, the Franciscans of Meaux had recently been given the task of ministering the word. According to Briçonnet's findings, these Friars privileged the richer parishes and breezed in, preaching tired old sermons, just to collect alms. Some rural parishes had not been graced with so much as a country curate's simple homily in seven to ten years.³¹

Between 1518 and 1521, Guillaume's solution was to put primary emphasis on forcing prebend-holders to reside in their parishes. A pluralist himself and intimately acquainted with the litigious immobilism of the benefice system, it is surprising that he should have thought he could make headway. When he reprimanded his clergy for justifying their absence as an acceptable sacrifice in order to carry out their more important service as courtiers, magistrates, and professors, Briçonnet had to anticipate their charges of hypocrisy since he had previously neglected his pastoral duties for these very same reasons.³² He preempted their critique by claiming that a 'clarion call' from the Scriptures had awakened his conscience. But he had already reformed his Abbey of

detailed presentation of these early visitations and synods, see Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 127–141, 157–175.

³¹ "Unde anno millesimo quingentesimo decimo octavo Roma rediens totam Dioecesim visitans in quaque parochia sollicitè admodum a decanis, parochialibus Sacerdotibus, Vicariis, Matriculariis, aliisque primoribus parochiarum sciscitatus est, quis praedicasset illis verbum Dei, quot praedicationibus, quali doctrina, vita aut moribus essent. Omnium autem responsa invenit totius Dioecesis hanc praedicationum Provinciam a multis ante praedecessoribus mandatam esse Fratribus minoribus Conventus Meldensis, qui raras admodum et infrequentes praedicationes facerent, easque potissimum tempore quaestorum, quas ut possent celerius colligere, uno eodemque die unus Praedicator quatuor aut quinque parochias eundem sermonem repetens, non ut animas sed se ipsos alerent, visitaret, et eas tantum, quae insignes essent, ex quibus inde uberius quaestus accederet. Hinc in Conventum suum quaestis onusti se recipientes, non prius redibant, quam aliud quaestarum tempus se offerret, ita ut Quaestores, non Praedicatores viderentur; minutas autem et tenues parochias septem, octo, novem et decem annis destitutas fuisse alimentum et populo Verbi Dei non sine animi dolore intellexit." Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l'église de Meaux* 2, 565.

³² "Sunt et plerique velamen erroris afferentes, quod longe gravioribus (ut asserunt) negociis invigilent, a principibus asciti, subseclis iudicum ascripti, laurea palaestrica donati, aut gymnasticis exercitiis continendis occupati. Pudet et alia dicere, quae nonnullos distineant." 1519 synodal sermon, reiterated again in 1520, Veissière, "Duo

St.-Germain-des-Près in 1508 and then taken reformist measures at St.-Malo. Briçonnet's activities at Meaux are thus better seen as a regenerated commitment to the ideal of reform after having spent several years serving the crown. He never, however, explains the origin of this pastoral re-awakening.³³

While thundering away in vain at his truant clergy, Briçonnet attempted to override the broken benefice system by organizing the diocese's parishes into thirty-two preaching circuits, whose ministers would fill the void of instruction. In 1518, he invited the Franciscans to choose those districts in which they would take responsibility for ensuring regular ministry in exchange for being permitted to solicit alms and undertook to supply the other stations with preachers at his own expense. Little information survives about whom he hired or how well the system worked before the Fabrists arrived in 1521. In February 1519, Pierre Richard, a well-known scholar at Paris, praised Briçonnet for engaging well-trained preachers from the University: "Today, secular clergymen, garlands and shining stars of the University of Paris, hasten from town to town and castle to castle, dispersing the Gospel throughout your diocese, not seeking their own profit, but that of Jesus Christ."³⁴ Leaving aside the dig at the Franciscans, with whom Briçonnet had

sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet," 104, see further 122.

³³ "Quoniam modo potero et ego, commitiones amantissimi, tanti sanguinis innoxius haberi; qui in annos deum ludere, et rem actam agere videar? Incebit auribus meis classicum buccinae tremendi iudicis, oves de manu speculatoris requirentis et interminantis....," Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet," 97. Among those who likely influenced Briçonnet's sense of pastoral calling, Veissière cites his university teachers Louis Pinelle and Josse Clichtove as well as the example of Sadolet, Gilberti, and the oratory of divine love during his time in Italy. See, Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 115–117; *idem*, "Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, et la réforme de son clergé," *RHE* 84 (1989), 665–666.

³⁴ "O quam felices, o quam beatae sunt illae oves Meldenses quae talem ac tantum meruerunt habere pastorem! Nunc, nunc tui evangelistae saeculares universitatis Parisiensis flores et sidera fulgentia, de oppido in oppidum per tuam dioecesim currunt et discurreunt, et per castela evangelizantes et curantes ubique assistunt, non quaerentes quae sua sunt, sed quae Iesus Christi....," dedicatory epistle, dated 18 February 1518 [n.s. 1519], to *Doctrinale sanctae ac providae vitae*, a collection of forty sermons on the two types of deaths (corporal and spiritual),

recurring troubles, it is remarkable that Briçonnet won praise for hiring university students so soon after helping to negotiate the Concordat, for this agreement had destroyed the *rota* system through which one third of the realm's prebends were supposed to be distributed to university graduates. Richard's praise may have reflected an ideal rather than described the reality, for in both 1519 and 1520 Briçonnet found his clergy still sadly wanting. Yet, his good reputation at the university may help explain why on 2 September 1521 the masters chose Briçonnet over the king's candidate as defender of the University of Paris' apostolic privileges.³⁵

By 1521, Briçonnet had created a second tier of ministers above the parish priests. Though it is not clear how these were to complement each other over the long term, his circuit preachers were evidently meant to carry the brunt of religious instruction. Below them, most curates were absentee and their vicars were scarcely capable of performing the sacraments. Despite having concentrated pastoral responsibility on an of elite thirty-two clerics, both tiers would seem to have been understaffed with qualified personnel. At the end of 1520, Briçonnet assessed the abilities of all the vicars and priests in the

judgment, the pains of hell and purgatory, and eternal bliss. Richard became a canon of the Cathedral at Troyes 1487 and was named its resident theologian (*théogal*) in 1497. Professor at the Collège d'Harcourt, he taught theology and was a noted preacher. Between 1508 and 1524 he published at least a dozen works, including *Confessionale seu pastoralis Decalogus curatis necessario requisitus* (1510, 1524), *Contra non recte de ... beati Petri apostoli martyrio sentientes* (1518), *Sermonum Opus super Epistolas et Evangelia totius anni* (1518), *Doctrinale sanctae ac providae vitae* (1519). Michel Veissière, "Une Dédicace de Pierre Richard à Guillaume Briçonnet (1519)," *BHR* 49 (1987), 121–128; 127–128.

³⁵ On 12 September 1521 Briçonnet visited Paris to be sworn in. With the position came the power to nominate several university officers. He also presided over a court dealing with matters of ecclesiastical privilege to which university 'clerics' could appeal. Normally it was a life appointment, but he resigned this position in 1530. Veissière, *Briçonnet*, 180, citing Guy Bretonneau, *Histoire généalogique de la maison des Briçonnet* (Paris, 1620), p. 184. James Farge claims that Briçonnet's 'rival' in this election was Artus Fillon, Bishop of Senlis. Only if the election was held after September 1522, when Fillon succeeded Calveau could this have been the case. See *Biographical Register*, no. 184, p. 165, citing du Boulay [Bulacius], César-Égasse, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, 6 vols, vol. 6 [16th century], (Paris: Petrus de Bresche, François Noël, 1665–1673; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1966), 129.

diocese. On the extremes he found only 14 'capable of preaching the Gospel' and 43 wholly incapable, even of administering the sacraments properly. In between them was a mediocre crowd, divided into two groups: 60 worthy of a year's probation and "the rest a little learned" (that is, capable of performing the sacraments), but incapable of preaching. The 43 'wholly incapable' he banned from performing the sacraments and demanded replacements from the responsible prebend-holders. The 60 were given a reprieve until the next synod to prove their worth, at which time many failed and were dismissed.³⁶ These results indicate that on the eve of the Fabrists' arrival, a large portion of the parish clergy could barely perform the sacraments properly let alone expound the basic tenet of the faith. There were not even enough fully capable preachers, a mere 14, to cover half of the 32 preaching circuits.

Before 1521, Briçonnet chiefly had concentrated on ameliorating the secular clergy rather than the regular clergy since the seculars were, in his opinion, the true intermediaries between the people and God.³⁷

Certainly, the spiritual battle of monks is a great and marvelous thing, but the one who compares this with the priestly office rightly administered, will find that that

³⁶ Presumably, the remaining group who were "a little learned" were permitted to administer the sacraments but not licensed to preach. "Et cum absentes huiusmodi Rectores tenentur in qualibet Synodo annuatim Vicarium unum aut plures pro regimine et cura animarum illi praesentare, idcirco anno millesimo quingentesimo vicesimo visitans dictam suam Diocesim examinavit omnes singulos Vicarios, et alios sacerdotes totius Diocesis, ut probaret, qui essent capaces Evangelicae praedicationis, et cum tantum quatuordecim invenisset, quinquaginta tres notavit insufficientes, sexaginta tolerabiles ad annum, alios mediocriter doctos, incapaces tamen praedicandi Verbi Evangelici. Id autem in sua Synodo eodem anno referens, insufficientes eiecit ab omnimoda Sacramentorum administratione; tolerabiles remisit usque ad Synodum proximam, admonens Rectores infra terminum sancti Martini tunc illis datum praesentare alios loco insufficientium, quod factum est. Plerique etiam anno sequenti qui tolerabiles fuerunt adjudicati, eieci fuerunt; alii quia eo anno profecissent, relict. Nichil tamen est iis annis immutatum super Stationibus et Praedicatoribus in illis ordinatis." Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l'église de Meaux*, 2, 565.

³⁷ "Et recte ait [Paulus] ferenda esse infirmiora vasa domini, quia ovium peccata piis gemitibus et suspiriis abluere non fuerit alienum a pastoribus, qui solidiora et aurea vasa sunt effecti; unde *inter vestibulum et altare*, [Joel 2:17], quasi mediastini [*sic* for mediastini], iram dei fusis lachrymis temperant deque bonitatem peccatis ovium subasperatam leniunt, ac tanquam aries muro iusticiae divinae admotus, misericordiae pietati piam vim afferunt." Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales Guillelmi Briçonnet," 111.

there is the same difference between them as between an individual and a king since the ministrations of priests serve the common good through charity and, of even greater importance, are made effective in heaven.³⁸

Nevertheless, he took direct measures to ameliorate both monastic communities as well as the moral life of the laity.³⁹ More than his clerical reforms, which were bogged down in the courts,⁴⁰ his reform of monastic houses garnered support from the royal court, the Parlement of Paris, and the laity of Meaux. In 1518, he supervised the restoration of the elite Benedictine convents of Farmoutiers and Jouarre, which Francis I and Marguerite's half-sister, Madelene d'Orléans, had led successively in 1511 and 1515. Evidently, the royals considered the reform of religious houses as Briçonnet's special bailiwick. That same year, they chose Briçonnet as one of three bishops to oversee the reform of the abbey of Almenèches, near Argentan in the Duchy of Alençon, whose reformation was favored by Francis I and stimulated by Marguerite.⁴¹ Over the next years Briçonnet's partnership with the court in reforming the regular clergy continued.⁴² In response to Marguerite's petition, Leo X's commissioned Briçonnet and Frales de

³⁸ "Magnus certe et admirandum monarchorum certamen, verum qui illud bene administrato sacerdotio conferat, inter utrumque tam interesse comperiet, quam inter privatum et regem, quod pastorale officium charitate in commune transeat, et altius coelis efficiatur." Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales Guillelmi Briçonnet," 96; for his critique of the orders' rivalry, 118.

³⁹ Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, p. 143–155.

⁴⁰ Briçonnet's secretary, Lermite, recounted the legal maneuvers his recalcitrant clergy employed to block his reforms, "Idcirco attendens Curatos et rectores huic officio praedicationis maxime vacare debere, paucos tamen in parochialibus locis, sed fere omnes Parisiis residentes esse, aegre ferens dictus Reverendus tot desertores militiae Christianae, qui alias capaces essent alendo gregi, invenire, in proxima Synodo anno millesimo quingentesimo decimo nono Stationibus ut anno priore assignatis Praedicatoribus, ordinavit omnes et singulos Curatos iuxta Iuris formam residere, curaque ovium intendere, in quos cum esset aliquot diebus processum, nonnulli appellationis remedio a notorio abusu ad Curiam Parlamenti, alii ad Metropolitanum, alii remedio quaerimoniae se tutantes, dictum Reverendum innumeris litium anfractibus vexavere...." Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l'église de Meaux*, 2, 566.

⁴¹ Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, p. 153. On Marguerite and the court's support for the reform of religious houses from 1515 to the early 1520s see, chapter 3.

⁴² Briçonnet's partnership with royal government included raising royal taxes. In 1518, the court asked him Briçonnet to represent the king at the regional assembly of Normandy (*États de Normandie*) and to secure funds from the church for the king. See below and Veissière, p. 137.

Coulbeuf, abbot of St.-André-en-Gouffern (Calvados) to reform the canons of Sées in the diocese of Alençon. The cathedral chapter was provided with a new constitution, which Francis I ratified in October 1522.⁴³

The hospitals and leprosariums of Briçonnet's diocese were also in disorder. In 1520, with the combined help of local notables and the Parlement of Paris, he forced the Trinitarians to withdraw from the Hôtel Dieu of Meaux.⁴⁴ They had usurped the foundation's revenues for their own use, neglecting the poor whom they were supposed to serve. After expelling them, Briçonnet reestablished the Hôtel on sounder financial and administrative footing.⁴⁵

Besides their interest in reforming the town hospital, the people of Meaux had a lively interest in redressing the fiscal abuses of the clergy. Though there is little direct evidence, their concerns echo in Briçonnet's accounting of the clergy's excuses for non-residence. Absentee prelates complained that the people refused to pay their tithes and that offerings had recently diminished.⁴⁶ Briçonnet's remarks indicate that lay discontent with clerical fiscal abuses started well before Fabrist or Lutheran criticisms hit Meaux,

⁴³Saulnier 1977, 451.

⁴⁴ The Parlement was represented by André Verjus, who subsequently proved to be a staunch opponent of the King's domestic and ecclesiastical policy as well as the 'heretics' supported by his sister as one of the *juges-délégués*.

⁴⁵ The reform of the *Hôtel Dieu* required sustained effort from 9 February 1519 [n.s. 1520] to 12 November 1520. Guillaume Briçonnet, Jean Bataille, *avocat du Roy* in the *bailliage de Meaux*, the Dean of the chapter of Meaux, as well as the governors, leaders and top bourgeois of the town and market (a separate legal entity) of Meaux presented themselves as plaintiffs against Fr. Nicole Musnier, "Docteur Régent en la Faculté de Droit en l'Université de Paris, Général de l'Ordre de la Sainte Trinité et Rédemption de Captifs" as well as his brothers. The Trinitarians had 'administered' the *Hôtel Dieu* for a long time, but had turned its revenues to their own use. By order of the Parlement, all the goods, lands, buildings, and rents as well as the duties pertaining to the *Hôtel Dieu* were turned over to Guillaume Briçonnet excepting the "Curé de S. Remi" and its lands, which were left to the Trinitarians to support a new house for which the bishop promised an additional 100 *l.t.* The rest was put in his charge for poor relief. Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l'église de Meaux*, 2, 274–276, doc. no. DVVII, "Ex Tabular. Monast. SS. Trinitatis Meldensis." Henry Heller has found that lay giving substantially increased to the *Hôtel Dieu* in Meaux even though charitable giving as whole was declining during the particularly dire war years following 1522, a fact which exhibits strong popular support for these reforms. See "Famine and Revolt," p. 144–145.

contributing to the erosion of the clergy's revenues.

By 1520, the clergy's perception of decreasing revenues was very likely accurate, even if diminishing lay generosity was not the whole cause, for the king was beginning to siphon off ecclesiastical funds into the royal fisc. In 1517, Briçonnet helped levy the first ever royal 'tenth' (*décime*) on church revenues in his diocese.⁴⁷ Fifty-five more tenths were to be exacted during Francis's reign. A new pressure from the crown on parish receipts had begun, which probably caused resentment down the fiscal food-chain, through the various levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, each of which were receiving lower net returns, to the parishioners at the bottom who paid the ever more assiduously exacted church taxes.

The clergy further complained that the laity were anticlerical, profane, and ignorant. To all this Briçonnet responded harshly: "Why do we complain that our rights are violated, that everyone insults the clergy, or that church law and things sacred are profaned? Why should we? We have merited it!"⁴⁸ In his analysis, if the clergy were as concerned about maintaining the people's faith as they were about preserving their incomes, the people's charity would not have diminished.⁴⁹

Briçonnet's response to the clergy went to the central problem and ultimate target of his reform: the turmoil of lay religious life. His rhetoric expressed this assessment in

⁴⁶ Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet," 97, 126.

⁴⁷ "Les besoins de l'État donnèrent lieu sous le même règne [Francis I] à l'impositions de Décimes: elles furent payées pour la première fois dans le Diocèse de Meaux en 1517, & se montrent à sept mille livres." Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l'église de Meaux*, 1, 324–325.

⁴⁸ "Quid ingemimus libertates nostras violari, ecclesiasticos omnes probro haberi, iura ecclesiastica sacraque omnia prophanari. Quidni? Talia meremur." Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet," 99–100.

⁴⁹ Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet," 126.

extreme terms: “religion is in exile,” “the church and flock are miserably ruined.”⁵⁰ Yet, he said, there was hope. Though the church was as dry and lifeless as tinder, there was still a seed of life, “Jesus will always enliven some members of the church body.”⁵¹

Briçonnet did seek to encourage lay piety directly, and his measures in this direction were, like his brother’s pardons at St.-Malo, traditional. Having established good relations with the Pope during the Concordat negotiations, Guillaume secured a liberal suite of indulgences for participating in the rites of the church and supporting its foundations.⁵² While trying to increase devotion with indulgences—which would also address the recent decline in lay giving—he followed this carrot with a stick, issuing injunctions against profaning holy days. This seems to be the sum of his direct approach to the laity.

These few measures did not go very far towards nourishing the laity directly by word, sacrament, and example. He chiefly aimed to provide his flock with caring pastors, who would stimulate the laity’s love of God and the church: “Only one food revives the soul: the love of God.”⁵³ Simultaneously, as an able administrator from a family of royal administrators, he was addressing the systemic problems of his diocese: absenteeism,

⁵⁰ Veissière, “Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet,” 96, 108, 118–119.

⁵¹ When discussing the dismal state of the church, Briçonnet asserted that there would always be some part preserved: “*Exsiccatus est vertex Carmeli* [Amos 1:2], et aruit velut testa virtus ecclesiae. Cuius licet *matrix sterilis et ubera arenia* [Cf. Hosea 9:14], manet tamen super semen vivificum, quo benignitate dei nunquam destituimur. Alias Sodomam et Gomorram scelere vinceremus, superbono IESV ad consummationem usque seculi in nonnulla membra corporis ecclesiae (cuius caput est) semper influente.” Veissière, “Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet,” 118–119.

⁵² On indulgences, Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 121–127. For his 11 August 1520 ‘*mandements*’ against public dancing and plays, “*choreas publicas... sive, ut vulgariter dicunt Eschafault.*” on Sunday and the Assumption of the Virgin, which were confirmed by royal *lettres patentes* and published 7 January 1521, see Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l’église de Meaux*, 1, 326; 2, no. 8, 555–556.

⁵³ “...sed uno tantum alimento spiritus reficitur. Id unum amor dei est.” Veissière, “Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet,” 102.

corrupt foundations, decreasing donations, and even his clergy's legal problems.⁵⁴

By the end of 1520, despite Briçonnet's zeal, the results of three years' effort were minimal. Successive measures had failed to make benefice-holders either reside themselves or supply effective vicars. The principal conduit for educating the laity was effectively blocked. Briçonnet had put in place an innovative program of circuit preachers to bypass this obstacle, but he had not yet been able to supply it with personnel capable of reaching the laity. So too, the literature he had published during these years was geared to the secular and regular clergy and without their ministrations could have had little effect on the laity.⁵⁵ Even if Pinelle's statute requiring parish priests to read Gerson's *Instruction des cures* to their congregations were still in force, the evidence indicates that Briçonnet had not yet taken an active interest in procuring or promoting literature suited for lay instruction before 1521.

Thus, prior to the arrival of the Fabrists, Briçonnet had cleared the ground of many obstructions and designed an efficient labor system for instructing the laity, but the seed had yet to be planted let alone the crop harvested. By 1521 he needed new workers and they would bring new seed.

II. Evangelical Renewal 1521–1523

⁵⁴ At the end of his 1520 synodal sermon, Briçonnet promised to set up a sort of legal clearing house which would take over pursuit of all suits brought by the clergy of his diocese in order to keep them out of the courts and retain them in their parishes. Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet," 126.

⁵⁵ In addition to his translation of the first part of Lefèvre's edition of Jordan's *Contemplationes Idiotarum* (1519) for the use of the nuns of Jouarre, Briçonnet published a new missal for the diocese (1518). His Latin synodal sermons of 1519 and 1520 were printed in 1520 and 1522 respectively. 1520 or 1521 saw a new *Heures de Meaux*, printed for Jean de Brie at Paris (the Easter table starts with 1521), whose sponsorship is unclear. Some of its typographical material would appear four years later in Simon du Bois' earliest evangelical imprints. See, Moreau 3, no. 128, p. 81: "*Jean de Brie (Simon du Bois?)* S.d. [almanac 1521–1530]." This evidence is too tenuous to support any claim that Du Bois and the Meaux reformers were connected before 1525.

Lefèvre d'Étaples and his disciples refocused Briçonnet's program upon a different objective. While responding to his need for better parish priests, they sought to 'evangelize' the people by giving them direct access to the Scriptures in the vernacular and clear instruction based on it. The concrete results of this effort, which required giving to the laity copies of Lefèvre's translations of Scripture, leading them in close study of these texts, as well as publishing a book of model sermons on the lectionary readings for Sunday and high holidays, took some time to materialize. Before we can consider how their efforts to effect it fit into and transformed Briçonnet's predating clerical reform, we need to ask whether the Fabrist had already formed this program before arriving in Meaux.

As we have seen in chapter four, Glareanus interpreted Lefèvre's move to Meaux as a flight from Paris in the wake of the Sorbonne's condemnation of Luther.⁵⁶ In 1519 and 1520, controversy over Lefèvre's treatises on Mary Magdalene, St. Anne, and Christ's three day descent had already driven him into intellectual and physical exile. That he ended up at Meaux shortly after the condemnation of Luther would seem to corroborate Glareanus' assertion. Although Lefèvre was aware of Briçonnet's efforts from the beginning, indeed in April 1519 he thought it newsworthy enough to relate it to Beatus Rhenanus through whom he sent greetings to German scholars including Luther,⁵⁷ nevertheless, there is no evidence that he and his disciples made any move to join in or aid the Meaux reform directly until after the Luther condemnation forced him to flee. His

⁵⁶ See page XXX.

⁵⁷ "Nam pridem libris Philonis donavi R.D. meum Episcopum Meldensem, qui nunc foris agit in dioecesi

choice of Meaux as a safe haven seems obvious since Guillaume Briçonnet had been his chief patron over the past decade and a half. In exchanging lodging at Briçonnet's Abbey of St.-Germain-des-Près in Paris for directorship of a lepers' hospital in Meaux (the position given to him upon arrival), Lefèvre might seem to have been searching for a "safer" spot under the wing of his patron, rather than choosing to answer the dire need of the bishop's floundering clerical reform program.

His flight from Paris and new title, however, do little to explain Lefèvre's subsequent activities or the decision of his disciples to join him at Meaux. By 1521, given their previous biblical studies, their high regard for German biblical humanists, and their sense that a new evangelical dawn was breaking, the Fabrists had decided, beyond fleeing persecution at Paris, to give voice to their understanding of the Gospel in a new way. One of their colleagues, Jean Le Comte (1500–1572), explained the Fabrists' move to Meaux as a flight from Paris into a new phase of their career: "Jacques Lefèvre and four of his friends and disciples withdrew to Meaux, in Brie, to be far away and safe, and to consider the best way to disseminate the holy doctrine of the Gospel which God had given them the grace to know."⁵⁸ Written some years later in the clear hindsight of his commitment to the Protestant cause, Le Comte's journal entry ascribes a deliberate evangelizing purpose in the turn of the Fabrists to Meaux. His interpretation gains credibility if one assess their actual activities at Meaux. To meet the Bishop's desperate

sua." Herminjard I, no. 20, 42–45, 43; Horawitz-Harfelder, *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus*, no. 105, 152.

⁵⁸ "Jacques Lefèvre et quatre de ses amis et disciples, s'étant retirés à Meaux, en Brie, pour être à part et en sûreté et pour délibérer touchant la meilleure manière de provigner la sainte doctrine de l'Évangile que Dieu leur avait fait la grâce de connaître..." Quoted from Jean Le Comte's journal, in a manuscript entitled *Genealogia et fata de la famille Le Comte*, by Ed. Besson, "Jean Lecomte de la Croix: Un réformateur peu connu," *Berner Taschenbuch auf das*

need for fresh energy, the Fabrists responded with enthusiasm and soon a focused program.

Although the Fabrists correspondence from their first three years at Meaux (1521–1523) is not extant, in several dedicatory epistles they publicly expressed and left a record of their intention to retool their Latinate, biblical scholarship to serve the needs of instructing a vernacular audience. This project took some time to bear fruit, yet their intention is evident from the beginning.

In a dedicatory epistle of November 1521 addressed to Antoine Ardillon, Abbot of Fontaine-le-Comte, Lefèvre announced that he and his colleagues were chiefly time striving in Meaux to make the Scriptures more accessible. The author of the work entitled *Apologia hermitarum*, Pierre de Lille, one of Ardillon's monks, had recently asked Lefèvre what should be the focus of his studies. Lefèvre responded that Pierre should concentrate on the Scriptures, announcing that he and his crew were then hard at work on a commentary on the Gospels intended specifically to aid direct appropriation of the Holy Word. The first section on Matthew was almost through the press, he announced, asking Ardillon and his brothers to pray that this work would further the glory of God and build up piety.⁵⁹

Jahr 1887, 26 (1876), 139–168; 145.

⁵⁹ Guy Bedouelle made the fine discovery of this preface and relates that Pierre de Lille, anchorite, and Antoine Ardillon, Abbot of Fontaine-le-Compte, were part of a circle of humanist clerics near Poitiers. Rabelais spent some time with them and mentions them in his *Tiers Livre*. See, Bedouelle, *Lefèvre d'Étaples*, p. 100–102; with, on p. 102, Lefèvre's preface to Pierre de Lille, *Apologia hermitarum Petri Dellila*, s.n., f. A1v:

"RP. Anthonio Ardithon Fontiscomitis abbati dignissimo, Jacobus Faber Stapulensis S.P.D.

"Petrus Delilla Borboniensis anachoritice professionis voluit me in transitu visitare et de plerisque studiis mecum conferre. Inter quae nulla illi adeo ut sacrarum scripturarum lectionem probavi. Et cum sit mentis pie ac religiose meum amplexus est sermonem. Itaque adjecit te eodem desiderio ardere, et avidissime amplecti quae ex officina nostra prodeunt. Quare cupiens augere tuum nobile desiderium volui tibi indicare quae in re nunc labores nostros exerceamus. Hic labor noster, hic conatus, hic tenduntur nervi ut commentarios in evangelia eritamus. Et jam

The following spring, Lefèvre's *Commentarii initiatorii in quatuor Evangelia*, issued from a press at Meaux with a programmatic preface to the reader.⁶⁰ While this Latin work could only serve the learned directly, Lefèvre articulated a broad, even universal, vision of the need to spread the gospel everywhere.⁶¹ Five biblical verses printed on the title page—each one a forceful injunction—announced the missionary intent of the work. Collectively they enjoin preaching the Gospel so that through faith believers throughout the world would be made just and live.⁶²

Lefèvre's preface expresses an inveterate optimist's hope for a bright future, for an imminent renewal of the church. Although he invokes the church's dark past, marred by ignorance, vice, and false doctrine, he never plumbs its miseries. He frames his analysis of the state of the church and plans for its amelioration with reference to the guiding principle of his thought: Christ is the author, sum, and goal of Christian life. Belief in the message of the Gospel will not only confer salvation in the hereafter but also bring peace on earth. All bishops, the "supreme" pontiff, kings, magistrates, and even the individual Christian are responsible for making this message known. Commitment to this duty is the standard by which they should be judged. By their efforts to inculcate the

ferme Matheus perductus est ad calcem. Idcirco, venerande pater, peto orationibus tuis et tuorum confratrum adjuvari ut opus ceptum ad Dei gloriam produci possit, et id feliciter ad finem usque, in quo et id prestante Deo multi proficere possunt ad pietatem."

"Vale, in Christo Domino qui est omnium certa, vera et indubitata salus. Meldis. XXIX novembris. Anno domini M.CCCC.XXI."

⁶⁰ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 434–442. The work was published at Meaux before Easter on a press set up by Simon de Colines, the Fabrists' usual printer, who normally worked out of his shop in Paris.

⁶¹ "Et hoc sit cunctis unicum studium, solatium, desiderium, scire evangelium, sequi evangelium ubique promovere evangelium." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 435.

⁶² The five verse are: "Vidi alterum angelum volutem per medium caelum habentem evangelium aeternum" (Ap. 14:6–7); "Praedicabitur hoc evangelium regni in universo orbe, in testimonium omnibus gentibus" (Mt. 24:14); "Euntes in mundum universum praedicate evangelium omni creaturae" (Mk. 16:15); "Evangelizo vobis gaudium magnum quod erit omni populo" (Lk. 2:10); "Non enim erubescio evangelium Christi. Virtus enim Dei est in salutem

Gospel men and women faced with their fallen state will be revived to new life through a three-fold mystical ascent of purgation of their will, illumination of their understanding, and perfection of their love.

In Lefèvre's view, the church persistently failed to embody this ideal.⁶³ As he saw it, the militant church was just then rebounding from a long fall, which had started with the reign of Constantine, into a pit of darkness where all Gospel light had been snuffed out.⁶⁴ Having reached its nadir, renewal, the re-dawning of the Gospel, had begun with the revival of Latin and Greek studies in Italy under the influence of Byzantine scholars and had continued with Reuchlin's study of Hebrew in the north. As further evidence, Lefèvre cites the recent voyages of the Spaniards and Portuguese, in which he saw the beginnings of a triumphal spread of the Gospel to all the world.

In this thumbnail-sketch of ecclesiastical history, Lefèvre ventures an indirect, yet far-reaching criticism of the militant church, which by failing to present the Gospel had opened the door to non-scriptural practices and beliefs. His criticism serves as the basis for a long appeal to authorities to see to the restoration of worship in strict accordance with the Gospel.⁶⁵ When speaking about the duties of bishops and the Pope, he ignores

omni credenti, Iudaeo primum et Graeco. Iustitia enim Dei in eo revelatur ex fide in fidem, sicut scriptum est, Iustus autem ex fide vivet." (Rm. 1: 26–27). Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 434.

⁶³ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 437–8.

⁶⁴ Again, Lefèvre places his assessment of the decline of the church within the great hope of the Gospel's present renewal: "Quam fidei amplitudinem, quem puritatis cultum redeunte evangelii luce nobis quoque annuat ille qui est super omnia benedictus. Redeunte inquam evangelii luce quae sese tandem mundo rursus hac tempestate insinuat, qua plerique divina luce illustrati sunt, adeo ut praeter alia multa a tempore Constantini, quo primitiva illa quae paulatim declinabat desiit ecclesia, non fuerit maior linguarum cognitio, non maior orbis detectio, non ad longinquiora terrarum spatia quam temporibus istis nominis Christi propagatio." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 437–438.

⁶⁵ "Proinde eo conatus, vigor nervique omnes, tum pontificum tum regum et potentatuum omnium contendere debent, ut conservent illum sicubi adest et instaurent sicubi labefactatus est; nam in eo solo nobis vitam assequendi aeternam spes relicta est. Agite igitur pontifices, agite reges, agite generosa pectora: ubi gentium expurgiscimini ad

the usual protocol of honor due them as heirs to the apostolic succession, stressing only and boldly that “no one is entitled to such a name except by virtue of their everlasting, incorruptible, and spiritual love of Christ and the Gospel.”⁶⁶ Yet, he never explicitly says that it was the church, the bishops, or the Popes, who were responsible for corrupting the cult and ecclesiastical hierarchy. For Lefèvre such diagnoses were beside the point. He concentrated on his main goal, administering the cure by convincing authorities to return the church to its pristine state when the Gospel was the sole foundation of preaching and the true cult.⁶⁷ Thus would religious practice conform to God’s will, eliminating “whatever thwarts and obstructs pure worship.”⁶⁸

Lefèvre’s assessment of church in his day was shaped both by a critical reflection

evangelii lucem, ad verum Dei lumen, respicite ad vitam, eliminate quicquid huic puro obest officitque cultui. Nolite attendere quid dicat aut faciat caro, sed quid dicat aut iubeat Deus. Sedulo mementote illius sententiae Pauli [Col. 2:21–23], Ne tetigeritis, neque gustaveritis, neque contrectaveritis quae sunt omnia in interitum ipso usu secundum praecepta et doctrinas hominum, quae sunt rationem quidem habentia sapientiae in supersitione et humilitate. Verbum Dei sufficit. Hoc unicum satis est ad vitam quae terminum nescit inveniendam. Haec unica regula vitae aeternae magistra est; cetera quibus non adlucet verbum Dei quam non necessaria sunt, tam nimirum superflua. Neque ad puritatem cultus, pietatis integritatemque fidei quod huiusmodi est, evangelio adnumerandum est ut neque creatura Deo.” Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 436.

⁶⁶ “In qua [evangeliae luce] primas ac summas partes [sic for partes] tenere debent pontifices, et maxime omnium qui inter eos in sacris visibiliter peragendis functionibus primus, summus maximusque appellatur; non enim nisi ab illo immortalis, incorrupto spiritualique Christi evangelii amore talis quisquam appellari potest.” Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 435.

⁶⁷ “Et utinam credendi forma a primaeva illa peteretur ecclesia quae tot martyres Christo consecravit, quae nullam regulam praeter evangelium novit, quae nullum denique scopum praeter Christum habuit et nulli cultum praeterquam uni trinoque Deo impendit. Sane si ad hunc morem viveremus, floreret nunc ut et tunc floruit aeternum Christi evangelium. Omnino ex Christo pendebant; et nos quoque ex eodem omnino penderemus.” Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 437.

⁶⁸ “... quicquid huic puro obest officitque cultui.” Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 134, 436. A full understanding of Lefèvre’s critique of the church would have to be teased out of his commentaries. Henry Heller has argued that Lefèvre’s theological positions grew closer to the Protestant reformers, in part under their influence, as exhibited in his *Commentary on the Catholic Epistles* (1524) and collaborative *Epistres et Evangiles* (1525). In Lefèvre’s 1522 *Commentary on the Gospels*, he already had laid the groundwork for such developments. Commenting on chapter 11 of John’s Gospel, he stressed Christ’s unique and all sufficient sacrifice for human sin and denied that sinners can earn merit before God through their deeds: “O quam ergo ingrati sumus, si id de CHRISTO non sentimus nimirum quod in ipso solo saluati, redempti et liberati sumus. ... Ubi ergo sunt nunc, qui sese credunt propriis operibus liberare a peccatis? Hanc gratiam intelligant se soli Christo domino debere, et desinant meritorum opera iactare. Sit Christus et gratia eius, tota gloria et gloriatio nostra: et sciamus quod ex nobis ipsis et operationibus nostris non possumus esse nisi servi: proinde quod liberi sumus, uni Christo acceptum referamus, quem oportuit pro omnium liberatione mori, ne omnes servitute peccati, et aeterna quidem periremus, acceptante deo illum unicum pro pignore, et

on its history as well as by an expectation that it would proceed through divinely ordained stages to its appointed end. He interpreted the political events and scholarly advances of the last few generations as signs that a new era had commenced. In this way he anticipated our modern dating of the Early Modern Period, which was once called the Renaissance and Reformation in closer keeping with humanists and reformers' understanding of their epoch as one of renewal achieved by returning to truths, which had been revealed in (Christian) antiquity and obscured during the Middle Ages. The change of titles betrays a programmatic shift of emphasis: the dominant frame of reference for inquiry has switched from the historical actors to the 'modern' scholar and reader. Despite being grounded in the renovative world-view of early sixteenth century, Lefèvre anticipated modern analysis of the age by predicting that religious renewal would only come from closer cooperation between ecclesiastical and magisterial powers. In this he was pointing to the key relationship driving what many historians see as a hallmark of early modern Europe, 'confessionalization': the intense collaboration of church hierarchies and state regimes to regulate European people's lives more thoroughly than ever before through religion.

During 1521-1523, Lefèvre and his disciples announced two goals during: to make the Gospel more accessible and to put their scholarship in the service of Briçonnet's episcopal reform. This program could serve as a model for a national, even international reform. At this time, Lefèvre's disciple, Gérard Roussel, publicized the need for effective

pro peccatis salvandorum omnium satisfactione." *Commentarii initiatorii in quatuor evangelia* (Meaux: Simon de Colines, [1522]), f. 348 v.

prelates in his preface to a new translation of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia* (Paris, September 1522). He encouraged François Bohier, who was beginnings his ecclesiastical career, to emulate his uncle Guillaume Briçonnet and thereby become a learned and pious prelate like Paul.⁶⁹ While the Fabrists hoped that bishops and secular authorities would take up their cause—as we shall shortly see their hopes rested on the court—their immediate task was to provide it with grounding texts. As the foundation for their other work, the first installments of their French translation of the Bible came off the presses in quick succession, the Gospels in June 1523, Acts, Paul's Epistles, the Catholic Epistles in November, and the Psalms in February, 1524.⁷⁰

When and why did the Meaux group decided to translate the Bible? The answers to these questions are central for understanding their vision of evangelical renewal, since giving the Scriptures to the people in the vernacular struck at the established rule that the Bible be read in Latin and interpreted only by the clergy.

Lefèvre had been writing Latin commentaries on the Scriptures and publishing devotional works since 1509 and Briçonnet had been concentrating on enlivening lay piety since 1518, yet neither seems to have felt the need for vernacular Scriptures before the winter of 1522–1523 when Briçonnet mentioned such a need in his letters to

⁶⁹ “Quod tibi idcirco dicatum volui, qui amore, obsequio, benevolentia, litteris non facile cuiquam cessurus sis, si modo te audieris, hoc est, si eas animi non neglexeris dotes quas tibi summus naturae parens abunde impartit; quo plane intelligas, quantum istoc tuum in sincera piaque studia adamem propensius desiderium, per quod anniteris assectari individue reverendum episcopum Meldensem Guillelmum Bricconnetum, tuum avunculum, virum sane cum primis probitate eximium, ingenio facundiaque praecipuum, rerumque cum humararum [*sic* for humanarum] tum divinarum scientia admirandum, denique (ne quid maius addam) nostro saeculo unum qui Paulinum propius agat pastorem, ad cuius instar, ac si tuus inter mortales scopus, nihil tu tibi non exis.” Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 136, 445–449; 448.

⁷⁰ Though the prefaces are signed by Lefèvre, it is clear that his disciples aided him. When explaining difficult passages of Scripture, Briçonnet frequently refers to the help he received from Lefèvre and other ‘expositors’ (Vatable and Roussel). See ch. 6, p. XX.

Marguerite. Their correspondence also indicates what prompted them to break with tradition and give the laity direct access to the full text of the Scriptures. From his first letters to Marguerite onward, Briçonnet quoted the Bible frequently, always from the Vulgate. Although Marguerite did not know Latin well, only rarely did he render a passage into French as part of his exposition. By January 1523, citing the problems posed by the misleading text of the Vulgate, Briçonnet was deferring Marguerite's questions about the meaning of difficult passages to Lefèvre and his helpers for explanations based on their philological exegesis of Greek and Hebrew texts.⁷¹ After the publication of Lefèvre's New Testament and Psalms translations, Briçonnet more often cited Scripture in parallel, first Latin, then French. Under the influence of the Fabrists, Briçonnet appears to have become convinced that the errors and inaccessibility of the Latin Vulgate posed serious obstacle to educating the laity. This conviction was certainly in place by January 1523, when he alludes to the Fabrists' translating project in a letter to Marguerite. Moreover, she wholly endorsed it, for when the second installment of the New Testament (Acts – Apocalypse) was printed in November 1523, Lefèvre boldly proclaimed that the ladies at court had expressly called for the translation of the Bible into French:

Today, God in his goodness has inspired the most exalted ladies and powerful princesses of the realm with a fervent and noble desires to have the New Testament printed both for their own instruction and comfort as well as for the subjects of this kingdom, that it might be "Most Christian" not only in name but

⁷¹ "Madame, sy ne congnoissois les grandes graces qu'il a pleu à Dieu donner à trois pauvres mendiants d'esperit qui sont icy en vostre hermitaige [probably Lefèvre, Vatable, and Roussel], je dirois la presumption estre grande de cuider satisfaire à vostre desir de mendicité insatiable, vous offrant estre le promoteur et scribe soubz eulx sur les difficultéz que nostre Seigneur vous donneroit mendier. ... Et saichant les graces qu'il vous a données et que ayant telle opportunité desdits trois personnaiges qui ont l'intelligence hebrahique et grecque, dont se peuvent esclarcir plusieurs tenebres qui sont par mauulvaises translacions en l'Escripture Saincte, me jugeray vous tenir propos duquel vous excusez." 16 January [1523], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, p. 13 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 88).

in deed.⁷²

The last clause underscores Lefèvre's conviction that reform meant making the Gospel accessible to the laity through a vernacular bible. By dangerously insinuating that France was not in fact 'most Christian,' he was courting danger. The following year, the editors of the rapidly appearing reprints decided to suppress this passage expressing Lefèvre's critical assessment of the existing church. Lefèvre's conviction, which became too radical to express publicly in 1524, had evidently been formed two years earlier in response to the publication of Luther's German Bible. In his first preface to the Gospels of June 1523, Lefèvre proclaimed that his translation formed part of a newly unfolding and already embattled restoration of the Church:

When St. Paul was alive, preaching and declaring the word of God with the other apostles and disciples, he said "*Ecce nunc tempus acceptibile, ecce nunc dies salutis*" [2 Cor. 6:2]. "Behold, now is the fitting time, behold the day of salvation is here." So too, today the time has come that our Lord Jesus Christ, our sole salvation, truth, and life, wishes his Gospel to be purely declared throughout the world, so that we do not go astray following the doctrines of men who suppose themselves to possess some [wisdom], when, as Paul says, they know nothing and deceive themselves.⁷³

He also declares that translation of the Scriptures in other lands had inspired him, no doubt referring to Luther's 1522 German Bible, which was the only notable vernacular

⁷² "Et presentement il a pleu à la bonté divine inciter les nobles cueurs et chrestiens desirs des plus haultes et puissantes dames et princesses du royaume de rechef faire imprimer le nouveau testament pour leur edification et consolation, et de ceulx du royaume, affin qu'il ne soit seulement de nom dit royaume treschrestien mais aussi de fait." Preface to the second installment of the New Testament (Acts–Apocalypse), c. 6 November 1523. Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 138, 457–468; 457–458; Herminjard I, no. 79, 159–169.

⁷³ "Quant saint Pol estoit sur terre preschant et annonçant la parolle de dieu avec le autres apostres et disciples il disoit: "*Ecce nunc tempus acceptibile, ecce nunc dies salutis*: Voicy maintenant le temps acceptable, voicy maintenant les jours de salut." Aussi maintenant le temps est venu que nostre seigneur Jesuchrist, seul salut, verité et vie, veult que son Evangile soit purement annoncee par tout le monde, affin que on ne se desvoye plus par autres doctrines des hommes que cuydent estre quelque chose et (comme dict saint Pol) ilz ne sont riens, mais se decoyvent eulx mesmes [Gal. 6:3]." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 137, 449–456, 449–450; (Herminjard I, no. 69, 132–138).

translation by that time.

Throughout these prefaces Lefèvre contrasts the spread of the Gospel, which will revive true religion, with the doctrines of men and the human traditions of doctors claiming to know the scriptures, which have led the church astray. Thus he undertakes a double task, to outline a program for spreading the Gospel and to defend it from attacks by misguided critics. Lefèvre's vision had radical implications. The coming renewal, he thought, whose beginnings he sees throughout Europe, will be achieved by giving the vernacular Scriptures to the laity and preaching to them from it. The laity's faith required vernacular Scriptures "so that they [the laity] may be as certain of the truths of Scripture as those who have it in Latin."⁷⁴ Francis I, he asserted, had decided to promote preaching, the second plank of his program.⁷⁵ In turn, he predicts that these measures will enlighten some of the laity, enabling them to instruct others. While not forbidden a place in this evangelical renewal to the clergy, Lefèvre denied that they had an exclusive right to interpret and teach the Scriptures. Only those who, whether clerics or lay persons, are granted insight into the meaning of the Holy Writ, should then take on the task of propagating the Gospel. In effect, Lefèvre rejects the church's claim that ministry

⁷⁴ "Et affin que ung chascun qui a congoissance de la langue gallicane et non point du latin soit plus disposé à recevoir ceste presente grace, ... vous sont ordonnees en langue vulgaire par la grace d'iceluy [Christ] les evangiles selon le latin que se lit communement par tout sans riens y adioster ou diminuer, affin que les simples membres du corps de Jesuchrist, ayant ce en leur langue, puissent estre aussi certains de la verité evangelique comme ceulx qui l'ont en latin. Et après auront par le bon plaisir de iceluy le residu du nouveau testament, lequel est le livre de vie et la seule reigle des Chrestiens, ainsi que pareillement est maintenant faict en diverses regions et diversitez de langues par la plus grande partie de Europe entre les Chrestiens." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 137, 449–456, 450; (Herminjard I, no. 69, 132–138).

⁷⁵ "Et telle est l'intention du debonnaire roy tant de cueur que de nom treschrestien, en la main duquel dieu a mys si noble et excellent royaume, que la parolle de dieu soit purement preschee partout son royaume à la gloire du pere de misericorde et de Jesuchrist son filz. Laquelle chose doit donner courage à tous ceulx dudit royaume de profiter en vayre [*sic for vraye*] chrestienneté, en suyvant, entendant et croyant la vivifiante parolle de dieu. Et benoiste soit l'heure quant elle viendra." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 138, 457–468, 465–466; (Herminjard I, no. 79,

of the word is a prerogative deriving from sacerdotal office, proclaiming it a duty of all who have a right understanding of the Gospel.

Lefèvre anticipated two criticisms of his project. Some would claim that the existing abridged Bible translations were sufficient for the laity. Lefèvre countered that he did not want to leave out or alter anything, since such changes might obscure the meaning that the Holy Spirit wanted to impart through the Scriptures.⁷⁶ Some would advance the graver traditional clerical objection to vernacular Bibles, insisting that obscure passages would confuse and lead the people into error. If so, Lefèvre responded, why were the Scriptures given to the Greeks and Romans in their mother tongues? It matters not that some passages are difficult to understand, they are first and foremost to be believed. Moreover, he claimed, the simple are often granted understanding about the meaning of obscure passages which remain hidden from clerics and those who consider themselves wise.⁷⁷ He fulminates against those who deny the Scriptures to the laity, and warns that those who teach the 'doctrines of men' will be punished on the day of judgment.⁷⁸

159–169). The boldness of Lefèvre's claim to have royal backing is indicated by the fact that the clause "en la main duquel...son fils," was suppressed in the subsequent 1525 Du Bois edition.

⁷⁶ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 137, 452–453.

⁷⁷ "Secondement diront que en leur [the laity] baillant ainsi les evangiles maintes choses seront difficiles et obscures, lesquelles les simples gens ne pourront comprendre, mais pourront estre cause de erreur; parquoy n'est convenable de les leur bailler ainsi. Il n'estoit point doncques convenable par ceste mesme raison que les evangelistes les baillassent ainsi aux Grecz, et ainsi les Latins aux Latins; car il y a moult de lieux difficiles et obscurs, lesquelz ne les Grecz ne les Latins ne pevent comprendre, et suffit de les croire." Lefèvre points out further that some of the most learned fell into error, such as Arrius, Sabellius etc...but not at all the simple folk. Moreover, the gospel is more easily communicated to the simple: "...le soleil spirituel...se communique aucunes foyes plus entierement et spirituellement aux simples, de tant qu'ilz sont plus humbles et petis, que aux clers moins humbles et plus grans, comme est congneu par la parolle de nostre seigneur disant en l'evangile saint Mattheu, Confiteor tibi pater domine caeli et terrae, quia abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et revelasti ea parvulis: Or pere seigneur du ciel et de la terre. je te rendz graces que tu as caché ces choses aux sages et prudens et les as revelé aux petis." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 137, 453–454.

⁷⁸ "Et se aucuns vouloyent dire ou empescher que le peuple de Jesuchrist ne l'eust en sa langue l'evangile,

Then Lefèvre turns to the laity, warning them not to become proud now that they have access to the Bible in the vernacular, especially if they gain insight while members of the clergy remain ignorant.⁷⁹ Lefèvre enjoins those who have been enlightened to instruct others, but admonishes them to address only those who are willing to accept it, without scandalizing those who are yet in the dark.⁸⁰

Lefèvre's apologetics and injunctions to the laity had particular urgency. While the installments of his translation were appearing, the Faculty of Theology in Paris launched an intense six-month inquest into the Meaux reform. In fifty-nine meetings from June 6 through December 2 they took aim at Lefèvre, Pierre Caroli, Martial Mazurier, and all the preachers in Meaux, as well as others connected with them.⁸¹ We will turn in the next chapter to this frontal assault on the program outlined by Lefèvre, but

qui est la vraye doctrine de dieu, ilz sachent que Jesuchrist parle contre telz, disant par saint Luc, *Vae vobis legisperitis qui tulistis clavem scientiae, ipsi non introistis, et eos qui introibant prohibuistis*. C'est à dire, Malheur sur vous, docteurs de la loy, qui avez osté la clef de science; vous n'y estes point entrez, et avez empesché ceulx qui y entroyent." "De ce fauldra il rendre compte devant le tribunal du grant juge au jour du jugement, et pareillement se on a presché au peuple parolles, faisant entendre quelles estoient les parolles de dieu, et elles ne l'estoyent point." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 137, 454–455.

⁷⁹ "Et se garde sur toute chose de se enorgueillir ou de juges les autres destituez de semblable grace et intelligence. Car l'esperit de dieu par saint Pol le nous deffend en plusieurs lieux, comme aux Corinthiens, disant, "Qu'est ce que tu as que tu n'aye receu, c'est à dire qui ne te ait esté donnee? Et se tu l'a receu, pourquoy te enorgueillis tu comme se tu ne l'avois point receu?" Et aux Romains, "*Dico enim per gratiam quae data est mihi, omnibus qui sunt inter vos, non plus sapere quam oportet sapere, sed sapere ad sobrietatem*: je dis à tous ceulx qui sont entre vous par la grace qui m'est donnee que ilz ne veuillent non plus savoir qu'il leur appartient de savoir, mais savoir a sobriété." Et plus oultre dit, "*Non alta sapientes, sed humilibus consentientes*: ne sentez point de vous orgueilleusement, mais soyez consentans aux humbles." Et pource de tant que les grans tresors de dieu vous sont communiquez qui estes simples et sans lettres et non point clerchez, de tant vous devez vous plus humilier et excercer en toutes graces et vertus." Preface to the second part of the New Testament, November 1523, Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 138, 459–460.

⁸⁰ "Et ne devez point semer les marguerites celestes, se intelligence vous est donnee, se ce n'est ne exhortant l'ung l'autre à aymer dieu (là git la vie chrestienne qui est vie spirituelle et celeste et non point charnelle et terrienne), et principalement es lieux et aux personnes ou povez seulement edifier et nul offenser. Car en ce monde y a plusieurs charnelz ayments seulement la fange et l'ordure et plusieurs envieux contre les spirituelz, lesquelz l'escripture sainte appelle porceaux et chiens. Et devant ceulx là (selon la doctrine de l'evangile) ne fault aucunement parler, ne semer les precieuses marguerites de l'escripture sainte; autrement les ungz le foulleroient de leurs piedz, qui sont leurs affections ordes et vilaines, et les autres à leur povoir vous feroient detrimement et detracteroient de vous. Soyez donques prudens comme serpens et simples, c'est à dire humbles, comme columbes en toutes choses, et suyvens la doctrine et l'esperit de dieu, qui est doux, bening, amateur de paix, ayez amour avec tous fors avec peché." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 138, 457–468; 460 (Herminjard I, no. 79, 159–169).

first Lefèvre's counsel in the face of this persecution deserves highlighting. In the preface to the second installment of his New Testament dated November 1523, he advised the laity, "[The Gospel] teaches that we must remain firm in faith, patient during persecution and tribulation, which purge and purify Christians making them more perfect, just as fire does gold... And [it] instructs us to flee all fleshly things and to follow only those that arise from the Spirit of Jesus Christ."⁸²

In sum, Lefèvre's prefaces from 1521–1523 were manifestoes proclaiming that the remedy for the deformed state of religion was to preach the Gospel and to provide it to the laity in the vernacular. He calls on bishops, priests, and secular authorities to implement this clear but controversial plan despite the manifest opposition of the conservative party.⁸³ While validating Briçonnet's attempts to bypass the intractable secular and regular clergy, Lefèvre refocused the locus of renewal from the clergy to the people, from the ministers to the message. He posited the daring precept that preaching the Gospel is not an exclusive right conferred by consecration, but the principal duty of

⁸¹ Clerval, *Registres*, 339.

⁸² Speaking specifically of the teachings in the Catholic epistles: "Dicte catholique, c'est à dire universelle, pource qu'elle appartient universellement à la doctrine de tous chrestiens. Elle enseigne que devons estre fermes en foy, patiens en persecutions et tribulations, qui purgent et purifient les chrestiens et les rendent plus parfaictz, comme le feu l'or. Elle monstre que nous n'avons aucun bien de nous, mais que tout bien et toute perfection vient d'en hault, de dieu qui est le pere des lumieres. Et baille enseignemens de fuyr toutes les choses de la chair et syvre seulement celle qui sont de l'esprit de Jesuchrist." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 138, 457–468; 462.

⁸³ "Parquoy aussi tous evesques, curez, vicaires, docteurs, prescheurs devoient esmouvoir le peuple à avoir, lire et ruminer les saintes evangiles, accomplissans le vouloir de dieu et les desirs de tresnobles cueurs et ensuyvans l'exemple du saint et bon evesque Chrysostom qui ainsi faisoit à son peuple, et par tous lieux l'a où il pavoit, comme il est manifeste par la dixiesme homelie qu'il a escript sur l'evangile saint Jehan, sur ce passage, *Et verbum caro factum est*, où il dit ainsi, *Curae vobis sit evangelias legere lectiones*, etc.: 'Ayez soing de lire les evangiles, lesquelles devez avoir entre les mains devant que veniez aux predications, et les recorder souventesfois en la maison, enquerir diligemment le sens d'icelles, et quelle chose est clere et quelle obscure en icelles... Et adonc toutes ces choses bien examinees et pensees, vous vous devez presenter tresattentifz aux predications. Et par ainsi sera grant profit à nous et à vous. Car nous ne aurons point grant labeur à vous monstrier la vertu de l'evangile quant en la maison vous vous aurés fait ainsi familiere la sentence selon la lettre. Et vous serés fais plus promptz, subtilz et ingenieux, non point

ministry. Only fulfilling that calling justifies holding clerical office. Finally, he invited all lay persons who had been granted insight to participate in the ministry of the word. This stance opened the way for the Meaux reform to radicalize and threatened to drive a wedge between his followers and Briçonnet, who staunchly defended the church hierarchy.

seulement à ouyr et entendre la sainte doctrine, mais aussi à enseigner les autres.'" [c. 6 November 1523], preface to second installment of his New Testament translation, Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 138, 457–468; 466.

6. The Meaux Experiment II: Model for National Reform (1521–1523).

While Lefèvre d'Étaples sounded a lucid call for the renewal of the church in his prefatory epistles and directed the implementation of that vision at Meaux, Briçonnet and Marguerite struggled to advance this program at court as a model for the reform of the Gallican church. Their extraordinary correspondence from the years 1521–1523 is the only insider record of their intense, behind the scenes battle to win over the king.

Covering the first three and a half years of the Meaux reform, the 120 extant letters exchanged between Marguerite d'Angoulême and Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet are important documents on two counts.¹ As they are typically portrayed, Briçonnet's treatise-like letters of spiritual direction have been seen as the source from which Marguerite received the ideas and forms of expression that dominate her later writings.² While scholars have argued about the subsequent influence of Luther, Calvin, and the 'Spiritual Libertines' on her religious development, they have stressed the enduring influence of Briçonnet's teaching, especially his Pseudo-Dionysian schema of three-fold mystical ascent: purgation, illumination, and perfection.³ That Marguerite specifically

¹ The letters exchanged by Briçonnet and Marguerite are preserved in the fair-copy manuscript penned by two of Marguerite's secretaries. Dating from 12 June 1521 to 18 November 1524, the last letter breaks off in mid-sentence. See, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, 2–3. Remarkably, no meetings or letters between them are attested thereafter. The ending of their relationship shortly after the record of their correspondence breaks off will be explained in the following chapter.

² Saulnier sees the inspiration for several of Marguerite's works in Briçonnet's letters: *Les Prisons* (Saulnier 1977, letters no. 19, 27–4, and note after 72 [Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 19, and 72]); *Comédie de Mont-de-Marsan*, (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 83); and *Le Malade*, (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 61). For more on the Briçonnetian roots of other works by Marguerite see Ferguson and Sommers in note 3.

³ Abel Lefranc provided the first extensive survey of Marguerite's spiritual journey over the course

planned when receiving them to consult his letters in future, is certain since their exchange only survives in a fair-copy manuscript penned by her secretaries.⁴

However, scholars have neglected the main subject and purpose that gave rise to, sustained, and regulated the tempo of their correspondence, promoting religious renewal, specifically by advancing Meaux as the model for a national reform.⁵ The bishop's

of her life through the optic of her religious poetry. His powerfully argued thesis presents her as more clearly Protestant than most interpreters are willing to accept. See *Les Idées Religieuses de Marguerite de Navarre d'après son Œuvre Poétique* (Les Marguerites et Les Dernières Poésies), (Paris, 1898; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969). Pierre Jourda contended that Marguerite turned away from reformed ideas after 1536. Augustin Renaudet replied, "Aux défenseurs actuels de son orthodoxie le soin d'en montrer l'accord avec le catholicisme contemporain." See, Renaudet, "Marguerite de Navarre. A propos d'une biographie," 217–235; 224.

Aside from Pierre Jourda, who in any case did not make a case for her strict orthodoxy, Renaudet, Lucien Febvre, Henry Heller, Paula Sommers, and Gary Ferguson agree that she had heterodox ideas and was influenced by unitive mysticism, but disagree about the priority and chronology of the various elements as exhibited in her writings. See Febvre, *Amour sacré, amour profane: autour de l'Heptaméron* (Paris: Gallimard, 1944); Heller, "Marguerite of Navarre and the Reformers of Meaux," 279–310; Sommers, *Celestial Ladders*, 9–17; 101–109; Ferguson, *Mirroring Belief: Marguerite de Navarre's devotional poetry* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1992).

⁴ Marguerite and Briçonnet's letters were probably copied into the manuscript during the period of their correspondence. Thereafter someone continued to consult it during her lifetime until at least some time after Briçonnet's death in 1534 but before hers in 1549, since later marginals refer to him as "feu évêque de Meaux" and Marguerite as the "la Royne," but not 'la feue Royne.' Notably, this reader leaned closer to the Protestant camp than Briçonnet had, since he or she crossed out, at one juncture, the bishop's description of Mary as being without sin. See Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, 2–3, 40; Saulnier 1977, 452–453.

⁵ Veissière considers their correspondence as chiefly "de nature spirituelle" and does little with it as a source for understanding the tenor of the Meaux reform 1521–1524. Although he notes rightly that "Notre curiosité se trouve insatisfaite en ce qui regarde les événements contemporains..." in our view he systematically misses its import as a record of their 'inner state of mind' as they championed the Meaux reform and a national renewal of the church. See *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 187–195; 191. Henry Heller does highlight their attempt to promote reform at court. His discussion concentrates on the circumstances that led to this project's failure rather than on what their correspondence can tell us about reform program they envisioned. See Heller's studies in chapter 6, n. 1, elements of which he reprises in "Panorama religieux and politique" for the years 1521–1524, in Briçonnet, *Correspondance*, 1, pp. 15–24, 129–131; vol. 2, 7–9, 85–87. In two long articles, Philippe-Auguste Becker provided a running commentary on large selections of their correspondence, but never went beyond summarizing the contents to interpreting what their relationship was in aid of. For useful explanations of some cryptic passages, most of which Martineau and Veissière have incorporated in the notes of their edition, see Becker, "Marguerite de Navarre, duchesse d'Alençon, et G. Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, d'après leur correspondance manuscrite (1521–1524), suivi d'un tableau chronologique," *BSHPF* (1900), 393–477, 661–667. The modern edition of the correspondence supersedes Becker's second article, which is composed entirely of enormous undigested quotes from Briçonnet's letters with no context, interpretation, or notes: "Les idées religieuses de Guillaume

theological disquisitions, which indeed make up the vast bulk of the exchange, were strung together like—to borrow a meaning of ‘marguerite’ in Latin invoked by him—so many Briçonnetian pearls of wisdom on what was essentially a string of communication between two leaders of an embattled evangelical movement.⁶ Briçonnet wrapped his metaphor-filled, spiritual musings around the gritty, practical problems that arose while pursuing their controversial initiatives. They develop strategies, exchange advice, encourage one-another, give progress-reports, and discuss setbacks. The code of military metaphors they employed throughout, one among several lexicons taken from the Bible, the Pseudo-Denis, and nature, was borrowed from the royal family’s preoccupation with fighting the first Valois-Hapsburg war. Marguerite and Briçonnet found it apt because in fact a religious cold war had broken out in response to their campaign at Meaux and the court. The territory in dispute, as they realized, was the hearts of royal courtiers and commoners; at stake was the religious direction of France.

Furthermore, their letters reverberate with many voices. They are not, as most scholars portray them, the remains of an intimate dialogue between Briçonnet and Marguerite and still less of some mystical monologue delivered by a master to his disciple. Repeatedly, Briçonnet claims to be writing as the pupil, even the stenographer, of Lefèvre and other scholars in his entourage.⁷ In turn, Marguerite sub-ministered the

Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux,” *Revue de Théologie et de Questions Religieuses* 9 (1900), 318–358, 377–416.

⁶ Briçonnet’s 63 letters, in comparison with Marguerite’s 64 (several from each are lost), constitute well over eighty percent of the total verbiage. For one of Briçonnet’s many metaphoric dilations on Marguerite’s name, see *Correspondance* 2, no. 65, p. 59 (Saulnier and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 119).

⁷ In one poignant letter, having relied on Lefèvre d’Étaples and others to answer Marguerite’s queries, Briçonnet writes, “Et sy, d’aventure, ne pavez par delà descouvrir [an answer to a question about

Meaux group's teaching to a growing group of sympathizers at court.⁸ Marguerite and Briçonnet's letters also allude to an array of additional letters, legal documents, religious books, and oral messages exchanged between their two circles. Unfortunately, all but a few traces of these battle-front communiqués have been lost. The sole surviving manuscript copy of their letters, in which the correspondents spiritualized events and from which an editor pruned sensitive material during transcription, is all that remains for reconstructing their strategy.

These letters provide two types of insider information not available from book prefaces, synodal letters, or the records of the Sorbonne and Parlement's investigations of the Meaux group. Their allusions to events as well as the chronological grouping of the letters allow us to follow the progress and regress of their campaign as well as their state of mind in the face of changing fortunes. Moreover, Marguerite and Briçonnet discuss theological themes and reform goals at greater length and more frankly than Lefèvre ever could in print.

Their correspondence was interrupted by two, four month-long *caesurae* (detailed in Table 2). These substantial pauses mark the division between three distinct stages in the early development of the Meaux reform and its relationship to court.

Scripture], envoyez la au Fabre [Lefèvre d'Étaples] qui se tient en vostre dict hermitaige [Meaux]: j'espere qu'il et ses deux compaignons [François Vatable and Gérard Roussel] satisferont à vostre desir, duquel seray, comme dict est, solliciteur et scribe, sy besoing est." (16 January 1523) Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 49, p. 15 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 88); cf., *Correspondance* 2, no. 53, p. 32 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 93); no. 73, p. 77 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 134); and no. 81, p. 108 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 144).

⁸ Marguerite and Briçonnet frequently used 'subministrer' and its derivatives to denote spreading Gospel as inspired by the Holy Spirit, e.g., Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 27, 137; no. 38, 210; vol. 2, no. 87, 125–126; no. 109, 183; no. 112, 119.

Table 2.**Chronological Grouping of Marguerite's Correspondence with Briçonnet**

Regular correspondence	Interruption in correspondence ⁹
Period 1. June 1521 – 18 May 1522	
	Caesura A. 18 May – 18 Sept. 1522 [4 months, 1 letter in response to 18 May]
Period 2. 18 Sept. 1522 – 10 Feb. 1523	
	Caesura B. 1523: 10 Feb. – Early June 1523 [4 months] ¹⁰
Period 3. mid-June 1523 – 18 Nov. 1524	

In each of the first two periods, Briçonnet and Marguerite championed the Meaux experiment at court as the basis for national reform. Both overtures were suspended when their hopes and plans succumbed to threats and set-backs. The third period of correspondence commenced in June 1523, just as the Faculty of Theology began heresy investigations against evangelicals and Lefèvre published the first installment of his French New Testament. On the defensive, Marguerite and Briçonnet set about protecting their band, and she, at least, eventually mounted a counterattack. By March 1524, while there is no marked hiatus, the nature of their correspondence changes after they disagreed

⁹ There were other extended *breaks* in their correspondence caused by illness, distance, and other preoccupation, but these were different in nature than the two much longer *break-downs* in communication forced on Marguerite and Briçonnet when circumstances turned clearly and firmly against their plans. Three periods of slackened intensity lasted approximately two months or longer: 10 July – 28 September 1521 [2 months 2 weeks, 1 letter in August], 6 March – 18 May 1522 [2 months 2 weeks, 1 letter, 20 April], and 21 July – 15 Sept., 1523 [2 months, no letter].

¹⁰ Based upon the editor's incorrect dating of a letter—Briçonnet, *Correspondence* 2, no. 56 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 107)—to early June 1523, they posit that two lost letters mentioned in it date to

about Michel d'Arande's preaching in Marguerite's city of Bourges. At issue was whether or not they should forcibly introduce the Meaux reform into territories under Marguerite's sway in spite of strong conservative opposition. Briçonnet urged caution; Marguerite pushed forward. Their argument reflected a basic shift in their relationship, and in particular, their respective commitments to an ever more embattled reform program.¹¹ Briçonnet's nominal role as leader and Marguerite's as follower, already ambiguous in the preceding three years, became clearly reversed. Their disagreement over d'Arande's preaching was harbinger of developments to come and marks a turning point in the formation of the evangelical network under Marguerite's wing. Reflecting that change in their relationship, Briçonnet's letters from March to November 1524 become indeed almost exclusively spiritual in nature, concerned with comforting Marguerite in the face of daunting troubles: her growing isolation at court, the death of three female relatives, and her continuing childlessness. Hence these last letters reveal little about the Meaux group's plans and actions or Marguerite's guidance. The following account attempts to reconstruct the nascent evangelical network's missing battle plans

Easter, in the middle of caesura B. This letter dates to mid to late June, after their correspondence had recommenced and testifies to two lost letters also from June. See below, note 114.

¹¹ Henry Heller observes that Briçonnet no longer spoke of reform in his letters of 1524, but more and more of the war, whose demands on the court allayed any hope of royal support for their projects. See, Heller, 'Panorama' for 1524, *Correspondance* 2, p. 86. Actually, the chief subject matter of Briçonnet's letters from 1524, which grow to extraordinary, treatise-like length—several exceed twenty pages in the modern edition—are the successive calamities that beset Marguerite and the rest of the royal family: Marguerite's continued childlessness, her rocky marriage with Charles d'Alençon, Louise of Savoy's repeated illnesses, and, most grievous, the premature deaths, after protracted illnesses, of three women close to her: her sister-in-law, Queen Claude, her niece, princess Charlotte, and her aunt 'de Némours,' Philiberte de Savoie. Understandably, Briçonnet concentrated on consoling Marguerite and other courtiers, but none of these preoccupations—war, illness, childlessness, or deaths in the family—fully explains his near total loss of interest in discussing their reform plans of two and a half years running, which, as we will see in chapter 8, were actively pursued by Marguerite and the rest of the Meaux group in 1524 and beyond while

and troop movements during these three rounds to 1524, when other sources pick up the relay.

I. Briçonnet's 'Band' and 'Captain' Marguerite

In February 1522, Briçonnet encouraged Marguerite, "You must become Captain [of our band] so that others will be inspired to enter into the promised land."¹² The Bishop had a penchant for preaching to the faithful as if they were still wavering converts, for the king's sister had long since become "captain" of the group then gathered at Meaux. Furthermore, before either of them had begun to collaborate actively with Briçonnet, she had been in contact with the Fabrists as her first letters from the summer of 1521 indicate. Evidently they were committed to spreading evangelical ideas prior to the beginning of the Meaux experiment.¹³ When Marguerite turned to Briçonnet, she was certainly seeking spiritual nourishment, but not simply nor even principally from him.

In the letter inaugurating their correspondence, Marguerite asked Briçonnet to send to her Michel d'Arande, a disciple of Lefèvre d'Étaples, in order to continue a

Briçonnet drew back.

¹² "Il fault que soiez capitaine pour animer les autres à entrer en la terre de promission..." Briçonnet to Marguerite, 5 February 1522, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 28, 144 (Saulnier 1977 no. 54.1 [= Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 53]).

¹³ This early dating of Marguerite's interest in evangelical ideas and contact with the Fabrist circle helps to explain the basis of Marguerite and her operatives' subsequent contact Anne Boleyn and her entourage. If, as we are arguing, Marguerite's 'evangelical' journey started before June 1521, then this increases the possibility that Anne was exposed to nascent evangelism before her departure from the French court in the Autumn of 1521. For a summary of the debate about Anne's religion and his material discoveries that point to an even stronger connection between Anne and Marguerite than previously established, see James P. Carley, "'Her moost lovyng and fryndely brother sendeth gretynge' Anne Boleyn's Manuscripts and Their Sources," in *Illuminating the Book: Makers and Interpreters. Essays in Honour of Janet Backhouse*, ed. Michelle P. Brown and Scot McKendrick (London and Toronto: The British Library and University of Toronto Press, 1998), 261–280; esp. 270–272. See further, chapter 9.

course of instruction.¹⁴ In all likelihood she had come to know Maistre Michel after 1519, when François Du Moulin introduced d'Arande's master to her during the Mary Magdalene debate. Judging from the timing and tenor of her first letter, Marguerite's attention probably fixed on Briçonnet, who had already helped her to reform religious houses in Alençon, because Lefèvre and his disciples had just formed the band at Meaux to which Marguerite refers in her second letter and repeatedly thereafter.¹⁵ While appealing for spiritual nourishment, she promised to protect and promote the Meaux band's reform venture as their advocate at court, or as Briçonnet would later have it, their captain.¹⁶

In the first phase of their correspondence, the issue of reform dominated. Briçonnet and Marguerite discuss it excitedly, swearing their allegiance, lamenting their insufficiency, decrying their adversaries. Though never spelled out in a point by point agenda, their main battle plans are discernible. Marguerite, Briçonnet, and his charges were engaged a multi-front struggle to renew the religious life of Meaux, to evangelize the court, and, ultimately, to convince Louise of Savoy and Francis I to adopt their program as the model for a national reform.

In their first letters, Marguerite and Briçonnet exchanged promises of their

¹⁴ [Before 12 June 1521] Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 1, 25; (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 15).

¹⁵ Marguerite referred to the Meaux group variously as 'bande,' 'freres,' 'compagnie,' 'sieurs,' 'peres,' and 'serviteurs,' Briçonnet *Correspondance* 1, pp. 29, 30, 37, 71, 194; 2, pp. 26, 107, 108, and 191. Given the frequent mentions of Lefèvre and d'Arande by name as well as allusions to Vatable and Roussel in their letters, it is clearly the Fabrists to whom she was referring.

¹⁶ "Je vous prie que ceste charité [Briçonnet and d'Arande's prayers] ne me soit desnyée et je m'oblige que, ainsy que serez mes bons advocatz envers le tout [God], qu'il luy plaira me faire estre la vostre en ceste court en toutz les affaires où me voudrez employer." [Bourgogne?, after 19 June 1521],

common commitment to promote “the one necessary thing” (*le seul nécessaire*), Christ and his Gospel.¹⁷ Marguerite called for Michel d’Arande so that he might “for the honor of God” preach and give spiritual aid to her entourage. In response, the Bishop praised her desire to know Christ, of which he had long been aware, and encouraged her “to die in Christ’s sweet battle,”¹⁸ yet, for pressing, unspecified reasons Briçonnet deferred sending Master Michel. Instead both he and d’Arande dispatched letters, which, Marguerite reported, gave her “an opportunity to begin hungering for understanding about the path to salvation.”¹⁹ Thankful for these edifying missives, Marguerite shared them with her aunt, Philiberte of Savoy, Mme. de Nemours, and expressed the wish to die as part of his band in the war he was waging for the faith and love of God.²⁰

If Marguerite and her aunt’s spiritual edification were the only thing at stake in these first few letters, their martial rhetoric of self-sacrifice in a holy war would have been grandiose. These martial expressions, however, show that Marguerite and Briçonnet were planning bold actions to advance ‘*le seul nécessaire*’ and that they were prepared to

Briçonnet *Correspondance* 1, no. 5, 33 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 5).

¹⁷ The phrase, “*le seul nécessaire*” appears throughout their correspondence as a sort of identifying slogan for their allegiance to the cause of the Gospel. For its frequent initial use, see Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, nos. 1–5, 25–35.

¹⁸ “Bataille il [Christ] livre, et, pour à icelle non resister, ains y mourir, secours yl donne... Je cuide congnoistre de quel dard estes navrée: secours querez, pour entierement en ceste douce bataille mourir, sans jamais vivre. Par icelle on parvient à mort vivifiante, et toutesfois mortifiant la vie, en vivant on meurt et en mourant on vit. Croiez, Madame, que j’ay prins singulier plaisir, long temps a, à congnoistre en vous la grace du debonnaire Seigneur.” Briçonnet to Marguerite, Meaux, 12 June 1521, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 2, 28 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 16).

¹⁹ “...je loue de toute ma puissance le seul bien nécessaire, qui, par sa bonté, permet à celle qui se peut dire moins que rien, tant de grace que d’avoir eu, par vostre lettre et celle de Maistre Michel, occasion de desirer commencer d’entendre le chemin de salut.” Marguerite to Briçonnet, [After 19 June 1521], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 5, 33 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 18).

²⁰ “...vous soit donnée sa paix éternelle [of ‘ung seul bien nécessaire’ = Christ’s], après les longues guerres que portez pour la foy et l’amour de Dieu. En laquelle bataille desire mourir en vostre bande. La toute vostre fille, Marguerite.” Marguerite to Briçonnet, [End of June – Beginning of July 1521],

fight on in the face of stiff opposition. At that juncture in July 1521, Briçonnet did not send d'Arande to her because he feared that a hostile reaction to his preaching at court might break the bond between Marguerite, Louise, and Francis, hence jeopardizing royal favor towards them.²¹ Briçonnet's caution presupposes that already by July 1521 he and Marguerite were soliciting royal support for the Meaux reform, and extolling it as a model for the French church.²²

Soon, however, their activity did foster a heated and divisive struggle. Few sources reveal the climate of religious conflict at Meaux, Paris, or the court before 1523, yet Briçonnet and Marguerite's correspondence plainly indicate that from the very beginning of their collaboration they and their entourages found themselves engaged in a bitter fight over fundamental religious issues and for influence over the king's policy on the Gallican church. The known actions of the Faculty of Theology confirm that already by the summer of 1521, their efforts were the focus of this undeclared but fiercely waged cold war. Soon after Lefèvre and his team, already under heavy suspicion, reached

Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 3, 30 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 18).

²¹ Agreeing with Briçonnet's reasons, Marguerite writes: "...puis que le temps, le pays et les propos ne sont propres pour la venue de maistre Michel, à quoy je m'accorde..." [End of June 1521], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 3, p. 30 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 18). Briçonnet's advice must have been conveyed in an accompanying message, since she writes, [c. 15 July 1521]: "...congnoissant que, pour le present, avez affection fondée en raison et seul regard du tout seul necessaire, je m'y emploiray avec sa grace, s'il luy plaist, comme à ce que autant puis souhaiter, car *il est bien clair, veu les raison de vostre lettre et de leur creance* [oral elaboration by letter carrier], *que sy la trienalité est rompue qu'ilz seront en danger trop grand et j'espere que sy les peres viennent icy qu'il leur sera respondu selon vostre conseil.*" (Emphasis added) Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 5, 33–34 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 20). Heller rightly points out that, in this case, "peres" probably refers to the Franciscans of Meaux whom Briçonnet had forbidden to show an image of St. Francis stigmatized. This conflict, however, was in Marguerite's eyes but the possible occasion, not the underlying cause, of a possible declined in Louise of Savoy and Francis I's support for the Meaux reform.

²² Veissière evidently finds Briçonnet's call for a national reform and what that might have entailed unremarkable for he only mentions it in passing: "A travers plusieurs lettres on perçoit que l'appui royal réclamé par Briçonnet ne regarde pas seulement le diocèse de Meaux et qu'il souhaiterait que le Roi

Meaux from Paris, they came under even closer scrutiny. In August, some four months after the Meaux group had assembled and well before Lefèvre published his controversial *Commentary on the Gospels* (1522), the Sorbonne cited Martial Mazurier for preaching the doctrine of the three Marys in the diocese.²³ A member of the Faculty, Mazurier had joined the Meaux group sometime earlier that summer. Though Lefèvre had already backed away from the controversy, if not away from his views, Mazurier's preaching gave the Faculty an opening to implicate the Meaux group.

In this heated climate, on 24 October and then again on 11 November, two days after the Sorbonne had condemned Lefèvre's Mary Magdalene thesis, Briçonnet asked for Marguerite's protection and passed on Lefèvre's humble recommendations.²⁴ Encouraging her to be like St. Cecile, who converted her husband and brothers, Briçonnet asked:

When you see a good moment, promote God's cause (*l'affaire de Dieu*), so that He might be better served and honored than He is presently in this realm, in which the King is his Lieutenant General and for which purpose he [the king] has sword in hand, which is the power of God, so that He might be honored and loved.²⁵

favorisât le rénovation chrétienne dans l'ensemble du Royaume de France." *Briçonnet*, 212.

²³ The Faculty of Theology pursued the Magdalene question from August 14 to November 9. They regarded the revision of her cult as the thin end of the wedge that might open up all the received practices of the Church to questioning: "Cum itaque proximis superioribus annis occasione quorundam opusculorum in lucem editorum, que plures esse Magdalenas disseruerunt et predicationum ad populum eandem sequentium sententiam multa et gravia oborta fuisse noscantur in populo scandala quam plurimi quoque potuerunt ea occasione abduci a sincera devotione in unicam Madalenam ut fructuose post lapsum penitentiae speculum hactenus habita necnon divelli ab universalis ecclesiae ritu unicam Magdalenam in suo officio astruentis; quinimo et posset etiam trahi dubium et ambiguitatem quandam de reliquis institutis que ecclesiastica sanctione observantur longa antiquitate receptis." Clerval, *Registres*, 281, 294, and 299–301; 299–300.

²⁴ Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 9, p. 48 (Saulnier 1977 no. 27.1 [=Jourda nos. 26 + 27]); no. 11, 60–62 (Saulnier 1977 no. 32.2 [=Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 32]). Though fearful about coming events, Briçonnet encourages Marguerite to persevere in the cause, praising her commitment to improving prelates.

²⁵ "Et, quant verrez l'opportunité, procurez l'affaire de Dieu, à ce qu'il soit autrement servy et honoré qu'il n'est en ce royaume, auquel le Roy est son lieutenant general et, à ceste fin, a le glaive en sa

Soon thereafter, Marguerite suggested that since recent events touched not only her own but, moreover, Christ's honor, the best course of action would be to shut the mouths of the hypocrites and the ignorant, who were attacking "our brothers," asserting "I can assure you that the King and Madame [Louise] have firmly decided in this case to make it clearly understood that God's truth is not heresy."²⁶ The hypocrites ranged against them were an assortment of mendicants and priests from Meaux as well as university doctors, whom they alluded to at this time and afterwards as the fathers (*pères*), monks (*religieux*), ministers contrary to the truth (*ministres contraires à vérité*), and doctors of the Temple who reap a Platonic or Aristotelian rather than a Christian harvest from their studies.²⁷

By the December 1521, Briçonnet and Marguerite were striving to protect the Meaux group from the Sorbonne and the disgruntled Franciscans at Meaux, whom Briçonnet had forbidden to beg for alms using an image of St. Francis stigmatized.²⁸ These measures were, however, but flanking cover as they tried to press on towards the greater goal of promoting the Gospel message, *la doctrine évangélique*.²⁹ While organizing defensive measures, Marguerite promised Briçonnet to share his exposition of

main, qui est la puissance de Dieu, pour le faire honorer et ayme." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 11, 61 (Saulnier 1977 no. 32.2 [=Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 32]).

²⁶ "Je ne sçay sy me doibtz plus resjouyr d'estre estimé du nombre de ceulx à qui desire de ressembler ou me contrister de veoir noz freres faillir soubz coulleur de bien faire. Mais, veu que la chose ne touche à moy seule mais va contre l'honneur de celluy qui a souffert par charité la mort, pourchassée par envye d'ipocrates soubz nom d'infracteur de la loy, il me semble que le plus tost clorre la bouche aux ygnorans est le meilleur, vous assurant que le Roy et Madame i ont bien deliberé de donner à congnoistre que le verité de Dieu n'est point heresie." [Compiègne, 21 or 22 November 1521], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 15A, p. 71 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 35).

²⁷ Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 25, pp. 134–135; no. 27, p. 137; and no. 33, p. 164 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda nos. 51, 52, and 58).

²⁸ Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, p. 34, note 8.

true doctrine with those at court whom “I find eager for it.”³⁰

Even at this early juncture, the struggle between those who wished to spread evangelical doctrine and those ministers hostile to it was, as Briçonnet and Marguerite saw it, fundamentally over the issue of the reformation of the church. For a time after Louise and Marguerite visited Meaux in September 1521, there were encouraging signs from court. In December, Marguerite could write brightly, “Madame [Louise] and the King are more inclined to a reform of the Church than ever.”³¹ Such optimism was the first of many false dawns of royal support for an evangelical enlightenment, which would never appear in the splendor Marguerite and her allies hoped. By February 1522, Briçonnet’s desire that the royal family set an example that would inspire the clergy and restore “living water” to “the presently dry and empty church” was completely frustrated.³² Marguerite complained of being alone, “surrounded by thorns,” and

²⁹ For their frequent use of this and related terms to describe their faith, see note 72.

³⁰ Alluding to Briçonnet’s latest letters in which he had expounded on God’s distribution of grace under the symbols of water and manna, Marguerite promises that “de telle eaue et sy douce manne, dont le prouffict de vostre escript ne retiendray, comme gourmande, que n’en donne la part aux esperitz que, en ceste compaignie, verray enclins à le desirer.” [Compiègne, c. 10 December 1521] Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 17, 75 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 38).

³¹ “Vous priant que entre touz voz piteux desirs de la reformation de l’Eglise, où plus que jamais le Roy et Madame sont affectionnéz, et le salut de toutes pauvres ames, ayes en memoire celle d’une imparfaicte, mal ronde, mais toute contrefaicte parle [perle = Marguerite]...” [Compiègne, c. 10 December 1521] Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 17, 75–76. (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 38), for dilation on Marguerite’s name as ‘pearl’ see, letter no. 11, 50–62 (Saulnier 1977 32.2 [=Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 30]).

³² 17 January 1522, Briçonnet complained of being “impeded from above” especially in his struggle with the “peres” and “religieux” in Meaux, but at that time claimed “L’affaire n’est hors d’espoir.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 23, 132–133 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 48). Later, Marguerite insinuated that Christ was not to be found among her companions and relatives at court, [c. 21–28 January 1522]: “Celuy qui est venu secher et tirer les pecheurs, duquel le nom est bien à taire au coeur indigne de le penser [Marguerite] et qui ne scet où le trouver, car de le sercher entre les parens et congneuz, il n’y est pas comme l’on veult.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 26, 136 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 61).

“submerged in bitter waters.”³³ Briçonnet identified these thorns as the ministers of the Church and intimated that Louise of Savoy’s closest advisor, the Chancellor Antoine Duprat, was among them.³⁴ Citing the multitude of destroyers surrounding her, Marguerite lamented that “the friends of God have good reason to cry and keep silent.”³⁵ At the end of May 1522 Marguerite was finally forced not only to be silent at court, but also to suspend private contact with Briçonnet.³⁶

³³ The climate for reform had worsened at court by late February. She relates, “J’ai trouvé Maistre Michel amendé et adoulcy,” which had allayed the immediate cause of troubles at court. Yet she still had good cause to decry the “ministres contraires à verité” there and beg “aydez l’environné d’espines.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 33, 164 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 58).

Her closing remark occasioned a long reflection by Briçonnet on the deplorable state of the church, in which he interprets the thorns pricking Marguerite as the ministers of the church: “Lesquelles [espines], hellas!, ... regnent encoires en trop de lieux au monde, spécialement au jardin de l’espouse [the church] qui est couvert....Veritablement l’on peult dire que c’est le jardin où le doux espoux a esté crucifié et ensevely: ‘Erat autem in loco ubi crucifixus est ortus, et in orto monumentum, etc. [Jn 19:41]’ Il y est encoires mort et ensevely sans resusciter, car les ministres mainent telle vie comme sy la vie estoit encoires morte et ne feust resuscitée.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 34, 165 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 59).

³⁴ In another cryptic passage, Briçonnet laments that prelates guilty of exchanging spiritual things for worldly goods do not ask forgiveness of the “chancellor,” a term which he glosses as “le doux Jesus, vray aigneau, qui seul ouvre les sceaulx et les cloux.” At this time, as the editors note, the Council of Sens was about to take place. Chancellor Antoine Duprat, the chief judiciary of France, whence Briçonnet’s metaphoric use of the term chancellor for Christ as a judge, was instrumental in organizing it for the chief purpose of forcing the clergy to grant the crown a several tenths of its revenue. Briçonnet would seem to be commenting archly on the involvement of the French chancellor in orchestrating an exchange of ‘goods,’ when all involved should rather be seeking the pardon of the ‘true’ Chancellor. Duprat would later be the nemesis of Briçonnet’s uncle, Semblançay. See 6 March [1522], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 36, pp. 180–181 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 61).

³⁵ Speaking of the spiritual nourishment that Briçonnet had sent to court “le bon grain que nous avez envoyé,” Marguerite laments that it is not yielding a good harvest, “...en lieu de bonté nous n’avons que amortisseurs [destructeurs] et tant de nouvelettez et de faintes [feintes] que les améz [aimés] de Dieu ont cause de pleurer et taire.” [26 February 1522] Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 35, 177 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 60).

³⁶ Marguerite to Briçonnet, [after 18 May 1522], “Vous sçavez la nécessité qui me fera taire. Dieu en fera sa volonté. Laquelle nous doit grace de sy bien entendre que sans l’entendre n’ayons que la sienne, vous priant par voz prieres vouloir y tirer, avec la bonne tante [Mme. de Nemours], la sumergée en eaue amere où trop est, Marguerite.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 39, 215 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 64). The editors point out that the ensuing four months of silence coincided with a period of warming Franco-papal relations. But those relations never thawed, and mere pro-papal sentiment can hardly be the full reason for her forced silence. Saulnier argues that Marguerite was not claiming that she needed to break off their correspondence but that she was simply expressing her spiritual need to be silent in the face of the mysteries expounded by Briçonnet. While normally balanced in his interpretations,

After nearly a year, the Meaux group, Briçonnet, and Marguerite had very little to show for their efforts. Lefèvre's prefatory epistle to Antoine Ardillon of November 1521 had expressed the Meaux group's desire to make the Scriptures accessible, but just as they were making their first firm steps towards fulfilling this intention by publishing Lefèvre's *Commentary on the Gospels* (before Easter 1522), strong opposition at court was threatening to close off their main hope for success, royal favor.

The Council of Sens (March 1522): Reform Stalemate

This initial period of activity closed with a missed chance to promote their agenda. In January 1522, Francis I called for archiepiscopal synods to be held throughout the realm for the "reformation of the church."³⁷ These councils were supposed to correct abuses, fill vacant benefices, and prevent their revenues (*deniers*) from flowing abroad. What abuses Francis had in mind is not clear since the term covered the full range of infractions of canon law and corruptions of religious practice whether from overzealous rigor, egregious delinquency, or heresy.³⁸ The issue of benefices and their revenues, on the other hand, touched directly on the still-smoldering discontent over the Concordat,

Saulnier's argument here flies in the face of Marguerite's repeated complaint during the preceding months that she was isolated and being attacked at court—"entouré d'espines," "en eau amare." Their correspondence then broke off for four months.

³⁷ "Au dict an 1521[1522 n.s.], en janvier, fut institué et ordonné par tous les diocèses archiépiscopaulx de France, de par le Roy, un concille gallical, pour estre fait tenu par chacune province archiépiscopalle, au huitiesme jour de mars ensuyvant, par chacun archevesque en son archevesché; et fut ce fait de par le Roy et son conseil, pour réformer l'Église et pour oster beaucoup d'abbus, et aussi pour parvenir aux vacans des bénéfices; et affin que les deniers d'iceux bénéfices n'allassent plus hors du royaume de France." *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris sous le règne de François Premier (1515–1536)*, ed. Ludovic Lalanne, (Paris: Renouard, 1854; reprint New York, 1965), 110.

³⁸ Mendicants, especially the Franciscans, and the regular clergy were engaged in an ongoing, vociferous battle for control of the parishes, about which the Faculty of Theology had rendered a series of judgments in favor of the secular clergy during the 1510s. The two groups were ever trading accusations of

specifically regarding the selection of prelates and priests, especially by foreigners (such as Luigi Canossa), and the payment of annates and church taxes to Rome.³⁹

Briçonnet is credited with having inspired Francis I to call these synods.⁴⁰ He certainly attended the Council of Sens in March 1522 (the only archiepiscopal synod of 1522 for which records survive), but he must have agreed with a contemporary chronicler, the conservative, Gallican-minded *Bourgeois de Paris* that “in the end, the council did not help a bit and nothing was put into effect.”⁴¹

The synodal statutes’ articles are a dog’s breakfast of insignificant and *pro forma* measures.⁴² The first article sets the tone of clerical retrenchment rather than reform: strict guidelines are laid down regulating the writing material to be used—parchment over paper—as well as the maximum prices to be charged for titles to benefices and notarized certificates proving clerical status. Lengthy regulations require canons to wear their habits, forbid clerics—those of royal or ducal blood excluded—from wearing luxurious

corrupt negligence and greedy intrusion. See d’Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 353–357.

³⁹ Francis I was likely baiting the clergy with the hope that he might suspend clerical payments to Rome. Later that summer, he specifically threatened Adrian VI with such measures if the Pope refused to side with him against Charles V. See chapter 5, note 17. After close cooperation with Julius II, this would have been yet another major oscillation in French relations with Rome. Previously, on 6 June 1520, Francis had granted the Parisian printer Toussaint Denis a three year license to print the *Taxe cancellarie apostolice et taxe sacre penitentie apostolice* (Paris: Denis Toussaint, 1520), which contained the schedule of fees owed to Rome by the clergy and laity for every conceivable type and circumstance of ecclesiastical promotion or penitential punishment: essential information in the new Concordat era. [This text can be downloaded as an image file via the BnF’s internet site at WWW.BnF.fr, texte numérisé, N053124.]

⁴⁰ Citing the unpublished minutes of the Council of Sens, BnF ms. Dupuy 456, Heller relates that Briçonnet and the Chancellor Antoine Duprat organized the synod. See Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, 129.

⁴¹ “Néanmoins finalement le dict concille ne prouffita de guères et n’y eut riens mis en effect.” Lalanne, *Bourgeois de Paris*, 111.

⁴² Joannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, (facsimile reprints Paris: Hubert Welter, 1902 and Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck – U. Verlagsanstalt, 1961), Vol. 35 (1798), 325–328. This text is reproduced from Edmund Martene and Ursini Durand, eds., *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium amplissima Collectio* (Paris: Montalant, 1733), vol. 8, cols. 1018C – 1022B.

vestments, and prohibit the founding of new confraternities. Beyond these *minutiae*, four articles do touch on issues identified by Briçonnet as essential to the reformation of the Church. In rather general terms, they condemn clerical absenteeism, lament unreformed monastic houses, and decry the excessive use of excommunication, yet they set forth no specific remedies. Rather, bishops are enjoined to go on fact-finding tours to identify the guilty and to investigate possible solutions. The tentative, do-nothing spirit of this synod is codified in the final, catch-all article. Proclaiming that it would be superfluous to add to the existing canons and councils of the Church, the article notes that the major problems of clerical absenteeism, irregular tenure of benefices, abuses of feast days, and superstitious worship of images, had been specifically brought to the attention of the council, yet it throws them back into the laps of the bishops.⁴³

Two other matters were treated at Sens which are not recorded in the statutes: heretical books and granting clerical tenths to the crown for the war effort. A pair of Lutheran books were condemned, including one by Andreas Carlstadt promoting clerical marriage, which had recently been reprinted at Paris.⁴⁴ Based on this example the council

⁴³ "IX. Multa nuper fuisse in medium deducta non ignoramus, quibus tam expresse, tamque exacte consultum est, per statuta conciliorum, constitutiones Romanorum pontificum, inhibitiones, adjournationes poenarum, minas carcerum, et censuras, ut non solum nihil commode possit adjici; verum etiam si quidquam addatur, supervacuum intuentibus reperietur, et sola in illis superabundaret repetitio." This article then lists the issues that 'ad dioecesanos remittuntur.' Mansi, vol. 35, col. 328 B.

⁴⁴ "Francisco [Poncher, Bishop of Paris], praesule celebratum Luteciae provinciale concilium 15 Martii 1522 in quo condemnati libelli duo, scilicet apologi pastoris Combergensis contra papisticas leges sacerdotibus matrimonium prohibentes, et de coelibatu et viduitate, auctore Andrea Carlostadio." *Gallia Christiana* VII, col. 159E. On 21 March 1522, the Council of Sens asked Parlement to suppress the sale of *De celibatu et viduitate* and *Contra papisticas leges sacerdotibus prohibentes matrimonium Apologia*. See Roger Doucet, *Étude sur le gouvernement de François Ier dans ses rapports avec le Parlement de Paris*, 2 vols, (Paris and Algiers, 1921–26), vol. 1, p. 334. An edition of the latter text was published in Paris by Jean de Gourmont at about this time, see Brigitte Moreau, "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'*Epistola Luciferi*," in *Le Livre dans l'Europe de la Renaissance*, Actes du

appealed to Parlement to enforce the widely flaunted edict against trafficking in heretical books.⁴⁵ It is claimed that the prelates at Sens demanded a royal ban against these tracts as their price—a down-payment on a commitment to fight heresy—for agreeing to grant to the crown several tenths of their revenue to support the war effort, which was Francis' chief reason for calling the archiepiscopal synod.⁴⁶ In the following months Francis only pursued payment of the clergy's forced gift, leaving in limbo church reform, be it Gallican or Evangelical, as well as the fight against heresy.⁴⁷

II. A Reform Program Rebuffed: Fall 1522

During the second period from September 1522 to February 1523, Marguerite and Briçonnet made their boldest overture to promote reform by presenting a formal program to Francis I, only to have it roundly rejected.⁴⁸ Although none of its specific provisions are mentioned in their correspondence, we can reconstruct its main lines.

After four months of silence between Meaux and the court, Marguerite signaled in September 1522 that it was time to renew their correspondence and cooperation.⁴⁹ Briçonnet attempted to capture Francis I's attention with a gift, in all likelihood Lefèvre's

XXVIIIe colloque international d'études humanistes de Tours, ed. P. Aquilon et H.-J. Martin (Paris: Promodis, 1988), 343–359. For the Council of Sens' appeal to Parlement on 21 March 1522, see "Poursuites contre les Hérétiques (1522–1589)," BSHPF 80 (1931), 502, citing AN X1A 1524, fol. 145.

⁴⁵ Imbart de la Tour 3, 208, with citation from Parliamentary records.

⁴⁶ Heller in Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, 129.

⁴⁷ "Ordre aux commissaires et baillis royaux de transiger avec les membres du clergé des diocèses de Sens, Chartres, Orléans et Meaux pour des biens non encore amortis, en donnant une somme de soixante trois mille livres." July 1522, *Ordonnances* 3, 179–186, no. 318.

⁴⁸ It is worth noting that for the year-long stretch between May 1522 and June 1523, including the two *caesurae*, only 17 rather short letters are preserved (4 others are lost), dating from the middle months of September 1522 to February 1523.

⁴⁹ Marguerite called for the renewal of their exchange "après longue actente" circa 5 September 1522, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 40, 215 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 69).

recently published *Commentary on the Gospels*. We do not have Briçonnet's accompanying message, only Marguerite's enthusiastic, if cryptic, report:

I wish I could adequately describe the countenance of the king and his answer after I offered to him your letter of presentation and read the first article of the one that you wrote to me. All the more so since it seems to me that your desire for his salvation, if possible, increases. I hope that the outcome will conform to his promise and the whole affair [will be] to the honor of the one true Honor [God], and that by Him and from Him it [Francis' promise] will be honored. Happy is he who honors Him through His Spirit. Begging you, in His charity, to employ that which you have learned from Him and not to bury the talent through neglect or cowardice.

On the day of truth, this commission will count against you if you invest His grace otherwise

The nuisance, Marguerite.⁵⁰

Whether it was Lefèvre's *Commentary*, with its clarion call for a state-supported restoration of the Church to its original Gospel purity, or one of Briçonnet's recently published programmatic synodal sermons, the occasion of Briçonnet's literary gift was managed by Marguerite as an opportunity to broach a related reform project. To this Francis responded favorably, and she vaunted Briçonnet as an eminently suitable candidate to take charge of it. When he heard this, Briçonnet lauded her plan (*propos*) calling on God to aid her in it⁵¹ and to enable him to live up to her recommendation.⁵²

⁵⁰ "Je vouldroys vous povoir faire bien au vray le rapport de la responce et du visaige que m'a faict le roy après luy avoir présenté vostre lettre de don et leu le premier article de celle que m'avez escripte. Car il me semble que le desir que vous avez à son salut, sy possible est, augmenteroit. J'espere que l'effect suivra la parolle et le tout à l'honneur du vray seul honneur, par luy et de luy honoré. Bien eureulx est qui par son esperit l'honore. Vous priant, en sa charité, d'user de ce que avez appris de luy et ne l'enterrer le tallent par negligence ou pusilanime [pusillanimité]. Dont, au jour de verité, se fera contre vous partie sy aultrement ne distribuez ses graces. L'importune, Marguerite." [c. 15 September 1522, St.-Germain-en-Laye], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 41, 216 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 71).

⁵¹ "Je luy [God] supplie de tout mon cœur qu'il imprime au vostre ce saint et veritable propos [her plans] et tellement rectifie vostre esperit en luy (qui est la seule infinie rectitude) qu'il le [Marguerite's heart] face son ministre, qui chascun, spécialement [=lui qui chacun fait son ministre et spécialement...] ceulx qui plus que aultres doibvent l'honorer entendement. Là gist la solidité ou ruyne de la chrestienté.

Meanwhile, Michel d'Arande was again at court preaching to the ladies giving the Fabrists' evangelical teaching a well-placed spokesperson. Though by mid-October Maitre Michel wished to return to Meaux, Louise desired him to stay in order to finish a series of lessons on a book of Scripture.⁵³ Since the court was shortly to move, Marguerite invited Briçonnet to visit in order to capitalize on their current favor and promote their agenda.⁵⁴ No source indicates whether he made this journey, but he and Lefèvre did send some specific proposals. They were bitterly disappointed by the king's response. In late November 1522, Briçonnet acknowledged that their plans had failed to inspire the king:

The letter carrier has informed me that Lefèvre and I have given our advice with fruitless results and enjoined me to tell you. Please cover the hearth for a time: the wood that you wish to set alight [Louise of Savoy and Francis I] is so green

C'est l'innovacion rectifiée que desirois par mes dernieres [lettres] estre solidée et confirmée en l'entendement du pauvre esgaré..." Briçonnet is referring here to plans for reforming the high clergy outlined to her in a previous letter, which is not extant [c. 10 September 1522], *Correspondance* 1, no. 40a, p. 216 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 70). Briçonnet alludes to the need for church reform from on high, continuing "Plusieurs regnent sans regner, vivent sans vivre, sont sans estre, destitués de l'esperit de Dieu... Plusieurs honorent Dieu de bouche, en cœur esgaré et eslongné, prophitesent, guerissent les demoniacles sans esperit de Dieu... qu'il fault songneusement regarder et esprouver si les esperitz sont de Dieu et quel est nostre esperit en noz operacions qui sont mauvaïses, sans la lumiere prevenente, assistente, et concomitante de l'Esperit de Dieu, qui doibt estre de nos œuvres, some il est de tout comancement, moien et fin." 18 September 1522, [Meaux], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 42, 217 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 72).

⁵² "Parquoy la garantize que avez faict au roy est mal assignée sy le debonnaire [Christ], qui pour tous a satisfait, ne m'en gecte hors." 18 September 1522, [Meaux], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 42, 218 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 72).

⁵³ "Le desir que maistre Michel a de vous aller veoir a esté retardé par le commandement de Madame, à qui il a commencé lyrrre (*sic*) quelque chose de la sainte Escripiture qu'elle desire qu'il parface." [c. 12? October 1522, St-Germain-en-Laye?], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 43, 218 (Saulnier 1977 no. 78.2 [=Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 78]).

⁵⁴ "Mais louez Dieu qu'il [d'Arande] ne pert point le temps, car j'espere que ce voiage servira et me semble, veu le peu de sejour que nous ferons par deça, que feriez bien d'y venir, car vous savez la fiance que le roy et elle ont à vous et sy avec vostre vouloir et debvoir, ma priere pouvoit avancer l'heure et mon conseil fust creu, en verité et desir regardant seulement l'honneur du Seul, vous conseileroit et prieroit de n'y vouloir faillir, la pis que malade, Marguerite." [c. 12? October 1522, St-Germain-en-Laye?], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 43, 219 (Saulnier 1977 no. 78.2 [=Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 78]).

that it will smother the fire. For several good reasons (the remaining ones we omit in the hope of telling you some day), we do not advise you to go further if you do not want to extinguish completely the burning brand as well as that other fuel, which desires to blaze and enflame others.⁵⁵

Evidently, Francis' reaction was so unfavorable that Briçonnet felt any further agitation might lead to a backlash.

What was the nature of their advice and why had it been rejected by the court?

The second question would seem to have at least two answers, both of which highlight the controversial nature of their plans. As Henry Heller has argued, in the fall of 1522 the court was pursuing closer relations with the Pope, a diplomatic situation that did not favor Briçonnet and his colleagues' ideas for religious renewal.⁵⁶ Moreover, Michel d'Arande's preaching at court in October 1522 created a scandal, which no doubt explains his desire to return to Meaux.⁵⁷ His teachings to Louise and the other ladies at

⁵⁵ "Le porteur [probably Denis Briçonnet] m'a tenu propos de grande pauvreté, auquel monsieur Fabry et moy avons dict nostre advis et conjuré le vous dire. Il vous plaira couvrir le feu pour quelques temps: le bois que voulez faire brusler est sy verd qu'il estaindroit le feu et ne conseillons pour plusieurs raisons (dont le surplus qu'il obmectra espere quelque jour vous dire) que passez oultre, sy ne voulez du tout estaindre le tizon et le surplus qui desire se brusler et aultres enflamber." [Meaux], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 47, 230 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 85). The editors rightly argue that the tenor of Briçonnet's letter indicates that this veiled passage refers to a failed effort to 'convert' the king and Louise of Savoy.

⁵⁶ Dating Briçonnet's 'cover the hearth' letter to September, not November-December, as maintained by Becker, Martineau, Veissière, and Saulnier, Henry Heller suggests that the court's rejection of their advice coincided with the arrival of the papal legate at court, who had been sent to mend relations. See "1522 Panorama religieux et politique," in Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, 130. For critique of Heller's dating, see Saulnier 1977, 223–224.

Even if Heller's interpretation of this letter may not correspond to the actual date of composition, his general thesis that the court's support for the Meaux group waxed and waned inversely to its closeness with the Papacy is correct. Though the court's display of support for Meaux (and its subsequent withdrawal) may have been politically calculated, Marguerite attested to the fact (as did Lefèvre in the prefaces to his French New Testament) that the court regarded the Meaux group's activities positively. The king's papal politics did not jeopardize his protection of the Meaux group, but did block any effort to act on their reform proposals.

⁵⁷ Becker considers the d'Arande affair as the whole explanation for the rejection of their 'advis,' see "Marguerite, Duchesse d'Alençon, et Guillaume Briçonnet," 427–428.

court so alarmed the King's confessor, Guillaume Petit, erstwhile supporter of d'Arande's master, Lefèvre d'Étaples, that he denounced him to the Faculty of Theology in Paris. On 15 November, Petit accused this Augustinian friar, who, he noted, no longer wore his habit, of secretly preaching false doctrines to Louise, Marguerite, and other ladies. D'Arande, he claimed, had attacked the veneration of the saints, ridiculed the Faculty of Theology, and, most ominously, defended the heretic Luther—who at that time still wore the habit of the Augustinian order!—as a saintly man, whose errors, if they were such, were not to be marveled at since Augustine, Jerome and others had erred as well.⁵⁸ Petit's denunciation and the Faculty's ensuing investigation angered the royal family. Weathering their displeasure, Petit complained to the Faculty about its indiscreet proceedings. By 15 December the royal family's feathers were smoothed when the Faculty suspended its inquiry.⁵⁹

After the bright days of hope following Francis' promises in September 1522, *détente* with the Pope and the d'Arande scandal may have made it inopportune to accept the Meaux articles, but the main reason, no doubt, for rejecting them was that they were so daring and offensive to conservatives as to make them too risky for the royals to adopt. Indeed, since Petit's denunciation and the Faculty's investigation of d'Arande followed

⁵⁸ "Tunc affuit reverendus in Christo pater dominus Trecensis episcopus, magister Guillelmus Parvi, regius confessor et unus de magistris ejusdem Facultatis, . . . querimoniam subjunxit, Facultati declarans quendam nomine Michaellem Heremitam (nunc vero in habitu secularium presbiterorum agit in regia domo) in curia morari et assidue in cubiculis dominarum scilicet matris regis et sororis versari quotidieque in illis cubiculis predicare mulieribus et non publice, qui asseritur non esse sane doctrine sed errores quosdam seminare presertim quo ad cultum sanctorum et venerationem, quodque pro viribus statui theologorum denigraret et Lutherum heresiarcham virum sanctum diceret, nec mirum si in aliquibus errasset qui [quia?] sic erraverunt et sancti ut Aug[ustinus], Her[onymus] et alii." Clerval, *Registres*, 328.

⁵⁹ See Faculty meetings for December 1, 8, and 15, Clerval, *Registres*, 331–332, and note 34, p.

on the heels of the attempt of Briçonnet, Lefèvre, and Marguerite to influence the court's ecclesiastical policy, they should be seen as an early volley in their counter-attack against the Meaux group's whole program. Though eager to protect d'Arande and its own reputation from accusations of heresy, the court did not want to risk the consequences of adopting his masters' controversial program. What were the offending proposals of Briçonnet and Lefèvre?

A Possible Reform Program

Briçonnet's discussion of church renewal contains three entwined themes: sharp criticism of the immoral life and corrupt teaching of prelates and theologians; a contrasting description of true ministers and correct doctrine; and, finally, specific recommendations for eradicating the former and instituting the latter.⁶⁰

Briçonnet frequently lamented that his fellow prelates (*mes semblables*) were worldly and devoid of spiritual understanding or zeal to preach the gospel.⁶¹ On their

338.

⁶⁰ Though present throughout Briçonnet's letters, he explicitly interrelates his three principal reform themes in several key letters. The first are a series of treatise-like missives from December 1521 through February 1522 on the spiritual 'eau,' 'manna,' and 'feu' by which God distributes grace. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, nos. 18, 19, 21, 28, and 34, pp. 76–97, 114–128, 138–154, and 165–177. In subsequent letters, he reprises these themes with vigor, see further Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, nos. 51, 58, 64, and 79, pp. 16–26, 39–43, 53–59, and 94–106.

⁶¹ Briçonnet derided his colleagues' failings repeatedly. To mention but a few outbursts from 1521–22, he: praises Marguerite for "...me invitant et mes semblables, comme faisoit le bon prophete David, à gouter la douceur et indicible suavité de la très-sainte et super-celeste pasture, comme de vostre grace avez faict...;" criticizes prelates for lack of devotion to Christ in the Eucharist, "O singuliere, très-digne et peu par mes semblables savourée innovation!" [Before 24 October 1521] *Correspondance* 1, nos. 8 and 9, pp. 39 and 41 (Saulnier 1977 no. 27.1, [=Jourda nos. 26 + 27]); laments their indifference to Christ's depthless love: "O quelle douceur abissale, peu désirée par mes semblables!" 11 November [1521], *Correspondance* 1, no. 11, p. 58 (Saulnier 1977 no. 32.2 [= Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 30]); when employing Francis I's emblem of the fiery salamander as a metaphor for Christ, he describes prelates as 'diabolical salamanders': "Helas! Madame, nous sommes au feu. Je parle de moy et mes semblables, de nature de feu regeneréz par feu. Et neantmoins plus froidz que viperes, que estraingons tout feu de grace, vraies

shoulders rested the responsibility for the utter infirmity of the Church:

The Church is presently as arid and dry as a water course in the scorching southern heat. Searing avarice, ambition, and lust have burned the living water, true doctrine, and image of holiness right out of it. Such wind dissipates and dries up every grace. Everyone strives after profit and honor, and as for God's—no one gives a damn about it any more. His sheep can see easily enough why they are barren and weak since their homeland is without water... We are completely worldly, we who ought to be spiritual. This occurs for want of wisdom and evangelical doctrine, which flows not and is not distributed as it should be. Everyone knows this, yet few take heed. This is a sign that we lack perfect love.⁶²

He urged Marguerite to convince Francis and Louise to set an example for the rest of the realm.⁶³ With this wish came a warning: the royal Trinity too was culpable for the destruction of the Church,⁶⁴ since they had the power to choose better prelates but did

salamandres diaboliques," 22 December 1521, *Correspondance* 1, no. 20, 107 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 41); and condemns them for forgetting Christ and their vocation in the pursuit of riches: "[in forgetting everything but God] est le port et abisme de toute oubliance, qui n'est gueres occuppé de mes semblables. Bien par cecité sommes oublians noz estatz et vaccacion [occupation], sçavans et cler-voyans au monde et à la chair, et pour noz honneurs, preeminences et plaisirs (que ne povons oublier) entretenir assez de plaiz [plaids = procès], procès et querelles, pour les garder et accroistre," 6 March [1522], *Correspondance* 1, no. 36, p. 180 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 61); cf. again on the avarice of prelates, 31 December 1521, *Correspondance* 1, no. 21, pp. 124–125 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 42). After the Meaux group's failure to convince the court to reform the clergy in November 1522, he continued his critique, if anything, with more bitterness, see below and *Correspondance* 2, no. 84, pp. 116, 120 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 148).

⁶² "L'Eglise est de present aride et sèche comme le torrent en la grand challeur australe. La challeur d'avarice, ambicion et voluptueuse vie a deseché son eue de vie, doctrine et exemplarité. Tel vent est dissipatif et desiccatif de toute grace. Ung chacun serche son prouffict et honneur. Il n'est plus question de celuy de Dieu. Les brebis peuvent dire qu'elles sont demeurées, comme la terre sans eue, infructueuses et languissantes... Nous sommes tous terrestres, qui debvrions estre tout esperit. Et ce procede par faulte d'eue de sapience et de doctrine evangelique qui ne court et n'est distribuée comme elle deveroit. Chacun le congnoit, peu s'en souvient, qui est signe de faulte d'amour divine." Briçonnet to Marguerite, [22 December 1521], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 18, p. 85, (Saulnier 1977 Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 39).

⁶³ "Je luy supplie très-humblement qu'il luy plaise par sa bonté allumer tel feu ès cœurs du roy, de Madame et de vous, que vous puisse veoir par son amour importable et ravissante tellement feruz et navréz [frappés et blessés] que de vous trois puisse yssir par exemplarité de vie, feu bruslant et allumant le surplus du royaume, et specialement l'Estat, par la froideur duquel tous les aultres sont gellez." 22 December 1521, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 20, p. 113, (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 41).

⁶⁴ "Le monde est plain de gens qui disent et monstrent avoir bonne affection et [la première chose] qu'ilz font est monstrier leurs piedz nectz et deschaux de toute sinsistre affection. Dieu le vueille (sic) par sa grace et qu'ilz ne couvrent leur sectes, divisions et partialitéz soubz le goust et manteau de l'honneur de Dieu, lequel est souvent postposé pour accroistre le leur. Helas! Pour savourer la vraie sapience ne fault

not.⁶⁵

This chastisement was a persistent and central theme for in January 1524, a full year after Francis had rejected their reform articles and when the winds at court had turned squarely against Briçonnet's uncle Semblançay, the bishop thundered an uncompromising challenge: the royal Trinity must either use its power to select good bishops or, if not, stand ready to suffer God's wrath:

Though this kingdom bears the title "Most Christian," it is especially full of bad prelates. I can not understand how the King, Madame [Louise of Savoy], and you, who are images of the truth, can suffer such disfigured and unproductive men, whom you, in part (by petition or otherwise), have established there, and, on the other hand how you can put up with such qualities in my colleagues. I do not think you are like [Pontius] Pilate, asking for the truth that you cannot stand to hear. The fullness of divine power made you His vessels filled with an abundance of grace and made you His outstanding images of truth for no other reason than for you to promote His truth in every estate, especially in the one that is now completely ruined. How can you ignore that most of those who should be preachers of the truth have no desire to announce it because they are not capable? I know that the king has chosen some good ones, for which I praise God. It is not for me to judge how many others tip the scales.

I beg you, Madame, henceforth exalt God's honor in the election and choice of His ministers, if you do not wish to incur His anger and wrath, which is ready to hand if you do not see to it. You say, "the time is not suitable." It is always the season for doing good. A master builder does not construct and then demolish his

point de saulce ne de moien... Les cœurs des princes sont empoisonnetz de telz goustz adulterins. L'on voit aussy quel feu sort des esclatz de telz boutefeuz. Ilz ne sont boutefeuz de Dieu. Car son honneur n'y croist point, ains me semble que de jour en jour il decreist en noz cœurs." "Les chiefz aussy sont sours et, par ce, le feu estainct ou bien casché. C'est à eulx, tant spirituelz que temporelz, ausquelz elle s'adresse. Car d'eulx vient et bien et mal. Ils ont les clefz des portes pour faire recevoir la sapience divine et sans eulx sera tousjours dehors." "Les chiefz et princes temporelz ne sont exemptz de nostre bestialité et ygnorance, ou qu'ilz les veuillent, permentent ou instituent. Tel l'or est converty en plomb et encoires et le plomb fondu. Il n'y a plus de solidité à l'Eglise. Elle porte le nom sans subsistance..." Briçonnet to Marguerite, 31 December 1521, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 21, 123 and 124, (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 42).

⁶⁵ "Sy la paresse des vigneron, comme dict le saige, rend la vigne infructueuse et en friche, que peuvent faire les vigneron de l'Eglise peu choisiz et esleuz? Là gist la source et naissance de poyson, qui tue les ames. Et pour neant l'on reclorra la vigne, sy l'entrée est à chacun ouverte et mal gardée." Briçonnet to Marguerite, 6 March [1522], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 36, 181 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 61).

work. If you want the Church to embrace its estate and profession and conform to the truth, a desire which I know God has inspired in you three, and you want Him to assist with His knowledge and power, see to it that when captains' posts [prelacies] become vacant, you fill them with such people whom you will not need to pull down but who will be able in our Lord to assist and support you in executing your godly desire.⁶⁶

Here and earlier, Briçonnet amplified his call for *bons pasteurs* from a diocesan to a national scale and insisted that royal control over the selection of prelates under the powers of the Concordat was the only way to effect broad changes where piecemeal efforts by individual prelates had failed before. As it was throughout his letters to Marguerite, the election of good bishops by the court would have been at the centerpiece of his and Lefèvre's articles in the fall of 1522.

But what should the royal family look for in a candidate? On this fundamental point Briçonnet's advice to Marguerite reflects a substantial shift of emphasis from his

⁶⁶ "Le royaume, combien qu'il se nomme très-chrestien, en [bad prelates] est spécialement plain et ne puis entendre comme le Roi, Madame et vous, qui estes ymaiges de verité, povez souffrir tel deffigrement et pauvreté, que en partie (par importunité ou aultrement) y avez mises, et l'autre endurez en mes semblables. Je ne vous repute comme Pilate demandans verité que ne voulissiez oÿr. Pour neant ne vous a la plenitude divine faict ses vaisseaulx rempliz de habondante grace, ne constitué ses excellentes ymaiges de verité que pour la promouvoir en tous estatz, spécialement en celluy qui tous ruyne. Comme povez vous ygnorer que la pluspart de ceulx qui doibvent estre preconizateurs de verité ne la vueillent car ne sçavent l'annoncer?... Je sçay que le Roy en a mis de bons, dont je loue Dieu. A moy n'est de juger de combien les aultres emportent la balance.

"Je vous supplie, Madame, procurer pour l'advenir l'honneur de Dieu en l'election et choix de ses ministres, sy tost ne voulez encourir l'ire et indignacion de Dieu, qui est present sy n'y pourvoiez. Vous direz: 'le temps n'est propre.' Il est tousjours saison de bien faire. Ung bon edificateur ne bastist pour demolir. Sy desirez que l'Eglise reconnoisse son estat et profession et soit reduict à sa verité, comme sçay que Dieu vous en donne à tous trois le vouloir, qu'il acoompaigne de sçavoir et pouvoir, pourvoiez, comme les places des capitaines vacqueront, telz y estre mis qu'il ne faille non seulement les demolir mais puissent en nostre Seigneur vous conforter et ayder à executer vostre saint vouloir." Briçonnet to Marguerite, 31 January [1524], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 79, pp. 104–105, (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 142). This passage comes in the context of Briçonnet's debate with Marguerite over forcing the Archbishop of Bourges to allow d'Arande to preach Advent 1524. See below. According to Becker's reading of Marguerite's subsequent letter to Briçonnet [*Correspondance* 2, no. 83, p. 114 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 146)], his request was evidently well received at court. In this second letter, however, Marguerite was obviously referring to a specific proposal relating to the investigation of Briçonnet's uncle Semblançay, not

diocesan reform agenda of 1518–1520. Beyond the appearance of a godly life and eagerness to perform their duties, he told her to test the candidate's doctrine and preaching. He warned Marguerite that many put up a good show of being upright and pretend to honor God while defending their particular sects, divisive positions, and particular views.⁶⁷ Moral qualities remained for him one benchmark of the true minister, but Briçonnet now believed the essential differences between true shepherds and wolves was doctrinal.

Given the Faculty of Theology's recent condemnation of Luther, the suspicion surrounding the group gathered at Meaux, and Guillaume Petit's denunciation of d'Arande, it is remarkable that Briçonnet did not explicitly articulate his understanding of true and false doctrine in his letters to Marguerite with reference to these manifest controversies. This silence in their private conversation is even more remarkable since on 15 October 1523 he publicly condemned Luther in a synodal letter to the people of his diocese. Briçonnet upbraided Luther as one who, in order to flatter the laity, overturns ecclesiastical hierarchy allowing anyone to enter the ministry; as one who interprets Scripture erroneously while despising the views of the Church fathers—including Briçonnet's favorite one, St. Denis (the Pseudo-Dionysius)—and as one who promotes

to the selection of Bishops. By January 1524, the wind at court was well against the Meaux group, nor would Marguerite follow Briçonnet's advice on the d'Arande-Bourges debate.

⁶⁷ See the passage quoted in note 64, which continues with the warning: "L'on vous persuade, Madame, que vous estes l'adresse de tous bons serviteurs de Dieu et plusieurs se disant telz se retirent à vous, comme à celle qui l'ayme, revere et honnore. Je crois que avez coeur et yeulx savourans, aussy voz piedz nectz. Mais, pour ne vous flatter, voz mains sont engantées. Je ne voy point encoires de flamme qui soit sortie de voz mains... Le royaume debveroit estre en ung feu, veu le temps que Dieu vous a donné la grace de pover souffler pour l'accroistre à son honneur. Il n'est pour neant escript qu'il fault esprouver les esperitz s'ilz sont de Dieu. Deffiez vous, Madame, premierement de l'auteur des presentes [Briçonnet] et

individual, libidinous freedom.⁶⁸

In warning Marguerite against “those who cover their divisive sects with the claim to sanctity” Briçonnet could have had Luther and his French followers in mind. Indeed, this is how scholars explain why six months earlier, in April 1523, Briçonnet revoked the licenses of some circuit preachers at Meaux.⁶⁹ Guillaume Farel, who left sometime that year, and other more radical figures at Meaux are considered to have been Briçonnet’s unnamed targets whom he described as sowing a deadly poison under the guise of true piety in their preaching.⁷⁰

Knowing Farel’s future career, this might seem a likely interpretation of

de tous aultres qui n’ont piedz ne mains nectes.” Briçonnet to Marguerite, 31 Dec. 1521, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 21, 123–124 (Saulnier 1977 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 42).

⁶⁸ “...Martin Luther, qui en [in the church] renverse tout l’ordre hiérarchique, bouleverse et détruit l’état qui contient tous les autres dans la devoir, s’efforce d’effacer le souvenir de la passion du très-excellent Jésus, et qui, tenant pour rien le mariage spirituel..., y admet sans choix le premier venu, pour flatter le populaire. Semblable à Chrysippe, qui se croyait seul sage, il tord à sa fantaisie par une interprétation nouvelle les saintes Écritures, et méprise tous ceux des anciens qu’il trouve contraires à ses témérités; le bienheureux Denis entre autres, ce disciple de Paul, dont les écrits sont après les Évangiles et les livres apostoliques ce qu’il y a de plus sublime et de plus sacré, il le traite de novateur!”

“...il répand une licence qui dispose à tous les crimes, non-seulement les malades et les faibles, mais les forts eux-mêmes et les bien portants, de telle sorte qu’il ne reste presque nulle différence entre la secte de Mahomet et la religion de Jésus-Christ. Luther rend même celle-ci d’autant plus pernicieuse, que, supprimant toute sanction, il veut que chacun soit le propre juge de l’usage qu’il fait de sa volonté et de sa liberté. Lui-même se pose en défenseur de la liberté de l’Église, quoique ce soit d’un point de vue tout charnel et non selon la vérité qu’il disserte sur la liberté, qui n’est après tout qu’une servitude supérieure à toute les libertés.” Briçonnet to the people of Meaux, French translation in Herminjard 1, no. 77, pp. 154–155; Latin original in Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l’église de Meaux*, 2, 558–559.

⁶⁹ See Veissière, *Briçonnet*, 228.

⁷⁰ “Quum ab ultima Synodo nostra commiserimus per litteras nostras quamplures, qui nostro gregi verbum Dei vice nostra disseminarent, intellexerimusque, nonnullos, *quae Dei sunt non sincere ac pure, licet speciem pietatis prae se ferentes, quod dolenter admodum referimus, temperare, sed adulterare: satagentes tam pestifero animarum morbo tamque praesenti veneno quam citius*, ut par est, ne paulatim serpens latius sese diffundat, occurrere, et medicamen adhibere quam saluberrimum, tenore praesentium districte praecipimus, mandamusque omnibus Curatis et Vicariis vestrorum Decanatum respective quam citius intimetis, nos omnes et singulos antea per nos commissos ex nunc revocasse, ut et harum litterarum serie revocamus, inhibentes praefatis Curatis et Vicariis, ne eorum quempiam quovis exquisito colore ad Praedicationis munia recipiant aut admittant, nisi expressum super hoc a nobis aliud mandatum habuerint.” [Emphasis added]. Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l’église de Meaux*, vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 557–558.

Briçonnet's April revocation. Yet it is unlikely that Briçonnet had partisans of Luther in mind since in his previous synodal statutes and throughout his correspondence with Marguerite he never names or alludes to Luther or his followers. When Briçonnet first condemned Luther in October 1523, he did so, as we will see, to join in the court in shoring up its image of orthodoxy in the face of the Sorbonne's attacks. Throughout his correspondence with Marguerite, however, Briçonnet's main targets were the doctors of Paris and Franciscans of Meaux. Marguerite certainly understood and shared Briçonnet's view. Just when Briçonnet was condemning Luther in public, in private she undercut the doctors' claim to be the arbiters of the faith, describing true doctrine as "pure linen, not from Paris, but from Paradise."⁷¹ Here and throughout their correspondence, Briçonnet and Marguerite stressed the need to convince Louise and Francis that the Parisian theologians affected piety and spread false doctrines.

That Briçonnet was more concerned about self-styled defenders of the faith than Lutherans is further evident in his exposition of *la doctrine évangélique*, the term he, Marguerite, and those in their entourages used to describe the true essence of the faith.⁷²

⁷¹ In December 1523, after the Meaux group had weathered the full onslaught of the Faculty of Theology Marguerite described true gospel teaching as "du pur lyn, non de Paris, mais du paradis." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 75, 83, (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 136).

⁷² Some representative examples of Marguerite and Briçonnet's use of 'Gospel' and its derivatives to designate true doctrine include the statements [emphasis added]: Christians should "confesser Jesus Christ estre vray filz de Dieu, comme fist saint Jehan Baptiste, disant qu'il n'estoit Christ, mais envoyé de Luy, comme sont tous *ministres evangelisans* non leurs doctrines, fantazies et proffictz particuliers, mais la verité. Et pour enseigner que l'on adore, revere, honore, ayme Dieu le Pere en esperit et verité, car aultre chose n'est *evangille*, disant à ses disciples qu'il leur envoie l'esperit de verité." (2, 100). "Tous Chrestiens sont ou doivent estre *Evangelizans*, ayans en leur coeur foy imprimée, amour en volonté ardente et en mourir vollantz par esperance." (2, 266). "...le debonnaire Jhesus [a] vaincu la puissance diabolique empeschant le royaume celeste, par luy ouvert et introduit les fideles, qu'il a, par sa sapience et *doctrine evangelique* instruit et illuminé, les purgeant de innumerables erreurs et superstitions et, comme grand evesque, edifié le vray Temple celeste, eglise fidelle bastie de pierres vives." (2, 286)

Briçonnet located the principal dividing line between true and false doctrine in the domain of soteriology, which was at the heart of the evolving reformation conflict.

Indeed, although Briçonnet was far from a systematic thinker or writer, and although he never specifically mentioned the reformation conflict in his letters, his presentation of *la doctrine évangélique* focused on the very topics over which traditionalists and innovators clashed most strongly: Christ as sole mediator, grace, faith, justification, merits, mosaic vs. evangelical law, as well as the Christian's servitude to sin and freedom under the Gospel. Though it would be worthwhile to reconstruct his views on these key topics and investigate their sources, here it must suffice to sketch some major features.⁷³ On key theological points, Briçonnet was often in agreement with German evangelicals, most likely under the influence of Lefèvre d'Étaples. Not only is such common ground evident in his letters to Marguerite, but if he did not share similar views, it would be difficult otherwise to explain the Sorbonne's attacks on him or how he could have lowered his guard far enough to allow more radical Lutheran preachers into his diocese.

Briçonnet does not repeat Luther's formula of justification by faith alone. Yet he

The locution "doctrine évangélique," and its equivalents, appears as the most frequent term Marguerite and Briçonnet use to describe the 'true doctrine of Christ.' For example, see: *doctrine évangélique*, 1: 68, 85, 87, 88, 124–125; 2: 57. *parole évangélique*, 1: 88; 2: 17, 54. *eau évangélique* (baptismal grace, living water), 1: 88, 93. [*loi*] *évangélique* (vs. Mosaic law), 1: 93. *connaissance évangélique*, 2: 55. *lumière évangélique*, 2: 57. *vérité évangélique*, 2: 100. *reception évangélique*, 2: 125–126. *distributions évangélique*: 2: 131. *pain évangélique*: 2: 152.

At times they employ the noun form, *évangile*, to denote the doctrinal message rather than the mere text of the 'Gospels' defining it as, "la parole vive de Dieu," 1: 88; "qui comprennent toute la vie d'un chrétien, foy, espérance et amour," 1: 182; and as God's instruction vs. [human] "*coutume*," 2: 52. The verb, *évangéliser*, 'to teach the gospel,' for them expresses the proper the action of all Christians, see 2: 100, 101, 131, 242, 266. Cf. *ministres évangélisans*, 2: 100; *prescheur évangélique*, 2: 126–127.

⁷³ Veissière provides no useful information about Briçonnet's theological training, see *Guillaume*

does declare similarly: “we are justified by grace, saved by faith and the grace of God, and not by our works, and in this there is only one to whom belongs the honor and glory whom we ought to honor and in him be glorified.”⁷⁴ On the basis of his belief in the sole meritorious and gratuitous gift of grace from God to humans, Briçonnet attacks “...those who mortify their flesh...[who] believe falsely through human, animal reason it is possible to achieve and because of their hard work arrive at the goal of spiritual vivifying life through fasting, prayers, and other works, in which they suppose their justification to exist and consist.”⁷⁵

Briçonnet attacks the dominant late-medieval view that by doing their very best (*facere quod in se est*) in a state of sin, humans could attract God’s initial grace (*gratia gratis data*) enabling them to do meritorious deeds. Nor does he accept that having offset their sins that a further infusion of grace (*gratia gratum faciens*) allows them to do deeds fully worthy of God’s acceptance and thereby earn their salvation.⁷⁶ Briçonnet does,

Briçonnet, 25–29.

⁷⁴ “Car par grace sommes justifiéz, par foy et par grace de Dieu saulvéz, et non par noz oeuvres, à ce qu’il n’y ait que ung à qui appartient honneur et gloire que devons honorer et en luy nous glorifier.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 116, 243. Again he stressed: “...il est certain que nostre filiacion n’est que de grace que recevons par foy et ne vient de nous; c’est don de Dieu, et non par noz œuvres qu’il nous a préparées pour y cheminer, comme dict divinement Monsieur saint Pol, que vous supplie, Madame, retenir en vostre cœur sans jamais l’oublier: ‘Gratia enim estis salvati per fidem; et hoc non est vobis, Dei enim donum est; non ex operibus (*sic*), ut ne quis gloriatur. Ipsius enim sumus factura, creati in Christo Jesus, in operibus bonis que preparavit Deus, ut in illis ambulemus.’ [Eph. 2:8–9].” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 34, 169; see further, vol. 1, no. 19, 93–94; no. 21, 127; vol. 2, no. 58, 43; no. 116, 257.

⁷⁵ “Il en est d’autres qui macerent leurs corps, travaillant pour en sortir et plus y entrent... Ilz cuident par raison naturelle et animale penetrer et pour debvoir parvenir à la fin de la vie spirituelle viviffiante par jeunes, oraisons, aulmosnes, et aultres œuvres, esquelz cuydent estre et consister leur justiffication... Telz sont trop en corps qui en œuvres corporelles et materielles mectent leur salut. Sainct Pol les appelle anymaulx (“Animalis homo non percipit que Dei sunt” [1 Cor. 2:14]). Lesquelz ne perçoivent, congnoissent et apprehendent ce qui est de Dieu, presumans de soy ce faire, en et par leur ame raisonnable vivante...” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 46, 224; and again at no. 21, 119.

⁷⁶ On the competing theories of justification and the terminology used in this debate, see Heiko Augustinus Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,

however, speak of three types of grace—prevenient, assistant, and concomitant grace—which correspond for him to the three stages of a sinner’s progress towards salvation: purgation, illumination, and perfection.⁷⁷ Briçonnet’s peculiar Pseudo-Dionysian schema of salvation should not obscure the central issue, his emphasis on God’s gift of prevenient grace prior to a sinner’s ascent on the road to salvation placed him with Luther, Staupitz, and others in the ranks of those who were critical of late-medieval Pelagian teachings on justification.⁷⁸ Like such thinkers, Briçonnet decries the belief that obtaining merits through good works will lead to salvation and disputes those who trust through free will humans can launch themselves on God’s covenanted road to heaven.⁷⁹

We have seen earlier that Briçonnet misconstrued Luther’s understanding of Christian liberty as an unbridled license to do as one wishes without sanction. Yet, when describing true liberty under the Gospel to Marguerite, he was much closer to Luther’s affirmed position either than he realized or than he was willing to admit. Like Luther in *De servo arbitrio* (1520), Briçonnet affirms that one sins of one’s free will and, apart from grace, no one can will to do good. After the infusion of grace, one is freed from the

1963; 3rd edition, Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth Press, 1983), 131–145, 160–174, and the ‘Nominalist Glossary,’ 459–476; *idem*, “Justification: Man’s Eternal Predestination,” in *Forerunners of the Reformation*, 123–133.

⁷⁷ On ‘grace and works’: “...la beneficque eaue de grace... nous a prevenu et tous les jours previent par ses benedictions en la naissance de noz œuvres. Car c’est luy qui les produict et faict naistre par grace preveniente. Lesquelles l’ardeur d’amour du feu embrase, attire par inspiration assidue, concomitante, assistante et confortante nostre debilité. Car, comme il est escript par saint Pol, nous ne sommes suffisans de nous comme de nous, mais nostre suffisance est de Dieu, qui nous prepare et faict ses ministres capables et ydoines, pour estre susceptibles de grace fructiffiante en luy et par luy et lequel parfaict pour luy nostre fruit qu’il conduit à perfection et maturité par grace perficiente, noz operations, lesquelles lors luy sont agreables, quant congoissons de luy tout et de nous rien.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 19, 96.

⁷⁸ See Oberman, *Forerunners*, 124–126.

⁷⁹ Of the three doctrines—prevenient grace, the bondage of the will, and predestination—emphasized by theologians critical of the Pelagian tendency in late medieval soteriology, Briçonnet has

Mosaic Law and made a slave to Christ, who does good works through and for the benefit of the sinner, even though the sinner never fully overcomes his sinful nature.⁸⁰ Briçonnet did, however, stress more forcefully than Luther that through grace and faith, humans could be partially regenerated in this life.⁸¹ Good works were the necessary fruit of faith by which it would be known to all.⁸²

If we look for the points that clearly divide Briçonnet from Luther, or more precisely from the perception of Lutheran thought current in France, we see that in his diocesan encyclical of October 1523, the bishop attacks him on a narrow list of positions,

nothing to say about the latter. See Oberman, *Forerunners*, 125.

⁸⁰ Some representative statements of his teaching of 'the bondage of the will' (a phrase, however, which he never uses), see above, note 74 and further: "C'est une grande peste qui regne aujourd'huy et au plus apparens. Dieu par sa grace les vueille illuminer, à ce qu'ilz se congnoissent estre vrayz serfs de Jesus, en qui avons nostre bien eueuse liberté. Car, comme il dict, nous serons vraiment livrés quant le bon Jesus nous delivrera: qui sera quant captiverons notre liberal arbitre à la volonté divine et dirons avec Monsieur saint Pol que nous ne sommes de nous comme de nous et que nostre suffisance est de Dieu, qui nous a faict ses ministres ydoines et capables de le servir, selon et en l'estat auquel luy plaist nous appeller, en attribuant ceste idoneité à grace preveniente de Dieu, duquel tout bien, et de nous tout mal. Lequel est sy grand qu'il retarde souvent, assoupist et amoingdris le bien que nostre Seigneur ouvre en nous, par ce que la racine de la vieille peau, qui est ne noz membres charnels, est encoires repugnante à la loy de l'esperit." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 21, 116.

Elsewhere, having noted that Adam and Eve had free will (*franc arbitre*) in the Garden, but descended 'volontairement' from freedom to servitude, from life to death, Briçonnet develops an argument combining the bondage of the will with adoptionism, a contrast between Mosaic and evangelical law, and a statement reminiscent of Luther's *semper justus, semper peccator*: "Combien que encoires ne feust venu le salvateur, il le voit par foy vistant aussy lors la nudité de Adam et Eve de robes pellicées signifiant leur peché estre couvert par foy, attendant leur verité qui couvrirait d'eulx et de leur posterité, par sa doreuse mort, tout peché... C'est le nouvel homme, duquel fault estre vestu au convi nuptial. Longue a esté, ennuveuse, tant digne expectation ne satisfaisant le vestement pellicé baillé par provision à l'extreme froid; gelant nature humaine captivée tant en la loy de nature que mosaïque vivant en servitude, attendant la liberté des enfans par foy regneréz en adoption de filiation par semence incorruptible et incontaminée, consumée ès cielz, demourant tousjours ce pendant travaillant et labourant en la terre maudicte, produisant fruit de malediction, espines et chardons." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 79, 97–98.

⁸¹ "...doivent de present tous chrestiens, estant hors la servitude et malediction de la Loy, aymer, servir et honorer la bonté divine (non pour la Loy qui n'est (que) pour les transgresseurs): du nombre desquelz ne sont plus comme dellivrez par le debonnaire Jhesus qui les a regneréz et innovéz en luy, faict enfans parfaictz en liberté d'amour pour correspondre, selon leur pouvreté et enfermeté, à l'infinie." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 116, 244.

⁸² "Par les œuvres on congnoist quelle est la semence de l'esperit et, combien que ypocrisie ou dissimulation puisse pour quelque temps regner, il est impossible que le fruit ne se montre tost ou tard et

chiefly for assailing the ecclesiastical hierarchy, purgatory, and the saints.⁸³ Briçonnet's most significant difference from German reformers was his insistence on obedience to the church however flawed it might be. Notably, Briçonnet and Marguerite's first significant dispute would be about whether to respect a corrupt prelate's right to license preachers.

The essential point here is that in his call for church reform, Briçonnet demanded the selection of good prelates, defined as those who were imbued with evangelical doctrine, which centered on an essentially Pauline understanding of soteriology.

se descouvre vital ou pernicieulx." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 34, 169.

⁸³ In his correspondence with Marguerite, Briçonnet frequently mentions Mary but rarely the saints, whom he never describes as intercessors, only mentioning Christ in this role. "...le doux Jesus, est celluy qui incessamment moienne et est nostre mediateur vers Dieu, supercelest Pere, pour nous deffendre de la puissance diabolique." Briçonnet *Correspondance* 1, 210–211; and again: "...entre Dieu et l'espouze [human nature after the fall] n'y a autre mediateur que le doux Jhesus, son espoux et collateral." Briçonnet *Correspondance* 2, 199.

Veissière argues contentiously in a note to this passage: "D'après Becker (*Idées*, 354) cette affirmation du Christ, unique médiateur, excluerait pour Briçonnet l'intercession de la Vierge et des saints, non mentionnée par ailleurs dans la *Correspondance*. Cet argument *a silentio* est excessif et se trouve contredit par ce que Becker écrit (à juste titre) quelques lignes plus loin, reconnaissant la 'dignité toute exceptionnelle de Marie pour Briçonnet.' Jésus-médiateur unique, oui. L'intercession des humains (les saints, la Vierge) se situe à un autre niveau et ne saurait lui porter aucun préjudice." Veissière is correct in this regard, Briçonnet certainly defended the doctrine of Purgatory as well as the invocation of the Saints and Mary in his second synodal letter of 15 October 1523: "...quelques personnes, ... ont osé prétendre et prêcher, au mépris de la vérité évangélique, que le Purgatoire n'existe pas, et que, par conséquent, il ne faut pas prier pour les morts, ni invoquer la très sainte vierge Marie et les Saints." Herminjard 1, no. 78, 156–158; 15).

Briçonnet's public defense, one coming on the heels of the Sorbonne's attacks, however, is rather ambiguous, leaving open the question how the saints were to be invoked: either directly as intercessors or merely indirectly as holy examples, which is way in which Lefèvre and the other Fabrists interpreted the proper use of their cult. In his private correspondence with Marguerite, Briçonnet completely disregarded of the saints as intercessors, diverging radically from contemporary religious practice as well as the express doctrines of conservative Parisian theologians at whose views of penance and salvation, not Luther's, he takes aim in his letters to Marguerite. To see the difference consider what a Franciscan from Geneva, Jean Gacy, wrote in 1524 in defense of the faith, "Nous scavons bien comme disent docteurs/ Que les bons saintz sont vrayz mediateurs/ Pour implorer la divine clemence/ Et obtenir pardon de nostre offence/ Affin que tout vienne à confusion/ Il [Luther] veult tollir leur deprecation." *Trialogue nouveau contenant l'expression des erreurs de Martin Luther* [Geneva: Wigand Koeln], 1 October 1524. BSHPF A 1162.

Briçonnet believed in purgatory but it did not function in his thought on redemption. He only mentions it in one passage, when describing the conscience-wracked pain felt by the soul that loves God when contemplating the full horror of its alienating sins: this he describes as the greatest pain in purgatory. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 118, 268.

Practically, he expected them to preach and teach this doctrine. As a model for them he had established an innovative system of preaching circuits in his diocese, and his helpers were supplying it with an appropriate, new literature, beginning with the translation of the Scriptures. As for the traditional cult, liturgy, and devotional practices, Briçonnet gave very little indication as to what he might have changed or added. His promotion of indulgences in 1519–1520, his defense of purgatory and the saints in October 1523, as well as his subsequent introduction of a procession of the Holy Sacrament in 1527 and a liturgy for the feast of the Visitation of Mary in 1528,⁸⁴ indicate that he was conservative in these matters. His soteriology did not serve as a critical optic for reassessing the cult. Evidently, he did not think that such beliefs and practices enticed people to trust in their own good works for salvation, but rather prompted them to embrace God's gift of grace.

Compared to Lefèvre, who openly denounced "false religious practices," Briçonnet hardly mentions such concerns in his letters to Marguerite. At the Council of Sens in 1522 the abuse of images was brought up, perhaps by Briçonnet, but, as in his earlier diocesan measures, the chief concerns of the council were fiscal and administrative problems among the clergy. In practice, Briçonnet was more concerned about solving administrative problems than purifying the cult. Both issues were, in any case, ancillary to what he and Lefèvre felt was the main goal, reintroducing the 'spirit of truth' by establishing *bons pasteurs* and spreading the Gospel via the vernacular Scriptures and preaching. These measures, which he so often broached with Marguerite, must have formed the chief items in the articles that Briçonnet and Lefèvre proposed in the fall of

⁸⁴ Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 382–386.

1522.

The Meaux Articles Tested: The Election of Artus Fillon

In the summer heat of 1522, it certainly might have appeared that the court had been won over to the Meaux platform. The image was real enough, but it quickly proved a mirage. While Briçonnet and Marguerite were campaigning for the selection of able prelates, the court exerted pressure on the local chapter to name Artus Fillon,⁸⁵ a close friend of Briçonnet and leading figure in episcopal reform circles, Bishop of Senlis. An impressive group of powerful courtiers, including Anne de Montmorency, Jean Brinon (President of the Parlement of Normandy as well as Marguerite's Chancellor in Alençon), Étienne Poncher (Archbishop of Sens), as well as Guillaume Briçonnet were dispatched to secure his election.⁸⁶

Briçonnet and Marguerite had promoted Fillon's candidacy, no doubt, as a trial run of their episcopal reform program.⁸⁷ Marguerite had been writing letters on Fillon's behalf and took interest in his preaching, much as Briçonnet had instructed her to do

⁸⁵Fillon's predecessor, Jean Calveau – a trusted servant of Marguerite and Francis I (see chapter 3), died in June 1522. Though nominated by the king, Fillon had to fight off a rival candidate elected by the chapter; "Nominatus a rege [Fillon], an prius electus a capitulo, ut scribunt Sammarthani, Robertum abbatem Caroliloci contulit, qui esset episcopatus Silvanectensis, cuius acceptus responsiense 9 VII 1522..." *Gallia Christiana* 10, col. 1440. Saulnier 1977, no. 74, specifies that "Cet ami de Briçonnet [Fillon] devient évêque de Senlis, non sans une pression précise de François Ier sur le chapitre: ses lettres du 31 août et du 10 septembre aux dits chanoines. Il est élu le 25 septembre, et dès le 28 le roi écrit au même chapitre pour le remercier de sa compréhension. Voir Couärd, 'Intervention royale dans l'élection d'Arthur Fillon.' In *Mém. soc. académ. de l'Oise* 11 (1882), p. 601; Picot, 38–40."

⁸⁶Briçonnet had been sent by the king to help elect and eventually to consecrate Fillon. See Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 181–182 and source in note 85.

⁸⁷Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 74 [28 September]; letter 78.1 [11 October]; letter 81.1 [22 October]; Marguerite thanked Montmorency—already an arbiter of prelacies—for helping with the election of Artus Fillon to the Bishopric of Senlis. Early the following year, 28 February 1523, Marguerite asked Montmorency to send her news of Artus Fillon's Lenten sermons and to be remembered to him, (Jourda,

when vetting candidates for prelacies. Fillon's *curriculum vitae* made him an eminently suitable candidate to serve as the leading example in any campaign for the selection of *bons pasteurs*. He had graduated first in his class from the Faculty of Theology in Paris (1504) and served as the vicar-general of the reforming Cardinals Georges I and II d'Amboise in the Archbishopric of Rouen in the 1510s. His *Speculum curatorum* (c. 1509), which was reprinted thirteen times to 1530 and used in the dioceses of conscientious bishops like Luigi Canossa, strengthened his reputation as a leading clerical reformer.⁸⁸

On the face of it, there would seem to have been enough about Fillon to please not just the likes of Briçonnet but even conservatives like Beda. Moreover, the court evidently saw in him a very useful prelate. Francis I's ministers had had their eye on him for some time. In 1519, royal officers reported favorably on Fillon's recommendations to the États-généraux of Normandy regarding royal taxes.⁸⁹

During his four year tenure, Fillon fulfilled the promise Briçonnet and Marguerite saw in him. He strove to improve religious life and training in his diocese. His 1522 statutes for Senlis (published in 1526) later served as a basis for those of Troyes (1529). He oversaw the reform of several monastic houses in Senlis and founded a school. He also composed for his clergy a treatise on administering the sacraments, *Tractatus de sacramentis ministrandis* (1522), and one on penance, *Tractatus de sacramento*

Répertoire, no. 100).

⁸⁸ For the following biographical information, see Farge, *Biographical Register*, no. 184, 165–167, and Saulnier 1977, notes to letter nos. 73 and 74, p. 207–209.

⁸⁹ Fillon sat in the États-généraux of Normandy as a representative from 1506–1522. *CAF* 5, 491, no. 17205: "...pour informer sur les propos tenus aux États de Normandie par Artus Fillon [Oct. 1519], 5

penitentie (1526), which was translated and reprinted twice in books of hours (1529 and 1537). In 1524 he paid for the publication of his diocese's Missal.⁹⁰ Like other doctors from the Faculty of Theology in Paris, he provided for religious causes in his will, leaving 1200 *livres* to the canons of Senlis for an obit mass, 200 to the *Hôtel Dieu*, 200 to the college for a house, and an unspecified sum to endow four scholarships at the College of Harcourt in Paris for students from Senlis and his home town of Verneuil.

Fillon's episcopacy provides a glimpse of what might have been had Briçonnet's proposals been followed. Though the crown nominated several other worthy prelates like him after the Concordat, in general most of its choices seem to have been no better qualified or reform-minded than under their predecessors, who were elected under the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. If anything pluralism increased.⁹¹ Lacking an effective governing body, the Gallican church had never and could never serve as a conduit for a national religious renewal without strong leadership from the crown. As it was, the diocesan reforms that did take place depended upon the qualities and inclinations of men who were placed in control of France's rich prelacies. Their reformist tendencies, however, were incidental to the reasons of state and patronage for which they were selected by the crown. Thus on into the Wars of Religion, while the majority of bishops

déc. 1519. Original de l'information faite par [Jean] Brinon."

⁹⁰ Moreau 3, no. 718.

⁹¹ In analyzing the impact of the Concordat, scholars have principally sought to answer two questions: Did the social background of prelates change and did pluralism increase or decrease? That prelates continued to be drawn from the elites, with perhaps a slight increased preference for noblemen of the sword over those of the robe, is, whether expected or not, rather beside the point that concerned late-medieval reformers as well as Briçonnet's generation: were prelates on the whole better or worse *pasteurs* after the Concordat? Edestein, Holt, and Baumgartner do not seem to get beyond the first two questions. Potter, Marc Venard, Nicole Le Maître, and Michel Veissière see evidence for an improving episcopacy in

and abbots certainly remained loyal to the Catholic church, collectively they offered no solutions to France's religious problems. Several top prelates were even able to side with the Evangelical and Protestant causes because of this lack of central control. Only late in the century, with the introduction of the reforms of Trent under royal patronage did pluralism cease and bishops see to effective changes in the parishes.

III. The Cold War Blazes Hot: May – December 1523

In this third phase of the Meaux group's career conservatives authorities in Paris waged a frontal assault against them in the name of extirpating heresy. Passing from the offensive to the defensive, the Meaux-Marguerite alliance came under new pressure that caused the first discord within the ranks. Conservatives exerted this pressure through judicial proceedings, public preaching, and a spate of anti-heresy books, which targeted the Meaux group and their adherents.⁹² Though Marguerite and Briçonnet were able to help muster royal protection, conservatives effectively curtailed their influence by fixing in the public's mind the frightening specter of royal support for heresy that the court had to dispel. Accordingly, since the conservatives' actions drove events, we need to concentrate on their attack and its impact, the better then to assess the evangelicals' response.

First, however, we should recall the conditions in which this episode unfolded.

the early part of the century.

⁹² When advising Louise later that summer, Beda reminded her that the Faculty had been waging a sweeping campaign against heresy for some time with "predications, disputations, livres, écrits, contre icelles doctrines, et autres actes Scholastiques soient à ce utiles, qu'il s'en fait chacun jour par les Supposts de notre Faculté" but that all these measures were not enough to stop the spread of heresy. See d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum* 2, pt. 1, p. 3.

Quite apart from the fray over heresy, those were wild times. Floods, frosts, hail storms, crop failures, price hikes, heavy new taxes, bandits, pestilence, Charles de Bourbon's treason, and above all the war with the Emperor rocked the lives of ordinary folk in a series of crushing calamities.⁹³ Though the population was not decimated by disease and war, dearth and dread afflicted everyone. If chroniclers did not see these events as apocalyptic signs, they certainly considered the times to be remarkably dire, and increasingly, following the lead of conservative clerics in Paris, they were coming to believe that the new religious ferment centered on the Meaux group was causing contemporary evils to reach a crescendo.⁹⁴

The Conservative Party's Attack

In May 1523, the conservatives' campaign against heresy opened when members of Parlement seized a rich cache of Lutheran books in the lodgings of a prominent

⁹³Four chroniclers from Paris tell much the same tale of woe: *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris sous le règne de François Premier (1515–1536)*, (as in note 37); Fernand Bournon, ed., *Chronique parisienne de Pierre Driart chambrier de Saint Victor (1522–1535)*, in *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île-de-France* 22 (1895); Georges Guiffrey, *Cronique du roy François Premier de ce nom*, (Paris: Renouard, 1860); Gustave Fagniez, ed., *Le livre de raison de Nicolas Versoris, avocat au Parlement de Paris (1515–1530)*, *Mémoires de la Société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Île-de-France* 12 (1885), 99–222; published as a separate off-print, (Paris, 1885), see esp. no. No. 163 [End of June 1524]: "En ce temps estoit tenu le reaulme de France avoir esté et estre persecuté de toutes les plaiez et persecutions que Dieu a acoustumé envoyer sur le peuple sur lequel il a l'indignation...[next follows a long list of curses]. Oultre, et qui pys est, survient l'erreur et venimeuse et dangereuse doctrine de Luter avec commotions, pilleries et mengeries de peuple, foulé de tous costé de tailles et larrecins de gens d'armes."

Two reporters, one from Metz, the other from Le Puy in Auvergne, recount similarly hard times during these war years. J.-F. Huguenin, ed., *Les Chroniques de la ville de Metz (900–1552)*, (Metz: S. Lamort, 1838). Augustin Chassaing, ed. *Le Livre de Podio ou chroniques d'Étienne de Médicis, bourgeois du Puy (Le Puy-en-Lay: M.-P. Marchessov, 1874)*.

⁹⁴Denis Crouzet has argued for the subsequent rise of apocalyptic fervor in France as a key factor in animating the blood-thirsty violence during the Wars of Religion. See, *Les guerriers de dieu*, as in chapter 1, n. [22]. The seeds of this development are apparent in the 1520.

nobleman-scholar and officer of the royal court, Louis de Berquin.⁹⁵ His library contained works by Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, and other ‘heretics,’ some of which he had translated, as well as other suspect works of his own device. On June 6, having been prompted by Pierre Lizet, Second President of the Parlement and leader of the conservatives there, the Doctors of the Theology initiated a sweeping inquisition against heretics and their works, which they pursued with vigor, even hardy courage, over the next six months.⁹⁶ In the inaugural session of June 6, they drew up a docket of cases for investigation including all the suspect works in Berquin’s library and, at Lizet’s petition, the sermons of Pierre Caroli and Martial Mazurier, two members of the Faculty who had been preaching at Meaux. As elaborated in the following meetings (15 – 19 June), the doctors intended to pursue what appeared to them as a heretical alliance linking Berquin and Meaux to Wittenberg. Scheduled for investigation were: Berquin’s manuscript defense of Luther, Lefèvre d’Étaples’ *Commentary on the Gospels*, the Meaux preachers’

⁹⁵ The principal sources for the conservative party’s 1523 heresy hunt are: Clerval *Registres*, pp. 354–425, esp. notes 18, 19, 35, 37, 51, and 60, pp. 415–422, which contain brief digests of the several concurrent investigations; and, for the Faculty’s final censures and related documents, d’Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum*, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 374–379 (‘Meaux’ articles), 403–404. (Anrould de Bronosse [Brouossio]), pp. 404–406 (Berquin), pp. 406–410 (Luther, Lutheran books, and Melanchthon); vol. 2, p. xi (Lefèvre and Berquin), p. xiii (Melanchthon), pp. xiv–xx (Luther and followers [Meaux group]), p. xx and p. 2 (correspondence with Louise of Savoy on combating heresy).

Important overviews of the 1523 Berquin investigation, which use additional sources, include: Nathaniel Weiss, “Lettre de la Sacrée Faculté de Théologie de Paris à Guillaume Petit, Évêque de Troyes, Confesseur du Roi, au Sujet de Berquin (1523)” *BSHPF* 53 (1904), 209–211; *idem*, “Louis de Berquin, son premier Procès et sa Rétractation d’après quelques Documents inédits (1523),” *BSHPF* 67 (1918), 162–183; Emile V. Telle, “Introduction,” to *Le Chevalier de Berquin, Declamation de louange de Mariage [1525]*, TLF 225 (Geneva: Droz, 1976), 3–112; Claude Longeon, ed., “Introduction” to *La Farce des Théologastres*, TLF 366, (Geneva: Droz, 1989), pp. 9–40; Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 170–178, and Imbart de la Tour, *Origines* 3, 196–202, 227–230.

⁹⁶ James Farge describes the Faculty’s new proceedings as an “unofficial inquisition,” see *Orthodoxy*, p. 169 and no. 37. Imbart de la Tour maintained essentially the same position, though he stressed more strongly than Farge that the “*parti intransigeant*” within the Faculty led by Beda surely dominated but did not represent all the doctors, *Origines* 3, pp. 225–235.

doctrines, as well as the works of Erasmus, Luther, and other unnamed Lutheran heretics represented in Berquin's library. The doctors had stocked a full fish-barrel to shoot at.

On through December, the Sorbonne ran through this agenda in a series of concurrent censure proceedings: Berquin (June – August), Lefèvre (June – August), translations of scripture, which targeted but did not name Lefèvre (August, October), Caroli and Mazurier (August – December), Luther and Melancthon (June, October), Erasmus (June, November), as well as, additionally, an Augustinian Doctor and member of the Faculty of Theology, Arnaud de Bronosse (July). Meanwhile conservative parliamentarians stood ready to prosecute heretics once the Faculty had passed theological sentence. For their part, on 23 November, conservatives in Parlement indicted an unconventional hermit associated with the Meaux group, Jean Guibert of Livry, on charges of claiming that the mass should be replaced with readings from the Bible, condemning prayers for the dead, and denouncing the custom of paying for masses.⁹⁷

Never before or after did the Faculty meet so often or with such single-minded purpose as during the period June through December 1523.⁹⁸ Why did conservatives pursue such strong, indeed frenetic action? Who was driving events, the heretics or those looking for them? These are crucial questions because their answers will largely shape our assessment of two issues: the pace and extent to which the Reformation progressed in

⁹⁷ Doucet, *Étude sur le gouvernement*, vol. 1, pp. 343–4, citing AN X2a 76, f. 3–14. The first proposition attributed to Guibert, namely that Bible-reading should replace the mass, resonates to a certain extent with Briçonnet's advice to Marguerite that she approach reading the Scriptures just like preparing to receive the host. Both dictums prescribe the substitution of the Scriptures for the sacrament of the Eucharist, in the first literally in the liturgy, in the second only by analogy. Both also elevate lay contemplation of the Scriptures and tend towards predicating correct participation in the sacrament upon fuller understanding of them. See note 103.

France in the early 1520s as well as the role of heresy proceedings in conservative Gallicans' ongoing struggle with the royal regime over the Concordat.

Opportunity, means, and motive: not just crimes, even judicial proceedings require them. As for opportunity, the seizure of Berquin's books provided conservatives with an open window through which to take aim against the leaders of what they saw with distress as a swelling crowd of heretics. Berquin's library brought together in microcosm the authors—Luther and Erasmus leading the way—and the ideas that conservatives had been maintaining were part of a common front uniting Lefèvre and his followers with 'Lutherans' abroad.

As for means, after being elected to the newly revived office of Syndic (1520), Noël Beda had secured the administrative powers within the Faculty, without which such a sustained and focused campaign could not have been waged.⁹⁹ When Pierre Lizet presented the Faculty of Theology with Berquin's heretical books, encouragement to hunt down heretics, and his promise of parliamentary support, conservatives had *de facto* the makings of show trial and *de jure* the religious authority and secular power needed to exploit the Berquin case as an opening for a wide-ranging campaign against other arch-heretics.¹⁰⁰

As for motive, conservatives had not been spurred to action in response to some stinging provocation by the '*novateurs*,' as they would be by the Placards in 1534.¹⁰¹ The

⁹⁸ See chapter 4, notes 7–9.

⁹⁹ Imbart de la Tour, *Origines* 3, 225–226.

¹⁰⁰ To proceed against those in orders, the Parlement required the further cooperation of an ecclesiastical judge, such as the Bishop of Paris in the case of Louis de Berquin.

¹⁰¹ Roget Doucet's assessment that the year 1523 marked a significant turning point in the early

Meaux group were hardly agitating the waters. Briçonnet and Marguerite had not been in contact since February because they had been stalled in pushing forward their agenda. Indeed, their collaboration only revived in June in direct response to the conservative faction's maneuvers. While Lefèvre's *Commentary on the Gospels* clearly irritated conservatives, the aggravation was of long-standing: it had been in print for over a year. Nor were the doctors reacting to advance news about his translation of the Gospels, which was published two days after Faculty's investigation began (June 8). While Marguerite had been anticipating its publication since January,¹⁰² only on 1 August, mere days after Marguerite had received her first copies (late July), did the doctors begin investigating the danger of new versions of the Bible in Latin and French. The Meaux group had seemingly attempted to conceal the existence of Lefèvre's translation from the Faculty—evidently with scant success—for when Marguerite sent a copy to her Aunt Philibert in late July, she warned her to guard lest it fall into evil hands. This remark only makes sense if the Gospels were not then for sale publicly and had not come to the attention of

'Reformation' in France is correct but not his claim that the *novateurs* were the protagonists. Rather conservatives, albeit nominally 'in reaction' to the "*novateurs*," escalated a conflict that clerical and political elites had previously waged among themselves over evangelicals' tempered reform program into a high-stakes public battle by successfully painting Evangelicals as revolutionary 'Lutheran' heretics: "La lutte cependant changeait de caractère: l'année 1523 nous montre *une recrudescence d'activité de la part des partisans des idées nouvelles, à laquelle les défenseurs de l'orthodoxie répondirent en modifiant leurs méthodes de répression.*" [Emphasis added] Doucet, *Étude sur le Gouvernement*, vol. 1, p. 335.

¹⁰² During the course of her biblical instruction by Lefèvre, Vatable, and Roussel via Briçonnet's letters (January 1523), Marguerite encouraged the Bishop to have their translation printed and distributed as soon as it was ready: "...suis contrainte, tant par ce que l'on m'a dict que l'expérience qui m'en donne la fièvre que avez eue, vous prier avoir regard que le travail que prenes d'apareiller [preparer, apprêter qqch.] la viande à voz brebis ne vous retarde (quant elle sera preste) la distribution. Car vous sçavez trop myeux que moy que sans sel n'y aura goust." Briçonnet *Correspondance*, no. 50, p. 15; (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 90).

the Faculty.¹⁰³ Finally, Caroli and Mazurier's preaching at Meaux can hardly have been causing great scandal (except to those like Lizet on the lookout for it) for contemporary journalists, who reported on heretical preaching of the "Lutherans of Meaux," in 1525 make no mention of their sermons in 1523. Just as telling, the Faculty had to create a special commission in order to gather evidence to sustain these charges, if not to gather a special commission in order to create evidence... as the Meaux group would later protest.

There is no evidence that Berquin had provoked the Sorbonne or Parlement. His response to the seizure of his library, however, may have irritated conservatives itching for a fight. By agreeing to have his books reviewed by the Faculty, he had accepted, at least in his own mind, a theological duel. Yet conservatives had not issued a challenge to debate but a summons to submit to censure. Given the content of Berquin's own writings, including an *Apologia* for Luther,¹⁰⁴ and his persistent attempts to refute the

¹⁰³ "Ma tante, au partir de Parys pour conduire le Roy, Mons^r. de Meaux m'envoya les Evangilles en françoys, translâtées par Fabry mot à mot, lesquelles il [Briçonnet] dist que devons lire en aussy grande révérence et préparacyon pour recevoir l'esperit de Dieu qu'il nous a lessé en sa S^{te} lectre comme quant nous l'alons recevoir sacramentalemant, et, pour ce que Mons^r de Vileroy m'a promys les vous faire tenir, j'ay bien voulu l'en prier, car ces paroles ne doivent point tomber en mauvaises mains, vous pryant, ma tante, que, si par elles Dieu vous fait quelque grace, que n'y veuillés oblîer, la plus que toute vostre bonne niepce et seur, MARGUERITE." Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaiglon, eds., *Heptaméron des Nouvelles de très illustre Princesse Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre*, 4 vols. (Paris: Eudes, 1880), vol. 4, pp. 185–187; 187, transcription with facsimile of ms letter.

¹⁰⁴ "Apologia... in cuius principio dicit ipse de Berquin auctor, esse quinquaginta octo folia, est Sedi Apostolicae contrarius, contumeliosus, sacris generalibus Consiliis planè derogans, Schismaticus atque perniciosam Lutheri haeresim manifestè afferens et dedendens." d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum* 1, part 2, p. 405A–B. Berquin's papers included over a dozen additional heretical works including several 'apologetic' compositions by Berquin, Latin tracts by Luther (e.g., *De Captivitate Babylonica* and *De abroganda Missa*), Melancthon (*Loci communes*), Carlstadt, et al., as well as Berquin's French translations of 'Lutheran' works, e.g., one described as "Liber ... continens rationes propter quas Lutherus Decretales caeterosque Juris Canonici libros igni publicè tradidit," which was probably a translation of Luther's *Quare papae et discipulorum eius libri combusti sint* (1520) WA 7, 154, 157, Hutten's *La Tyrade Romaine* [*Trias Romana*], and Erasmus' *Le Paradis du Pape Jule* [*Julius exclusus*]. The latter work had been published at Paris circa 1518 by Jean de Gourmont, see Brigitte Moreaux, "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'*Epistola Luciferi*," 343–359; 346; n. 32, p. 351. For the

doctors and lawyers reviewing his case, he plainly hoped to prove that one could follow Luther and other *novateurs* a long way without falling into heresy.¹⁰⁵

Rather than a riposte to flagrant provocation, the conservatives' campaign began as a calculated maneuver predicated on encouraging signals from the royal court and Parlement that indicated the time was ripe to snuff out the leading lights of all those whom they lumped together as Lutheran heretics. During the previous Lenten season, as we know from a letter from Marguerite to Anne de Montmorency, Louise of Savoy attended the sermons of Guillaume Petit.¹⁰⁶ Evidently, the king's confessor, who was also Bishop of Troyes, had regained whatever favor he may have lost by denouncing d'Arande a few months earlier.¹⁰⁷ On 29 April, in the wake of the court's patronage of his sermons, Petit appeared before his cathedral chapter with a mandate from the king "to refute and exterminate a great many errors, foreign to the orthodox faith, which are spreading throughout France, ... of a certain Master Martin Luther of Saxony."¹⁰⁸ Louise's favor and this royal order could have only been welcome news to conservatives:

identification of some of these titles see, Weiss, "Louis de Berquin," 169–170.

¹⁰⁵ "Berquin ... a dit qu'il ne veult empescher que ceux de la Faculté ne les [his books] voyent, mais il a requis qu'il soit présent pour les lire et donner à entendre à quelle fin tout a esté fait, à ce que, par faute d'estre bien advertis, on ne puisse calomnier ce qu'il a fait, ou y adjouter et varier," AN X1A 1525, f. 203v cited by Weiss, "Louise de Berquin, son premier procès," p. 167. Émile Telle argues persuasively that like other evangelicals Berquin admired Luther's thought, but not his ways, *Declamation*, pp. 18–30, esp. pp. 20 and 24–6 and n. 21, citing Berquin's defense of Luther's views of faith and works in letter to Erasmus, 31 October 1528, Allen 7, no. 2066, p. 525, ll. 68–74. Cf. Imbart de la Tour's assessment, 201–202.

¹⁰⁶ Dated March 1523, see Génin 1, no. 7, 153–5 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 102).

¹⁰⁷ Petit was, as noted above, a moderate Catholic and a chief supporter of 'Erasmian' biblical humanism at Court, and had not appreciated the personal consequences of their heavy-handed swatting at d'Arande. Nevertheless, the Faculty of Theology considered him sympathetic enough to their fight against the 'Lutheran' heresy to appeal for his intervention at court from then into the next decade. See Farge, 155, 254–256.

¹⁰⁸ Imbart 3, 208–209, citing A.D. Aube, G. 1282, *Delib. capitul.*, f. 4 (29 April 1523). Petit's anti-heresy commission thus coincided with Briçonnet's first revocation of preachers' licenses in Meaux.

the court had taken a turn to the religious 'right.'¹⁰⁹

Within days of Petit's proclamation the Parlement of Paris ordered the bookshops of Paris to be inspected. For unknown reasons, the royal prosecutor pursued his investigation into Berquin's private study, perhaps having following a paper trail from the print shop to his door.¹¹⁰ The discovery of his suspect works was signaled at Parlement on May 13, which ordered them to be examined by the Faculty of Theology, thus launching a summer season of heresy hunting.

Defensive Maneuvers and Battle Results

In the judicial cut and thrust of the next months, conservatives carried their attack forward, while the royal court parried blows from falling on their *protégés*. Several scholars have provided able accounts of individual skirmishes between the court and the alliance of the Sorbonne and Parlement during that six-month contest.¹¹¹ Here, we want

¹⁰⁹ Heller and others argue that French policy was still hostile to Rome during the summer of 1523, during which time the court threatened the Pope with the specter of giving further support to the 'novateurs.' As all scholars note, Francis I did not feel the need to coordinate his domestic religious policy with the image of it that he tried to project abroad (e.g., his crackdown after the Placards and simultaneous wooing of the Protestant princes in 1534–1535). In any case, in dealing with Rome in 1523, the specter of heresy was but one potential and rather weak arm in Francis' diplomatic arsenal, which included marching on Italy, setting up a rival Pope, or, most effective and most to the liking of Gallican sentiment at home, the threat of stopping the flow of gold to the curia. It was precisely the latter menace that Adrian VI feared in the summer of 1523. See Heller, "Panorama religieux," in *Correspondance*, p. 7–9.

¹¹⁰ The Faculty of Theology suspected that Berquin was readying some of his writings and translations of 'heretical' works for publication. Their condemnation, addressed to Parlement, alludes to this likelihood: "Demum cum proximis diebus viri cuiusdam nobilis Ludovici de Berquin codices quidam scripti et libri ad vestram curiam essent delati, quod per illos ipse diceretur perversa Lutheri dogmata iam dudum damnat instaurare ac defensare, necnon in linguam vernaculam illa transferendo, aut in illarum approbationem sermone Gallico novos libros edendo..." d'Argentré 2, xii, col. A. Berquin may already have been on the conservatives' hit list for his criticisms of the doctors during their censure hearings on Luther (1518–1521) as well as his publication of a lost satirical tract, see Weiss, "Louis de Berquin, son premier procès," 166–167, and Telle, *Declamation*, 22–23.

¹¹¹ See Clerval, *Registres*, as per note 95; the Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 130–131, 169–170; Imbart, *Origines* 3, 223–235; and Weiss, "Louis de Berquin, son premier procès."

to demonstrate that while by no means the only figures involved, Marguerite and Guillaume Briçonnet played leading roles in orchestrating the court's response.

Taking stock, we know that the court intervened on behalf of Berquin, Lefèvre, Arnaud de Bronosse, and Erasmus, as well as during the censure hearings on new translations of the Scriptures. The court effectively quashed all these investigations, except the one against Arnaud de Bronosse. As a member of the Faculty, he was fully within its jurisdiction. Queen Claude and her almoner, who was Bronosse's superior in the order, were only able to diminish the severity of his forced retraction.¹¹² When the court did not intervene, as in the investigations of Luther, Melanchthon, Caroli, and Mazurier, as well as the trial against Jean Guibert, conservatives handed down speedy convictions. The books of the declared German heretics were beyond redemption despite Berquin's best efforts. They were condemned and burned on a pyre whose flames he was meant to share on 8 August 1523. Caroli and Mazurier, again both doctors subject to the discipline of the Faculty, were sentenced to retract the positions ascribed to them; Guibert was condemned to be enclosed in a monastery. While Mazurier accepted his sentence, over the next several years Caroli and the Hermit appealed their convictions. With help from Marguerite and other friends, Caroli kept his freedom and Jean Guibert was eventually absolved.¹¹³

We can see the hands of Briçonnet and Marguerite pulling the strings that led to the court's successful intervention. First, it is clear and striking that their correspondence

¹¹² Clerval, *Registres*, 368–370, 417 n. 35.

¹¹³ See chapter 8 below for Marguerite's long campaign in support of Caroli, and the use to which

revived in early June 1523 in frantic response to the Sorbonne's campaign.¹¹⁴ In the first letter, Briçonnet quipped a hurried and excited reply to news about the Sorbonne's investigation, encouraging the court to take firm action:

Madame, by letter of M. the Protonotary [Bourdailles], I know the concern that you and your mother have for our Lord's affair. He [God] is a gentleman [lit. *gentil homme*] and will not be without a fitting reply, by enflaming your ardor for Him.... Having been grieved that He has been offended without having given offense, you ought to give thanks to Him that He has decided in and through you to lead back those poor erring souls from their blind ignorance to knowledge of Him! That such people should complain! I implore you, pray for them and all their ilk that they turn to face the sun and be illuminated.¹¹⁵

the network put news of Guibert's acquittal.

¹¹⁴ In a poor editorial decision the editors have obscured the clear interruption of Marguerite and Briçonnet's correspondence in February and its sudden revival in June. For this new phase in their correspondence, the first letter in their edition, numbered 56 is actually found transcribed after letter 58 in the manuscript. The editors agree with Becker that this no. 56 interrupts the responsive links between letters 58 and 59 where it falls in the manuscript and is thus misplaced. These three letters and two more (nos. 57 and 60) are all undated and come before no. 61, which is dated June 24 in the manuscript. Now 57, the first of this series in the manuscript is obviously an immediate response to the breaking crisis of the heresy investigations, which opened on 6 June. Letter 56, which refers to two lost letters from Marguerite (Briçonnet, *Correspondance*, nos. 56A and 56B) is a digression on the theme of "repos en Dieu" and contains no obvious references to events or to liturgy for June to justify putting it before no. 57. The only concrete bit of data in letter 56 is the conveyance of Artus Fillon's regards to Marguerite. Fillon and Briçonnet were indeed together working for the defense of the evangelicals in Paris during 'mid-June' (see below). This is an additional fact that makes the decision to place no. 56 before 57 not just arbitrary but wrong-headed. Letter 56 should be retained, as indicated by the manuscript's order, at some indeterminate time after their correspondence recommenced (thus after no. 57) for two reasons: First, because the mention of Fillon probably puts the letter circa June 16–18, when he was active with Briçonnet in Paris overseeing the Faculty's dealings; and Second, because Briçonnet also mentions lost letters by Marguerite in letter 58, just as he does in no. 56, indicating their close proximity: ("...comme par sa grace saignement en et par luy escirpvez, Madame,..." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, p. 40). Thus letter 56 should be considered a witness to other missives from Marguerite during this highly charged period, instead of, as per the editors, during Lent. Her letters, like the Protonotary's lost letters on behalf of Marguerite (mentioned in letter 57, see below), formed part of the same frenetic exchange.

¹¹⁵ "Madame, par lettres de Monsieur le prothonotaire, ay entendu la sollicitude de Madame et de vous pour l'affaire de nostre Seigneur. Il est gentil homme et ne sera sans revanche [*revanche*, revenge or a reply to an accusation] acroissant son feu en voz coeurs, ... Que devez, en ennuy de ce qu'il est offensé sans offencer, le mercier qu'il luy plaist, en et par vous, reduire à sa congnoissance la cecité des pauvres esgaréz! Que ceulz sont à plaindre! Lesquelz et tous leurs semblables vous supplie avoir en voz prieres à ce qu'ilz se retournent au soleil pour estre illuminéz, sans oublier, s'il vous plaist, le capitaine des aveugles et indignes ministres, Vostre inutil filz." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 57, p. 38–39 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 107). The editors sensibly follow Becker's intuition that this letter refers to the Faculty of Theology's

While seeing the Sorbonne's investigation as an attack on their efforts to promote the Gospel, Briçonnet described God as the chief victim, who would inspire Marguerite to avenge him. In describing God as a *gentil homme* the bishop was also alluding to the one through whose injury He had been offended, namely Berquin, who was in contemporary social terminology precisely a *gentilhomme*, a member of the *petit noblesse*.¹¹⁶

More broadly, however, *l'affaire de Dieu* connoted the need to counter the whole scope of the Sorbonne's investigation. Briçonnet and Marguerite were key links in organizing the royal court's early, tone-setting action. On June 16, in only the Faculty's third meeting, Beda carefully noted the presence of one of Briçonnet and Marguerite's close associates, Artus Fillon, whom the Syndic evidently considered to be a hostile observer: "nevertheless" (*tamen*), he reported, the Faculty proceeded with the business of dividing up Berquin's books for review and condemning his *De usu et efficacia missae*.¹¹⁷ Beda's suspicions were well grounded. Two days later, the Faculty received a summons from the royal Chancellor, Antoine Duprat, to send representatives to hear the king's pleasure. The following day, the Chancellor received the Faculty's delegates flanked by an episcopal commission comprised of trusted prelates: the Archbishop of

inquest against Lefèvre, Berquin, and Erasmus. They fail to realize that "Monsieur le prothonotaire," whom Briçonnet and Marguerite frequently mention thereafter as a go-between, is Marguerite's almoner "le prothonotaire Bourdailles," Lefranc, *Comptes*, 1524, p. 59; cf. Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 8.

¹¹⁶ Both the Bourgeois and Versoris name him "gentilhomme": Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 169–170; Versoris, no. 119, p. 34–35. *Dictionnaire du moyen français* for social connotation of the term.

¹¹⁷ "Die Martis [16.VI.1523] fuit sacra Facultas congregata insequendo conclusiones prius factas super examinandis variis doctrinis, de quibus fiebant graves querimonie et oriebantur plura scandala, quale dicebatur esse scriptum magistri Jacobi Fabri super euvangeliiis et quedam Erasmi opera et cuiusdam nomine de Berquin. Et illi congregationi affuit reverendus dominus episcopus Silvanecectensis magister Arthurus Fillon, doctor eiusdem Facultatis. Materiis autem in medium positis et discussis,..." [emphasis added] 16 June 1523, Clerval, *Registre*, p. 356–357; 356. *De usu et efficacia missae* was the last book listed among those deemed to be a composition by Berquin, see d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum* 1, part 2,

Sens, Étienne Poncher, as well as Bishops Artus Fillon, Guillaume Briçonnet, and Michel Boudet of Langres.¹¹⁸ Duprat informed the delegates that the king would permit the Faculty to review but not to censure Lefèvre d'Étaples' works and instructed them to send suspect articles to the episcopal commission for judgment. Answering Petit's denunciation of the previous fall, Duprat told the doctors that Michel d'Arande—now clearly designated as Marguerite's almoner—whose investigation they were perhaps planning to reopen, rightfully wore the garb of the secular clergy since he was no longer an Augustinian Friar and that they should leave him in peace.¹¹⁹

Meanwhile, Berquin was challenging the Faculty in similar style, but with more aggressive intent. Instead of adopting the usual procedural stalling tactics available to reluctant defendants, Berquin demanded quick justice. He could be confident in seeking this encounter since friends at court were covering, perhaps scripting, his every maneuver. On June 15 and again on June 26, he presented letters from Francis I to the Faculty authorizing the doctors to extract articles from Berquin's books in order to show him where they believed he had gone wrong, but in no case to pass sentence.¹²⁰ As with Lefèvre, they were instructed to send suspect articles to Chancellor Duprat and the episcopal commission for their judgment. With no small amount of *sang froid*, the Faculty ignored the king's letter and sped his case to Parlement for trial the next day. The

p. 405A–B; vol. 2, p. x–xiii.

¹¹⁸ See Clerval, *Registre*, 358. Boudet very likely had biblical humanist interests since he was the recipient in 1519 of a dedication by Nicolas Bérault, a close friend of Berquin and the future preceptor of Morelet du Museau, Étienne Dolet, Melchior Wolmar, and the Coligny brothers. See Telle, *Déclamation*, p. 16. See further, M. de la Garanderie, "Bérault," in *CE* 1, 126–128.

¹¹⁹ Clerval, *Registre*, 358–359.

¹²⁰ Both letters were discovered and published by Weiss in "Louis de Berquin, son premier

same scenario of Berquin seeking to debate only to be rebuffed and condemned repeated itself in Parlement. On 5 August, as his case was being pushed on through to the Bishop of Paris' court (Berquin had minor orders) Francis I had to send in a company of archers to take him into safe custody and enforce the evocation of his case to the Grand Council. As the '*Bourgeois de Paris*' related, "The king did this to save him, since otherwise he would have been in grave danger of being sentenced to death, for he certainly merited it."¹²¹

As these events were unfolding, Briçonnet and Marguerite began corresponding at a feverish pace. Between the Faculty's sessions on 6 June and 24 June, the date of Francis I's second letter on behalf of Berquin, they exchanged at least nine missives, six of which survive.¹²² In these highly allusive letters, we find Briçonnet sending Artus Fillon's greetings to Marguerite as well as battle plans to the court via her almoner, asking her to recommend them to the king.¹²³ He was emboldened to make these recommendations after hearing Francis speak encouragingly about the need to manage "those who presume and delude themselves that they have the key of divine knowledge,"

procès." 168–169 and 172–173.

¹²¹ "Au dict an 1523, le samedy, huictiesme aoust, furent bruslez plusieurs livres, par l'autorité de la cour de Parlement, devant la grande église Nostre-Dame de Paris, qu'avoit faict un gentilhomme, nommé Loys Barquin, seigneur du dict lieu, en Picardie, qui estoit grand clerc; mais il estoit luthérien; lequel avoit esté prisonnier à la conciergerie du Palais à Paris, et depuis rendu à l'evesque de Paris, comme clerc. Et fut ce faict pour les dictz livres estant hérétiques et maulvais contre Dieu et sa glorieuse mère. Depuis fut prisonnier quelque temps à la cour d'église, néanmoins il en fut mis hors de par le Roy, qui estoit près de Meleun, et s'en alloit de là les montz; lequel il envoya quérir par son cappitaine, Frédéric, des archers de sa garde; et fit ce le Roy pour luy saulver la vie, car aultrement il eust esté en grand danger de sa personne d'estre mis à mort par justice, car il l'avoit bien gaigné." Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 169–170:

¹²² See note 114 above.

¹²³ "La lumiere je quiers et serche, pour tenebres chasser, que vous supplie très-humblement, Madame, comme indigne ministre, voulloir procurer vers Madame, à la fin que j'escriptz plus amplement à Monsieur le prothonotaire [Bourdailles], qu'il vous plaira ouÿr." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 56, pp.

the doctors of theology of Paris.¹²⁴ In return, Marguerite reported the good news that when the king and their mother read his letter they had “tears in their eyes”—the power of his letters endures to this day—and praised his mystical, literary style but did not forget Briçonnet’s practical intent with regard to events.¹²⁵ Yet, in closing, Marguerite warned him that because of their worldly preoccupations her mother and brother were still “too green”—a direct reference to the terms Briçonnet used to announce of the royals’ rejection of their reform proposals at the end of 1522—to be enflamed by their program for the reform of the Church.¹²⁶

Reminiscent of her attempt in September 1522, Marguerite was again trying to use Briçonnet’s letters and immediate events as an opening through which she might lead the other members of the royal trinity from protecting evangelicals to promoting their reform agenda. While Briçonnet continued requesting her guidance and help at court over the next month,¹²⁷ Marguerite kept refocusing him on the goal of convincing Francis and

35–38 (Jourda, *Répertoire* nos. 106).

¹²⁴ In good Briçonnetian style, he writes: “Ayant hier, Madame, en la bouche du Roy oÿ propos selon son nom très-chrestien (dont loué soit le Pere de lumiere, qui les tenebres de nature humaine par lumiere filiale a illuminé) a esté d’une part joieulx et consolé, voyant la superexcellente divine bonté se cascher de ceulx qui presument et cuident avoir la clef de la sapience divine, de laquelle estantz excludz n’y permectent aultres entrer, et luire ès coeurs humbles se confiant de la seulle douceur et misericorde, et d’aultres part lermoyent que telz dons de grace d’Esperit de Dieu soit noyé en la mer de tribulacions et occupacions du monde, que l’Ennemy luy suscite, prevoyant le fruict que nostre Seigneur par son ministre pourroit avoir.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 58, p. 41 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 110).

¹²⁵ “non n’a mis les sens en oubly.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 59, p. 44 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 111).

¹²⁶ “Aidez, s’il vous plaist, par prieres que ceste grace en nous ne soit par nous sterile et soufflez souvent ce divin feu pour nous enflammer, et attizez le bois encoires vert, à force d’occasions.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 59, p. 44 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 111).

¹²⁷ On 1 July 1523, Briçonnet wrote asking her for further marching orders: “Vous suppliant très-humblement qu’il vous plaise ordonner de voz prisonniers volontaires et leur commander vostre vouloir, comme vous plaira plus amplement entendre de Monsieur le prothonotaire.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 62, p. 52 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 116). By this date, while Lefèvre and d’Arande had been protected, the Berquin case had just moved ominously to Parlement and the Sorbonne was then turning to a new round

Louise ‘to spread the gospel light’ and increase its ‘miraculous catch’ of the Church. On 24 June, despite some unspecified dangers at court, Marguerite called for Briçonnet to come “set free the word of life, which so many want to imprison.”¹²⁸ By late July, such plans were dropped since the time was again not opportune. As Francis I readied to depart from Paris to join his armies in the south, Briçonnet offered very cautious advice on avoiding the issue of reform: prayers for the war effort should be ordered throughout the kingdom and the king should not lead his armies personally lest evil befall him and his kingdom, “embanked by enemies,” be thrown into total chaos.¹²⁹ As for domestic religious affairs, he proposed nothing, merely urging Marguerite to continue being a ‘shining lantern’ to those who “have come to evangelical understanding,” in other words, to continue safeguarding the movement at court, while waiting for favorable circumstances to advance it.¹³⁰

of investigations against their fellow doctors Bronosse and Caroli, see Clerval, *Registres*, 361–264, dates 26 June – 1 July, 1523.

¹²⁸ “Parquoy plus je regarde ce qu’il luy plaist par vostre lettre me administrer et plus j’ay cause d’oublier mon peril en sa seureté et ne regarder que à sa dignation.... Et sy avez tant pris de poisson que nous en avez icy ung petit departy, encoires fault il parachever par une voix. Mais premier fault puriffier les vaisseaulx. Parquoy vous renvoye le vostre, affin que vueillez venir mectre en liberté la parolle de vie que tant veullent emprisonner. Mais j’espere que la verité qui nous delivre nous delivrera.” Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 60, p. 51 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 115). Notably, the attempt to imprison ‘the word of life’ must at that date refer not to Lefèvre’s translations of the New Testament, which would only be investigated in late July, but to the trials of Lefèvre, Berquin, et al. as well the books in Berquin’s library.

¹²⁹ Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 64, p. 56–57 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 118).

¹³⁰ Two related spiritual themes run throughout Marguerite and Briçonnet’s letters of June and July (Briçonnet, *Correspondance*, nos. 59–64): the growth of the church, under the trope of the several miraculous catches of fish mentioned in the New Testament, as well as the nature of the Gospel light, which, lodged in human lanterns, occasions its growth. Accordingly, speaking through these metaphors, Briçonnet advises, “Je rendz graces à Dieu, souveraine lumiere, qui vous a inspirée sy oportune visitacion, plus utile que ne cuidez, suppliant le seul necessaire, qui ne faict rien en vain, vous estre pour loyer accroissement de grace et tellement illuminer vostre lanterne qu’elle soit tousjours sur le candelabre pour exemplartité de vie et lumiere à ceulx qui viennent à congoissance evangelicque, à ce que à chascun la voiant loue la sublimité de la puissance divine, ayant en son vaisseau fictile logé telle amplitude de lumiere qu’il soubztraict de ceulx qui de soy poursuivent de leurs oeuvres, se cachant des saiges et se

By the time Francis I left in late July, Marguerite and Briçonnet had managed because of the king's close proximity to Paris, to muster a robust defense against the conservatives' attacks. Their ultimate goal of enticing Francis and Louise to back their positive plans to combat the conservatives and renew the Church was thwarted as war preparations increasingly preoccupied the court.

Battling in Public, Battling for the Public

On 23 July 1523, after having invoked the support of God and Parisians, Francis I left the capital to campaign against the Emperor's forces in the south.¹³¹ With the king safely away, conservatives used the court's very success in protecting 'heretics' as a powerful lever to move public opinion against royal policy. At first in the halls of the University and the Parlement, then from the pulpits of Paris, and even more broadly, if more circumspectly, via print to all of Europe, members of the Faculty of Theology in Paris depicted the royal court, and more particularly the ladies in it, as fomenters of heresy and heresy as the root of France's calamities. The broad sweep and heavy impact of this attack has not yet been realized.

By calling into question the very religious legitimacy of Francis I's regime, conservatives successfully forced the court to run up the flag of orthodoxy, lest they lose popular support, but could not bring it to back the full-scale 'reign of terror' that they

communicquant aux petitz." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 64, for the quotation p. 55 and further, 57–59 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 118).

¹³¹ In order to attract divine and human blessing, Francis participated in public prayers, processions, and a special ceremony in which the most sacred relics of St. Denis were placed on the high altar where they were to remain for the duration of the Hapsburg war. See Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, p. 201.

specifically intended.¹³²

During the course of their oft frustrated and menaced investigations in the summer of 1523, conservatives became convinced that female courtiers, Marguerite leading the way, were the chief protectors of heretics at court.¹³³ Guillaume Petit had given good grounds for such a view the previous fall when he denounced d'Arande's heretical preaching to the ladies at court. In the summer of 1523, that d'Arande was now Marguerite's almoner clearly implicated her as a leading supporter of the heretics at court.¹³⁴

Just then, leading intransigents on the Faculty were preaching in Paris against the court's tyranny and support of heretics. Drawing on long-standing, and recently burgeoning, popular discontent with the regime, these defenders of the faith blamed France's multiple calamities on the court's heretical leanings. The basis of popular discontent was financial and dated back to the beginning of Francis' reign. In 1516, the king and his courtiers had several actors from Paris thrown into jail for parodying the

¹³² In 1525, once the Doctors had achieved their goal, Hangest crowed "Partout où ce régime de terreur a été établi, grâce au Christ, il n'est plus, dans le royaume très chrétien, d'homme qui ose professer le luthéranisme ou affirmer ouvertement les erreurs de Luther." Dedicatory epistle to Louis de Bourbon, quoted in translation, Imbart, *Origines* 3, 210–211.

¹³³ Marguerite appeared quite orthodox to some up until circa July 1522 (date of privilege) when Jacques de Mortières, Chaplain for Châlon-sur-Saône, saw fit to dedicate to her his translation of Battista Spagnuoli's *Parthenice Mariane* (Lyon, Claude Nourry and Jean Besson, 22 October 1523). This work is a thoroughly traditional piece of Marian piety, perhaps distinguished only by its considerable zeal for the Mother of God and the benefits she confers. Mortières, who seems not to have known Marguerite personally, explains that he has been so hardy as to dedicate the work to her because he believes her to be especially devoted to Mary (a4v). Paris, Bibl. École des Beaux Arts, Masson 764. BnF Numérisé N053587 (may be downloaded as image file from the BnF web site, WWW.BnF.fr).

¹³⁴ See the record of Duprat's interview of 19 June 1523 with representatives of the Faculty, Clerval, *Registres*, 359. Beda continued to view Marguerite as a leading champion of the heretics. At some point after her marriage to Henry d'Albret (Jan. 1527), when reviewing the events of 1523, he annotated the Faculty's censure of Lefèvre of that fall: "La Roine de Navarre, sœur du roi François [supp]ortoît M. Jacques Faber." *ibid.*, xxii.

regent, Louise of Savoy, in a play. They portrayed a stock comic character, Mother Mayhem/Dame Dotty (*mère Sotte*), as a queen running the court, taxing, pillaging, and robbing everything and everyone in sight.¹³⁵ In 1522, to the anger of Parisians, the king treated several parliamentarians to the same summary royal justice for suggesting that taxes were being embezzled by the king's officers.¹³⁶ The people of Paris had good reason to be scandalized, for Francis I set up a royal commission to investigate his financial ministers in 1523.¹³⁷

In the summer of 1523, the conservatives' criticism of the court for fomenting heresy fit part and parcel with popular discontent over its fiscal and administrative mismanagement. The court recognized this connection, for when forbidding the Faculty of Theology to proceed with their heresy investigations against Lefèvre and d'Arande,

¹³⁵ "Au dict an [1516], en décembre, furent menez prisonniers devers le Roy, à Amboyse, troys prisonniers de Paris, joueurs de farce; c'est à sçavoyr Jacques le Bazochin, Jehan Seroc et maistre Jehan du Pontalez; lesquelz estoient liez et enferrez et furent ainsy menez à Amboyse. Et ce fut à cause qu'ilz avoient joué des farces à Paris, de seigneurs; entre autres choses, que *mère Sotte* gouvernoit en cour, et qu'elle tailloit, pilloït et desroboit tout; dont le Roy et madame la Régente advertiz furent fort courroucez. Parquoy furent envoyez querir, par douze archers du prévost de l'hostel du Roy, enferrez et liez et menez à Bloys prisonniers." Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 44.

¹³⁶ "Le troysiesme dud. mois de novembre [1522], maistre Robert Turquan, maistre Loys Segulier, maistre [André] Verjus, tous consilliers, hommes de grantz vertuz et d'extimacion, furent de l'auctorité et mandement du Roy, lors estant logé chez mons. Mesgret, et la Royne et madame, menéz et constituéz prisonniers à la Bastille. La cause et motif fust que parce que vertueusement et prudemment ilz avoient remonstré à la court (lors mons. le chancellier present et envoyé de par le Roy pour adviser et trouver maniere pour de rechief avoir argent) que l'on devoit adviser que l'on faisoit des deniers du Roy et à quoy il estoit employez et qu'il avoit gros revenu, et neanmoins que d'icelluy n'estoit fait aucune chose pourfitable pour le reaulme et la chose publique, et que partant il estoit à inferer que ses deniers ou la plus grant partie d'iceulx estoient mis et emploiez es bource et pourfictz particuliers. Oy ce, mons. le chancellier et aultres maistres des requestes, ses coadherens monstrerent presentement signe evident qu'il n'estoient de ce contant et led. jour en firent le rapport au Roy et à madame la Regente, qui de ce courroucée ordonna lesd. Consilliers estre menez à la Bastille, non sans grant irritation et commotion de peuple." Versoris, p. 26, no. 92.

Circa 1523, the king threw several printers and poets into prison for publishing offensive satires contained whose titles explicitly link the secular and spiritual troubles of the realm: *Le monde sans croix*, *Le Monde qui n'a plus que frire*, *Le Monde qui est crucifié*, etc. See Émile Picot, *Sotties* 3, 299–300.

¹³⁷ See chapter 5.

Duprat also chastised them for criticizing royal government, notably by having students debate what should happen when a king, government, royal power, or other great persons were reckoned to be the cause of chaos within the realm.¹³⁸

Further implicating the royal regime in heresy, when Berquin narrowly escaped from the stake in early August, the word about town was that he had been saved because his friends had intervened with “powerful ladies” at court.¹³⁹ Under this euphemism, Marguerite, Louise, and, perhaps other women close to Francis I, like Philiberte de Nemours, were implicated in championing a man already condemned in popular opinion as a Lutheran heretic.¹⁴⁰

Similarly, on 8 August, while he was liberating Berquin, Captain Frederic asked the Parlement on behalf of the king to prosecute Dom Guillaume Josse, a member of the Faculty of Theology.¹⁴¹ Evidently he had been slandering of the court in his sermons, for

¹³⁸ “... regem non bene accipere quedam acta et attentata per Facultatem, ut dicebat [Duprat]. Primo ipsa Facultas divulgari fecerat et publice disputari unam propositionem in scolis collegii Navarre, ubi in multis et rex et eius regimen atque regnum seditiose taxaretur et cum aliis quibusdam personis generosis.” Clerval, *Registres*, 358.

¹³⁹ “Quant au regard de quelque gentil homme, nommé Barquin, ... prins fust de par la court, et, combien que jà fust son procès fait et en grant dangier de sa persone, par oucuns de ses amys estant en court et ayans credit et auctorité envers aucunes dames de grant estat et poteste, requis fust du chancelier et finalement renvoyé au grant conseil.” *Versoris*, no. 119, p. 34–35.

¹⁴⁰ Crediting Berquin’s salvation to the ladies at court had to be the product of the rumor mill, since the Parliamentary registers and other chroniclers only record that the king officially evoked his case of his own will, *proprio motu*, but do not indicate who had influenced his decision. “Du samedi, VIIle jour d’aoust. Ce jour la court, en ensuivant l’arrest par elle donné, a rendu et rend à l’evesque de Paris present et acceptant maistre Loys Berquin, constitué prisonnier par ordonnance d’icelle pour, appelléz avec luy deux des conseillers de lad. court et aucuns docteurs en theologie, luy faire son proces sur les cas à luy imposez. Et depuis est venu en la court la capitaine Frederic, a presenté à lad. court unes lettres patentes dud. seigneur [Francis I] données le v^e jour de ce moys, par lesquelles lad. seigneur *proprio motu* a évoqué à luy et en son grand conseil le procès touchant led. Berquin.” Registers of the Parlement of Paris, AN X1a 1525, f. 330 v., cited in *Versoris*, no. 119, p. 34–35, note 2. The *Bourgeois* of Paris only mentions the king as Berquin’s savior. See note 121.

¹⁴¹ “Aussi a dit [Capitaine Frederic] que le Roy luy avoit donné charge dire à lad. court qu’il vouloit que le procès de frere Josse fust fait. A quoy luy a esté respondu que la court n’en a eu aucune

the following February, Francis I again sent in Captain Frederic and his archers to arrest Josse for his persistent 'seditious' preaching. Josse's sermons and imprisonment created a broad public sensation duly recorded by all contemporary chroniclers.¹⁴² Pierre Driart, the *Chambrier* of the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris, commented that after Josse's arrest the people felt it was no longer possible to preach the truth about the evil of Francis' government.¹⁴³ In September 1523, another hoary doctor, Guillaume Duchesne (Quercus), who had an international reputation as leader of the intransigents in the Faculty, had been preaching from the pulpit of St. Victor that the evils besetting the realm were due to the free rein of Luther's adherents.¹⁴⁴ Not only did Josse and Duchesne's views reflect those of most of the Faculty, but they and their colleagues had successfully

charge, et parce que on dit que l'evesque de paris ou son official en a eu charge, la court s'enquerra qu'il y a esté faict. Et s'il plaist au Roy que la court en prenne congnoissance, qu'il face ceans envoyer les charges et informacions pour, ycelles veues, y proceder ainsi qu'il appartiendra par raison." AN X1a 1525, f. 330v cited in *Versoris*, no. 119, p. 34–35, note 2.

¹⁴² Josse had been slurring royal government for several years: "En la dicte année[1524], le lundy dernier jour de février, fut prins prisonnier par commandement du Roy, un religieux de l'ordre Saint-Benoist, nommé Jean [Guillaume] Josses, docteur en théologie; et fut prins par le capitaine, Frédéric et ses archers de la garde du Roy, ... et estoit le commun bruict que le Roy l'avoit faict prendre, parce que, en icelle année et aultres précédentes, il parloit aucunes choses contre l'honneur du Roy et de la police mauvaise qui estoit au Royaume; après il fut mis en la Conciergerie prisonnier où il fut." Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 187–188. Though the reason for Josse's arrest was not clear to even the best informed, it certainly upset the people. *Versoris*, an advocate at the Parlement, reports, p. 43, No. 139: "La cause de son emprisonnement ne just sceuee, mais le peuple ne fust content de son emprisonnement."

¹⁴³ 28 February 1524: "Un nommé dam Josse, moyne de Cluny, docteur en theologie, lequel preschoit le karesme à Saint-Severin, après la predication par luy faicte, fut pris prisonnier par le capitaine Federic et fut mis dedict jour en la Consiergerie, pour ce que on disoit qu'il avoit mal parlé de la majesté royale et du sang [Marguerite and Louise]; laquelle chose esmeut fort le peuple, disans qu'il ne failloit plus prescher et que on ne osoit dire verité." *Driart*, p. 87.

¹⁴⁴ 28 September 1523: "fut faicte la procession du recteur, en l'eglise de ceans [St. Victor, Paris], et fist la predication mons. maistre de Quercu ou refectouer, pour ce qu'il pleust un peu, et prinst pour son tesme: *Obsecro vos ego vinctus in Domino, ne deficiatis in tribulationibus meis pro vobis, que est vestra gloria, a[d] Romanos*, où il decida moult bien les tribulations qui estoient pour lors, tant en l'eglise que au royaume et à l'université, à cause des heresies semées par Luter et ses adherens, lesquelles il dict ne avoir esté que rechauffées, pour ce qu'elles avoient esté condempnées auparavant par l'eglise." *Driart*, p. 79. For Quercus' reputation see Erasmus' letter of 1521 cited chapter 4, note 81, and WA Br 2, 376, 109.

instilled them among Parisians.¹⁴⁵ These views spread to the provinces. The writer, probably from Rouen, of a street play for the year 1523, the *Farce Morale de troys Pelerins et Malice*, placed the blame for the *desordre* in the world on women, who were running the state.¹⁴⁶ Specifically, he blamed the *desordre* in the Church on those *de religion* and *grans histoyriens*¹⁴⁷ who followed Luther.

The entwined accusations of misrule and heresy against the crown was also spread in a phalanx of anti-heresy books that the Paris doctors began writing, soliciting, and approving during 1523–1524. The Faculty had previously been mandated to review all religious books prior to publication, but it never had nor would ever operate as an omnipresent censorship board. Whereas in 1522 they had not formally approved any anti-heresy tracts, nor had any specifically been printed on Parisian presses,¹⁴⁸ in 1523 the Faculty approved the publication of some eight polemical works (six in Latin, two in French) from June to December, several of which were written by its own doctors.¹⁴⁹ A

¹⁴⁵ Farge argues that “Josse’s sermons probably reflected the mood of the Faculty, since the doctors not only sought to obtain his release but also assumed financial burdens of the case.” *Orthodoxy*, 257. Given the Faculty’s instructions to Louise of Savoy of Oct. 7, 1523 on how the court could exculpate itself from suspicions of heresy, this is certainly the case. See below.

¹⁴⁶ In Émile Picot, ed., *Recueil général des sotties*, vol. 2, (Paris: Firmin Didot et Cie, 1904; reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Co., s.d.), 299–321, esp. 308–311.

¹⁴⁷ “L’historien est un greffier tenant registre des arrests de la cour et justice divine.” (Amyot). *Dictionnaire du moyen français*.

¹⁴⁸ Among the 169 works known to have been published at Paris in 1522, none were obviously written to combat heresy or Luther, nor did the Faculty approve any in its sessions. See Clerval, *Registres*, 307 and Moreau 3.

¹⁴⁹ All but one of the works approved by the Faculty were printed in 1523. In order discussed, they were [In brackets: dates they were discussed and approved in Clerval and bibliographical references]:

Wollick, Nicolas [Volcy de Sérerville, Nicolas]. Sermon by Jean Glapion du Maine. *Collectaneorum Libellus. Le petit Recueil du Poligraphe instructif, et moral, faict en latin et françoys sur les elementz des lettres, commandemens de la loy: oraison dominicale, et sermon des cendres, pour deux ieunes princes de renom*. [Paris, Didier Maheu, 1523]. [24 July 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, p. 371 and note 51, p. 420. Moreau 3, #587. Higman V 68].

Clichtove, Josse. *De veneratione sanctorum opusculum duos libros complectens*. Paris: Simon de

further three closely related works should be added to this tally.¹⁵⁰ Together, these made up the bulk of anti-heresy literature printed in Paris for that year.¹⁵¹

Colines, 3 September 1523. [24 July 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, p. 371, n. 51, p. 420. Moreau 3, #456. Telle, *Dilutio*, p. 65.]

Campester, Lambert. *Heptacolon in summam scripturae sacrilegiae Martini Lutheri in Apologia eius contentam*. Paris: Simon de Colines, 1523.

[11 August et 2 October 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, pp. 377, 396, and notes 51, 59, and 81 pp. 420–421, 424. Renouard, *Colines*, 44. Moreau 3, #443.]

Fisher, John. *Assertionis Lutherane confutatio*. Paris: Claude Chevallon, 22 August 1523. [31 August 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, p. 382, notes 51 and 67, pp. 420, 422. Moreau 3, #529.]

Henry VIII. *Assertio septem sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum*. Paris: Claude Chevallon, [1523]. [31 August 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, p. 382, notes 51 and 67, pp. 420, 422. Moreau 3, #514.]

Netter, Thomas [Waldensis, Thomas]. Ed. Jean Roch. *Sacramenta Thome Walden sextum videlicet volumen doctrinalis antiquitatum fidei Ecclesiae catholicae contra Wittelevistas et eorum assecclas Lutheranos*. Paris: Francois Regnault [for Josse Bade and Poncet?], 24 December 1523. [1 September and 16 December 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, pp. 374 and 411, and notes 51 and 100, pp. 420, 425. Moreau 3, #558]

Hangest, Jérôme de. *Antitologie contre certains articles des novateurs*. Paris: Pierre Vidoue, 27 August 1523. [7 September and 2 October 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, pp. 386, 396, notes 51, 72, 81, pp. 420, 422, 424. Crouzet, *La Genèse de la Réforme*, 85.]

Bernardus Lutzenburgus [Lutzenburg, Bernard]. *Catalogus haereticorum: aeditio tertia... mox aucta*. Paris: Jean Petit (for Pierre Vidoue), 13 July 1524. [16 December 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, p. 411 and notes 51, 100, pp. 420, 425. Moreau 3, #598. Armstrong, *Before Copyright*, 171, 263.]

¹⁵⁰ Even if not mentioned in the Faculty's less than complete records, these three works have obvious connections with the formally approved anti-heresy works:

Campester, Lambert. *Apologia in Martinum Lutherum Haereseos Acephalorum ac Sacrilegorum antesignanum: qua strictim huiusce factionis loci insigniores expenduntur, qui subiudiciuntur*. Paris: Simon de Colines, [1523]. [Renouard, *Colines*, 44; Moreau 3, #442; Farge, *Biographical Register*, nos. 169 and 338. A. Godin, "Lambert Campester..." in *Luther en son temps. Table ronde de Montpellier 1983* (1984), 85–97.]

Clichtove, Josse. *De bello et pace opusculum, Christianos principes ad sedandos bellorum tumultus et pacem componendam exhortans*. Paris: Simon de Colines, 3 August 1523. [Moreau 3, #455.] See especially the chapter, "Animandos potius esse principes Christianos ad arma in hostes fidei sumenda," fols. 27r – 29r. Clichtove specifically invites Christian princes to wage holy war on Martin Luther and the "Lutheran faction" asking rhetorically: "Sed cur non expergiscimur a gravi somno, quo tenemur: ut Lutherianam hanc factionem caelo et terris bella intentantem dissipemus, evertamus, et exterminemus, antequam amplius invalescat?" He goes on to excoriate Luther as a traitor to Christendom for arguing that Christians should not fight the other great enemy: the Turk.

Faculty of Theology, Paris. *Determinatio Facultatis theologiae Parisiensis super aliquibus propositionibus certis e locis nuper ad eam delatis, de veneratione sanctorum, de canone missae deque sustentatione ministrorum altaris et caeteris quibusdam*. Paris: Jean Petit (and Pierre Vidoue) [1523?]. [Moreau 3, #585. Rodolph Peter, "Recherches sur l'imprimeur de la *Determinatio*..." *Actes du Colloque Guillaume Farel* 1 (1983), 221–223.]

¹⁵¹ These eleven anti-heresy works are a not inconsiderable portion of the 174 books published in Paris in 1523, see Moreau 3.

Primarily aimed at combating heresy,¹⁵² some of these works went so far as to suggest that Luther and his followers were being protected in France.¹⁵³ Soon after publication, the royal court had two of the works approved by the Sorbonne seized: Jérôme de Hangest's *Antitologie* and Lambert Campester's *Heptacolon*. It has been suggested that there were political reasons for the court's action. Campester, at least, is supposed to have had connections to the Constable de Bourbon, whose treason became known shortly before these works were seized.¹⁵⁴ However, it seems the court had been angered most immediately because Hangest had written boldly and offensively against the crown. This Parisian doctor had a sharp tongue and quill, which had already gotten him censured by the Faculty,¹⁵⁵ and his *Antitologie* was not approved without some doctors objecting.¹⁵⁶ Moreover, his work was in French and, in the words of Beda, it was specifically aimed "against the errors of Luther and of those who wish to defend them."¹⁵⁷

Rumors about Luther's supporters at court were soon well known outside France.

In October 1524 Jean Gacy, a Franciscan in Geneva, published a scathing exposition of

¹⁵² The doctors desired Netter's *Sacramenta* to be printed immediately since they found it to be useful in combating heresy: "[the reviewers] retulerunt quod esset liber multum utilis ecclesie ad confutendum errores, consentit. imo rogavit, dictum impressorem, ut diligenter intenderet illi impressioni, et quando opus esset, de hoc daret suum decretum in principio dicti libri imprimendum." Clerval, *Registres*, 375. The same motives applied in approving Campester's *Heptacolon*, "consensit Facultas et voluit quod imprimatur tanquam utile et conducens extirpationi errorum dicti heretici." Clerval, *Registres*, 377.

¹⁵³ A full survey of these eleven works would have to be undertaken to assess how openly they implicated the court in the spread of heresy.

¹⁵⁴ See Crouzet, *La Genèse de la Réforme*, 84.

¹⁵⁵ Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 25.

¹⁵⁶ 7 September 1523: "Et post deliberationem a nonnullis magistrorum, facte sunt parve quedam difficultates; placuit tamen quod vendatur." Clerval, *Registres*, 386.

¹⁵⁷ In explaining the reasons why the court had been tainted with suspicion of heresy, Beda informed Louise of Savoy on 7 October 1524, "ce qui est moult scandaleux, puis naguères ont esté sous le nom et autorité du Roy prins et emporté certaine quantité de volumes, deux traitez composé par Messire Hierosme d'Angest [Hangest] contre les erreurs de Luther, et de ceux qui les voudroient soutenir." d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, p. 4 col. B. Hangest is only known to have published one anti-heresy work in 1523.

Luther and his adherents' errors, which along with Hangest's work, was among the first in the '*gallic*' vernacular. It culminates with a strident denunciation of all those kings, dukes, and other princes who have promoted Lutherans, especially noble women. He echoes the Sorbonne suspicions about d'Arande and the ladies at the French court:

In the courts and presence of princes, this poisonous Lutheran tradition has been preached and disseminated by several secular preachers, who have been sent first and foremost to seduce ladies and demoiselles. These women, under the pretext of devotion and zeal for the truth, have given such men a warm welcome due to their damnable curiosity for such deadly newfangled ideas as well as interest in spreading the sects that proceed from them. Through them, many princes and princesses, prelates, clerics, nobles, and, more broadly, all the estates have been miserably seduced and deceived. Indeed in Francophone (*gallic*) lands they have propagated this lethal sect, which is now known in France by the inane name of "the sect of the Turlupins"¹⁵⁸ who with 'wolfish' malice secretly defame and damage the Virgin, the honor of God, the blessed saints, their images, the dead, the sacraments, and good deeds. Just like Luther in Germany, the Turlupins [in France] have princes who suffer their existence as well as ladies and demoiselles who delight in them. Because of them, the Turlupins are able to voice their accursed ideas without fear.¹⁵⁹

The second work referred to here is probably Campester's.

¹⁵⁸ "turlupin – Sectes d'hérétiques qui se répandirent en France, en Allemagne et dans les Pays-Bas pendant le XIII^e et le XIV^e siècle; ils soutenaient qu'on ne doit avoir honte de rien de ce qui est naturel. XVI^e s. Autant en dit un turlupin de mes livres, Rab. *Prol.* liv. I." E. Littré, *Dictionnaire de la Langue Française*.

¹⁵⁹ "Aulcuns au decepteur [Luther] non seulement ont este propices ains de luy se sont fait complices... Et que pis est en leurs cours et presences concioner et divulguer ceste pestifere tradition lutherienne à aulcuns seculiers prescheurs qui sont envoye à premierement seduire dames et damoiselles courtisiennes ausquelles soubz espece de devotion et de zele de verite amplement est receptacle de l'esperit de dampnable curiosité tant par ceste mortifere adinvention que par dissemination d'aultres sectes à elle consequentes desquelles plusieurs et princes et princesses, prelatz, ecclesiastiques, nobles, et generalmente de tous estats sont miserablement seduitz et deceuz. Mesmes aux Gaulles ont fait pulluler la virulente secte qu'en France modernement par ung vocable ridicule ont appellé la secte des Turlupins qui de malice lupine occultes dissimulateurs et manifestes decepteurs sont infamateurs de la Vierge, sans per [peur] et sans si [souci] diminuteurs de l'honneur divin, impugnateurs des benoitz saintz, abolisseurs de leurs imagez, aux trespassez et deffunctz inferant indicible dommaige, contempteurs des sacremens impeditors de bien faire, [en] bref predicateurs et innovateurs des anciennes erreurs, adinventeurs des nouvelles. Et tout ainsi que leur patron Luther à aulcuns princes et seigneurs qui le protegent et deffendent par tuition de leur glaive vibre encontre exteres nations. Pareillement Turlupins ont princes permettant et dames ou princesses avant agreable par lesquelles se tiennent en securité de leurs execrables ditz." Gacy, *Triologue nouveau*, e3r – e3v.

At this same moment (November 1524), the papal nuncio, Jerome Aleander, expressed to Francis I the Pope's concern about d'Arande's preaching as well as Briçonnet's activities at Meaux.¹⁶⁰

Having met with resistance from the court since the beginning of their summer campaign in 1523, the doctors of Paris had sought to depict royal advisors, particularly the women there, as responsible for the growth of heresy. By the following year, their efforts were a ringing success.

White-Washing the Taint of Heresy

When Louise of Savoy gained powers as regent on 12 August 1523, she set about dispelling the image of heresy being cast upon the court.¹⁶¹ The Faculty sensed perceptively that they would have an easier time managing her than the king. Two days into her regency they considered sending representatives to her in order to protest against the court's recent intervention to prevent them from censuring Lefèvre's Bible commentaries and translations as well as Berquin's books, "through which he plainly supports Luther's damned writings."¹⁶² They decided to wait until Chancellor Duprat and

¹⁶⁰ Reported by Henry Heller, "Panorama religieuse, 1524," Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, p. 86.

¹⁶¹ "Déclaration portant pouvoir pour la Duchesse d'Angoulême de Gouverner le Royaume, en Qualité de Régente, pendant l'Absence du Roi, sons fils." 12 August 1523. *Ordonnances* 3, no. 355, pp. 282–289. Louise was given all regalian powers. No provision was made for her replacement should she become unable to fulfill her duties.

¹⁶² 14 August 1523: "Inter alia post deliberationes statuit quod littere ad dominum nostrum regem per unum de magistris mitterentur et quod duo alii irent Blesas [Blois] illustrissime matris scilicet cristianissimi regis nostri et domino cancellario rationes dicturi propter quas Facultati videntur maxime pernitiiosa que sub nomine eiusdem domini nostri regis fieri cernuntur in causis fidei ut pote pro commentariis et translationibus magistri Jacobi Fabri et pro libris de Berquin per quo[s] manifeste favet damnatis scriptis per Lutherum." Clerval, *Registres*, 378.

Louise's anticipated visit to Paris.¹⁶³ By mid-September, the Regent was trying to shore up the royal court's image of orthodoxy. Since the Faculty had held back its letters to her, she must have been responding to the public rumors that the doctors had been fostering, rather than to their direct protests. On 19 September, Louise invited the Faculty to join a new, counter-heresy campaign. The court was planning to commission twelve mendicants to denounce Luther throughout the realm and asked the doctors to choose three secular priests from the Faculty's ranks to join the missionary team.¹⁶⁴ The doctors declined, arguing that licensing preachers was the business of the bishops.¹⁶⁵ They were not going to let the court off the heresy hook so easily by agreeing to this small measure. Nevertheless, Louise continued to project the court's concern that sacrilege was harming the realm, by issuing an *ordonnance* against brigand troops:

who rise in revolt with horrific blasphemies ... against the honor and reverence due to God and his glorious Mother, to such an extent that one has to surmise and fear that most of the calamities, misfortunes, and afflictions, which beset this realm, arise and proceed from the ire of God, who has been exceedingly provoked by the limitless evils that these more than malevolent and miserable brigands commit every day.¹⁶⁶

In Louise's estimation, not heretics but blaspheming brigands, who in fact were none other

¹⁶³ 17 August 1523, Clerval, *Registres*, 378.

¹⁶⁴ Clerval, *Registres*, 391–392.

¹⁶⁵ The Faculty was, however, encouraged by this turn of events for they then considered sending recommendations on combating heresy in further letters and white-papers to court. On 6 October the doctors did finally select three preachers for the royal missionary team, but on the following day these candidates refused to go and the Faculty dropped the matter there. Clerval, *Registres*, 397–398.

¹⁶⁶ "...insurgent par blasphemes horribles, en l'invention des quelz ilz se glorifient, contre l'honneur et reverence de Dieu et de sa glorieuse Mere, tellement qu'il est à doubter et à craindre que grant partie des calamitez, fortunes et adversitez dont est affligé ce royaume, viennent et procedent de l'ire de Dieu, provoquée par l'abisme de maux que chacun jour font et commectent lesd. plus que meschans et malheureux aventuriers, pour lesquels extirper, chasser et eliminer hors de ce royaume, plusieurs constitucions et ordonnances ont esté faictes..." "Ordonnance contre les aventuriers, pillards chefs de

than the king's marauding, unpaid troops, were responsible for provoking God's anger and its catastrophic consequences. It is not a very convincing argument that invokes an effect as its own cause. French people considered the king's mutinous troops as but one of the evils resulting from his misrule. Moreover, Louise's revelation that it was blaspheming brigands who were inciting God's wrath was late in coming: they had been plaguing France since the start of the war in 1521. The essential thing to notice here is that the Regent's preaching campaign and *ordonnance* admitted the essential premise of the court's conservative critics: impiety was causing the calamities afflicting the realm.

After this transparent attempt to shift the blame, Louise quickly capitulated. On 6 October she sent an envoy to ask the Faculty for advice about how to extirpate heresy and how persons of high status could exculpate themselves of a reputation for favoring it.¹⁶⁷ The haughty Regent had humbled herself admitting, for all intents and purposes, that the crown had, 'unwittingly' as Beda would graciously allow, abetted the spread of heresy and that some of its members were justly suspect. Beda's response—penned, approved by the Faculty, and posted in one day—contained a staunch defense of orthodoxy as well as unveiled disdain for the court. He browbeat this proud but groveling ruler, reciting the litany of ways by which the court had impeded the Faculty and the Parlement in their efforts to combat heresy, thus leading to the royal court's justified disrepute.¹⁶⁸

bande et Blasphémateurs." 25 September 1523. *Ordonnances* 3, no. 359, p. 298–304.

¹⁶⁷ Clerval, *Registres*, 397–398.

¹⁶⁸ d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 3–5: To the two questions, Beda responded:

I. On how to combat heresy:

1 and 3) The court should order all royal officers by *lettres patentes* from the *Grand Conseil*, in accord with an *Arrest* from the Parlement, to force everyone [presumably all officials] to renounce Luther's errors publicly. If rigorously executed "it is to be hoped that hereafter no one will dare to defend this

As for practical solutions, Beda instructed the court to give the Faculty free rein and full support in all its measures. Just as the doctors had rebuffed her request for

damned doctrine and that thereby it will be abolished in the kingdom.”

2) The court should order that in every diocese on pain of excommunication all Lutheran books be turned in to be burned, as had done the Parlement at Paris.

4) [A warning, not an instruction]: To some it seems that these pernicious doctrines have been suffered and covertly allowed to enter, spread, and multiply in the realm. As it says in Scripture, as often as God’s elect people Israel fell away from the purity and integrity of the Faith given to them in the Law, they were punished with “plagues, famines, wars, and other scourges of God.”

5) The Faculty should be allowed to “damn and destroy” every book or individual doctrine that upholds, defends, praises, or favors Luther, which the Faculty has been trying and would continue trying to do.

6) In conclusion, the Regent can be assured that if persons of whatever rank have hitherto favored this condemned doctrine or disparaged all those whom have attacked, reprovéd, and damned it, they have in so doing “taken away the honor of the King, herself, and the good and utility of the Faith and of the realm.”

II. An explanation of how those who allege that they have been wrongly defamed for having favoring heresy gained this reputation.

1) Before the matter was well understood, several “*grands personnages*” had praised Lutheran doctrine at Court and maligned all those who condemned and reprovéd it.

2) Although the King had often commanded that the books of Luther should be burned, his orders had only been executed very tardily after the Parlement and Faculty mounted great pressure.

3) The suspicion of heresy against the court grew greatly, not only at Paris, when people heard that since Easter the king had impeded several Bishops and their officers from extirpating heresy, such as the Bishop of Séz, and more recently the Bishop of Paris [François Poncher] during the Berquin trial. [Jacques de Silly was Bishop of Séz, 1511 – 1539, which lies in Marguerite’s Duchy of Alençon, thus implicating her once more. This incident is otherwise unattested.]

4) The court’s reputation grew, since it had repeatedly evoked the cases brought against Lefèvre and Berquin from Parlement, which in the judgment of all learned, unprejudiced people, were most pernicious and dangerous procedures, since “it is by such subtle machinations that delinquents are defended as well as errors and heresies nourished.”

5) What is very suspicious, every means possible have been tried to impede the Faculty from rendering its judgment of Berquin’s books, “which were written for no other reason than to defend, propagate, and uphold Luther’s errors and heresies.”

6) And everything possible was done to impede the Faculty from examining Lefèvre’s books. Those responsible for this sought “manifestly” thereby to nourish errors against the faith in this kingdom.

7) What is a serious scandal, recently, a great quantity of books, including two by Jerome Hangest against Luther’s errors and those who uphold them, had been seized in the king’s name.

8) In conclusion: Anyone, who instructs the King and Regent contrary to these articles does not love their honor and salvation or the purity of the faith and the good of the kingdom.

Finally, Beda described the remedy for freeing great lords from a reputation of heresy:

1) The only way to “purge and justify” these *grands personnages* is for them to imitate St. Paul and defend what they had formerly persecuted and damn and reprove that which they had in error praised and defended.

2) Permit prelates freely and without hindrance to use their power to smite heresy and heretics of all ranks [implied against recalcitrant “*grand personnages*”]. Otherwise, in saving the honor and reputation of a few individuals, the crown would eternally condemn both these persons and themselves, from which the realm would suffer much.

members to join the court-sponsored preaching campaign, so again Beda refused to take the court on as an equal partner. Under Beda's plan, the Faculty would be not just arbiter of the faith, but its inquisitorial judge. The royal court would serve as its sergeant.

What was the effect of Beda's proposals? On 15 October, Guillaume Briçonnet published two synodal decrees that largely conformed to them. He condemned Luther, ordered Lutheran books to be burned, and required his ministers to defend a certain number of doctrines undermined by the German 'schismatic.'¹⁶⁹ While later events certainly corroborate that Briçonnet disapproved of Luther's divisiveness, with these decrees Briçonnet was primarily seeking to protect Marguerite's reputation in the light of the court's submission to the Faculty. The day before he issued them, he wrote to her "I assure you, Madame, my taint will not touch you."¹⁷⁰ In his timely condemnation of Luther, he was bending with the prevailing winds. On 19 and again on 26 October, letters from the court reached the Faculty. The court's response to his articles was so favorable that Beda felt the Faculty could take a short, but well deserved break in matters of faith (heresy) until after All Saints Day.

¹⁶⁹ See above and note 68.

¹⁷⁰ In a long development on God as a mirror of perfect love, which human souls [mirrors] reflect imperfectly, Briçonnet writes: "Mais l'amour qui demoure en soy ternist son myrouer, dont procede la peste et ruine de toutes creatures: estant de ce nombre et de tous le capitaine, ne vous nommeray ['nommerez' in ms.], s'il vous plaist, pourtant mere inutile. Car combien que me regarde fort et mon plaisir et, par ce, soit mon myrouer en excellence terny, *je vous assure, Madame, que la terniceure ne viendra jusques à vous, que ne vueille en vostre myrouer congnoistre vostre voulloir pour, en Dieu, l'acomplir autant que en donnera la grace.*" 14 October [1523], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 68, p. 66 (Jourda, *Rés.*, no. 123). Immediately after these words, Briçonnet signals that he is responding to her letters about pressing matters at court because of which she had written to him and requested his attendance at court. Given the timing of this letter, which was written after the Faculty had sent Beda's response to court (7 October), shortly before the court's favorable response (19 October arrived in Paris), and a day before he effectively fulfilled Beda's instructions as far as Bishops are concerned (15 October), his words can only be interpreted as a promise to protect Marguerite's compromised reputation.

How favorable was the court's response in reality? As for Louise's "conversion,"¹⁷¹ it was no capitulation. She may have halted the court's interference in the Faculty's affairs, but she stopped short of joining them, as Beda requested, "in condemning that which courtiers had formerly praised." Nevertheless, the Faculty had won that round by forcing the court and Briçonnet to fly the flag of orthodoxy and refrain from further meddling. For the rest of 1523, the pace of the Faculty's meetings slackened. All that remained on their docket was to refine the retractions that they would impose on Caroli and Mazurier and to draft the *determinatio* they would publish against the Meaux group.¹⁷²

IV. The Bourges Breakout: November 1523 – February 1524

Suffering under the Faculty's attacks and a growing public reputation as champions of heretics, Marguerite and Briçonnet faced the difficult choice between pushing ahead with or drawing backing from their reform plans. Louise's kowtow to political necessity limited their room to maneuver. Marguerite answered this challenge by undertaking a new initiative in her city of Bourges that pointed the way forward to the expansion of an evangelical network under her wing as well as to the spurning of Briçonnet and sympathetic powerful figures like him, who balked when religious controversy endangered their reputation, lives, and, in their view, the prospect of

¹⁷¹ Clerval characterizes Louise's appeal to the Faculty in October as a "conversion," *Registres*, p. 423, note 79.

¹⁷² Caroli and Mazurier would contest the articles attributed to them and forms of retraction imposed on them throughout the fall, but no help came to them from court. On 2 December, the Faculty finally passed sentence on the 'Articles de Meaux' and had their determination published at Paris. See note 150 for bibliographic details; reprint, d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, pp. xiv–xx [=d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, 374–379].

promoting a true reform.

The *Bourgeois de Paris* recounts the only measure against heresy that the court is supposed to have taken in the fall of 1523 after receiving Beda's instructions. Twelve mendicant doctors sponsored by Louise, he claims, dispersed to the four corners of the realm to preach against heresy.¹⁷³ According to its records, the Faculty of Theology did not, in the end, send out any members to join this campaign, nor do any other sources corroborate that the court's twelve evangelists actually were sent. Thus the *Bourgeois*' account probably registers rumors in Paris about the court's overtures to the Faculty rather than any real follow through in the provinces.

Marguerite's correspondence and Lefèvre's preface to the second installment of *Le nouveau testament*, dated 6 November 1523, however, suggest they intended to use (or subvert, depending on whose idea it had originally been) this mission, which Louise was presenting to conservatives as evidence of the court's anti-Lutheran orthodoxy, as a means to spread evangelical preaching beyond Meaux. Lefèvre proclaimed in his prefatory epistle that the king was intending to spread evangelical doctrine, but makes no mention of combating heresy: "[The king desires] that the word of God be purely preached throughout his kingdom."¹⁷⁴

¹⁷³ "Au dict an 1523, en ce temps, le Roy et madame la Régente, sa mère, par délibération de conseil, envoièrent douze docteurs religieux des quatre ordres mandiennes par toutes les contrées de France et d'ailleurs, pour prescher la foy catholique, pour abbatre et adnichiller les hérésies de Luther. Et, pour ce faire, furent prins des docteurs à Paris et ailleurs qui furent envoyez, les uns en Normandie, les aultres en Champaigne, les aultres en Picardie, les aultres en Guyenne, les aultres en Bourdeloys et Auvergne, aultres en Lyonnois, aultres en Languedoc et Daulphiné, et plusieurs aultres lieux et leur fut baillé certaine somme d'argent pour ayder à faire leur despence et partirent en novembre." Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 187.

¹⁷⁴ "Et telle est l'intention du debonnaire roy tant de cuer que de nom treschrestien, en la main duquel dieu a mys si noble et excellent royaume, que la parolle de dieu soit purement preschee partout son

The only preacher assuredly known to have been sent out from court during the Advent season of 1523 was Marguerite's almoner, Michel d'Arande, to Bourges. While Louise was cranking up her orthodoxy campaign and accepting Beda's advice in September and October, Marguerite signaled to Briçonnet that he was needed at court more than ever¹⁷⁵ since they were having to swallow a bitter pill.¹⁷⁶ In the midst of these troubles she arranged d'Arande's preaching mission to Bourges. On 8 November, Marguerite thanked the canons of the cathedral for having accepted her almoner as their Advent preacher¹⁷⁷ Soon thereafter, we find her urging Briçonnet excitedly that rather than submit to adverse circumstances it was time for them to act (as she indeed has just done): "After having considered for some time our ingratitude [to God during current adversity] and fixed my gaze on His immovable goodness, I confess that we justly suffer

royaume à la gloire du pere de misericorde et de Jesuchrist son filz." Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 138, 457–468, 465–466 [See also Herminjard I, no. 79, 159–169]. Lefèvre does assert that preaching anything other than the 'pure words of God' promotes sects and division. As with Briçonnet, the whole tenor of Lefèvre's preface is directed against the impediments and false doctrine of the Doctors of Theology, not Lutherans. Moreover, just when it would have been expedient to do so, he specifically avoids claiming that this preaching campaign should or would be directed, as Louise claimed, at extirpating Lutheran heresy.

¹⁷⁵ Before September 15 and circa 4 October, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, nos. 65 and 67, pp. 59–60, 63–64 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 119 and 122).

¹⁷⁶ Again Marguerite's reference to events is highly allusive, but around the time her mother was accepting Beda's advice, Marguerite wrote to Briçonnet (between 14 and 25 October) about the need to bare up henceforth as circumstances became 'bitter': "Mais je pense que nostre appetit n'est encoire préparé à telle viande [pain = doctrine évangélique] et que, *pour ceste heure, nous fauldra acoustumer de manger lettues ameres*. Dieu vueille que les puissions sy doucement avaler que la douceur de l'aigneau ne nous soit refusée, auquel seul puissions trouver goust, santé, force et consolacion et nostre tout en luy." Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 69, pp. 66–67 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 124).

¹⁷⁷ The date of Marguerite's response to their acceptance of her original offer implies that she had decided to send d'Arande to Bourges in October, round about the time the court was planning its missionary team. Marguerite to the Canons of Bourges. Blois, 8 November [1523] "Mesieurs, j'ay esté advertie par ce que n'ont escript Monsieur le général de la Beaulme et lieutenant Bigot, comment vous avez pour agréable le prescheur que ay intention vous envoyer, de quoy je suis très aise, espérant que sa doctrine et prédication ne seront par de là de peu de fruit." H. de La Ferrière-Percy, *Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François I^{er}: Son livre de dépenses (1540–1549). Étude sur ses dernières années* (Paris: Aubry, 1862; reprint Calmann-Lévy, 1891), 160–161 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 130).

since we have flinched under the spur.”¹⁷⁸ Briçonnet responded with caution to her enthusiasm for sending out preachers (*chevaliers*). He advised that ministers who can not endure that spiritual food is not distributed for a time “are not yet *chevaliers* worthy of sitting at the Lord’s table.” Rather, he asserted, true seasoned captains of the faith (*vielz capitaines esleuz pour conseil*) patiently endure adverse circumstances, following the will of their Lord and begged her to be such a one.¹⁷⁹

This emerging gap between Marguerite and Briçonnet’s views on advancing God’s cause (*le seul necessaire*) is revealed in their deeds. While d’Arande preached evangelical doctrine in Bourges, Briçonnet fought on two fronts to keep evangelical renewal on a conservative, even keel. On 13 December, at Meaux he redoubled his injunctions against Lutheran preachers who were continuing to agitate even after his October decrees. Turning from the danger of radical zeal from below to that of lax immobility from above, he kept imploring Marguerite to see to it that the king would select good prelates who would promote the pure evangelical doctrine.¹⁸⁰

Meanwhile, d’Arande’s Advent sermons were a success and Marguerite sent him

¹⁷⁸ She opens the letter enthusiastically, exclaiming: “Le nom de Celuy en qui seul toutes choses sont bien eueuses soit loué, benoist et glorifié, par lequel sommes sanctifiés, justifiés et saulvés!” Subsequently, she argues that, although unworthy vessels, “il [God] ne cesse de les [his vessels] preparer par tous les moiens qu’il congnoist, tant de tribulacion que de prosperité, pour les faire vaisseaulx dignez de luy par luy dignifiés. Et bien doivent estre doulces les adversitez qui sont de tel bien preparacion. Et plus nous doivent consoler ses verges de correction que ses graces doulces non meritées et mal receues. Parquoy, *après avoir pensé ung peu nostre ingratitude et levé l’oeil pour regarder son importable bonté, je confesse que justement nous souffrons: car trop avons recalcitré contre l’eguiillon...* Je remectz le surplus à la creance du porteur, que vous sçavez estre seur et affectionné pour son seul Seigneur et Maistre...” [translated portion italicized] [c. 10 November 1523], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 71, p. 71 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, 129).

¹⁷⁹ 20 November [1523], Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 72, pp. 71–76; esp. 74–76 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 131).

¹⁸⁰ See above Briçonnet’s passionate plea in, section B at note 66.

back to preach Lent in 1524, urging the canons of Bourges to give him another warm welcome and—expressing the intent of this mission—to continue “to honor Gospel teaching (*la doctrine évangélique*) above all else.”¹⁸¹ The canons were evidently receptive to Meaux group’s evangelical doctrine, which, according to Farel, now included a healthy critique of abuses in the cult of the saints.¹⁸² The Archbishop, François de Beuil, was not pleased with these developments. After d’Arande’s first Lenten sermon, via his diocesan prosecutor the Archbishop threatened Marguerite’s almoner with excommunication and imprisonment if he persisted.

A major scandal was at hand. As soon as she received word Marguerite instructed the canons to permit d’Arande to preach and forced the Archbishop’s prosecutor to explain himself to the king.¹⁸³ Finally, she turned to Briçonnet for advice.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸¹ “Messieurs, maistre Michel, mon aulmosnier ordinaire, s’en retourne présentement par de là, pour annoncer la parolle de nostre Seigneur durant ce saint karesme, lequel pendant qu’il a esté en ce lieu m’a faict très bon recit et estime de l’ordre et honesteté requise que tenez au saint service divin qui me tourne à merveilleux plaisir et contantement de vous tous, et vous prie, autant que faire puis, y vouloir continuer de bien en mieulx, ensemble *d’avoir la doctrine évangélique en singulière recommandation*, selon le bon zelle que Dieu vous en peult donner et la bonne opinion qui de ce m’est permis et licite en avoir. Et a tant remettant à vous dire plus de mes nouvelles sur la créance de mon dict aulmousnier...” [Translated passage emphasized] 29 January [1524], La Ferrière-Percy, *Marguerite d’Angoulême*, 159–160 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 141). Huguet, *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*, “avoir en recommandation”: estimer, honorer.”

¹⁸² See Farel’s description of the results of d’Arande’s preaching at Bourges, Herminjard I, no. 97, pp. 205–207.

¹⁸³ 11 February 1524. Marguerite to the Cathedral chapter of St.-Étienne, in Bourges. “....Nous avez fait grand plaisir de nous donner à congnoistre le zèle que avez à la parole de Dieu que nous désirons faire annoncer par nostre aulmosnier, lequel le roy et dame et toute ceste compaignie ont plusieurs fois expérimenté et fait prescher devant eux le St. Évangile, de quoy ils sont bien édifiez, et nous donnent merveille et l’empeschement et défenses que dite luy avoir esté faictes et données par un nommé Gaudon, soy-disant procureur de l’arcevesque de Bourges, lesquelles en cet endroit ne peuvent ny ne doivent avoir lieu, car il n’est question que de l’honneur de Dieu et de la charité que devons à nos subjects. Pour quoy trouvons lesd. défenses fort estranges, et ne pouvons penser estre procédées dud. arcevesque, mais plus-tost de quelque esprit malin auquel Dieu n’a point tant fait de grâce qu’il puisse rien goûter de luy. Et à ceste fin avons envoyé vers led. arcevesque pour en entendre la vérité. Attendant la réponse duquel et que led. Gaudon soit venu devers le roy soy justifier, veuillez faire continuer les sermons et prédications de nostredit aulmosnier.... Soyez seurs que l’arcevesque ne l’entend, et quand j’auray sa responce, le vous manderons:

Marguerite's plans to combat the Archbishop enjoyed the high ground at court. François de Beuil had been elected instead of the king's candidate in the first major contested election after the Concordat.¹⁸⁵ Thus Marguerite could count on the full support of her brother, who had recently returned to court, against this hostile prelate. Yet, upon hearing of her plans to beat down the Archbishop, Briçonnet protested, advising instead that d'Arande should stop and preach elsewhere. Defining the limit of acceptable action in promoting the Gospel, Briçonnet upheld the powers of bishops to license preachers in their dioceses free from royal intervention, forbade criticism of the established cult, and, finally, argued that if preaching the Gospel caused scandal, then one ought to desist lest God be dishonored and the people's hearts be hardened against His message.¹⁸⁶

mais que nul ne craigne de ouyr la parole de Dieu." Louis-Hector Chandru de Raynal, *Histoire de Berry depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789*, 3 vols., (Bourges: Vermeil, 1844–1847), vol. 3, p. 302.

¹⁸⁴ "...j'envoie ce porteur, procureur du roi à Bourges, bon et loyal serviteur, devers vous, pour vous compter le tout et prendre vostre conseil à parler au malade [the Archbishop of Bourges]." (Blois? Between 12 and 24 February 1524), Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 86, pp. 124–125 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 150).

¹⁸⁵ See chapter 3, page XX.

¹⁸⁶ Briçonnet's letters of 24 and 25 February 1525 are the most important sources for understanding his nuanced approach to reform, see Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 87 and 88, pp. 125–131 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 151 and 152). The voice of principled non-violent activism is so rare among the ardent reformers of the century that his letters deserve to be read in full. Here we highlight his prescriptive conclusions, stemming from the d'Arande controversy at Bourges:

1) Partisans of the Gospel should not fight among themselves, nor should they attack the misguided, p. 126: "Toutesfois les membres de la vraie sapience ont entre eulx solide et perpetuelle coherence, les unissant la souveraine unité et vraie paix se communicquant en eulx. Et, par ce, ne combatent point ensemble et aussy peu contre les membres de presumptueuse sagesse... A ceste cause, contentions qui ne servent que à subversion des auditeurs sont deffendues."

2) Zeal can actually hurt reform. Briçonnet counsels reform without scandal, pp. 126–127: "L'on peult aucunes fois s'esgarer soubz umbre de zelle qui doibt estre dressé selon... supernaturelle discretion, à moult sçavoir embrider nostre zeile procedant de l'amour divine et du prochain... Scandalle est grand barriere qui doibt retenir tout prescheur evangelicque, mesmement que, faignant aller plus loing, peult tousjours retourner et rompre le pain pour ouvrir les yeulx par sapience humaine ou aultrement detenuz. Tout zelle de l'honneur de Dieu doibt estre pur, et plus est ardent, plus fault craindre qu'il n'y ait quelque chose meslée du propre. L'ediffication du prochain est, soubz, l'honneur de Dieu, la fin seule du preconizateur: laquelle cessant, aussy doibt il."

3) Briçonnet counsels backing off from preaching when it has started to cause scandal, pp. 127–

Marguerite did not follow Briçonnet's advice. Francis I seized part of the Archbishop's *temporalia* and d'Arande was permitted to continue preaching.¹⁸⁷ To smooth over this divergence in strategy, a few weeks later she sent a charming letter, praising Briçonnet for enduring his torments (his continuing troubles with the Franciscans of Meaux and his uncle Semblançay)¹⁸⁸ like St. Lawrence, with his eyes fixed single-mindedly on his savior. "Nevertheless," she explained, "I am not as perfect as Saint Peter who, when driven by the persecution of his master, put his hand to the sword, not knowing the great good which would come from so much suffering [i.e. Jesus' suffering and death, not the pain of the slave whose ear Peter cut off]."¹⁸⁹ Peter had spilled blood before being ordered to put up the sword by Jesus; Marguerite, less perfect, was willing, figuratively, to go even further even after having been admonished by Briçonnet. She begs him not to suffer his 'bitter cup' alone, but allow her to try, as Simon did for Christ,

128: "La prudence est caller, n'entreprendre ou ne continuer l'oeuvre dont l'issue n'est honorable ne volve. Je me suis quelque fois persuadé que raison et honnesteté deust contraindre nostre honneur à se contenter et dissimuler, ...et ce pour obvier au scandalle."

4) Briçonnet cautions against all the high-minded justifications put forward by zealots on all sides, p. 130: "C'est assavoir l'honneur et zelle de Dieu, le bien de la chose publique, tant d'Eglise que temporelle, le scruplure de conscience et semblables drogues, dont chascun se veult ayder, qui sont souvent beneficquement distribuées. L'application indiscrete en est mortelle."

5) Evangelical preachers marching orders tell them where to avoid, when to move on, and to obey the episcopal hierarchy. Speaking of d'Arande, who had not been received by the Archbishop, he writes, p.131: "...au chef des articles de leurs instructions leur est enjoinct laisser les lieux où ne seront receuz et secourre la pouldre de leurs piedz. L'on peult dire qu'il [d'Arande] est receu. L'on respond que à l'aulture n'appartient à envoyer evangelizer que à l'espoux ministerial [clerical hierarchy], qui seul peult 'receptvoir' ou regecter."

¹⁸⁷ See Farel's letter cited in note 182 and Brimont, *Le XVI^e siècle et les guerres de la réforme en Berry*, vol. 2, p. 134.

¹⁸⁸ See Marguerite's references to these troubles: discussing the 'Great Ropemaker' [God as archetype of the true Franciscan]; and specifically the Semblançay investigation; letters Jourd, *Rép.*, nos. 146 and 150.

¹⁸⁹ "Toutefois ne suis je sy parfaicte que saint Pierre qui, pressé des persecutions de son maistre, mist la main au glayve, ignorant le très-grand bien qui procede de très-grant peine." 16 March 1523, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no 89, p. 132 (Jourda, *Répertoire* 153).

to ease his suffering. She was gently cajoling him despite his scruples to continue to use the king's power when and however they could to promote their agenda.

Whether principle or cowardice motivated Briçonnet, almost two years before the Meaux group was to be forcibly suppressed, he signaled the limits of his willingness to lead. So long as they enjoyed royal protection and did not create public scandal he was keen to promote evangelical preaching. Since conservatives had clearly signaled that they would continue attacking Lefèvre, Berquin, and anyone else diverging from their narrow conception of the faith, Briçonnet had effectively signaled that he would demit from leadership of their battered company if matters became more contentious.

Briçonnet reached his decision when Marguerite forced the issue of what to do in the face of opposition to reform beyond his jurisdiction. Despite the conservatives' constant threat, she pressed forward in exporting evangelical preaching from Meaux and the court to Bourges and beyond. From then on, as Briçonnet held back, she emerged as the dynamic leader of French evangelicals; an influential figure at court, who was committed to exploring ways to promote the Gospel in the changing landscape of a new age. By 1524, Marguerite's entourage at court and the Fabrists at Meaux had become the twin standard-bearers to which other evangelicals rallied.

7. From Meaux to Madrid: The Network Knits Together (1524–1526)

Hercules Germanicus

Germanum Alcidem deus aethere misit ab
alto:/
Qui nobis oculos redderet, atque fidem.

The German Hercules

God has sent a German Hercules from
heaven on high,/
who has restored our vision and faith.

– Nicolas de Bourbon, *Epigrammata* (1530), f. 11v.

En ayment Dieu de cuer entierement

En ayment Dieu de cuer entierement,
Consolons nous ensemble uniquement,
Quelque tourment qu'on nous face ou
grevance,
Ne delaissons fraternele alliance,
Comme plusieurs font infidelement,

Les saints escriptz universellement;
Mandent à tous d'avoir parfaictement,
Dilection l'ung à l'autre et fiance,
En ayment dieu .&.

Quant il viendra au jour du jugement,
Il pugnira les tyrans durement,
Et les esleux seront hors de souffrance.
Vivons donc tous en certaine esperance,
Prenans en gré le temps presentement,
En ayment dieu :&.

While loving God with whole heart

While loving God with whole heart,
Let us comfort each other, every one.
Whatever misery or pain they inflict on us,

Let us not abandon our brotherly bond
As some have done faithlessly.

The Holy Scriptures command throughout
That we should love each other perfectly
And trust one another totally,
While loving God with whole heart.

When the day of judgment comes,
He will punish those tyrants terribly,
And the elect will be freed from pain.
Let us live therefore in this sure hope,
Patiently enduring the present season,
While loving God with whole heart

– Anonymous rondeau in “*l'Initiatore instruction*” [c. 1529], Arsenal ms. 5096, fol. 57r.

These two poems voice the views of the Navarrian network. Using the inclusive “we,” the authors speak for their brethren. Recalling shared beliefs and experiences, they orient their history (past, present, and future) around the three cardinal virtues: faith

brought them together, love unites them, and hope will sustain them against ongoing oppression.

Nicolas de Bourbon proclaims in scarcely veiled terms that Martin Luther, the “German Hercules,” had restored their vision of the true faith.¹ Like Bourbon, during the 1520s people of diverse backgrounds began joining the group championed by

¹ To my knowledge, this is the first time that Bourbon’s *Hercules Germanicus* appears in print since its original publication. In 1990, C. Lauvergnat-Gagnière announced the discovery of Bourbon’s previously unknown *Epigrammata* ([Lyon, Laurent Hylliare], February 1530) at the Bibliothèque Municipale of Lyon (BM Lyon Rés. 167 292) in “Un peu de nouveau sur Nicolas Bourbon l’ancien,” *BHR* 53 (1991), 663-693. Among the *Epigrammata* are many evangelical poems, like *Hercules Germanicus*, that Bourbon suppressed in his well-known *Nugae* (1533 & 1538), upon which Bourbon scholarship has hitherto relied. Lauvergnat-Gagnière’s very useful appendix (pp. 685-693) compares these three editions noting the dozens which appeared only in the *Epigrammata*. A few examples of those poems Bourbon excised will give an idea of their aggressive, evangelical tenor: “*Fides*: Pectore sincero promissis credere Christi/ Ista potest iustos reddere sola fides” (fol. 5r), “*Sectae Monachorum*: Quis varias sectas monachorum invenerit autor?/ Nescio, sed genium credo fuisse malum” (fol. 14r), “*In monachos nostris temporis*: Hac monachi passim sumpus atque cucullis/ Sese immorataleis semideosque putant...” (fol. 15r), “*In sacrificulos nostri temporis*: Sacrificus modios precularum murmarat octo:/ Non aliter turpis simia labra movet,” (15v), “*Opera quae non sunt ex fide*: Si desit tibi vera fides, in rebus agundis./ Nil nisi peccatum quod facis, esse potest” (19r), “*Caro et spiritus apud Paulum*,” (fol. 19r), “*Sancta ecclesia pauper est*” (fol. 39r), “*Canones Antichriston ton Romanion* [in Greek characters]: “Tot canones qui sunt, nisi fraus et aperta tyrannis?/ Retia scribarum, pontificumque furor?” (fol. 34v), and, notably: “*In eos qui Lutherani dici gaudent*,” (fol. 46r.)

Since its discovery, the *Epigrammata* has not been edited, nor to my knowledge have scholars studied this important work, for it is not cited once in a recent symposium devoted to *La génération Marot: poètes français et néo-latins (1515-1550)*. *Actes du colloque international de Baltimore, 5-7 décembre 1996*, ed. Gérard Defaux, Colloque, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance 11 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997), see especially Perrine Hallyn-Galand, “Marot, Macrin, Bourbon: ‘Muse naïve’ et ‘tendre style,’” 211-240.

The probable source for Bourbon’s epigram cited above was the placard by Hans Holbein the Younger, *Hercules Germanicus* (1522). Bourbon’s two lines, however, do not reprise the themes of the twelve-line poem on the labors of Luther-Hercules printed below Holbein’s woodcut. Robert Scribner observes that the depiction of Luther as Hercules, a humanist invention, had a short life span in Germany, see *For the Sake of the Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 32-34, with reproduction of Holbein’s placard. For the text of the poem and commentary, see Theophil Burckhardt-Biederman, “Über Zeit und Ablaß des Flugblattes: Luther als *Hercules Germanicus*,” *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* 4 (1905), 38-44, 39. As Marc-René Jung notes, Bourbon distributed this heroic epithet liberally, naming the famed Hellenist, Guillaume Budé, the “French Hercules,” in his 1533 *Nugae* (f. e6r), see *Hercule dans la littérature française du XVIe siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 1966), p. 77.

Bourbon evidently had a deep respect for Hans Holbein’s work, since he was later involved in the immensely successful project to reprint the *Historiarum Veteris Testamenti icones ad vivum expressae* (1538) illustrated by Holbein, for which he wrote a preface to the second edition (1539) that was included

Marguerite.² They believed that a new age—called by Roussel an “evangelical enlightenment”—was dawning, whose hero, if not leader, in France was Luther.³ The second poem, *While loving God with whole heart*, fills the last page of a manuscript made for Marguerite containing French translations of two catechisms by the Lutheran Johannes Brenz and an anonymous evangelical treatise on confession. The rondeau concludes the manuscript like a benediction or perhaps a pilgrim’s song for the road ahead, encouraging a fraternal band ‘carrying their crosses and following Christ’ to remain steadfast in the face of persecution.⁴ This exhortation offers no hope that their suffering would end in this life, only that God would settle accounts in the hereafter.

in subsequent reprints (at least 5 more to 1550). All these editions are in the BnF.

² Shortly after he published his *Epigrammata*, Bourbon made his way from the humanist circle around Francis Tournon, to whom he dedicated this work, via evangelical circles at the University of Paris, into the household of Marguerite of Navarre, who later selected him as tutor for her only surviving child, Jeanne d’Albret. Marguerite probably knew of Bourbon from at least before July 1530, since he addressed a poem to her during her second pregnancy (1529-1530). See Jourda, *Marguerite*, p. 151, n. 93, citing *Nugae* (Paris, 1533), ff. h2v and h5v and *Nugarum libri octo* (Lyon S. Gryphe, 1538), pp. 123 and 128, nos. XCCCIII and CLV;” and Jean Dupèbe, “Un document sur les persécutions de l’hiver 1533-1534 à Paris,” *BHR* 48 (1986): 405-417.

³ For Roussel’s description, see chapter 4, p. 166 ff. The sentiment that a new age was dawning was ubiquitous. In 1526, Pierre Toussaint, a young humanist from Metz who made his way into the network via the circles around Erasmus and Farel at Basel, described the times as the era when “renascens Christi Evangelium!” Herminjard 1, no. 181, 444-448; 445.

⁴ For study of this manuscript’s content and illuminations see Myra D. Orth, “Radical Beauty: Marguerite de Navarre’s Illuminated Protestant Catechism and Confession,” *SCJ* 24 (1993): 383-427; *idem*, “Manuscripts pour Marguerite,” in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 85-105; and Marc Venard, “Un catéchisme offert à Marguerite de Navarre,” *BSHPF* 142 (1996): 5-32, who takes issue with Orth’s interpretation of the illustrations and studies only the first of the two Brenz catechisms, of which he provides a transcription. Orth will respond to Venard in *Le livre réformé en français avant Calvin*, ed. William Kemp and Jean-François Gilmont (Geneva: Droz, expected 2002). In that same volume I will provide a study on the three treatises in the manuscript, entitled “Three ‘Lutheran’ Catechisms in *l’instruction initiatrice* (c. 1529) and Their First French Readers: Textual and Contextual Evidence.”

While loving God with Whole Heart is anonymous and, barring further research, it does not seem to have been published in its day. It is not among the known works of the two most likely candidates in her circle, Marot and Marguerite herself. The poem certainly was not unworthy of Marguerite and she discussed loving God with whole heart, being unified in and through Christ, which she contrasted with the infidelity of others, and bearing up under tribulations, etc... in letters to her brother and Sigismund von

Both poems reflect the state of mind of Marguerite's network at the end of a decade in which it had come to life, suffered bouts of intense persecution, lost many members, and yet survived. The fortune of these verses as literary objects accurately reflects that of network members: they went underground. Bourbon thought it wise to suppress his epigram and other controversial verses in subsequent editions of his poetry (1533 and 1538); the rondeau and catechism in Marguerite's manuscript were evidently never printed, though, ironically, the treatise on confession reached the public as an anonymous tract in 1530. The very creation of the two poems exemplifies that though clandestine and long-suffering, the network was not idle as "tyrants" tormented them.

This chapter and the following one aim to shed light on the network's formation, major activities, and impact in the 1520s. Sources reveal that circa 1524 a far-flung group knit together around Lefèvre and Marguerite. Its members did not merely admire Luther, moreover they collaborated actively with German reformers in order to bring their vision of religious renewal to France. From that time forward, French evangelicals were, as they saw it, 'bearing their crosses' in an effort to propagate evangelical views within the Most Christian Realm. Calling it "Christ's cause," "the Gospel," and like terms, they tried to advance their program through six interrelated projects: 1) preaching, 2) printing

Hohenlohe in 1525, see chapter 8, notes 80, 84, 91 and 93. The poem exhibits other similarities to Marguerite's literary style. In the manuscript, on the left-hand page facing the poem are fifteen passages from Scripture in Latin, which provide the inspiration and authority for the poem's exhortation. This *mis-en-page* citing of authorities resembles Marguerite's practice in her *Miroir*, in which scriptural citations are noted in the margin and her *Discord*, which she announces at the beginning is a meditation on Romans, chapter 7.

One of the illustrated miniatures in *Instruction initiatrice* is precisely of Marguerite, her husband, and their entourage bearing crosses in procession behind Christ on his way to Calvary. This image reinforces the rondeau's encouragement of Marguerite's band to suffer persecution for the sake of true

religious books, 3) nourishing evangelical conventicles, 4) protecting their brethren from prosecution, 5) promoting members to positions of influence, and 6) advocating “evangelical politics” at the French court.

When examined in detail, these activities reveal that the network was trying to appropriate the fruits of German reformation for France in a way suited to their circumstances and in accord with their distinctive ideas about the goal of reform and the work of God in the world. Refocusing scholarly debate from a piecemeal assessment of individuals—Lefèvre, Briçonnet, Farel, Roussel, and Marguerite in chief—and their doctrines to an analysis of their collaboration reveals a far more unified movement than scholars have hitherto been willing to accept. This interpretation validates the Navarrian network’s sense of themselves (the *nos* and *nous* in the poems above) as a conjoined group that agreed upon and taught a coherent body of evangelical doctrine. The most divisive disagreements between them were strategic, concerning how stridently they should combat false doctrines. Their more or less radical strategies were rooted in different circumstances and personalities, as well as contrasting beliefs about what God demanded or would enable them to do. In the face of ongoing persecution, some members split off from the group adhering to Marguerite even though they shared similar goals.

Accordingly, any account of their story must proceed from an understanding of the political context, which regulated the climate of repression. From 1524 to 1530, French public life was dominated by the long-drawn-out conclusion to the first Valois-

religion.

Hapsburg war. Events divide the period into three stages. 1. Formal fighting had commenced in the summer of 1521 and dragged on through a series of French set-backs. In the summer of 1524 combat escalated into an all or nothing showdown as Francis I's most powerful vassal, Constable Charles de Bourbon, who had defected the previous autumn, entered the lists as the commander of a large imperial army. With both sides committing all their resources, open hostilities came to a decisive halt on 24 February 1525 at Pavia where Francis I led his army to utter defeat. He along with the more fortunate survived with their lives, but not their freedom.⁵ 2. The king's captivity, lasting until March 1526, constituted a second period during which France was left with a regency government, no firm peace established, and an uncertain future. 3. The war moved into a third phase when Francis I bought his release by signing the exacting Treaty of Madrid. To ensure its fulfillment in France, Francis was allowed to exchange places in captivity with his two eldest sons. Upon reaching French soil, he repudiated the agreement and spent the next four years trying to beat down the Emperor's demands and to free his sons, alternately, by war, attrition, and negotiation. In that vulnerable position, Francis needed as many foreign allies as he could muster, particularly the Pope without whose help he could not defeat or appease the Emperor.

During these three phases, the political climate changed for evangelicals from bad to worse to bad. As France entered the decisive months of the war in the fall of 1524, they had little room to maneuver. The royal court, which had successfully parried attacks on them in 1523, was increasingly preoccupied and needed to maintain good relations

⁵ For the diplomatic preliminaries to the war, see Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 170-182.

with the Pope. Evangelicals rightly feared for their future as conservatives continued to investigate their activities in preparation for a new round of trials.⁶ After Francis was captured, conservatives wrested control of religious policy from the crown. The bounds of safety for evangelicals quickly narrowed, snapping shut as their protectress, Marguerite, left on “pilgrimage” to Spain to negotiate her brother’s release. In October 1525, the Parlement ordered the arrest of the principal members of the Meaux group. Some escaped, many stood trial, and the rest were forced into silence. When Francis I returned from captivity, the situation improved since Marguerite convinced him to intervene in their favor once again. Yet, until his children returned in 1530 with the fulfillment of the Treaty of Cambrai (1529), evangelicals were barely able to breathe their views in private, let alone resume their public campaign. During these years, Marguerite ordered the network to refrain from giving conservatives occasion to sound the alarm bell of heresy, which would disrupt Francis I’s relations with the Pope. Yet she encouraged them to operate covertly. Their only hope for future success was indeed to ‘suffer the present age,’ while awaiting freer days ahead. During this tyranny of silence, they had no French Hercules to champion them, only a Caesar who would brook no insubordination from either them or their tormentors.

I. Birth of the Network

By 1524, French people who had been inspired by the German Hercules and other less muscular religious heroes such as Erasmus and Lefèvre had begun collaborating. A

⁶ French evangelicals note either the threat or examples of repression in every almost every letter.

rich dossier of correspondence from the period 1524 to 1527 affords a remarkably detailed picture, unsurpassed thereafter, of the inner life of this network. In over two hundred letters, some five score men and women appear working together: an association of leaders whose followers remain largely unnamed and uncounted.⁷

II. An International “Fraternal Alliance”

The fellowship of the elect, to which the rondeau *While loving God with whole heart* appeals, was far more extensive than Marguerite’s immediate circle. This fraternal alliance was international from its very beginning.⁸ By the end of 1524, anchored in France at Meaux and the court, the network had active members in Paris, Alençon, Bourges, Macon, Lyon, and Grenoble. Over France’s eastern boarder, it had refuges in Southern Germany and Switzerland, where Guillaume Farel acted the unofficial leader of expatriate evangelicals.

Before 1524, it is not known whether the network existed as such, but its roots were in place. During the first years of the Meaux experiment, Lefèvre and his disciples were in contact with reformist circles at Poitiers and Paris.⁹ For lack of sources, it is impossible to determine how much farther the Fabrists’ influence extended via their numerous former students, colleagues, and admirers. As for their international ties, despite having well-formed connections prior to 1521, the Meaux group and circle of humanists in Paris, including Berquin, were not in touch with German humanists and

See the sources cited in section I below.

⁷ There were some two hundred active participants in the network over the period 1520-1550.

⁸ For but one instance their frequent use of the lexicon of ‘brotherhood,’ see below at note 21.

reformers again until 1524.¹⁰ The Valois-Hapsburg war interrupted communications.¹¹

At least, and perhaps at best, they were able to keep abreast of foreign events. In his New Testament prefaces of 1523, Lefèvre alluded to the Europe-wide progress of the Gospel, that is the movement rallying behind Luther, as if it was common knowledge.

Meanwhile, a small number of French adherents to Luther's cause had departed from the south-eastern corner of the realm to establish contact with the reformers of Switzerland and the Empire. By early 1523, François Lambert, followed by Anémond de Coct and Claude de Tauro, made their way on a sort of converts' pilgrimage to Wittenberg.¹² To that point, although none of them had been corresponding with the Meaux group or Marguerite's entourage, a chain of human contacts linked them indirectly. François Lambert had been a leading preacher in the Observant Franciscan house at Avignon. After his superiors discovered his stash of Lutheran tracts, he fled.

⁹ See chapter 5, p. 232 and n. 59.

¹⁰ Prior to 1524, the correspondence of Erasmus, Luther, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Capito, and the Blaurer and Amerbach brothers, which reveals much about the network's subsequent development, contains no evidence that the Meaux group or other members of the network in Paris were in contact with any German evangelicals or humanists.

¹¹ As Glareanus reported from Paris to Zwingli in Zurich in December 1521, because of the outbreak of the Valois-Hapsburg War, he had had no news about Luther and thought it newsworthy to mention the Faculty of Theology's condemnation of Luther, which had occurred eight months earlier in April. See *ZW* 7, no. 193, 482-483.

¹² For a concise summary of Lambert's life and work, see Reinhard Bodenmann, preface to "Bibliotheca Lambertiana," in *Pour retrouver François Lambert: bio-bibliographie et études*, ed. Pierre Fraenkel, *Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana* 108 (Baden-Baden & Bouxwiller: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 1987), 9-213; 19-35. Nathaniel Weiss consecrated many articles to the early reformation in France, with detailed, but rather piecemeal references, to all its major figures. For de Coct and de Tauro see his "Guillaume Farel: ses premiers travaux 1521-1524." *BSHPF* 67 (1919), 179-214, esp. 183-187; "Les débuts de la réforme en France d'après quelques documents inédits, les premiers missionnaires. Pierre de Sibiville, Michel d'Arande, Aimé Meigret (1523-1524)." *BSHPF* 70 (1921), 197-212, esp. 197-205, and his contribution with J. Meyhoffer, "Farel ouvrière de la Réforme française... (1521-1525)," in *Guillaume Farel, 1489-1565: biographie nouvelle écrite d'après les documents originaux par groupe d'historiens, professeurs et pasteurs de Suisse, de France et d'Italie* (Neuchâtel et Paris, 1930; reprint Geneva: Skatline, 1978), 111-131; 113-114.

Armed with a letter of recommendation from an anonymous patron in southwest France, Lambert secured lodging with Lefèvre's close friend, Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, just over the border in Geneva.¹³ Agrippa, in turn, plugged Lambert into an international circuit of humanists and reformers, who hosted him all the way to Wittenberg.¹⁴

Anémond de Coct was from Guillaume Farel's native Dauphiné, where, sometime in 1522, they had met. Before leaving for Germany with Claude de Tauro, de Coct converted Pierre Sébiville, a noted reformist preacher in the region's capital, Grenoble.

In 1523, while at Wittenberg, the three Frenchmen formulated ambitious plans to promote the evangelical movement in Savoy, France, and Italy.¹⁵ Luther and Spalatin encouraged and aided them, even finding Lambert a wife shortly after he threw off the frock, but the Frenchmen did not stay long. In the summer of 1523, de Tauro and de Coct journeyed south with letters written by Lambert and Luther to the Duke of Savoy and courtiers in France. From then on, they then used Zurich, Basel, and Strasbourg as their

¹³ Evidently Lambert sought a safe haven in France before going abroad, since the letter of recommendation to [Agrippa] for "bonus hic pater" [Lambert], is dated 5 June 1533 from Dax (départ. Landes), a small city in southwestern France (Aquitaine) near Bayonne: Herminjard 1, no. 51, 100. The anonymous recommendation for Lambert is curious. Dax is hundreds of miles in the opposite direction from Geneva. Nor is Dax known on any other count as an early center of evangelicalism.

Whoever his patron may have been, Lambert certainly had an established circle of friends and family in Avignon and Lyon who were in regular contact with Basilius and Boniface Amerbach at Basel, who had studied in Paris and Avignon. After his departure in 1522, Lambert's relation (*affinis*), Jean Montaigne, and another named Capal kept up contact between their friends at Avignon and Lyon and the Amerbach in Basel. For their letters between 1523-1525, see AK 2, no. 777, 294; no. 924, 433; no. 962, 472-482; AK 3, no. 1013, 25-26; no. 1019, 36-37.

The presence of Lambert's anonymous friend at Dax may explain Farel's otherwise inscrutable visit to Guyenne [Aquitaine] in 1523 and decision while there to leave France for Basel, in effect, following Lambert's footsteps. See *Guillaume Farel: biographie nouvelle*, p. 115-116.

¹⁴ On 17 June 1522, Agrippa recommended "bonum hunc patrem" [Lambert] to Capito at Strasbourg as "diligens Minister verbi Dei," Herminjard 1, no. 52, 101-102. Two years later, in December 1524, Lambert recapitulated this circle of communication, writing from Strasbourg to Agrippa in order to extend Capito's greetings and inquire about the progress of the Gospel in Geneva, see Herminjard 1, no. 133, p. 317. For Lambert's onward journey, see Bodenmann, "Bibliotheca Lambertiana," 19-23.

bases of operations. In December 1523, at Lambert's request, Luther solicited a place for him in Strasbourg so that he could promote the reform in France closer to home.¹⁶

Sometime in late 1523, Farel joined them abroad, landing at Basel.¹⁷

Beginning in late 1523, these expatriates and their hosts, Zwingli at Zurich, Oecolampadius at Basel, and Capito and Bucer at Strasbourg, entered into a lively correspondence with their confreres back home, most importantly, with Farel's scholarly family, Lefèvre, Roussel, as well as his former colleagues and students from the College of Cardinal Lemoine in Paris. The Navarrian network was born, an international solidarity from the start. The remains of their cross-border correspondence are our main source for reconstructing the network's existence in France. Over the next years, communications flowed along a central artery extending from Zurich, through Basel, Strasbourg, Lyon, where Marguerite resided with the royal court from October 1524 to August 1525, up to Meaux and Paris. Information did not, however, travel in a linear relay, but dispersed along the main trunk and other by-ways through a web of contacts. Individual writers representing their local cell passed on news about the activities of their immediate brethren as well as those farther afield, and, in turn, solicited similar reports from their correspondents.

¹⁵ See Herminjard I, nos. 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 75, and 79.

¹⁶ Lambert headed south against Luther's advice and despite his offers for further help at Wittenberg. See Luther's recommendation on his behalf to Nicolas Gerbel, *WA Br* 3, no. 691, 200-201; Herminjard I, no. 80, 170-171.

¹⁷ Weiss places Farel's arrival at Basel towards the summer of 1523, but this seems unlikely since Oecolampadius, Erasmus, Zwingli, and Capito do not note his presence until early 1524. Moreover, the letters to him from the Meaux group from January 1524 (see below) indicate that he had only just arrived there. For Weiss, see *Guillaume Farel: biographie nouvelle*, p. 115-120.

A simplified diagram of this far-flung and yet densely integrated network can be drawn by following one of the first strands in their communications. In late 1523, at Anémond de Coca's request, Ulrich Zwingli wrote a letter of encouragement to Pierre de Sébiville in Grenoble, who was being troubled for his evangelical preaching. Entreating Sébiville to stand firm, Zwingli couched his entreaty in the hope that the *pietas Christi* might advance in France as much as it had in Germany.¹⁸ In February 1524, de Coct published Zwingli's letter along with a letter from Luther to the Duke of Savoy.¹⁹ Such publicity may not have strengthened Sébiville's position versus his persecutors, but it did signal publicly the support of the two leading German reformers for the evangelical cause in France and Savoy. Oecolampadius followed up in March 1524, encouraging by private letter Sébiville as well as a certain noble named John of Coct's acquaintance, who was influential at court.²⁰ Later that year, Sébiville reported back to Coct at Zurich about the

¹⁸ For Zwingli's letter to Sébiville, see ZW 8, no. 325, 142-147; Herminjard 1, no. 82, 173-177. Sometime before 28 December 1524, Zwingli and Anémond de Coct wrote another two lost letters to Sébiville perhaps in response to news of his retraction after investigation. See Herminjard 1, no. 132, 313-316, 314. For the larger context, Weiss, "Les débuts de la réforme en France d'après quelques documents inédits," *BSHPPF* 70 (1921), 197-212, who cites the printed edition of Sébiville's retraction, p. 203, n. 2.: *Abjuratio heresis, Lutheriane facta per fratrem Petrum de Sibiville, religiosum ordinis minorum. Et sententia diffinitiva contra eum lata in curia spirituali sedis episcopalis Gracianopolis* (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Université de Paris, Rés. XVIe, 795, no. 20).

¹⁹ *In hoc libello contenta. Annemundi Cocti Equitis Galli ad lectorem Epistola. Christianissimi doctoris Martini Lutheri ad illustrissimum principem Carolum Sabaudiae ducem Epistola. Huldrici Zuinglii [Tigurin] Episcopi vigilantissimi ad Petrum Sebevillam Gratianopolitanum Ecclesiasten Epistola. Praediabitur hoc Evangelium regni in universo orbe, in testimonium omnibus gentibus et tunc veniet consumatio. Matthaei 24.* [Zurich: Christoph Froschauer], February, [1524]. See WA 3, no. 657, 148-154.

²⁰ Based on Coct's favorable report, Oecolampadius speaks of [Sébiville] as being of "nostrae fraternitatis," 9 March 1524, *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 189, 273-274 and Herminjard 1, no. 96, 203-205. For Oecolampadius's letter of the same day to "Johannes" see *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 188, 270-272. The editors suggest Giovanni Francesco Porporato at the court of the Duke of Savoy as the most likely candidate for the recipient. The mention of Anémond de Coct in both letters written on the same day and sending of the first to Sébiville, suggests rather that the second went to another Frenchman.

Jean Morelet du Museau is a more likely candidate for the recipient. He was a finance minister

severe persecution that he and other evangelicals in France had been enduring. Many had fallen away from their fellowship, and yet some remained steadfast. His chief supporters, he noted, were the group gathered around Marguerite d'Alençon at Lyon, led by Antoine Papillon, Michel d'Arande, and Antoine Du Blet. Beyond them, Sébiville reported that Aimé Galbert, Coct's kinsman, remained steadfast and passed on a rumor, a false one it turns out, that Briçonnet and Lefèvre had removed images at Meaux.²¹

Following the leads in this correspondence points to an evangelical group in the Dauphiné made up of the friends and family of Lambert, Sébiville, Farel, de Coct, de Tauro about which little evidence survives for this period.²² Next, to the north at Lyon was a group that combined locals, such as Antoine Du Blet, a rich merchant who accompanied Farel on a tour to see the major reformers in 1524,²³ and courtiers in Marguerite's train. Looking at this group a more closely, one finds that at about the same

and French ambassador to the Swiss cantons from 1523–1524 and related to Guillaume Briçonnet by marriage. His near relation (son?), Claude, had been a student of Nicholas Bérault and Guillaume Budé in Paris. In 1524, both Budé on his behalf and this Claude Morelet himself wrote to Erasmus in Basel. Furthermore, a few months later, on 31 July [1524], Oecolampadius was corresponding with one of these "Morelets." See, Allen 5, no. 1354, 270ff.; *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 206, pp. 295-296; Herminjard 1, no. 108, 248-250; and, for Jean Morelet de Museau's ambassadorship, *CAF* 9, 75. See note 22 for Coct's mention of "Johannem meum" who may or may not be the same person.

²¹ Sébiville's letter was dated on the "feast day of the innocents," 28 December 1524. His information about Meaux was a grossly exaggerated, but not unfounded. See below at note 46 for acts of iconoclasm at Meaux and Herminjard 1, no. 132, 313-316, 315.

²² On 2 September [1524], Anémond de Coct wrote to Farel that he had received a letter from his brother and that "In dies expecto a nostris [in France or the Dauphiné] literas per Joannem meum. Deus det dextrae suppetias!" Herminjard 1, no. 120, 282-283. Subsequently, Farel's brother Gauchier, their family members, and others from the region, including the Waldensian community, which would finance the first edition of Olivétan's bible, were leading agents in turning the Dauphiné into one of the French strongholds of Protestantism. Good evidence for their activity only survives after circa 1530.

²³ Du Blet supplied Lefèvre with books from Germany (Herminjard 1, no. 98, 206-209; excerpt *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 203, 289). Shortly after 15 May 1524, he and Farel left Basel with a letter of recommendation from Oecolampadius to Luther, but only made it as far as Zurich where they had an interview with Zwingli. See, *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 196, 280-282; *WA Br* 3, no. 745, 293-295; Herminjard 1, no. 101, 215-216; and for Lefèvre and Roussel's acknowledgment on 6 July 1524 of a letter

time Sébiville wrote to Coct in Zurich, their ally at Lyon, Antoine Papillon,²⁴ a member of the royal *grand conseil* and a protégé of Marguerite, wrote an upbeat report to Zwingli, about the evangelical cause at court. He notes that despite heavy opposition, Marguerite stood firm and was aided by a growing circle. Naming its members, he cites as its leaders himself, her almoner Michel d'Arande, Jacques Groslot (the *bailli* of Orleans),²⁵ and the learned Pierre Amy, who was a friend of Lefèvre and Conrad Pelikan.²⁶ The remaining leads in Papillon and in Sébiville's letters connect them, albeit less closely, to the Meaux group in the north and its many associates in Paris and beyond.

If one were to trace all of the people and their relations in the extensive correspondence of Farel and the Meaux group during 1524-1525, which will be discussed below, the network's organizational diagram would become denser with additional nodes connected to these main centers and more interconnections between them, but the picture would not alter much in shape.

from Farel with a report on their meeting at Zurich, see Herminjard I, no. 103, 219-228 and no. 104, 231-240; Schmidt, Gérard Roussel, no. 2, 171-178; *Brief Oekolampads* I, no. 203, 290-291 (excerpt).

²⁴ ZW 8, no. 346, 221-225; Herminjard I, no. 125, 294-298. See Weiss, "Les débuts de la réforme en France," *BSHPF* 70 (1921), 211 for the identification of these and several other evangelicals mentioned by Sébiville.

²⁵ If Groslot was not already Marguerite's master of requests by late 1524, he soon would be (at least as early as 1526) and was obviously working closely with her in 1524. Thereafter, Marguerite frequently entrusted him with sensitive missions on behalf of evangelicals. In 1526 she sent him to Paris to see to Berquin's release from prison as well as to secure a disputed legacy in Guillaume Farel's favor, despite his being under suspicion of heresy and in exile. See *Comptes*, 71 and 82; Scheurer, *Correspondance de Jean du Bellay* I, p. 332, note 2.

²⁶ In July 1524, Lefèvre mentioned to Farel that he was passing on a letter from Conrad Pelikan to Pierre Amy, who was residing with François Du Moulin de Rochefort, the royal almoner and Lefèvre's champion during the Magdalene affair. See Herminjard I, no. 103, 225.

III. Project France and the German Connection

The letters just cited demonstrate that although the network was wide-spread its members considered themselves to be a group working on a common project to promote a reform of France. They looked to the Meaux group and Marguerite's court circle for leadership and admired German evangelicals, to whom they had lines of communication via their expatriate brethren. Turning now to describe their 'project France,' Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples' first known letter to Guillaume Farel offers a rich and symbolic starting point, for this communication between two leaders of the nascent network broaches the major problems and activities that would preoccupy them over the coming years.²⁷

On January 13, 1524, Lefèvre wrote a response to a letter (now lost) from Farel, who had recently landed at Basel. Lefèvre begins by congratulating him for fleeing France, "You have wisely distanced yourself from the hate of those who wish us evil to take up residence among true Christians."²⁸ Turning to the Meaux reform, he reports that in the time since Farel had left they had distributed the complete New Testament in French to the laity. In response, the common folk had become so avid for the word of

²⁷ Lefèvre's letter to Farel also deserves special attention because it was long lost and its telling content does not yet function in scholarship. Stolen from the BnF in the 19th century, this letter resurfaced in Neuchâtel in the 1980s. See G. Berthoud and A. Labhardt, "Lettre de Lefèvre d'Étaples à Guillaume Farel du 13 janvier 1524: Présentation et traduction," *Librarium* [Zürich] 26 (1983), 216-17. This article contains a French translation and photograph of the original Latin letter. Cf. Herminjard I, no. 85, 183-184.

²⁸ "Tu as agi sagement en te soustrayant à la haine de ceux qui nous veulent du mal, pour te retirer parmi les chrétiens." Berthoud, "Lettre de Lefèvre d'Étaples à Guillaume Farel..." *Librarium* 26 (1983), 216. This statement as well as the fact that Lefèvre did not hesitate to turn over to Briçonnet a package of books sent by Farel and freely named him as the sender, would tend to refute the thesis that Farel left Meaux because Briçonnet had withdrawn his license to preach.

God that they would now rather suffer anything than be deprived of it. Meanwhile, the Faculty of Theology, who were “persecuting Christ not men,” had published a condemnation of propositions that it had invented and attributed to the Meaux group. The ministers at Meaux, Lefèvre protests, had preached the words of Scripture purely and explained its meaning without controversy, except for Pierre Caroli and Martial Mazurier, members of the Faculty of Theology, who had railed against the exaggerated cult of the saints, abuses of the Mass, and the simony of priests. Consequently, these two had been excluded from the ranks of the Faculty. As for the package of books that Farel had sent, Lefèvre had—evidently in obedience to standing policy—turned them over to Briçonnet, mentioning that they came from their former colleague. Since the bishop had departed immediately thereafter, Lefèvre had not yet been able to read them. In the mean time, he was expecting from *Germania* Luther’s translation of the Old Testament and a certain (*nescio*) Melanchthon’s *Commentary on John*. “Happy are you,” interjects Lefèvre, “to be in a place where you can keep current with all that!” Finally, to aid his ongoing Bible translation project, Lefèvre asked Farel to have copied for him the edition of the Psalms and Prophets in Aramaic. Lefèvre closes with greetings to Johannes Oecolampadius and Ulrich Hugewald.

In this letter, Lefèvre looks inward to France and outward to the Empire simultaneously. He is concerned about persecution at home and rejoices at the freedom in *Germania*. Preoccupied with their program of evangelical preaching at Meaux, he is enthusiastic about the laity’s reception of the translated Scriptures. Equally, he is eager to read the latest books of German reformers as resources for his own writing projects,

which serve those proselytizing efforts. The rest of the network's correspondence is filled with a similar admixture of topics.

Concentrating on the larger network, the central task remains to describe their program, its development, implementation, and effect on the laity. Any attempt to assess this history will repeatedly encounter the problem that has dominated all interpretations of the early French reformation: what and how much did French evangelicals owe to the German reformers. That question will be born in mind throughout the following account, which will focus on the network's praxis, allowing the question of their doctrinal similarities to and differences from the German reformers to arise in due course. A firm understanding of the network's program is best achieved by turning to its core, preaching.

Preaching at Meaux, Bourges, and Beyond

Since 1521, Guillaume Briçonnet, the Meaux group, and Marguerite had made preaching the centerpiece of their reform program. In the early months of 1524, as the bishop drew back from Marguerite's contentious attempt to have d'Arande preach at Bourges, she and the rest of the network pressed forward, there and farther afield.

The results of their 1524 Lenten preaching campaign heartened evangelicals far and near. Having heard precise reports from France, Farel recounted the impressive tally: Gerard Roussel preached steadfastly at Meaux, as did Michel d'Arande at Alençon and Bourges, as well as Aimé Meigret OP and another unnamed preacher at Lyon.²⁹

²⁹ Dated 2 April 1524 from Basel, Farel conveyed to his former student, Cornélius Scheffer, who was with his employer, Christian II of Denmark, in Wittenberg, very recent and remarkably precise information about the situation in France, especially d'Arande's troubles at Bourges during Lent and their

Meanwhile, other members of the network spread the news that Sébiville had continued to preach in Grenoble despite growing opposition. Meigret joined him for a guest sermon on April 25, fresh from his successful tour at Lyon.³⁰ This scattering of high profile preachers resembles the missionary program that the court had announced in the fall of 1523. Although network members did not claim that Marguerite specifically commissioned the others besides her almoner d'Arande, they described these preachers as working to the same end and praised her shortly thereafter for protecting them as they came under increasing fire during 1524.

After Easter, opposition to this preaching campaign built rapidly. Conservatives in Grenoble and Lyon charged Meigret with heresy within days of his sermons.³¹ The effects were soon felt. On May 15, 1524, Nicolas Le Sueur, the *élu* or chief royal tax official at Meaux, reported to Farel the mixed news that while many others preachers

outcome. Farel must have received this information from other now lost letters from the Meaux group, for no other letter from any French evangelical exists between Lefèvre's January letter and this one.

For example, a few days after Farel wrote to Scheffer at Basel, on July 6, 1524, Lefèvre further informed him, that d'Arande had been assisted at Alençon by another member of the Meaux group, Jean Mesnil, "... Joanne Mesnillio, qui comes fuit Michaëli, ducatus Alenconiensis apostolo." Herminjard I, no. 103, 219-228; 222.

How Farel picked up contact with Scheffer at Wittenberg is another unknown perhaps explained by de Coct and de Tauro's recent stay there. Despite the remaining riches, a great deal of correspondence of Farel and the rest of the network is missing from this period. See, Herminjard I, no. 97, 205-206 (excerpt), citing "J.E. Kappens [=Kapp], *Nachlese einiger zur Erläuterung der Reformations-Geschichte nützlich* (Leipzig, 1727), [II] 602;" letter missing in Quadroni, *Farel Corr.* At about the same time, Farel wrote another letter (if it is not the same as the one just cited) about his dislike of Erasmus to an anonymous recipient. Since the letter is only known through a copy owned by Georg Spalatin, the chancellor of Electoral Saxony, the recipient may have been Scheffer again, and in any case was certainly someone in close contact with the Saxon evangelical establishment. See *Guillaume Farel: Biographie Nouvelle*, pp. 125-126 & n. 1, citing, Kapp, "*Klein Nachlese II*," p. 604; letter missing in Quadroni, *Farel Corr.*

³⁰ Herminjard I, pp. 206, 228, 248-250, 281, 282.

³¹ Henri Hours, "Procès d'Hérésie contre Aimé Maigret (Lyon-Grenoble: 1524)," *BHR* 19 (1957), 14-43, with documents relating to the investigation.

were falling silent, Roussel continued to announce the pure gospel.³² Farel's former student, Jean Canaye, complained in July from Paris that while Roussel's sermons had great success at Meaux, he had only visited the withering evangelical group in the capital twice since Farel's departure without preaching either time.³³ Perhaps sensitive to such criticism, both Lefèvre and Roussel signaled to Farel during that same month that Caroli announced the Gospel "well-enough" in Paris at St. Paul's on every feast day. By August 5, the Faculty of Theology was investigating his sermons.³⁴ Two weeks later the Faculty at Paris took its first critical look at Roussel's sermons at Meaux. The Chancellor of the church of Paris reported that when preaching to the people on Assumption of the Virgin Roussel had maintained that whether Mary had been taken up bodily into heaven or not was irrelevant; the important matter was to understand the spiritual message in the Epistles and Gospels for the feast day.³⁵ The Faculty asked the Parlement take up the matter but the investigation went no further. Meanwhile during that summer Meigret was back in Paris, having put off his Dominican habit—if not a sermon, a public statement in itself—to respond to the Faculty of Theology's investigation of him.³⁶

³² Herminjard 1, no. 102, 216-219, 218-219; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 1, 169-171; *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 203, 289 (excerpt).

³³ Herminjard 1, no. 105, 240-243, 242; French translation in Nathaniel Weiss, "Guillaume Farel: Ses premiers Travaux 1521-1524," *BSHPF* 68 (1919), 179-214; 190-192.

³⁴ Friday, August 5, 1524, see Farge, *Registre*, session 36B, pp. 44-45.

³⁵ 19 August 1524: "Deinde quod cum multe materie fidei tractarentur in facultate... Dixit [the chancellor] preterea se audivisse virum honestum et gravem qui referebat quod, in sermonem die ultimo Assumptionis in civitate Meldensi, quidam nomine Geraldus, thesaurarius ecclesie, pro nunc predicando ad populum, hec aut similia verbo protulisset: quod sive sit assumpta Virgo in corpore vel non, non est curandum sed magis insistendum expositioni evangelii et epistole. Deinde loquens de veneratione sanctorum et ipsam attenuens, dixit, 'Objicietis michi quod in ipso habetur, 'Laudate Dominum in sanctis ejus,' respondeo quod in hebreo habetur 'in sancto' et non 'in sanctis.' Si quis sanctos velit laudare, agat in cimbali bene sonantibus.'" Farge, *Registre* 1, p. 47, 40 B.

³⁶ Coct reported Meigret's change of garb in a postscript to Lefèvre's letter to Farel of July 6,

By Advent of 1524, evangelical preachers were under heavy attack. In mid-December, Anémond de Coct received a fresh progress report at Basel: Michel d'Arande had preached without incident at Mâcon.³⁷ Less fortunate, Sébiville had been arrested but then released at Grenoble. The good news, Coct reported, was that Sébiville had been offered the pulpit at Lyon for the following Lenten season. Two weeks later, Sébiville explained that the situation was less rosy than his supporters at Zurich had been led to believe. While "secret friends" had indeed liberated him,³⁸ he had been forbidden to preach again in Grenoble on pain of death.³⁹ Meanwhile, Aimé Meigret published a programmatic apology for evangelical preaching along with the text of the sermon that he had delivered at Grenoble in April. When he took the pulpit again in Lyon during Advent, Louise of Savoy had him arrested.⁴⁰

Meigret's indictment on heresy charges signaled a severe downturn in the Evangelical's fortunes. At the end of December 1524, the Pope wrote to Louise to

1524, Herminjard I, no. 103, 219-228, 228. For the Faculty's investigations, see Farge, *Registre* I, sessions 32B, 33A, 34B, 35B, and 36C.

³⁷ "Toutes fois, Valgris, est venu, lequel dit que Maigret est prins à Lion. Mais Madame d'Alençon y est: loué soit Dieu! Sébiville est deslvré et preschera ce caresme à S. Paul à Lion, ainsi qu'il avoit pièça [depuis longtemps] esté prié." And again: "Maigret a presché à Lion maulgré les prestres et moynes. Arandius presche à Mascon." Anémond de Coct to Farel from Basel, 17 December 1524, Herminjard I, no. 130, 308-311: 309 and 311.

³⁸ Archival sources from Grenoble reveal that the notables there did not desert Sébiville after his retraction and being banned from preaching. On 9 January 1525, they sought to have him made a citizen of Grenoble and paid for the initial expenses of naturalization. They petitioned the General of the Franciscan Order to have him admitted to another convent. Their request evidently succeeded since he was again preaching Lent in 1526 at Sisteron and coming under suspicion. Anémond de Coct's father, Hughes, who was *auditeur* of the *Chambre des Comptes* of Grenoble, may have been one of Sébiville's 'secret friends.' See A. Prudhomme, *Simple notes sur Pierre de Sébiville, premier prédicateur de la Réforme à Grenoble (1514-1524)* (Bourgoin: Vulvillez, 1884), 29, 38-39, 43-44; and J.J. Hémardinquer, "À propos du procès d'hérésie contre Aimé Meigret (Grenoble, 1524)," *BHR* 19 (1957), 480-481, citing G. de Manteyer, *Pierre de Sébiville à Sisteron, 24 février – 17 avril 1526* (Gap, 1944), 25 pp, extract from *Bulletin de la Société d'Études des Hautes-Alpes* (1945).

³⁹ Herminjard I, no. 132, 313-316, 314.

congratulate her for making an example of the “heretical preacher.”⁴¹ Shortly thereafter, in a plan devised by the Chancellor Antoine Du Prat, to which Meigret consented, his case was transferred from the court of the Archbishop of Lyon to a new commission specially created to try his case made up of two doctors from the Faculty of Theology and two hand-picked jurists from the Parlement in Paris, André Verjus and Philippe Pot. In April, with the Parlement’s enthusiastic backing, Louise and Du Prat asked the Pope to elevate this special commission into a permanent inquisitorial court, a request which the Pope granted on May 20, 1525.⁴² Thus, Meigret’s case and royal court’s initiative led to the creation of the *juges délégués*, who would pursue heresy vigorously over the next two years.⁴³

⁴⁰ On the content of Meigret’s Grenoble sermon see below.

⁴¹ On 29 December [1524] the pope congratulated Louise on the arrest of the “Lutheran preacher” [Meigret]. See Fraikin, *Nonciatures de Clément VII*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1906), appendix I. Bref de Clément VII à Louise de Savoie (Rome, 29 décembre 1525 [1524!]), pp. 297-298. For the correct date and context, see Henri Hauser, “Un nouveau texte sur Aimé Meigret,” in *Études sur la réforme française*, (Paris: Picard, 1909), 69-80.

⁴² On 23 January 1525, the council of Archbishop of Lyon announced the news of the transfer of Meigret’s case to Noël Béda, *Herminjard* 1, no. 136, 323-325.

⁴³ Meigret may have agreed to have his case tried by this commission calculating that it would manage his case to a favorable conclusion as had the special commission of three bishops set up the previous year by Duprat to vet the Faculty of Theology’s articles against Lefèvre et al. See ch. 6, p. 295.

James K. Farge stresses that the Parlement of Paris provided the initial impetus for the establishment of the *juges délégués* based on the one established to hear Meigret’s case, see *Registre* 1, p. 79-80, note 9; *idem*, *Orthodoxy*, 181, 258. The Parlement may have seized on the opportunity, but the initiative and willingness of the court to ask for the pope’s permission were the crucial factors. The earliest involvement of the Parlement noted was on 29 March 1525, but already in January, the Council of Lyon had announced to Béda the exact outline for this special commission, which Antoine Duprat had conceived and whose parliamentary representatives, Philippe Pot [replaced upon death by Jacques de la Barde] and André Verjus, he had already chosen. That the *juges*, Parlement, and Faculty of Theology then thwarted royal will until Francis’s release was hardly the court’s initial plan, which was reflected accurately when after his return from captivity Francis reconstituted the *juges délégués* with the pope’s permission, stocking it with his chosen men.

While the Meigret affair was breaking, more newsworthy trouble for the network brewed at Meaux.⁴⁴ Shortly before Christmas 1524, commoners ripped down placards announcing the papal Jubilee indulgence and distributed handbills that called the pope the Antichrist. Then one night in early January, persons unknown cut down prayers to the Virgin and several saints that were posted in the cathedral. After both incidents, Briçonnet cooperated with the Parlement of Paris's investigation, ordering his flock to reveal the names of those responsible on pain of excommunication. By March, two preachers from Meaux, Jacques Pauvan and Antoine Saulnier were imprisoned in Paris for their heretical preaching. On March 18, with the help of Briçonnet, the Parlement sentenced several commoners, including a wool-carder, Jean Le Clerc, not for heresy but for 'great irreverence' in having posted *ethicquettes* [handwritten placards?] during the Jubilee, claiming that the Pope had no power. For that crime, the court had them whipped through the streets of Paris and Meaux, branded with the fleur-de-lis on their faces, and banished. During the investigation into the disturbances at Meaux, though nothing came of the deposition, witnesses implicated Gérard Roussel in the distribution of the anti-papal placard, reporting that his servant had been seen delivering to another priest the leaflets that were later handed out when the indulgence placards were ripped down.⁴⁵ Thus Sébiville's letter to Zurich in December 1524, accurately recorded the

⁴⁴ For the following account, see Veissière, *Briçonnet*, 318-325.

⁴⁵ The king's prosecutor in Meaux informed the Parlement that "Pierre Lorseau, grand chapelain de l'église, ... dit ... que depuis Noël dernier il a appris et entendu dire par honorable homme Hugues Tiersault, marchand à Meaux, ... que le serviteur de M. Gérard Roussel, ... avait porté plusieurs chartes et papiers qu'il avait données à un certain prestre de Saint-Christophe, dans lesquels il y avait quelques diffamations touchant le pape, comme disait ledit Tiersault qu'il criait et qu'il paraissait que les livres diffamatoires contre le pape, affichés à la porte de l'église et autres lieux, avaient été tirés desdites chartes,

pulse of an aggressive iconoclastic movement at Meaux if not the correct ministers responsible for animating the people.

The network felt the danger rising and tried to surmount it. Just as the Meigret affair was breaking and commoners at Meaux began agitating, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples dedicated his *Commentary on the Catholic Epistles* to Antoine Du Prat. Having been convinced to do so by the reports of "many courtiers and learned men in the royal court," he made an eloquent appeal to the Du Prat's political interests, proclaiming that preaching the Gospel throughout France would be the surest guarantee of domestic peace. Although he does not broach the topics directly, Lefèvre's dedicatory epistle responds to the tumult at Meaux as well as the court's decision to back the prosecution of evangelical preaching. Lefèvre and his advisors at court, who were without doubt the group gathered around Marguerite, must have seen that the tide was rising against them for he did not in fact publish the work for another two and a half years, and then, not as usual at Paris but at Basel (Cratander, 1527).

Lefèvre's reluctance to print his *Commentary on the Catholic Epistles* in 1525 reflects the fate of evangelical preaching during that year: it all but ceased in France. Sébiville evidently never took the pulpit in Lyon during Lent 1525.⁴⁶ Only at Meaux and Paris did the Fabrist circle continued to preach, but they were silenced one by one. Caroli

que ledit Tiersault avait vu dans les mains dudit prêtre de Saint Christophe, affirmant qu'il avait entendu dire ces choses, en présences d'Adam de Saint-Prix, Denis Roussot et Pierre Verdelot, prêtres." Charles Schmidt, "Gérard Roussel, inculpé d'hérésie à Meaux, 1525," *BSHPF* 10 (1861): 220. Obviously, Roussel had enemies among the clergy, but the details in this report are precise enough to make the accusation against him credible.

⁴⁶ Sébiville was again preaching at Sisteron during Lent 1526, stirring up controversy yet again. His end is not known, but his name did appear on the Roman index as one of the principal heretical writers.

was banned from preaching and lecturing in Paris. Mazurier was pursued for his efforts at Meaux. In August, Briçonnet forbade all preaching in the town and market of Meaux.⁴⁷ After being brought to Paris in chains, Meigret was evidently freed during his trial, but by 25 September 1525, as Roussel reports, he had been jailed again.⁴⁸ One week later, on October 3, the Parlement of Paris began an all out offensive against the leaders of the Meaux reform, ordering the arrest of nine commoners from Meaux, the transfer of other suspected heretics from the Briçonnet's episcopal jail to Paris, the arrest and indictment for heresy of Caroli, Mazurier, Roussel, the Franciscan Jean Prévost, Nicolas Mangin,⁴⁹ and Lefèvre d'Étaples. Briçonnet was ordered to appear in court and Louise of Savoy to send Michel d'Arande to them for questioning.⁵⁰ After three years of repeated attempts, conservatives finally crushed the evangelical preaching campaign and its leadership at Meaux.⁵¹

though no works have survived from his pen. See note 38.

⁴⁷ Veissière claims that Briçonnet halted preaching in order to prevent the spread of a recent epidemic. Even if he claimed such a reason, one would rightly suspect that the investigation of the *juges délégués* of Mazurier and others, as well as his loss in June and August of a series of decisions in his cases against the Franciscans of Meaux over preaching rights had as much to do with his decision. See Toussaints du Plessis I, 278-280; cf. Veissière, *Briçonnet*, 323.

⁴⁸ Herminjard I, no. 162, 389-392, 392; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 5, 185-187.

⁴⁹ Mangin was one of five ministers commissioned by Briçonnet to lecture on Romans to the people. See note 48.

⁵⁰ Toussaints Du Plessis, *Histoire de l'église de Meaux* 2, 280-281: no. DLXVII, "Extrait des Registres du Parlement," also quoted *in extenso* by Veissière, *Briçonnet*, 348-350.

⁵¹ Briçonnet's attempts to stave off the inquisition and his eventual capitulation are studied in Veissière, 348-268; *idem*, "Le procès de Guillaume Briçonnet au Parlement de Paris en 1525," *BSHPF* 130 (1984), pp. 5-27; *idem*, "Le procès de Guillaume Briçonnet au Parlement de Paris en 1525 II: quelques textes," *BSHPF* 132 (1986), pp. 543-560; Samuel Berger, "Le procès de Guillaume Briçonnet au Parlement de Paris, en 1525," *BSHPF* 44 (1895), 7-22.

Appropriating the German Reformation

If preaching was the central pillar of the network's program, they built much else around it to make it a more complete house of learning. As Lefèvre's first letter to Farel indicates, French evangelicals were following the German reformers with keen interest. What did they observe? What did they appropriate into their own program?

In the first place, their morale was boosted by the success of their German confreres. In July 1524, Lefèvre thanked Farel, Oecolampadius, Pelikan, and Hugewald exuberantly for the letters and books that they had send to him, which, he said, consoled and rejoiced him beyond words in the hope that "Christ would make himself known in France as fully as he had in the rest of Europe."⁵²

While pursuing their preaching program, network members read the books of reformers and catholic respondents for inspiration and guidance. The network's correspondence for 1524, which, albeit lacunary, is the fullest of any year, contains identifiable references to over fifty such works (see Appendix B III). If this sample is representative, network members were attempting to master large portions of the latest the literature of the German Reformation. In their letters, they mention having read or having tried to obtain scholarly and vernacular editions of the Bible as well as works by

⁵² The letters from these four reformers to Lefèvre are not extant. Herminjard 1, no. 103, 219-228, 220. Throughout their correspondence, network members repeatedly express their admiration for German evangelicals. For instance Nicolas Le Sueur wrote to Farel, "Contratulatur vobis Germanis [including 'Heleveticis'], et acceptam Deo ac Domino nostro Jesu Christo ferimus gratiam quae apud vos relucet, non tam multiplici Scripturae pura et Christiana professione, quam pharisiacae traditionis et servitutis contemptu, ac christianae libertatis (que spiritu et veritate constat) restitutione." 15 May 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 102, 216-219, 217; *Brief Oecolampads* 1, no. 203, 289 (excerpt); Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 1, 169-171.

Brunfels, Bugenhagen, Erasmus, Farel, Hesshus, Lambert, Lonicer, Luther, Melanchthon, Myconius, Oecolampadius (10 titles!), Pelikan, and Zwingli.

Given this reading it is not surprising to find that the Meaux group specifically affirmed having designed some parts of their reform program on the basis of German models. Indeed, other parts, about whose origins they have left no record, betray signs of German engineering as well.

Consider again their carefully devised preaching campaign. In its fully developed form, the Meaux group's program focused on the regular rhythm of Sunday and feast day services (i.e., not exclusively on the Lent and Advent preaching seasons). During the Mass, preachers read the epistle and gospel lessons in French and then expounded them in a close exegetical sermon. Lefèvre's New Testament translation was equipped to serve as an integral part of this preaching oriented service. Its last four gatherings contain a detailed lectionary table specifying (by incipit and excipit) the New Testament readings for all the Sundays and major feast days of the year.⁵³ The laity were thereby able, as Lefèvre instructs them in the preface, to study the New Testament passages that they would hear explained from the pulpit. The Meaux group did not intend their charges either to read Scripture alone or, in place of the traditional *exempla*-filled homilies, to

⁵³ "Table pour trouver promptement tant ou françois ou latin les evangiles, epistres et lecons contenues ou nouveau testament qui se disent en l'eglise es dimanches et jours de feste, et aussi es vigiles, jeunes, et rogations," (Simon de Colines, 1523), eee1r. Taking up four quires (eee-hhh8), this table was an expensive addition either for the buyer or for Bishop Briçonnet who distributed them *gratis* to the needy. Some exemplars do not have the table, but one of these (BnF Rés. A 6414*) had a manuscript table of pericopes "selon notre usage." For edition and bibliographical notes, see Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, trans., *Le Nouveau Testament: fac-similé de la première édition Simon de Colines, 1523*, ed. M.A. Screech, 2 vols., Classiques de la Renaissance en France (East Ardsley, England: S.R. Publishers; New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1970), xii-xvi.

come to their plain didactic sermons unprepared. By July 1524, as Lefèvre indicated to Farel, the Meaux group had been practicing this Sunday schooling of the laity, complete with a textbook, homework, and regular lectures, for quite some time.⁵⁴

Turning to the foundation of their didactic preaching system—the use of vernacular Scripture readings during the service—the Meaux group quite likely took their inspiration, or at least received strong support, from Johannes Oecolampadius's *Quod expediat Epistolae et Evangelii lectionem in Missa vernaculo sermone plebi promulgari* (1522).⁵⁵ If prior to 1524, Oecolampadius was not the one who specifically prompted the Meaux group to adopt vernacular lectionary readings, he certainly became an influential voice on Meaux group's program thereafter. Throughout 1524, they read his letters and books with great enthusiasm.⁵⁶ In July 1524, based on Oecolampadius's advice,

⁵⁴ "Nunc in tota dioecesi nostra, festis diebus, et maxime die dominica, legitur populo et epistola et evangelium lingua vernacula; et si paroecus aliquae exhortationis habet, ad epistolam aut evangelium, aut ad utrumque adjacet." Herminjard 1, no. 103, 219-228, 221. After this time, the Meaux group continued to alter the liturgy. Roussel was criticized for not saying the *Ave Maria* before preaching as was traditional. See Charles Schmidt, "Gérard Roussel, inculpé d'hérésie à Meaux, 1525," *BSHPF* 10 (1861): 222. 23 June 1524, Beda accused Mazurier of suppressing the rite and 'cantus' in the 'mass' for the dead, only using the Lord's Prayer in the vernacular, adding, "Anima defuncti orat Deum pro nobis." [Instead of the reverse] Farge, *Registre* 1, p. 98-99. The Meaux group did not, evidently, introduce a full vernacular rite for the mass for Roussel reported favorably on this as an innovation at Strasbourg to [Nicolas le Sueur] in [December 1525]: "In conventu populi nihil dicitur aut canitur quod non intelligatur ab omnibus..." Herminjard 1, no. 168, 408-415, 411-412. Cf. Quadroni, ed., *Rép. Corr. Farel*, p. 16, no. 45, identifies this letter as being sent by Lefèvre or Roussel to Farel and fails to note Herminjard's identification, if only to refute it. I have verified that the letter cited by Quadroni (Geneva, BPU, ms. lat. 112, fols. 77-78) is the same letter that Herminjard identified, I believe correctly, as from Roussel to Le Sueur. Cf. Again, I have verified that Quadroni, *Rép. Corr. Farel*, p. 16, no. 43 ["Gérard Roussel to Farel," December 1525, from Strasbourg] (Geneva, BPU, ms. lat. 111a, fol. 50.) is the same letter that Herminjard has published more correctly as ["Gérard Roussel to Guillaume Briçonnet," December 1525, from Strasbourg], in Herminjard 1, no. 167, 404-408; and Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 6, 188-191.

⁵⁵ Guy Bedouelle and Bernard Roussel, "La lecture de la Bible en langue vivante au XVI^e siècle: chronologie de quelques textes et faits marquants," in *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse*, ed. Francis Higman (Geneva: Droz, 1990), 62.

⁵⁶ Roussel lauded Oecolampadius as one of the chief learned men of the day: "Ad quem modum et hoc etiam tempore quosdam sibi servat in bonis, quas vocant, literis, apprime doctos, inter quos arbitror esse Oecolampadium, qui, cum sit omni doctrinae genere cumulatissimus, ut vix haberi possit cui

Briçonnet authorized Roussel and four other preachers to give daily public lessons on Romans and the Psalms according to the *lectio continua*. Caroli adopted a similar practice in Paris.⁵⁷

A completing feature of the Meaux group's preaching program was put in place in late 1525, just as it was being shut down by the Parlement. Lefèvre and his disciples published a model sermon book to aid less able prelates: the Meaux group's well-known *Epistres et Evangiles* [Paris: Simon Du Bois, c. 1525].⁵⁸ By publishing this work, which was a codification of their long-standing practice, they were disseminating their pedagogical program via print, and moreover, providing a textual substitute for their stymied effort to preach.⁵⁹

The genre of the *Epistres et Evangiles* and the Meaux group's intent in publishing it were, admittedly, hardly new developments in the history of homiletics. Sermon

conferatur, totum se Christo permisit, ut illis neglectis quae mundus in precio habere solet, solum Christum amplexetur, magnificat." To Farel, 6 July 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 104, 231-240m 223; *Brief Oecolampadi* 1, no. 203, 290-291 (excerpt); Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 2, 171-178. In this passage, Roussel alludes to Oecolampadius's *De passione Domini, de venerando et laudando Deo in Maria, de invocatione Divorum contra [Joannem] Fabrum*.

The enthusiasm for Oecolampadius was shared by a humanist circle in Paris centered on Guillaume Budé, Nicolas Bérault, and Pierre Petit. He received public accolades in reprints of two of his translations of Chrysostom: *Divi Joannis Chrysostomi...in totum Geneseos librum homiliae sexagintasex a Joanne Oecolampadio doc anno versae*, (Paris: Jean Petit, July 1524), dedicated by Pierre Petit to Michel de Boudet, Bishop of Langres; and *Divi Joannis Chrysostomi Psegmata quedam nuperrime a Joanne Oecolampadio in Latinum vesa* (Paris: Jean Petit, September 1524), dedicated by Nicolas Bérault to François Poncher, Bishop of Paris. Bérault and Petit reprinted these texts despite the Faculty of Theology's denial of permission, Farge, *Registre* 1, 44, n. 87. See further the letters of Budé, Claude Morelet, and Oecolampadius in note 20.

⁵⁷ Lefèvre to Farel, 6 July 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 103, 219-228; 222 and 227.

⁵⁸ Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and his disciples, *Épistres & Évangiles pour les cinquante & deux semaines de l'an: Fac-similé de la première édition Simon du Bois*, ed. M.A. Screech (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1964); *idem, Epistres et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an*, ed. Guy Bedouelle et Franco Giaccone (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976).

⁵⁹ See above at note 27 for Lefèvre's denial in January 1524 that the Meaux group preached anything beyond the pure text of scripture, which accurately characterizes the style of sermon in their

collections had long served as guides for parish priests and many were then available.⁶⁰ In the 1520s, if conservatives preferred to publish the Latin sermons of reformist preachers like Michel Menot to combat heresy,⁶¹ other well-established French *postille* collections remained available as well as the old stand-by sermon substitute, Gerson's *Opus tripartitum*.⁶² Lefèvre and his disciples rejected these traditional models in favor of a new, exclusively text-oriented sermon, which they considered better suited to instructing the laity in the pure Gospel. As noted previously, Jean Le Comte de La Croix testified long afterwards that a new model preaching book had been in gestation since Fabrists arrived at Meaux.⁶³ Even so, just as Luther's German New Testament had provided inspiration for Lefèvre's translating efforts, so too Luther's vernacular *postille* collections (1522 onwards) may have done the same for the Meaux group's sermon handbook. After February 1525, when Bucer published the first installment of his Latin translation of Luther's *Aventspostille*, which he dedicated to the "evangelical brothers dispersed in France," the Meaux group would have been able to work with Luther's text

handbook.

⁶⁰ Two major French books of homiletics included Nicholas of Lyra's *Les postilles et expositions des épitres et évangiles dominicales, avecques des festes solennelles*, trans. Pierre Desrey (Troyes, 1492, with many reprints) and Maurice de Sully's *Expositions des évangiles* (Paris, 1522?). See Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 309, citing Screech, ed., *Épîtres & Évangiles*, introduction, 12-13; and Henri Meylan, "Lefèvre d'Étaples: les thèmes théologiques de les Épîtres et Évangiles," in *Colloque de Tours: L'humanisme français au début de la Renaissance*, (Paris, 1973): 185-192; 191-192.

⁶¹ In March 1525, the Faculty of Theology approved the reprinting of Menot's *Sermones quadragesimales*, Farge, *Registre* 1, p. 90, sessions 84B and 85C.

⁶² On the possible models for the Meaux group's *Epistre et Évangiles* and their use at Meaux, see further Screech, ed., *Épîtres & Évangiles*, 12-16.

⁶³ See chapter 5, p. 230 ff.

itself.⁶⁴ The comparison, however, of the Meaux group's sermon book with these possible models still needs to be undertaken.⁶⁵

All evangelicals believed that didactic preaching was an essential first step to the spread of the Gospel. Beyond encouraging this pastoral approach, Farel, Oecolampadius, and Zwingli challenged the Meaux group and other preachers in France to attack the errors of the traditional church. Farel had specifically urged Roussel to challenge the Faculty of Theology to debate just as he had disputed Catholic authorities at Basel. Following the model established by Luther, Farel had printed, posted, and then successfully defended 13 theses in February 1524.⁶⁶ As models, Roussel could well have used Farel's theses and the others being sent to the Meaux group.⁶⁷

Roussel replied to this appeal with excruciatingly painful outbursts of self-doubt, fear, anger, and hope. He, like Lefèvre, agreed with their mentors in Germany that they were fighting against the reign of the Antichrist.⁶⁸ He wanted to advance "the Christian

⁶⁴ *Primus tomus enarrationum in epistolas et evangelia, ut vulgo vocant, lectiones illas quae in missa festis diebus ex historiis evangelicis et scriptis apostolicis solent recitari. Authore Martino Luthero. Opus optima frugis, latinis hactenus incognitum.* [Strasbourg, Johannes Herwagen, 1 February 1525]. Bucer's dedicatory letter to the 'evangelical brothers dispersed in France' is dated 13 January 1525. Bucer's translation of Luther's introduction to this collection, would then be translated twice into French both of which were printed by the network's printers Du Bois and Lempereur: *Breve instruction pour deuement lire l'escripture* [Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1529?] and *La maniere de lire l'evangile et quel profit on en doibt attendre* [Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1529?] (Higman, *Piety*, L 115 and L 114).

⁶⁵ Screech, ed., *Épîtres & Évangiles*, 12-14, shows that the Meaux group had a radically different approach than predecessors in French.

⁶⁶ *Gulielmus Farellus christianis lectoribus. Februar [1524].* [Basel: Andreas Cratander], February 1524. Oecolampadius translated Farel's theses into German and these were printed in a further five editions. Gilmont, "Oeuvre imprimé Farel," no. 1-1 through 1-6, 113-116; Herminjard 1, no. 91, 193-195 for Latin text.

⁶⁷ As noted in Appendix B III, Farel sent the Lutheran theses defended at Breslau by Joannes Hess to Lefèvre, who approved of them, see Herminjard 1, no. 103, 219-228, 225-226 plus the theses, 228-231; *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 203, 290 (excerpt).

⁶⁸ For example, "Ceterum arma Christiane militie potentia per Deum, ad demoliendum quidquid aversus illum munitum fuerit, ad evertenda consilia et omnem altitudinem erigentem se adversus

cause,” but he also saw clearly that if he tried, he only stood to lose his life, not to win a public disputation as Zwingli had at Zurich and Farel at Basel. Nettled by Farel’s demands, Roussel complained:

... as for what you exhort me to do in your letter, namely that, having posted theses drafted in Christ’s printshop, theses indeed which wholly contradict the Sorbonne, I should then assail those fat Parisian bellies, which hitherto have been considered the sole storehouses of theology, requires great strength of faith and gifts of the Spirit different from those which I have felt in myself so far.... In addition to this you want a single little man [*unus homuncio* = Roussel or Lefèvre?] to ensure that books are printed in both French and Latin that will refute their errors, errors which until now everyone has accepted. It is as if you have forgotten about the Parlement of Paris’s decree that stipulates no one may publish theological books unless they have been previously approved by the Faculty of Theology. As a result, only Sorbonnic books are printed these days, nothing else. Go on now, who is able to do what you ask when the Parlement is on the side of the theologians, sanctioning everything that they decree? To convince you that I am telling the truth, I will relate what happened here a few days ago...⁶⁹

cognitionem Dei: quae si semel, per vestras orationes ad Deum, inheserint mihi, *non est ut metuum hominum larvas, Antichristi regnum cum suis infulis ac scholis, quae, pro humanis traditionibus, quibus se aliis preferant, magno coram Deo merito, dense digladiantur, ac novas semper adinveniunt, novas sectas, novos cultus, de quibus ne tantillum meminit Scirptura....*” [Emphasis added] Roussel to Johannes Oecolampadius, 24 August 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 118, 274-278, 277; *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 213, 309-312; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 4, 180-184.

The key terms used by network members in their denunciations of the church, its clergy, and its errors include: synagogue, the Antichrist, Satan, the Devil, Pharisees, scribes, hypocrites, doctors, superstition, human traditions or inventions. Like the German reformers, Lambert, Farel, and Coct openly attacked the church with these terms in their publications. As revealed in their private correspondence, Lefèvre, Roussel, and other evangelicals in France shared similar views. For examples see Herminjard 1, pp. 148-151, 217, 232, 234-236, 217-28, 275-278, 281, 296, 311, 314, 376, 390, 408, 411-412, 499 n. 2. See also Nicolas de Bourbon’s poem on the Roman Antichrist cited in note 1.

⁶⁹ “... nam quod scripto adhortaris, ut ventres Parisinos adoriar, affixis e Christi officina positionibus, quibus nihil conveniat cum Sorbona, quae hactenus credita et unicum theologorum asyllum, non parvum exigit fidei robur, ac alia spiritus manifestatione opus esset quam sit ea quam hucusque sensi in me. Hortaris, ut unus homuncio [Roussel or Lefèvre?] ... adhuc autem det operam libros imprimi in gallica latinque lingua, quibus errores ipsorum convellantur qui hucusque pro receptissimis habiti sunt. Quasi tu ignores decretum Parisini Senatus quo cautum est ne quis invulgare libros theologie audeat, nisi antea approbatus a Facultate Theologie Parisinae; ut nihil hodie apud nos imprimatur non sorbonicum, neque imprimi queat. Age, jam qui fieri potest quod petis, cum Senatus a parte theologorum stet, ut quod hi decreverunt cunctis comprobet calculis? Et, ut quod dico verum putes, aperiam quod superioribus diebus apud nos acciderit.” Herminjard 1, no. 104, 231-240: 234; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 2, 171-178. See further Roussel’s second tortured refusal to jump into the arena with the Doctors of Theology addressed to

Roussel goes on to tell of the arrest of several members of the network at Meaux. He was plainly consternated at being asked to pick a fight that he knew he could not win, and yet believed to be just. He would not, he could not, challenge the Faculty unless he was granted greater courage and wisdom.

IV. The Invention of the French Evangelical Press circa 1525

Although French evangelicals balked at disputing church authorities publicly, they all agreed with their mentors in *Germania* that vernacular works were desperately needed to advance the cause in the realm. As is now well established in scholarship, only in 1525, just after the flood of reformation pamphlets in Germany had reached its high-water mark, did evangelical books written in French appear in significant numbers, including the first translations of Luther and other reformers into French.⁷⁰ The focus of this study sharpens this picture: the Navarrian network was responsible for inventing the first

Farel, Herminjard 1, no. 117, 270-273, and Oecolampadius, Herminjard 1, no. 118, 274-278; *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 213, 309-312; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 4, 180-184.

⁷⁰ Francis Higman, Jean François Gilmont, Rodolphe Peter, and four generations of scholars stretching back through the past century have reconstructed this picture, which Higman has brought together in his bibliography *Piety and the People*.

In a sermon from 1519, Josse Clichtove complained that Luther's writings were appearing at Paris in French and German [among the German students there?]. For Clichtove's report, see Henry Heller, "Reform and Reformers at Meaux, 1518-1525," (Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, 1969), 2, citing Jules-Alexandre Clerval, *Iudoci Clichtovei Neoportuensis Vita et Operibus 1472-1543*, (Paris, 1894), 30-31. Similarly, in 1521 the Parlement complained about, "certains livres imprimez, ... translatez de latin en language françoys ... en grant scandalle et opprobre de la foy catholique," which apparently included a lost French translation of Melanchthon's treatise against the Sorbonne's *Determinatio*, the *Adversus furiosum Parisiensium Theologastorum*. See Imbart 3, 170 citing AN X1A 1523, fol. 310 [covering the year 1521], and 175. On 2 October 1523, the Faculty of Theology censured a French translation of Melanchthon's *Passione Christi*. "Die Veneris IIa hujus mensis [October] et ani [1523]... multa fuere in consultationem posita, videlicet de libris Melenthonis de quadam *Passione Christi* sermone gallico edita, ..." Clerval, *Registre*, 396; Imbart 3, 171. This may be a confused reference to one of the pieces in the *L'Oraison de Jesuchrist, qui est le Pater noster* (Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1525?, [Higman, *Piety* F 25]): "La Manière de méditer et penser à la passion de Jesus Christ." This was in fact a French translation of Luther's "Sermo de mediatione dominicae passionis (1521)," WA 61, p. 105, referring to WA 2, 134. Higman,

successful French evangelical presses. Not only are its members' ink-stained fingerprints on scores of these evangelical books, but they were consciously and collectively working towards this goal since early in 1523.⁷¹ According to all available evidence, the Navarrian network's guiding hand was behind a broad, well-coordinated publishing campaign. Reconstructing their effort requires expanding the scope of analysis beyond French printed books, which have hitherto been the principal focus of research, to include Latin texts, manuscripts, and the network's correspondence, which reveal much about the planning and execution of their program.

The French market for evangelical literature in Latin was strong from the beginning of the Luther affair. In 1521, seven of Luther's best selling Latin works were reprinted anonymously in Paris to supply local demand. After the Faculty of Theology condemned the Augustinian friar from Wittenberg and the Parlement issued edicts regulating the market in religious books in 1521,⁷² Luther's works ceased being reprinted in Paris. Reformation tracts, however, continued to filter into France at some unknown rate. For instance, in 1523, works by Luther, Melanchthon, Simon Hesshus, Erasmus, Lonicer, and others were on sale in Lyon.⁷³

Censorship, 83.

⁷¹ For two overviews of the evolution of heterodox literature in French by the master of this field, see Francis M. Higman, "Le levain de l'Évangile," in *Histoire de l'édition française: le livre conquérant du moyen âge au milieu du XVII^e siècle* (Paris: Promodis, 1982), 305-325; *idem*, "Le domaine français, 1520-1562," in *La réforme et le livre: l'Europe de l'imprimé (1517-v. 1570)*, ed. Jean-François Gilmont (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1990), 105-154.

⁷² On the advent and development of censorship see Higman, *Censorship* (1979); James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy* (1989); *idem*, "Censorship in Paris: The Roles of the Parlement of Paris and King Francis I." *Renaissance and Reformation*, new series, 13 (1989) 173-183; *idem*, *Le parti conservateur au XVI^e siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la renaissance et de la réforme*, (Paris: Documents et inédits du Collège de France, 1992).

⁷³ As noted above, network members were avid readers of these works. Parmentier to Boniface

While Latin works remained available, different groups hatched plans to produce evangelical books in the vernacular. During 1525 these efforts converged and succeeded under the leadership of the Meaux group and sympathizers at court. The first recorded plan did not, however, originate with the French. In 1521, Bucer informed Beatus Rhenanus that the imperial knight, Franz von Sickingen, was keen to have Luther's writings translated for the benefit of the French speaking Charles V.⁷⁴ Sickingen's plan never materialized, but Bucer would shortly become involved in similar translating program. As mentioned above, upon arrival at Wittenberg in 1523 Lambert, de Coct, and de Tauro hatched plans to translate Luther's treatises for France. At first, however, they produced not French but Latin translations of Luther's German works. This was nevertheless an important intermediary step. Once Luther's German works reached Europe's intellectual *lingua franca* they could be sold anywhere and translated into any vernacular. For this, the Frenchmen encouraged their German friends in what was by 1523 an well established project to render Luther's important German works into Latin. Two of Melanchthon's students, Johann and Jacob Rhellican, as well as Bucer

Amerbach from Lyon, *AK* 2, no. 292, 440; see further no. 938, 440-441. Parmentier noted: Andrea Focchi, *Renestellae de magistratibus sacerdotiisque Romanorum libellus* (Curio, 1523). Philip Melanchthon, *Annotationes Ph. M. in Ev. Matthaei* (Basel: Curio, May 1523). Philip Melanchthon, *In Ev. Joannis annotationes Ph. M* (Basel: Curio, May 1523). Simon Hesshus, *Apologia Simonis Hessi adversus dominu Roffensem* [s.l.s.d.]. Ulrich Hutten, *Ulrichi ab Hutten cum Erasmo Rot. ... Expostulatio* [Strasbourg, Johannes Schott?]. "Judicium Lutherii adversus Erasmi." "Messias Judei venit." Otto Brunfels, *Problemata Othonis Brunnfelssi. I. De ratione Evangeliorum. II Quare in Parabolis locutus sit Christus* [s.l.: Johannes Schott]. Johannes Lonicer, *Jo. Lonicieri Catechesis de bona dei voluntate erga quemvis Christianum* (s.l., s.d.). Sebastian Munster, "Dictionarium hebraycum" [(Froben, June 1523)] Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, *Commentarii initiatorii in quatuor Evangelia* (Basel: Cratander, March 1523).
⁷⁴ 5 April 1521, *Bucer Corr.* 1, no. 31, 146-149; 147.

specifically announced that their translations were intended for the benefit of France.⁷⁵

The French expatriates also tried to ensure that Luther's Latin works remained available, for example securing promises from Valentin Curio at Basel to reprint Luther's treatise *Adversus falso nominatum ordinem episcoporum*.⁷⁶ They also kept their brethren back in France informed about what was going to press. Thus, in October 1524, writing from the court at Lyon, Antoine Papillon asked Zwingli to dedicate his *De vera et falsa religione* to Louise of Savoy in order to win her support of the evangelical cause.⁷⁷ The following March, having heard that Louise had had Meigret arrested, Zwingli in fact dedicated his lengthy compendium of doctrine to Francis I.⁷⁸ Meanwhile, François Lambert was publishing at a feverish pace at Strasbourg from 1523 to 1526, including an attack of the Franciscan rule (with preface by Luther) as well as a dozen Latin commentaries on books from the Old Testament, two of which he dedicated to Francis I.⁷⁹ The publication of these books, conjoined with those by Frenchmen abroad—Coct's two pamphlets of letters

⁷⁵ In his preface to Martin Luther, "*De humanis traditionibus vitandis. Item de iniquo mamnone contiones*" (Basel: Thomas Wolff, 1525), Johann Rhellican specifies that he and his cousin Jacob undertook their translations at the request of François Lambert and another Frenchmen in order to facilitate the passage of Luther's German works into French. See, Herminjard I, no. 67, 129-131. *De iniquo mamnone contiones* was published in French translation soon thereafter at Paris in: Sebald Heyden and Martin Luther, *D'ung seul mediateur entre Dieu et les hommes, Jesuchrist... Ung sermon de mammona iniquitatis, c'est à dire des richesses d'iniquité* [Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1526?]; Higman, Piety, H 12 and L121. For Bucer's first translation's of Luther into Latin, see Appendix B III, no. 32 and note 64. For a list including all Luther's works translated from German into Latin, see WA 61, 101-105.

⁷⁶ Anémond de Coct and Michel Bentin made this request. See, Herminjard I, no. 120, 282-283; cf. Appendix B III, no. 33.

⁷⁷ "E re Christiana esse Dubleto [Antoine Du Blet] et mihi videtur, si Ludovicae, Andium, Cenomanorum Angolismorumque duci, Christianissimi regis matri, librum "De vera et falsa religione", quem scripturum te recepisti, dicaveris." Papillon to Zwingli, 7 October 1524, ZW 8, no. 346, 221-225, 255; Herminjard I, no. 125, 294-298.

⁷⁸ For *De vera et falsa religione commentarius*, see ZW 3, 590-912. See further, Bernard Roussel. "La dédicace à François Ier du *De vera et falsa religione commentarius* de H. Zwingli (mars 1525)," in *Le livre et la réforme*, ed. Rodolphe Peter et Bernard Roussel (Bordeaux: Société des bibliophiles de Guyenne, 1987), 187-216, with introduction and French translation of dedicatory epistle.

by himself, Lambert, Luther and Zwingli as well as two Latin works by Farel⁸⁰—constituted a concentrated missionary effort in Latin, organized by members of the network for the reformation of France. These treatises were a small but nevertheless important contribution to the scores of Latin works from the Empire and Switzerland then circulating in France.

Building on this base of Latin literature, Antoine Du Blet, Michel Bentin, de Coct, Farel, and François Lambert pursued plans to produce French books at Basel and Strasbourg.⁸¹ The results, however, were disappointingly small. From 1523-1527, only four evangelical books in French are known to have been printed at Basel and another six at Strasbourg. Basel's Andreas Cratander, who had strong ties to the Schabler-Resch publishing house and had previously reprinted many of Lefèvre's Latin works, printed all four: Farel's lost *Epistre chrestienne* as well as his very influential *Le Pater Noster, et le Credo en françoys*;⁸² a reprint of Lefèvre's New Testament; and an anonymous pamphlet with a programmatic title and equally strident evangelical content: *Exhortation sur ces*

⁷⁹ See Appendix B III and Bodenmann, preface to "Bibliotheca Lambertiana" (as in note 12).

⁸⁰ See Appendix B III.

⁸¹ "[Michel Bentin] Cogitabat Tipographiam adoriri, me in vertendis gallice libris comite. Ego, ut verum fatear, animo ad eam rem ita sum propenso, ut quod maxime velim ad etiam me posse confidam. Opto enim Galliam evangelicis voluminibus abundare, siquidem illa sunt quae de Iesu testimonium perhibent. Praeterea, quum Vaugris Lugdunum ibit, scribam ad fratres, ut pecuniae aliquid ad me mittant." Anémond de Coct to Guillaume Farel from Basel, 2 September 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 120, 280-284, 282.

By 18 November 1524, Coct had arranged with Conrad Resch to have Lefèvre's edition of the NT reprinted "en plusieurs exemplaires," which may have meant a big print run or with different title pages. He also secured a promise to have Farel's works printed as well as, it seems, other works in the care of Michel Bentin: "Je luy [Resch] ay parlé des livres françois que avez, et semble estre bon que, après ce que le Novel Testament sera imprimé, ilz soyent imprimez. Es choses que j'ay aporté donera ordre nostre frère Michel Bentin." Herminjard 1, no. 128, 306.

⁸² Farel's expositions of the Lord's Prayer and Creed, for which he borrowed from Luther, was taken up in three other publications in a total of 18 further editions, including the *Le livre de vraye et parfaite oraison* (Paris: Simon Du Bois for Christien Wechel, 1528). See Guillaume Farel, *Le Pater Noster et le Credo en françoys*, ed. Francis Higman (Geneva: Droz, 1982), and literature cited in chapter 8.

*sainctes parolles de nostre segneur [sic] Jesus "Retournes vous, et croyes à l'evangile" ... et comment et la quelle fin on doit faire les bonnes oeuvres ... et de la subjection et obeissance qu'on doit rendre aux segneurs.*⁸³ Cratander also printed a fifth French religious book during these years: Claude Chansonette's translation of Erasmus's *Modus conifitendi* (1524), which Chansonette dedicated to Marguerite. Members of the network had no hand in this work, indeed, most of them despised it and its author.

Meanwhile at Strasbourg, despite Lambert's stated intent in 1523, no evangelical works in French were printed there until 1525. That year the *Livre tresutile de la vraye et parfaite subjection des chrestiens*, a translation of Luther's *De libertate christiana* (1520) was published and by July, the evangelical cell in Metz was reading it.⁸⁴ The next year

note [169].

⁸³ The *Exhortation sur ces sainctes parolles*, which calls for worship to be purified according to the Gospel, emphasizes 'Lutheran' themes (e.g., the new versus the old law, the old law as a pedagogue, and the *doctrine evangelique* versus the *doctrine des hommes*), and criticizes the traditional church's doctrines as *marchandises*. Also noteworthy, the author stresses obedience to secular authority and repeats many evangelical bywords such as "... vivre selon la parolle de nostre seigneur en vraye et vive foy," (B6r). Stylistically a bit loose, the work also shares much in common with the thought of Guillaume Farel and his fellow exiles circa 1524, including an emphasis on the "table de nostre seigneur" as "...vraie union et charite avec tous les fideles et chrestiens en ce qu'on faict la remembrance et commemoration de celluy qui est chief de toute charite... annuncant la mort de ce tresbon Jesus ... qui se sict a la dextre du pere est mort pour nous, affin que nous fussions ung corps par charite, mettans la vie l'ung pour l'autre comme membres d'ung mesmes corps." (B1r-B1v). My 'vraye et vive' thanks to William Kemp for supplying me with a photocopy of this rare, unpublished work.

⁸⁴ One of those with access to this work at Metz was the exiled wool-carder from Meaux, Jean Le Clerc. Guillaume Farel, Jean Le Clerc, other Meaux refugees, François Lambert, and Agrippa of Nettesheim were all in contact with a substantial circle of commoners and nobles in Metz, including Pierre Toussaint and the Dex [d'Esch] family, whose Nicolas brought the Luther translation from Strasbourg. The evangelical cell at Metz was not, however, powerful enough to stand up to strong repression led by the Lorraine family. See *Les chroniques de la ville de Metz* (900-1552), ed. J.-F. Huguenin (Metz, 1838), pp. 823b-829a ; 827; Rodolphe Peter, "Les premiers ouvrages français imprimés à Strasbourg, 2e suite," *L'Annuaire des amis du vieux-Strasbourg* (1980), no. 0a, 36-38; A.-L. Herminjard, *La réforme à Metz: six lettres inédites de Farel et de Pierre Toussaint (1525-1526)* (Paris: Ch. Noblet, 1876); off-print from *BSHPPF* 15 (1876) which contains an appeal to Robert II de la Marck, sr. of Sedan, to intervene in favor of the evangelicals at Metz; and the focused article with broad implications by Bernard Roussel, "Les premières dissidences religieuses du XVIe siècle à Metz (Hiver 1523 - Été 1525)," in *Les réformes en Lorraine (1520-1620)*, ed. Louis Châtelier, Centre de Recherches en Histoire sociale et religieuse, no. 2

brought the publication of the Wolfgang Schuch' *Epistre chrestienne envoyee a tresnoble Prince monseigneur le duc de Lorayne*, with an introduction by "Theodulus Philadelphus," probably François Lambert, "to the Christian brothers in the *Gaules* (French speaking lands)," which describes the author's martyrdom in the Duke's territory.⁸⁵ Four more tracts—*Prophetie de lesaie de l'enfant nouveau en Jesuchrist*, a translation of Luther's *De Christo Iesu puero nato* (1527),⁸⁶ and three 'Lutheran' works by the French exile, Guillaume Dumolin⁸⁷—swelled the Strasbourg tally to six books by 1527. Thereafter, the network members' project to produce vernacular works bore no more fruit in either Basel or Strasbourg. Only circa 1540, did a new wave of French exiles, including Calvin, induce printers in these cities to produce more heterodox religious books in French.⁸⁸

Until 1525, evangelicals in France had even more difficulty publishing than their expatriate friends. Only four evangelical books in French are known to have been printed in France during 1524, Lefèvre's translation of the Psalms, two reprints of his New Testament, and Aimé Meigret's sermon from Grenoble. Throughout that year Lefèvre, Roussel and Nicolas Le Sueur lamented that they could not go to press with the

(Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1986), 11-45.

⁸⁵ Rodolphe Peter, "Le martyr alsacien Wolfgang Schuch," *Revue d'Alsace* (1987), 91-127, including a critical edition of the tract.

⁸⁶ Possibly translated by François Lambert from Johannes Lonicer's Latin translation *De Christo Iesu puero nato ex 9. Iesae capite vaticinium* (1527), WA 19, no. 360, 128. See Higman, *Piety*, L 118.

⁸⁷ Guillaume Dumolin's treatises are heavily inspired by Luther, and, given their titles, oriented to the Francophone parts of the Empire. Nothing about them suggests a connection to the network. See Appendix B I.

⁸⁸ After Calvin settled at Strasbourg in 1539, the city's presses again produced religious books in French. At Basel except for one Farel tract in 1532, no more were printed until 1544. See Higman, *Piety*, printer by city tables. For the transition of evangelical printing abroad to Geneva by way of Vingle at Neuchâtel, see *idem*, "Le levain de l'Évangile," 305-325, 382-389.

manuscripts they had in hand because of heavy censorship.⁸⁹ In order to have his revised Latin edition of the Psalms published, Lefèvre had to buy the good will of the Parlement by dedicating the work to its first president, Jean de Selve.⁹⁰ Worse still, Lefèvre and his colleagues found that they could no longer rely on the services of their usual printer at Paris, Simon de Colines. In the estimation of Lefèvre and Colines' step-son, Robert Estienne, aside from editions of the Bible, he was producing nothing but rubbish, exemplified by his printing of the *Antilutherus* (1524) by the Fabrists' former colleague "*Cloacarius*," Josse Clichtove.⁹¹

In the face of these constraints, network members in France asked their brethren in Basel to help them publish religious books. The leaders behind the network's campaign within the kingdom were Gérard Roussel and Nicolas Le Sueur. They pursued two plans simultaneously. As an immediate expedient, they and some rich friends from Lyon sent manuscripts and subsidies for their publication to Basel. As noted above, this attempt produced small results.⁹² Their second more daring plan was to establish a press at Meaux, as they had previously done for Lefèvre's *Latin Commentary on the Gospels* (1522). This time, however, they intended to print vernacular works for the laity, which,

⁸⁹ Herminjard I, nos. 98, 103, 104, and 117.

⁹⁰ "... jam primarius praeses habebat ad manus, nomini suo dedicatum, quo favorem curiae emercaremur, ad quicquam, si opus esset, excudendum. Nam scis ordinationem Senatus, omnibus libris, tum excudendi, tum precio exponendis, praebentem impedimentum, nisi instituti quidam censores (et iidem, si non etiam indocti, certe male adfecti) adprobaverint." Lefèvre to Farel, 6 July 1524, Herminjard I, no. 103, 219-228; 223.

⁹¹ Lefèvre and Roussel promised to send to Farel a letter by Robert Estienne describing Colines' latest publications as well as examples of them once published. Herminjard I, nos. 103 and 104. Expressing the sentiments of the Meaux group, Jean Lange wrote to Farel from Meaux January 1, 1524: "De cloacario non loquor (certè Clithoveo dicere putabam); non tibi unquam persuadeas, quàm ille repuerascit vel vanos istos theologici ordinis accubitus anhelet, depereatque." Herminjard I, no. 83, 178-181, 180.

like Lefèvre's Bible translation, they would distribute for free. For this project, they asked Farel to spare no expense in obtaining type sets and matrices like those used by Froben at Basel.⁹³

The following year, 1525, in answer to the network's needs and plans, Simon de Colines (or rather, almost certainly his step-son, Robert Estienne, using his material) and two new printers, Simon Du Bois at Paris and Martin Lempereur [de Keyser] in Antwerp, began publishing a large stock of evangelical books. Except for Lefèvre's Bible translations, all of these French imprints were anonymous. While Colines' presses ceased being used by 1526 (the year in which Estienne set up his own printing house), over the next ten years Du Bois and Lempereur would carry on the brunt of printing first editions of evangelical books in French. Many of these were reprinted by other printers, some of whom, such as Pierre de Vingle and later Estienne Dolet at Lyon, were clearly evangelical as well.

⁹² Herminjard 1, no. 102, p. 218; no. 124, 292-3.

⁹³ "Quod ad imprimendos libros vulgari idiomate attinet, egi cum amicis, qui tuum consilium probant; sed commodior modus non est illis visus, ob decretum Senatus, quam si in nostra urbe Meldensi peculiaris esset impressor, qui nostris impensis formaret libros, gratis deinceps sed pauperibus per nos communicandos. Qua in re tuam operam requirimus, ut, si fieri potest, per te nobis matrices aeneae, aut quod magis optamus, styli ferrei, matricum quod vocant radices ac capita, nostris quidem sumptibus reddantur, quod supiamus Frobenianum impresionem assequi aut propemodum imitari. Nihil addubito istic esse complures, qui istiusmodi stylos apparent, cum apud nos pauci sint, et adhuc non admodum industrii. Nec moror sumptus, modo hisce nobis uti liceat: in quam rem quid studi impenderis, fac resciam quamprimum. Nam ut hoc ad te scriberem primores urbis curarunt, qui tibi bene colunt ex animo." Roussel to Farel, 6 July 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 104, 231-240, 237-238; *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 203, 290-291 (excerpt); Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 2, 171-178. Roussel's request is curious, reflecting either great ignorance about printing or forward looking vision. Traditionally, all French vernacular works at that time were printed in gothic type. A switch to roman type for vernacular works began in France after 1530 (cf. German vernacular works remained in gothic/batard until this century). Thus, in late 1524 Coct and Bentin in Basel were seeking gothic character sets from Lyon in order to print vernacular works since they could not obtain them there. Was Roussel planning on printing vernacular works in Froben's clear roman type?

The advent of these evangelical publishing houses can best be assessed by first considering the manuscripts that the network had in hand and were evidently intending to publish as these printers came on line. For the years 1523 through 1526 various sources mention some forty manuscript books authored by members of the network.⁹⁴ Although no doubt partial, this list is extremely revealing about their intellectual and reforming interests. On it one finds nineteen manuscripts belonging to and probably written by Berquin. He had translated works by St. Jerome, Luther, Hutten, and Erasmus into French, written strident defenses of evangelical (Lutheran) doctrine, and composed caustic literary attacks on the champions of the traditional church. Turning to the French exiles, one finds references to five works by Farel, a French translation by Anémond de Coct of a letter by the Duke of Würtemberg in which he authorizes evangelical preaching in his territories, and Lambert's 116 theses for a disputation at Metz.

Members of the Meaux group and Marguerite's circle at court authored the remaining fourteen works in manuscript, including: a letter by Briçonnet "on the Ethiopian," two illustrated manuscripts of Lefèvre's New Testament translations, an unnamed theological *opusculum* by Martial Mazurier, a defense of Jacques Pauvan by Matthieu Saulnier, *De vana rei Christianae (quam publicam vocant) administratione* by Nicolas Le Sueur, a *Commentary on the Psalms* by Michel d'Arande, a *Commentary on Romans* by Gérard Roussel along with his translation of the *Pentateuch*, a placard posted at Meaux "Against the Papal Jubilee Indulgence" of 1524, "Four poems on the death of

⁹⁴ See Appendix B II. which has been culled in the main from letters in Herminjard volume I and the censorship records of the Faculty of Theology in Paris.

Charlotte Valois” by Marguerite as well as three translations of works by Luther, including, Marguerite’s verse interpretation of his “*Explanatio dominicae orationis*” (1520), Antoine Papillon’s rendering of *De votis monasticis iudicium*, and Antoine d’Oraison’s translation of *Sermo Martini Lutheri de praeparatione ad moriendum e vernaculo in latinum versus*.

Several observations should be made about these texts. First, barring correction, only three of these forty manuscripts works survive in exemplars today, a presentation manuscripts of Lefèvre’s translation of the Gospel of Matthew (c. 1523), Oraison’s Luther translation, and Marguerite’s poems on Charlotte. Second, only seven of the forty are known to have been printed during that era, and all of them went through the presses of the aforementioned evangelical printers. In May and June 1525, the Faculty of Theology censured manuscript copies of four translations of Erasmus by Berquin.⁹⁵ Half a year later, in January 1526 the Faculty of Theology in Paris again condemned these works, but this time the copies in hand were printed books, which had been seized from Berquin’s library. Three of these survive in imprints done by Simon du Bois evidently in the latter half of 1525. The fourth translation survives in an edition by Pierre de Vingle (Lyon, 1531), which was possibly a reprint from a lost Du Bois edition of 1525. Roussel’s translation of the *Pentateuch*, which he presented to Marguerite in 1526, may also have influenced Lefèvre’s translation of the Old Testament, whose first installment Martin

⁹⁵ One of the doctors had handed the manuscripts over to the Faculty after one of Francis I’s officials had presented to them to him for a private review. Francis I was most likely seeking theological sanction for Berquin’s translations without going through the full Faculty of Theology at Paris, since he had most likely commanded them to be made in the first place. When Erasmus was in touch with Guillaume Budé and François Tournon in 1522 about his possible move to France, Budé announced that Francis I had

Lempereur printed at Antwerp in 1528. Rounding out the list, Marguerite's poems on the death of her niece Charlotte appeared at the head of her *Discord* (Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1533).

Third, the high non-publication rate of these manuscripts, which is particularly striking in the cases of the works of Farel, Coct, and Lambert, indicates how difficult it was for members of the network to publish even when they had access to amenable printers. Although Schabler and Cratander printed Farel's *Pater Noster* and *Epistre chrestienne* in 1524, they refused to print his *Antichristi* because they deemed that the time was not suitable. A fitting occasion never seems to have presented itself.⁹⁶

Fourth, a high proportion of these manuscript works were specifically dedicated to Marguerite including Oraison and Papillon's translations of Luther, Le Sueur's work on Christian government, Roussel's translation of the books of Moses, and Briçonnet's letter, which he had sent to her and she had made into a small pamphlet for her mother. For that matter, all of the authors or translators mentioned were more or less closely tied to her through the network or her direct patronage.

Fifth, and most importantly, the references to these manuscripts reveal that network members participated in a vibrant, creative intellectual circle. Printed books only exposed the part of their thought that network members dared to publish in the face of censorship, not all that they thought, believed, or taught privately. Le Sueur's work on

decided to have some of Erasmus' works translated, see Allen 5, [no. 1319 and 1328, pp. 153. II. 43-45].

⁹⁶ On Farel's attempt to have his manuscript works printed, see Herminjard 1, no. 120, 280-284; 281. After a bitter quarrel with Farel in the Spring of 1524, Erasmus saw to it that he was banned from Basel and printers prevented from publishing his works. For their conflict, see Nathaniel Weiss, "Guillaume Farel, la dispute de Bâle, le conflit avec Erasme (1524), (d'après quelques documents inédits),"

Christian government is an instructive example. As early as May 1524, he sought to have Farel published it at Basel, describing it as a work that shows “by the authority and example of Scripture that the world would be better governed the law of Christ than ‘Gentile’ [Roman or customary] laws.”⁹⁷ Though it remained in manuscript it evidently circulated within the network since in December 1525, for Roussel advised Le Sueur to send copies to Paris to edify his brothers there. He promised to look into having it printed at Strasbourg should he remain in exile much longer.⁹⁸ If Le Sueur’s work was published, no trace of it has come to light. The fact that so many of these manuscripts did not make it to print even after the Network had secured the services of willing printers in 1525 suggests further that informal editorial boards, made up of printers, colleagues, and patrons within the network, determined what would be printed, given the circumstances. Farel’s *Antichristi* is a good example. Certainly not everyone in the network was consulted nor did each member agree with every book published by their confreres. Network members were, nevertheless, in a practical way collectively responsible for the total production. That is, for example, precisely why Lefèvre disapproved of a caustic response to the Faculty of Theology’s *Determinatio* against the Meaux group, which Farel had most likely written. Its gratuitous attacks on individuals, Lefèvre told Farel, would

BSHPF 69 (1920), 115-145.

⁹⁷ “... Scripturae et auctoritate et exemplo, multo faelicius Christi quam Gentilium legibuseam gubernari posse, quinimo, eas plurimum obesse unitati quam falso sibi promittunt.” Nicolas Le Sueur to Guillaume Farel, 15 May 1524, Herminjard I, no. 102, 218; *Gérard Roussel*, no. 1, 169-171.

⁹⁸ “Bene feceris si compendium tuum in rem Christianam, ad illos [fratres meos] miseris, mea causa, pro illorum instructione. Si nobis hic manendum diutius fuerit, hoc vellem abs te et amicis impetratum, ut hic officinam erigeremus, e qua prodirent libri magna ex parte in vestram linguam transfusi, ad populi institutionem, cujus generis sunt quos tibi suggessit Dominus.” [Gérard Roussel] to [Nicolas Le Sueur] from Strasbourg to Meaux, [December, 1525], Herminjard I, no. 168, 408-415; Quadroni, ed., *Rép.*

harden the hearts of their adversaries, who would hold himself and his colleagues accountable.⁹⁹

After their failed attempts in 1524 to set up presses at Basel and Meaux, the Navarrian network, in effect, ‘invented’ the presses of the clandestine-Colines [Estienne], Du Bois, and Lempereur to serve as their publishing outlet. While no source states this explicitly (i.e., no letter exists in which a member of the Meaux group heralds Du Bois’s presses as their new *officina*), the weight of evidence is overwhelming. Scholars have long remarked that the catalogues of these three printers are interrelated and rich in evangelical works authored, edited, or translated by members of the network. To summarize their findings and those presented here: these printers shared the same origins and work to the same purpose. Du Bois and Lempereur both received their training as printers in Paris; both started printing in 1525; both printed many first editions of works by members of the network; both reprinted works first published by the other; and their anonymous works ended up with great frequency side by side in the same contemporary bindings, bookstores, and private libraries, notably Anne Bolyen’s in England.¹⁰⁰ The

Corr., no. 45.

⁹⁹ “Accepi etiam illam arcem subsannationem, quae, si in manus multorum venerit, vehementer motura et bilem, et nobis etiam inconsciis conflatura invidiam, quasi quippiam tale promoverimus. Utinam scriptor comoediae pepercisset aliquorum nominibus, quorum mallet resipiscentiam quam nomini eorum inuri notam! Sed id Dei munus est.” Lefèvre to Farel, 6 July 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 103, 219-228, 223. Cf. Oecolampadius strong letter of recommendation on behalf of Farel to Luther, despite what some considered his overly tempestuous attack on their enemies. See *Brief Oekolampads* 1, no. 196, 280-282; *WA Br* 3, no. 745, 293-295; Herminjard 1, no. 101, 215-216.

¹⁰⁰ On Anne Boleyn’s collection of evangelical imprints, which contained dozens of anonymous works printed by Du Bois and Lempereur, see James Carley, “‘Her moost lovyng and fryndely brother sendeth gretyng’ Anne Boleyn’s Manuscripts and Their Sources,” in *Illuminating the Book: Makers and Interpreters. Essays in Honour of Janet Backhouse*, ed. Michelle P. Brown and Scot McKendrick (London & Toronto: the British Library and University of Toronto Press, 1998), 261-280, and his forthcoming article in *Le livre réformé en français avant Calvin*, ed. William Kemp and Jean-François Gilmont (Geneva: Droz,

conjunction of their books is so strongly marked that these two printers must have shared the same distribution network.

Over the period 1525-1526, the presses of Colines, Du Bois and Lempereur produced a total of twenty-one of the twenty-nine known evangelical works in French.¹⁰¹

All of them except Lefèvre's translations were anonymous. One finds among them:¹⁰²

- seven of the eight editions containing works in whole or part translated from works by Luther
- two translations of works by the "Lutherans" Melanchthon and Sebald Heydan
- four of the six editions of Lefèvre's translations of the New Testament and Psalms
- the Meaux group's *Epistres et Evangiles*, a translation of Pierre d'Ailly's commentary on the penitential psalms, which was possibly done by Pierre Caroli, and a lost translation of *Homilies* by Chrysostom printed at Briçonnet's command
- all four translations of works by Erasmus from these years, including the *Exhortation au peuple* [Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1525?] (an anonymous translation of the *Paraclesis*), and the three translations by Berquin published by Du Bois
- the *Oraison de Jesuchrist*, which is an augmented reprint of Farel's *Pater Noster* (Basel 1524), and an *Epistre chrestienne tresutile à ceulx qui commencent lire la sainte parolle de Dieu*, possibly authored by Farel as well
- finally two anonymous works with strong evangelical content: the *Petit livre de la loi et de l'evangile, de l'effect et force des deux, et de la difference diceulx. Responses à quinze obiections de predestination* (1525?)¹⁰³ and the *La traicté du souverain bien*

expected 2002).

¹⁰¹ The eight evangelical works by other printers all had direct connections to the network. Four were done at Basel and Strasbourg have already been mentioned above. Of the remaining four, two were works dedicated to Marguerite by Agrippa von Nettesheim (Lyon: Nourry and Carcan, 1525) and Jean de Vauzelles (Lyon: Gilbert de Villiers, 1526) the third was a reprint of Lefèvre's New Testament (Lyon: Nourry, 1525), and the fourth was a reprint (Paris: Jerome Denis, 1525) of Pierre d'Ailly's commentary on the seven penitential psalms first printed by Du Bois in 1525.

See note 1 for Vauzelles's future collaboration with Nicolas de Bourbon. He dedicated at least three other works to Marguerite over his career, see appendix B I for: Lucian of Samostate, *Le martire de verite, dialogue de Lucian mis en lumiere Francoise* (c. 1531); Vauzelles, *Theatre de Francoise desolatione sur le trespas de la tresaugust Loise: louable admiration de Savoie et de feminine gloire: represeante d'une vrai zeile*, (c. 1531); and Pierre Arétin, *Trois livres de l'humanite de Jesuchrist: divinement descrite, et au vif représentée par Pierre Aretin Italien*, trans. Jean de Vauzelles (1540).

¹⁰² For the works discussed below, see Appendix B I, which is ordered by year then author/title.

¹⁰³ Previously thought lost, Andrew Pettegree discovered a copy of this work at the BM Lyon in March 2000 and kindly signaled its existence to me. The *Petit livre* is from the same press as a translation of Luther's *Magnificat*, attributed by Higman to Simon de Colines (1525). The first of the two treatises in it is a summary of evangelical doctrine. It teaches that: the difference between the law and the Gospel have existed in all ages "Et tousjours a este le temps de la loy et de l'evangile" (a2r); the law is a "pedagogue"

(Du Bois, 1526?), which is dedicated to Marguerite “of Alençon” (thus probably before her marriage in January 1527)

Except for the revised edition of Farel’s *Oraison* and reprints of Lefèvre’s translations of Scripture, all these titles were first editions. Like the network’s reading list of German reformers from 1524 and its manuscripts, this group of printed works contains many translations of Luther’s treatises, several works edited or translated by network members, anonymous works whose content is clearly evangelical, and a treatise dedicated to Marguerite.¹⁰⁴ These similarities demonstrate the direct filiation between what the Navarrian network read, wrote or translated, and, as is claimed here, were responsible for publishing via these three printers.

Notably, the evangelical tracts printed by Colines-Estienne, Du Bois, and Lempereur contain many short expositions of evangelical doctrine whose content is similar to the beliefs expressed by network members in other sources. Several are expositions of one or more of the three symbols of the faith (the Ten Commandments, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Apostles’ Creed), which answered the need for lay instruction. Marguerite had given voice to her personal desire for such instruction in June 1524, when she asked Briçonnet for a mediation on the Lord’s Prayer.¹⁰⁵ Around that time she

(a7r and b4r); which damns consciences and allows grace to be known (a8r); leading to the conclusions that those who trust in works are hypocrites (b2r); and that “les justices des saintz sont ung drapeau souille de sang menstrueux.” The second treatise on predestination seeks to explain the “haultes et difficiles” objections to predestination to “Chrestiens et Chrestiennes” (reminiscent of Lefèvre’s addresses to the reader) willing to read it “attentivement and humblement.” Neither treatise has given up the secrets of its origins and both deserve fuller study.

¹⁰⁴ See note 101 for two additional works dedicated to Marguerite among the other eight evangelical works in France printed from 1525-1526.

¹⁰⁵ “Et si l’Esprit, congnoissant en vous, a parfaict l’oraison donnée du Pere par le Filz, sans oublier l’espître de saint Denis, dont Madame a desir, je vous en demanderay volontiers, sans crainte de reffus, le double....” Marguerite to Briçonnet, [Tours or Amboise, before 4 June 1524]. Briçonnet,

thought enough of Luther's explanations of it to put it into verse, but she never published it. Similarly, in February 1525, responding to criticism of his pastorate, Gérard Roussel explained that he had urged the people to say the *Pater Noster* instead of the *Ave Maria*, since he believed it was as efficacious as the prayer to Mary.¹⁰⁶ Marguerite and Roussel's interest in the Lord's Prayer as a locus of instruction was mirrored in the production of the network's presses. It is important to note, however, that much was missing among the network's vernacular works: Berquin's forthright defenses of Luther, his and Farel's attacks on the Catholic doctors, as well as translations of the controversialist works by Luther and other reformers. The network's printing program was broadly unified, stealthy, and restrained. It was designed to disseminate evangelical doctrine to the laity while avoiding controversy and easy censure.

These conclusions are amply demonstrated in two important firsts in this corpus. The first two datable works in the oeuvre of Du Bois and Lempereur are representative of the network's intentions, and highly significant treatises in their own rights. Du Bois's first dated work, the *Brief recueil de la substance et principal fondement de la doctrine Evangelique*, with a preface to the faithful reader signed September 1525, is a hitherto unknown, augmented translation of Philip Melanchthon's *Epitome renovatae ecclesiasticae doctrinae ad illustrissimum principem Hessorum*.¹⁰⁷ Written at the request

Correspondance 2, no. 103, 162 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 172).

¹⁰⁶ Charles Schmidt, "Gérard Roussel, inculpé d'hérésie à Meaux, 1525," *BSHPF* 10 (1861): 221.

¹⁰⁷ The *Brief recueil* is therefore the first extant translation of a work by Melanchthon into French. I will present full documentation of this discovery and a critical edition of this text in a forthcoming article: "Philip Melanchthon's Debut in French: The *Brief recueil de la substance et de la doctrine evangelique* (1525)," in *Le livre réformé en français avant Calvin*, ed. William Kemp and Jean-François Gilmont (Geneva: Droz, expected 2002). The dependence of the *Brief recueil* on Melanchthon's *Epitome* is clear

of the Landgrave of Hesse, Melanchthon's treatise presented a concise apology for the evangelical movement and clear summary of its principal doctrines. In the preface, speaking for his fellow ministers, the anonymous translator repackages Melanchthon's work to address the situation in France:¹⁰⁸

We have no doubt, good Christians, that you thirst and hunger deeply in your hearts for the pure and unadulterated word of God, and even more, crave that it be freely and publicly preached... Certainly, we, who have been commissioned to minister and disseminate His word to the faithful, yearn for nothing else than to be able to proclaim it to you purely and clearly... But since we are prevented from preaching by those who fear that if the truth were known it would gut their bellies and rob them of their honor, so that we do not leave you wholly forsaken, we can still nourish your faith through the written word. Hereafter, we will provide, God willing, or rather He will provide through us, an abundance of books. For now, we offer to you this little tract, culled from the Latin writings of a certain faithful man. Though small in size, it contains rich treasures, I believe, if you read it properly.¹⁰⁹

from the beginning of both texts. The *Brief recueil* begins (A4r) [addition italicized]: "*Si maintenant on voit presque par tout l'evangile du filz de Dieu estre persecutee en laquelle toutesfois consiste et est enseignee la vraie et seule religion, c'est à dire purite de foi, et le vrai service de Dieu: nul ne s'en doit donner de merveille. Car d'elle on en a tousjours juge en diverses manieres comme tesmoigne S. Paul quant en la i. aux. Corint. i. [1 Cor 1:23], il dit que l'evangile est aux Juifz esclandre [sic], et aux grecz folleie.*" Melanchthon wrote: "De religione seu evangelio semper varie iudicatum est, ut testatur Paulus, cum queritur Judaeis esse scandalo, Graecis videri stultitiam." *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl*, vol. 1, ed. Robert Stupperich (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1951), p. 179, ll. 1-5 [= *Corpus Reformatorum* 1, 703].

¹⁰⁸ The *Brief recueil* thus made it to print only one year after Philip Melanchthon completed and sent his *Epitome* to the printers at Wittenberg in September 1524. More precisely, it can be shown that the *Brief recueil* was translated from an edition done in early 1525 by Herwagen at Strasbourg, thus further reinforcing the publishing triangle of Strasbourg—Basel, Paris, and Antwerp.

¹⁰⁹ "Nous ne doubtons point peuple Chrestien que n'ayez en vostre cueur fort grand soif et faim de la pure et immaculee parolle de dieu et moult desirez que elle vous soit liberalement et publiquement preschee... Et certes nous aussi ausquelz est commise l'administration et dispensation d'icelle parolle ne desirons riens tant que la vous pouvoir annocer pure et nette... Mais pourtant que sommes empeschez de ce faire par ceulz aux ventres et à la gloire desquelz nuyroit verite manifestee, affin que ne vous delaissons du tout, reste au moins que par escriptz ne cessons de aider vostre foi. Ce que nous ferons au plaisir de Dieu, voire il fera en nous ci apres plus amplement. Pour maintenant nous vous offrons ce present bref livret, extraict des escriptz latins de quelque fidele, petit en quantite, mais moult grand en valeur, comme il me semble si on le lit bien." *Brief recueil*, A2r–A2v.

Reminiscent of Roussel's stab at the fat bellies of the Parisian doctors, the translator has described exactly the situation faced by the evangelical preachers in Meaux and throughout France in September 1525. Speaking on their behalf, the translator addresses their collective flock. Having been prevented from preaching, he announces that these pastors will embark on a printing campaign through which they will continue their ministry of the Word. The preface is in effect, the official launching of the Navarrian network's book project.

Martin Lempereur's first French work, dated June 1525, is a second edition of Lefèvre French translation of the Psalms. For this edition Lefèvre wrote a new final exhortation to the reader entrusting it to Lempereur in distant Antwerp rather than to Colines in Paris.¹¹⁰ Lefèvre had headed each of the Psalms with a thesis-driven exegetical summary (*argument*) that adds a polemical dimension to this otherwise unadorned translation. Addressing the reader, Lefèvre responds to the charges of inventing a new faith and misleading the laity leveled against him and his colleagues during the past year. He also defends having diverged radically at times in his French translation from the Latin Vulgate. For instance, he explains that his substitution of "praise God in his holy place" for "praise God in his saints" in Psalm 133:2 more accurately reflected the original Hebrew.¹¹¹ His new exhortation, like the individual arguments on the psalms, indirectly attack the church. In several of his arguments, he

¹¹⁰ In 1526, Colines would in fact then reprint Lempereur's second edition, not his own first edition. See Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 142, 487. Cf. Higman, *Piety*, B 74. Lefèvre's choice verifies that the Meaux group had changed allegiance from their habitual printer to committed evangelical ones. Similarly, Lefèvre would have Lempereur print every future installment or revised edition of his Bible translation.

depicts the church as being in a middle age and without sound doctrine (*[dans] ung temps moyen l'eglise estant sans bonne doctrine*), and undermines its cult of the saints as well as other traditions.¹¹²

More than latent implications, when teaching the Psalms, the Meaux group drew clear conclusions from such passages and pointedly, if not savagely, criticized the established practices of the church. Gérard Roussel explained to Farel that when instructing the laity of Meaux, he used the Psalms as a set of common places to undeceive his listeners about the false traditions (*humana prescripta*) of the church.¹¹³ Similarly, a hostile witness reported that in his sermon on the feast day of the Assumption of the Virgin in 1524, Roussel had explicitly taught Lefèvre's substitution of "praise God in his

¹¹¹ Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 142, 489-492, 491.

¹¹² Psalm 51. "Priere pour appaiser lire de Dieu des tribulations venues pour ung temps moyen de l'eglise estant sans bonne doctrine: car apres le temps propice sera venu pour renouveler la doctrine dicelle et le dernier temps de grace."

Many of Lefèvre's arguments on the Psalms are, like this one, assertions about the dilapidated state of the church and its false traditions. Several deserve to be quoted since the work remains unpublished. I have consulted the Colines (1524) first edition [Paris SHP A 1185; Higman, *Piety*, B 71] and cited Psalm numbers to facilitate comparison with other editions:

Psalm 29: "Priere en esperit du peuple fidele de la primitive eglise: et de son esperance en Jesuchrist."

Psalm 38: "Que pour [par] persecutions, la doctrine de Dieu ne doibt estre teue ne celee. Et que ce n'est riens de ceste presente vie: mais celle a advenir est tout."

Psalm 70: Aultre oraison en ce mesme esperit [de Jesuchrist contre les adversaires dicelui] de ses faictz merveilleux. Du dernier temps de son eglise. Des reproches par ses ennemis. Et que sa puissance pour annoncer l'evangile ne cessera jusques à la fin du monde."

Psalm 91: "De la louenge du matin de la foy: c'est de la primitive eglise. Et de la nuit suivante. Apres laquelle nuit et gloire terrienne des pecheurs: doibt le iuste Jesuchrist et son peuple estre florissant et exalte au dernier aage et vieillesse de l'eglise."

Psalm 93: Que Dieu fera vengeance sur ceulx qui sent au siege d'iniquite qui par leurs traditions baillent pesans fardeaux pour commandemens, ressemblans à ceulx qui firent mourir Jesuchrist et condampnerent le sang innocent."

Psalm 136: "Aultre l'ouenge semblable en rememorant la providence de Dieu et ses anciennes merveilles. Deffense de adorer les images et creatures: mais en tous estatz, adorer, beneir et louer Dieu seulement."

¹¹³ "... nec premitto Psalterium literatis qui apud nos sunt, interpretari, excussis pro occasione per me locis qui ad sinceram fiduciam faciant, quique humana prescripta convellant." Roussel to Farel, 6

holy place” for “...in his saints” arguing that “Anyone who wants to praise the saints acts like a clanging cymbal [cf. 1 Cor 13:1].”¹¹⁴ Evidently, Roussel had seized on one of the high days of Marian piety to warn his flock that the cult of the saints obscured true worship of God. In his 1525 exhortation, Lefèvre responded to conservatives’ attempt to silence their teaching by admonishing the laity to close their ears to “those who forbid, damn, and turn them away” from having the Word of God and to pray for them.¹¹⁵ The translator of the *Brief recueil* closed his introduction with exactly the same instruction.¹¹⁶

These works from the presses of Du Bois, Lempereur, and the clandestine Colines formed the publishing arm of the network’s missionary campaign. Originally intended as a supplemental arm to their preaching, as the ministers in their fellowship were progressively gagged from 1524 through 1525, network members turned to printing as the vehicle for their ongoing outreach to their brethren.

The obvious next step in this analysis of the network’s program would be to assess the doctrines and instructions for life and worship across the whole corpus of their sermons and treatises. Another study will have to be devoted to that fascinating project.¹¹⁷ Even in this brief survey, it is apparent that the certain major doctrines and

July 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 104, 231-240, 237-238; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 2, 171-178.

¹¹⁴ See note 35.

¹¹⁵ “...les contradisans, maldisans et desgoutans les simples de la parolle de dieu...” Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 142, 492.

¹¹⁶ “Et les seducteurs diceulx [the king’s heart, i.e., Francis I], lesquelz par cuer deprave repugnent à verite sans point de doubte Dieu les humiliera, voire mesme en ce monde ci. Mais quelz qu’ilz soient, endurez les et portez en patience, priant Dieu pour eulx et pour tous, ne rendant mal pour mal: mais delaissant toute vengeance à celui qui juge justement. Et se [si] ainsi vous le faictes, vous saulveres voz ames, renderes la doctrine de Christ louable par tout, et ser[a] incontinent la bataille et la victoire votre.” *Brief recueil*, A3r.

¹¹⁷ Despite being reported in disparate and sometimes biased sources, there is some material for reconstructing what ministers in the network preached: 1) The Sorbonne’s *Determinatio* against the Meaux

themes—justification by faith through grace, Christ as sole mediator, the true church as the body of Christ united by faith in Him, as well as critiques of the visible Church, its cult of the saints, and its other human traditions—are consistently articulated in the evangelical works discussed above. These emphases accord with the views that Lefèvre expressed in his predating Latin commentaries and Bible prefaces, presenting a common front.

This basic agreement further reflects that these evangelical books were the product of an integrated group, not mere individual authors or printers. Having read deeply in the thought of Erasmus, Luther, and other reformers, members of Navarrian network selected works from these authors for translation or composed treatises inspired by them in order to instruct the laity. The fate of their manuscripts, notably those of Berquin, demonstrates that they published fewer and less strident treatises than they wished.

Notably, network members produced the majority of all evangelical books printed in French during these years. They managed to establish evangelical presses just as their enemies in the Faculty of Theology and Parlement succeeded in silencing evangelical

group and their other decisions against Pauvan, Saulnier, Caroli, Mazurier, Meigret, etc... (d'Argentré, *passim*; Clerval and Farge, *Registres*, *passim*). 2) "[20] Propositions Martiali Mazurier imputatae a Franciscanis [of Meaux]" as well as accounts of Briçonnet's preaching in Toussaints Du Plessis, *Meaux* I, 278-279, no. DLXIII (a reprint of Boulay, *Historia Universitatis Paris* 6, 173) and *passim*, cf. Veissière's many studies. 3) The Meaux group's *Epistres et Evangiles*. 4) Meigret's published sermons from Lyon and Grenoble and trial record (see Appendix B I). 5) Letters by Lefèvre, Roussel, Sébiville, Le Sueur, and other network members in which they describe the mode and content of their evangelical sermons (Herminjard I, *passim*). 6) Farel's response to the Sorbonne's *Determinatio* (Appendix B III, no. 21). 7) Reports in chronicles and trial records.

preachers.¹¹⁸ These findings justify as a working hypothesis that all the evangelical books produced by authors, printers, and patrons with ties to the network constituted its collective, public voice.

V. Leadership and Strategy – Doctrine and Purpose

The network developed under the shadow of persecution, which darkened its members' every decision and step. Especially in such circumstances, a dispersed, dissident group can not develop or continue to function without, to borrow some apt military terminology, effective 'command and control.' Many scholars have asserted that French evangelicals' lacked strong leaders and doctrinal unity.¹¹⁹ Whatever the causal connection posited between these desiderata, they are adduced as the main reasons why the early evangelical movement was not much more than the passing fad of a few

¹¹⁸ The Faculty of Theology also had its own ongoing anti-heresy publishing campaign. First begun in 1523 (see chapter 6), it could be further reconstructed from James Farge's studies of the doctors of theology in Paris, and especially his editions of their registers of conclusions. This campaign was the complementary arm of censorship and inquisition, but has received less systematic attention. For a solid start in this direction, which concentrates on what the Parisian doctors themselves authored, but not all the books that they approved, see Francis M. Higman, "Premières réponses catholiques aux écrits de la Réforme en France, 1525–c.1540," in *Le livre dans l'Europe de la renaissance*, Actes du XXVIII^e colloque international d'études humanistes de Tours, ed. P. Aquilon and H.-J. Martin (Paris: Promodis, 1988), 361–377.

¹¹⁹ For the scholarly consensus on the 'magnificent anarchy' of the early reformation, see the introduction. David Nicholls, a leading proponent of these views, writes: "Coherence and order [among French evangelicals] developed more slowly: *heresy was still individual and individualist, defined by what it was against rather than by positive doctrinal content*. People did not suddenly convert to a form of coherent Protestantism." In his article, "France" in *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed. Andrew Pettegree, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992): 126. In formal terms, there was no 'coherent form of Protestantism' anywhere in Europe prior to 1530 if one requires confessional statement to see such an identity. If not, then French evangelicals exhibit nigh on as much coherence as the German evangelicals with whom they were in contact and agreed about what the Gospel fundamentally taught. As for their individualist doctrines being "defined against what [they] were against" (apparently even a common enemy did not foster unity according to Nicholls) see below for an explanation based on the Meigret case of how such distortions arise in documents produced by those prosecuting the 'heretics,' who obscure the positive content of their message.

remarkable individuals with vaguely similar religious sentiments. Speaking particularly of their books, but reflecting his assessment evangelicals' activity in general, one scholar has gone so far as to assert that "There was never any concerted propaganda campaign by evangelicals either on a local or national level. Individual works were written or translated in a random fashion..."¹²⁰ Leaving aside the loaded word 'propaganda' and the unstated assumption that evangelicals intended and failed to achieve a separate church, such assessments of the group's deficiencies still need to be addressed.

These interpretations do not account for the fact that persecution forced evangelicals to curb how they articulated and acted upon their beliefs. When one inspects the hard evidence, the French evangelicals' alleged (debilitating) diversity of doctrine turns out to be an auditory distortion: they taught the same basic evangelical lessons and held similar views about the 'false' beliefs and practices of the church, but differed in how loudly and stridently they voiced their views. They were constantly faced with the

¹²⁰ David Nicholls, "Heresy and Protestantism, 1520-1542: Questions of Perception and Communication," *French History* 10 (1996): 182-205, 199, asserts that "The nature and content of books available, Protestant or Catholic, was uncontrolled and arbitrary," (p. 199) without citing and comparing any primary sources. Likewise, when dealing with evangelical preaching, while recognizing that "... the precise content of preaching is difficult to determine," (p. 189, again 192-193), which apparently excuses him from looking at the sources that are available, he asserts confidently enough that "[by 1524] the doctrinal diversity within the 'Meaux group' had passed the point of no return;" (p. 189); that they preached a "vast range of heretical or evangelical propositions" (p. 193); and that "the very inconsistency of evangelical preaching gave their hearers the opportunity to pick and choose ideas." (p. 195). Nicholls relies on Veissière's assessment of the various condemnations leveled against individuals from the Meaux group, who concludes that the Meaux group were doctrinally varied, see *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 304. Ever seeking a measured analysis founded in the sources Guy Bedouelle concludes: "Nous avons voulu suggérer combien il fallait apporter de nuances dans les jugements formulés sur ces hommes de Meaux. Il est vain de vouloir les cataloguer, de les rejeter en bloc d'un côté ou de l'autre. Chacun d'entre eux a eu ses réactions propres, ses affinités, ses courages, et ses faiblesses. Et une action où tel a pu mettre son courage, apparaît pour tel autre comme une faiblesse. Mais chacun a apporté une coloration particulière à une inspiration commune." *Lefèvre*, 99. His assessment has merit in validating that members of the Meaux group had different temperaments, but the emphasis should be put on their unifying "inspiration commune" and be described concretely.

question of how forcefully they could proclaim their message without running the risk of being condemned as heretics. The level of risk changed with the circumstances. Equally some members were willing to brave more danger than others.

Less explicable is how scholars have been able to maintain that evangelicals lacked leadership, when the network's enemies, the general public, outside observers, and its members themselves all plainly proclaimed that it had well-known champions. Ascertaining how closely these proclamations matched the real leaders' identity and how well in fact these leaders managed to guide the network is a delicate task. In pursuing it below, it should be remembered that the image and the reality of the network's leadership were both important factors in its development. Heresy accusation and investigations certainly hampered its leaders' efforts, but notoriety also allowed these individuals to serve as models whom sympathizers could emulate and to whom they might rally.

To tackle the complex problem of assessing the network's leadership and doctrine, strategy and purpose, consider once more the heart of the network's program: preaching. In his letter of 13 January 1524 to Farel, Lefèvre described two types of sermons that ministers were delivering at Meaux. He claimed that most preachers concentrated exclusively on explaining doctrinal core of the lectionary readings, refraining from criticizing the 'exaggerated' cult of the saints and human traditions. Others, like Caroli and Mazurier, Doctors of Theology with the implicit authority to do so, built attacks on such false practices into their expositions of the faith. According to Lefèvre, the two preaching styles shared the same doctrinal core but differed in their rhetorical strategies and emphases. The first instructed listeners exclusively in those

truths that should be embraced. The second went an extra step, denouncing unbiblical practices that were revealed in the pure light of the Gospel as obstructions to its dissemination.

Lefèvre's distinction between the two preaching modes, which equally characterizes the division between the books the network members did publish versus those they would have liked to but did not make public, was strategic in several senses. Members of the network recognized that most of the clergy and people were wedded to established doctrine and practice. This situation raised the problem of persuasion. How could they best lead the misguided to the truth? By presenting evangelical doctrine in its unadulterated purity or by presenting this coupled with an attack on the false human traditions that had obscured the people from seeing it? And if one attacked, how fiercely did the church's false practices need or deserve to be denounced? This problem of persuasion was coupled with another practical issue. With enemies seeking to stop them with sword and fire, how far could they could pursue either pedagogical style and still survive? Or was it acceptable to "cover the fire," as Briçonnet had once put it, that is to dissimulate their message?

In answer, the first strategy or pedagogical style, embodied in the Meaux group's *Epistres et Evangiles*, was less immediately provocative. Ultimately it proved to ensure the viability of their program, since, by avoiding controversy and abstaining from approving in public the Lutheran 'heretics' to whom they owed much, they did not alienate the crown. Their carefully framed teachings did not, however, mollify

conservatives, who recognized that they would undermine established practice, even if such conclusions were not forcefully stated.

It is difficult to tell how widely evangelical ministers conformed to the first homiletic style, which Lefèvre obviously preferred. Nicolas Le Sueur praised Gérard Roussel's preaching precisely because he offered the full truth without exposing himself to easy attack. Roussel came under investigation nevertheless. Le Sueur underestimated the sensitivity of the doctors' ear for heresy.¹²¹ Those with more caustic tongues made easier targets and became more visible public figures.

Aimé Meigret's preaching provides a remarkably instructive example about the way contemporaries reacted to the teaching of an outspoken preacher. A rare constellation of sources reveal what he said and how it was received, including: his sermon of 25 April 1524 in Grenoble, depositions by fifteen mostly hostile witnesses, the Faculty of Theology's condemnation of his sermons there and at Lyon, as well as evidence about the impression that his preaching made across France. At Grenoble, having only one day to speak, Meigret attempted to summarize the message that he had been expounding at length in Lyon.¹²² The theological core of his teaching is a clear Pauline interpretation of justification by faith in Christ through grace. He told his

¹²¹ "Nichil de Girardi nostri pura ac christiana praedicatione ad te scribo, quod jam pluribus epistolis compertum habeas, et fueris ipse expertus. Adeo sibi circumspectus est cum sinceritate sermo, ut nullus pateat calumniatorum insidiis locus, ita autem ut nichil veritatis evangelicae praetermittat." Le Sueur to Farel, [Before 1 May 1524], Herminjard 1, no. 102, 216-219, 218-219; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 1, 169-171.

¹²² Meigret declared to his audience that the central truth is that, "Par la foy sommes justifiez. Les bonnes oeuvre et a Dieu agreables sont le fruit de nostre justification" which he contrasts with "scholastic theologians'" notion of *actus fidei* and *actus spei* ("J'espère félicité supernaturelle par mes merites et la grace de Dieu"), see Henry Guy, ed., "Le sermon d'Aimé Meigret," *Annales de l'Université de Grenoble*,

audience that evangelical doctrine, which is “new to us,” directly opposes the theologians’ teachings about faith and works. From this basis he attacks the cult of the saints, fasting, clerical celibacy, the conceit that being in orders is more perfect state of Christian life, as well as the church’s commandments and system of merits. Meigret’s exposition stresses Lutheran themes: the law is a pedagogue; Christians are free from the law under the Gospel and thereby through faith better able to fulfill it; salvation by faith apart from works consoles whereas the church’s doctrine of the law damns consciences; and the Church’s false doctrines are satanic inventions.

Witnesses hostile to Meigret’s sermon reported very little of his explicit assertions about the true essence of the faith, retaining only his attacks on the clergy and traditions of the church.¹²³ Only two, evidently sympathetic, listeners restated the soteriological core of his sermon. This same pattern of selective reporting, which was in keeping with the inquisitorial object of such investigation, probably characterizes the Faculty of Theology’s censures of Mazurier, Caroli, Mazurier, d’Arande, Roussel, and others, whose original sermons we lack. Traditionalists registered the evangelicals’ most egregious breaches of orthodox doctrine and traditional practice, rather than the core teachings upon which gave rise to these attacks. They did not seek to engage and refute evangelical’s arguments, but merely to condemn them as transgressions of received truths, which were held to be beyond discussion.

n.s., *Lettres-Droits* 5 (1928): 181-222; especially 205-211.

¹²³ Henri Hours analyzes these testimonies with great insight in “Procès d’hérésie contre Aimé Maigret (Lyon-Grenoble: 1524),” *BHR* 19 (1957), 23-28 for analysis, 29-43 transcriptions of the witnesses’ depositions.

Like his sermon at Grenoble, Meigret's sermons at Lyon created a widespread stir. In Le Puy en Auvergne, a local notable, Étienne de Médicis, recorded that in reaction to Meigret's attacks on the jubilee indulgence offered at the city's famous shrine of the Black Virgin: "The good Lady of Le Puy became very upset and he was arrested in short order.... This Meigret defended the errors of that damned apostate and heretic Martin Luther."¹²⁴ Indeed, de Médicis was well informed. Meigret had been taken into custody in late 1524 as related above. His arrival for trial in Paris made a similar impression there.¹²⁵ Moreover, Meigret had indeed explicitly defended Luther's doctrines. In his published sermon from Grenoble, he proclaimed, "We have reached that miserable state that anyone who preaches the Gospel is called a heretic or Lutheran, and one who lauds human traditions and inventions is, in your judgment, an evangelical preacher."¹²⁶ In other words, Meigret asserted that true doctrine was not Lutheran, but implied that Luther had taught true doctrine. Everyone caught his meaning.

While a well known figure, Meigret ranked in popular reports as only one of several heretical preachers poisoning France. Étienne de Médicis reported that during

¹²⁴ "Item, en ce mesme dit an [1524], ung tel prescheur comme ceulx desquels venons de parler, preschoit à Lion, affirmant le contraire de la verité de ce saint Pardon. Mais finalement la bonne Dame du Puy n'en fut pas bien contente, car ne tarda guieres qu'il fut apprehendé, et l'appelloit-on Mesgret, qui soubstenoit les erreurs de ce maudit apostat et heretique Martin Luther." Augustin Chassaing, *Le livre de Podio ou chroniques d'Étienne de Médicis, bourgeois du Puy* (Le Puy-en-Lay: M.-P. Marchessov), 1874, vol. 1, 185.

¹²⁵ Meigret arrived on 1 February 1525, Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 226.

¹²⁶ "A telle misère sommes venus, que qui vous presche et declare l'Evangile est heretique ou Lutherien; qui magnifie les humaines traditions et inventions (a vostre jugement) est prescheur evangelique." Guy, *Sermon d'Aimé Meigret*, 207. One of Meigret's auditors, the Dominican J. Audry, had heard Pierre Sébiville say to neighbor in the audience: "Acousté bien à la fin, car vous verrés qu'il dira merveilles et soustiendra bien les oppinions de Leuter." Hours, "Procès d'Hérésie contre Aimé Maigret," 40. On 9 March 1525, the Faculty of Theology censured Meigret for having affirmed "Propositio VIII. Quod ille maledicit et est detractor, qui dicit: Que Luther et mechant homme." d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 13.

Lent 1524 a “pack of preachers” had denigrated his Lady of Le Puy, including one at Bourges, who was likely Michel d’Arande. This heretic, de Médicis attested, also received his due. As soon as this preacher at Bourges uttered his blasphemy against the Virgin, his pulpit collapsed under him, throwing him to the ground, and, appropriately, he turned dark as coal. The Black Virgin of Le Puy’s “evident sign and miracle,” de Médicis relates, convinced the majority of the parish to make the pilgrimage to Le Puy.¹²⁷

Through hearsay, preaching, and print, conservatives succeeded in portraying key members of the network as leaders of a larger, shadowy menace. In January 1525, a chronicler at Paris reported that the College of Cardinal Lemoine (Lefèvre, Farel, and Roussel’s old school) had become a center of Lutheran heresy, blaming the Bishop of Meaux for it.¹²⁸ A year later, after the Parlement, Faculty of Theology, and *juges délégués* had launched their trial and punishments of a series of heretics from Meaux,¹²⁹

¹²⁷ “Item, aussi pareillement destourna plusieurs d’y venir ung tas de prescheurs qui, de leur pouvoir, en preschant la karesme en plusieurs parties, detraictoient ledict saint Jubilé contre droict et equité, en dilacerant l’honneur, le bien et le loz du très-saint, devot et singulier habitacle de Nostre Dame du Pus d’Anis et dudict Pardon, là de tout ancienneté cultivé, ainsi qu’il appert par beaucoup de vieulx escripts. Dont à plusieurs de ces prescheurs n’en print pas trop bien, car ung devot prebste du diocese de Bourges raconta làhault en ladictte sainte eglise que, en sa parroisse, ung prescheur affirmoit au peuple le Pardon du Puy estre une fatuité et que ce n’estoit qu’un fol vouloir d’y venir, lequel tantost lesdite paroles ainsi laidement proferées, la chiere et luy, tout rua jus, et vint soubdainement aussi noir que charbon; de quoy ledit peuple, qui cella avoit ouy et veu, s’en esmerveilla moult; si se recommandarent humblement à la Vierge Marie du Puy, et y vindrent la plus grande partie de la parroisse bien devotement rendre graces à Nostre Dame et gaigner le saint pardon, & racontarent tout au long le contenu de ce mistere...”

“Ce n’est petit de chose de oser entreprendre de parler ainsi desordonnéement de la noble maison imperiale de la bonne Dame, de laquelle tous bons chrestiens reçoivent tant de graces, dons et benefices, et [oùt] Dieu, pour l’honneur de sa benoiste Mere, monstre journellement evidens signes et miracles.” Chassaing, *Le livre de Podio*, vol. 1, 184-185. De Médicis [Podio] cites Meigret’s preaching, as in note 124 above, as one of his examples for this assertion.

¹²⁸ “Item, en ce moys [January 1525] y eust esmeutte au Cardinal-le-Moyne, à cause d’aucuns leuteriens qui y estoient, et pulluloit fort la mauvaise doctrine, de laquell on estimoit estre fauteur monsr. de Meaulx.” Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 101-102.

¹²⁹ The investigation of heretics from Meaux escalated from late 1524 into 1526. See note 50 above. Contemporary chroniclers took note, see *Driart*, 101-102, 104-105, and 113; Lalanne, ed.,

Parisians considered the whole diocese to be a Lutheran enclave under the leadership of Falry, meaning Lefèvre d'Étaples, better known by his Latin name Faber [Fabri] Stapulensis.¹³⁰ During the Parlement's investigation of the Meaux group, Briçonnet's lawyer reported the Franciscans there had called the bishop, the "heretic of Meaux," and blamed the capture of the king on his heresies.¹³¹

People on the street came to know the tales of and put names to the chief members of the pack of preachers mentioned by de Médicis and, like the Parlement, blame them for the calamities washing over France. In journals and popular anti-heretical literature d'Arande, Mazurier, Meigret, Sébiville, and Marguerite are all targeted as leaders of the heretics. In early 1525, a report circulated at Paris that a Franciscan had been burned at Grenoble for being a Lutheran and that his companion had fled to Germany to be with Luther.¹³² The rumor resembles the fate that Pierre de Sébiville had been threatened with in December 1524 but not actually suffered. In the figure of the executed friar's friend

Bourgeois, 276-277, 363; and Fagniez, *Versoris*, no. 292, 87.

¹³⁰ "Falry" might be a conflation of Farel's name, but after his three years absence it would seem unlikely. "Au dict an [1525], la veille de Noel... Et faut noter que la plus grande partie de Meaulx estoit infectée de la faulce doctrine de Luther, et disoit-on, qu'un nommé Falry, prestre, estudiant avec autres, estoit cause des dictz embrouillemens, et entre autres choses, qu'il ne falloit avoir ès églises aucunes images, ne prendre eaue béniste pour effacer tous les péchez, ne prier pour les trespassez, à cause qu'incontinent après le trespas ilz alloient en paradis ou en enfer, te qu'il n'y avoit nul purgatoire, et qu'il n'estoit vray et ne le croyoit pas." Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 276-277.

Similarly Pierre Driart reported: "En ce temps [December 1525] regnoit fort ceste mauldicte secte de lutheriens et principalement en l'evesché de Meaulx." Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 113.

¹³¹ 18 August 1525, in defense of Briçonnet, his lawyer "Dit que quelque fois il y avoit ung frere à Meaulx qui vouloit prescher, et pour ce que le curé luy dit qu'il eust pacience, luy respondit qu'il estoit des Lutheriens de Meaulx et que, si on le vouloit croire, ils seront IIIIxx Cordeliers avec IIIIxx harquebutes. Et ce sont ventéz qu'il avoient un arrest à l'encontre de l'evesque de Meaulx, l'appellant heretique de Meaulx, et dissant: c'est par cest heretique de Meaulx et par ses heresies que le Roy est prisonnier." AN X1a, 8 342, 255v, cited in Michel Veissière, "Le procès de Guillaume Briçonnet au Parlement de Paris en 1525 II: Quelques Textes," *BSHPP* 132 (1986): 543-560.

¹³² "Au dict an [1525], en février, fut bruslé à Grenoble un cordelier qui tenoit le parti de Luther, ... et y eust un aultre cordelier qui estoit son compaignon qui s'enfuit et s'en alla en Allemagne devers

may lurk the memory of François Lambert, whose relations with his fellow Franciscan are not known, or Sébiville's ally, Anémond de Coct, who, though not a Franciscan, had indeed fled like Lambert to be with Luther and may in the telling have acquired the cowl.

Accounts of the spread of the Peasants' War into Lorraine during the spring of 1525 became a lodestone which attracted all other stories about heretics in France. Fresh after the disaster at Pavia, the French had interpreted the spread this uprising as an invasion by Lutherans and their massacre by the Duke as a blessing from God.¹³³ In the *Chanson des Leutheriens*, which was composed during the summer of 1525, after rejoicing over the slaughter of 40,000 'Lutheran' peasants by the Duke of Lorraine, the author chastises their homegrown brethren:

Where [Lutherans] did you get the crazy idea to concoct a new faith and condemn the time-honored law? That's heresy to a tee. Under the guise of doing a good turn, you've slipped your error into Alençon, where Michel [d'Arande] has taught Lord-knows what kind of theology. And at Meaux the carders of frise have their grand provost, the good prophet Marcial [Mazurier], who preaches in some God

Luther." Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 227-228.

¹³³ The spread of the Peasants' War to Lorraine was interpreted at Paris as a "Lutheran" invasion, see Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 244-245; Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 107; *Cronique du roy François Premier*, 31 and 54; Fagniez, *Versoris*, 74-75, no. 236; and for the reports recorded in the minutes of the Parlement of Paris, which constitutes a sort of official version of the events, see Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 324.

The defeat of the Peasants may well have been a more sinister affair. A chronicler at Metz sympathetic to the peasants recorded that under promise of a safe-conduct, M. de Guise convinced the peasants to surrender, separated the disarmed peasants into small groups, and then under pretext of their breaking the peace, systematically butchered them. See Huguenin, *Chroniques de la ville de Metz*, 821-822.

A vernacular song composed circa 1525 holds up the defeat of the Peasants as a warning against those who were turning to follow Luther in protest against the king! The author promises that the king will follow their will and reestablish peace upon return: "Par jour et nuit ont combatu [the Duke of Lorraine and his forces]// Très bien que on les prise;/ Lutherériens sont confondus./ Dont Dieu l'ont regracie.// O bons François, ne faite pas/ Courser vostre Dieu pour ce cas./ Car c'est chose vilaine./ Prenez aultre part vos esbas./ Sans point chercher, ne hault, ne bas./ L'erreur Luthérienne./ Le temps viendra qui n'est venu./ Qu'aurés à votre guise/ Vostre roy qui est détenu./ En paix, je vous affie." Le Roux de Lincy, ed., *Recueil de chants historiques depuis le XII^e jusqu'au XVIII^e siècle avec des notices et une introduction*, 2 vols. (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969 [1841-1842]), vol. 2, 98-99.

forsaken way. If the exalted knight of the house of Guise [Lorraine] would have encountered you in that flock [of peasants], you'd have best commended your hide to heaven for he would have tanned it full well... Because of your foolish deeds, the people die of famine, war grinds them down, and plague takes us all by surprise. Everyone damns you for these calamities. The Green Oak [Guillaume Duchesne, one of the *juges délégués*] will call you to account, and expose your sect, which has brought every evil down on us.¹³⁴

In *Le chapeau des Lutheriens*, written toward the end of the 1520s, the author all but names Marguerite and Lefèvre when giving a detailed account of how they had fomented heresy in France. In a section titled "Lutherans are almoners,"¹³⁵ having attacked women who have had Luther's writings translated into the vernacular and preachers who spread Lutheran doctrine, the author launches into an incisive attack on leading members of the network.¹³⁶ Claiming to have been the student of an unnamed

¹³⁴ "D'ou vous vient ceste fantasie/ Vouloir une foi innover/ Et l'antique loi reprouver/ C'est ung parfaict tour d'eresie./ Soubz une simple courtoisie/ Vostre erreur creust iusques Alençon/ Michelot en faisoit leçon/ Dieu scet desquelle theologie./ A Meaulx les escardeurs de frise/ Avec leur grant provincial/ Le bon prophete Marcial/ Y preschent Dieu scait de quel guise./ Si le hault chevalier de Guise/ Vous eust rencontrez au tropeau./ A dieu commande vostre peau/ On leust conroye de main mise./... Par la vostre sottie entreprinse/ Le peuple par famine est mort/ D'autre coste guerre le mort/ Peste nous suit à la surprise./ Chascun vous en athematise/ Le chesne vert sur vous crierà/ Et vostre secte descrierà/ Qui au monde tout mal atise./" From *La chanson des Leutheriens* in *La balade des leutheriens avec la chanson* [Lyon: Jacques Moderne, 1525?], fol. 3r-4r. Paris SHP Rés. 15939 in-8, [Higman, *Piety*, B 1].

The *Chanson* must have been composed before the death of the *juge délégué* Guillaume Duchesne, "Le chesne vert," in November 1525. "Au dict an 1525, au mois de novembre, trespasa monsieur de Quercu [= Du Chesne], docteur en théologie, curé de Saint-Jean en Grève, et est inhumé en la dicte église, et estoit très homme de bien, grand clerc et bon prédicateur, et avoit d'aage environ de soixante et quatorze ans." Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 270. Though Pierre Driart got the month of his death and first name wrong (there was another Jean Duchesne/Quercu, but he was not the curate of St. Jean en Grève), he reports that Duchêne's reputation was as great as that of Jean Gerson! September 1525 "Jehan du Quercu," Doctor of Theology and curé of Saint-Jehan en Grève dies "qui lisoit et preschoit continuellement, bon catholique et ennemy des Luteriens pour son temps, autant optime que de son temps avoit esté maistre Jehan de Gerson." Driart, 111. For mention of Guillaume Duschene, curate of St. Jean en Grève, as one of the *juges délégués*, see Fraikin, *Nonciatures de Clément VII*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1906), 430, and of his having passed away since the pope first licensed them in 1525, 432.

¹³⁵ Michel d'Arande was one of Marguerite's almoners until 1526, when Gérard Roussel replaced him.

¹³⁶ In its first half, *Le chapeau des Lutheriens* gives a roughly chronological history of the development of Lutheran heresy in France. The section in question corresponds to the period prior to the Meaux groups flight in October 1525. See ll. 55-150, in Jean Babelon, *La bibliothèque de Fernand*

'crafty bastard,' a teacher at Paris with whom Luther made a secret alliance, the author describes this "evil man" as the one who had introduced heresy into France through his translations of the Gospels and Psalms. Through these he had ensnared honorable women as well as the always suspect urban conventicles of lay women and men, the "Beguines and Gaultiers." Next he relates about this man:

After he had translated the Scriptures, he had wool combers and carders preach, women too, which goes against nature. A certain Michel got involved as best he could, inspiring phony zealots (*caffardeurs*). He had the support of the patron of type cutters, who sent him to stir up Normandy, where now the faith goes begging in many places.¹³⁷

Although the author is careful not to name Lefèvre d'Étaples, whom he describes as having fled to escape being burned like the cloth workers from Meaux, or Marguerite, the patron of type cutters,¹³⁸ he does finger Michel [d'Arande], her almoner, who had preached at Meaux and Alençon at her request. The author of the poem was certainly well informed for during 1525, in the wake of d'Arande's preaching at Alençon, local officials found evidence of an evangelical cell. Soon after d'Arande's departure, a weaver was caught with package of Lutheran books.¹³⁹ The king's sister and Lefèvre

Colomb, *Revue des Bibliothèques*, suppl. 10 (Paris: Champion, 1913), appendix 2, 262-264. Giving this passage different interpretive weight, Guy Bedouelle stresses the 'willed calumny or meanness' of the author in making Lefèvre out to be as 'extreme' as the other preachers at Meaux. See *Lefèvre* 106-107.

¹³⁷ "Après qu'il eust translaté l'Escripture/ Il fist prescher paigneurs et eschardeurs/ Femmes aussi, qui est contre nature:/ Ung Michelet si [se] mist a l'aventure/ Qui dedans Meaulx faisoit du caffardeurs/ Il eut appuy du patron des fondeurs/ Qui l'envoya barboullier Normandie/ La ou la foy en aulcuns lieux mandye." *Le chapeau des Lutheriens*, ll. 127-134, in Babelon, *La bibliothèque de Fernand Colomb*, 264.

¹³⁸ "Fondeur: Fondeur en caractères d'imprimerie ou simplement fondeur en caractères." *Dictionnaire de la langue française: abrégé du Dictionnaire de Littré*, ed. A. Beaujean (Le Livre de Poche, 1990). The author seems to imply that Marguerite protected heretical type-cutters (who were sometimes also printers), perhaps alluding to Simon Du Bois, who moved to Marguerite's Alençon from Paris in 1529.

¹³⁹ "A Bourges, dés 1525, peu de mois après le départ d'Arande, et pendant la vacance du siège, on

d'Étaples, who was tutor of the king's children at the time that this poem was written (c. 1529), could not be singled out without risking retribution from the crown, but their identity would have been clear to any reader attuned to recent events.

If Marguerite could not be named, Beda had been sure of her role in private¹⁴⁰ and the rumor of her support circulated broadly. In 1525, within the cloister of the Notre Dame of Paris malcontents staged a procession in which devils sporting the name Luther on their front and back led about a lady on horseback. This event may be interpreted as an attack on Marguerite her band of Lutheran sympathizers.¹⁴¹

In these years, the network was known to the public through the personas of its leading members. Traditional catholics exaggerated when they portrayed network members as the vanguard of a broad Lutheran movement, but they did identify with little distortion the same people that the network's adherents acclaimed as their chiefs. Within weeks of the Parlement's sweeping indictment of the Meaux group in the fall of 1525,

lit publiquement dans le palais ducal, les oeuvres de Luther. L'année suivante [1526], une enquête ordonnée par les vicaires capitulaires fait découvrir chez un tisserand, Pierre Vulgrin, tout un ballot de livres hérétiques: livres imprimés ou copiés à la main, quelques-uns glosés par des particuliers." Imbart 3, 195 citing A.D. Cher G, 378,. Delib. capit. f. 96 [1 Dec. 1525] and f. 155 [4 Oct. 1526].

¹⁴⁰ See chapter 6, note 134.

¹⁴¹ Speaking of events in the summer of 1525, Knecht relates: "The threat of heresy was also perceived as home-based. A masquerade, held in the cloister of Notre-Dame, included a woman on horseback drawn by devils with placards on their chests and backs bearing Luther's name. This reflected the belief, widely held in Paris, that Lutheranism flourished at the French court, for the woman was almost certainly meant to portray Marguerite, the king's evangelically minded sister." Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 236, citing AN X^{1A} 1530, ff. 33b-34a. James K. Farge claims that Luther-devil procession was an satire on the Faculty of Theology. See Farge, *Orthodoxy*. It is difficult to credit this interpretation given the procession's symbolism and fact that it was held at Notre Dame, several of whose canons were doctors in Faculty of Theology.

The incident may be an satirical representation of the assertion, ascribed to Pierre Caroli, that if illuminated by God "a devout woman could understand Holy Scripture better than" the doctors of theology. Caroli developed and extensive argument for allowing women to read, and even interpret Scripture. See his propositions 20-25, in d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 27, and for partial translation and notes, Herminjard 1, no. 158, 378-380.

commoners at Meaux narrated the suffering of their group and particularly its leading preachers in protest songs. They sang “Don’t preach the Gospel truth any more, Master Michael. There’s too great a danger of being dragged to jail!”¹⁴² That was sensible advice for a warrant was out for d’Arande’s arrest and he had not yet been taken in custody as had many of the brethren and less well connected fellow preachers at Meaux. D’Arande would soon turn up at Strasbourg with Lefèvre and Roussel.

Beyond heretical doctrines, conservatives particularly excoriated these heretical leaders for promoting conventicles of commoners and women who discussed religion and even “preached” amongst themselves. As in the passage from *Le chapeau des leutheriens* cited above, all catholic accounts charged evangelicals with fomenting social and religious disorder by forming such devotional circles. In justifying its edict of 5 February 1526 forbidding the publication, sale, or possession of Lutheran books, translations of Scripture, or the Meaux group’s *Epistres et Evangiles*, the Parlement reasoned that:

¹⁴² “Ne prêchez plus la vérité// Maître Michel!/ Contenie en l’Evangile./ Il y a trop grand danger/ D’être mené/ Dans la Conciergerie,” Henri-Léonard Bordier, *Le chansonnier Huguenot du XVI^e siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris: Tross, 1870; reprint Geneva: Slatkine, 1969), vol. 1, xiii ff. for documents concerning the protest songs and their text, which are reprinted in Lovy, *Les origines de la réforme française: Meaux*, 151-153. Henry Heller asserts based on this stanza: “The radical craftsmen meanwhile increasingly scoffed at the timidity of the Fabrists. In the *Marché* of Meaux the craftsmen sang mocking verses about the once revered curate of St. Michel [i.e., those quoted above].” Heller, *Conquest*, 33, cf. 57-58. This analysis does not stand up to scrutiny. All three protest songs are in sympathy with the ministers of Meaux. The one just quoted goes on to mock the “chapperons fourrés” (justices), “satellites” of “l’ennemi [the Devil], who were pursuing d’Arande and the others. In a second protest song, the craftsmen of the *Marché* complained: “*Je me plains fort/ Qu’on me veuille ruer jus/ La vraie doctrine/ Qui est du bon Jésus/ Et qu’on a oppressé/ Aussi ses bons ministres/ Parce qu’ils ont parlé/ De la sainte évangile.*” [emphasis added]. There is no indication in these songs, as alleged by Heller, that the people drew a distinction between conservative Fabrists and more radical preachers. The laity would have had good reason to be upset after 1526 when the Fabrists did return but not to Meaux.

Many people who read the books of Holy Scripture translated from Latin into French dream up heresies, form conventicles to debate about the Catholic faith, condemn the commandments and ministers of the Church, separate themselves from the common body of the true faithful in their views on the Church's sacraments, teachings, and commandments, and sow other damned errors. Because of this, myriad scandals, evils, and misfortunes have fallen and will continue to descend on the kingdom.¹⁴³

Similarly, in a public epistolary exchange, Beda browbeat Erasmus for advocating the translation of the Scriptures pointing to the nefarious result at Meaux.¹⁴⁴

Scholars have seconded the conservatives' view that access to the vernacular Bible led the laity to deviate in doctrine and commit violent acts.¹⁴⁵ The ripping down of the Jubilee indulgence placards and prayers to Mary at Meaux are the most noteworthy of a few such disturbances, which, it is claimed, show that the Fabrists had lost control of the movement they had started.

Before assessing the claim about the Fabrists' loss of control, one needs first to determine whether, as accused, they took the truly revolutionary step of forming, promoting, and nourishing evangelical cells.

The evidence reveals that network members did seek to establish groups in which lay people could read and discuss Scripture as well as to participate in various devotions,

¹⁴³ "Et pource que plusieurs personnes au moyen de ce qu'ilz lisent les livres de la sainte escripture translatez de latin en françois sont inventeurs de plusieurs heresies, font conventicules, et disputent et traictent de la foi catholique, contempnent les commandemens et ministres de leglise, se diuertissent du train commun des vrais fideles quant aux sacremens predications et service de l'eglise, et sement grans erreurs dont viennent et pourroient advenir plusieurs scandalles, maulx, et inconueniens en ce royaume." *Les arrestz et ordonnances de la court contre Luther: les lutheriens et leurs livres: et aultres livres deffendus*, a2v [Paris, 1526?]. This rare, published parliamentary *arrest* appears to have been printed within days of being announced through the streets of Paris. It also contains the text of the Parlement's edict of 12 August 1523 against possession of books by Luther. Parisians took note of this edict, Lalanne, ed. *Bourgeois*, 276; *Cronique du Roy François*, 55.

¹⁴⁴ Beda to Erasmus, Paris, 21 May 1525, Allen 6, no. 1579, 81-86, ll. 154-166. For a fine

such as praying. At Meaux, aside from the circle of scholars gathered at the bishop's court, a group of local notables led by Nicolas Le Sueur remembered Farel fondly, promising him their financial aid to publish evangelical literature that was supposed to nourish such groups.¹⁴⁶ At court, Marguerite drew together an evangelical circle, by having d'Arande teach and preach, while she instructed others eager for evangelical doctrine.¹⁴⁷ Similarly at Grenoble a group of local notables championed Sébiville's preaching and helped to secure his release from prison. Sébiville reported in December 1524 that such groups of the faithful, like the one gathered around him at Grenoble, met to discuss religious matters, read books, pray, and, occasionally, as Canaye described at Paris, to hear sermons in private. And although Sébiville claimed that authorities were troubled much less by these private meetings than by his public sermons, that was not the case elsewhere, as at Meaux. Private meetings, nevertheless, certainly proved harder to police than public sermons.¹⁴⁸

Significant numbers of artisans also adhered to the movement.¹⁴⁹ The intensive religious education offered at Meaux was specifically intended to reach large numbers of

exposition of the public exchange between Beda and Erasmus, see, Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 186-197.

¹⁴⁵ See Imbart, Farge, Nicholls, and Heller.

¹⁴⁶ As reported to Farel by Roussel, 24 August 1524, Herminjard 1, no. 117, 270-273, 273.

¹⁴⁷ See chapter 6, note 30.

¹⁴⁸ "Pour confabuler ensemble secrètement de l'Évangille nul ne dict rien, mais de en parler publicquement il n'y pend que le feu. Les Thomistez ont voulu procéder contre moy par inquisition et caption de personne, et sy ne feust certains amys secretz, je estoie mys entre les mains des Pharisée[n]s. Je ne dis pas que il ny aye merueilleusement grands zélateurs de l'Évangille, mais ilz sont en petit nombre." Herminjard 1, no. 132, 313-316.

¹⁴⁹ For a detailed presentation of the "Popular Roots of the Reformation: The Lutherans of Meaux," see Henry Heller, chapter in *The Conquest of Poverty*, 27-69. Heller's account of the Calvinist revolt revolves around the social disjunction and antagonism between urban notables and artisans. See below for remarks about the Meaux group's attempt to cultivate lay people of all social orders as, in effect, religious teachers.

the laity. Bishop Briçonnet had established daily lectures on Romans and the Psalms, which was, in effect, a sort of lay biblical school that served as a model for such cells.

These groups became the basis for *conventicules et monopolia*. The local prosecutor at Meaux reported that after Roussel's sermons:

many wool-combers, carders, and other unlettered people of that sort, having the books of Paul's Epistles, the Gospels, and the Psalms in their native tongue, which they carried about with them—even though they had been forbidden to dispute about religion, the faith, the sacraments, privileges of Rome, and the paintings and images that they wanted to do away with—would form conventicles and *monopolia* in the church. Notably, on the feast day of the Purification of the Virgin and last Sunday [5 February 1525] they threatened to beat those who wanted to depict the event in procession.¹⁵⁰

The implication was that Roussel had fostered such heretical disturbances. One of the lay leaders during these meetings was the wool-carder, Jean Le Clerc, mentioned previously.¹⁵¹ A few months after being banished from France, he went to the stake at Metz for having defaced images there, asserting his right as a layman to speak the truth when the ministers fell silent.¹⁵² Impetuous and outspoken, Le Clerc's actions were but a slight aberration of the Meaux group's plans. Although Gérard Roussel did not trust Le Clerc to carry letters for him safely to Metz, he commiserated with Farel about this

¹⁵⁰ "Lundi 6 février 1524 [1525 n.s.], le promoteur représenta que tous les dimanches et fêtes après le sermon que M. Gérard Roussel, trésorier et chanoine, avait fait, que plusieurs peigneurs, cardeurs et autres gens de même trempe, non lettrés, avaient des livres des épistres de saint Paul, des évangiles, des psaumes, en langues maternelles, qu'ils portent avec eux, quoiqu'il leur fût défendu de disputer sur la religion, sur la foi, les sacrements, privilèges de Rome, et des peintures et images qu'ils voulaient oster, et qu'ils font des conventicules et *monopolia* dans l'église, et notamment le jour de la Purification de la Vierge, et le dimanche dernier ayant menacé de frapper ceux qui leur représentaient..." Charles Schmidt, "Gérard Roussel, inculpé d'hérésie à Meaux, 1525," *BSHPF* 10 (1861): 220.

¹⁵¹ Pierre Driart did not record his name, but described Le Clerc's crimes and sentence accurately enough, see Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 104-105.

¹⁵² See chapter 1, at note 12 for quotation.

layman's suffering in France and fate at Metz.¹⁵³ Indeed, as reported above, Roussel had been closely implicated in the events for which Le Clerc was banished. Moreover, Le Clerc's deep biblical learning, which was appreciated by fellow evangelicals at Metz and noted by the crowd at the time of his execution, was exactly what the Meaux group intended to produce: lay people learned in the Scriptures, who were capable of perpetuating the faith.¹⁵⁴

Such evidence indicates that the Meaux group and their evangelical confreres throughout France consciously sought to establish and nourish a sort of catacomb church under the umbrella of the vitiated church militant. Indeed, as in the *Brief recueil* and Lefèvre's preface to the Psalms, many books that the network published specifically addressed themselves to these groups of the faithful.¹⁵⁵ The claim that early evangelicals intentionally fostered the development of quasi-clandestine church groups is important

¹⁵³ "...ut mihi justior querendi occasio relictā videatur quam tibi, etiamsi has partes in tuis postremis literis, iisque inabosolutis, praeripuisti, hac, opinor, occasione motus quod per illum non scripserim qui apud nos multa passus, vitam finivit apud Metenses: id quod a me praetermissum est, quod metuere ne interciperentur literae, nec satis compertum esset num fuerit te conventurus, cum non de industria sed inopinato hunc Metis reperiis. De quo Christi milite non scribo, quod noris plus satis quae erga se acta sunt per eos qui hoc nomine se Christi esse gloriantur, quod fortiter tueantur traditiones quas a patribus acceperunt, nec interim, veluti animalia minime (sic) bisulca ac ruminantia, expendant quam absint a Christo, qui verus pater es, et apostolis, qui pro patribus nati sunt filii quos constituit Dominus super omnem terram." Roussel to Farel, 25 September 1525, Herminjard I, no. 162, 390; Schmidt, Gérard Roussel, no. 5, 185-187.

¹⁵⁴ At Metz, Le Clerc joined the city's small, embattled evangelical group, which was in close contact via Pierre Toussaint, Guillaume Farel, and François Lambert to their brethren at Strasbourg and Basel. See the letters circulated in this circle from July through August 1525 in Herminjard 5, no. 153b, 385-388, no. 154a, 388-391; Herminjard I, no. 155, 371-373, no. 157, 375-377. For Jean Le Clerc's deeds and 'martyrdom' at Metz, see the chronicle as in note 85.

¹⁵⁵ For instance, the anonymous *Epistre chrestienne* (Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1525?; Higman, *Piety*, F 8) is addressed to "Ma treschere seur, ... et tous ceulx qui ont desir, que l'honneur de Dieu soit garde," (A2r), whom the author, possibly Farel, urges to remember the 'spiritual understanding' of Christ's sacrifice, "[il] est ressuscité pour nostre justification, afin que puyssiez edifier vostre mesnage en la crainte de dieu, et tous voz prochains en l'edification du vray corps de Jesuchrist." (C4r). The italicized passage clearly states the in-group missionary intent of such works.

for it recasts the whole debate about whether or not evangelicals intended to break with the existing church into more comprehensible terms. Network members did not *a priori* recognize the militant church, at least in France, as the true Church only as its inescapable shell. Effectively, they had already relegated this structure to the realm of *adiaphora*, those things which were neither necessary nor fundamentally pernicious to the true church, the body of Christ. When discussing the office of minister with Farel, Gérard Roussel agreed that the people should be able to choose their own ministers.¹⁵⁶ He only stipulates that the people must first be well instructed in true doctrine otherwise they would not be able to distinguish good from bad ones. When Roussel next states that he was not opposed to a hierarchy within the church, he was neither affirming or rejecting the existing one, only stating the need to have one that conforms to the will of the Holy Spirit, “whatever in the end that may be” (*quicumque tandem sit*). As far as his embryonic discussion of church polity goes, Roussel has withdrawn confidence from the existing Church rather than broken with it. His attitude is reminiscent of Lefèvre’s assertion that the church was in a middle age of unsound doctrine. Roussel and Lefèvre were not

¹⁵⁶ “Pastoris munus, ut neque nomen, non arrego mihi, etiamsi in numero habeam solos haberi [pastores] quos ad ministerium verbi deligit spiritus. Non agam tecum in re de qua nolum quemquam digladiari, cum nobis hoc agendum sedulo, quo verbum Christi annuncietur, ut maxime nulli suus decedat honor. Certum est Philippum diaconum, ab apostolis designatum in ministerium pauperum, gratiam habuisse verbi, ut fidem facit liber Actorum; tamen, utcumque suo ministerio fidem recepissent Samaritani, duxerent apostoli mittendos Petrum et Joannem, ut impositis manibus reciperent spiritum, perinde ac si non haberet Philippus idem donum quod apostoli, aut, quod magis placet, ne quicquam tibi dissentiam, in hoc missi sunt ut illorum assensu concordi cum Philippo Samaritanorum fides roboraretur. Nec mihi displicet ordo in ecclesia: sed hunc solum amplector quem exhibet ac requirit spiritus, quicumque tandem sit, ne infirmos nactus oculos cogar deinde in luce meridiei cecutire. Presbyteros a populo deligi mihi probatur, sed requiro antea populum fieri christianum et Dei agi spiritu, qui, si desit, non video qui ita succurri possit christianae rei, cum scindatur incertum studia in contraria vulgus. Sed de his hactenus, ne videar quicquam iis refragari quae cunctis persuasa esse velim, ut qui maxime.” Roussel to Farel, 6 July 1524, Herminjard I, no. 104, 231-240, 236; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 2, 171-178.

wedded to the traditional church but neither did they consider it their duty to reject or flee it completely, for in the process he would have to abandon those whom he considered the true body of the church: the people.

Roussel and other evangelicals thought that the only basis for the perpetuation of the church lay in teaching true doctrine to the laity. In the face of the militant Church's hostility to it, they resorted to fostering conventicles of true believers. Anémond de Coct and Antoine Papillon likened their situation in France to a remnant of God's people that would embrace "Christ returning from exile in Egypt."¹⁵⁷

The evangelicals' decision to form and instruct lay groups behind the back of church officials and secular authorities was a strategic step dictated by circumstances and rooted in certain fundamental beliefs. As Lefèvre had argued in his preface to his *Commentarii initiatorii in quatuor Evangelia*,¹⁵⁸ secular and church officials only exercised true authority to the extent that they conformed and promoted the word of God. And if, as is plain from their statements, the network members did not regard the Roman or Gallican churches, or rather their clergies, as legitimate in this absolute religious sense,

¹⁵⁷ "Futurum profecto esse video, ut non modo Galliae nostrae, verum et Italia et Hispania gentesque reliquae Christum ex Aegypto redeuntem ambabus ulnis sint excepturae." Anémond de Coct to Reader, 1 February 1524, *WA Br* 3, no. 657, 148-149; Herminjard I, no. 86, 184-186, [dated 24 January 1524]. "Quodque vehementissime dolendum est, tanta hypocriticae hujus justitiae vis, tam crassum speciosumque tectorium est, ut nostrorum oculi latentem sub his impuritatem pervidere non possint. Tam multos praeterea Romanense illud idolum satellites omnis generis sibi apud nos comparavit, ut nusquam aut plures, aut potentiores, aut versutiores. Quos tametsi Deus contriturus sit cum illorum principe Antichristo, plurimum tamen Christo, ex Aegypto redeunti, negotii exhibent, eoque rem adduxere, ut (quae summa certissimaque Christiano spes est) nihil hac in re ab homine quoquam expectari possit." Antoine Papillon to Zwingli, 7 October 1524, *ZW* 8, no. 346, 221-225; Herminjard I, no. 125, 294-298.

"Interim nihilo secius suae domino reliquiae salvae sunt, indesque credentium numerus augetur, qui pro se quisque, quoad licet, Christi negotium promovent in omnesque occasiones intenti (qua fenestra aperitur), sacrum hoc incendium vibrant quamque possunt latissime spargunt!" *ZW* 8, p. 223-224:

¹⁵⁸ See chapter 5 at note 66.

they certainly recognized that these hierarchies exercised real temporal authority which had to be dealt with. If church officials opposed true religion, then they had to be circumvented until the time when they might be converted. Whence all their demands for prayers that their persecutors might be enlightenment by the Holy Spirit.

Did then the Meaux group 'lose control' of the lay groups whom they had animated? Lefèvre had certainly warned them not to cause scandal when instructing fellow lay persons.¹⁵⁹ Though repeated in other books and from the pulpit, certain lay persons did risk offending some in order to edify others by destroying the physical supports and processions surrounding the cult of the saints, Mary in particular. Roussel, however, does not seem to have fundamentally disapproved of Le Clerc's goals, though he may well have deemed his means to be rash. Lefèvre too had his critical remarks to make about the church and its cult of the saints in his Psalms *arguments* and elsewhere. If the Meaux group did lose control over some of the laity (and those few are the only ones who register in the sources, not all the ones Lefèvre claimed were avid for the Gospel), that loss did not result in some hydra-headed beast of many heresies. Rather, the laity seems to have been good students of the Meaux group's doctrine, but bad disciples of their strategic restraint, for they attacked precisely the images, practices, and traditions that had been held up to them in the teachings of the Meaux group as aberrations of the pure cult.

¹⁵⁹ "Et ne debvez point semer les marguerites celestes, se [si] intelligence vous est donnee, se [si] ce n'est en exhortant l'ung l'autre à aymer dieu (là git la vie chrestienne qui est vie spirituelle et celeste et non point charnelle et terrienne), et principalement es lieux et aux personnes ou povez seulement edifier et nul offenser." Lefèvre to reader, 6 November 1523, preface to second installment of the New Testament, Rice, no. 138, 457-468, 446; cf. Herminjard I, no. 79, 159-169.

While Lefèvre and Roussel could dream of a national church renewed according to their understanding of true doctrine, realistically they, like Coct and Papillon, recognized that the possibility was remote, not for lack of enthusiasm from the laity, but because of impediments from authorities. Thus, while lauding and admiring the heroics in Germany, they accepted that France might be passed over in God's inscrutable will. They were prepared to accept persecution and failure because they held a distinctive notion about how the Spirit worked in the world. In responding to Farel's imprecations to be bolder, Roussel told him to moderate his zeal, asking "What is it to you if God decides to let an abundant harvest rot in the fields of France... Faith does not complain about the inscrutable will of God, but suspends judgment, and patiently waits for God's work to unfold."¹⁶⁰ Charles Schmidt dubbed this approach to church renewal "mystical quietism," considering it to be imbued with a regrettable pacifism or fatalism.¹⁶¹ Yet if network members were resigned to accept whatever happened as God's will, Roussel also protested to Farel that he, at least, would not temporize in the face of persecution as some of their confreres advised. Nor, on the other hand, he gives note, would he incite scandals

¹⁶⁰ Continuing their conversation about true ministry and the 'harvest of souls' to be expected in France, Roussel responded to Farel's evidently harsh criticisms: "Perire messem, nec parvam, Domino, ob inopiam demetentium, doles; sed non inde unquam consulendum, ut non vocatus se ingerat isti operae. Deinde, quid tua, si sic velit agantur res dominus messis, qui, in motum oculi, sine tua sollicitudine, multo copiosorem fructum colligere potest? Si sua perire velit, quid ad te? -- Dicis: 'Ad id me adigit charitas, quae proximi saluti consulit.'-- Sed vide, ne reclamet fides, quae divinae voluntati cuncta subiicit, quae, incomprehensibilium iudiciorum Dei abyssos subingrediens, haeret, suspendit iudicium, ac patienter expectat opus Dei. Stata semel credit esse omnia, ut prepopere non sit quicquam agendum attentandumve; et, ut voluntati Ipsius nihil posse resistere asserit, ita, avertente Ipso manum, ne esse ut quem laborare conveniat." Roussel to Farel, 24 August 1524, Herminjard I, no. 117, 272-273.

¹⁶¹ Charles Schmidt, "Le mysticisme quiétiste en France au début de la réformation sous François I^{er}: G. Roussel," *BSHPF* 6 (1858): 449-464.

that he deemed were counterproductive to the spread of their message.¹⁶² Roussel realized that he and others lacked the courage to proclaim the Gospel as boldly as he believed it should be. He freely admitted that he feared for his life and could not willingly embrace the martyr's crown, begging Farel, Zwingli, and Oecolampadius to encourage him to be bolder with their prayers. But lack of courage was not the sole reason he would not follow all Farel's fervent advice. Roussel and the others in the network held more limited views than Farel about what was permissible and productive in promoting God's word. Although cowed by persecution, they were not immobilized by fear, only prudent and crafty; certainly calculating, but not unprincipled. They covered their flanks when preaching or publishing books while awaiting freer days.

The network members' hope in a brighter future was not ill-founded, for as they rejoiced time and again, Marguerite "the most evangelical person in all of France," was protecting and championing them.¹⁶³ They could reasonably expect that she might succeed in convincing the king to support them should his hands ever become freed from political entanglements. Many members reported during 1524-1525 that without her intervention they would have suffered death. Other evidence suggests that Marguerite

¹⁶² "Ne memorem, amicos cum quibus scis me versari [Herminjard suggests Lefèvre and Vatable], continuo causari: 'necdum venisse tempus commodum, ac frustra conseri manus cum portis Inferi, priusquam Evangelium latius sparsum fuerit, priusquam altius infixum sit mortalium animis!' Quorum sententiae non subscribo equidem, sed mihi contra videtur tunc minus opus fore conflictationibus, sed, si quando commode, jam praecipue cum deducenda plebs annuat, cum, a vera luce in tenebras olim ablegata, in eam unde exciderat revocanda sit lucem.... Quantum possit oratio firmandis animis adversus hostes Verbi, fidem nobis fecerunt apostoli: quibus, in hoc orantibus Deum, motus sit locus in quo essent, nempe in expressione impetratae Dei quam postulassent [gratiae]." Roussel to Farel, 24 August 1524, Herminjard I, no. 117, 271-272.

¹⁶³ Sébiville asserted about Marguerite "Il n'y a point aujourd'hui en France plus évangélique que la Dame d'Alençon." Herminjard I, no. 132, 315-316. Nicolas Le Sueur, Roussel, Pierre Toussaint, and Antoine Papillon all sang her praises as their fully committed and powerful patron. See Herminjard I, nos.

took an active interest in managing the network's whole program. At the end of 1524, reminiscent of Lefèvre's report of having been guided by friends at court in framing his dedication to Chancellor Duprat and Antoine Papillon's request that Zwingli direct his work to Louise of Savoy, Marguerite had word sent to François Lambert that he should desist from dedicating any more books to Francis I, since they were only alienating the king.¹⁶⁴ Nevertheless, friends, meaning the group around Marguerite at Lyon, gratified Lambert with 20 *écus*.¹⁶⁵ Far from bristling under this reproach, Lambert rejoiced at the payment and never again did he dedicate a work to Francis I. Similarly, in 1524 after Antoine Papillon translated Luther's *De votis monasticis iudicium* for her, Marguerite rewarded him with a place in the Dauphin's household.¹⁶⁶ In that same year the

102, 104, 125, 130, 131, 153, and 178.

¹⁶⁴ "Aussy escripvez à François Lambert, qu'il désiste d'escirpre je ne scé quelles sottes lettres et livres qu'il escript à ceulx de Mets et aultres, au grant détrimet de la Parrole de Dieu. *Parturit, ut audio, libellum de vocatione sua per sortem, et nescio quae alia ridicula. Item faciunt se vocaris Apostolos, Evangelistas et Episcopos*, et je ne scé quelz aultres titres plus plain[s] d'arrogance que de science. Nostre frère le chevallier Coctus m'a promys qu'il luy en escripveroit bien égrement. Jehan Va[u]gry m'a dit que Madame d'Alençon luy avoit fais dire qu'il n'escripva plus ny au Roy ny à aultres [Lambert had written three times to Francis I, in May and August 1524] Dieu luy doint grâce de dire et escrire seulement ce qui est nécessaire aux povres âmes, et à sa paix!" [Latin italicized] Pierre Toussaint to Guillaume Farel, from Basel to Montbéliard, 17 December 1524, Herminjard I, no. 131, 312-313.

¹⁶⁵ "Paupertatem multam sustinemus; nam omnia carissima, et obruor ego debitis multis: fratres aulici, et forsan tu cum illis, miserunt mihi aureos solares viginti; nihil opportunius habui unquam. In omnibus benedictum nomen Domini, qui juit nos, et potens est nos liberos facere a tam extrema paupertate! Gratias ago omnibus, qui dederunt et juverunt paupertatem meam." François Lambert to Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, from Strasbourg to [Lyon], 31 December 1524, Herminjard I, no. 133, 317. The money had come along with information about the situation in France in a letter from Antoine Papillon, indicating that Marguerite lay behind both the warning and the money to Lambert. "Denique eruditissimus Papilio in suis literis, salutem ad me ex tuo nomie scripsit. Gavisa est vehementissime tota ecclesia sanctorum qui apud nos sunt, audientes fructum Verbi apud aulicos, itidem apud Galliam ferè omnem." *ibid.*, 316.

¹⁶⁶ "Il ne j [y] a eu deulx grans personnaiges à Grenoble, le temps du Roi estant à Lyon [August 1524]. L'ung se appelle Anthonius Papilio, le premier de France bien sachant l'Évangille, et en langue latine très-élégant. Il a translaté le traictié de votis monasticis à Madame d'Alençon, seur du Roy, de quoy il a eu beaucoup d'affaires avecques celle vermine parrhisienne. Toutefois ladicte dame l'a bien récompensé, car elle l'a fait maistre premier des Requestes du Daulphin, et si est du grant conseil." Sébiville to Anémond de Coct, from Grenoble to Zurich, 28 December 1524, Herminjard I, no. 132, 314.

conservative Jean Gacy put the public on guard against such doings: “What will I say about certain ladies, who... to satisfy their folly have had books by Luther translated from Latin into French?”¹⁶⁷ Conservatives said it often and pointedly: women were having Luther’s works translated, and on their shoulders rested the blame for the spread of heresy in the realm. Marguerite’s bold patronage of Briçonnet’s band and their larger fraternal alliance clearly endangered her reputation. When Francis I fell captive, conservatives seized the occasion to reproach the royal family for its misdeeds, most prominently for fomenting heresy. In 1525, Marguerite faced the enormous challenge of simultaneously preserving her brother, her network, and her reputation.

W.G. Moore raises the doubt whether this passage really indicates anything more than that Papillon transferred, which is one of the possible meanings of “*translater*,” either the original Latin or a translation of *De votis monasticis iudicium* to Marguerite. His doubt are answered by the context: Sébiville writes that Papillon was a good Latinist, an important requirement for a would-be translator, and that he received the reward of a place in the Dauphin’s household for it, which is a far greater recompense than the gift of a mere book would warrant, but is one fully in keeping with the dedication of a work that he had translated for her. See further Erasmus’s warning to Berquin about his translating activities in which he holds up the untimely death of Papillon—Erasmus suspected that he was poisoned—as a warning. Allen 6, no. 1599, 150-151.

Interestingly, in 1526 Berquin was caught with a manuscript in which he? claims to have translated Luther’s *De votis monasticis iudicium* in order to disseminate it widely to the public: “*Libellus, cujus titulus est: Ludovici a Berquin adversus calumnias quorundam Epistolas Apologetica ad amicum, quia aperte damnatam Lutheri doctrinam probat & tuetur, sacrae Religionis vota execratur & subsannat & autorem transtulisse impiissimum Libellum illum Lutheri de votis Monasticis inscriptum docet, ut Libelli illius venenum in plebeios diffunderet*” d’Argentré 2, pt. 1, p. 41. This points to possible connection between Papillon and Berquin, unknown from other sources, but not surprising given their common profile as protégés of Marguerite.

¹⁶⁷ “Que dirai je d’aulcunes dames/ Cuydans verite surmonter/ Pourtans grand prejudice aux ames/ Pour leur folie contenter/ Les livres Luther translater/ Ont fait en francoys du latin/ Qui prend cop lieve trop matin.” Gacy, *Triologue* (1524), g3v. Cf. chapter 6, note 159, for his attack on women led astray by Lutheran preachers.

8. Resurrecting King and Reform (1525-1530)

The year that Francis I spent in captivity was among the most dramatic as well as self-consciously dramatized episodes in Marguerite's life. When her brother was at the lowest point of his reign and her network was being crushed, Marguerite employed her considerable creativity and guile to resurrect them both. Extending her metaphor, one might say that after Francis I returned to the kingdom, evangelicals still had to wait another four years for their Pentecost. Only when the king's children were ransomed in 1530 did they receive Marguerite's blessing to pursue the evangelical cause more openly.

I. The King in Captivity and Reform in Exile (1525-1526)

The captivity of Francis I gravely endangered the royal regime, forcing it to mature politically. In foreign affairs the crown was required to hone its crude diplomatic skills: the only arm left at its disposal. On the home front, it had to face down the defiance of the Parlement of Paris, which voiced years of mounting discontent with Francis's rule. In response to the first challenge, the crown quickly became adept at forming and running a multi-party alliance scheme to check Charles V's military advantage. So too, the crown neutralized its domestic critics effectively by making empty promises and by sacrificing on the altar of orthodoxy the heretics whom conservatives claimed had provoked God's wrath.

Pavia exhausted France's military options versus the Hapsburg lands and England, and, to turn Bismarck's dictum on its head, they turned to diplomacy as a form of war by

other means. On the eve of the Valois-Hapsburg clash, although France had begun its long cultural and political tutelage under Italian masters, it was not yet skilled in the art of the courtier or the ambassador.¹ At the end of the 1510s France's diplomatic corps remained underdeveloped and was little used either to prevent the war or to serve French strategy during it.² After the start of hostilities, Francis I only had resident ambassadors in Venice, Rome, and the Swiss cantons. In English affairs, Francis I's personal *détente* at the sensational Field of the Cloth of Gold (June 1520) failed to prevent the English from secretly joining the Emperor in 1521.³ A flurry of envoys sent to the German

¹ Garret Mattingly argues cogently that until the 1520s, compared with the English or Spanish, the French were unskilled in diplomacy and had an underdeveloped ambassadorial corps. The latter assertion is certainly true, for the number of resident ambassadors and envoys sent from and to France increases markedly after 1525. See *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955; reprint Baltimore: Penguin, 1964), 148-151; CAF 9.

Francis I had an early (1515 or 1516) and abiding interest in Balthasar Castiglione's *Art of the Courtier*, which, however, when published in 1528 did not contain the flattering passage that the king had earlier inspired him to put in. The King's reader, Jacques Colin, translated this work for him in 1529. See Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 6, 8, 473, and on French taste for things Italian, 125. On the influence of Italian culture on France see, Picot, Gadoffre, and Fumaroli.

² Mattingly also argues that the election of Charles V caused a fundamental, destabilizing shift in the political landscape of Europe by reducing the number of major powers from four (the Hapsburg lands, France, Spain, and England) to three (the Hapsburg lands including Spain, France, and England), upsetting the "multiple balance of power" envisioned by Cardinal Wolsey in the Treaty of London (4 October 1518). On the wrong side of this imbalance, France was in desperate need of the advantages that diplomacy could afford against its more powerful Hapsburg rival and woefully ill-equipped to secure them. *Renaissance Diplomacy*, 144-148.

Scholars are agreed that the Valois-Hapsburg struggle dominated international relations in Western Europe during the first half of the Sixteenth Century. Recent interpreters, however, describe this battle as principally a dynastic fight for preponderance in Italy, rejecting an older interpretation that accepted early sixteenth-century rhetoric (Charles V as the new Charlemagne, etc...) that portrayed Charles as seeking to encircle France and achieve hegemony (*monarchie* or *monarchia*) over Western Europe. The following summary is based on Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, chs. 8, 10, 11 and Richard Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660*, *The Short Oxford History of the Modern World*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 79-130, esp. 79-80, 99-104, and 109-110. For the older view see H.G. Koenigsberger and George L. Mosse, "Empires" in *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), 174-211, esp. 180-182.

³ France's exchange of resident ambassadors with England ceased in June 1522 when England joined with the Hapsburg, see CAF 9, 17-21, 93-96. While at war with England, the French sent three envoys to Henry VIII from June 1524 to April 1525 to seek peace. The permanent French mission to England then recommenced in June 1525. Although Mattingly incorrectly asserts that France had no

princes in 1518-1519 ended after Francis lost his bid for the imperial crown. Although Charles V recognized that with the advent of the Luther affair, the princes of the Empire might serve as a fifth French column, Francis did not see their potential, accrediting no further ambassadors to the German princes until the formation of the Schmalkald League in 1531.⁴

After Pavia, the Regent, Louise of Savoy, sent waves of envoys and ambassadors to England, the Swiss cantons, the Pope, and other Italian powers. Notably, she also established secret contact with the Grand Turk, inaugurating France's historic ties to the Middle East. She was slow to treat with Charles V, trying first to enlist the support of his aunt Margaret of Austria (Savoy), Regent of the Low Countries. Though rebuffed there, French overtures to the Italians eventually led to the establishment of the League of Cognac in 1526. Because Henry VIII was upset with Charles V for not sharing the spoils of war, by the summer of 1525 he was eager to make peace with the French and gain what advantages he might from them. After France and England signed the Treaty of the

representatives in England before the war, he is certainly correct that they did little to forestall England from siding with the Emperor.

⁴ Charles V's representatives at the Calais Peace conference (August 1521) accused Francis I of trying to use the Lutheran heretics to overthrow him at the Diet of Worms: "Quotiens et conatus est Gallus, dum Imperii comitia Wormatiae haberemus, ... Pestilentissimum etiam Lutheranium virus fovere variisque artibus diffundere non destitit, veluti hac via ad novos summos Pontifices, ad novos Caesares creandos, ad certam christiani orbis ruinam parandam et implacabiles tempestates excitandas aditus patefieri videretur." *Journal de Jean de Barrillon: Secrétaire du Chancelier Duprat 1515-1521*, 2 vols., ed. Pierre de Vaissière (Paris: Renouard, 1897 & 1899), 2, 226-238; 231. Chancellor Duprat's response makes no reply to this charge, *ibid.*, 2, 238-249; cf. 247. Nor has any other evidence come to light to substantiate Charles V's charge.

During 1518-1519, Francis sent at least 17 different missions to "Allemagne" involving 25 ambassadors. From 1520-1530, only three ambassadors are known to have gone to "Germany." The first, Hans Temperan, was active at Bern in May 1523. He does not seem to have had any dealing outside the Swiss cantons. The second, Antoine de L'Apostolle, sr. de Margency, was sent to the Duke of Guelders October 1528, thus was not involved with any of the other principal powers of the Empire. On the third, Louis de Rabodanges, who was accredited to see Charles V at the Diet of Augsburg, see below. From 1531

Moore (30 August 1525),⁵ Louise of Savoy and Chancellor Duprat followed Cardinal Wolsey's advice during their final negotiations with Charles. In the end, France's web of allegiances pressured Charles V enough to convince him to release Francis in exchange for his sons, rather than hold him until the fulfillment of the Treaty of Madrid.

Meanwhile on the home front, the news of Pavia distressed the French, inciting fears of imminent invasion, for the northern frontier was dangerously exposed. At first Henry VIII did indeed propose to Charles V that they carve up France between them. French dread, which deepened as the Peasants War spread into Lorraine, was soon quelled as the Duke of Lorraine savagely crushed the ill-equipped commoners and it became plain that Charles V and Henry VIII would not invade.

Ironically, from the crown's perspective, the greatest threat was internal. With the regency government reeling under the blow of Francis's captivity, the Parlement of Paris, voicing the views of a large portions of the third estate, seized the opportunity to confront the crown with their many grievances at the first ten years of Francis's rule.⁶ On March 20, a few days after news of Pavia reached Paris, the Parlement of Paris signaled their intentions by freeing from jail several printers of anti-royalist tracts and the preacher Jean Josse who had slandered the royal regime for its toleration of heretics.⁷ That same day, President Briçonnet, brother of Guillaume, declared in Parlement that "the calamities

onwards, Francis sent a steady stream of ambassadors to the German princes and Diets. See *CAF* 9, 6-8.

⁵ *Ordonnances* 4, no. 394, 92-109.

⁶ For instance, the chronicler Versoris mentioned excessive royal taxation in November 1521, October 1522, and September 1524: Fagniez, *Versoris*, no. 57, 20-21; no. 88, 25; no. 186, 58; as did Pierre Driart for March 1524, Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 88. See further, Terrasse, *François I^{er}*, 313-316; and Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 228-236.

⁷ Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 233-234.

suffered in this Realm are due to the heresies and blasphemies spreading throughout the Realm.” That day the Parlement elevated the ad hoc tribunal commissioned to hear Meigret’s case into a full inquisitorial court.⁸ Then on April 10, the Parlement submitted its own set of ransom demands to the Regent at Lyon. In exchange for its continued cooperation, the Parlement wanted her to address a remonstrance of thirty two articles.⁹ Four days later, the Paris City Council, acting in concert with Parlement, submitted its demands.¹⁰

The Parlement’s protest concerned four principal matters: the crown’s abrogation of freedom of the Gallican church, its abuse of the judicial system, the crimes committed by the royal army, and the excessive burden of royal taxation.¹¹ In chief, the Parlement asked the Regent: to abolish the Concordat of Bologna and restore of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (art. 2); to cease evoking benefice suits from the Parlement to the king’s *grand conseil* (art. 5); to appoint no more laymen to clerical offices in the Parlement (art. 10); to stop the king’s army from afflicting the people (arts. 17-22); and to

⁸ “20 Mars 1524 [1525 n.s.]. Les calamités survenues en ce Royaume sont attribuées aux hérésies blasphèmes ledit Président Briçonnet parlant. Le même jour sur le rapport fait à la cour de ce que dessus arrêt d’icelle pour republier l’ordonnance de Louis II^e ci-devant lue et publiée et bailler vicariat par l’évêque de Paris et un Président de Enquêtes un conseiller et deux Docteurs pour faire le procès aux entassés à doctrine de Luther et autres hérésies.” BPF MS 140, fol. 1r, copy of registers of the Parlement of Paris.

⁹ April 10, 1525: “Les articles en forme de remonstrance envoyer par la cour a Madame mere du Roy Regente en France.” BnF MS Clairambault 324 ff. 269r – 273r; cf. BPF MS 140, fol. 2r. Knecht mentions these remonstrances, basing his analysis upon entries in the registers of the Parlement of Paris, *Renaissance Warrior*, p. 232.

¹⁰ Mentioned in a report on May 10 by the representatives of the Paris city council about their meetings with Louise on April 14 and after, in Le Roux de Lincy, ed., *Procès-Verbal des délibérations tenues à l’Hôtel de Ville de Paris pendant la captivité de François I^{er}* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1844), 14-15.

¹¹ In April 1525 “Louise avoit veu à part les Instructions envoyées par la Court, qu’elle avoit divisé en quatre poincts en ce qui concerne l’Estat et liberté de l’Eglise, de la Justice, de la Gendarmerie, soullagement du peuple et des finances:” in “Poursuites du Parlement pour l’extirpation des hieresies de Luther. Extraict des registres de Parlement.” BnF MS Clairambault 324 ff. fol. 239.

refrain from alienating crown lands, imposing new taxes, or increasing the *taille* (arts. 23-29). The demands of the Paris City Council similarly concerned taxes and pillaging by the royal army.¹² Both bodies coupled their demands with an urgent appeal to Louise to take vigorous action against heresy. The Parlement blamed the “evils that have welled up in the church” on the lack of free (i.e., capitular) elections under the Concordat, which had prevented sound pastors from being selected and enabled heresy to spread.¹³ The City Council of Paris asked “her to see to it that the Lutherans are chased from the realm because their errors have enraged God against us.”¹⁴

In response, Louise certainly “ruled as if they [the remonstrances] had never existed”¹⁵ in administrative and judicial matters. For that, she encountered stiff resistance from Parlement throughout her regency, especially against her chief advisor, Chancellor Duprat, but never open rebellion.¹⁶ Louise refused to revoke the Concordat or proceed with other administrative changes until Francis’s return, but she threw the Parlement a

¹² The Paris city council protested chiefly against a 100,000 *écus* extraordinary tax on them and the pillaging of royal troops in the Paris region. Le Roux de Lincy, *Procès-verbal des délibérations tenues à l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris*, 15-16.

¹³ Although none of the Parlement’s articles specifically accuse the crown of supporting heretics, it cites the spread of the “Lutheran” threat as its chief justification for the whole set of demands. The preamble of the remonstrance states that the welfare of the king and realm, which were obviously wanting, rests upon a free church and the correct exercise of justice. They then pass immediately in articles two (the first article is a pro-forma request for prayers for the king and realm) and five to blaming the spread of ‘evils in the church,’ i.e., as President Briçonnet defined it the spread of heresy, on the Concordat and evocation of benefice cases to the *grand conseil* which had led to the present calamities including the king’s capture. BnF MS Clairambault 324 ff. 269r – 273r

¹⁴ “... elle voulsist donner ordre que les Luteryens soyent debouttez, car ce sont erreurs dont Dieu se courrouce.” Le Roux de Lincy, *Procès-verbal des délibérations tenues à l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris*, 16.

¹⁵ For Louise’s continuing fight with the Parlement during the regency, Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 232-236.

¹⁶ Versoris wrote a long account of the report given on May 10, 1525 by the representatives of Parlement and Paris city council about their meetings with the Regent. She sidelined their complaints and asked them for more funds to raise an army for the defense of the realm, a response which, “contenta quelque peu [barred in the MS] ceulx de Paris.” Fagniez, *Versoris*, No. 232, 72-73.

bone by authorizing the pursuit of heretics.¹⁷ Over the following year, Louise continued to sacrifice the 'Lutherans' as expiation for the calamities in the realm.¹⁸ Her sanction gave conservatives a free hand to mount the investigations that led to the mass indictment of the Meaux group in October 1525, and Berquin's arrest in January 1526.

Marguerite's Diplomatic Role

Marguerite thus faced a two-fold challenge during her brother's captivity: to save him as well as her religious brethren. She was well prepared for the starring role she would play in preserving them both. Throughout the first phase of the Valois-Hapsburg war she had been a leading figure at court, directing military affairs, supervising domestic

¹⁷ In her response to the Parlement she promised in letters to President de Selve and councilors Verjus and Prévost, "... au regard des autres articles ausquels Elle peult pourvoir et faire exécuter, *comme l'extirpation de la secte et heresie de Luther, venalité d'offices de Judicature, euocations, commissions extraordinaires, desordres de la gendarmerie et discipline militaire, oppression de peuples, desrobemens de finances, desquisement d'acquis, alienation de Domaine, immensité de dons plus a plain spécifiés esd. instructions, Elle est deliberée y donner provision pour temps passé et aduenir, et faire cesser telles voyes et abus, et deffendre a Mr. Le Chancelier [Duprat] de non user, ne sceller evocatons sinon ez cas de l'ordonnances et à Madame supplié et escript à nostre St. Pere affin d'envoyer rescript pour informer et proceder contre les coupables et faulseurs des Erreurs de Luther conformément, et selon lesd. instruction, lesquelles elle nous a ordonnées porter à Mr. Le Tresorier Robertet, pour estre gardées secretement, ...*" [Emphasis added]. April 1525: "Poursuites du Parlement pour l'extirpation des hérésies de Luther. Extraict des registres de Parlement." BnF MS Clairambault 324, f. 239.

Similarly, Louise promised to the Paris city council, "qu'elle a délibéré d'extirper tous erreurs et Luthériens." Le Roux de Lincy, *Procès-verbal des délibérations tenues à l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris*, 16.

¹⁸ On June 10, 1525 the Parlement registered letters from the Regent authorizing the execution of the Papal Bull establishing the special heresy commission, the *juges délégués*. See, *Ordonnances* 4, no. 387, 72-73: "Lettres de la Régente, ordonnant l'exécution d'une bulle du Pape, du 17 Mai 1525, relative aux poursuites a exercer contre les Luthériens, (10 June 1525)." On February 14, 1525, just before Pavia, Louise had reissued her decree of September 25, 1523, against blasphemers whom she blamed for having "provoqué l'ire de Dieu nostre createur sur ses royaume, pays et seigneuries, veu les guerres, mortalitez et famynes qui ont esté et sont de present, a nostre tresgrant degret (sic), ennuy et desplaisir." *ibid.*, no. 384, 64-66. By December, the court had been forced to draw a stronger distinction between blasphemers and heretics. The former were separated from the more pernicious heretics, as in the edict authorizing prisoners condemned to death or heavy corporal punishment to be handed over to the galleys, including "... larrons, pillars, meurdriers, regnyeurs et blaphemateurs de nom de Dieu, et de sa glorieuse Mere, joueurs de cartes et de detz, et autres vaccabonds oysifz, ..." but not "...ceulx qui auroient commis heresie, crime de leze magesté, ou autres grans et enormes cas, ..." *ibid.*, no. 406, 154-165; 155.

government, and negotiating with foreign powers. When Louise was incapacitated by reoccurring attacks of gout, Marguerite took her place at court.¹⁹ She helped to direct military operations by routing men and money to the most urgent trouble spots on France's menaced frontiers.²⁰ When disbanded soldiers were ravaging the countryside in 1523, Marguerite coordinated her husband and Anne de Montmorency's efforts to mop them up.²¹ In order to keep her brother's armies in good fighting order, she freed Francis's chief officers from domestic entanglements.²² Marguerite paid particular attention to Anne de Montmorency, Francis's boyhood friend and closest companion. When Montmorency was away from court, she sent him regular reports about the health of the royal family, apprised him of the court's movements, praised his conduct while on campaign or hiring mercenaries in Switzerland, assured him of the royal family's favor,

¹⁹ See Marguerite's letters: Génin 1, 153-5, no. 7; the summary of BnF f. fr. 3024, fol. 129 in Génin 1, 419, and Génin 2, 53, no. 2 [Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 102, 186, and 303].

²⁰ Thus, at the end of the first summer campaign of the war, Gaspard de Coligny, Maréchal de Châtillon, asked Marguerite to prevent the King from sending more troops to the Spanish front near Bayonne. Since the fighting season was almost over the expense of raising these troops would be wasted; further fortifications would suffice. Letter mentioned in a letter from "M. de Chastillon [Gaspard de Coligny]" to "M. Le Tresorier" [Robertet], 3 August 1521 BnF, Fonds Clairambault, 319, fol. 180 (See Saulnier 1977, no. 22.1 [Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 21]).

Similarly, on 16 June 1523 she wrote to Montmorency informing him that funds were on the way to resupply Thérouanne, which was being besieged. Marguerite's letter went with others from court announcing the same news. Génin 1, no. 50, 213-214 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 109).

²¹ In March 1523, Marguerite informed Anne de Montmorency that she had instructed her husband to drive the rogue troops towards him in Anjou and Maine in order to catch them in a pincer movement. Génin 1, no. 7, 153-155 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 102). Cf. chapter 6, the problem of rogue troops prompted a royal decree 25 September 1523, "Ordonnance contre les aventuriers, pillards chefs de bande et Blaphémateurs," *Ordonnances* 3, no. 359, 298-304.

²² For instance, in May and August 1524 she helped to manage the Sr. de Lorges suit at Parlement so that he could rally to the troop muster in the south of France. Uncatalogued letters: Clémencet no. 1110, 31 May 1524, Marguerite to the Parlement of Paris; Clémencet no. 1114, 9 Aug. 1524, Marguerite to the Parlement of Paris. The case had something to do with the *bailliage* of Orleans, whose *bailli*, Jacques Grosloot, was in her entourage. See chapter 7, p. 336 and n. 25. The sr. de Lorges did join the royal army and was listed among the major French captains captured at Pavia. See Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 103.

and attempted to arrange an advantageous marriage for him.²³ In short, she along with Louise of Savoy were helping to manage his rising star, ensuring that, after the defection of Bourbon, one of Francis I's best generals remained devoted.

In foreign affairs, Marguerite seconded Francis's limping diplomacy as far as it went. From 1518 to 1521, she helped to cultivate good relations with Henry VIII. She presided in place of Queen Claude at the Field of the Cloth of Gold. A month later, as Cardinal Wolsey's "daughter by adoption," she sent greetings to Henry VIII's chief advisor, cajoling him to keep the pledges that the English had made.²⁴ The following summer, while Wolsey was supposedly brokering peace but actually forming a secret alliance with the Emperor, Marguerite played out a farce at court with the English ambassador, Fitzwilliam. Although powerless to do anything about it, Marguerite recognized the disjunction between the rhetoric and *réal politique* of English policy. She tried to maintain the moral high ground in preparation for the coming conflict.

Fitzwilliam reported that:

I was with the King's sister, who told me many of the Pope's acts, which, if true, are little to his honor. She said twice or thrice that it was a strange thing the house of France ever used a plain way without dissimulation, and yet all princes were glad to hear of their loss [of Milan]. I said the King was not glad of the loss or dishonor of Francis; and she said, laughing, "If so, there is one, but no more." I see they do not trust England in the least, but give us good words for fear.²⁵

²³ See, for instance, Saulnier and Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 114, 118.2, 138, 158, 171, 177, 186, 187, 197, 199, 200, and 202.

²⁴ Étienne Poncher, Archoishop of Sens, to Cardinal Wolsey, 13 July 1520, *Letters and Papers* 3, p. 329-330, no. 912.

²⁵ Summary of Fitzwilliam's letter to [Wolsey], 2 August 1521, *Letters and Papers* 3, no. 1456, 595-597. Wolsey had offered to arbitrate peace negotiations but was secretly preparing to sign an offensive treaty with the Emperor, which he did at Bruges on 23 August 1521. See Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*,

A month later, while Machiavellian negotiations took place at Calais, Marguerite and Fitzwilliam traded accusations of breaking faith. He complained that the French were preparing to send the Duke of Albany, pretender to the Scottish crown, home to stir up trouble for the English. In turn Marguerite accused Henry VIII of dealing falsely saying:

Do you not see that the Cardinal is ever negotiating peace almost to the day of battle? Our enemies are attacking, and at Ardres, which Francis did not fortify at your master's request, Englishmen were present when it was taken and helped to raze it. What say you to that? And as for trust, that is past. The King will make himself strong, and trust in God.²⁶

As Fitzwilliam admitted to Wolsey, he did not know whether English forces had been at Ardres, but he had sworn to Marguerite on his honor as a gentleman that Henry VIII had not sanctioned its sacking. Marguerite then "began to speak sweetly, saying that she believed him (Henry VIII) to be honest, and would continue do so until she saw otherwise, after which she would never trust man again." Fitzwilliam, a childhood companion of Henry VIII, was offended by this exchange and blustered to Wolsey:

... I assure your grace this was a thing devised by my Lady (Louise of Savoy), for she stood so near that she might hear every word.

So I pray and beseech your grace to consider I am a young man ... and have a fiery temper; and if a man should ever speak to me as she [Marguerite] did, which impugned the King's honor and yours so mightily, I fear that I would have made him such an answer, that peradventure would have gone that the [King's] grace would not have been contented..... I beseech you grace to rid me hence, if it be the King's pleasure ... for though the French king and my Lady [Louise of

178-179.

²⁶ We have modernized spelling, punctuation, as well as syntax where needed, and removed the brackets supplied by editors around words where original manuscript is damaged, when their reading seems correct. Fitzwilliam to Wolsey, 15 September 1521, *Letters and Papers* 3, no. 1581, 658-660, for this and the following quotes.

Savoy] speak fairly with their mouths, I perceive well enough what they think in their hearts.

Brave words, but Fitzwilliam was clearly out of his league. He had been kept in the dark by Wolsey about Henry VIII's real plans and had no inkling that Marguerite's charges might be true or what she was doing in voicing them. Marguerite and Louise saw clearly the direction of English policy. Fitzwilliam was naïve enough that their chastisement of Henry VIII for breaking the chivalric code of honor ruffled his feathers so much that he asked to be relieved of his duties lest he committed some outrage. If he did not suspect it of his own masters, he at least saw that Marguerite could dissimulate with fair words. Without giving overt insult, Marguerite served notice to Wolsey through Fitzwilliam that while she desired France and England to remain friends, the French court knew what England was up to and were ready, 'making themselves strong and trusting in God,' to do battle.

After the English took up arms against the French in 1522, the French court focused what diplomacy they had on relations with the Pope: the last front where they might gain some advantage. Surprisingly the new Pope, Adrian VI, adopted a neutral stance during the beginning of his pontificate. He wrote to Marguerite asking for her aid in ending hostilities. She responded in humble obedience affirming her desire for peace, yet she derogated nothing from the justice of her brother's cause, replying that Francis I sought peace at the cost of much gold—a euphemism for the continuing war.²⁷ Paying lip

²⁷ "... Et perche col Re mio fratello Signore, non mi resta luogo di poter far molto; essendo sua Maestà per se stessa assai disposta ad obedire V. Santità, non solo nelle cose della pace, la quale è sempre stata tanto da sua Maestà desiderata, che l'ha con molto oro comprata da quelli, ch'hora lo spendono per

service to Adrian's wishes, she implicitly seconded Francis I's threats to cut off the rich flow of funds from the French church to Rome should the Pope refuse to help the French retake Milan. Adrian spurned Francis's demands but hesitated to turn against him lest the chief source of Papal revenue dry up and the French king become a champion of Lutheran heresy.²⁸ Only later that summer, when Francis prevented ecclesiastical taxes from going to Rome, did Adrian finally side with Charles.

France was then isolated diplomatically until 1524, when the next Pope, Clement VII, made overtures to broker peace, sending Gian Matteo Giberti, Bishop of Verona, to both Charles V and Francis I. While Francis I was away on campaign, Giberti arrived at the French court in Lyon equipped with letters of recommendation, including one for Marguerite among a handful of top courtiers.²⁹ France's fortunes had taken a radical turn for the better since the nuncio had received his instructions at Rome to seek peace. Bourbon's army had just been turned back from Marseilles and Francis I was on the verge of gaining the upper hand in the war by invading Milan. The French did not want peace;

farli guerra: ma in qualunque altra cosa, che piacerà a V. Beatitudine comandargli essendo certa, ch'ella per al prudenza, et bontà sua non gli comanderà mai cosa, che sia contro l'honor suo; pregarò Dio, che mi facci degna di poter pregare per la prospera, et lunga uita di V. Santità, dalla quale dipende ogni speranza di quelli, che desiderano la pace, et quiete de' Christiani: et se a quella piacerà altra cosa comandarmi, mi trouarà sempre tanto pronta ad obedire la, quanto io sono obligata. Et baciando li piedi di V. Santità, a quella humilmente mi raccomando. Da Lione, alli 23 di Giugno. 1522. Di V. Beatitudine obedientiss. figliuola, et humiliss. seruetrice, Madama d'Alanson." [Girolamo Ruscelli], *Lettere di principi le quali osi scrivono da principi, o a principi, o ragionano di principi*, 3 vols. (Vinetia [Venice]: F. Ziletti, 1581), vol. 1, f. 102v–103 r; [Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 66]. Marguerite's public letter to the Adrian VI accompanied one by Louise de Savoie for the same purpose.

²⁸ Knecht quotes a letter from Adrian VI to this effect, *Renaissance Warrior*, 201.

²⁹ Giberti was equipped with letters of credence for a diplomatic sweep through Europe. For the one to Marguerite, dated 30 October 1524, see Fraikin; Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 196; Bartolommeo Fontana, ed., *Renata di Francia, duchessa di Ferrara, sui documenti del archivio estense, del Mediceo, del Gonzaga e dell'Archivio segreto Vaticano*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1889-1899), vol. 3, 365-66. Giberti also carried bulls "mandata nostra" from the Pope announcing the Jubilee indulgence, which was celebrated in France during November and December of 1524.

they wanted the Pope to sign an offensive treaty with them. In November, at the same time that Marguerite was secretly encouraging 'heretics' like d'Arande, Sébiville, and Meigret, she fostered good relations with the Pope by making known that Louise and most of the court participated in the jubilee indulgence accorded by the Pope.³⁰ Louise's arrest of Meigret in December contributed to the same end. Only when Francis had retaken Milan and was besieging Pavia in January and February 1525 did Clement abandon his neutral stance and sign an ill-timed treaty with Francis against Charles V.³¹

By the time disaster struck at Pavia, Marguerite was already skilled in the diplomatic art of dissimulation. She knew how to play on the codes and gestures of obedience to Rome, religious orthodoxy, and chivalric honor to promote mercenary designs. Before she could put her talents to work in favor of her brother and network, a deeply troubling personal challenge confronted her: Charles d'Alençon dragged himself back to court after having escaped from the Battle of Pavia.

³⁰ On November 18, [1524] Marguerite informed Anne de Montmorency that Louise had gone to St. Jehan at St. Juste near Lyon "pour faire faire les processions et, dimanche prochain, recevoir tous N.S., suivant le jubile ottroyé par le pape. Je croy que par de la vous n'en ferez pas moins [in Italy]." Génin 1, no. 21, 171-2 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 197). Shortly after the mass for the Jubilee indulgence was celebrated on Sunday, [November 20, 1524], Marguerite told Montmorency that "Madame et la compagnie remonte aujourd'huy à son logis de Saint-Just, après avoir faict les processions générales par ceste ville, où la plus part a receu le saint sacrement." Génin 1, no. 23, 173 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 202). Notably, Marguerite does not state that she participated in the Jubilee indulgence: an inexplicable lapse if she had done so.

The Papal jubilee indulgence was celebrated in Paris in December as follows: participants were instructed to: fast on Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday [7, 9, 10 December], say five *Pater Nosters* and five *Ave Marias* each day of fasting "tant pour la paix que pour la pestillance," select the confessor whom they liked [and confess], and receive the host on the following Sunday [11 December] "qui fut chose moult agreable au peuple pour plusieurs causes, et singulièrement pour ce que on en avoit point veu d'autelz et que ilz estoient donnez en vraye charité." Bournon, *Chronique parisienne de Pierre Driart*, 100. Another chronicler remarked "et en ce faisant [fasting and communing], on gaingoit les pardons semblables à l'an jubilé, qui fut une chouse de dévotion et bien ordonnée." *Cronique du roy François Premier*, 43.

³¹ On 19 February 1525, Giberti reported from the French court to Aleandre about the favorable disposition of Louise of Savoy toward Rome, whose children, he reported, were worthy of her. All was

Charles d'Alençon in Hell at Lyon

Within weeks of his return to Lyon, Charles d'Alençon passed away. His death is a blind spot in history. Since his demise, no one has wanted to expose what the sources insinuate. To call his death a plain suicide or a murder would be an injustice, for pinning responsibility to only one party would obscure the collective will to see him out of the way; his own will and that of those around him, chiefly the royal Trinity. His cause of death was said by Marguerite to have been a five-day pleurisy, an inflammation of the pleura membrane next to the lungs. That is to say that the term covered a number of not well-understood fatal maladies under which any number of deadly sins could hide.

Charles had commanded the French rear-guard at Pavia. Of the major nobles present, to a man they either died or were captured with their king, including Anne de Montmorency, commander of the *avant-garde*, as well as Charles's co-commander of the rear-guard, Philip Chabot, Sr. de Brion, but not Charles.³² Of the unnamed thousands of

well with Franco-papal relations on the eve of Pavia. See *Letters and Papers* 4, pt. 1, no. 1102, 485.

³² Martin du Bellay relates that during the first hours of the battle "... la compagnie du duc d'Alençon et du seigneur de Brion avoient deffaict quelque nombre d'Espagnols." (vol. 1, 353-4). Later he includes Alençon's co-commander of the rearguard, the Sr. de Brion, among those taken hostage (vol. 1, 358). It is never made clear how the two were separated, but it appears that Alençon turned tail and ran, whereas Montmorency, the commander of the forward guard, is explicitly mentioned as having been captured while rallying his troops to the king, even though the battle was over. Du Bellay does his best to exculpate Alençon: "Le duc d'Alençon, lequel avoit la conduite de l'arriere garde, voyant l'armée deffaicte, le Roy pris, et n'y avoir esperance de ressource, par le conseil de ceux qui estoient près de luy, avec si peu qu'il avoit de reste, se retira par dessus le pont qu'avions faict sur le Tesin." [Addition marginale de la main, semble-t-il, de Martin du Bellay: "... et feist rompre le pont à sa queue, qui fut cause que plusieurs des nostres se cuydants retyrer par ledict pont furent prins ou noyez. Je pense bien que cela ne veinst de son advys, mays de ceulx qui estoient près de sa personne."] V.-L. Bourrilly, and F. Vindry, eds., *Mémoires de Martin et Guillaume du Bellay*, 4 vols. (Paris: Renouard, 1908-19), vol. 1, 356. For an account of the battle, with only the mention that Alençon escaped, see Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 218-225, esp. 224-225.

Nicolas Versoris, a jurist at the Parlement of Paris, who had precise news about the battle (who fought on both sides, who died, who was captured, etc...) concluded: "A brief parler toute la fleur et chevalerie de France fust prinse ou morte, qui sera, si Dieu par sa grace, bonté et misericorde n'y remédie,

foot-soldiers killed, many were hacked down or drowned when they could not escape over the bridge that elements of Charles's rear guard destroyed to cover their flight. On the return home, this rag tag band was, nevertheless, still capable of sacking French towns, despite the fact that many of the retreating troops were falling ill and dying.³³ Yet, Charles must have seemed sound enough when he arrived at Lyon for a well-informed witness remarked in surprise that Alençon had died almost before it was known that he was ill.³⁴ The visiting magistrates from Paris were similarly confused about Charles's illness and date of death, having been led to believe he expired four days later than he in fact did.³⁵ A chronicler at Paris, sympathetic to Charles's plight, whom he considered too kind and too generous to be a great warrior and for that liked him the better, later reported that Charles "took death" (*il prins la mort*). Death did not take him, he embraced it.³⁶

The *Bourgeois de Paris* related similarly that Charles died bodily on April 11 but that his

la perte et destruction totale du reaulme. Apres laquelle deffaicte advenue fut le Roy mené à Pavye en Espagne." Gustave Fagniez, ed., *Le livre de raison de Nicolas Versoris, avocat au Parlement de Paris (1515-1530)*, in *Mémoires de la Société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Ile-de-France* 12 (1885) 99-222; published as a separate off-print, Paris, 1885, p. 67-68, no. 218.

³³ "Milites redeunt ab Italia nudi et famelici; quidam civitatem Dignensem penitus diripuerunt, et in summa provincia tota perdita est." Jean de Montagne to Boniface Amerbach, from Avignon, 2 May 1525, AK 3, no. 1016, 33, ll. 212-214.

³⁴ A well-informed Capal wrote to Boniface Amberbach from Lyon, 16 May 1525 about the battle of Pavia and Alençon's death: "Quis unquam vel a mortuis didicit tot tanatasque Gallorum equitum copias cum duobus bellicosissimis peditibus, Helueticis scilicet et Germano, tam breui spacio et ferme nullo negotio esse deletas? Solus dux Alanconius fuga male servatus est; paucis enim post diebus, ut huc venit, priusquam pene sciretur egrotare, expiravit." AK 3, no. 1019, 36-37, ll. 15-19.

³⁵ Representatives of the Paris town council left for Lyon after 22 March, with letters of introduction to all the principal powers at court, including Charles d'Alençon. When they were led to believe that Alençon died on the Saturday of Holy Week 1525, April 15. All other witnesses assign his death to April 11. See, Le Roux de Lincy, ed., *Procès-Verbal des délibérations tenues à l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris Pendant la captivité de François I^{er}* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1844), 15-17.

³⁶ "Le mardy et mercredy xviii^e et xix^e jour avril Vc XXV après Pasques, furent apportez nouvelle que mons. le duc d'Alençon, estant à Lion ou à Saint-Just pres Lion, estoit allé de vie à trespas [He had died on the 11th]. Il fust fort plaint, car combien [qu'] il ne fust de sa persone si chevalereux que oucuns [aucuns] aultres, toutesfoys il estoit estimé bon catolique et crestien et bien ayment les poveres. Dieu

spirit had already left him because Louise of Savoy had blamed him, at least in part, for the defeat of her Caesar, as well as, one may surmise, the death of her half-brother, René of Savoy, who expired from his wounds days after the battle.³⁷

Suicide and murder, terms laden with dreaded implications in Christian doctrine, were doubly unacceptable as determinations of the cause of death when the deceased was the king's brother-in-law and he died in the company of the Regent, his wife, and the court. What Parisian journalists said in oblique terms and observers at Lyon registered in their surprise official chroniclers implied by their awkward and otherwise inexplicable silences and contradictions about the death of this noble, who was next in line for the throne after the king's three sons.³⁸ Moreover, the court marked his death with little funeral pomp.³⁹ Preoccupation with the king's captivity cannot explain away this dishonor to the second person of the realm, for three women close to Francis I, his wife

veuille avoir son ame! Il fust dict avoir prins la mort à cause de la prinse du Roy, son beau frere, et de la grant calamité de France." Fagniez, *Versoris*, p. 71, no. 226.

³⁷ "L'an 1524 (1525), le mardy de la sepmaine Sainte, au dict an, qui fut l'onziesme avril, mourut à lyon sur le Rhône le duc d'Alençon, de sa mort corporelle, qui [spiritual death] estoit arrivé auparavant et tost après la desconfiture et prinse du Roy de là les mons. On dit qu'il mourut d'une pleurésie et d'ennuy [torment, pain, sadness] à cause de la dicte desconfiture et prinse du Roy, où le dict duc d'Alençon qui y estoit menoit l'arrière garde. On disoit que la dicte arrière garde ne frappa oncques coups à cause que la dicte desconfiture et prinse du Roy estoit jà advenue, dont madame la Régente luy en dit des choses que le dict duc d'Alençon print à desplaisir." Lalanne, ed., *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris*, 235-6 (Bourrilly, ed. *Journal...*, 198).

³⁸ In his quasi-official history, which richly lauds the royal family, Jean Bourdigné did not discuss Charles d'Alençon's conduct at or fate after Pavia, only mentioning in passing that he had died in order to explain how it was that Marguerite remarried. See *Hystoire agregatiue des Annalles et cronicques d'Anjou et du Maine*, (Paris: Anthoine Couteau and Galliot du Pre; Angers: Clément Alexandre & Charles de Bougne, 1530), fol. CCIIIr [MMI r]. For a description of Pavia and list of the dead and captured, which passes over Alençon's escape and death in silence, see Georges Guiffrey, ed., *Cronique du roy François Premier de ce nom* (Paris: Renouard, 1860), 44-46.

³⁹ V. L. Saulnier and Pierre Jourda see nothing suspicious in Alençon's death or the confusion created by it, and only sweetness and light in Marguerite's reaction, citing her recollections of his passing in her *Prisons* and *Dernières poésies*. They also describe Alençon's funeral and entombment shortly after his death as "honorable." By comparison with the pomp afforded to all others near his rank throughout Francis

Claude, his daughter Charlotte, and his aunt Philiberte de Nemours, who died during his absence in 1524, all received fitting memorial upon his return, but not Charles.⁴⁰

The suspicions about his death raised by all this circumstantial evidence is corroborated in Marguerite's letters. When writing to Francis I just after Charles had returned, Marguerite buried the news at the end of a cheery letter about the good health of his children. She expressed Charles's utter depression at having escaped alone, writing that he considered his life as death and offered up all that he had in order to free Francis.⁴¹ Later, while sitting vigil at his sick-bed, Marguerite wrote to Francis that Charles would go to paradise a happy man if he could but see the king before dying, saying that his own fate was in God's hands.⁴² She told Francis not to worry about her: she would bear up if Charles should pass away. Far from being distraught, upon hearing the news of Charles's demise, Francis rejoiced. And after two days of mourning, Marguerite, by her own admission, did not shed another tear over the man with whom she had been joined in, by all indications, a loveless marriage for fifteen years, the better, she said, to dedicate herself to saving Francis.⁴³

Enough irregularities and motivating circumstances surround Charles's death to warrant, even now, a coroner's inquest into his corpse in lieu of the judicial inquest that

I's reign, it was so unspectacular as to be truly remarkable. Saulnier 1973, 441-443; Jourda, *Marguerite*, 104-105.

⁴⁰ Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 250.

⁴¹ "Qui sera pour fin, après vous avoir supplié recevoir les très humbles recommandacions de monseigneur d'Alençon, qui estime si maleureuse sa prisonnière liberté, que jusques à vous revoir, tient sa vie morte, qui avecques tout ce que Dieu lui a donné, mettra pour vostre service," [c. 10 March 1525], Génin 2, 28 (Saulnier 1973, no. 206.1 [Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 213]).

⁴² "... s'il [Charles d'Alençon] vous avoit veu avant mourir, il en iroit plus content en paradis. Je ne say que vous en dire, Monseigneur; tout est en la main de Dieu..." Génin 2, 29-30 (Saulnier 1973, no.

did not and could never have taken place in his day. That Charles already saw his life as death well before falling ill, that witnesses at Lyon received conflicting reports about when Charles died, that his generous testament left all to Marguerite,⁴⁴ a testament which his sisters would repeatedly contest, that Francis instantly framed plans to aid his own release based on the remarriage of his sister,⁴⁵ that an albatross of ill-fame so quickly and quietly slide from Marguerite's neck, that the Alençon territories escheated to the crown because Charles had had no children by Marguerite, and that contemporaries whispered about or studied to ignore the cause of his death, all this evidence warrants deep suspicions about the cause of his untimely demise. But we do not need a forensics report affirming the presence of poison in his bones to know that Charles's death was not natural, indeed that it was willed. Other cultures imbued with martial virtues would have seen suicide as the only way out of his disgrace, indeed as an honorable choice. In his Christian culture such a view could not be articulated, and therefore, seemingly, has been barred from entering the realm of historical assessment as the cause of his death. An illness may have been the occasion of his death, but the evidence requires us to entertain seriously the possibility that those nearest to him at court may have acquiesced in the

214; [Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 214]).

⁴³ Génin 2, 30 (Saulnier 1973 and Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 218).

⁴⁴ Charles desired Marguerite to have her dowry and "je veux quelle soit la vye durant dame et maistresse de tous mes chasteaux et maisons et je luy donne entierement tous mes meubles quelque part quels soient assis." Once this gift, other contractual obligations, and debts were fulfilled, he left to his sisters "ce qu'il leur pourra appartenir." See the collated copy, dated 30 March 1525 [1526 new style], of Alençon's will, dated 11 April 1525, is in BnF Clairambault, ms. 324, fol. 283. Soon after his death Marguerite gained the usufruct of all Charles's lands. See the various gifts and confirmations of titles accorded her by Louise and Francis I: 10 May 1525, *CAF* 1, 404, 2153; 9 June 1525, *CAF* 1, 408, 2169; 21 April 1526, *CAF* 1, 441, 2330; 18 July 1526, *CAF* 1, 456, 2411.

⁴⁵ Such at least were the reports that soon circulated throughout Europe. Some saw Charles d'Alençon's death as an act of God. See, Jourda, *Marguerite*, 106-107.

ending of his life through neglect or even assisted it with ‘medicines’ too strong, meant to cure the malady of his existence not his illness.

Short of finding poison in his remains, which lie buried in the Cathedral of Alençon, none of these suspicions can be proved, but they frame his demise as a dark backdrop against which Marguerite’s year long effort to save her brother and her spiritual brethren appears in stark contrast. Marguerite would, as her contemporaries credited her, save Francis from a deadly fever and preserve his honor from the consequences of defeat. Charles’s sudden fall, from which Marguerite could not or would not save him, is the inverse image of her “miraculous resurrection” of Francis. Drawing on the credit she accrued from the latter victory over death and dishonor, she was able to save the network to whose fellowship she had so deeply committed herself. Charles’s death bore directly on the subsequent evolution of the network, for through it her hands were freed from a disgrace, and thereby she was able to act boldly. The divergence of her reaction to the troubles of the two men, who were closest to her and who faced similar physical and moral danger, sheds light on the obscure corners in her supposedly mystical, pious ‘soul,’ where her guile hid: the cunning she needed to preserve her brother and spiritual brethren.

Francis I in Purgatory at Madrid

Marguerite’s heart followed Francis I into captivity, which she likened to purgatory, a period of spiritual testing and purification through which he would emerge strengthened to renew his realm and the church. That long year of bondage, especially during her journey to Madrid to negotiate her brother’s release from August to December

1525, was equally an ordeal that threatened to destroy the evangelical network, whom she had been championing at court. After she left, France became truly purgatorial for them as conservatives readied fires to purify the land of heretics. It was in saving Francis, that she was able to save them.

Now if this tale seems to have a healthy dose of the theatrical in the telling, it does so precisely because that is how Marguerite scripted and acted her part. Long before she penned most of her poetry, plays, or prose, she was composing narratives and dialogues for the political dramas at court. These contained admixtures of *réal politique* plots, chivalric trappings, and pious speeches. During Francis's captivity, Marguerite's production was designed, in part, to win her brother's support for her network and their shared vision of a renewed church and realm based on a return to the Gospel.

As for the political context of Marguerite's starring performance, on the eve of the captivity crisis she found herself marginalized at court.⁴⁶ In February, just before Pavia, Chancellor Du Prat wrote to Marguerite to announce, or rather boast, that Francis I had augmented his powers under the regency.⁴⁷ Marguerite must have felt quite unneeded at court, for she soon contemplated leaving the seat of power in Lyon for Paris, perhaps, though she does not say, in order to look into the case against Meigret or return closer to her spiritual home at Meaux.

⁴⁶ For the political events during Francis I's captivity, see Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 239-248; Jourda, *Marguerite*, 106-136; Terrasse, *François I^{er}* 1, 311-344; and Gilbert Jacqueton, *La politique extérieure de L. de Savoie: relations diplomatiques de France et de l'Angleterre pendant la captivité de François I^{er} (1525-1526)*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Philologique et Historiques, fasc. 88 (Paris: E. Bouillon, 1892).

⁴⁷ [February 1525], mentioned in Marguerite's response of February 20, [1525], *Archives Du Prat, Glanes et Regains*, 15 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, 203 and 204).

Soon thereafter, in the immediate aftermath of Pavia, at the time when her bedraggled husband had returned, she expressed her regret that she could not, because of her “ill-fortune in being a woman,” serve Francis I better than Anne de Montmorency (or her husband) though her will to help him was greater than theirs.⁴⁸ Despite not being a man, she took part in the diplomatic overtures to England and Italian powers. Then, when Francis I and Louise authorized her to negotiate his release, she hand-picked a group of trusty counselors.⁴⁹ Her journey to Spain lasted from mid-August until just before Christmas 1525. In the end, her negotiations with the Emperor failed to bring about a treaty. Montmorency took over and brought off the signing of the Treaty of Madrid on behalf of Francis I in January. That agreement was no triumph. In essence, after a long wait, Francis finally resorted to a last-resort ruse, whose plan Marguerite had transmitted from Lyon: he would capitulate to all the Emperor’s demands and sign any treaty that would guarantee his release, even one in which he gave up Burgundy (the chief sticking point in the negotiations) with the intention of repudiating it upon reentering France.⁵⁰ And so it happened. In all these formal negotiations and secret machinations

⁴⁸ “Bien est vray que toute ma vie j’auray envie que je ne puis faire pour luy office pareil au vostre, car où la volenté passe toute celle que pouriés avoir, la fortune me tient tort, qui, pour estre femme, me rend le moyen difficile.” Marguerite to Montmorency, [March 1525], Génin 1, 176, no. 25. (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 207). Later, in a variation on the female humility topos, Marguerite wrote to Francis “Je say bien, Monseigneur, que ce n’est à moy à vous conseiller; mais mon desir ne seroit content si je nous celoïs reïns que je pense ...” and proceeded to tell him to hold firm during the negotiations since pressure from the Italians and English would soon make the Emperor yield. Génin 1, no. 24, 58 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 306). Francis obviously trusted her since he selected her as ambassador and stipulated that if he were forced to abdicate in favor of his son in the event that he was not released, then he would have had Marguerite rule as regent should their mother, Louise of Savoy die. Champollion, *Captivité*, p. 421 ff.

⁴⁹ Marguerite asked Francis I whom she should take with her to Spain. but many of the choices were left up to her, for in her entourage were members of her household and several gentleman, such as Guillaume Du Bellay and Stanislaw Laski. Génin 2, no. 7, 34 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 228).

⁵⁰ On December 10, [1525], while returning to France, Marguerite advised Francis, in accordance

Marguerite played a significant role, but found no means, as she hoped and others predicted, to persuade the Emperor to offer terms acceptable to the French, nor, for that matter, did Montmorency. Her truly heroic victory was in shaping the religious meaning ascribed to, as well as the consequences of, Francis's captivity.

Well before taking up her headlining diplomatic role, Marguerite had begun articulating a relentlessly religious interpretation of Francis's imprisonment. From the time that news of his capture reached the court until his release, Marguerite portrayed the situation, first for her brother, then for the royal court, and finally for the realm, as a kind of divine trial that would transform Francis into God's instrument for the renewal of the church, not just in France, but throughout the world. She described this test through a series of metaphors. Only reading the letters of Marguerite and others on the scene in series can reproduce her powerful religious myth.⁵¹

In the first days of his captivity, which coincided with the Lenten season, Marguerite told Francis that his letters from prison were like ministrations of the Holy

with the plans laid out by the court at Lyon, to hold out a bit longer for a good peace, which the Emperor should more readily grant since the continuing battle in Italy was going against him. However, if this plan should fail, she tells him to refuse nothing (not his lands or children) in order to gain his freedom. Génin 2, no. 25, 60 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 313). Late on January 8, 1526, Marguerite informed Duprat of that they were ready to agree anything in order to have Francis released. She admits that the terms will be prejudicial to the king's estate, but stresses the essential point: Francis will be free, i.e., to repudiate the treaty and live to fight another day. *Archives Du Prat, glanes et regains*, 18-19 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no.328).

⁵¹ No claim is being made here that the elements of Marguerite's religious gloss on Francis captivity were original, or that she was the only one trying to put an interpretive spin on it. Indeed, many of the themes she introduces—Francis and St. Francis, the Christ-like attributes of the king, etc...—were common tropes in the depiction of her brother. See Anne-Marie Lecoq, *François I^{er} imaginaire: Symbolique et politique à l'aube de la Renaissance française* (Paris: Macula, 1987).

Marguerite's orchestration of these religious themes, however, was masterful and, as revealed in the rich documentation on Francis's captivity, framed the court's interpretive discourse. See, Aimé Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité de François I^{er}*, Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France, 1st ser. (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1847), *idem*, *Les poésies du roi François I^{er}* (Paris, 1847).

Spirit, which consoled Louise and herself in the passion of their suffering.⁵² Francis I had a rather more somber view of his personal position vis-à-vis the God-head, considering his defeat as a chastisement visited from heaven. In the Lenten spirit of penitence, he decided to purge himself by fasting. Instead of weakening his body through privation,⁵³ Marguerite begged him to strengthen his soul by reading Paul's Epistles and the Gospels. To convince Francis to follow her advice, she informed his closest companion in captivity, Anne de Montmorency, that three years earlier a devout recluse had prophesied that if the king would read the Scriptures daily, he would be transformed into a conduit of God's salvation on earth.

My cousin, there is a very devout hermit who, three years ago, kept urging a man whom I know to pray to God for the king and to do him service, which this man did indeed do. This man informed me that he is convinced that if the king would read Paul's Epistles as if in prayer when he retires for the day, he is sure that the king will be redeemed to the glory of God and his own honor. For God promises in his Gospel that anyone who loves the truth, the truth will save. I believe that the king does not have a copy, so I am sending my own copy to you, asking you to beg him for my sake to please read them [Paul's epistles and the Gospels]. I firmly believe that the Holy Spirit, who abides in the written word, will do as

⁵² "Monseigneur, vostre lecture a porté tel effect à la santé de madame et de tous ceux qui vous aiment, que ce nous a esté après la douleur de la pacion ung saint Esprist, voyant la grace que Nostre Seigneur vous fet que la prison n'est que preuve de vostre vertu..." Marguerite to Francis I, Lyon, [c. 10 March 1525], Génin 2, no. 2, 27 (Saulnier 1973, 206.1 [Jourda, *Répertoire*, 213]). The letter goes on to speak of their being in the midst of the Lenten season, so the 'passion' mentioned must refer to the news of Francis's capture, metaphorically anticipating Christ's passion on Good Friday.

In response to Francis's first letter after being captured, Louise and Marguerite reassured him that their 'Trinity' would stand firm and that with them in charge his children and realm would remain safe during his absence. While reiterating that they shared in Francis's suffering through their union in the royal trinity, Marguerite subordinated this religious metaphor to another narrative in which she plays the role of Francis's spiritual guide through the individual divine trial that he was experiencing. For the initial mention of their triune solidarity in face of adversity, see Marguerite d'Alençon and Louise of Savoy to Francis I, Lyon, 28 February and [March] [1525], Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, no. 46, 134 and no. 53, 142; *idem*, *Poesies*, pp. 229 and 230 (Jourda, *Répertoire* nos. 205 and 206); and on the royal Trinity see further Marguerite to Francis I, September [1525], Génin 2, no. 2, 40 (Jourda, , *Répertoire*, no. 239).

⁵³ Letter 206.1 [213] as in note 52.

marvelous things through the king as he did through those who wrote the Scriptures down.⁵⁴

Though she does not name the hermit or the man, her allusions point back to Meaux and the enigmatic figure of Jean, the Hermit of Livry, and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples.⁵⁵ Approximately three years earlier Marguerite had visited Meaux (September 1521). As related above, Jean the Hermit was in contact with the Meaux group and came under investigation at the same time as them in 1523.⁵⁶ According to Marguerite's report, the recluse Jean must have been aware of Lefèvre's translation project and encouraged him to complete it. Especially important, Marguerite relates that Lefèvre had long ago predicted that the King would be redeemed, not merely, as Marguerite interprets it, from Francis's unforeseen captivity, but from his sinful life to the glory of God and his own honor. In subsequent letters, Marguerite reiterated her belief that Francis was on a religious journey while in captivity. She wrote:

I entreat you, my lord, do not doubt that your captivity has occurred for any other reason than to convince you that He loves you greatly and to give you time to reflect and realize just how much He loves you. He wants to have your whole heart,⁵⁷ just as He has given to you His own. For after having united you to

⁵⁴ "Mon cousin, il y a quelque recluse fort dévoute, qui trois ans a, n'a faict que inviter ung homme que je congnoys à prier Dieu pour le Roy et luy faire service, ce qu'il a faict; et m'a mandé qu'il est assuré que s'y plaist au Roy par manière d'oraison, tous les jours, quand il sera retiré, lire les épistres de Saint-Pol, il est assuré qu'il sera délivré à la gloire de Dieu et l'honneur de luy; car il promet en son évangile que qui aime la vérité, la vérité le délivrera. Et pour ce que je pense qu'il n'en a point, vous envoye les miennes, vous priant le supplier de ma part qu'il les veuille lire, et je croy fermement que le Saint-Esperit, qui es demouré en la lettre, fera par luy chouses ainsy grandes comme il a faict par ceulx qui les ont escriptes." Marguerite to Anne de Montmorency, 3 March 1525, Génin 1, no. 26, 177-178 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 208).

⁵⁵ Marguerite's description of how to read the Scriptures 'as if in prayer' is an important instance of how the Meaux group taught lay people to engage in the new experience of reading the divine word on their own.

⁵⁶ See chapter 6, pp. 286-287 and n. 97.

⁵⁷ This passage ("...car il veult avoir votre cueur entièrement, comme par amour vous a donné le sien, pour après vous avoir uny à luy par tribulations, vous desliverer à sa gloire et vostre consolacion par le

Himself through these tribulations, He wants to redeem you through the merits of His victorious resurrection to His glory and your consolation, so that through you His name will be magnified and sanctified, not only in your kingdom, but throughout Christendom, even unto the conversion of the infidel. O how blessed your brief imprisonment will appear hereafter, through which God will have redeemed so many souls from faithlessness and eternal damnation!⁵⁸

Later that summer, Francis I fell deadly ill. Marguerite only found out about Francis's condition after she had begun her "pilgrimage" to Spain to negotiate her brother's release.⁵⁹ In forced journeys, she rushed to his bedside. When she arrived his condition seemed hopeless. The Spanish doctors, who were not inclined to let Francis play dead, deemed him to be mortally ill, a determination that convinced Charles V to visit his languishing "brother." At that moment of crisis, Marguerite 'saved' Francis. Jean de Selve, First President of the Parlement of Paris, wrote back to his insubordinate colleagues in Paris an eye-witness account of Francis's healing:

A weak ago, the Duchess d'Alençon gathered together all of the King's and her own gentlemen as well as the ladies to pray to God and to receive our Creator. Afterwards she had mass said in the king's chamber. At the moment the Holy Sacrament was elevated, the Archbishop of Embrun [François Tournon] urged the

mérite de sa victorieuse résurrecsion...") is very close in substance and development to the rondeau *En aymant Dieu de cuer entierement* quoted at the head of chapter 7.

⁵⁸ "...je vous supplie, Monseigneur, croire sans riens en douter que ce [Francis's captivity] n'est que pour esprouver combien vous l'aimez, et pour vous donner le loisir de penser et connoistre combien il vous aime; car il veult avoir votre cuer entièrement, comme par amour vous a donné le sien, pour après vous avoir uny à luy par tribulations, vous deslivrer à sa gloire et vostre consolation par le mérite de sa victorieuse résurrecsion, afin que par vous son nom soit congnu et sanctifié, non seulement en vostre réaulme, mais par toute la cristienté jusques à la conversion des infideles. O que bienheureuse sera vostre brefve prison, par qui Dieu tant d'ames deslivrera de celle d'infidélité et esternelle damnacion!" Marguerite to Francis I, [May 1525, Lyon], Génin 2, no. 5, 32-33 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 219). Cf. Marguerite's epistolary homiletics during this time: God can make things from naught and ice burn. Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 234; During advent of 1525, she prayed that God would, just as he had send his only son to be the mediator between Him and humans, "envoier le moyen de paix a sa gloire, vostre honneur, et consolation de tous ceus qui vous aiment." Génin 2, no. 21, p. 53 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 303).

⁵⁹ Marguerite sends news to Francis I about the progress of the "pèierins," i.e., Marguerite and her company on their way to Spain (i.e., as if on the road to St. James of Compostela). [Before 19 September 1525], Saulnier 1975 C and Saulnier 1977, no. 243.1.

king to look at the Holy Sacrament, and just then, the king, who had been without sight or hearing, fixed his eyes on the Holy Sacrament raising his hands. After the mass, the Duchess had the Holy Sacrament presented to him so that he could worship it. All of a sudden the King said: "This is my God who will heal me body and soul. I beg you, let me receive him." And when someone told him that he could not swallow it,⁶⁰ he replied, "let it be done." Then the Duchess had part of the host broken off, which he received with such great contrition and piety that there was not a soul there that did not break down in tears. The Duchess then received the remainder of the Holy Sacrament and from that hour the king has gotten better and better.⁶¹

The story of Francis's recovery, as narrated by Jean de Selve for consumption at home, particularly in the unruly Parlement, showed that Francis was saved by the grace of God and Marguerite's pious offices. This miraculous work of God, as de Selve described it, directly refuted the Parlement's claim that the afflictions of the realm were due to the crown's irreligious policies.⁶² Thereafter members of the royal court adopted the metaphor of passion to describe Francis fevered condition and resurrection his recovery.

⁶⁰ Not being able to swallow seems to have been an imposition to communing properly.

⁶¹ "Il y a aujourd'huy huict jours que madame la duchesse [Marguerite d'Alençon] feist mectre en estat tous les gentilshommes de la maison du Roy et les siens, ensemble ses dames, pour prier Dieu, et tous receurent nostre Createur; et après, fut dicte la messe en la chambre du Roy. Et à l'heure de l'elevation du Saint-Sacrement, monseigneur l'archevesque d'Ambrun exhorta le Roy à regarder le Saint-Sacrement; et lors, ledict seigneur, qui avoit esté sans veoir et sans ouïr, regarda le Saint-Sacrement, esleva ses mains, et après la messe, madame la duchesse luy fit presenter ledict Saint-Sacrement pour l'adorer. Et incontinent le Roy dit: 'C'est mon Dieu qui me guerira l'ame et le corps, je vous prie que le reçoive.' Et à ce que l'on luy dict qu'il ne le pourroit avaler, il respondit: 'Que sy feroit.' Et lors madame la duchesse fit departir une partie de sa sainte hostie, laquelle il receut avec la plus grande compunction et devotion, qu'il n'y avoit cueur qu'il ne fondit en larmes. Madicte dame la duchesse receut le surplus dudict Saint-Sacrement. Et de ceste heure-là, il est tousjours allé en amendant." Jean de Selve to the Parlement of Paris, Toledo, 1 October 1525, Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, no. 158, 331-333; 332.

⁶² Selve said Francis's complete recovery, "est oeuvre de Dieu miraculeuse, ainsy que les François et Espagnolz qui ont esté allentour de luy, ont chascun jugé." He then proceeds to tell the Parlement the moral of the story: "Messieurs, je vous ay volontiers escript ces choses icy, afin que vous congnoissiez comment Dieu, par sa bonté, a le royaume de France, tant en chef que en membres, en singuliere recommandation, et avons grande occasion de le recongnoistre. Vous certifions deux choses: sy est que le Roy a faict grandz promesses et voeux à Dieu le créateur de faire et antretenir beaucoup de choses que vous sçauvez cy-après, qui sont toutes à l'honneur de Dieu, paix et soulagement de ses sujetz, en tous estat; et aussy est qu'il a receu jusques icy le cour de parlement en bonne et grande estimation. J'espere, au plaisir de Dieu, que luy donnerez tousjours occasion de continuer à porter l'amour à icelle que le chef doit à ses

Moreover, the royal secretary Florimond Robertet informed Marguerite that the court believed she deserved the credit for his recovery.

Louise of Savoy understands and feels certain that after God you have played a great part in this passion, which, along with the joy at his resurrection, will, I believe, considering the One who has accomplished it, be long-lasting, free the king honorably and quickly, and bring joy and happiness to our lord king, to Louise, to the whole realm, as well as generally in all Christians affairs. To you, Madame, belongs the honor and credit for this, which indeed everyone grants and attributes to you.⁶³

Upon hearing of the miracle at Madrid, Odet de Foix wrote in a similar vein:

Madame, since Our Lord has been pleased to bestow such great mercy on us in saving our master from a most deadly illness, I have high hopes that we will soon see him back in France through your efforts given how mightily you are striving there. Believe me, I am sure that, after God, you have assisted and aided him more than all the doctors.⁶⁴

In the elaborate symbolic overlay of Christ and Francis, passion and fever, resurrection and recovery, everyone at court was quick to see the political implications of Francis's new life in the negotiations for his release as well as versus the regime's

membres." The attempt to mollify the Parlement is clear. The unstated warning is that, contrary to what the Parlement had argued in their remonstrances, God approved of Francis and his government.

⁶³ "... [after God] elle [Louise de Savoie] scet et sent certainement que avez porté vostre grant part de cest passion, avecques la joye de resurrection, laquelle je tiens, veu celluy d'où elle est procedée, estre de longue durée, de briefve et honneste delivrance et de grant contentement et satisfaction audict seigneur [God] et à Madame, à tout le royaume, et generally à toute la chose publique chrestienne et à vous, madame, l'onneur et merite qui vous en est par tout le monde du et attribué." Florimond Robertet to Marguerite, 7 October 1525. Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, no. 179, 356-57 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 265). Louise assured Marguerite "... [la] nouvelle de la bonne santé du Roy et de vous... [et] de la grasse [grace] qu'il [God] nous a fayte," had resurrected her from her own death and passion (in that order), *ibid.*, no. 155, 329, incorrectly dated [September 1525]. Rather the letter must have been written after Francis's recovery and been contemporaneous with de Foix's letter [c. 6 October] since Florimond records that "Pommeraye" had brought the news and Louise says that she was then sending "Pommeraye" and another officer to Marguerite to confirm the report of the king's good health.

⁶⁴ "Madame, j'ay bonne espérance, puisqu'il a pleu à Nostre Seigneur nous faire si grant grace de nous saulver le maistre d'une si griefve maladie, que le verrons de brief, avec vostre bonne ayde, à la diligence que y ferés, et me tenés pour tout certain que, après Dieu, l'avés plus servy et aydé que le

critics.⁶⁵ And Marguerite was equally quick to capitalize on her augmented credit. A few weeks later Marguerite reminded Francis of her hope that he would reform the church. On 4 October 1525, the Feast of St. Francis, she wrote that she would, “implore Him who commanded St. Francis to repair His ruined church to give you the grace to become the agent through whom He will complete the restoration of the church for the benefit of all Christians.”⁶⁶

Finally, but not perhaps with the finest sense of religious symbolic order, Marguerite interpreted Francis’ captivity as a purgatory from which he would emerge by the grace of God alone. When negotiations for Francis’s release were frustratingly stalled, Marguerite wrote to him:

My Lord, I beg you for the honor of God, rejoice and be comforted. Believe me, He who revived you when the doctors despaired will deliver you when every recourse seems exhausted. God’s grace alone, which He has already given to you, is enough to pluck you from purgatory in Spain.⁶⁷

So much for Marguerite’s exegesis of events. In sum, she depicted her brother’s experience in captivity through a set of metaphors that elided from one to the other

medecins.” Odet de Foix à Marguerite, 6 October 1525, Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, no. 171, 346-47 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 264).

⁶⁵ Marguerite was also keenly aware of the leverage that Francis’s near fatal illness afforded in negotiating with the Emperor, and kept it as a reserve arm. When Charles V proved reluctant to treat with her, Marguerite instructed her brother to have a relapse in order to pressure Charles V to lower his demands and force him to negotiate. See, Jourda, *Répertoire* nos. 250, 252, 254. Marguerite tells Montmorency to have Francis play ill, Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 267.

⁶⁶ Marguerite wrote Francis that she would “... supplier Celluy qui a coumandé a saint François d’aler reparer son esglise destruite vous donner grace d’estre celluy par quy y parfera son euvre au bien de tous le[s] cristiens.” Ritter, no. 7; Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, p. 342; and *idem*, *Poésies*, p. 231; (Jourda, no. 260).

⁶⁷ “Monsieur, je vous supplie pour l’honneur de Dieu vous fortifier et resjouir, et croire que celuy qui vous a resuscité contre l’opinion des medecins, vous deslivera quant tout secours vous semblera failly. Car la grace seule que Dieu vous a donnee est suffisante pour vous tirer du purgatoire d’Espagne.” Génin 2, no. 18, 48 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 301).

according to circumstances and the religious seasons. Immediately after Pavia, she ascribed to him the role of a Lenten penitent, who should read the Scriptures for his salvation. Then while he suffered a deadly fever, she depicted him as a quasi-Christ undergoing a passion, whom she then saved by partaking in the sacrament of Christ's passion. After his recovery, she returned to her campaign to shape Francis's understanding of his captivity as a preparation to fulfill a new role thereafter as God's agent for the reform of the church, telling him to follow the path of the saint whose name he bore, the saint who began the restoration of the Church. Finally, she told Francis that he would be saved from his physical and spiritual captivity by the grace of God alone, who was purifying him for His work through purgatory in Madrid. In early 1526, when Francis was about to be released, Marguerite reassured him from France that everyone was looking forward to his return, which, against the expectations of many, had come about because of their unrelenting trust in God alone.⁶⁸

While working to convert Francis to her vision of reform, Marguerite claimed his aid in making one small step in that direction. During the early weeks of October, just after she had healed Francis, the Meaux group suffered the chastisement that conservatives had long reserved for them. On November 12, Francis I issued the only royal command of his whole captivity, ordering the Parlement of Paris to suspend the cases against Lefèvre, Roussel, and Caroli until his return from captivity.⁶⁹ No one has

⁶⁸ [February 1526], Génin 2, no. 33, 74 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 338).

⁶⁹ 12 November 1525, "Lettres au Parlement de Paris, lui ordonnant de suspendre incontinent les procédures a tort commencées à l'encontre de Jacques Fabri, Pierre Caroli et Girard Ruffi, à l'instigation des théologiens de l'Université de Paris. Madrid, 12 novembre [1525]." Text in Toussain Du Plessis, *Histoire de l'église de Meaux* 2, p. 282; mention CAF I 5, p. 736, no. 18505.

ever doubted that Marguerite was behind this order. The proof is that during the following spring, as Francis made his slow ascent from Spain towards Paris, Marguerite kept cajoling him to trounce the Parlement, which, ignoring his orders, was attempting to ramrod the cases against her protégés to fatal conclusions.⁷⁰ These heresy cases, she claimed, “touched her honor closely.” Thus in the early months of 1526, Marguerite wrote to Francis again requesting his intervention on behalf of the Meaux group as well as Berquin, who had been arrested in January 1526.⁷¹ When Francis and Montmorency finally put a stop to the Parlement, she thanked them profusely.⁷²

Francis was resurrected, but did Marguerite succeed in rehabilitating his image or her own reputation, both of which had been tarnished in the preceding years?

Contemporaries actually gave Marguerite very little credit for her role in Spain. The

⁷⁰ Marguerite complained that the Parlement was not respecting Francis's letters of November ordering the suspension of the trials against Lefèvre, Roussel, and Caroli. She called their actions “fasheries” and petitioned Francis to do something about these matters “which touch her honor so closely.” “Toutesfois ce qui plus me desplait n'est pas tant ce qui touche de bien près à mon honneur que de voir vostre volente si mal entendue, suivie et obeye, principalement de ceus que je pensois entierement n'avoir l'oeuil qu'a vous. Et pleust a Dieu, Monseigneur, que toute ces fasheries fussent endormies jusques a vostre retour non pour crainte de mon ennuy qui ne peut estre plus grand que celuy que j'ay de perdre le bein de vostre veue, mais pour la contrainte [eu] quoy ces affaires me mettent de vous en importuner car estant icy seulle de tous amis n'ayant consolacion, conseil ny force que de la seurrete de vostre promesse.” Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 319, 70-71 with text; Ritter, no. 33.

⁷¹ Marguerite sends lyrical praise to Francis for saving Berquin, and vilifies those who pursued him, claiming that Berquin has suffered for God and the king's glory. Marguerite thanks Francis for redoubling his efforts to save Berquin from the Parlement “according to your promise” claiming that Berquin had suffered for God. The King's mercy will honor God and himself. She contemns the Parlement of Paris for their malice and forgetfulness of God and the king. “Monseigneur, le desir que j'avoir d'obéir à vostre coumandement estoit assez grant, sans l'avoir redoublé par la chérité qu'il vous a pleu faire au pouvre Berquin, selon vostre proumesse; dont je suis seure que celuy pour qui je croy qu'il a souffert [i.e., God] aura agréable la miséricorde que pour son honneur avez fait à son serviteur et au vostre. Et ceux qui, en vostre tribulation, ont oublié et Dieu et vous, [the Parlement] connoistront leur malice n'avoir seu faire ingnorer verite et l'esperit que le Tout-Puissant vous a donné; dont maindre ne sera leur confusion que la gloire perpetuelle que vous en rendra Celui qui par vous augement la louange de son nom.” Herminjard 1, no. 172, 421; Génin 2, no. 35, 77 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 347).

⁷² Marguerite thanked Montmorency for having helped to save Berquin from prison (19 November 1526) whose life she valued as much as her own. Génin 1, no. 54, 219 (Jourda, *Répertoire* no. 362).

Bourgeois de Paris criticized her long and expensive journey, concluding that in the end, “it did not help a bit.”⁷³ Marguerite herself was sensitive to such an interpretation, and did her best to explain that the Emperor’s “dissimulation” and “hypocrisy” had caused their negotiations to fall through.⁷⁴ Only the official histories took the court’s line that she had been instrumental in redeeming her brother from captivity, indeed claiming that she had convinced the Emperor to release her brother under reduced terms, an assertion which was patently false.⁷⁵ As for the resurrection of the king and Marguerite’s holy role in it, none of these images, which the court tried to project, seem to have gained common currency in the public domain.

For the sake of the network’s survival, the most important question was whether after Marguerite’s long effort Francis would live up to the exalted role that she had scripted for him as their champion.

⁷³ “Au dict an 1525, au mois d’aoust, ma dicte dame d’Alançon, naguères veufve du seigneur d’Alançon, s’en alla en Espagne, et partist de Lyon, où elle estoit, avec tout son train par l’autorité de madame la Régente, sa mère, pour aller vers l’Empereur, pour et au nom de ma dicte dame la Régente, et pour espérer pacifier et faire quelque bon traicté, et appointment avec le dict Empereur, pour et affin de r’avoir le roy de France, soit par mariage du Roy à madame Éléonor, seur du dict Empereur, veufve du feu roy de Portugal. On dit qu’elle y alla avec trois cens chevaux, où il y avoit plusieurs grandz seigneurs, tant évesques que seigneurs et gentilzhommes en grand nombre, avec gens de conseil pour la conduire: et que la dicte dame la Régente luy bailla d’estat par chacun jour pour sa despence, la somme de cinq cens livres, qui est par mois la somme de quinze mil livres. Et s’en revint au mois de décembre ensuivant à Lyon, vers madame La Régente, sa mère, après que le Roy de France, son frère, fut guary; et n’y fist rien.” Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 258-259. Versoris only noted that Marguerite left, saying nothing about the outcome of her journey. Fagniez, *Versoris*, no. 269, 82.

⁷⁴ Marguerite complains about the Emperor and his Spanish advisors’ lack of honor and honesty in the negotiations, which explains her lack of success. Jourda, *Répertoire* nos. 266, 270, 271, 272, 277, 301, 329.

⁷⁵ Louise send Marguerite “vers lesleu empereur enuoya pour (par tous licites moyens) de son trescher filz et Roy treschrestien traicter la deliurance. Duquel voyage iclle noble et vertueuse duchesse d’alencon si prudemment se porta que a toutes les dames francoyses acquist glorieux renom et louenges eternelles. Et si bien ouura que son beau parler fut cause de flechir lesleu empereur ia par sa bonne fortune incite a soy condescendre a appoinctement et mettre icelluy noble Roy Francoys a deliurance soubz certain pact et condition, de laquelle chose depuis dieu aydant sortit plain effect.” Bourdigné *Histoire agressive*

Safe Havens and Home

As is well known, Marguerite recalled Lefèvre, Roussel, and d'Arande from exile as her brother was being released. What has not been realized is that when planning her pilgrimage to Spain Marguerite foresaw the consequences of her pending absence for her protégés and prepared an emergency exit for "Antonius Peregrinus" (Antoine the Pilgrim) Lefèvre d'Étaples, "Tolinus" Gérard Roussel, and "Cornelius," Michel d'Arande.⁷⁶

The flight of the refugees from Meaux to Strasbourg is not surprising since Farel, Lambert, and Agrippa von Nettesheim were already there.⁷⁷ Basel too would have been a logical destination. During the summer of 1525, Jean Prévost from Meaux and a fellow Franciscan had fled there.⁷⁸ It would have been natural for Lefèvre, Roussel, and d'Arande to follow Prévost's footsteps, who had followed the path of their own letters to Oecolampadius, Conrad Pelikan, Hugewald, the Amerbach family, and the printer Cratander. Indeed, before returning to France in 1526, Lefèvre did journey to visit

des annales et chroniques d'Anjou et du Maine, (1530), CCIIIr-v [MM2r-v], which is repeated verbatim by the *Cronique du roy François Premier*, 48-49.

⁷⁶ Marguerite's three protégés took these aliases during their stay at Strasbourg, much to the derision of Erasmus. Their identity and whereabouts were evidently very loosely kept secrets, since the boys on the street knew who they were and Lefèvre compromised their position by sending his servant back to Meaux. See Allen 6, no. 1675, p. 281, ll. 70-72; [Roussel] to [Le Sueur], Herminjard I, no. 168, 408-415.

⁷⁷ Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, 49.

⁷⁸ Two Franciscans, one of whom, Jean Prévost, had preached at Meaux, arrived at Strasbourg during July 1525, bringing letters from Antoine du Blet [at Lyon?] to Jean Vaugris and Conrad Resch authorizing a line of credit to Farel, probably for their printing enterprise at Basel. "[P.S.] Tout maintenant sont arrivez deux frères, quondam religieux de St. François. L'ung s'appelle Joannes Praepositus [Prévost], lequel a esté prisonnier à Paris: praedicabat in Episcopatu Meldensi. Il a apourté des lettres de Bletus à Vaugris, faisantes mentions de voz L escus, et dit en somme que l'on vous baille argent. Vaugris m'a dit qu'il en fera devoir auprès de son oncle." Pierre Toussaint to Guillaume Farel, Basel to Strasbourg, [c. 9] July 1525, Herminjard I, no. 152, 364-366; 365-366. See further Herminjard I, no. 153, 366-368, no. 157, 375-377, no. 161, 386-389; 388.; and Herminjard 5, no. 154a, 388-391.

Erasmus in Basel in mid-May.⁷⁹ While there he likely arranged with Cratander for the publication of his *Commentary on the Catholic Epistles*, which appeared in 1527.

A body of evidence suggests that building on these established contacts, Marguerite helped to prepare the Meaux group's way to Strasbourg. In the summer of 1525, her distant cousin, Sigismund von Hohenlohe, Dean of Cathedral Chapter of Strasbourg and an early leader of the Reformation there, had written to her. In late June, as she prepared for her trip to Spain, she wrote to Sigismund, thanking him for his offers of aid, asking him to keep in close contact.⁸⁰ Soon thereafter, she also wrote to the young Polish noble, Jan Laski in Basel, whose brother had served in Francis I's army at Pavia.⁸¹ These letters established direct and timely ties with those able to offer refuge to her protégés should need arise during her absence.

⁷⁹ For the relationship of Lefèvre and Erasmus in their later years and Lefèvre's visit, see Guy Bedouelle, "Lefèvre d'Étaples et Érasme: une amitié critique," in *Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (1450?-1536): Actes du colloque d'Étaples les 7 et 8 novembre 1992*, ed. Jean-François Pernot (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995) 23-42, esp. 39-42. It is possible that Lefèvre also stopped at Basel before going to Strasbourg, at least this is what a lost letter by Farel to Nicolas d'Esch, dated 9 July 1526, is supposed to have said. "... Faber Stapulensis ... s'estoit retiré à Basle et de là à Strasbourg, sachant qu'il [Farel] y estoit." See summary, *Herminjard* 8, no. 179a, 484-485.

⁸⁰ Marguerite repeatedly stressed that she was bound to Sigismund by more than blood. Religious ties united them as part of God's elect: "...dans les ames fidèles qu'une volonté, un Dieu et une esperance; qui est la fiance de tous les esleus." Génin 1, no. 28, p. 181, translation into French of Hohenlohe's German translation from the original French letter printed with Sigismund's *Kreuzbuchlein* in Johann Christian Wibel, *Merckwürdige Lebens-Geschichte des Grafen Sigmunds von Hohenlohe*. Frankfurt & Leipzig, 1748.

The exchange of letters between French evangelicals in Lyon, Strasbourg, Basel, and Metz was particularly lively in the mid-summer of 1525. Sigismund and Marguerite's letters could well have been carried by any number of those crossing the borders: Jean Vaugris, Michel Bentin, or Jean Prévost.

⁸¹ Marguerite wrote her letter to Jan Laski, who was lodging with Erasmus, just before leaving for Spain, i.e., between Lyon and Aigues-Mortes where she embarked, in late August (Jourda, *Repertoire*, no. 232). Erasmus mentions her letter to Laski in his to Marguerite of 28 September 1525, Allen 6, no. 1615, 176. ll. 49-56; trans. Génin 1, no. 31, 184 (Jourda, *Repertoire*, no. 255). Jan Laski left thereafter for Venice and his brother Stanislaw, returning from captivity, accompanied Marguerite to Spain. See AK 3, nos. 1027, 1028, and 1076; and CE 2, 301-302; "Stanislaw Laski."

Remarkably, when Lefèvre and Roussel fled from Meaux, they headed to Strasbourg without telling their patron, Briçonnet.⁸² Gérard Roussel only informed him after their arrival when money troubles became pressing. Excusing himself for not having gone to Avignon to improve his Hebrew (as Vatable had done years before), he turned his offer to move there into a recommendation for staying at Strasbourg noting that there were many learned men in the city from whom he could learn equally well. Barring a move, Roussel asked for funds from his benefice to be forwarded or an exchange be made for another *sine cure* closer to him in Denis Briçonnet's diocese of Lodève.

If the Meaux group's flight was a hurried shambles, their destination appears to have been prearranged, for d'Arande soon joined them there from Lyon.⁸³ While Briçonnet had been left in the dark, Marguerite was kept informed about their situation during her stay in Spain. Not only did Francis I write to suspend the Parlement's proceedings against them shortly after the trials began, she was kept informed about their whereabouts by Sigismund von Hohenlohe, who wrote to her at least twice during her

⁸² "Male me habuit quod Tuae Dignationis consilium non antea resciverim quam egressus essem regno, quod dudum cupieram commigrare in locum Avenioni proximum, quo me jam proficisci volebas; nec alia sane causa id cupieram quondam, quam ut in literis hebraicis et in eruendis prophetarum oraculis instructor ad te redirem. Adeoque quod hucusque non licuerat, occasione nuper accepta, obvium factum per te est, si modo non defuissem negocio. Non quod non sint in hoc in quo degimus loco viri peritia linguarum juxta ac dono prophetiae prediti, quorum consuetudine assequi possim quod cupio, in meam et proximi aedificationem, qui putem vix fieri posse ut redeat christianae religionis puritas hactenus pene obsoleta, nisi adsint qui fontes porrigant quos reliquit nobis Spiritus per Mosem et prophetas, e quibus promptum sit et veluti ad manum cuique bibere." Herminjard I, no. 167, 405; Quadroni, ed., *Rép. Corr.* Farel, no. 43, p. 16 mistakenly identifies this letter as being sent to Farel and fails to cite it as per Herminjard; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 6, 188-191. On Roussel's financial needs, see *ibid.*, 406, and his accompanying letter to Nicolas Le Sueur, *ibid.*, no. 406, 412-414.

⁸³ The date of d'Arande's arrival at Strasbourg is not indicated in any contemporary sources. He was still at Lyon on October 8, six days after the Parlement of Paris had published its arrest against the Meaux group. See, Michel Bentin to Oecolampadius, Herminjard I, no. 164, 398-400; *Briefe Oekolampads* I, no. 284, 395-397

stay in Spain.⁸⁴ Though these letters are lost, they contained information on the Meaux refugees, for subsequently on March 9, 1526, when Francis was readying to cross back into France, after thanking him for these missives, Marguerite told him that the king would recall the refugees upon return. Although they had actually lodged with Capito,⁸⁵ Sigismund may have helped finance their stay since Marguerite thanked him specifically for hosting them.

Given that Sigismund and Marguerite had established these ties during the summer 1525, that Briçonnet was ignorant of the Meaux refugees movements, that she shepherded their return to France, and that she also saw to it that Caroli and Pierre Toussaint enjoyed safe havens with Anne Malet de Graville, Baroness d' Entragues, Marguerite seems to have masterminded the preservation of members of her network.⁸⁶

Writing some fifty-five years later, Jean Sturm claimed that Lefèvre and Roussel had been sent by Marguerite to consult with Bucer and Capito.⁸⁷ Having been a pillar of

⁸⁴ In Marguerite's letter to Sigismund von Hohenlohe of March 9, [1526], she mentions having received one letter while in Spain (September - December) and the other when she returned to her mother's side in France (14 January), Herminjard I, 419, no. 171; Génin I, no. 48, 211 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, 340 mentioning nos. 326 and 326.1).

⁸⁵ Farel's handwritten note on a letter by Roussel to Le Sueur, Herminjard I, no. 168, note 1, 408-409.

⁸⁶ Caroli found refuge with the Baroness d'Entragues after the Parlement's indictment of October 3. In December, the Baroness rebuffed the Parlement's *hussier sergent* who was sent to arrest him. Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, pp. 357, 371. After having reached France by way of a short stay in prison in Lorraine in the summer of 1526, Pierre Toussaint had passed some time at court with Marguerite and the other evangelicals before being lodged, evidently at Marguerite's request, with the Baroness "in hac arce generosissimae mulieris Dominae d'Entragues, exulum Christi susceptricis." Herminjard I, no. 181, 444-448, 445; Schmidt, Gérard Roussel, no. 8, 193-196; J. J. Herzog, "Das Leben Joannes Oekolampads und die Reformation der Kirche zu Basel," (Basel, 1843), vol. 2, 286; *Brief Oekolampads* I, no. 415, 567-569.

After having been a member of Claude de France's entourage at court, where she likely heard Marguerite's evangelical preachers, she ("Antragues") became one of Marguerite's "Dames" in 1529. Her daughter "Madlle. d'Entragues," after having been on the roles at 300 l.t. was listed as "hors" (no longer part of) Marguerite's household by 1539, see *Comptes*, 69, 81.

⁸⁷ Sturm, Jean. *Quarti antipappi tres partes priores* [*Antipappus quartus*], (Neapoli Palatinorum

the protestant movement in Strasbourg and a long-time agent for France in the Du Bellay diplomatic corps from the 1530s onward, he had been well placed to know.

Roussel's Protestant biographer, Charles Schmidt, denies Sturm's report, asserting that it was Briçonnet who sent them to Strasbourg. Schmidt's pronouncements are usually sound, but in this case, given all the evidence Sturm's first hand testimony ought to be believed.

II. Reform Held Hostage (1526-1530)

The release of Francis I from Spain in exchange for his sons was an incomplete blessing for French evangelicals. Hard as Marguerite had tried to instill her sense of religious mission in her brother, upon return he soon subordinated religious to political affairs, chiefly to returning his sons from captivity and reestablishing control over domestic critics who had impeded the regency government while he was away.

Marguerite understood this, and regulated her network's pursuit of religious renewal accordingly.

[Neustadt], in officina Matthaei Harnisch, 1580), p. 8 [B1v]: "Capitonis vero et Buceri tanta statim fama erat: ut Iacobus Faber Stapulensis, et Gerardus Rufus clam e Gallia profecti, Capitonem et Bucerum audierent: et de omnibus doctrinae praecipuis locis, cum his differerent, missi a Margareta Francisci Regis sorore, Nauarrae Regina, auia huius Henrici Regis: cui mater Ioanna, hanc quam nunc tuetur, haerediatriam doctrinam atque Religionem tradidit.

"Quocirca id quod in Gallia in religione boni est, id prope ex hoc fonte derivatum est: et Evangelica vitis in Gallicis Ecclesiis, aliquid etiam germinis ex nostra urbe accepit, cuius fructus ex illis Ecclesiis non facile deperibit."

"Jean Sturm dit dans un des ses écrits contre Pappus *Antipappus quartus*, (Neustadt, 1580, in-4°, p. 8) que Lefèvre et Roussel vinrent à Strasbourg, secrètement envoyés par la duchesse d'Alençon, pour s'entretenir avec Bucer et Capiton sur les principaux point de doctrine." Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, 49, n. 2; and Jourda, p. 132, following Schmidt.

Arrested Reform – Sequestered Evangelicals

As Francis was returning to France, Marguerite hoped to recommence the campaign to advance the Gospel in France that had been stalled since the fall of 1524. All of this would depend on the good will of Francis I. Over the spring and summer of 1526, the indications from court rapidly deteriorated, forcing evangelicals to defer their hope. By autumn, it was clear that Francis would protect them, but that any sort of overt evangelical activity would not be tolerated.

Marguerite's directives to the network followed in lock-step with the quickly changing political developments. Her decision-making is revealed in a series of three letters to Sigismund von Hohenlohe from March to July 1526. When writing in March, Marguerite had guarded hopes. Hohenlohe's previous letters had greatly encouraged her "to follow the path of truth," on which she protested she was less far advanced than he thought. She prayed that God would commence His work in her—she who "has no merit apart from Him"—aided by Sigismund's prayers. Having made this humble disclaimer, she gave him precise directions about what to do next. As for his desire to preach before the king, she advised him to come at the end of the month or better in mid-April, when all his friends would be assembled. She thanks him for aiding the servants of God, with all of whom, she said, they were united through living faith. She promised that when the king returned, he would recall the exiles. This was to be the recommencement of their efforts to spread the Gospel, yet she was realistic about the difficult prospects facing them and the need for discretion:

I am hoping that in God's infinite mercy and with your help the Word of truth will be heard. At the start, as you may well imagine, there will be much trouble. But God is God, and He is who He is. Just as He is as invisible as He is incomprehensible, so too His glory and victory are wholly spiritual. He is the conqueror that the world thinks vanquished, as you know better than myself. But it is better for me to keep silent than to speak. I am longing to see you and learn at your feet. Your good cousin, Marguerite.⁸⁸

After Francis's arrival (17 March 1526), she had to postpone her offer to Sigismund, indicating a general halt to their plans for evangelical preaching. On May 10, 1526 the royal council decided to break the Treaty of Madrid.⁸⁹ The following day Marguerite wrote to Sigismund. She related that the report of his friends, that is d'Arande, Lefèvre, and Roussel, who had since returned to court bringing news about the reformation in Strasbourg, had increased her desire to see him. Yet, despite the desire of her brother, the political situation demanded that they put evangelical preaching on hold.⁹⁰

My dear cousin, all of your friends here deem that, for certain reasons, it is not the right moment for you to visit. As soon as we have succeed in the matter that we are trying to accomplish for the honor of God, I will certainly let you know. If the All-Powerful One makes us worthy of it, I hope that we will be able to accomplish that which he has permitted us to begin.... In the meantime, if there is anything that I can do to prove my affection for you, I will do it as if for myself, putting all my confidence in Him through whom all things are possible."⁹¹

⁸⁸ "J'espère aussi de l'infinie miséricorde de Dieu, qu'avec votre secours la Parole de vérité sera entendue. Au commencement, comme vous pouvez penser, il y aura bien quelque difficulté. Mais Dieu est Dieu, et il est ce qu'il est; quoiqu'il soit aussi invisible au'incompréhensible; sa gloire et sa victoire sont choses toutes spirituelles, en sorte que celui-là est vainqueur que le monde croit vaincu, comme vous le savez mieux que moi; aussi vaut-il mieux me taire que de parler. Je désire vous voir pour recevoir de vous instruction. Votre bonne cousine, Marguerite." March 9, [1526], Herminjard I, no. 171, 419; Génin I, no. 48, 211 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 340).

⁸⁹ Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 253-254.

⁹⁰ Obviously, in the interval between March and May, Marguerite must have sent some message to Hohenlohe, probably with the king's messenger to Lefèvre, telling him not to come in April.

⁹¹ "... mon chere cousin, pour certaine raison, selon le jugement de tous vos amis, ce n'est pas

By July, Francis had committed himself to open conflict with the Emperor. Having already established close relations with England in April, he had joined the League of Cognac (22 May 1526) with Rome, Venice, Florence, and the Sforza.⁹² All this meant that there was no end in sight to the war with Charles V, which, as Marguerite next told Hohenlohe, entailed an indefinite halt to evangelical preaching:

My friend, I can not begin to express how pained I am that the circumstances are such, as they appear to me, that your visit here would not give you the consolation you desire. It is not that the King would not gladly see you, but there is disagreement about the liberation of his children, a matter which touches him to the core. This I have explained to the letter carrier (a person with whom I could speak openly), who can give you the full details. As soon as I believe that the time is ripe, I hope to God that I will not have to keep you waiting."⁹³

Invoking their "fraternal alliance... which arises from new birth and forms a genuine bond," Marguerite signed off.⁹⁴ Their collaboration did not end there,⁹⁵ but

encore le moment de venir ici. Dès que ce dont nous nous occupons pour l'honneur de Dieu se sera réalisé, je m'empresserai de vous en instruire. J'espère, si le Tout-Puissant nous en rend dignes, que nous pourrons achever ce qu'il nous a permis de commencer.... Et, en attendant que nous nous voyions l'un l'autre, si vous pensez qu'il y ait quelque chose où je puisse vous témoigner mon attachement, j'agirai comme pour moi-même, en mettant ma confiance en Celui par lequel toutes choses sont possibles." Marguerite to Sigismund von Hohenlohe, May 11, [1526], Cognac, Herminjard I, no. 175, 430-431; Génin I, no. 49, 212 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 350).

⁹² Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 253-258.

⁹³ "Mon ami, je ne puis vous exprimer tout le chagrin que je ressens; car les circonstances me paraissent encores telles, que votre venue ici ne pourrait vous procurer la consolation que vous désirez. Ce n'est pas que le Roi ne vous vît volontiers; mais l'on ne s'entend pas encore complètement au sujet de la libération de ses enfants, à laquelle il tient autant qu'à celle de sa propre personne, comme je l'ai expliqué au présent porteur, duquel vous pourrez apprendre toute la vérité; aussi m'en suis-je volontier entretenue avec lui. Mais dès que je croirai le temps propice, j'espère en Dieu que je ne vous ferai pas languir." Marguerite to Sigismund von Hohenlohe, July 5, [1526], Herminjard I, no. 179, 441; Génin I, no. 51, 214 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, 354).

⁹⁴ "J'ai pour vous tous les sentiments d'affection qu'il est possible d'éprouver pour un parent, moins encore en raison des liens périssables que forment la chair et le sang, qu'à cause de l'amour fraternel; car celui-ci résulte de la nouvelle naissance qui forme une union véritable, dans laquelle désire aussi s'unir à vous." Herminjard I, no. 179, p. 441-442. These sentiments again echo the rondeau *En aymant Dieu de cuer entierement* in the manuscript made of Marguerite quoted at the head of chapter 7. Herminjard's text is a French translation of Hohenlohe's German translation of the lost French original. The theme of brotherly bonding is clear and explicit enough to leave little doubt that it was in the original.

Marguerite was signaling to her great *chagrin* that, lacking a royal stamp of approval, no evangelical preaching could occur for the foreseeable future.

Meanwhile, Sigismund's friends at court sent out similar reports of hopes raised and deferred. In May, Michel d'Arande, who had been newly nominated to the see of St.-Paul-trois-Châteaux (a tiny diocese of some thirty parishes on that Rhône between Valence and Avignon) wrote to Farel that Marguerite had enjoyed Capito's letter to her and requested more from him.⁹⁶ By June, Roussel was complaining about the heavy constraints imposed on him at court. He could not journey to Paris as he wished and had no news about their friends there, but hoped soon to be able to look into Farel's affairs as well as other aspects of their evangelical plans *in rem Evangelii*. Meanwhile, Roussel was arranging so that Farel could return to France. He warned however, that since their departure, many had abandoned the evangelical ranks and few remained. If matters did not improve, Roussel was considering returning to Strasbourg or perhaps seeking exile in Venice.⁹⁷

In July, Pierre Toussaint reported in much the same vein to Oecolampadius, that he would have returned to *Germania* if he did not have good hope that "the Gospel of

⁹⁵ See below for Sigismund's almost unknown political dealings with France at the beginnings of France's entry into the Protestant politics of the Empire and Switzerland.

⁹⁶ From court [Cognac?], c. 11 May 1526, Herminjard 1, no. 188, 469-470. The letter is dated 1526 in Farel's hand. Herminjard puts it merely to summer 1526. It must be from circa 11 May when Marguerite wrote to Sigismund, for d'Arande speaks of Michel Du Blet as if he were alive (he died in late April or May, see *ibid.*, no. 176), and had not yet left court (d'Arande was away being installed in his diocese on 17 June 1526, see *ibid.*, no. 178 and Haag, "Arande, Michel de").

⁹⁷ "Si res non cesserit prout sub Deo speramus, mox ad vos convolabo, vel etiam Venetias... Plurima nobis decoquenda fuerunt. nec pauciora supersunt." 19 June 1526, from Blois to Strasbourg, Herminjard 1, no. 178, 438-440; 440; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 7, 192-193.

Christ will soon reign in France.”⁹⁸ Nevertheless, he gave a scathing report on the status of the evangelical cause at the court, “that most dangerous whore.” Praising Marguerite to high heaven, he claims that both the king and the queen mother were prepared to join with her in promoting the Gospel of Christ, so long as the war did not delay them.

Toussaint laments that with the royal family so ready to be persuaded, there were no true ministers at court. Bishop Briçonnet, who had recently preached before the royal family, was a pseudo-prophet who tried to please men, one of those who talked evangelically in order to secure benefices and then stepped into the front ranks of those persecuting the ones “whom the world calls Lutherans.” As for Lefèvre, he had no heart (*animus*).

Toussaint did not blame Roussel, but did count him among those who were saying “Now is not the time, the season had not come!” But, Toussaint protested, the Gospel cannot be preached without the cross: “If the Emperor or Ferdinand were as favorable as Francis and Marguerite, what would they not have done in Germany!”

Toussaint had the self righteous indignation of a man who just had suffered prison and torture for his faith. He had been drawn to France by the prospect of a land rich in learning and more open to evangelical beliefs than his native Metz, which was controlled by the conservative Lorraine (Guise) family. Yet, he too deferred his cross, refusing to take up the rich appointment offered to him at court even though he recognized the need for ‘true ministers,’ claiming that he was disgusted with the temporizing and hypocrisy there. Nevertheless, he stayed on quietly in France at Paris to pursue his studies.

⁹⁸ “Et certe Germaniam repeterem, nisi sperarem brevi regnaturum Christi Evangelium per Galliam.” Herminjard 1, no. 181, 444-448, 445; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 8, 193-196; Brief

In August, Roussel gave his side of the story to Farel. Guillaume had obviously heard of Toussaint's report and, as a result, had admonished Roussel for not doing more. Roussel reprimanded his former pupil: "Temper your pen!" "Do not marvel that I have done nothing until now, but rather wonder that I have not already returned to you. For if I should have followed the advice of my friends, believe you me, I would have scarcely lived a week here in France." He explained that as Marguerite's preacher at court he was the target of envy and his life was in great danger. Yet the Lord strengthened him and other evangelicals at court. They had begun to be treated less harshly, and there was some hope that they would be able to preach freely again. Meanwhile, Roussel told Farel that he had presented the first fruits of their translation of the Old Testament to Marguerite, who received it with great joy. He would try to have their joint project published. He and friends at court were also looking for a way to bring Farel back to France. In the meantime, Roussel was soliciting a gift of 20 *écus* from Marguerite for Farel and a colleague had heard that other friends had recently sent a further 50 *écus* to them at Strasbourg. Aside from these small measures, however, Roussel said in sum, "we have to dissimulate many things." That is exactly how the evangelicals' situation remained for the next four years until the King's children returned from captivity: they were able to work behind the scenes, but not preach in the open.

A Parting of Ways: Briçonnet and Farel

Francis I's captivity and return put strain on the network that led to a parting of ways. Under the stress, in a sort of one-upmanship of true commitment to the Gospel, evangelicals separated into several groups. The circle around Marguerite rejected Briçonnet, while Farel and his colleagues gave up hope on them.⁹⁹

Briçonnet's conservative turn. By the time Marguerite left for Madrid, her intense partnership with Briçonnet was over. Never would she take his instruction or collaborate with him again. Briçonnet did try to maintain close relations but was rebuffed.

The record of their intimate relationship breaks off abruptly in November 1524. The perception left by the scribe's half-copied line, the last known words exchanged between them, is no mere glitch in the source base. Whatever the cause of the interruption in the transcription, if she had remained attached to Briçonnet after the Meaux debacle, why did she not have her scribe finish the job later? Marguerite dropped contact with Briçonnet in favor of direct collaboration with the group around Lefèvre. In the first place, as argued above, Marguerite likely arranged for the Fabrists to take refuge at Strasbourg before her trip to Spain without the knowledge of Briçonnet. It was certainly she who managed their return, not Briçonnet. At court, the evangelicals in Marguerite's orbit did not let Briçonnet back into their circle.

⁹⁹ In this three part divergence of the Meaux group are seen the roots of, or at least prototypes of, three successors to the early evangelical ferment in France: a line of reformist Gallican bishops, French evangelicals who continued to seek some sort of reform according to the pure Gospel, and, with Farel, the French reformed wing of the Protestant community. See, Oberman, *Initia Calvini*, 39-43 for the powerful effect that the persecution, which caused the evangelical ranks to split, had on the reforming outlook of Farel and Calvin.

Upon hearing of Francis's imminent return, like many other leading nobles and prelates, Briçonnet descended on the royal court in the hope of rendering valued service. Like other would-be advisors, he was excluded from the Regent's privy counsel.¹⁰⁰ He followed the court to Cognac, where Marguerite would have heard him preach in conservative fashion, between April and July 1526.¹⁰¹ Toussaint's severe criticism of him likely reflected the feelings of the evangelicals Marguerite had gathered to her, for none of them speak about him in their relatively abundant correspondence from the summer of 1526.¹⁰²

This breakdown in relations is easily explained. As Toussaint alluded, Briçonnet had effectively capitulated to the conservatives in Paris. Early in 1525, he had already helped the Parlement with their investigations that led to the arrest of Jacques Pauvans and Matthieu Saulnier as well as the sentencing of Jean Le Clerc and other commoners

¹⁰⁰ In April 1526, while Briçonnet was left to cool his heels outside the regent's council chamber along with other great lords when Francis I returned to France. "Cependant les efforts des Rois pour réduire le personnel du Conseil ordinaire se renouvelèrent, avec un inégal succès, pendant toute la durée du xvi^e siècle. Au mois de mai 1525, le Conseil réuni à Lyon autour de la régente Louise de Savoie comprenait dix-sept ou dix-huit membres; il n'en comptait plus que sept au mois d'avril suivant [1526]: l'hussier Jacques de Mailly, signalant la présence à la Cour d'un grand nombre de hauts prélats et de "gros seigneurs", tels que les cardinaux de Lorraine et de Bourbon, les comtes de Saint-Pol et de Vaudémont, les évêques de Meaux et de Lisieux, ajoutait que la porte du Conseil leur demeurait constamment fermée." Noël (Joseph-Marie) Valois, *Étude historique sur le conseil du roi, introduction à l'inventaire des arrêtes du conseil d'État* (1886), cii-ciii, citing, AN X_{1A} 1529, fol. 211 r (17 April 1526) and François Decrue, *De Consilio Regis Francisci I*, p. 91.

¹⁰¹ See further, Veissière, *Autour du Guillaume Briçonnet*, pp. 37-54 addition to *Guillaume Briçonnet*, p.379: "Voyage: le 3 avril 1526, on signale la présence récente de G. Briçonnet auprès de la cour dans la région de Bayonne, à l'occasion de la délivrance de François Ier. AN X_{1A}, 1529, fol. 210 r-v, 3 avril 1526 (J.K. Farge)."

¹⁰² Toussain criticizes Briçonnet as a weakling, in comparison with Marguerite's spiritual commitment. Guillaume Briçonnet had preached very conservatively at court and was no longer a true evangelical, one of the ones whom Roussel said had slipped from their ranks: "... illic [court] nihil videam synceritatis, et omnes quaerunt quae sua sunt, non quae Jesu Christi. Episcopus Melden[is] dicitur illic parum sincere tractasse Verbum diebus superioribus, plus studens hominibus placere quam Deo. Et habet Aula multos tales pseudopphetas." Herminjard 1, no. 181, p. 446.

from Meaux. After the Fabrists' flight to Strasbourg, he had helped with the prosecution of other heretics at Meaux. In December 1525, he had sought to reassure his critics by investigating the faith of his flock in the town and marché of Meaux. A year later, in December 1526, well after Marguerite's protection had recommenced, he formalized his capitulation by coming to an agreement with Pierre Lizet, the Faculty of Theology, and the Franciscans of Meaux.¹⁰³ Over the next few years, he denounced several other heretics. In 1528, one of them burned at the stake. Such severity, for there were relatively few executions for heresy during the 1520s,¹⁰⁴ forced artisans who were committed to the evangelical cause to flee the diocese. In 1528, a *foulon* from Meaux then living at Troyes was investigated for his proselytizing. Other agitators from Meaux were reported in the nearby region at Soissons. Again in December 1530, Briçonnet had another group of lay persons in his diocese charged with heresy, resulting in their banishment.¹⁰⁵

According to her leading biographer, Marguerite's relationship with Briçonnet did not terminate abruptly, but cooled gradually during her voyage to Spain and, upon return, as her new marriage preoccupied her.¹⁰⁶ This interpretation does not stand up to scrutiny. As was obvious to evangelicals in 1526, following the debacle of the Meaux reform,

¹⁰³ 1 December 1526, Lizet reported to the Faculty of Theology that Briçonnet was willing to come to an amicable settlement, i.e., take the advice of the Sorbonne. Farge *Registre* 1, p. 158-159, session 180A.

¹⁰⁴ See William Monter, *Judging the French Reformation: Heresy Trials by Sixteenth-Century Parlements* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

¹⁰⁵ "Guillaume Briçonnet et le procureur du roi au Parlement accusent du crime d'hérésie un certain Pierre Vaneau, prêtre, Thomas de Nesle, ... ung nommé François, serviteur de la vefue feu Thomas Patron, et Antoine Le Moine. Ils sont tous par la suite bannis du royaume à jamais, leurs meuble et biens confisqués." Veissière, *Autour du Guillaume Briçonnet*, pp. 37-54 to complement, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, p.

which had been the principal focus of their relationship, Briçonnet had become a persecutor instead of protector of the evangelical cell at Meaux that had grown strong during the day of his reforming experiment.

Farel's defection. If Briçonnet turned coat because he thought evangelical reform had led to evil results, Farel gave up hope for France because, in his view, it had not gone far enough and was dead in its tracks. If the network's program may be likened to a car, Farel was the equivalent of a back-seat driver: after 1523, he did not have his hands on the wheel or the best view of the road, but he gave plenty of advice about how to guide it forward. Farel did not just give advice, he demanded action. He may well have felt that nobody was at the wheel, since many of those whom he had left behind kept turning to him for prayers and practical help. Late in 1526, Farel's incessant injunctions ceased after Roussel extended an offer, if not to jump into the driver's seat at court or Paris, at least to ride shotgun from just over the border at Sedan, where as a court preacher to the powerful de la Marck family and with a printing press at his disposal, he might attempt to change the situation in France.

In December, Roussel extended this promising offer to Farel.¹⁰⁷ The de la Marck family was an important military dynasty in the service of Francis I, whose members had Lutheran tendencies.¹⁰⁸ Their lands lay just over the border in Lorraine north and west of Metz. After Farel's brief, failed attempt to evangelize in latter city, he had remained

396, citing James K. Farge for information from AN X1a 1524, fol. 44v.

¹⁰⁶ Jourda, *Marguerite*, 92.

¹⁰⁷ Marguerite had also been using her agent, Jacques Grosloot, to secure funds for Farel in a disputed inheritance case. See Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 361.1 [361]; Herminjard I, 297 and note 17; and Scheurer I, no. 165, p. 332-334.

intensely interested the possibility of reforming the region, staying in close contact with Pierre Toussaint, Nicolas Dex [d'Esch], and the rest of the evangelical circle there.¹⁰⁹ Thus, had he accepted Farel would have known his employers and been back in a field that he had longed to harvest. Since Farel was a marked man in France and could not be brought home, the de la Marck's promise to put a printing press at his disposal offered the possibility of evangelizing his homeland, for whose reformation he still entertained hopes in the summer of 1526.¹¹⁰ However, Roussel stipulated as a condition for accepting that Farel guard his tongue, for a time, on controversial issues like the Eucharist. This was not a new request for throughout Farel's career his fondest allies would tell him to moderate his zeal. The offer was so good that, even the normally skeptical Pierre Toussaint gave his hearty endorsement.¹¹¹

We do not have Farel's response to Roussel's offer, only his self-justifying annotation, written years later on Roussel's letter. He recalls that he did not take up the post in Sedan because he had already started to preach in Aigle, a substantial town in the Bernese hinterland. He adds with satisfaction that two years after starting this work there, the town passed over to the Reform. That Aigle was reformed rather less through Farel's preaching than by fiat when Bern's adopted the Reformation is the lesser of two distortions in his explanation. As late as October 1526 in Strasbourg, he had been at his wit's end about where he would go next. As related above, throughout the summer,

¹⁰⁸ Roussel's letter to Farel testifies to their evangelical leanings.

¹⁰⁹ For the evangelical cell at Metz, see chapter 7, p. 360 and n. 84.

¹¹⁰ Farel would use Vingle's presses at Neuchâtel for this same purpose from 1531-1533 with Antoine Marcourt, Pierre Viret, and others, prefiguring Geneva's rise as the missionary printing capital to France.

Roussel had been looking for a way to bring him back to France. When Farel decided to try his hand at reforming Aigle, he had no official mandate from Bern to preach. He began by posing as school teacher, giving free lessons as cover for his illicit attempt to proselytize the town. In fact, by the time Roussel's offer would have arrived in late December or early January, he was already in trouble for his first few clandestine sermons. For whatever reason he rejected Roussel's ample offer—it may well have been the stipulation that he temper his tongue in denouncing the false practices of the Church—Farel chose a harder, more obscure path that preserved his freedom of action. In so doing he effectively turned his back on France. His hardening of heart towards his homeland is reflected in his letter to Capito of May 1529. Having heard that Pierre Toussaint had been called from Paris to Metz, Farel ardently supported the move since, he believed that Toussaint would reap a much more abundant harvest for God there than in France. His homeland seemed to him a completely lost cause because of Francis I alienation from the Gospel.¹¹²

After Roussel's offer of December 1526, evangelicals in France and Farel stopped regular correspondence. Farel even dropped out of contact with Pierre Toussaint, whom he continued to hold in the highest regard, until the former canon of Metz eventually migrated from France to Switzerland in 1531, after which they became close comrades.

¹¹¹ Toussaint to Farel, 17 December 1526, Herminjard 1, no. 131, 312-313.

¹¹² "Audivimus Petrum Tossanum evocatum esse à Metensibus. Gauderemus si fructus aliquid proferret illic, Christum praedicans. Nam apud Francos quid promovere possit non satis video, sub tam insano capite qui passus est interdici plebi Novo Testamento, ut nulla supersit via veritatis agnoscendae, neque libris, neque aliis commonstrantibus, Pater novit quae in sua habet potestate momenta. Huic nemo resistere poterit, quin sua perficiatur voluntas, quam plenius cognoscere det suis, eamque perpetuo sequi!" Herminjard 2, no. 257, 177-180; 179-180.

From 1527 onwards, rather than brothers in arms, the relationship of Farel and other expatriate ministers with their former brothers in France resembled that of distant cousins who kept in occasional touch and bore each other good will but had little in common. With that distancing of their relationship, the most important set of sources for understanding the inner life of the evangelical network in France comes to an end. Thereafter, the story of Marguerite's network can only be told from scraps of evidence, gleaned from the reports of friends and enemies outside their circle. Rarely do their voices rise above the wall of silence enveloping their decisions or are their hands revealed from behind the protective cloak of dissimulation, which enabled them to survive and continue to act.

The Evangelical Network Underground

After 1526, what was left for Marguerite and the network to do? Tantalizing strings of evidence indicate that while dissimulating their beliefs, she fostered the network as well as she was able, readying them for the day when they could act more openly. As the ever changing political events kept pushing back the day that Francis's children would be returned, the network returned to a cold war against its domestic enemies and secret cooperation with the friends that remained to them abroad. This concealed campaign entailed an interconnected program of building the network, promoting the evangelical cause through print, and establishing the network's political clout as France became involved in the beginnings of European-wide, Protestant Politics.

These three tracks of the network's development in the late 1520s can best be described by concentrating on a notable example of each: for the network's reestablishment, Marguerite's attempt to rehabilitate the lives and reputations of Jean Guibert, Pierre Caroli, and Lefèvre d'Étaples; for their clandestine print campaign, her intervention to save Louise de Berquin; and for their entry into protestant politics, her cultivation of the Du Bellay brothers. A number of examples will be clustered around these major cases to sketch the fuller profile of her network's years of patient preparation.

Reknitting the Network

The *Sentence de frere Jehan Guibert hermite de Livry* is a strange little pamphlet printed by Simon Du Bois probably sometime shortly after 29 July 1527 when the sentence was passed.¹¹³ The one remaining copy has attracted almost no scholarly attention.¹¹⁴ Although it is one of Du Bois' famous anonymous tracts, it is not a religious book in the traditional sense. Quite simply the text is a reprint of the final sentence issued in the heresy case of Jean Guibert. Judicial documents were rarely published in that period, even edicts by the Parlement of Paris or the king. Why then did the budding evangelical printer Simon du Bois indulge in publishing a little piece of eye-numbing legalese?

¹¹³ The complete title reads, *Sentence de frere Jehan Guibert hermite de Livry. Tous mes os diront Seigneur Dieu qui est ce qui est semblable à toi? Qui delivre le paoure de la main des puissantz son indigen et paoure de ceusz qui le deschirent. Pseaul. xxxviii.*

¹¹⁴ See Higman, *Piety*, S 11, Moore, *La littérature allemande*, p. 48, no. 199, and Imbart 3, p. 210 and n. 2, for brief mentions.

The case of Jean Guibert was a *cause célèbre* in its day. Guibert's long ordeal in court had begun during the conservatives' first onslaught against heresy in 1523. He had been indicted along with the Meaux group and Berquin. In the time since, he had been sentenced and appealed, sentenced again, and, as some heard it (falsely), burned at the stake.¹¹⁵ Guibert and Lefèvre had known each other at least as early as 1505, when Faber had held the hermit up as a shining example of the contemplative life.¹¹⁶ Lefèvre's move to Meaux put him next door to Guibert at Livry. What their relations were at that point is unknown.¹¹⁷ They would appear to have been close, especially if as seems likely the 'recluse' whom Marguerite mentioned to her brother when sending the Scriptures to him in captivity was Jean Guibert. If so, Marguerite was bringing his case to the king's ear surreptitiously.

As the pamphlet relates, in 1527, in response to a second appeal, yet another special commission set up by Cardinal Du Prat had found Guibert not guilty. This was a victory not just for the hermit, who had been incarcerated since 1523, but for all the "Lutherans" of Meaux with whom he had been identified. Publishing his sentence amounted to advertising their exoneration for heresy. Moreover, Guibert's prosecutors were chastised, being sentenced to pay three-quarters of the trial's cost.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ Weiss claims that Guibert was burned in 1526, three years after his trial first trial in 1523. See, "Guillaume Farel," *BSHPF* (1919), 200, no. 2 in which he cites Guibert's case from AN X2a 78, f. 3r and X 4873, fol. 41.

¹¹⁶ See Rice, *Prefatory Epistles*, no. 45, pp. 142, and 144, n. 9.

¹¹⁷ Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, p. 236.

¹¹⁸ The prosecutors obviously resisted paying for years, for Francis I gifted the trial fees to two servants in 1534: *CAF* 2, p. 715, no. 7230: "Don à François de Marconnay et à Claude de Thouyn, gentilshommes de la vénerie, de 500 livres parisis, montant d'une amende à laquelle ont été condamnés Jean Guibert, Guillaume de La Châtaigneraye et Jean de La Maille. Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 14 juillet

Had Marguerite been involved in fixing this outcome? While no direct evidence exists, the details of his final sentence hint at multiple complicities leading back to Marguerite. Among the judges who acquitted Guibert were three noteworthy figures. Jean de Selve, Abbot of Turpenay, René du Bellay, and the Abbot of St. Mark (Médard) in Soissons. Another Jean de Selve, First President of the Parlement of Paris, was encountered above as the mouthpiece of Marguerite's miracle in Milan. The Abbot Jean de Selve was no doubt a close relation. René Du Bellay was a councilor in the Parlement of Paris. Marguerite's close relations with his brothers Jean and Guillaume will be taken up below. The last figure, the Abbot of St. Mark, was Jean Olivier, uncle of François Olivier, whom Marguerite would name as her chancellor of Alençon in 1530 and promote through the ranks of the royal administration to the high office of Chancellor of France (1545).

Guibert's salvation was part of Marguerite's concerted campaign to save everyone in her circle. A few days before the final sentence in Guibert's case, some adherents of the Faculty of Theology saw fit to make a notarized deposition about the suspicious activity of the Abbot of St. Mark of Soissons. They reported having seen the Abbot seeking from the Papal Legate a blanket exoneration from the charge of heresy for Caroli and Lefèvre.¹¹⁹ Why the Faculty of Theology deemed this action suspicious is no mystery

1534."

¹¹⁹ [26/27 July 1527] "A la requête de la Faculté de théologie en l'Université de Paris, représentée par Jean Tannel, prêtre, grand bedeau de ladite Faculté, ... Jacques Mynet, prêtre, écolier étudiant en ladite Faculté, et Bernard Ollerie, banquier, à Paris, déclarent "que ung jour ou deux après le jour Saint Jehan Baptiste dernier passé..., eulx estans en la court du prieuré du Temple. ... auquel lieu.... Monsr. le cardinal appellé des Medecis, et que on disoit estre lors legat en France, estoit lors logé. ... ilz veisrent illecques ung gros moyne, que on disoit estre abbé, ... *auquel auditeur icelluy abbé demandoit une provision, pour et ou*

for the abbot had been named in January as one of the new *juges délégués*.¹²⁰ At the king's request, the old foursome of heresy judges, two of them staunch conservatives from the Faculty of Theology, had been relieved of their duties in favor of a reconstituted commission dominated by the king's trusty men, including in chief, the bishops Michel Boudet of Langres, who helped quash the investigation of Lefèvre *et alii* in 1523, Claude de Longwy of Mâcon, in whose diocese d'Arande had preached in 1524, and Luigi di Canossa of Bayeux, Marguerite's old friend.¹²¹ Jean Olivier's association with the royal court's new protectionist regime gave these agents of the Faculty of Theology good reason to be alarmed.

By the middle of 1527, the Faculty had a over a year's worth of evidence to justify their suspicion of Marguerite and her agents. In late 1526, as related above, at Marguerite's instigation, Berquin had been forcibly liberated from the Parlement's jail by the king's men. So too, in the spring of 1526 Clément Marot, who was a member of Marguerite's household and had been charged with heresy in her absence, gained his freedom do to her intervention.¹²² At the end of 1526, Marguerite arrived with the court

*nom de Fabri et Charoly, pour avoir juges pour congnoistre de certaines charges dont lesd. Caroli et Fabri avoient esté chargez par indormation que led. Abbé disoit avoir esté faicte contre eulx, et parse que lesd. Actestans oyrent led. Abbé (parler audit auditeur et qu'il sollicitoit pour lesd. Fabri et Caroly et qu'il leur sembla que lad. Mathiere estoit audieuse, se retirent; et, ce faict, en sorans dud. Temple, led. Maistre Jacques demanda à deux des diverses foix, le nom dud. Abbé, qui ne luy en voullurent riens dire; et led. Olleric, quelques jours après veit et recongnut led. Abbé au palais, en la salle, et demanda lors aux gens qui le suyvoient qui il estoit l'abbé de Saint Marc de Soissons [Jean Olivier]" Ernest Coyecque, *Recueil d'actes notairiés relatifs à l'histoire de Paris et de ses environs au XVI^e siècles*, vol. 1, Histoire Générale de Paris (Paris, 1905-1923), p. 167, no. 826.*

¹²⁰ See below for the conservatives belief that the new *juges délégués* were instruments of Lutherans at court, who had devised the new panel.

¹²¹ Fraikin, *Nonciatures*, App. XIII, 428-433: Bull of Clement VII, January 25, 1527.

¹²² The circumstances of both Marot's arrest and his release are not known. See, Clément Marot, *Oeuvres poétiques*, ed. Gérard Defaux (Paris: Classiques Garnier 1990), vol. 1, LXX; and Gérard Defaux,

at Paris. This was too late to save the preacher from Meaux, Jacques Pauvans, who was executed in August as a recidivist. Shortly before 1 January 1527, however, Aimé Meigret was released from jail. The circumstance of his liberation are unknown, but the date of his release and Marguerite's championing of him in late 1524 suggests her intervention.¹²³ Meigret then fled to Germany where he died by early 1528. In March 1527, Marguerite had asked for copies of all the Faculty of Theology's condemnations against heretics "since the beginning of the Luther affair."¹²⁴ Her reason for asking was no doubt to provide her network with ammunition to shoot at the Faculty. In the summer of 1526, Roussel had told Farel that Lefèvre was completely absorbed in responding to Bédà.¹²⁵ In early 1526, the syndic of the Faculty had published his annotations against Lefèvre and Erasmus. Though the royal court had forbidden its sale, the damage to Lefèvre's reputation had been done. Marguerite seems to have been looking for a way to redress the balance. In July 1527, the royal court sent 12 propositions taken from Bédà's attack on Lefèvre and Erasmus to the University of Paris for examination.¹²⁶ So too, after being freed in 1526, Louis de Berquin had pursued a course of revenge against the "Théologastres," about which more will be said in the next section

Le poète en son jardin: étude sur Clément Marot et "l'Adolescence clémentine," Collection Unichamps 51, (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1996), 92-93, 100.

¹²³ As Zwingli heard it, Marguerite was responsible for the liberation of Berquin and Meigret. "Iam quod scribamus, nihil serii occurrit; nam de ecclesiis Galliarum ab oecolampadio quiddam, opinor, accepisti. Domina Dux Alanconiae concionatorum habet Christianum et laterum in aula. Gerardus Rufus ob fratrum preces aulica tedia devorat, aliqui concionator verbi futurus Blesis, quae est egregia urbs regni. Berchinus et Macrinus liberabuntur. Rex verbo favet. Metensis cardinalis non repugnat, cui aiunt connubium ineundem cordi esse." 1 January 1527, ZW 9, no. 568, 4-5; Herminjard 2, no. 190, 3-5.

¹²⁴ Farge, *Registre* 1, p. 165: 188 B, mention (Appendix A, no. 10021).

¹²⁵ "Salutat vos Peregrinus, qui totus in tractando Bédà occupatur, sed modestius quam plerique vellent." Roussel to Farel, 27 August 1526, Herminjard 1, no. 182, 448-451, 450-451; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 9, 197-198.

As well as protecting her network from legal action, she found them important positions. Lefèvre became Francis I royal librarian and tutor to his remaining children, his third son Charles as well his daughter Margaret. Pierre Caroli she made curate of Alençon, entrusting him with the revision of poor relief in the town.¹²⁷ She also aided Caroli in his long campaign to be reinstated in the Paris Faculty of Theology.¹²⁸ As related above, d'Arande had been made Bishop of St. Paul-trois-Châteaux soon after Francis's return, and Roussel took his place as one of her almoners. In 1529, she secured for Roussel the abbey of Clairac in her southern territories.¹²⁹ Pierre Toussain and Guillaume Farel rejected the positions offered to them in 1526. For her secretary Clément Marot she obtained a place in the king's household in 1527,¹³⁰ just as she had for the father of another of her poet-secretaries, Victor Brodeau, who would publish evangelical verse dedicated to her later in life.¹³¹

Marguerite also started making appointments in the University and convents of Bourges in her Duchy of Berry that would make it one of the leading centers of jurisprudence as well as evangelicalism in France. In 1529, Andrea Alciato, a leading

¹²⁶ 9 July 1527, CAF 1, p. 512, no. 2702, citing Du Boulay, *Historia universitatis*, vol. 6, p. 200.

¹²⁷ See Marguerite's request to Francis I for help with reforming the poor relief system in Alençon. Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 374. On her social application of "faith active through charity" see, L. Boutry, "Les chartes de charité de Henri et de Marguerite de Navarre," *Revue internationale de sociologie* 8 (1900), 867-876. See, Vauzelles' dedication of a work to her on poor relief, *Police subsidiaire à celle qui si infinie multitude des povres survenuz à Lyon sur le Rosne, l'an mil cinq cens XXXI. Avec les graces que les povres en rendent à Dieu et à messieurs de l'église et aux notables de la ville* (Toulouse, 1531) as in Appendix B.

¹²⁸ See New letter dated [Before 30] September 1528, cited in Appendix A, no. 10023.

¹²⁹ Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 508.

¹³⁰ Defaux, *Le poète en son jardin*, 100, 113-117.

¹³¹ See Brodeau's letters to Montmorency, in Jourda, "Victor Brodeau," and Victor Brodeau, *Les louanges de Jesus Nostre saulueur* (s.l., s.n., 1540), dedicated to Marguerite, see Appendix B 1; and Victor Brodeau, "Poésies," ed. H.M. Tomlinson, TLF 312, (Geneva: Droz, 1982).

jurist in Europe, came to teach law attracted by an enormous salary, reported to have been between 600 and 1000 *écus* (more than 1200 to 2000 *livres tournois*). He was soon joined by Pierre de Rébuffe, a jurist with Lutheran tendencies, as well as Melchior Wolmar, a leading scholar of Greek and Latin, who brought his young student Theodore Beza with him and would go on have such a lasting influence on another student, John Calvin.¹³² In 1530, she tried to secure the Abbey of Issoudun in Berry for a protégé despite the monks' right of election.¹³³ Similarly, in her southern territories she sought the nominations to the sees of Sarlat¹³⁴ and Albi in favor of two protégés.¹³⁵ The latter

¹³² Alciato had been at Avignon before Bourges and was in contact with the uncle of Antoine Oraison, the young prelate who translated Luther's *De la préparation à la mort* for Marguerite in 1524. See Alciato's letter to Boniface Amerbach, Avignon, 26 May 1528, AK 3, no. 1261, pp. 326-329; p. 327, ll. 50-55: "Novissime id argumenti assumere coactus sum, ut veteri amico Oresono, Rmi legati sororio, qui tum [Greek: monomachesth[d]ai emelle], morem gererem. Caeterum non censeo huiusmodi opusculum in presentia edendum, quod in eo multa sint, quae ad controversias [Greek: toutoon mooroon Basileoon] pertinent, subvereorque, ne, si aliter in eo quicquam pronuntiatum reperiatur, quam alterutri eorum sederit, auctori noxae sit." AK's note on Oresono: "For Antoine Honoré d'Oraison see. Allen Nr. 2039, 57." On Antoine Honoré d'Oraison, see also Marchischal's article as cited in Appendix B 1, under 1524, Luther, trans., Oraison, *De la preparation a la mort*.

For the influence of Alciato on Calvin, see Oberman, *Initia Calvini*, 37 with references to further literature. For the teachers and prelates hired by Marguerite at the end of the 1520s, see: Louis-Hector Chandru de Raynal, *Histoire de Berry depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789*, 3 vols. [numbered 2-4] (Bourges: Vermeil, 1844-1847), vol. 3, 305, 368, and 380; Le Vicomte de Brimont, *Le XVI^e siècle et les guerres de la réforme en Berry*, 2 vols. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1905), vol. 1, 139-150, whose claims are not always substantiated; and Françoise Michaud-Fréjaville, "Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre, Duchesse de Berry, 'laquelle a fort humainement traité ses sujets de Berry'" in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du Colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995), 52.

¹³³ Génin 1, no. 86, 262-264, and no. 87, 264-265 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 481 and 486). Thus, Marguerite continued the crown's policy of undermining the capitular right of election in those diocese and abbey's where it still existed under the Concordat. In 1531, the Pope would extend the Concordat, granting to Francis I the right of nomination to all the remaining benefices. In 1531, he issued instructions to members of his *Grand Conseil* about proper procedure for nominating benefices, in BnF MS Clairambault 334, dd. 238-239v: "Lettre de Francois I^{er} aux conseil au sujet des nominations ecclésiastiques, 1 avril 1532."

¹³⁴ In 1530, Marguerite tried to gratify Montmorency by supporting the nomination of one of his favorites to a see in her territories, see Saulnier 1976 (Saulnier and Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 445, 445.1, 446, 446.1-446.4).

¹³⁵ In 1528, Marguerite sought the nomination of Albi for Gabriel de Grammont, Bishop of Tarbes, see Génin 2, no. 53, 100-101 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 420). Marguerite had just asked Gabriel's relative

nomination put her in conflict with the Chancellor, Cardinal Du Prat, who had his eye on the diocese.¹³⁶ The most important of her episcopal nominations was in favor of Jean du Bellay to which will be discussed below.

Marguerite's efforts to install her men into these various positions initially brought few results for the network's evangelical campaign. For the period 1526-1530, there is no evidence of evangelical preaching at Paris, Meaux, Bourges, Alençon, or Lyon. A reference to Sébiville's continued preaching at Sisteron during Advent of 1526 is the last information known about him.¹³⁷ As for d'Arande at St. Paul-trois-châteaux, in 1528 Capito described him as an upstanding prelate¹³⁸ and the bishop is known to have held a diocesan synod in 1529, but, for lack of records, little else can be said about his episcopacy until his retirement in 1539.¹³⁹ The only evangelical preaching of any sort was at Blois. In January 1527, Capito reported to Zwingli that Roussel would soon preach in this important city.¹⁴⁰ Later that year, Matthieu Malingre, a Dominican and

Charles de Grammont, Bishop of Aire, to serve as Henri de Navarre's lieutenant governor over Aquitaine ["Guyenne"], see *Archives municipales de Bayonne Registres gascons* (Bayonne, 1898), vol. 2, 524; mentioned in BnF Fiches Picot, no. 679 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 415).

¹³⁶ *Archives Du Prat, Glanes et Regains*, 24-25.

¹³⁷ See chapter 7, n. 38.

¹³⁸ Capito's acclaim of d'Arande in his 1528 dedication of *In Hoseam prophetam V.F. Capitonis Commentarius* (Strasbourg, 1528; for text, dated 22 March 1528) may simply have been based on memory and been pure flattery. Capito could however have had some more recent information, since Marguerite's circle and the Strasbourg group remained in some contact throughout 1526-1530, on which see below. See further for a full translation of text and notes, Olivier Millet, "Wolfgang Fabricius Capiton à Marguerite de Navarre (1528): Dédicace de *In Hoseam prophetam commentarius*," *Le livre et la Réforme*, ed. Rodoloph Peter and Bernard Roussel (Bordeaux: Soc. des Bibliophiles de Guyenne, 1987), 201-216; and partial translation and notes Herminjard 2, no. 227, 119-123.

¹³⁹ Louis-Anselme Boyer de Sainte-Marthe, *Histoire de l'église cathédrale de Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, avec une chronologie de tous les évêques qui l'ont gouvernée* (Avignon: François-Sebastien Offray, 1710), 213-218, 216-217 for d'Arande's synod.

¹⁴⁰ 1 January 1527, ZW 9, no. 568, 4-6; Herminjard 2, no. 190, 3-5. Marguerite has Roussel and another 'Christian' preacher at court. He 'devours' prayers for the luke-warm court and will soon be preaching in Blois. Berquin and Aimé Meigret have been released. The king favors the Gospel. The

future reformed pastor in Switzerland, gave heterodox sermons there on the epistles of St. Paul, which Clément Marot attended.¹⁴¹ That is the last report of evangelical preaching for these years.

All in all, Francis I's religious policy during the period of his children's captivity was one long disappointment for evangelicals. Late in 1526, network members became hopeful when they heard that Francis would call a council to decide the religious controversy. As Farel reported from Strasbourg to Nicolas d'Esch at Metz, based on information he had from Roussel, Francis I would assemble the churches of France to ensure that evangelicals were no longer persecuted and allowed to preach. Farel put this development down to Marguerite's influence: "The Marguerite is as bright as ever and she had preserved in the strength (*virtue*) that the sun of justice has given to her."¹⁴²

Cardinal of Lorraine, Antoine, is not wholly hostile since he wishes to marry: ZW 9, no. 568, 4-5: "Iam quod scribamus, nihil serii occurrit; nam de ecclesiis Galliarum ab oecolampadio quiddam, opinor, accepisti. Domina Dux Alanconiae concionatorum habet Christianum et laterum in aula. Gerardus Rufus ob fratrum preces aulica tedia devorat, aliqui concionator verbi futurus Blesis, quae est egregia urbs regni. Berchinus et Macrinus liberabuntur. Rex verbo favet. Metensis cardinalis non repugnat, cui aiunt connubium ineundem cordi esse."

¹⁴¹ See further, Defaux, ed., Clément Marot, *Oeuvre poétiques*, vol. 1, XV, LXXXIII-LXXXIX, 613; Robert Sauzet, *Mendiants et Réformes: Les réguliers mendiants acteurs du changement religieux dans le royaume de France (1480-1560)*, Tours: Publications de L'Université de Tours, 1994: "Malingre (Thomas), O.P., ou Maliques de Morvilliers. Ami de Clément Marot, en 1527, il prononce à Blois des sermons hérétiques détestant publiquement la messe," citing, *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'ordre de St. Dominique*, no. 29, p. 13; A. Guerrier, in *Histoire de Blois*, 1988, p. 99; Samuel Mours, *Le protestantisme en France au XVIème siècle*, 1959, 56. Upon reaching Switzerland, Malingre was the author or editor of at least eleven collections of religious songs or verse, see Higman, *Piety*, C 95, C 99, C 101, C 102, M5 - M 10. One of these, *L'epistre envoyée à Clement Marot* welcomed the famed poet to Switzerland during his second exile, testifying to their long friendship, see Higman, *Piety*, M 5.

¹⁴² "Le roy a propousé d'assembler ceux de France, pour terminer aussy ces questions, ou pour ne plus chasser ceux qui portent l'Évangile, lesquelz il veut qu'ilz soient ouys, et pour tout rompre. La marguerite est tousjours claire et garde la vertu que le soleil de justice luy a donné; ... Il n'y a une au près de la marguerite que luyt, et est mise au descouvert, prenant son lustre de l'or de la Sainte Escripiture, la quelle est annoncée par elle purement; et j'espore que plusieurs autres seront aussy enchassés en ce bel or et nétés et acoustrés: ce que devons prier, car ce que vous escriptz n'est pas affin que les adversaires le sachent et méient payne de leur empescher, mais pour la consolations des fidèles, affin qu'ilz prient Nostre Seigneur que sa sainte Parolle aye lieu et par tout soyt adnuncée." 16 October 1526, Herminjard 5, no.

Those councils were long delayed. When they finally met in 1528 under the leadership of Chancellor Duprat and François Tournon, their main purpose was to obtain a grant of four tenths from the clergy for Francis's war effort, which the Pope had authorized.¹⁴³ As reward for their help, the councils were allowed to pass a series of strong edicts against the Lutherans. The councils of 1528 were simply a repeat of those of 1522 and Louise's policy during the Regency: an exchange of support against heresy in return for gold and obedience.

All the while, the punishment of heretics and other religious criminals was set on slow-burn.¹⁴⁴ Leaving aside the lesser charges and punishments,¹⁴⁵ the list of those executed is still impressive. In September 1525, a young lawyer went to the stake at Paris for being a Lutheran.¹⁴⁶ The next year, a young man from Auxerre was executed for

182a, 398-411: 403-404.

¹⁴³ As reported by Driart in February 1527, Papal bulls were published requiring the tenths to be paid to Francis I on pain of excommunication, privation of benefices, and prison, see Bournon, *Chronique parisienne de Pierre Driart*, 122-123.

¹⁴⁴ In his recent monograph on heresy trials in France, William Monter makes an artificial distinction between the execution of "true protestant martyrs" and others guilty of religious crimes. See William Monter, *Judging the French Reformation: Heresy Trials by Sixteenth-Century Parlements* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 58-64. See further note 146.

¹⁴⁵ Many of these cases have been related above in relationship to the Meaux group and Briçonnet's actions after 1526.

¹⁴⁶ 17 September 1525: "L'an mil cinq cens vingt cinq, un jeune filz d'environ vingt et huict ans, licentié ès loix, nommé maistre Guillaume Hubert ou Joubert, filz de l'avocat du Roi à la Rochelle, demeurant à Paris pour aprendre la pratique, après avoir esté prisonnier environ quinze jours seullement, le samedy dix septiesmes fevrier, [Lalanne: veille des Brandons], fut par le bourreau mené en un tombereau devant l'église Nostre Dame de Paris et devant l'église de Sainte Geneviefve, par arest de la cour, où il fist amende honorable, criant mercy à Dieu, à la Vierge Marie et à madame Sainte Geneviefve; et ce pour avoir tenu la doctrine de Luther et mesdit de Dieu, de Nostre Dame et des saintz et saintes du Paradis. De là fut mené à la place Maubert où il eust la langue percée, puis fust estranglé et bruslé, mourant neantmoins bon repentant et reconnoissant bien avoir deservi la mort." [Emphasis added]. Bourrilly, *Bourgeois*, 363. Monter does not count this as an instance of an execution for Lutheran belief, but will the death of Denis Rieux, who was guilty of "saying that the Virgin Mary had no more power than an image that he held in his hand and then broke." Monter's basis for distinguishing the two cases so neatly is not clear. *Prima facie* the two cases seem similar and any formal distinction would have to be substantiated with evidence from their trial records. See Monter, *Judging the French Reformation*, 61-63.

stealing a hostiary from the parish church of the arch-heresy hunter Guillaume Duschêne, a crime which prompted in addition an expiatory procession.¹⁴⁷ On 28 August 1526, Jacques Pauvans of Meaux perished in the flames for his recidivism.¹⁴⁸ On 4 March 1527, a *prothonotaire* (an administrative official in the church) from Anjou, went to the stake, where he was strangled and then burned along with his trial records.¹⁴⁹ In December of that year, a minor noble named de la Tour burned for heresy at Paris.¹⁵⁰ In 1528, “Lutherans or some other enemies of the Catholic faith” destroyed a statue of the Virgin and Child in Paris, inciting Francis I to make an expiatory procession and replace the damaged Madonna and child with a magnificent replica in silver. Had the culprits been caught, they would surely have burned. In December, Denis Rieux a boatman from Meaux was executed.¹⁵¹ The following year, 1529, a new edict against blasphemy was cried on the streets of Paris.¹⁵² In August 1529, a draper was sentenced to death for swearing by the Virgin while playing dice. Such punishments for blaspheming were, in the pursuit of heresy, the equivalent of indicting a Mafia boss on charges of failure to pay taxes. In May 1530, there were executions nearly every day, many for crimes of heresy,

¹⁴⁷ Given the parish targeted by the ‘thief’ and his companion, who escaped, and the object stolen, a monstrosity for the host, the act may have been more than a sacrilegious act motivated by greed, but an act of iconoclasm as well. See Bourrilly, *Bourgeois*, 373-374. Cf. Monter, *Judging the French Reformation*, 61-62. The thief was not a “boatman” as per Monter, but “un jeune homme d’environ vingt quatre ans, natif et marié à Auxerre, et bastelier.” The boatman was Denis Rieux of Meaux in 1528 (Monter, 63). Note well, some religious criminals escaped: During these years a mouse that stole the consecrated host during mass managed to elude pursuit. No doubt the mouse communed unworthily. One may suspect that the rodent was allowed to escape, for finding him may have presented more problems, both theological and practical, than catching it was worth. *Cronique François Ier*, 81-82.

¹⁴⁸ Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 291-292; Driart, 120.

¹⁴⁹ Although Pierre Driart does not specifically say that the *prothonotaire* was guilty of heresy, the manner of his execution strongly suggests it. See, Bournon, *Chronique parisienne de Pierre Driart*, 124.

¹⁵⁰ Monter, *Judging the French Reformation*, table of heresy executions on 251.

¹⁵¹ Bourrilly, *Bourgeois*, 364.

including several from Ivry (Livry) and Meaux who denied purgatory and the intercession of the saints.¹⁵³

Against these executions, chroniclers from Paris juxtaposed several miraculous interventions by the Virgin Mary and the saints. In 1528, the Virgin's lacerated statue resuscitated a stillborn child.¹⁵⁴ In 1528, a criminal sentenced to death, who was devoted to the Virgin, though he was hung in due form, was miraculously preserved by her, "*quod pie creditur*."¹⁵⁵ The people declared 1530 to be the year of miracles, because Mary and other saints, in response to repeated prayers and processions, saved them from a series of natural disasters.¹⁵⁶ By the time that the king's sons were freed from captivity, Marguerite's evangelical network did not just have the Parlement against them, but, in the eyes of many Parisians, the saints and the Queen of Heaven.

The Clandestine Evangelical Press

The third and final trial of Louise de Berquin resulted in his death on 17 April 1529 before a crowd of 20,000 onlookers.¹⁵⁷ The Virgin too had played her part in

¹⁵² Bourrilly, *Bourgeois*, 365.

¹⁵³ During a plague scare, heresy suspect from Meaux were summarily executed: "Durant ce temps [c. 5 May 1530], fut faicte fort grosses justices de plusieurs mauvais garçons prisonniers, tant pour la multitude estant ès prisons que parce que il estoit bruit que la peste se estoit mise à la Conciergerie du Palays. Il n'estoit jour que il n'y en eust de panduz et estranglez et les aultres bruslez. Aussi, durant ce temps, furent faict pugnitions de quelques habitens de Meaulx qui tenoient l'erreur de Luther et aultres aussy frapez de pareille maladie qui estoient d'Ivery près Paris, qui dissoient indiscrettement que il n'y avoit point de purgatoire et que sans cause estoit l'intercession des saintz implorée et firent amende honorable au parvy Nostre Dame." Fagniez, *Versoris*, 126, no. 422.

¹⁵⁴ Fagniez, *Versoris*, 112-114, no. 379; Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 132-133.

¹⁵⁵ Fagniez, *Versoris*, 115, no. 384; Bournon, *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, 135.

¹⁵⁶ "Dieu nous fist miracle tout evident et fust ceste année dicte et jugée année des miracles." Fagniez, *Versoris*, 123-124, no. 420; Fagniez, *Versoris*, 123-124.

¹⁵⁷ Berquin's execution was a major event noted by all chroniclers: Versoris, 119, no. 396; Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 378; and Driart, 138-139. In 1526, Driart had been one of the ecclesiastical judges

brining him to trial: Berquin's servant had fainted in front of a statue of her and on him were found compromising letters that contributed to his conviction for heresy.¹⁵⁸

The notoriety of Berquin's three trials risks overshadowing the significance of his actual heretical deeds. On one level, Berquin's case was an important test of wills between conservatives and the crown, emblematic of the consistent pressure from below on the royal court to exterminate heresy. Oddly, although Berquin was a notorious heretic, his crimes were not manifestly public. He was not a popular preacher or brash barrister, but a scholar, writer, and translator, in short, one of the leading evangelical authors of that era, most of whose writings were privately held in manuscript or published anonymously. He became infamous because he was indicted, not the reverse.

While little is known about Berquin's actual publications or circle of friends after 1523, the evidence points to a strong connection with Marguerite and her evangelical network. After having helped to save him in 1523 and 1526, she tried yet again to exculpate him during his final trial. When begging Francis to intervene on behalf of "le povere Berquin," whom he had save twice before, Marguerite claimed that Berquin would to show that "the forgers of heretics slander and disobey you more than they are

brought in by the juges délégués, who condemned Berquin as a Lutheran heretic, see *ibid.*, 115. Génin quotes an account of Berquin's death in 1529 from a contemporary source, which says that 20,000 people were at his sentencing on the 16th, the day before his execution. Génin 1, 219, no. 54.

For studies of Berquin's final trial, see Romain Rolland's extremely rich article in which he shows with many manuscript sources that Berquin's trial in 1528-1529 was but one element in a bitter struggle between conservatives and evangelicals: "Le Dernier Procès de Louis de Berquin, 1527-1529" *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 12 (1892), 314-325. See further Telle, Longeon, and Farge as cited in chapter 6, n. 95.

¹⁵⁸ See V. L. Bourrilly, "Une lettre inédite de Louis de Berquin (26 décembre 1526)," *BSHPPF* 51 (1902): 634-637, 637.

zealous for the faith.”¹⁵⁹ Marguerite was obviously very close to Berquin. One chronicler claimed that after his release in late 1526, Marguerite had hired Berquin into her household at the request of her husband, Henry d’Albret.¹⁶⁰ Although Berquin does not appear on Marguerite’s roles for those years (it was probably the Queen who installed Berquin on her husband’s roles), it is noteworthy that her close connection with the arch heretic was public knowledge. Other testimony of Berquin’s important role within the network exists. In a poem that long remained in manuscript, Marguerite’s secretary, Clément Marot advised the “Mercury of Germany”¹⁶¹ [Berquin] to seek his fortune with the Duchess of Alençon.¹⁶² After Berquin’s execution, Marot or another close to him denounced Berquin’s judges in a vitriolic poem that remained unpublished during the sixteenth century.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ “...les forgeurs d’hérétiques plus maldisans et désobéissans à vous que zélateurs de la foy.” [Before 7 March, 1529], Génin 2, no. 51, 97 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 434). Marguerite repeats the same themes and uses the same terms, e.g., “zélateurs de verité,” as Berquin had used in justifying himself to Anne de Montmorency in his letter of 26 December 1526, edited by Bourrilly in the work cited in note 158. After the affair of the placards of 1534, Marguerite would similarly claim to her brother that conservatives had ‘planted the placards’ as a ploy to justify unleashing the resulting heresy hunt against evangelicals.

¹⁶⁰ “...Le Roi retourné [March 1526], il le [Berquin] saulva, et le print madame d’Allançon, royne de Navarre, à cause de son mary, en son service. Parquoy Dieu le voulut punir, luy fist enfler le coeur; car luy estant à pleine délivrance, dit et maintint que les dictz juges luy avoient faict tort et les menassa. Si les mist en procès en la cour de Parlement, disant qu’il en vouloit avoir réparation.” This passage comes in the course of recounting the history leading to Berquin’s 1529 arrest and burning. Lalanne, *Bourgeois*, 380.

¹⁶¹ For the designation of Berquin as the “Mercury of Germany,” see Claude Longeon, ed., “Introduction” to *La Farce des Théologastres*, TLF 366, (Geneva: Droz, 1989).

¹⁶² *Mercur en forme de Rondeau*, “Mille douleurs te feront souspirer...” the poet tells ‘Mercure’ [= Berquin]: “Donc si tu quieres au grand chemin tirer/ D’honneur, et bien, vueilles toy retirer/ Vers d’Alençon la Duchesse excellente/ Et de tes faitz (tels qui sont) luy pressente/ Car elle peult te garder d’endurer/ Mille douleurs....” Clément Marot, *Oeuvres* [Sébastien Gryphe, 1538], ff. 32-33, d8v-e1r. This poem is not included in Defaux’s edition of Marot’s *Oeuvres poétiques*, though he uses Gryphe’s 1538 edition as one of his principal witnesses for Marot’s work, precisely because it was authorized and likely corrected by Marot himself. Nor does Defaux mention this poem in his *Le poète en son jardin*.

¹⁶³ See ‘L’Epistre de Barquin,’ in Defaux, ed., *Oeuvres poétiques*, vol. 2, 71-73 with notes, 840-844.

Furthermore, the little that is known or suspected about Berquin's literary output leads deep into the Navarrian network's ongoing clandestine publishing campaign in the late 1520s. Berquin had vowed to revenge himself on his accusers of 1526. The literary manifestation of his vengeance inscribed itself in a long battle of books with Noel Beda and other leading conservatives on the Paris Faculty of Theology. Lefèvre d'Étaples commentaries on the New Testament and many of Erasmus' works had, after the Luther condemnation, become the chief targets of the Faculty's censorship campaign. In 1526, despite the hesitation of the Parlement and rest of the Faculty of Theology in proceeding against the heretics after the return of Francis I, Beda published his *Annotationes* against Lefèvre and Erasmus. First Lefèvre d'Étaples and then Berquin meditated self-justifying attacks on their persecutors.¹⁶⁴ After 1526, works published against the syndic of the Faculty and his ilk mounted. About this time appeared the scathing *La Farce des Theologastres*, which has been attributed to Berquin or his intimates.¹⁶⁵ In 1527 and 1528 were published twelve articles against Beda's purported symbol of faith in Latin, the *Duodecim Articuli*, followed by *13 propositions* in French taken from the syndics' works. Both have been loosely attributed to Berquin, but given that Lefèvre planned to respond directly to Beda, his hand may have been in them as well. For his part, Erasmus responded to his Parisian critics with at least five works: *Notatiunculae ad naenias Bedaicas*;¹⁶⁶ *Elenchus in censuras Bedae*;¹⁶⁷ *Dilutio contra Clichtove*;¹⁶⁸ *Apologia*

¹⁶⁴ See Roussel's letter to Farel, 27 August 1526, Herminjard I, no. 182, 448-451; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 9, 197-198..

¹⁶⁵ See Claude Longeon's fine edition as in note 162.

¹⁶⁶ Farge, *Registre* I, 1528, n. 52.

¹⁶⁷ Farge, *Registre* I, 159A, 209B.

adversus debacchationes P. Sutoris;¹⁶⁹ and *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae*.¹⁷⁰ In Beda's *Apologia Natalis Bedae Theologi, aduersus clandestinos Lutheranos* (1529),¹⁷¹ in addition to defending himself against Erasmus, the syndic attacked a number of possible candidates for the authorship of the 12 and 13 articles against him: Martial Mazurier, Pierre Caroli, and Louse Berquin. Clichtove and other members of the Faculty joined ranks with Beda by publishing other Latin works against the 'hidden' Lutherans of the realm. In addition, Clichtove was the main advisor and drafter of the anti-heresy articles promulgated at the Council of Sens in 1528. The evangelicals struggle with Beda and his colleagues continued into the 1530s.¹⁷²

Along with the *Sentence de Jehan Guibert*, the network's tracts against Beda and the other *théologastres* were but one arm of their literary campaign. The *Instruction initiatore*, a manuscript made for Marguerite whose liminary poem was quoted at the head of chapter seven, points further to the complicity between Berquin, the printer Simon Du Bois, Marguerite, and the rest of her circle of evangelical writers. In the first place, circa 1529, Simon Du Bois printed the treatise on confession contained in the manuscript. Though the prose was substantially reworked, the content of this treatise remained essentially the same between the manuscript and printed versions. The work instructs believers to confess first to God and then to faithful persons, who need not be priests, in order for their sins to be forgiven. The author does not do away with the

¹⁶⁸ Farge, *Registre* 1, 339 A.

¹⁶⁹ Farge, *Registre* 1, 141 C.

¹⁷⁰ Farge, *Registre* 1, 339 B, 340 A, 342 A, 342 A.

¹⁷¹ Reprinted in d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, vol. 3. pt. 2: 2-80. Paris: A. Cailleau, 1736.

formal ritual of confessing to priests, as all laypersons were required to do once per year. Rather the treatise instructs the penitent to observe the church's law, but to only consider the priest's words of absolution as a sign of God's forgiveness and not as its actual conveyance through their priestly power of the keys. As for any penances imposed, the treatise tells believers to do them in humble faith, not as repayments for the debt of their sins, but in order not to scandalize their neighbors who have not yet understood that forgiveness comes from God alone. This Nicodemite approach to the sacrament of penance is reminiscent of Jean Guibert's practice of hearing confession, in which he did not claim to grant absolution—a practice that his final judges upheld as licit—as well as of Gérard Roussel's later transformation of the sacrament in his diocese of Oloron.¹⁷³ Notably, the section on confessing to a priest was dropped when it was later reprinted at Geneva.

The translations of the two Brenz catechisms in the *Instruction initiatore*, betrays other interconnections between the evangelical ranks. In an exact parallel to Berquin's practice in his augmented translation of Erasmus' treatises of the Ten Commandments and Credo, the translations of the Brenz catechisms clearly signal the presence of interpolated additions in the margin of the work.¹⁷⁴ Some of these are marked "addition," others by the name "Claudius."¹⁷⁵ These gestures, which exhibit a scrupulous respect for

¹⁷² See Chapter 9.

¹⁷³ See Chapter 10.

¹⁷⁴ I will provide a full study of this manuscript's text in the forthcoming work mentioned in Chapter 7, n. 4.

¹⁷⁵ Many of these additions give a sharper critical edge to Brenz's original work. For example, Brenz defines the church as: "Quid dicitur Ecclesia lingua nobis vernacula? Responsio. Congregatio, non illa quidem lignorum et lapidum, sed populi Dei." *D. Martini Lutheri Theologi, Catechismus, lectu*

the original text, reveal an intimate world of mutual recognition. They presuppose that the reader (Marguerite) knew the content of the original work, the identity of the original author, Johannes Brenz, the identity of the translator/compiler, who likely provided the passages marked 'addition'—Simon Du Bois and Roussel have been suggested—as well as, the identity of the second set of additions by the mysterious "Claudius." Moreover, this text was obviously either destined to be printed or had already been printed by Simon Du Bois at the time it was copied. The scribe copied catch-words at the bottom of most pages, a procedure common in the type-setting of printed books, but one that made no sense in manuscripts (at least with the frequency found in the *Instruction initiatore*), even ones copied in pre-formed quires of parchment. One can only assume that Marguerite's intimates had or were intending to print these catechisms with her approval.

These links between Berquin, Marguerite, and her circle to Du Bois establish their complicity in the ongoing production of evangelical tracts. In 1528, Simon Du Bois printed for Chestien Wechel, who had received a royal privilege, the most popular evangelical work of the early French reformation: the *Livre de vraie et parfaict oraison* (Paris, July 1528).¹⁷⁶ The book is an amalgam of many short catechetical works whose

dignissimus, latinus factus per Vincentium Obsopoeum. Huic adiecti sunt alij quoque gemini Catechismi,[!] Iohannis Brentij Ecclesiastae Hallensis, eodem interprete. Haganoae, An. M. D. XXIX. R3r [question 47]. Paris, BPF Rés. 11,962(1). The *Initiatore* introduction expands: "Theophile. Que signifie eglise en notre langue commune? Theodidacte, Eglise, signifie congregation. Quant doncques nous disons. le croy la congregation, *non pas ce monceau de boys et de pierres, ou la multitude des antichristians, ministres, qui ne sont rien moins que vnion ou congregation, veu que chacun deulx veult estre differend de lautre, tant en sentence, ou opinion, que en supersticieuses et hipocriticques ceremonies.* Et quoy doncques? la compaignie totale du peuple de dieu. Cest adire des chrestiens qui sont le vray temple de dieu, et qui tous iouxte le commandement de leur maistre, sent vne mesme chose, et demeurent en vne mesme reigle, saichans [24 r.] que quiconques se retire dunite. Il se retire de dieu." 23v. Emphasis added.

¹⁷⁶ Francis M. Higman, "Luther et la piété de l'église gallicane: le *Livre de vraye et parfaicte oraison*," *Révue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* 63 (1980), 91-111; Higman, Piety, L 97 as in

eclectic origins reflects the diversity of influences and multiple textual connections within Marguerite's network. Among the work's ten parts—which were printed in the first edition as separately signed segments, possibly for individual sale as pamphlets—were parts of Farel and Berquin's previous works on the symbols of the faith, passages of Scripture taken from Lefèvre's translations, and other texts which had previously been published by Du Bois. The two homilies by Chrysostom, which were some of the first works by this Greek father to appear in French translation, likely had been reprinted from a lost edition by the Meaux group (probably by Lefèvre or Roussel) that, as related above, Bishop Briçonnet had had published during the years of the Meaux experiment.

During the time that the network's public work was largely on hold, the presses of Simon Du Bois and Martin Lempereur continued to produce its devotional tracts, Lefèvre's Bible translations, and controversialist works. In the first category, were more translations of works by Luther, Erasmus, Brunfels, and the pseudonymous Hermann Bodius, who may have been Martin Bucer.¹⁷⁷ While not all of these editions can be tied to a specific author or editor in Marguerite's orbit, the evidence that does exist points in that direction. For instance, despite being uninvited from preaching at court in 1526, as was reported to Luther in 1527, Sigismund kept in contact with Marguerite, sending translations of his works to her.¹⁷⁸ Among the evangelical works of these years, two

Appendix B 1.

¹⁷⁷ See Appendix B 1 for the years 1527-1530.

¹⁷⁸ "Sigismundus ille Comes de Hohenloë iussit, ut se tibi vehementer commendarem. Perstat enim in sincera sententia tes eucharistias [in Greek characters], detestaturque ignobilem illorum arrogantiam. Neque cessat libellos tuos in gallicam linguam versos subinde mittere Gallorum regis sorori foemina pietate misericordiaeque erga exules et afflictos singulari. Quam, si tu per otium posses, plurimum cupit libello aliquo per te in tam sancto instituto ut perseveraret adhortari. Nomen illi Margarethae Ducissae ut ferunt

should be held up for special note, for they demonstrate that evangelicals had an ongoing, assertive reforming agenda in their publishing campaign. Sometime after Du Bois' move to Marguerite's Alençon in 1529, he printed the first French translation of the work that had so delighted German evangelicals when it came to their attention: Lorenzo Valla's *On the False Donation of Constantine*.¹⁷⁹ Second, a mysterious little tract claiming to be a work by Augustine clearly declares its controversialist intent in the subtitle:

Divi Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi de contemptu mundi ad clericos libellus, nihil esse eis in terra possidendum demonstrans. Plaude, sacerdotum exploditur philargyria. Si vacat Christiane Lector, an a CHRISTO sui absint discipuli introspecies, sin minus, quae tibi ex isto libello hic praemittimus, ne graveris aspicere, nec ea quidem Lutherus scripsit, nec in lucem edidit, sed pater eius, ut aiunt, professionis diuus Augustinus.

This work has only just been discovered and has not yielded its origins, but it appears to have been part of the evangelicals' printing campaign of these years.¹⁸⁰

The Advent of Protestant Politics

The Du Bellay brothers are justly known for their major roles in the political history of Francis I's reign. In the otherwise excellent studies devoted to the most

Alegoniae. Ita tamen ne hortatu suo id factum esse quisquam resciscat." Nicholas Gerbel to Martin Luther [2 April 1527], WA Br 4, no. 1093, 189, II. 22–30.

¹⁷⁹ Laurentz Valle Poete et Orateur Romain sur la Donation de Constantin Empereur [Alençon, Simon Du Bois, 15229-1534?]. See Appendix B 1 in the works listed for 1529. This edition is not signaled in either Moore, *La littérature allemande*, or Higman, *Piety*. It was evidently reprinted at Geneva in 1543, see *Aspects de la propagande religieuse*, 227.

¹⁸⁰ An initial inquiry in the *Patrologia latina* database has not allowed this author to establish that this title or its incipit is indeed from a work by Augustine. The tract's date of publication is conjectured based on it being bound in a contemporary binding with Louise de Berquin?, *Duodecim Articuli infidelitatis magistri Natalis Bedae*, [Paris: Josse Bade, 1527?] (B Maz. Rés. 18044A 3e p.). a1v: "Audite Fratres charissimi salutiferam patris nostri doctrinam, qui non terrenam, sed aeternam concupiscitis haereditatem, qui non vultis sortem accipere in terra morientium, sed cum psalmista decantare, Portio mea in terra viventium, qui Aegyptum reliquistis, & ad promissionis terram festinatis."

important of the brothers, Guillaume and Jean, assisted by René and Martin, three important points have been downplayed. First, Marguerite cultivated their careers from their beginnings in the 1520s. Second, their collaboration was founded upon a set of shared commitments to: furthering the dynastic ambitions of Francis I, patronizing scholars and poets of the new renaissance letters, and promoting an evangelical reform of the Gallican church. Third, they collaborated closely to promote this agenda throughout the 1530s and 1540s.¹⁸¹ Exploring the first and second points briefly here, will lead into a discussion of the first development of Protestant politics at the court of Francis I, thus preparing the way for an examination of its more momentous episodes during the following decades.

Guillaume and Jean Du Bellay made their first major contributions to the royal regime during Francis I's captivity. After several perilous journeys to Italy on furtive missions for the crown during the first days of Francis's captivity, Marguerite selected Guillaume Du Bellay to accompany her as one of her councilors during her trip to Spain. In 1527, she helped to secure the see of Bayonne for his brother Jean. In 1528, she ensured that Guillaume Du Bellay was paid by the royal chancery for all the expenses he

¹⁸¹ Jean Du Bellay is often said to have been a protégé of Anne de Montmorency. This view fails to account for the following: 1). Everyone at court after 1527, when Montmorency became Grand Master of the royal house, had to go through Montmorency for royal and ecclesiastical appointments as well as in diplomatic affairs. 2). Everyone therefore was 'his good friend' including Marguerite at least as far as was required by their having to work through him to get to the king. 3). All foreigners recognized Jean and Guillaume as more or less sincerely evangelical and Anne de Montmorency as a staunch, though pragmatic conservative. 4) When Montmorency fell in 1542, Jean did not tumble thereafter, as did Montmorency's other protégés, rather Montmorency's enemies, such as the Duchesse d'Estampes counted Jean Du Bellay as an ally. 5). When Henry II came to power with Montmorency as his chief minister, Jean Du Bellay was sidelined to Rome. [See Potter for the claims about Jean Du Bellay's relationship with Montmorency].

had incurred in serving the crown.¹⁸² The Chancellor, Cardinal Antoine Du Prat, had scolded Guillaume as incompetent and a waster of the king's funds, preventing the him from being paid. More than just intergovernmental power politics was at play here. By 1528, conservatives and evangelicals at court were becoming known as such, leading to factional struggles. In the summer of that year, an anonymous Catholic, probably an Italian under the inspiration of the members of the Faculty of Theology, wrote to Rome from Paris to protest the recomposition of the *juges délégués*. He claimed that although Francis and Louise were good Catholics, they had been prompted by "others close to them" (alluding to Marguerite) to reconstitute the commission which was now stacked with "declared or suspected Lutherans." The time had come that:

... the heretics seek to depose saintly judges using Langey [Guillaume Du Bellay, then French ambassador to Rome], who is also of the sect... wishing to replace them with men who incline to their party.... All these heretics collude and are working together (much better than are the just), and they are determined to spread their heresy. If the Devil is able (and you have opened the door with the Pope's bull), you will not have to wait long before you hear that France has been as badly ruined as Germany.¹⁸³

Reflecting the views of conservatives at Paris, whose fears that the heretics would take over were exaggerated, the Du Bellay brothers were already considered to be linchpins of the evangelical party at court. This letter helps to explain why Jean Du Bellay was investigated for a short time in 1530 as a heretic.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸² 1528, 30 April; & Jourda 404 and 407.

¹⁸³ Romain Rolland, "Le dernier procès de Louis de Berquin, 1927-1529," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 12 (1892): 314-325; 317-319.

¹⁸⁴ BPF MS 140, "Religionnaires: Procès et procédures contre eux," copied from the records of the Parlement of Paris, fol. 13 r and 14 r: Jean du Bellay investigated as a heretic. 12 September 1530. "Chambres assemblées le Roi se plaint à la cour de l'avis qu'elle avait informé contre l'évêque de Bayonne

Throughout the period 1528 through 1530, Marguerite was in close contact with both Du Bellay brothers as they played major roles in France's missions to Rome and England, especially as Henry VIII's Great Matter unfolded.¹⁸⁵ At the beginning of 1531, Marguerite had Jean Du Bellay by her side for a conference whose purpose is not known. In September of that year, Marguerite and her mother recommended him for the see of Paris, whose appointment he received shortly thereafter. Thus one of her trusted evangelical allies was established in perhaps the most important ecclesiastical post in the realm for countering the power of the conservative party.¹⁸⁶

No immediate positive results for Marguerite's network came from her collaboration with the Du Bellays. Yet the foundation of their subsequent attempts to promote an evangelical settlement for France through foreign intrigues was being laid. From 1528-1531, protestants in southern Germany and Switzerland started to make the first overtures towards France in order to gain its support in a grand alliance against the Emperor. These beginnings of France's involvement in Protestant politics are shrouded

[Jean du Bellay] pour crimes d'hérésies lequel était de son conseil et commandement sur tous les autres prélats du Royaume réponse aux députés que la cour ne sait ce que c'est qu'elle députera vers sa Majesté aucuns des Messieurs qui lui apporteraient le procès du prisonnier où l'on dit qu'il a été informé contre l'évêque." 20 December 1530 "Rapport des députés d'être allés vers le Roi pour lui faire entendre que ce qui lui avait été dit contre led. évêque n'était par véritable."

¹⁸⁵ For French involvement in the build up to Henry VIII's 'divorce' see the rich documentation in Guy Bedouelle and Patrick le Gal, *Le "Divorce" du Roi Henry VIII: Etudes et documents* (Geneva: Droz, 1987). The Du Bellay brothers, their agents such as Doctor Gervais Wain, and Marguerite and her husband Henri d'Albret would all play their part in coercing judgments favorable to Henry VIII from the faculties of law and theology within the realm. See further, Farge, *Orthodoxy* and Joachim Le Grand, *Histoire du divorce de Henry VIII, Roy d'Angleterre, et de Catherine d'Aragon*, 3 vols. (Paris: M.G. Baguenault, 1688).

For Marguerite's contact with Jean Du Bellay while on ambassadorial missions, see Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 408, 429, 430, 467, and 495.

¹⁸⁶ Marguerite to Anne de Montmorency, [September 1531], Génin 1, no. 96, 276-277 (Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 517).

in some mystery and have never been studied as a whole. Here only an outline of them can be developed.

In the first place, the German and Swiss used the network of French evangelicals as their conduit to the French court. The reformers at Strasbourg had remained actively interested in promoting the evangelical cause in France even after Farel's defection. There was an overt religious cover and a furtive political underbelly to this development. In March 1528, Sigismund von Hohenlohe finally made his longed-for journey to France as ambassador from Strasbourg. The purpose of his mission is not explained in the sources, but it coincided with Marguerite's return to court in the Paris region from an extended trip in her new southern territories. The only known result was that Francis I commissioned Hohenlohe to engage a company of 3,000 Landsknechts for France.¹⁸⁷ While Sigismund's contact with Marguerite and France continued until 1530, its nature and purpose is unknown and deserves further research.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁷ Rodolphe Peter, "Strasbourg et la Réforme française vers 1525," in *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVI^e siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre. Actes du colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975)*, edited by Georges Livet and Francis Rapp, (Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977), p. 269-283.

¹⁸⁸ After Sigismund's return to Strasbourg, Marguerite and he exchanged a further set of letters in June 1528, see Rodolphe Peter, "Strasbourg et la Réforme française vers 1525," in *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVI^e siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre, Actes du Colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975)*, ed. Georges Livet and Francis Rapp (Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977), 269-283; 274.

In December 1528, a certain Stiebar, evidently a Swiss student from Basel then studying in Paris wrote to Amerbach about his potential involvement with Sigismund's troop raising for Francis I: "Comes de Hoenlohe non modo aureos montes est pollicitus, sed nolo ullis rebus me implicari; id mihi propemodum contigit. Cuius gratia Basileae dixeram hic me aliquot menses restitutum." Stiebar, Paris, 21 December 1528, AK 3, no. 1314, p. 381.

On 15 December 1529, Bucer reported that Sigismund von Hohenlohe had returned from France with news about an anti-evangelical league. This was probably an exaggerated interpretation of the terms of the Ladies Peace: "Comes ab Hocheloë germanus, qui a Gallis huc pridem rediit, invulgat neque incredibile neque inexpectatum foedus, quod in Elvetios et respublicas ab euangelio stantes moliuntur monarche, nempe pontifex Rhomanus, caesar, Gallus, Ferdinandus, Stephanus a Gyß, Lotaringiae ducis frater. Non deerunt reliqui episcopi, neque impediet eventus aliquis tam [tetrum] ac funestum consilium, nisi Tucus perrexerit; adeo se confirmarunt adversus libertatem et evangelium." ZW 10, no. 943, 355-357, 357; Bucer

While these political contacts were being engaged, Marguerite's reputation for supporting the evangelical cause encouraged Capito, Bucer, and Zwingli to dedicate several of their books to her, the king, and other members of the royal family.¹⁸⁹ Bucer's dedication of his commentary on the Psalms to the Dauphin on 13 July 1529 coincided with the negotiations for the Treaty of Cambrai (3 August 1529). Based on insider information, Bucer called public attention to the fact that Lefèvre d'Étaples was tutor the king's children and using Psalms in his lessons. Given the timing and target of his dedication, his undeclared intent seems to have been to help jump-start the prospects for evangelical renewal in France at the very moment that it appeared likely Francis I's hands would be freed by the return of his children.

Similarly, Zwingli's dedication of his *Christianae fidei brevis et clara expositio ad regem Christianum* [*Fidei expositio*] in July 1531 to both Francis I and Marguerite, points to a second and initially more important track of possible collaboration between France and the protestant powers.¹⁹⁰ Zwingli and Philip of Hesse had been meditating a

Corr. 3, no. 262, 342-345.

Finally, in December 1530, the Small Council of Strasbourg received a long report, possibly from Sigismund, about the evangelicals in France and at court, including Marguerite, d'Arande Caroli, Roussel, and Lefèvre d'Étaples, as well as detailed advice about whom to approach in the king's council in order to promote better relations with the German Protestants. See *Politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg* I, no. 857, 561-565.

¹⁸⁹ Rudolph Peter and Bernard Roussel, eds., *Le livre et la Réforme* (Bordeaux: Société des bibliophiles de Guyenne, 1987): articles by G. Schrenck, "La dédicace à François Ier du *De vera et falsa religione commentarius* de H. Zwingli (mars 1525); B. Roussel, "Wolfgang Fabricius Capiton à Marguerite de Navarre (1528): dédicace de *In Hoseam prophetam commentarius*;" O. Millet, "Le félin et le dauphin: Martin Bucer dédie ses commentaires sur le psautier au fils de François Ier." See also Olivier Millet, "Wolfgang Fabricius Capiton à Marguerite de Navarre (1528): dédicace de *In Hoseam prophetam commentarius*," *Revue française d'histoire du livre*, n. s. 50 (1986) 201-216.]

¹⁹⁰ On two possible directions of south German Protestants political allegiance, either with the princes in the north or the Swiss cities with whom they had historically closer ties, see the masterful account by Thomas A. Brady, jr., *Protestant Politics: Jacob Sturm (1489-1553) and the German Reformation*, *Studies in German Histories* (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1995), 65-80.

military alliance against the Emperor since before the Marburg colloquy.¹⁹¹ They intended to entice France into joining their cause. Contacts with the French ambassadors Lambert Meigret, brother of the deceased heretic Aimé, and Louis Dangerant [Boisrigault] broached a semi-official connection between the French court and south German and Swiss Protestant powers.

In this context of possible political collaboration with the Protestant powers of Germany and Switzerland, Marguerite sent her powerful and telling message to Martin Bucer at the Diet of Augsburg, pleading with the Protestant powers to put forward a common confession to the Emperor in order to help the evangelical cause in France.¹⁹² How Marguerite and her entourage had become so well informed about German politics is not known. They clearly recognized the importance of this moment in imperial affairs and for the future of the evangelical cause in general. With the king's children on the verge of being returned (9 August 1530), Marguerite and her advisors acted promptly and

¹⁹¹ The first phase of Zwingli and Hesse's plans is only cursorily studied by Albet Hyrvoix whose source rich and bizarrely confessional article concentrates on the events of 1531 leading up to the second Cappel War, see Albert Hyrvoix de Landosle, "François Ier et la première guerre de religion en Suisse," *Revue des Questions historiques* 71 (1902): 464-537. To his rich documentation should be added some two dozen letters in volumes 10 and 11 of ZW between Zwingli and the two French ambassadors, Lambert Meigret, who had Protestant leanings, and, Louise Dangerant [Boisrigault], who seems to have been a traditional catholic. Initial inspection indicates that Meigret and Zwingli tried to quietly bypass Boisrigault at times. The multiple levels of complicity, which were dictated by the respective religious views of the diplomatic agents involved, was typical of French diplomatic relations.

¹⁹² See Chapter 2, p. 63. Notably Bucer wrote to Luther (25 August 1530) one day after he and Melancthon had decided to come to an agreement if possible in order the better to resist the Emperor. See Brady, *Protestant Politics*.

The carrier of Marguerite's letter or message to Bucer was almost certainly Louis de Rabodanges, extraordinary ambassador from France to the Emperor, August-September 1530. CAF 9, p. 41. His instructions were dated 31 July 1530. Marguerite received letters carried by Rabodanges before 7 August 1530 at Blois, see Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 486. Since he next proceeded to the Emperor at the Diet of Augbourg, he, or someone in his train, was the link between Marguerite and others in her entourage at Blois with Bucer at Augsburg in August. Montmorency and the rest of the court would have had no immediate knowledge of her missive since they were far south for the reception of Francis's children on 9 August

daringly outside the official diplomatic channels to urge foreign powers to collaborate with them in promoting the evangelical cause within the realm. Marguerite saw from the beginning of the rise of Protestant politics in the Empire that her network's aspirations for evangelical reform in France depended in large part on the continued success and unity of the German Protestants as well as their willingness to lend a helping hand.¹⁹³

In sum, Marguerite and her network's unofficial relations with reformers abroad had opened the way for the beginning of French involvement in confessionally colored international politics. After the Schmalkald League formed in 1531, France would respond to the opportunity to exploit this arm against the Emperor. The Du Bellay brothers would come to dominate French involvement in this new field of foreign relations for the next dozen years, widening the paths to Strasbourg, Basel, Zurich, and Wittenberg that had already been blazed by evangelical scholars in Marguerite's network.

1530. See Génin 1, p. 260, n. 5; p. 446-447.

¹⁹³ Oecolampadius, who had been such an encouraging supporter of the French evangelicals, expressed some of the earliest and severe doubts to his more politically ambitious colleague Zwingli. In March 1530, he wrote: "De Gallis mihi parva spes est. Quavis enim ratione potius, quam euangelii praetextu, conciliari posse videntur. Utinam saperent!" ZW 10, no. 1005, 532. Even with news of the probable return of Francis I's children, he remained skeptical: "Gallia tardius iacet Christo. Nunciant enim, qui inde hoc Pasca [17 April] venerunt, episcopos et theologos multum grassari in eos, qui Christum profitentur. Ad quod non solum tacet rex, sed et minatur ignem doctissimis Gerard Rufo et Iacobo Fabri et aliis, nisi dissuaserint sorori, quod persuaserunt, videoque optimos nostros amicos, qui illic, valde sibi metuere. Quod si iam reluctatur domino, periculum est, ubi receperit vel non receperit liberos, per hypocrisin simulaturum euangelium." Oecolampadius to Zwingli, 4 May 1530, ZW 10, no. 1018, pp. 564-565; Herminjard 2, no. 290, 249-250.

9. Legitimizing the Evangelical Movement (1531–1539)

The present state of research does not allow the story of Marguerite's network to be told after 1530 as a continuous narrative. Aside from Marguerite's correspondence, few letters exposing the internal life of the network exist; only a patchwork of external reports on the deeds of its leading members survives. This skein of information, nevertheless, attests to their ongoing activity. After the king's children were returned from captivity in 1530, network members became more daring than ever.

With the network's hopes for an evangelical reform resting squarely on the king, Marguerite and her closest allies at court worked to move his policy towards their goals when the political climate was favorable. As it had in the 1520s, their chances for success followed an up-down rhythm in both the 1530s and 1540s. In the early 1530s, a favorable conjunction of events—Henry VIII's break with Rome and the formation of the Schmalkald League—gave the network the opportunity to steer France to an evangelical political and religious alignment. This effort succumbed mid-decade to the after-effects of the 1534 Placards, Anne Boleyn's execution, and the unwillingness of the German Protestants to explore a religious dialogue with the French. Then until 1540 followed a period of pro-imperial, conservative ascendancy at court under Anne de Montmorency, leading in 1538 to the beginning of the crown's first serious attempt to root out heresy. In 1540, after Montmorency's policy of appeasement failed to induce Charles V to tender

Milan to France in an acceptable marriage offer, new room for evangelical policy makers at court opened up.

This chapter will focus on two concurrent and interrelated developments: 1) the preaching campaign at Paris led by Gérard Roussel and Nicholas Cop, which Marguerite sponsored in an attempt to legitimate the evangelical movement; 2) Marguerite and the Du Bellay brothers' attempt to establish a four-way religious concord and political alliance between France, England, the Schmalkald League, and even the Pope that would bring about an evangelical religious settlement as well as a powerful antidote to Hapsburg preponderance.¹ V. L. Bourrilly, Pierre Imbart de la Tour, and Karl Seidel have devoted

¹ A third essential track would be to conduct an integrated survey of all the local evangelical groups in Marguerite's territories, of Alençon, Bourges, Nérac, and beyond in Paris, Lyon, Rouen, Blois, Bordeaux, etc..., but given the present state of scholarship is not possible. The scope of such activity has been suggested in Chapter 2.

Such an inquiry would have to start with the *BSHPF* and journals of local history, which over the past century and a half have contributed a vast number of articles and edited snippets of primary sources for all of these communities. Offering a wealth of information, these articles are of uneven quality and completeness. For the purposes of studying Marguerite and her network, these studies would have to be redone systematically with a similar questionnaire answered in each case. For example, Bernard Roussel has critically examined the beginnings of reform at Alençon and Metz. With scrupulous respect for the sources, he does not accept any predating claims for a coherent movement that are not well documented. In other locales, his critical standard would have to be met through a systematic inquiry into the remaining sources. See, Bernard Roussel, "Marguerite de Navarre: Les débuts de la Réforme et les troubles d'Alençon, 1530-1534," *Société historique et archéologique de L'Orne* 105 (1986), 87-106; *idem*, "Les premières dissidences religieuses du XVI^e siècle à Metz (Hiver 1523 - Été 1525)," in *Les Réformes en Lorraine (1520-1620)*, ed. Louis Châtelier, Centre de Recherches en Histoire sociale et religieuse 2 (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1986), 11-45.

To cite but one important example, a study of Marguerite's territory of Berry and Bourges would yield profitable results. A number of studies have culled interesting vignettes from the capitular records of the archiepiscopal cathedral chapter of Bourges. Along with these, there are also extant records from the town council, university, and other corporations that have not yet been mined. See first Le Vicomte de Brimont, *Le XVI^e siècle et les guerres de la réforme en Berry*, 2 vols., (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1905), 113-182, which is useful but has hardly exhausted the subject, as well as Nathaniel Weiss, "La réforme à Bourges au XVI^e siècle," *BSHPF* 53 (1904), 307-359, 474-478; Louis-Hector Chandru de Raynal, *Histoire de Berry depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789*, 3 vols. (Bourges: Vermeil, 1844-1847); Sylvie Le Clech-Chartron, "Jacques Thiboust, notaire et secrétaire du Roi et familial de Marguerite de Navarre: Amitiés littéraires dans le Berry du 'beau seizième siècle,'" *Cahiers d'archéologie et d'histoire du Berry* 96 (1989), 17-27; Françoise Michaud-Fréjaville, "L'entrée dans sa capitale [Bourges] de Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse de Berry," *Cahiers d'archéologie et d'histoire du Berry* 96 (1989) 7-10; *idem*.

substantial studies to this two-track evangelical campaign.² The account below will strengthen several points in their presentations, demonstrating Marguerite's major role at every stage of these events as well as her full cooperation with the Du Bellay brothers on both the domestic and international fronts in their calculated attempt to legitimize the Evangelical movement.

I. The Evangelical Breakout: Paris 1533-1534

From 1533 to 1534, evangelicals and conservatives battled each other at Paris in a series of turbulent events that claimed the attention of the French public and observers abroad. During Lent 1533, Marguerite had Gérard Roussel preach evangelical sermons at

"Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre, Duchesse de Berry, 'laquelle a fort humainement traité ses sujets de Berry,'" in *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995).

Such an inquest into the locals known to have been strong-holds of Marguerite's network would differ sensibly from Henry Heller's approach to the early reformation which was to take representative cities that saw significant 'Calvinist' agitation and adumbrate a theory of how Calvinism gained ascendancy across France. Rather the procedure outlined here would test the working hypothesis of the existence of evangelical cells organized by leading members of Marguerite's network, which has been formulated based on the evidence reviewed in chapter 7.

Aside from studies on Meaux, the most impressive local religious histories before mid-century have been done on catholic reforms and the always exceptional Waldensian communities. See the works of Venard, Le Maître, Audioso, and Paravay.

² Accounts of the tumultuous events at Paris are a mainstay of all histories of early modern France, including the overview presented in Chapter 1. However, the parallel political events are not taken up in the recent reformation histories of Denis Crouzet, *La genèse de la Réforme française, 1520-1562* or Marc Greengrass, *The Reformation in France*. The compelling integrated accounts of the following authors should be the mainstay of any account of the French reformation in the 1530s: V. L. Bourrilly, "François I^{er} et les Protestants: Les essais de concorde en 1535," *BSHPF* 49 (1900), 337-365, 477-495; *idem*, "Jean Sleidan et le Cardinal du Bellay: Premier séjour de Jean Sleidan en France (1533-1540)," *BSHPF* 50 (1901), 225-242; *idem*, *Guillaume du Bellay, Seigneur de Langey, 1491-1543* (Paris: Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition, 1905); and V. L. Bourrilly and Nathaniel Weiss, "Jean du Bellay, les Protestants et la Sorbonne (1529-1535)," *BSHPF* 52 (1903): 193-231; 53 (1904), 97-143; Imbart 3, book 3, 498-578; and Karl Josef Seidel, *Frankreich und die deutschen Protestanten: die Bemühungen um ein religiöse Konkordie und die französische Bündnispolitik in den Jahren 1534/35*, Reformations-geschichtliche Studien und Texte 102 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970). See also, two important articles, whose contributions are larger than their titles indicate: Jean Dupèbe, "Un Document sur les persécutions de l'hiver 1533-1534 à Paris," *BHR* 48 (1986), 405-417; and William Kemp "Marguerite of Navarre, Clément Marot, and the Augereau

the Louvre, which attracted thousands of auditors. The Faculty of Theology responded by sending out six preachers to denounce heresy from rival pulpits. One important witness to these events has been almost completely overlooked because its editors mis-dated it.³ An English agent in France provides the best information available about what Roussel preached:

Beda de Cornibus, a cordelier [should read: "Beda, and de Cornibus, a cordelier (=Pierre de Cornibus, OFM)"]⁴, and other doctors of this town, have complained to the King of Peter Gerarde [Gerard Roussel], who preached before the Queen of Navarre this Lent in Paris. Mons. de Lange [Guillaume du Bellay] tells him [Volusene] they have noted three or four articles on which they say he intends to build a house of heresy,⁵ viz., [1] *omnia sunt munda mundis*,⁶ and therefore this

Editions of the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*," *Journal of the Early Book Society* 2 (1999), 113-156.

³ Florence Volusene to [Cromwell], 25 April [not 1531 as per the editors, but 1533], *Letters and Papers* 5 pp. 99-100: 212.

James Farge realized that this date is erroneous, *Orthodoxy*, 201, note 216: "The editor of *Letters and Papers*, 5:99, no. 22, is surely mistaken in dating as 1531 – rather than 1533 – a letter from Florence Volusene to Thomas Cromwell describing the protests of Beda, de Cornibus, and other doctors about Roussel's Lenten sermons." 201-204: However Farge is not concerned with the content described in this letter. He takes from this letter that after Beda's exile, the Faculty set up a special commission on Roussel's preaching. Six months later they sent their final report to the Faculty, which Farge notes has never been found, thus making Volusene's report even more important. Farge, *Register* 1, p. 291, 386 A, note 30: "Dans sa letter de Moulins du 18 mai, citée de manière trop abrégée dans le *C.A.Fr. Ier* (2: 421, no. 5849), le roi accuse réception des 'articles [de la faculté] clos et scélez, contenant les propositions erronées, hérétiques et scandaleuses preschées ces Advents et Caresme passes par Ledit M. Gérard, comme disant avoir entendu, sans autre information.' Texte intégral dans J. Le Grand, *Histoire de divorce de Henry VIII* (Paris, 1688), 3: 626. Les articles de la Faculté contre Roussel n'existent plus. Cependant Philippe Bouvot, bedeau au dix-septième siècle, qui n'avait pas accès au registre des procès-verbaux pour cette affaire, connaissait ces articles. Il intercala dans une liste des archives la notice suivante: '1533. Le lundy 12 may, les propositions de Gérard Roussel rapportées à la faculté de théologie. Signées: N. Béda, syndic.' (BN ms lat. 15445, p. 41) Cependant la Faculté décréta une deuxième fois, le 29 décembre 1533, des 'causae oppositionis contra magistrum Girardum Roussel' et les fit sceller et signer par le doyen de la Faculté, Dominique Le Cirier, pour expédition à la commission royale (AN mm 248, f 3r.)." This is why Volusene's sermon summaries are all the more important.

⁴See Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 50, 158, 198, 266 n, for Pierre de Cornibus. He is not mentioned in the Faculty's deliberations about Roussel's 1533 Lenten sermons. Evidently he was preaching against Roussel.

⁵R.J. Lovy, *Origines*, 170, cites the first three articles in translation, without noting the source or giving any critical interpretation.

⁶A reference to one of the following:

Rom. 14:14 "scio et confido in Domino Iesu quia nihil commune per ipsum nisi ei qui existimat quid commune esse illi commune est." RSV: "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but it is unclean for any one who thinks it unclean."

Rom. 14:20 "Noli propter escam destruere opus Dei/ omnia quidem munda sunt sed malum est

delectus ciborum, should be superstitious.⁷ [2] *Sicut ancilla contrectans panem dominae suae immundis manibus, offendit dominam, sic nos Deum quicquid operemur sine fide et conscientia munda.*⁸ [3] *Sicut non licet uxori mutare, augere vel imminuere vel commentatione aliqua aut glossa in hunc vel illum sensum trahere testamentum mariti,*⁹ *sic nec licere Ecclesiae sacras literas sic pro arbitrio suo fingere ac refingere.*¹⁰ Has not heard the fourth article.

Roussel's Lenten sermons targeted the observance of fasting,¹¹ but they aimed at inculcating a deeper message: namely that only faith makes works acceptable to God and only those rites ordained by God in Scripture were to be followed. On the later point, his use of the image of a *testamentum* implies that he was speaking about the sacraments, in

homini qui per offendiculum manducat." RSV: "Do not, for the sake of food, destroy the work of God. Everything is indeed clean, but it is wrong for any one to make others fall by what he eats."

Luke 11:40-41 "stulti nonne qui feci quod de foris est etiam id quod de intus est fecit verumtamen quod superest date elemosynam et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis." RSV: "You fools! Did not he who made the outside make the inside also? But give for alms those things which are within; and behold, everything is clean for you."

Tit. 1: 15: "omnia munda mundis coinquinatae sunt eorum et mens et conscientia." RSV: "To the pure all things are pure, but to the corrupt and unbelieving nothing is pure; their very minds and consciences are corrupted."

⁷ The conclusion attacks compulsory fasting.

⁸ Works without faith and a pure heart are offensive to God.

⁹ There is no obvious allusion to Scripture or Canon Law in this passage.

¹⁰ The church should not change or elaborate anything stated in Scripture going beyond what is written in it. This is an appeal to the principle of *sola scriptura*, shared by Lefèvre and his followers with reformers in the Empire. The principle undergirds the call to reject all practices and doctrines of faith which cannot be proved plainly from Scripture and are only supported by the traditions of the church (the councils, church decrees, papal pronouncements).

¹¹ Roussel's thought on fasting was widely espoused in the Navarrian network. In his *Epigrammata* (1530), Nicholas de Bourbon had argued in almost exactly the same terms, f. 34: "*Christianus Homo liber: Sanis sana quidem sunt omnia, mundaque mundis./ Ergo cibus quorsum quaeso, diesque status?*" See Chapter 7, note 1 for commentary on this recently discovered work.

In 1531, Clément Marot and members of the network were indicted for breaking the Lenten fast: "18 Mars 1531. Commission de la cour avec clauses à Nicolas Hennequin et S. [Croucon] pour instruire le procès de Laurent et Louis Mégret, Mery Dileau, André le Roy, Clément Marot, André de Villeneuve, et leurs complices chargés d'avoir mangé de la chair pendant le carême, et autres jours prohibés.... 30 de ce mois Etienne [Saurier/Claurier] secrétaire du Roi et de la Reine de Navarre a cautionné Clément Marot sub pœna commeti et a promis ne sortir la ville sans avertir lad. cour." BPF MS 140, fol. 14 r.

particular the Eucharist, which his hearers would soon be taking in fulfillment of their yearly obligation to commune.¹²

Furthermore, this English observer goes on to report that one of the Sorbonne's preachers, probably François Le Picard, incited a mob to attack some of Marguerite's servants as heretics when he encountered them on the street. The letter is mutilated but the gist of the event is clear: the preacher used an exemplum of the English commoners rising up against a Bohemian heretic (a fictional story about Huss?) to justify the people of Paris doing the same against Roussel:

The King has commanded Gerard whenever he preaches before his sister to have two honest men of judgment sworn to recite faithfully what he says, which is but a small punishment. Three or four who preached against him seditiously are commanded to "fre waird" amongst their friends. Amongst them is one Cordelier¹³ who spoke openly in the pulpit of a great clerk who came from Bohemia to England, and there preached erroneous opinions; the princes and nobles persuaded by his eloquence suffer him, and the commons for fear of great men, though they grudge not being able to hurt him; "than what followed the corn was marvelous fair on the the erroneous preaching of this doc[tor] came and new bread, this bread but swell men and poison them, s..... and perished many thousands. The setting apart all fear, ordinance a of princes, went of their own zeal and stoned this doctor to death, and so which was perceived to be sent by God certain flies that bite and poison the and so should ye do, said th[e preacher] with this heretic Gerard, which is none [fit teacher of] princes and ladies. After this *same day as he was going on the str[eet] sermon, he perceived certain servants of [the Queen] of*

¹² See Chapter 10 for a detailed presentation of Roussel's later eucharistic theology. Roussel's emphasis on not changing God's institution (*testamentum*) in 1533 anticipates his later arguments as well as the simplified liturgy he proposed for the celebration of the Eucharist.

¹³ In Volusene's account, he probably intends Pierre de Cornibus mentioned above. However, in the actual events it could also have been one Geoffroy Thomas [an Englishman?, which would explain Volusne's interest and the reference to heretics in England] See Farge's discussion of the bachelors of theology banished for their preaching against the King of Navarre and Roussel, *Régistre*, I, p. 286-7, 379 A [16 April 1533], note 18: "Il s'agit des six bacheliers en théologie mentionnés à la séance 377 A et dans la note 1533:11. On connaît l'identité seulement de deux d'entre eux, François Le Picart et le Mathurin Louis Lescudier. Un certain Geoffroy Thomas, Franciscain, dont le nom figure plus tard parmi le exilés, ne fut probablement pas bachelier de la Faculté."

Navarre, and shewed to them that was saying , these be these heretics, and sofalois hurt five or six of them by his exhort[ation] ... will be corrected.
[Emphasis added].

Although the Sorbonne's preachers had been instructed not to target individuals (i.e., Roussel and his patrons), the hardy young François Le Picard had justified popular insurrection against authorities in order to beat down Roussel and the other heretics in Marguerite's train. As the English observer reports, Francis I intervened quickly to quell the pulpit war that had boiled over into the streets, placing Roussel under house arrest with Marguerite and banishing the Sorbonne's seditious preachers as well as their leader Noël Beda. Marguerite's sponsorship of her almoner's preaching at Paris had made the evangelical cause in France headline news at home and abroad.¹⁴

Later that summer, members of the Faculty of Theology attempted to censure Marguerite's *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (Alençon 1531, four reprints, Alençon and Paris 1533). Having chastised these doctors in the name of the king, the University's new rector, Nicolas Cop gave his celebrated All Saint's Day address to the assembled University of Paris. Drawing on the ideas of Erasmus and Luther he called stridently for the free preaching of the Gospel. His sermon was too bold. When he was forced to flee later that month, Marguerite and the Du Bellay brothers covered his flight.

Jean du Bellay's vicar in Paris, his brother René,¹⁵ reported to his brother that he was fighting off attempts to force him to give authority to a special heresy commission to investigate Cop as well as two Augustinians, Courault and Bertauld, who were sought for

¹⁴ See Bourrilly and Kemp's articles cited above for several reports by Germans in Paris to Melanchthon and others about these events.

their evangelical sermons as well. Another agent in the network, Jacques Colin, similarly reported to Jean Du Bellay that Marguerite was so worried about the case against Cop that she was going to make a special trip to court to plead on his behalf.¹⁶

In the meantime in December 1533, Antoine Marcourt's circle at Neuchâtel had published a spurious tract purporting to be the *Confession de Noël Beda*, in which, addressing Francis I, Béda is depicted as renouncing his scholastic theology to embrace the evangelical cause. The Chancellor Duprat and Grand Master Anne de Montmorency used the occasion to recall Beda to make him answer to the tract, which being an obvious forgery, allowed him to regain Paris rehabilitated. Then during Lent 1534, Roussel again preached controversial sermons under the sponsorship of Bishop Jean Du Bellay in Notre Dame. This time an angry mob chased him from the pulpit, forcing him to take refuge in the Bishop's house.¹⁷

All this ferment came to an explosive conclusion with the clandestine posting of Antoine Marcourt's placards against the Mass on the night of 17-18 October 1534. In January, after over a dozen people had been executed, radical sacramentarians poured salt into the psychological wounds inflicted on Christ's real bodily presence by again distributing another attack on the mass in the form of a pamphlet, *Petit traicté...de*

¹⁵ René du Bellay was encountered in Chapter 8 as one of the judges who acquitted Jean Guibert.

¹⁶ Similarly, Martin Bucer reported to Ambrosius Blaurer: "Über den Franzosen kommt bessere Nachricht [i.e. information since Cop's arrival]; was ich über den Rektor geschrieben, ist wahr, das Übrige nicht. Die Königin von Navarra verhindert viel Schlimmes. Jetzt ist zu meiner Betrübnis der Landgraf beim Franzosen; was heißt das anderes als nach Ägypten gehen?" Ambrosius and Thomas Blaurer, *Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer, 1509-1548*, ed. Badischen Historischen Kommission, dir. Traugott Schieß, 2 vols. (Friburg-im-Brigau: Friedrich Ernst Fehsenfeld, 1908 & 1910), vol. 1, no.396, 466-469; 469.

¹⁷ Bournon, *Chronique parisienne de Pierre Driart*, 167: 1 April: Roussel prevented from

l'Eucharistie. The Paris magistrates redoubled the repression of heretics. Francis I then gave the judicial terror his active support, coming to Paris to participate in an extraordinarily grand procession of the Sacrament, which was capped with the burning of six more heretics.

While over 200 were imprisoned, many others escaped. A general warrant was put out for the arrest of over fifty named suspects. Heading the list were Pierre Caroli, Clément Marot, and Marturin Cordier, followed by other less famous figures. Two points need to be stressed with regard to the placards and their aftermath.

First, whoever was responsible for their posting, the Parisian authorities instantly targeted several obviously well-known groups of heretics, not just at Paris but in other urban centers, such as Alençon, and as far away as Grenoble and the Dauphiné. When one inspects the list of those executed or wanted: many of them had known ties to Marguerite and her network. Among those executed one finds, Antoine Augereau, who reprinted Marguerite's *Miroir* three times in Paris in 1533,¹⁸ and Étienne de la Forge, who was a leading figure in the Paris evangelical community.¹⁹ He was fondly remembered by Calvin in his *Contre la secte phantastique et furieuse des Libertins* (1545). What Calvin did not mention and no one has seemed to notice is that Marguerite succored his

preaching at Notre Dame: "par les auditeurs comme estimé suivant la doctrine de Lhuter."

¹⁸ See William Kemp's article in note 2. Nathaniel Weiss, "Une victime du *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* de Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François Ier: L'imprimeur Antoine Augereau et sa famille (1534-1559)," *BSHPF* 42 (1893), 242-47; and A. de Montaignon, "Anthoine Augereau, natif du Poitou, d'après la *Liste des hérétiques ajournés par le seigneur du Roi* (Bibl. Munic. de Soissons, ms. 189, fol. 79)," *BSHPF* 11 (1862), 354-258.

¹⁹ Étienne de la Forge was originally from Tournai and may have provided a link between the Paris evangelicals and Martin Lempereur, who published Molinet's *La complainte de la terre sainte* "Imprimé en Anvers par Martin Lempereur. Pour Jean de la Forge demeurant à Tournay devant la court de l'evesque."

family. De la Forge's son Étienne is found on her rolls in 1539 as one of her *escolliers pensionnaire*.²⁰ Marguerite may well have helped his widow, Pellone Bouzin, who was sentenced to perform honorable amendment in April 1535 and had her goods confiscated. One year after Étienne's execution, she married Jean [Johannes] Kléberg, "le bon allemand, an extremely rich German banker who had recently settled at Lyon."²¹ Kléberg helped his wife gain the posthumous rehabilitation of Étienne de La Forge from the charge of being a 'sacramentarian' so that she could keep his estate. At Lyon, Kléberg went on to be a sometime associate of Dolet and the Du Bellay brothers.

Marguerite's connection with the evangelical cell in Paris went deeper still. In early 1535, another rich émigré merchant at Paris, Christophe Hérault, who was sought in connection with the placards, was caught at Antwerp. In his deposition, he described his circle of friends, which included Étienne de la Forge, and claimed to have intervened with Marguerite the previous year on behalf of Gérard Roussel and several of their incarcerated brethren. Moreover, he claimed to own a copy of Marguerite's *Miroir*, "Le livret de la Royne de Navarre, [sans] scavoir declarer l'intitulacion dicelluy."²²

Moore, p. 86: 1532.

²⁰ *Comptes*, 1539, p. 79 and 96: "Estienne de la Forge [jr.]" at 50 *l.t.* was one of Marguerite's 22 *Comptes*, 1539, p. 79 and 96: "Estienne de la Forge [jr.]" at 50 *l.t.* was one of Marguerite's 22 "escolliers pensionnaires."

²¹ See Nathaniel Weiss, "Le réformateur Aimé Maigret, Le martyr Étienne de la Forge et Jean Kleberg," *BSHPF* 39 (1890), 245-269; and "François Ier accorde à la veuve d'Étienne de la Forge l'héritage du martyr, que le fisc n'avait pas encore saisi, Hesdin, mars 1537," *BSHPF* 39 (1890), 269-271.

²² Julius Frederichs, *De Secte Der Loïsten of Antwerpsche Libertijnen (1525-1545): Eligius Pruystinck (Loy de Schaliedecker) En Zijne Aanhangers* (Gent: J. Vuylsteke, 'S-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1891); and J. Frederichs, "Un luthérien français devenu Libertin Spirituel: Christophe Héraulte et les Loïstes d'Anvers (1490-1544)," *BSHPF* 41 (1892), 250-269.

The list of executed and pursued for the placards contains a profile of the network on the ground level.²³ While their activities are only hinted at in the deposition of Christophe Hérault, it is clear that they were looking to Marguerite and Roussel as their champions to promote the evangelical cause, and protect it as well when the placards gave authorities an excuse to strike. Marguerite had taken on that role for herself by first putting Roussel up to preach, and then in the aftermath of the Placards, when she tried to convince her brother, perhaps disingenuously, that the placards had been posted by those who wanted to unleash judicial violence against her protégés.²⁴

II. The Improbable Religious Concord 1533-1536

The dramatic events at Paris coincided with France's complex foreign relations with England, the German princes, and the Pope. As Henry VIII's break with Rome unfolded, Marguerite and the Du Bellays coordinated French policy to promote a dialogue for religious concord and an alliance against the Hapsburg with these powers. This tandem opened up a seemingly real possibility for religious peace in Europe and evangelical reform in France.

²³ See the detailed study of the Parlement's most wanted list of heretics by Gabrielle Berthoud, "Les 'Ajournés' du 25 janvier 1535." *BHR* 25 (1963) 307-324.

²⁴ In December 1541, long after these events, Marguerite reminded her brother of her conspiracy theory about the origins of the placards. Speaking of the king's orders to the Parlement [of Bordeaux]: "Car coume [comme] vous desirez que l'innocent ne soit prevenu par malice, aussy vous voulez que le téméraire et qui tourne l'escripture de Dieu en liberté de la chaire et désobéissance des supérieurs soient pugniz, coume la raison et juste....et n'y a homme que ayme à lire la Sainte Escripiture, que, s'il voit quelqu'un en parles légierement, qui ne le repraigne, plus pour la crainte de vous desplaire que de pugnisions. Dieu merci, Monseigneur, nul des nostre n'ont esté trouvé sacramentaires, combien qu'ils n'ont guères porté maindres peines; et ne me puis garder de vous dire qu'il vous souviengne de l'opinion que j'avois que les vilains placars estoient faits par ceux qui les cherchent aux aultres." Génin 2, 114, p. 196.

Marguerite and England

During the course of Henry VIII's pursuit of an annulment, marriage to Anne Boleyn, and Act of Supremacy in the early 1530s, Marguerite became a crucial partner in Henry VIII's appeal to Francis to break with Rome. On June 22, 1533, having heard from the Dukes of Norfolk and Rocheford of Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn, Marguerite wrote to the French ambassador in England asking him to extend her special greetings to the new queen.²⁵ Under the guise of this simple expression of court *politesse* lay the beginnings of a much deeper *entente*. The following day, June 23, the English ambassador, the Duke of Norfolk, gave Henry VIII glowing report about his two, five-hour interviews with Marguerite. He considered her:

“... one of the most wisest frank women, and best setters forth of her purpose, that I have spoken with, and as affectionate of your Highness as if she were your own sister, and likewise of the Queen.”²⁶

This was no idle compliment. Norfolk goes on to report Marguerite's detailed analysis of the factional politics at the French court. She related some important, though seeming trivial details. The Dauphin hated the Grand Master Anne de Montmorency, who, like some censorious uncle, had embarrassed the young man by publicly criticizing his choice in dress and mistress. More substantively, she explained that the Grand Master, was promoting a number of pro-Imperial, dynastic marriages at court that would benefit Henry's enemies, notably Scotland. However, she reported with some glee that

²⁵ Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 569.

²⁶ John Sherren Brewer and J. Gairdner, *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 24 volumes (London, 1862 sqq); vol. 6, pp. 308-310, no. 692.

not all boded well for Franco-Hapsburg relations since Francis I was dissatisfied with his wife Eleanor of Portugal, Charles V's sister. Norfolk related:

She told me also that no man can be worse content with his wife than her brother is, so that these seven months he neither lay with her, nor yet meddled with her. I asked her the cause why; and she said, “*Purce qu'il ne le trouve plesaunt a son apetyde* [because he does not find her pleasing to his taste];” nor when he doth lie with her, he cannot sleep; and when lieth from her, no man sleepeth better.” I said, “Madam, what should be the cause?” She said, “She is very hot in bed, and desireth to be too much embraced;” and therewith she fell upon a great laughter, saying, “I would [not] for all the good in Paris that the king of Navarre were [no better] pleased to be in my bed than my brother is to be [in hers].”

Having been supplied with such critical information, the Duke of Norfolk recommended Marguerite as Henry's good and true friend.

Even as Henry became disillusioned with the French, especially after his French pension was cut (Dec. 1534) and as the French cardinals kept failing to produce the miracle he desired at Rome (1534-1535), she nevertheless tried to facilitate close cooperation on military and religious issues, even going outside normal diplomatic channels to do so. By late 1535, after Henry had broken with Rome, Marguerite figured heavily in his diplomatic plans. On Nov. 18, 1535, he sent a special ambassador with instructions to incite Francis to follow Henry's example and make himself head of the French church. Such action, Henry proposed, would provide Francis with “inestimable treasure” enabling him, as Henry was urging him, to go to war with the Emperor. Henry instructed his ambassador to consult Marguerite first before making such a suggestion to Francis, who had already rebuffed a similar overture, and only to proceed if she was

agreeable.²⁷ In essence, Henry considered Marguerite the most sympathetic courtier to the “English option” in reformation affairs at the French court. Notably, the secularization of church lands is the main enticement that historians have considered likely ever to have tempted Francis to break with Rome.

The English ambassador’s report on Marguerite’s formal response to this plan has not survived. She did react, however, in a rather curious and secret way. Within a month of Henry’s letter from London, a Frenchman calling himself the Bailly of Amboise came furtively and in haste to London claiming to be one of Marguerite’s servants, saying that he would only to speak with the king. His arrival consternated the resident French ambassador, puzzled the English, and the worried the Imperial ambassador. The English and French made inquiries, but their diplomatic correspondence, the only source for this affair, do not reveal the purpose or outcome of this special envoy’s visit. The French and English told the Imperial ambassador that this Bailly of Amboise was a heretic trying to use Marguerite’s name as an *entré* with Henry. He seems, however, to have been something more than a heretic fleeing to England under false pretenses. In France, the English ambassador evidently found the answer to London’s questions about the nature of this Bailly. On December 13, 1535, the ambassador wrote: “he trusts that the letters sent to Cromwell by Barnaby have answered it, as well as Bryan’s [another English

²⁷ Brewer 9, 281-282, no. 838: 18 Nov. 1535, Henry VIII to Wallop: “Is sending Sir Francis Brian, gentleman of the Chamber, to the French king, to set forth certain practices with the queen of Navarre, which he thinks convenient should be declared to him after Brian has travailed with the Queen and found her inclinable.” For an impressive overview of Henry’s complex foreign relations, with particular attention to French affairs but less emphasis on Marguerite’s role in it, see D.L. Potter, “Foreign Policy,” in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, edited by Diarmaid MacCulloch, Problems in Focus Series (Houndsmill and London, UK: MacMillan Press, 1995), 101–133, with notes 267–276.

ambassador] instruction to the queen of Navarre.”²⁸ The ambassador then reported that he did not have much to do in France. In other words, Marguerite had shot down Henry’s plans; they were not going to get a hearing.

Lacking these letters from the English diplomatic corps, this ‘bailli’ and his mission remain a mystery. However, the excitement about him was over and done with when they had spoken with Marguerite and she determined that Henry VIII’s overtures were not going to be well received at court. While we cannot prove, though it seems likely, that Marguerite had sent a messenger to England outside the normal diplomatic channels, we do know that she herself would in the 1540s do just this and attempt to orchestrate *détente* with Henry VIII outside the main lines of royal diplomacy.

After 1535, Marguerite continued to champion the alliance with England at the French court. In 1540, when the English were again seeking closer relations with France against the Emperor, Marguerite advised the English ambassador about French affairs. For this year alone there are seventeen dispatches from the English ambassadors reporting news, advice, warnings, and more gossipy stories about life at court from Marguerite.²⁹ So important was her help that, following her request, they used a cipher in their correspondence to hide her name and that of her collaborator, the king’s mistress, the duchesse d’Étampes.

²⁸ Brewer 9, 328-329, no. 980: 16 Dec. 1535. Sir Francis Bryan to Cromwell.

²⁹ See Brewer 15 (which covers the year 1540), nos. 130 (p. 42), 223-4 (pp. 79-80), 240, 253 (p. 95), 285 (pp. 118-119), 332 (p. 133), 418 (pp. 160-161), 459 (pp. 189-190), 480 (pp. 202-203), 543 (p. 243), 574 (pp. 256-257), 842, 870 (pp. 435-436) 930, 961, and 990 (p. 494).

This surprisingly deep relationship formed a central part of the Navarrian faction's political aspirations. England's support was seen as a key factor for the enduring success of the international evangelical cause. Not surprisingly, when French overtures to the German princes fell through in 1535 and Henry executed his evangelical wife, Anne Boleyn, Marguerite's relations with England withered until the reprise of proposals for an evangelical league after 1540. Marguerite's importance in English affairs and as a model to English ladies at court, was poignantly attested in 1544 when Anne Boleyn's daughter, princess Elizabeth, translated Marguerite's religious poem, the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* into English,³⁰ and again in 1550 when the Seymour sisters lamented her death in a poetic dialogue.

The Appeal to the German Protestants

While Gérard Roussel and Nicolas Cop's sermons stirred the domestic scene, the du Bellay brothers were laying the groundwork for an ambitious alliance. In the late 1520s they had begun recruiting a corps of extremely talented German scholars at the University of Paris, including Johann Sturm, Gervais Wain, Ulrich Chelius, and Johann Sleidan. Emulating a move contemplated by the English in 1533, the Du Bellay brothers managed in 1535 to convince Francis I to invite Melanchthon and other German reformers to France for a colloquy on the religious differences separating Catholics and Protestants.³¹ Meanwhile, Jean du Bellay was sent to Rome to attract the new Pope, Paul

³⁰ Sheil, Marc. *Elizabeth's glass within: "The glass of the Sinful Soul" (1544) by Elizabeth I, and "Epistle dedicatory" & "Conclusion" (1548) by John Bale*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993.

³¹ The first beginnings of these overtures likely date back to November 1531, when Charles V's

III, to this scheme as well as to get him to defer the bull of excommunication against Henry VIII.³² The link between French overtures to the Papacy, England, and the Protestant princes is epitomized in one letter. In June 1535, on the eve of his departure for Rome, Jean Du Bellay wrote to Philip Melanchthon to reassure him and his masters that his trip was intended to build support for this grand alliance, not to undermine it. Shortly thereafter, Jean's brother Guillaume reinforced the plans for a colloquy with an intense burst of diplomatic activity in the Empire.

Now the question is rightly raised, who had devised this course of policy? The Du Bellay brothers carried out the brunt of the leg-work, inspired many of the specific decisions taken by the court, and shaped policy with their reports from Germany and Rome. So too the du Bellays were the ones who kept level heads and to whom Protestants looked for protection when Francis unleashed the repression that during the early months of 1535 sent at least eighteen to the stake.³³ However the du Bellays were often absent. Conservatives at court such as Cardinal Du Prat and Anne de Montmorency may have acquiesced to such plans for a time for tactical reasons, but they were far from

operative at Rome reported 'the pope has seen letters written by the kings of England and France to the Lutherans, in which they encourage them to obtain a Council such as that sect wishes, and not a General Council.' Muxetula to Charles V, LP 5, no. 534, 246.

See Bourrilly's articles in note 2 for the political build up since 1534 to this invitation, which had centered on French aid to the Duke of Wurtemberg in his quest to retake his duchy from Hapsburg control.

³² For Francis I's instructions to Jean du Bellay and the latter's letter to Melanchthon just before departing, see *Correspondance du Cardinal Jean du Bellay*, 2 vols, edited by Rémy Scheurer (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1969), vol. 2, nos. 238–240, 1–14.

³³ Herminjard, vol. 3, no. 498, 266–270: Jean [Johannes] Sturm to Philip Melanchthon, at Wittenberg, from Paris, March 6, 1535.

desiring such a religious union. The remaining evidence suggests that Marguerite had a large hand in shaping Francis's policy during this phase of foreign policy.³⁴

The sixteenth-century Catholic apologist, Florimond de Raemon, asserts categorically that at this time Marguerite proposed to Francis a confessional concord with the Protestant princes based on a seven-point plan, which called for the marriage of priests, the cup for the laity, and changes in the rite of the mass.³⁵ This is an interesting and precise bit of information, which if true makes the sermons of Marguerite's almoner, Roussel, in 1533 and his subsequent theological treatise the prime locus for determining on what points the French evangelicals at court could have joined with the Germans.³⁶ Contemporary evidence corroborates Raemon's view.

In the summer of 1535, Martin Bucer, who was in contact with the Du Bellay diplomatic corps via Johann Sturm, reported that certain persons, namely the Du Bellays and Marguerite, were directing French foreign policy towards a religious settlement. Writing in 1535 to Thomas Blaurer and Johann Zwick, Bucer explained that:

There are certain eminent people – and, according to trustworthy witnesses, upstanding Christians – in the king's court, who, since until now they have not been able to conciliate the king with other arguments to our, nay rather Christ's cause, they have attempted to prove that we long for nothing so much as a judgment – indeed an authoritative one – of our case; and furthermore that by no

³⁴ The *Histoire ecclésiastique* credits both Marguerite and the Du Bellay's with directing French policy towards rapprochement with the Protestants in 1535, but cites no evidence. See, *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France*, ed. G. Baum and E. Cunitz, 3 vols. (Paris, 1883-9; reprint, Nieukoop: B. de Graaf, 1974), 26-29.

³⁵ Florimond de Raemon, *L'histoire de la Naissance... de l'hérésie de ce siècle*, book 7, ch. 3. (p. 849-854 in the Rouen, 1623 edition).

³⁶ This inquiry needs to be further pursued. The findings about Roussel's eucharistic theology in Chapter 10 suggests that French evangelicals would not have had trouble finding a common accord with the Germans (at least Bucer and Melancthon) on the central issue of the real presence.

means do we want everything transformed once for all, but only those things which pertain to religion....³⁷

As Bucer indicates, Marguerite and the Du Bellays were leading Francis I to the policy of concord under false pretenses. The German powers read as much into Francis's support of the terror after the Placards. It was an image that the Du Bellays' promises could not counteract. Thus in December 1535, the Elector of Saxony finally refused Melanchthon's request to journey to Paris, which rendered the French evangelicals' plans a dead letter.

Yet during the following five years, one finds Bucer, Melanchthon, and Luther as well as the cities of Bern, Basel, Strasbourg, and Geneva writing to Marguerite most immediately to succor individual evangelicals and more generally all those oppressed for their religious views, as well as to reopen the religious negotiations.³⁸ With the French

³⁷ "Sunt optimi quidam et veris probati testimoniis Christiani *in aula regis*, qui, cum aliis rationibus non possint hactenus *Regem* eo mitigare in nostram, imò Christi caussam, conati sunt ut de nobis tesificarentur, nos nihil æquè atque caussæ nostræ iudicium et quidem gravissimum expetere, tum nequaquam velle immutata semel omnia, sed ea tantum quæ religio sit ferre...." [From a contemporary copy in the Basel Archives], Herminjard 3, no. 476, p. 199, n. 1.

³⁸ The following list of letters is based on Jourda's *Répertoire* and other sources as noted for letters not repertoried by Jourda.

1534: June 13. Melanchthon to Marguerite in support of Baduel: Jourda, no. 597. Herminjard 3, no. 472, 189–190.

1535: Feb 8. Bucer letters to Francis I and Marguerite. J.V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer: Études sur la Correspondance avec de nombreux textes inédits*, 2 vols. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958), vol. 2, 508, notes 2–4.

1535, Dec. 23. Council of Geneva thanks Marguerite for her aid to the afflicted refugees who had ended up in their city. Jourda, no. 606; Herminjard 3, no. 536, 381–382.

1535: October. Bucer to Marguerite asking her to help revive the stalled concord negotiations. V.-L. Saulnier, "La correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre. Complément au répertoire." *BHR* 33 (1971), 571–604, no. 605.1.

1537: April 3 [8]. Bucer to Marguerite. Pollet, *Bucer* 2, 508, note 5.

1537: April 8. Bucer to Marguerite. After hearing news of the unsuccessful mission by south German and Swiss cities to France to plead for tacit freedom of religion, freeing of religious prisoners, and exiles to return without having to abjure. Jourda, no. 671

1538, May 31. Basel to Marguerite on behalf of Antoine de Castanet of Toulouse, who had

court having turned towards Rome, Bucer could but praise Marguerite for her aid in the spread of the Gospel while warning her to avoid the errors of the Libertines.³⁹ For the Protestants, one step was necessary as a prelude to an eventual alliance: Francis I must suspend heresy proceedings and allow their co-religionaries freedom to exercise their religion. In 1535, Marguerite and the du Bellays were able to achieve a general amnesty first for Lutherans, then in 1536 even for Sacramentarians, on the heavy condition both would abjure their errors within six months.⁴⁰ The religious *status quo ante* was reestablished: so long as dissenters did not go public with their views, the crown would not pursue them. This was the limit of the evangelical party's sway over Francis's foreign and domestic religious policy until Montmorency's power faded in 1540.

studied at Basel. Jourda, no. 773; Herminjard 5, no. 715, p. 17.

1538, July 5. Bucer to Marguerite. Recommends Baduel and warns against Libertines. Jourda, no. 774; Herminjard 5, no. 721, 38.

Another letter mentioned by Sleidan to Jean du Bellay, 25 October 1538, in Bourrilly, "Jean Sleidan," *BSHPF* 50 (1901), 236. Sturm had sent a packet of letters through three weeks earlier, so this letter much have been one that came to him in the interval.

³⁹ Jourda nos. 671 & 774.

⁴⁰For summaries of the edicts, N.M. Sutherland, *The Huguenot Struggle for Recognition* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980), 336–337, and *passim*.

10. Secret Diplomacy and Religious Dissimulation (1540–1549)

Marguerite's network continued to operate in the 1540s in increasingly difficult circumstances. The examples discussed below show the impressive range of their activities: from playing gambits on the international diplomatic stage—often behind the scenes—to slowly and quietly building evangelical communities on the local level. While they were pursuing these positive developments, Calvin took aim at the network's leaders in several anti-Nicodemite works. His campaign, to which the network could scarcely respond, was a crucial phase in forging the evangelical communities of France into an ascendant reformed movement. The important point will be to come to grips with the extent to which Calvin's mission towards France aimed at, though he would not have used these terms, extracting evangelicals from under the wing of Marguerite and her network to form them into a distinct religious community under his leadership.

I. "The Emperor is Hypocrisy and the Pope the Devil": Evangelical Diplomacy at the Court of Francis I, 1540-1547

"... I have to love Prince Henry, for ... he and I be both of the same religious opinion, for neither of us love the Pope; and I think the Pope would be glad to see both our destructions, for which purpose he practices with the Emperor, that is to say, with hypocrisy; for the Emperor is Hypocrisy and the Pope the Devil."¹

¹ Spelling and syntax are slightly modernized. For this and the following quotes, Paget to Henry VIII, 26 Feb. 1542, Paris, in John Sherren Brewer and James Gairdner, eds., *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*, vol. 17 (London, 1900), no. 128, pp. 52–55. Hereafter cited as *LP* 17, no. 128, 52–55. Note well, the Letters and Papers are a mix of summaries, translations, and original texts. The summaries and translations often contain direct quotes from the original text (which are themselves sometimes the contemporaries author's translation of statements or documents in other languages). Half-quotes are reserved to indicate the editors' summary, full quotes for direct quotes from the

Thus spoke Marguerite of Navarre in February 1542 when broaching a secret proposal to the English ambassador, William Paget, for the alliance of their two kingdoms. She predicted that an agreement sealed by marriage of the kings' children would bring "the greatest benefit that ever came to Christendom." In effect, an anti-Hapsburg axis would have been created comprising England, France, the Duke of Cleves, who was married to Marguerite's daughter, as well as the Duke's allies, the Schmalkald League.

Invoking the religious stumbling block to past proposals of union, Paget objected that there was no greater popery than in France where recently a dozen honest persons had been imprisoned for vilifying the Bishop of Rome. Blaming the influence of the "maskers in red caps" (cardinals on the king's council), Marguerite assured him that other good christians at court, including the Admiral de Brion and the du Bellay brothers, could, with English help, send their enemies to the devil and bring France round to an alliance based upon a religious union.

This exchange draws attention to an important historiographical blind spot. The 1534 Affair of the Placards is generally thought to have sealed the religious fate of France. Thereafter, while scholars have noted the rise of factionalism at the French

original documents.

Marguerite's partner in proposing the 1542 Franco-English marriage alliance, Admiral Chabot de Brion, similarly called the Pope the Devil. 'Paget likens the Pope to 'vice,' "Call you him vice? quod he [the Admiral], he is the very Devil.'" *LP*, no. 263, 141–5, Paget to Henry VIII, 22 April, 1542. Paget wished he might see the day that pardons were as little set by there as in England. "Par le corps Dieu," quod he [the Admiral] cholerickly, 'for my part I set nother by pardon nor pope, et le Diable emporte et le Pape et tous les Papillions avecques.'" *LP* 17, pp. 190–193: Paget to Henry VIII, 15 May, 1542.

court,² they have argued for the diminishing influence of evangelical courtiers, Marguerite in particular.³ Thus, they discount the religious component of subsequent French overtures to the English and the German Protestants as mere pretext.

² As all contemporary observers noted, Francis I's councilors exerted key pressure in shaping French policy, yet they were divided politically. This account will stress their religious divisions. Scholars date the rise of court factionalism in France to the mid-1530's when courtiers allied themselves around Francis I's two sons: R.J. Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior and Patron: Reign of Francis I*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 483–486; cf. with respect to 'the fight against heresy' and members of his court, 508–518; Richard Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494–1660*, The Short Oxford History of the Modern World, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 107–109.

For a useful summary of interpretations of court factionalism, its nature and bases, and influence in the Henrican Reformation, see Joseph S. Block, *Factional Politics and the English Reformation 1520–1540*, Royal Historical Society Studies in History 66, (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1993), 1–8. Against a host of other interpreters, Block's study argues vigorously that religious conviction consciously and consistently animated the reform factions at Henry's court and had significant influence in advancing their cause despite Henry's own religious conservatism and the opposition of catholic factions.

³ Pierre Jourda's account of Marguerite's political role is marred by contradictory and contentious arguments that underplay Marguerite's evangelical commitments. This is particularly evident in his lack of treatment of her 'evangelical diplomacy,' which will be discussed below. For example, he barely mentions and fails to interpret her involvement in the 1540–1546 overtures to the Schmalkald League and Henry VIII. See Jourda, *Marguerite*, pp. 304, 309 and 313. See further Augustin Renaudet's critical review of Jourda's biography, "Marguerite de Navarre. A propos d'une biographie," chap. in *ibid.*, *Humanisme et Renaissance* (Geneva, 1958; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1981), 217–235.

Heather Vose suitably highlights Marguerite's important role in English diplomacy, but does little to explain why she was thus engaged, and misses the point that her involvement with England formed but a part of a much larger religious and political program. She cites several of the same passages used here, including the quote that introduces this section (p. 319–320). From such evidence, she limits her conclusions to pointing out that Marguerite, though a woman, had an important political role: "While by no means a complete answer, nor even a perfect picture of her extensive diplomatic intercourse with Henrician England, the image emerging is that of an intelligent, articulate woman whose perception and confident self-acceptance within a male-dominated sphere enabled her to be friend and peace-maker in cross-Channel relationships. How far her experience as a woman actually influenced her political consciousness and activity is a question arising naturally, and needs to be addressed as part of a wider study on the nature of power.... If some elements of her role in Anglo-French affairs still remain obscure, her staunchly positive efforts in compromise and negotiation over more than a quarter of a century are beyond dispute." see "Marguerite of Navarre: That 'Right English Woman.'" *SCJ* 16 (1985), 315–333; 333.

Most scholars, e.g., Lucien Febvre and Denis Crouzet, tend to follow Jourda when interpreting the later phase of her career. Maurice Causse presents Marguerite as a cagey, double-dealing diplomatic player, who ultimately sold out on her evangelical commitment. His portrayal of Marguerite's diplomatic skills and evangelical commitment is corroborated by the findings of this study, but not his conclusion that she abandoned her evangelical brethren in the end. Lucien Febvre, *Amour sacré, amour profane: autour de l'Heptaméron* (Paris: Gallimard), 1944; Denis Crouzet, *La genèse de la réforme française, 1520–1562*, Regards sur l'histoire, Histoire Moderne 109 (Paris: SEDES, 1996); Maurice Causse, "'La Familière Exposition' de Gérard Roussel et l'aventure 'Nicodémite' en Guyenne," *BSHPF* 131 (1985), 5–33; *ibid.*, "Les dissimulations de Marguerite de Navarre et l'aventure Nicodémite," *BSHPF* 132 (1986), 347–390.

The sources show, however, that during the period 1540-1546 an evangelical faction⁴ operated at court, whose anchor had long been Marguerite. Its major figures were the Admiral Chabot de Brion, the Du Bellay brothers, and less reliably, Mme. d'Estampes, the king's mistress.⁵ They promoted foreign policies that would create conditions favorable to an evangelical religious settlement for France. While ultimately they failed to sway Francis to support their plans in full, they played the cards of their evangelical diplomacy to the very end of Francis' reign.

One may object that establishing this thesis, or indeed any assertion about the real intentions of the players in international relations, is an extremely hazardous enterprise. Foreign relations were fundamentally vitiated by duplicity. Diplomatic sources, the chief

⁴ Jean de St. Mauris, the imperial ambassador in France and brother-in-law of Granvelle, wrote to Charles V, 15 Nov. 1546, that the 'Protestants in Court are receiving much favour, Madame d'Estampes calling them her brother evangelists, for she inclines to the Lutheran discipline.' *LP* 21, pt. 2, no. 406, 194. While St. Maurice cast doubt on the Duchess d'Estampes's sincerity, from the early 1520s Marguerite and her network of clients consistently referred to their beliefs and adherents with forms of the word 'évangélique.' See chapter 2, n. 3 for early examples. In the 1540s, 'evangelical' continued to be the self-designation of Marguerite and others to describe their religious commitments. Their enemies testify to this: Sussanée or Alexandre de Villedieu, wrote "*In Samarthem*," "Against Charles de Ste.-Marthe," Marguerite's secretary who would give her funeral oration, in his *Quantitates* (Paris, 1542) "Tu te vantes d'être évangélique/ Tu parles sans cesse du Christ/ Tu dis qu'il est doux de vivre à la manière des apôtres/ ..." Translated in J.J. Hémardinquer, "Les Prisons d'un poète: Charles de Ste. Marthe," *BHR* 20 (1958), 177-83; 178.

⁵ For instance, on 3 April 1542 Paget reported to Henry VIII the reasons the Admiral, Chabot de Brion, gave for his, Mme. d'Estampes, and Marguerite of Navarre's support of the proposed marriage alliance between their two nations. "Paget reminded him [the Admiral]... that if the practices of others broke it off, it would touch no man so much as himself; for the Emperor's darling was the Constable, "whose hand is the Chancellor," [Guillaume Poyet] and if they once came in again together he [the Admiral] could look for no courtesy at their hands. He seemed pleased, and said it was true that the Emperor, whom he loved not, had lately made overtures through the Pope's nuncio for a French ambassador to reside with him, as a proof to the world of friendship between them, but his master would scant listen; as to the Chancellor, he only meddled with judicial matters; "as touching this treaty now in hand, no creature knoweth it but I and Madame d'Estampes and the third suspecteth it." "That is the Queen of Navarre (quod I). So it is (quod he), who is a right English woman. And whereas you said it touched no man as much as me, yes, it toucheth these two no less; the one in respect of the Queen, who, if the King and th'Emperor join, must be otherwise treated than she is now, and th'other in respect of Navarre, for then farewell her kingdom." *LP* 17, no. 232, 110-111: Paget to Henry VIII, 3 April 1542.

access to this history, present a dizzying array of contradictory evidence. In their public and private negotiations, which are often hard to distinguish, most parties engaged in strategic dissimulation to mislead their foes as well as give their potential allies, whom they could not always trust, only as much information as they needed to respond as desired. As one English ambassador remarked of the French in response to a friendly overture, “I never trust these crafty children.”⁶ Diplomatic sources may thus be thought to present deceptive appearance often enough to vitiate attempts to locate real intentions. In particular, anyone attempting to analyze the goals of French courtiers encounters additional interpretive problems similar to those faced by scholars of the Henrican Reformation. Both courts were divided by factionalism. Arguments turn on sorting out the ‘real’ interests—dynastic, personal, pecuniary, religious, or otherwise—of the King and his closest advisors as well as the relative importance of each in setting the final course of action taken by the court.

Measuring three aspects of the activity of evangelical courtiers allows one to assess the sincerity of their attempt to build a political and religious alliance with England and the Schmalkald League in the 1540s: to what extent their overtures were consistent with previous attempts to gain an evangelical settlement for France; how far and how dangerously their plans went beyond what was needed to fulfill the purely mercenary demands of Francis I’s dynastic ambitions (i.e., to what extent their plans were

⁶ *LP* 21, pt. 2, p. 117, no. 248, 9 Oct. 1546. The document is not signed or addressed, but is clearly from an English agent, probably the ambassador to France, Nicolas Wotton [*CAF* 9, p. 93], addressed to a superior. The author makes this remark when discussing an overture by the evangelical faction at court. His remark typifies foreign attitudes about French trustworthiness, and conversely, French attitudes to foreigners.

ideologically as opposed to merely politically driven); and how they used their administrative powers within France to support the evangelical cause.⁷

The End of the Road: Insurmountable Obstacles 1540-1547

After the evangelical courtiers' failure in 1535 to secure an alliance with England and the Protestants of the Empire, conservative, pro-imperial Catholics gained ascendancy at court. The Constable, Anne de Montmorency, induced Francis I to rapprochement with the Emperor, which coincided with new royal orders to pursue heretics in 1538-1540.⁸ When the Emperor failed, as Montmorency had hoped, to tender Milan—long the center of Francis I's dynastic ambitions—in an acceptable marriage offer, Montmorency gradually fell from power, but conservatives remained in control.

During the period 1540 to 1547, the evangelical faction attempted to resurrect the alliance system championed by the du Bellay brothers in the mid-1530s. However, their plans now had a crucial difference: they excluded the Pope from the proposed cooperation between France, England, and the Protestant Schmalkald League. Previously, the Du Bellays had attempted to resolve English and Protestant differences with the Papacy. Now, the evangelical faction at court secretly advised that with the right help from the Pope's enemies, they could convince Francis I to break with Rome.

⁷ Ultimately, full reconstructions of how evangelical courtiers used their power locally would allow us to ascertain the sort of reformed Gallican church to which Marguerite and her evangelical allies may have aspired, but which they could never fully articulate or pursue.

⁸ N.M. Sutherland, *The Huguenot Struggle for Recognition* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980), 337–339.

Marguerite and Cleves Marriage Scheme, 1540-1543

In its first formulation during 1540-1543, the evangelicals' alliance scheme hinged on the marriage with Marguerite's daughter Jeanne d'Albret with the Duke of Cleves-Julich-Berg. His Landsknecht-rich territories straddled the border between the Low countries and the Empire. He was at odds with the Emperor over his recent succession to the Duchy of Gelderland. Although linked by family and affinity to the Duke of Electoral Saxony, he had yet to adopt the Confession of Augsburg. Furthermore, he was on good terms with England up to and well after the few months in 1540 that his sister Anne was married to Henry VIII.

The marriage of Marguerite's daughter Jeanne d'Albret to the Duke de Cleves on June 14, 1541 was a major religio-political event.⁹ On the political front, it sealed a close alliance between Francis I and the Protestant princes. While the Duke de Cleves was not formally a member of the Schmalkald league, this alliance provided a proof of Francis' commitment to the Protestants powers, which they had never had good reason to believe previously. The marriage fostered the hope that Francis would reopen the religious dialogue in order to deepen the alliance with the Germans and English, creating the most favorable opportunity for an 'evangelical' religious settlement since the failed negotiations of 1535. For the pro-Imperial, catholic faction at court, the marriage was a blow.¹⁰ It was worse still for Henry d'Albret, King of Navarre, who had placed his

⁹ Alphonse de Ruble, *Le mariage de Jeanne d'Albret* (Paris: Adolphe Labitte, 1877) p. vi, and passim for the discussion which follows.

¹⁰ In fact, Montmorency received the final humiliation at the marriage ceremony, which was a complete reversal of his pro-Imperial policy, that drove him from court for the rest of Francis's reign. He

greatest hope for regaining his lost kingdom of Spanish Navarre on a secretly proposed the marriage of Jeanne with Charles V's son, Don Philip.

The political implications of the marriage were clear when it was first proposed in the spring of 1540. For Marguerite, with whom the idea did not originate, the choice of whether or not to support it was very difficult. In the first place, she was caught between the conflicting wills of her brother and husband. In addition, the marriage proposal had many personal and practical problems. William, the German speaking Duke de Cleves, was twice the age of her beloved daughter Jeanne who was twelve. Moreover, the Duke had not settled his disputes with the Emperor over the lordship of his territories. It was only a matter of time before the Emperor would make war on the Duke if he persisted in his opposition. Thus he was not the ideal man to offer Jeanne an easy transition to adulthood or the married life, nor was it at all clear that the alliance secured by this marriage had any chance of surviving an imperial attack on Cleves.

It is therefore significant that, despite these drawbacks, Marguerite took great pains to bring about the union. She did more than simply arrange the terms of the marriage contract with her brother and the house of Cleves. Beyond this, she sent out a barrage of over two dozen letters during the winter of 1540-1541 to the Duke de Cleves as well as the Elector of Saxony, John-Frederick, and Philip of Hesse whose support were key to the proposed Franco-Protestant alliance.¹¹ Indeed, during this period the danger

was humiliated by having to carry the reluctant Jeanne d'Albret to the altar.

¹¹ Jourda, *Marguerite d'Angoulême*, 299–301. For these letters see Jourda, *Répertoire*, and Saulnier 1972, 283–336: nos. 804.1, 820.1, 822.1, 822.2, 822.3, 823, 828.1, 830.1, 833.3, 857.1, 858.2, 858.3, 858.4, 858.5, 858.6, 861, 864, 872.2, 874, 881.1, 887, 890, 891.1, 891.2, 891.3, 891.4, 891.5.

that the alliance would fall apart was high. The Emperor sought every means to break it up. He made overtures to the Protestants for a religious settlement at meetings of Worms and Regensburg, which would have eliminated the Protestants' reason for joining with France. He fulminated against the Duke of Cleves at the imperial Diet and then declared him to be an outlaw. Eventually, he neutralized Philip of Hesse by threatening to prosecute his bigamous marriage. Furthermore, neither Luther, nor the Protestant princes much trusted Francis I because of his periodic fits of persecuting their confreres.

Marguerite's letter writing campaign evidently helped to reassure at least the Duke de Cleves and the Saxons. In the year after the marriage Marguerite advised them on whom to use at court to keep Francis's commitment strong. In this she was working for them in much the same capacity that she had done for Henry VIII in the 1530s.

After the marriage, the greater alliance, however, needed to be cemented with a clear victory over the Emperor, that would regularize the Duke of Cleves' situation. It was in this context that Marguerite sought to bring England into the quadruple anti-Imperial, anti-Roman alliance outlined above. The English rejected these enticements. In 1542, a general war broke out in which Cleves and France confronted the Emperor. Despite Marguerite's hopes, Francis, as feared, permitted the alliance to come to a crashing halt. In September 1543, at a crucial moment in the war, he idled his troops on the frontier instead of rallying to the endangered Duke of Cleves, leaving him to suffer a complete defeat at the hands of Charles V. Even though this destroyed the links between

France and the German Protestants, Philip Melanchthon and the Duke of Saxony would still appeal to Marguerite for help thereafter.¹²

The next year, 1544, England seized the opportunity to join with the Emperor and attack a weakened France, taking Boulogne in few short months. Under the influence of Cardinal Tournon, Francis I capitulated to the Emperor in the treaty of Crépy (1544), leaving France and England at war. The Franco-Imperial peace was to be sealed through a dynastic marriage. Hinging on this, Francis promised in the secret articles of Crépy to support the Council of Trent, ally against the Turk, make no treaty with England that did not include the Emperor, and subsidize troops for Charles V's planned war against the Schmalkald League.¹³ It was a complete route of the hopes of evangelicals at court.

The Last Gasp of Evangelical Diplomacy, 1545-1547

During the following year, 1545, French evangelical courtiers joined forces with ambassadors from the Schmalkald league to undermine the Franco-Imperial rapprochement and give the Anglo-French-Protestant alliance scheme second life.¹⁴ The first, necessary step was to end the ongoing Anglo-French war. That summer, the evangelical faction encouraged Johann Sturm and his Protestant colleagues to mediate

¹² See Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 942; Saulnier 1972, no. 941.3.

¹³ For the secret articles, see A. Hasenclever, "Die Geheimartikel zum Friede von Crépy vom 19 September 1544," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 45 (1926), 418–426.

¹⁴ David Potter has written an incisive article on "Foreign Policy in the Age of the Reformation: French Involvement in the Schmalkaldic War, 1544-1547." *The Historical Journal* 20 (1977): 525-544. His central theme, namely that French policy toward the German Protestants was indecisive because of the factionalism at court, is sound and will be validated below. He does little, however, to explain the policy goals and initiatives of the evangelical faction at court and separate them from the initiatives of Francis's 'official' policy, which was dominated, as he rightly argues, by Tournon and Admiral Annebault and their licensed diplomats. Concentrating here on the evangelicals' overtures to the English via their secret

between the warring kingdoms.¹⁵ When the Protestants agreed, the evangelicals were able to convince Francis to enter formal negotiations.¹⁶ At the ensuing meeting, representatives of the Emperor, Henry VIII, Francis and the Protestant Princes were all present. While the licensed diplomats traded unacceptable terms, Jean Sturm, Johann Sleidan, and Dr. Bruno arrived in November on a covert mission to Paget, the English ambassador. They had been sent by Marguerite, Mme. d'Estampes, the king's influential mistress, and Longueval with an ambitious plan to fix peace and then proceed to an

messengers, we hope to tease out one side of the complex double game at court.

¹⁵ Francis I expressed willingness for the Protestants to mediate, but he did not commission Sturm to pursue the matter. Other councilors worked against Tournon for this peace for a variety of motives. Jean du Bellay, the Dauphin Henri (who was merely interested in preventing his brother from getting Milan through the imperial marriage stipulated at Crépy), and the Admiral, were the ones who urged Sturm to move the Protestants, but they were not tendering strong offers of religious league. *LP* 20, part 1, no. 1205, 598–600, Bucler and Mont to Henry VIII, 16 July 1545, Worms: "A learned man named Johannes Sturmius, an Argentine, privily retaining to the French king, on the 13th inst. Sent a letter (enclosed) desiring Mount to speak with him next day at Spirs. At their meeting, Sturmius said that a trusty servant whom he often sends to the French Court, two days ago brought letters and also word that, fourteen days ago, being in France with letters from his master to the French king, the Cardinal Bellaius and others asked news of Germany, and he answered that at Worms the Protestants were sorry for the present wars between Francis and Henry. Next day the servant repeated the same words to the French king, who answered "that he might bear well the Protestants for arbiters and pacificatours" betwixt him and Henry, who he has ever loved, perceiving their setting together to be done by craft of others, and that the intolerable cost of the war would be better employed otherwise. Francis added that he thought Henry would render Bologne upon honorable conditions, seeing the expense of keeping it; and he himself would pay all the arrears of the pension, being 800,000 crs. and continue the payments at the accustomed terms. Francis said also that Henry laboured to make a confederacy with the Protestants, which, as tending to prolong the war with France, the Emperor did not mislike. Sturmius had no commission from the French king to propose such things, but had letters from Cardinal Bellaius, the Dolphine and the Admiral, desiring that they should be proposed to the Protestants; and he desired Mont to declare this to Henry. Mont asked for things [to be put] in writing and wrote out the articles (herewith) which Sturmius signed."

Cardinal Tournon strongly opposed the evangelical faction's plans. Sturm told Henry's ambassadors that "Cardinal Turnon and another had interceded with the king of France not to try anything by the Protestants, as any alliance with them would offend the bishop of Rome. Sturmius said that he should easily get the French king himself to write to the Protestants thereupon, provided that they ask it; and he besought Mont to learn whether the King could bear that the Protestants should be mediators, as the French king desired that, by ambassadors of the Protestants, a cessation of hostilities might be the sooner obtained....[and concluded] it seems worth while to send this by a special messenger [to pursue this mater]." *LP* 20, part 1, no. 1207, 600–601, Mont to Paget, 16 July 1545, Worms.

¹⁶ Negotiations started in October 1545 and dragged on through December. *CAF* 9, missions nos. 194 and 195, p. 32.

alliance between England, France, and the Schmalkald League.¹⁷ Paget did not trust them, but since they were offering far more for Boulogne than the French ambassadors,

¹⁷ In a first interview, Sturm and Bruno presented plans for a league with the English and the French as their own plans. The Protestants were certainly interested in this alliance (see Brady), but doubted French trustworthiness. Paget reports: "Brewno began, much as Sleidanus did at his first access to Henry, and [said] apparently *ex tempore*, that (as their common enemy the Pope had the hearts of all the great princes, viz., the Emperor, king of Romans, king of Pole and French king, and this war between Henry and France not only increased the force of others [the Emperor and his allies] who, "not in words yet in re," were common enemies [implied: to England and Protestants], but drew the French king more to the Pope's devotion, whereby at length a conjunction of the great princes with the Pope would bring the Princes of Almayn and Henry under the bp. of Rome's tyranny) they were sent to induce Henry and the French king to agreement. The enfeebling of Henry's power was a decay to their own... And he urged Paget to assist in alienating the French king from them [the Emperor, king of Romans, and the Pope], who [Francis] would do more at the desire of his Princes and States than for any other if Henry would show himself disposed to peace." When Paget called Francis untrustworthy, "Brewno broke in by saying that he heard that personally there had been no contumely between the Kings as between the French king and some other, and therefore the fault lay on their ministers, the King was loved by the French king, the Queen of Navarre, the Chancellor and also Madame Destampes." Paget responded that 'the French were alluring the Protestants to work for them on pretense that it would bind them against the Bishop of Rome; that was a new and pleasant tale to the Protestants but old to the English, who had heard so much of "the taking of Avignon, the devising of a patriarcha," that it was now out of their creed until they should see it done.' *LP* 20, 2, pp. 402–404, Paget to Henry VIII, 21 Nov. 1545, Calais.

In a second interview (22 Nov.), Bruno and Sturm revealed that their real authority to broach such plans came from the evangelical faction at court. *LP* 20, part 2, no. 856, 416–418, Paget to Henry VIII, 23 November 1545: "[Sturm and Bruno] expressed desire for this peace to take effect by their means, as they would then trust to come in confederation with the Kings. Here they set forth the French king's desire for it and the travail of some personage (naming nobody) [Mme. d'Estampes or Marguerite, see further] to induce him thereto, contrary to the minds of the Admiral, Bayard and Card. Turnon, who were Papists and desired to have the matter ended by the Emperor... Now, fearing that those who were so travailling with the French king might withdraw, and the French king seek other friendship noisome both to Henry and them, they wished Paget to tell them whereto Henry would "grow." Answered that this was a piece of his commission which he might not speak of save in presence of his colleagues [Gardiner and others], and which would be best reasoned with the French king's ministers [Admiral d'Annebaut, François Olivier and Bayard] sent for the purpose. They said that they had further commission than, perhaps, the special commissioners [Pierre Rémon, Matthieu de Longuejoux (Bp. of Soissons), and Guillaume Bochetel] who were coming knew of; for Mons. de Longuevale had sent a letter to Paget by his man Laplanche, who prayed them to deliver it and would tarry after the first assembly with the French commissioners; this was not an indirect mean, but, as things were to be spoken not meet for all men to know... [They would] declare more if Paget would promise to participate it to none but Henry and his secretary at home.'

Then next day Sturm came to Paget. Having discussing terms for Boulogne, "afterwards [he] made overtures (which he had commission to utter as his own device) which were the work of Madame Destampes and Mons. Longuevale; the French king hated the Emperor, and so did the Dauphin... [there follow details of France's insincere negotiations via Admiral d'Annebaut with the Emperor, which were only to counter English overtures] Sturmius durst undertake to get the French king to revoke the Admiral if Paget would persuade Henry to revoke Winchester. Paget thought that in any case the Admiral would not tarry long there unless to take advantage of what was done here [i.e., sidelining Henry VIII]. Nay, said Sturmius, the Admiral should never how of this overture of his, and prayed Paget to let none know it save the King, and in anywise to kept it from Winchester. Madame estampes, the Dauphin and Longuevale, who

he communicated their overture to Henry privately.¹⁸ Henry bit and Mme. d'Estampes was able to convince Francis to offer the terms devised by the Evangelicals, which formed the basis of the treaty signed six months later in June 1546.¹⁹

laboured to set the Admiral "besides the cushyn," willed him [Sturm] to open it, and it was this: –Henry to keep Bulloyn, be paid his pension yearly, and have the daughter of Scotland for the Prince [Edward], Bulloyn to be kept until arrears and war expenses were paid. That Henry and the French king should not consume each other, to the advantage of their enemies, but make peace and take the Protestants in with them was the reason why the latter travailed in this matter. Henry and the Protestants would thus be safe from the Emperor and Pope.' Paget expressed grave doubts to Sturm, but nevertheless asked Henry VIII for instructions on all matters, and confessed that "he has more trust in Sturmius's private practices, who is in credit with the French king and those about him that are "not the great favourers of the Bishop of Rome, whereof the Admiral, Bayard and Turnon are chief captains."

Shortly thereafter, circa December 5, La Planche came to Paget to reveal that the evangelical faction at court fully supported the tripartite alliance, and were working to induce Francis to split with Rome. As proof, he produced a letter of credence from Marguerite to Paget. It expressed a desire for peace and, in veiled terms, for a religious league. '[Marguerite] Thanks God for setting these Princes on the way to this happy peace, of which she learnt by La Planche that Paget is one of the ministers. Assures him that she and Madame d'Estampes act together in promoting it... If Paget's king is not too unreasonable, she hopes for a real amity; for, by their influence, the King her brother will be found more than reasonable. She prays God to bind these two hearts in one, to exalt His holy name in order that, without idolatry, He alone may be honoured as God in Heaven and on Earth.' *LP* 20, part 2, no. 942, 470.

Paget reports: '[La Planche] plucked me a letter out of his bosom from the Queen of Navarre [above]," which he delivered with commendations from her and Madame Destampes, and declaration of their desire to bring about peace; for, if those who wrought to join their King with the Emperor prevailed, they who were against the Pope were ruined, and if they could compass as peace, these Papists (the Admiral, Turnon, and the Secretary) "be sent to the Devil headlong." [While discussing the terms for Boulogne] Laplanche wished that Boulloyn were bulla in mari, since both Princes insisted on having it and this peace was France's only hope of deliverance from the tyranny of Rome... and thought that the Emperor tossed the ball both to France and England and would end by deceiving both; that embassy [French to Emperor] was sent because hope was given of better success, but Longueval had got them revoked and Madame Destampes prayed Paget (if she might put the King in hope of Boulloyn) to command her, and thought when peace was made there might be an interview'... [Paget then proposed unacceptable terms to Laplanche, but] he allowed that Sturmius had told him somewhat (and recited the overture). "If Madame Destampes," quoth Laplanche, "can bring the King to that, she will think herself the happiest woman in the world.'" *LP* 20, part 2, pp. 469–470.

¹⁸ *LP* no. 984, pp. 483–487, Paget to Henry VII. 15 Dec. 1545, Calais. This long report details the complex maneuvering at court which resulted, despite the 'papalist' councilors opposition, in Francis I allowing Mme. d'Estampes to send La Planche, Sturm, and Bruno to offer a much more attractive package to Henry.

¹⁹ 20 December 1545, Henry VIII instructed Paget to offer to Francis via Sturm a remittance of all pensions, debts, and money payments owed to England in exchange for allowing Henry to keep Boulogne and support Francis in an immediate rejection of Rome and the Scots. Inscrutably, he argued that should Francis reject these terms (which were ridiculous) this would show to the Protestants that the French were not serious about rejecting the Pope. In any case, this was just a ruse. Henry told Paget to accept Sturm's terms, 'Sturmius is to be pressed earnestly in this, seeing that it contains almost nothing but what was proposed by himself and by La Planche, from the Queen of Navarre and Madame Destampes.' Barring that,

The proposed three-way religious and military alliance, however, was left hanging. During the autumn of 1546 the court evangelicals sent a secret messenger, La Planche, repeatedly to remind the English of Marguerite and Madame d'Estampes' overture for a larger religious union. Wotton reported to Paget—who was now in England on the receiving end of diplomatic dispatches—that La Planche had said that “... *for the glory of God and increase of love between our masters, he [Longueval] desired the French king to reject the Bishop of Rome, and the thing was easy, for Madame d'Estampes desired it and felt sure of it if she might have the king's assistance.*”²⁰ Wotton responded to Longueval that Henry had entreated the French to break with Rome in the past [1535] and would not do so again unless assured that Francis would accept. La Planche insisted that the time was ripe, but that evangelicals at court could not propose the matter themselves; the overture must come from Henry: “*if Madame d'Estampes might assure the French king that the king [Henry] would continue [to be] his friend she will not fail... for the Bishop of Rome has of late so pricked the French king that he will easily give ear to it.*” Paget dismissed this offer of religious concord as a mere pretense to beat down the terms of the Boulogne treaty, pointing out that he knew the French were already making overtures to the Protestants.²¹ Paget meant by this that since Francis was

Henry would settle for a truce. The eventual terms of the treaty ‘of the Camp’ for Boulogne, followed those proposed by the evangelical camp in November–December 1545. See *LP* 20, part 2, no. 1011, 502, Henry VIII to Paget, 20 December 1545; for the terms, Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, 503, citing *LP* 21, part 1, no. 1014.

²⁰ Italics indicate passages in cipher. For this and the following quotes, *LP* 21, 2, no. 248, 117.

²¹ *LP* 21, 2, no. 289, 136–137: Paget to Wotton, 19 Oct. 1546, ‘Wyndesour,’ “the manner of breaking this overture indicates a practice to recover Boulogne before the day appointed by the treaty, and it is not convenient that Paget, who was a minister to make the treaty yesterday should be a minister tomorrow to alter it, nor will the King like the motion, “it” being the key wherewith he keeps locked the door

not going to get anywhere with the Protestants without breaking with Rome, there was not need for English pressure. Paget was half right. The Emperor was preparing for war with the Protestant powers, whose future was in grave doubt. In response to the Schmalkald League's proposal of a three-way league between the Schmalkald League, England and France, Francis I and his conservative councilors were demanding, outrageously, for Boulogne and the Imperial crown as the price for French aid. Obviously, these terms were non-starters. In November 1546, the French evangelicals could but repeat their secret pleas: it was only Henry who could induce Francis to break. They made no mention of changing the treaty, only of a offensive-defensive alliance. Indeed, as the situation in Germany grew dangerously worse for the Schmalkald League, the evangelicals gave up on their broader goal of a military and religious alliance, in order to do their best simply to aid their "brothers" in Germany. Cardinal du Bellay told Wotton, "unless the Protestants are succored, the game is up for the evangelical cause (*actum est de negotio Evangelii*)."²²

of his good brother's friendship; for we know that the French King has already made means to enter in League with the Protestants, who will not agree thereto unless he forsake the Bishop of Rome, and to come to the point now, as if to please us, and expect some reciproke from us, is a proceeding which Paget cannot like; and a meeting between the Princes before the matters in question are concluded might only breed less friendship. "If Monsr. Longuevale think it good that means be made to take away jealousies, we have a debt owing us, we have a pension viager due to us and a perpetual pension due to the posterity, and claims and titles are not clearly out of the book, and these be matters to work upon in my fantasy; and these be the same that Laplanche and I devised on at Calais, wherein, and all other things that I may honestly and with discharge of my duty towards my master and country, I will be glad to put to my hand to the best of my power, for the continuance of the amity between both the Majesties."

²² There seems to have been some disagreement among Francis's evangelical councilors about the priority of forming a military league and inducing Francis to break with Rome. From December 1545 to October 1546, Marguerite, Mme d'Estampes and Longueval had coupled these items giving priority to an Anglo-French alliance based on rejecting Rome, which was to be secured by a meeting of the two kings. By November, du Bellay preferred succoring the greatly endangered German Protestants immediately. Evidently, he felt it would take too long to achieve a French break with Rome. *LP* 21, 2, no. 457, 214-216, Wotton to Paget, 28 Nov. 1546, from 'Chauny': "Has since spoken with the Cardinal of Belay (gives a

As late as December 1546, the Duchess d'Estampes, was still promising that she could induce Francis I to break with Rome, so long as the suggestion came from Henry wrapped in a promise of full-cooperation against the Emperor. Henry was reluctant. To his death in January 1547 he tried rather to hinder an already shaky Franco-Protestant *entente*. Meanwhile, Francis told the Protestants that he would do as Henry VIII did. So no grand anti-Hapsburg, anti-papal league was formed at the eleventh hour. The best that the French evangelical courtiers could managed was to induce Francis to provide covert funds to the Schmalkald league in December 1546, well after the tide of battle had turned against them. On December 31, Wotton wrote home from the French court that Protestant envoys were departing from France towards England having been gratified with more than fair words, and noted that "The Queen of Navarre is sent for, and therefore the Protestants' matter is likely to prosper."²³ This last gasp of evangelical diplomacy, always highly risky and improbable given the nature of the divided French

cipher to represent his name in future) who made a long tale of this affection to this amity and thought the time come to make it straiter, as the Protestants needed help and his master had answered them that he would make a league with them if the King would; if thus leagued together, Belay thought they need fear no one, and unless the Protestants were succoured *actum est de negocio Evangelii*. The Cardinal goes not directly to the rejecting of the Bishop of Rome, but says that that must follow this league. Wotton replied that the French King would doubtless advertise the King of the matter, and they would act therein as expedient. Had a long conversation, in which Wotton said that had the Protestants been content with reason they might have been in league with us. The Cardinal replied that they durst not, because of the French threats [articles of Cr py], and therefore they demanded what they knew the King would not grant. The man shows himself earnest for the Gospel and anxious about the end of matters in Germany."

²³ LP 21, part 2, no. 648, 214–216, Wotton to Paget: 'The Queen of Navarre is sent for, and therefore the Protestants' matter is likely to prosper. The Protestants have had their answer and are shortly departing towards you, only telling Wotton that the answer was good. They are reported to have declared the danger to all princes if the Protestants are overtrodden, the Emperor's intent being manifest; and to have had answer that the French king had made a confederacy with the King of England and would do as that King did. This the ambassadors misliked not, but pointed out their present necessity, seeing Duke Moryce's attempt in Saxony and the Emperor's reinforcing his army under Mons. de Buren now, when it was thought that war should cease for the winter. What answer they have had thereupon Wotton cannot learn, but supposes that it was better than fair words.'

court, ended with the death of Francis I in March 1547. Henry II's palace revolution swept the evangelicals from court.²⁴

Several observations reveal the seriousness and limitations of the evangelicals' plans. First, their overtures were extremely secretive and often pursued outside the normal diplomatic channels. The English were understandably reluctant to pursue such tenuous offers until they proved to be unimpeachably profitable.²⁵ Second, evangelicals claimed that French would split with Rome not as the basis for, but as the possible, much desired consequence of a alliance with England and the Protestants. For the English, the French evangelicals protestation of religious brotherhood, was more a red-herring than good bait, since this issue was quite superfluous to settling the immediate military issues. A religious compact, however, as the Protestant envoys had always argued, was key to a firm offensive and defensive alliance with them against the Emperor, to which the evangelical party equally hoped to attract Henry and thereby Francis. The French evangelicals were, therefore, trying to bring three powers together with very different

²⁴ Thereafter, the new king would help the Protestants and profit by it, probably because a religious compact was never in question. Brady, *Protestant Politics*, 359–362; Richard Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494–1660*, *The Short Oxford History of the Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 124–126.

²⁵ Such an offer may well have fallen on deaf ears. J.J. Scarisbrick argues that Henry's goal during 1546 was to secure the Protestants for himself to the exclusion of the French, lest their troops be used against him. He admits that there is much confusion over the direction of English policy at this time. Among a half dozen plausible interpretations of Henry's intentions, Smith may be correct in arguing that Henry feared a double-cross by the Emperor and therefore was keen to enter a league with France and the Germans. Given Paget's response, Scarisbrick is probably closer to the truth. See, *Henry VIII* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 465–470, esp. 467 and note 5. Similarly, Potter cogently argues that Henry VIII had no grand strategy, but rather sought to gain the maximum profit and honor from his foreign policy. Keeping his options open and other powers divided were key to making his designs succeed. "Foreign Policy," in *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, 106, 110, 118, 133.

agendas in which the issue of religious concord ranged from being superfluous to essential.

From this history, one can draw the conclusion that Francis' evangelical councilors opportunistically promoted policies designed to fulfill simultaneously his dynastic goals as well as favor the establishment of their religious beliefs in France. The evangelical party's plans never succeeded for a number of reasons. One stumbling block, seemingly as central and insoluble as the Eucharist debate, was Francis I's quest for lost lands, Milan and Boulogne. Continual defeat or stalemate on the battlefield always put him in a position of needing the help of foreign powers, be it Rome, England, or the Schmalkald League, to regain them. For evangelicals, this need was a double-edged sword. It made Francis amenable to alliances with 'heretical' powers, yet these powers always, and rightly, suspected his motives. The evangelicals appear to have been sincere in their efforts to use these political alliances of convenience to leverage a fuller reformation in France. They consistently pursued these plans even when French policy was favorable to Rome and the Emperor as well as after the times when these marriages of convenience had brought all the political gains that Francis I desired. A religious concord was never necessary for the French court to get what it desired out of England or the Protestant powers of the Empire, either in Francis I's reign or during that of his son. Yet evangelical courtiers tried to push French policy in that direction, since it would promote their cause at home, by binding Francis' dynastic ambitions to those powers outside the realm who shared their religious ones.

Failed Diplomacy and Domestic Damage Control

Perhaps the best way to assess the seriousness of self-acclaimed evangelicals at court is to inquire how they used their power in the domestic spheres in which they had greater control than in French foreign policy. Give the present state of scholarship, no full survey is possible, though there are some telling examples for the Du Bellays²⁶ and rather less evidence for Mme. d'Estampes or her creature Longueval.

The figure upon whom this study concentrates, Marguerite of Navarre, measures up rather well on the test of her domestic politics. In 1540, Martin Luther called on her, "to testify about Christ before kings," and "to protect ministers of the word, to promote the cause of Christ, and to defend other devout confessors of the truth ... so that God's word and truth may spread as widely as possible among the churches of France and the kingdom of France may truly be called and upheld as most Christian."²⁷ Luther's idealized list of duties matches her actual deeds. As to protecting ministers, her early support of evangelicals has been noted. From the mid-1530s, she advanced several protégés, despite well-deserved suspicions about their orthodoxy, to high ecclesiastical posts including Jean du Bellay, her almoner, Gérard Roussel, and Antonio Caracciolo, the eventual Bishop *and* Reformed minister of Troyes. Others whom she championed and would later criticize, as "maskers in red caps," such as Cardinals François Tournon, an

²⁶ On the Du Bellay brother's patronage of a gamut of evangelical writers, see the works by V.L. Bourrilly cited in chapter 9, note 2.

²⁷ *WA Br* 9, no. 3565, 299–301; 301, 23–35: "...optatius sit...ut Vestra Celistudo pergat ...confiteri constanter christum et filia Regum in Honorem filii dei Christi et summi domini loqui de verbo et Testimoniis dei coram regibus, fovere ministros verbi, provehere negocium christi et reliquos pios confessores veritatis defendere... Orabimus pro inclyto regno Galliae, vt deus Vestram Celistudinem servuet et stabiliat ac... ut in Ecclesiis Galliae Verbum et Veritas Dei quam latissime propagetur. ut regnum

early champion of the Jesuits, and Georges d'Armagnac, some-time reforming bishop of Rodez, would become pillars of the Counter and Catholic Reformations in France.

As to protecting 'devout confessors', she was never able to convince her brother after 1536 to allow freer religious expression, especially via evangelical preaching. Nevertheless, she seems to have tried. In 1540, while condemning Sacramentarians to her brother, she reminded him of her view that the 1534 Placards was a devious plot hatched by conservatives who then unleashed the ensuing persecution. Her response to failing to sway Francis to reigning in the conservatives or even to promoting evangelical preaching was evidently to short-circuit the pursuit of heresy in the judicial system. A notable setback came in the 1530s when the Dominican whom she had installed as inquisitor at Toulouse went to the stake for heterodox views. In the early 1540s, she claimed regalian privilege and set free several religious detainees at Bordeaux. Further, she successfully appealed to Francis to lessen the severity of sentencing statutes governing religious crimes. He went so far as to require any future heresy indictments against Marguerite's servants to be evoked to his council, where, as in the past, she could obtain leniency.

In sum, the evangelical faction's diplomacy and Marguerite's domestic efforts indicates that their idea of a reformed Gallican Church more closely resembled those of the princes of England and Germany than the "Devil" in Rome. The chances of inducing Francis to make that march, however, were never great because of factors beyond their control. If evangelical diplomacy failed on the international front, there were perpetual

battles to be waged at home. Since religious persecution in France was linked to the conservatives' ascendancy at court, it can be argued that the evangelicals party's diplomacy slowed its growth, and that this in turn gave some cover to the spread of the broad currents of evangelicalism. This assertion is born out in the careers of Claude Baduel, Rector of the University of Nîmes and Gérard Roussel, Marguerite's almoner, closest spiritual advisor, and Bishop of Oloron.

II. Building Evangelical Institutions: Claude Baduel and Gérard Roussel

Marguerite, Claude Baduel, and the University of Nîmes

The story of Marguerite's involvement with Claude Baduel and the University of Nîmes is a clear example of how she tried to spread the evangelical movement through established institutions. Previously, at Bourges in her Duchy of Berry, Marguerite had hired several famous legal professors and installed several prelates who helped to fostered the evangelical group there.²⁸ Many students, such as Theodore Beza and John Calvin were introduced to evangelical ideas there.

In the late 1530s and 1540s, Marguerite contributed to a similar development in Nîmes. Claude Baduel was recommended three times to Marguerite as a promising young scholar whose heart was in the right place, first by Philip Melanchthon in 1534, and then twice by Martin Bucer in 1537 and 1538.²⁹ In 1537, the council of Nîmes asked

²⁸ See chapter 9, n. 1.

²⁹ See Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 597, 671, 774.

for Marguerite's help in elevating their Latin school into a University.³⁰ She took up their cause, and by 1540 with her brother's help she managed to have University of Nîmes established with Claude Baduel as its first rector. Meanwhile she forced six local bishops to endow the school with annual incomes of 200 *livres* each. In 1542, she obtained confirmation of the school's foundation from the Pope.

During the 1540s, Baduel led an embattled existence at Nîmes.³¹ He was the linchpin of an extended network of evangelicals in the region, including local notables and artisans as well as learned men as far away as Toulouse. This role involved him in a series of conflicts at Nîmes as well as the trials at friends across the region, such as Morlet, a local shoe-maker, who was indicted for heresy at Toulouse, and René Gasné, the nephew-in-law of Guillaume Pellicier, Bishop of Montpellier, who wanted him prosecuted for his crimes against religion.³² Meanwhile, as representative of these brethren, he was in extensive contact with John Calvin at Geneva after 1547, with whom he had become friends during his journey to Strasbourg.

To round out the picture of Baduel's leadership, on 26 May 1549, he recommended one of his promising students as a suitable 'minister' to a bishop in the

³⁰ For this letter and the following events see Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 792, 796, 826, 893; S6, nos. 646.2, 646.3, 685.1, 685.2, 883.1.

³¹ Gaufès has written a fine study on Baduel's career. Here, some important moments and letters from his Nîmes years will be developed. See M.-J. Gaufès, *Claude Baduel et la réforme des études au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1880).

³² Gaufès, *Claude Baduel*, 205-208; 211 ff. For Baduel's letter on behalf of Morlet, BPF MS 186/1 & 186/2, *Transcription des principaux fragments d'un manuscrit, contenant des lettres et des discours de Cl. Baduel* (Numéros d'ordre dans le ms. d'Avignon)," nos. 1, 5, 6, 7, 29 and 83, and of behalf of Gasné, nos. 4, 84, 85, and 86.

entourage of Marguerite of Navarre at Nérac, who must have been Gérard Roussel.³³

Baduel lauds the student's morals and his zeal for the Church of Christ, saying that he was fleeing to Nérac because he was being persecuted on account of the name of Christ, which to him was most dear. Baduel ranks him among those few truly enflamed by a love and zeal for Christ and his Church, a man well suited to be one of its ministers.

My reverend father, last year when you were at Nîmes with the Queen of Navarre, I recommended to you the present letter carrier... This day has been reserved for him by the Lord, who watches over the circumstances and affairs of all the saints. He is now fleeing to you having endured the greatest persecution for the name of the One whose glory he desires above all things. Moreover, considering the extreme scarcity of such ministers, one ought to eagerly embrace a man of his probity and an opportunity like this. Considering your established custom, your exemplary benevolence, and your ordained authority, you ought to make sure that the church of Christ does not forgo the efforts of so faithful a person which this age so desperately needs... I know him to be a good and moderate man completely inspired by incredible love and zeal for Christ and his church.³⁴

³³ Gaufres does not make much of this letter.

³⁴ BPF MS 186/1, fol. 24v°–25v° (copie d'un manuscrit à Toulouse). "Ep. 38 [Numéros d'ordre dans le ms. d'Avignon]. *Neraco*, prélat ami de la Reine de Navarre, a qui Baduel recommande un ecclésiastique luthérien. 26 Mai, [1549]." "C. B. Neraco R.P. [Reverende Pater] S.P.D. [Salutem plurimam dicit.]

Anno superiore cum tu Nemausum cum Re.[Regina] Navarrae venisses istum tibi commendavi. Sed cum tardius ad te fuisset deductus et Reg.[Reginam] praesentatus factum est in subita vestra decessione [end 24v°] ut neque ego tibi diligentius commendare atque in tuam fidem pietatemque tradere potuerim neque tu eum ita cognoscere ut ipsius dignitas postulabat. Nam hujusmodi res postea ei acciderunt ut cum maximopere cuperet tamen nec vobiscum loqui nec vos Avenionem proficiscentes consequi potuerit. Itaque ad istud tempus reservatus a Domino qui tempora negotiaque sanctorum moderatur ad te nunc confugit multa perpersus nomine illius cujus gloriae est cupidiss[imus] in summa autem paucitate talium ministrorum desideranda est hujus modi opportunitas atque integritas. Quare pro tua consuetudine summaque charitate et autoritate dubis [dabis?] operam ne Ecclesia Christi opera istius tam fideli et necessaria hoc tempore carere videatur id que ut facies te etiam atque etiam rogo. Ego quia istum virum bonum et moderatum singularique Christi ejusque ecclesiae studio et amore inflammatum plane cognovi. Propterea non dubitavi opinionis meae testimonium ei apud te dare. Tu pro tuo ingenio plura majora que in eo reperies quum [quam?] ego possim aut animadvertere aut his meis [end 25r°] literis declarare. Bene vale Praesul Re. [Reginae] Nemausi xxvi maii."

There are two main possibilities for this prelate addressed : 1. Charles de Pisseleu, Brother of the Duchesse d'Étampes, Bishop of Condom, in whose diocese Nérac was situated. "Il est nommé en 1544, à l'évêché de Condom, par l'autorité de Marguerite, pendant la période même, cruciale,... de la présente étude," Causse, "Familière Exposition," 6. The Parlement would pursue him and Tristan de Bizet, Bishop of

This letter, from one member of Marguerite's network to another, is a striking example of what appears to have been an informal system for the formation and placement of evangelical ministers. Baduel describes him as faithful, avid for the glory of God, inspired by love and zeal for Christ and his church, and, in short, as one of the rare breed of true ministers of his Gospel. From the pen of Baduel or in the ear of a bishop close to Marguerite, such phrases meant that such a man was an evangelical, who shared their desire for the advancement of the church of Christ.

In the eighty plus letters that remain from Baduel's correspondence from the years 1548-1550, there are many other examples in which Baduel seeks a position for a student or colleague as a teacher, or rather as a sort of lay minister, in an evangelical community, which is exactly the role that Baduel fulfilled at the University of Nîmes.³⁵

In addition, Baduel's correspondence from these years shows that he had a close relationship with a network of evangelical notables in the south of France as well as protestant leaders in Switzerland and the Empire, including Calvin, Marthurin Cordier (formerly of Bordeaux) at Lausanne, Philippe Melanchthon, et Gervais Wain. It is striking that despite his description of Marguerite to Melanchthon as having been "less a support for us than she used to be," he could still count on her aid. When in 1549 he started seeking refuge in Switzerland, he told a friend that she would recommend his

Saintes, (after 1550) for being lax in the pursuit of heretics. 2) But the addressee is more likely Gérard Roussel, who was Abbot of Clairac, which is near Nérac, seat of Marguerite's power. He habitually attended her court and traveled with her. He also had had connections with the German evangelical circles in which Baduel traveled before he settled in France and become rector of Nîmes. It was certainly not the Bishop of Agen, the Cardinal of Lorraine.

³⁵ See BPF MS 186/1 and 186/2; and Gaufres, *Claude Baduel*, passim.

candidacy for a post at the Academy of Lausanne.³⁶ That friend was Jacques de Renaud, sr. d'Alen, who had previously offered his services to Calvin and sent his son to study at Lausanne. When Renaud died the following year, Baduel spread the word in southern France and notably to Marthurin Cordier at Lausanne, that the faithful had lost one of the major pillars of their communities, one who “longed in this our most wretched slavery and under this oppression for the most beloved tabernacle of the Lord and desired to follow your most holy church.”³⁷ Baduel’s letters offer a brief glimpse onto the activities of the network linked to Marguerite, which, unfortunately, are for the most part lost from sight. Nevertheless, it is evident that Marguerite had quite consciously promoted an academy that, at least in part, trained ministers for an evangelical reform of the church, who in turn fed back into the reform program in her territory in the Béarn.

Bishop Gérard Roussel’s Evangelical Reform at Mid-Century

Gérard Roussel, the likely recipient of Baduel’s letter of recommendation cited above, was perhaps the most important spiritual leader in Marguerite’s entourage from 1526 until her death. His career as Bishop of Oloron from 1536-1555 is an important test-case for the late stages of the French ‘evangelical’ movement.

After his participation in the failed reforming movement at Meaux, Marguerite took Roussel under her protection appointing him as her almoner, personal confessor, and

³⁶ BPF MS 186/1, no. 21, f. 18r–19 r. Reginaldo (Renaud d’Alen) projet de départ pour la Suisse. 1549, “Ea in re me etiam Regina Navarrae sua autoritate et commendatione iuavaret.”

³⁷ BPF MS 186/1, no. 90, f. 53v–55r. Petro Cassoleto (Cordier), a Lausanne. 1550. “Tu noveras hominem singulari praeditum pietate ac charitate qua perpetuo in hac miserrima servitute nostra atque oppressione ad tabernacula domini amabilissima suspirabat sanctissimamque ecclesiam vestram desiderabat.”

court preacher:³⁸ a close relationship that would last until her death in 1549. In Paris during the Lenten seasons of 1533 and 1534 Roussel's popular sermons helped to ignite and sustain the year and a half long battle between the Faculty of Theology and evangelicals for the heart of the Parisian public. When Roussel landed in jail, Marguerite secured his release from prison. Roussel eventually retreated with Marguerite to her southern territories. Despite his suspect résumé, Marguerite convinced the Roman Curia to name him coadjutor to the See of Oloron in 1534, to which he was promoted in 1536, making his official entry in 1539.³⁹ About his career as Bishop there exist several reports that depict him as an active prelate setting up schools, teaching students, preaching frequently, holding synods, caring for the poor, and helping to lead the religious life of Marguerite's court.⁴⁰ Roussel should have been able there in the Béarn, if ever, to implement the evangelical reform hoped for earlier.

Late in his career, Roussel composed two works titled the *Familiere exposition* and *Forme de visite de diocese*.⁴¹ The *Familiere exposition* explains in dialogue form the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer. Had it been published,

³⁸ A. Durengues, "Gérard Roussel, abbé de Clairac, évêque d'Oloron," *Revue de l'Agenais* 43 (1916), 340–362; 343.

³⁹ Durengues, "Gérard Roussel," 353: Roussel was only admitted into his church 24 January 1539. The chapter of Oloron had put up a rival to Roussel. He overcame these obstacles on 29 March 1539. Durengues cites Menjoulet, *Chronique du diocèse et du pays d'Oloron*, 1869, p. 41.

⁴⁰ See Charles de Ste.-Marthe, *Oraison funèbre de la reine de Navarre*, 1550; Florimond de Raemon, *L'histoire de la naissance... de l'hérésie de ce siècle*, book 7, ch. 3, (p. 849–851 in Rouen, 1622 edition); Charles Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel: Prédicateur de la reine Marguerite de Navarre. Mémoire, servant à l'histoire des premières tentatives faites pour introduire la Réforme en France* (Strasbourg, 1845; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970) passim; A. Degret, "L'évêque d'Oloron, G. Roussel et la curie romaine," *Revue de Gascogne* (1904): 227–228; and Durengues, "Gérard Roussel," 345–359.

⁴¹ The full titles of these works are: *Familiere exposition du Symbole, de la loy et Oraison dominicale, en forme de colloque* and the *Forme de visite de Diocese*. The *Familiere exposition* will be cited hereafter as *FE*, with manuscript foliation. They are extant in only one manuscript at the *Bibliothèque*

as Roussel wished, it would have counted among the two dozen or so catechetical expositions of the symbols of the faith that were published in French during the years 1520-1550.⁴² Roussel's text remained in manuscript because the Faculty of Theology in Paris condemned a version of this work in 1550.⁴³ The second work is, as its title advertises, a diocesan visitation manual. Together, these texts contain the evangelical doctrine and the revised orthopraxy that Roussel ostensibly taught in his diocese. Regrettably, the episcopal records for Oloron in this period are lost, preventing an assessment of the full scope and impact of his program. However, court records and chroniclers register that Roussel was implementing this program. Significantly, the same issues stressed in his visitation manual kept provoking local conservative catholics to attack Roussel: namely his reform of the cult of the saints, confession, and more obliquely, indulgences.

After sketching the political environment in which Roussel operated, the principles of Roussel's reforming program will be analyzed, concentrating, in particular, on his visitation manual. This juxtaposition of context and text, shows that Roussel believed his solafideist theology would renew the cult and promote unity at a time when, as he recognized, schism threatened. With this promise of unity, he sought to make his program acceptable to the state-building projects of his secular lord, Henri d'Albret.

Nationale, fond français 419.

⁴² See Francis Higman, article on catechisms.

⁴³ Had they seen the version preserved in BnF ff. ms 419, they would have been more incensed. It has additional, demonstrably heterodox, material on faith and works and the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. Nor would his second work in this manuscript, the *Forme de visite de diocese*, have pleased them.

The Béarn of Henri d'Albret, King of Navarre

In 1534, when Marguerite of Navarre promoted Roussel's candidacy, she needed the agreement of her husband, Henri d'Albret, for Oloron was one of two bishoprics in his sovereign territory of Béarn.⁴⁴ Like many contemporary princes, Henry had undertaken an ambitious campaign of state-building. In this regime, the ecclesiastical lords were key figures: by law the Bishop of Lescar presided over the estates of Béarn, the Bishop of Oloron seconded him, and they along with several abbots sat on the King's privy council.

Henri's most important officer was Roussel's senior colleague, Jacques de Foix, Bishop of Lescar. His signature appears on many edicts that strengthened Henri's government.⁴⁵ He drew up complete lists of the feudal dues owed to the crown, exacted them, and published for the first time in 1552 the customary law code of Béarn. Jacques de Foix' actions as a leading prelate in the Béarn complemented his role in government. As Bishop of Oloron and later of Lescar, de Foix published two breviaries: one for Oloron with a special rite for the region's patron Saint Grat, the other dedicated to the Virgin Mary. In Oloron, he created an episcopal chancery in the important Basque city of Mauléon and published the statutes of the diocese in 1529.⁴⁶ In Lescar, he imposed the

⁴⁴ Oloron extended across Henry d'Albret's sovereign territory of Béarn into those lands that he ruled in fief or as governor with his wife, Marguerite d'Angoulême, on behalf her brother Francis I.

⁴⁵ According to Abbé Menjoulet, Foix oversaw "la réformation générale du domaine, commencée dès l'an 1538." He notes that Foix was an active member of government as well as an reforming, resident bishop well before this date. See Abbé J. Maximien Menjoulet, *Chronique du diocèse et du pays d'Oloron (Béarn méridional et Soule)*, 2 vols. (Oloron: Marque, 1864 and 1869); vol. 2, 38, 43, 54–55.

⁴⁶ Menjoulet, *Chronique*, vol. 2, 38.

rule of St. Augustine on his cathedral canons.⁴⁷ Notably, as Henry d'Albret issued a series of edicts against heresy, Jacques de Foix enforced them by bringing sectarians to trial.⁴⁸ Finally, in 1552, the bishop of Lescar had his 1551 synodal statutes printed at the same time as the Customs of Béarn.

The statutes of de Foix from 1529 and 1551 provided guidelines for the faith and the administration of the church. Notably, on the issue of doctrine, he declared that his clergy were to adhere to all the articles defined by the University of Paris since the Council of Basel, to the Ten Commandments, and to a treatise on the seven sacraments.⁴⁹ In essence, over his career, Jacques de Foix integrated a typical late-medieval reform program with the project of early-modern state-building.

⁴⁷ See Charles Dartigue-Peyrou, *La vicomté de Béarn sous le règne de Henri II d'Albret (1517–1555)*, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg 67, (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1934), 453.

⁴⁸ Dartigue-Peyrou quotes the key clauses of this edict in *La vicomté de Béarn*, 456: “Le 1er mars 1541, le vicomte s'en prend pour la première fois aux prédications de fausses doctrines qui ‘depuis quelque temps, que ce soient des prêtres, des religieux habitant un monastère ou des pères appartenant aux quatre ordres mendiants, se sont retirés et se retirent journellement dans les ‘églises des villes, lieux et villages du pays et sont soutenus dans leur attitude par la complicité des jurats de l'endroit. De plus, ces agitateurs marchent avec l'assentiment des curés et des vicaires, dans les églises de qui ils prennent la parole. Ils prêchent témérairement la doctrine qui leur plaît et certains d'entre eux agissant par ignorance, témérité ou malice scandalisent le dit peuple et le séduisent, lui inculquant diverses erreurs contraires à la loi de Dieu et à la Sainte Ecriture...qu'ils profanent, interprètent mal et rendent obscure... Afin de lutter efficacement contre semblable danger chacun des évêques dans son diocèse chargera des personnages instruits, capables et de jugement sûr, détenir l'œil au guet dans l'intention nettement arrêtée d'éviter que le peuple chrétien n'entende prêcher nulle hérésie ou doctrine contraire à la loi de Dieu. Il appartiendra donc aux seuls prélats de n'admettre comme prédicateurs que des hommes de orthodoxie incontestable. Tous jurât et tout prêtre convaincu d'avoir contrevenu à ces prescriptions sera frappé d'une amende égale à dix fois le montant d'une peine pécuniaire de la catégorie supérieure.” [AD Basse-Pyrénées. B 2229]

⁴⁹ Dartigue-Peyrou, *La vicomté de Béarn*, 454: “Non content d'avoir amorcé quelques réformes disciplinaires dans le bréviaire de 1541, l'évêque de Lescar prit d'importantes décisions dans les “constitutions synodales” de 1552. En vertu de ce règlement, les futurs prêtres durent adhérer aux articles de foi prescrits par l'Université de Paris lors du concile de Bâle, admettre les dix préceptes du décalogue et le traité sur les sept sacrements de l'église. De plus, ces récipiendaires promirent de ne jamais abandonner le sacerdoce, de s'abstenir de tout blasphème et de s'attacher à conserver perpétuellement les donations, prébendes, chapellenies et autres bénéfices ecclésiastiques.” In addition, he repeated the canonical statutes requiring that clerics take orders in a timely fashion, that priests remain resident in their parishes fulfilling

What then was Roussel's place in this grand plan? Although Henri d'Albret supported his candidacy,⁵⁰ Roussel was embattled throughout his episcopacy with the local ecclesiastical lords. The Roman curia provided him with the see in 1536,⁵¹ but he only took possession in 1539 after overcoming the cathedral chapter's nominee.⁵² In 1545, the minutes of the privy council record Roussel complaining to the king that three royal councilors, his "capital enemies," had been defaming him as a heretic.⁵³ Jean d'Escurre, a priest, and Jean de Marca had made "an abusive inquiry without commission against the suppliant (Roussel) as to his religion and in several trials he (d'Escurre) had told [the council] that although the suppliant is an upstanding gentleman, he smacks of Lutheran opinions and books." The third councilor, Martin de Poey, had libeled Roussel by spreading the rumor that the Parlement of Bordeaux had twice indicted Roussel on charges of heresy. Enraged by this falsehood, when Roussel encountered the councilor, there were "some choice and uncouth words between them... and the suppliant

their duty to instruct the people, and that the laity abstain from touching church revenues.

⁵⁰ See the memoir of 1535 signed by Henry to his agent at Rome to promote Roussel's candidacy. The whole plan was obviously inspired by Marguerite, since it calls for the aid of her allies in the French ambassadorial corps in Rome. Moreover, it calls for her to be informed directly should problems arise. The original is conserved in BnF MS Dupuy 153, f. 71r–72v. The printed edition in Menjoulet, *Chronique*, vol. 2, 481–485, should be corrected against the manuscript since there are some poor readings and important lines missing, which bear on Marguerite's strategy.

⁵¹ For the date of his provision with Oloron as well as his Abbey at Clairac, see A. Degret, "L'évêque d'Oloron, Gérard Roussel et la curie romaine," *Revue de Gascogne* (1904), 227–228.

⁵² The rival was Gaston de Foix. He would seem to have been a local candidate (related to the bishop of Lescar?), as was typical of the upper clergy of Béarn until Julius II subjected these sees to non-resident Italian cardinals. See Menjoulet, *Chronique*, vol. 2, 44; and Dartigue-Peyrou, *La vicomté de Béarn*, 445.

⁵³ See Dartigue-Peyrou, *La vicomté de Béarn*, "pièces justificatives" XXXVIII and XXXIX, pp. 603–606. The first document relates to the trial of an Augustinian friar who was being pursued for preaching heretically in Oloron. In it, the three men against whom Roussel complains, Mgr Jean d'Escurre, Mgr. Martin de Poey, and Jean de Marca are all cited as members of the King's council. They also appear to have been the close collaborators of Henri's chancellor, Jacques de Foix in many other documents published by Dartigue-Peyrou.

[Roussel] was compelled to tell the other that he would be very happy to die at the same time as the forenamed de Poey.” The sixty-five-year-old Bishop had some fire in his belly; he wanted to “call out” his slanderer to protect his honor.

Henry d’Albret did silence Roussel’s enemies, but their supposed commission and attacks were not unfounded. In an earlier ordinance, Henri d’Albret had fulminated against disorder in the churches “principally with regard to those in the diocese of Oloron.”⁵⁴ The magistrates of Bordeaux also had their eyes on Roussel. In 1546, they cited the town of Clairac over which Roussel ruled as Abbot, as one of the chief centers of heresy in the region.⁵⁵

Nevertheless, Henri d’Albret never publicly pursued Roussel as a heretic, even after Marguerite of Navarre died in December 1549. Rather, Henri’s religious policy aimed at peace. In 1546, Henri ordered that all accusations for heresy be made lawfully in notarized documents.⁵⁶ False accusations would incur the same harsh penalties as

⁵⁴ See this particular command among the list of Henry d’Albret’s several edicts pertaining to religious affairs in Dartigue-Peyrou, *La vicomté de Béarn*, 489–491.

⁵⁵ The record reads: “Le 13 novembre 1546, le premier président Delage a remontré qu’il falloit donner ordre sur le fait de la foi et religion chrétienne, aussi pourveoir sur ledit fait quant aux habitants de Bregerac, Sainte-Foi, Moncaret, Cleirac, lieux grandement diffamés dudit crime d’heresie,” in Jean de Métivier, *Chronique du Parlement de Bordeaux*, published by Arthur de Brezet and Jules Delpit, 2 vols., Publications de la Société des Bibliophiles de Guyenne (Bordeaux: Société des Bibliophiles, 1886–1887) 448.

⁵⁶ For the text in *Béarnaise* see Victor-Pierre Dubarat, ed., *Documents et bibliographie sur la Réforme en Béarn et au Pays Basque*, 2 vols. (Pau: Vignancour, 1900; Pau: G. Lescher-Moutoué, 1904), vol. 1, 36–39. Maurice Causse argues correctly that this edict provided Roussel with the rhetorical point of departure to justify his *Familiere exposition* to Henri d’Albret. Causse further asserts that Roussel used obedience to the terms of the edict as a cover to inculcate heretical doctrines to his flock in a conscious act of dissembling. In this author’s view, Roussel rather had a firm belief that his doctrine, however misunderstood, was the true, universal, indeed *catholic*, basis for Christian life and that it was compatible with Henri d’Albret’s religious policy. See Causse’s “Les dissimulations de Marguerite de Navarre et l’aventure nicodémite,” *BSHPF* 132 (1986) 347–390; esp. 348–350 on Henri’s edict.

heresy justly proved. Meanwhile, he enforced that only ministers licensed by the bishops could give religious instruction.⁵⁷

In the Béarn, Roussel faced a difficult situation. While he enjoyed the legal support of his king, he was viewed by the chief royal officers as a wolf guarding the flock. Regrettably, none of these documents describe the nature of Roussel's supposed heresy. However, it is clear that while he was being held responsible for the growing religious disorder, Roussel had to reckon with the standard of orthodoxy imposed by Henri d'Albret's edicts and embodied in Jacques de Foix' reform program. How then did Roussel articulate his program in this context?

Roussel's Reform Program: Theory and Impact

Regarding Gérard Roussel's two manuals of religious instruction one first wants to know: Did he ever apply in practice the theology expressed in these prescriptive texts? As shown above, traditional catholics evidently saw and heard enough to indict Roussel as the regions heresiarch. On the protestant side, in the second of Calvin's *Epistolae Duae* (1537), he attacked Roussel in all but name for becoming a bishop, billing his old

⁵⁷ Moreover, Henri enjoined the people to live in obedience with the law of God "according to form and manner that will be committed, handed down, taught, exposed and made to be understood by the aforementioned priests, pastors, and superiors." In particular, Henri decreed against those who met in illicit, secret gatherings to dogmatize about the faith and criticizes "the ordinances and constitutions of the holy Roman church, the customs, (and) the ceremonies observed through long usage in the churches of these dioceses." See Dubarat, *Documents*, vol. 1, 37–38: "... habem prohibit et deffendut.... à totes persones privades no disputar, domatizar per las tebernes, taules publiques et en las maisons particulares, per assemblades et conventicules secretes, sus los punctz de la fee, ordenances, et constitutions de la sancte Glisie Romane, costumes, cerymonyes obervades per long usadye en las glisies de lors diocese et sus so no mover auguns dobtes ny difficultatz per questions et disputes, loes ungs ab los autres; mes habem injungit et injungim de viver en l'obedience et observance deus comandamentz de Diu, segond et en la forme et maneyre que per lods. prelatz, pastors, superiors, lors comys et deputaz los sera ensenhat, expausat et feyt entendre, senhs res en revocar en dobte et no remenhs, affin que si aucuns se trobaben haber mal sentit de

friend as the archetypal Nicodemite: a variety of hypocrite who knows the true doctrine but practices the impure catholic cult for worldly reasons.

In the *Familiere Exposition*, Roussel answers the charges of schismatic heresy and cowardly Nicodemism. On the political level, Roussel responds directly to Henri d'Albret's state-building program and anti-heresy edicts. In the preface, the bishop advertises to Henri that his teachings will alleviate the people's ignorance that leads to "impiety and injustice." Thereby, God will make them obedient, which, Roussel says, "I would consider a very much greater honor and benefit to you than if [God] were to make you his minister to conquer the kingdoms of the earth." This was, perhaps, but small comfort for Henry whose more modest plans to retake Spanish Navarre were always thwarted.

Remarkably, on the theological level, as several scholars have suggested, Roussel's catechetical texts share many precepts with protestant thought including a centering, almost overwhelming, emphasis on the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ's sole meritorious sacrifice. Paul J. Landa has demonstrated several examples of the influence of Luther and Calvin on Roussel's theology in his unpublished dissertation from 1976, titled "The reformed theology of Gérard Roussel, Bishop of Oloron." But did such theological dependence make him a cowardly protestant hiding under a bishop's miter?

It appears not. Roussel provides his characteristic answer to the issue of reform and schism in his discussion of the most important doctrinal issue of the Reformation, the

la fee et religion crestiana, sien punitz..."

Eucharist, which will be analyzed below. Anticipating those findings, while Roussel follows Calvin's 1543 *Institutes* closely when explaining the sacrament and in describing a simple rite for its observance, he never rejects the traditional church because of its corrupted mass. He rails against "the abominations, abuses, irreverence, discords and debates that are an affront to God and dangerous to souls," surrounding the sacrament, but he never names the specific abuses.⁵⁸ Rather, Roussel calls for an end to contention: "If this simplicity had been followed [namely following Christ's words in simple faith], there would not have been introduced the diverse opinions and discord that do great injury to the truly Christian union commanded and required by this sacrament."⁵⁹ This principle, for Roussel, applied to all disputes over doctrine and practice.

When one turns to the crucial issue of how Roussel put this call for renewal without schism into practice, the evidence is sparse yet telling. Both catholic and protestant historians from the sixteenth century report that he was an active prelate, well loved by the people.⁶⁰ According to them, our Bishop preached three times daily, associated other preachers in his work, taught in the local schools, and convoked synods.

⁵⁸ *FE*, 168v., 403.

⁵⁹ He begins "I indeed recommend this simplicity [namely following the words of institution] to you as that which makes one walk with confidence without turning to the right or left, without falling into dispute, which engenders and nourishes discord and does not at all edify the true union to which this sacrament tends (with the passage quoted following)." *FE*, 156r., 372: "Si en toutes institutions et ordonnances est requis suyvre l'intention et parole de l'instituteur et ordonneu[x] d'autant plus au présent sacrement, qui n'est de l'escholle du sens et raison humaine, mais du tout de l'escholle de foy... Ceste simplicité m'est de par vous la bien recommandée comme celle qui faict cheminer avec confiance sans se destourner ny à dextre ny à sénestre, sans tumber en dispute qui soit pour engendrer et nourrir discorde et non point édifier à vray unyon à laquelle tend le sacrement. M.: Si ceste simplicité eust esté suyvie, n'eussent esté introduictes les diverses opinions et discordes, au grand préjudice de l'union vrayment chrestienne recommandée et exigée par ce sacrement."

⁶⁰ See Charles de Ste.-Marthe, *Oraison funèbre de la reine de Navarre*, 1550 (Latin and French), reprinted in *Heptaméron*, ed. Anatole de Montaiglon (Paris: Eudes, 1880), 231 ff; Florimond de Raemon.

The most significant of these reports is Sponde's spectacular tale of Roussel's last synod. He relates that a crowd in Mauléon expelled Roussel's vicar-general, a former Benedictine and the future reformed pastor at Clairac, Charles Aymérici, for having spoken against the invocation of saints and indulgences. Roussel convoked a synod at the Basque stronghold to calm the people and to explain the actions of his lieutenant. In the first session, he scandalized the clergy by suggesting that a certain number of saints' days should be suppressed. Then, while Roussel was preaching to the laity about these matters, a local grandee took a hatchet from under his cloak and with a few stout blows chopped the pulpit down. Roussel fell *ex cathedra* and his men carried him away half-dead.⁶¹

The *Forme de visite de diocese*⁶² provides what was probably Roussel's agenda for such a synod. Roussel had four main concerns for his diocese: 1.) He requires above all that the clergy administer the sacraments truly and preach "pure Word of God, (which is) the Gospel that Jesus Christ commanded to be preached to every creature."⁶³ 2.) They

L'histoire de la naissance... de l'hérésie de ce siècle, book 7, ch. 3, (p. 849–851 in Rouen, 1622 edition); Charles Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, 119–121; and Chanoine A. Durengues, "Gérard Roussel, abbé de Clairac, évêque d'Oloron," *Revue de l'Agenais* 43 (1916) 340–362., "Gérard Roussel," 345–359.

⁶¹ *Gallia Christiana*, vol. I, "Ecclesia Olorensis," col. 1277B–1279B, which summarizes the near contemporary account of Sponde (Spondanus). More expansive treatments are in Menjoulet, *Chronique* vol. 2, 58–61; and Marc Forissier, *Histoire de la Réforme en Béarn*, Vol. 1 (Tarbes: Edit. d'Albret, 1951) 81.

⁶² The *Forme de visite de diocèse* is found in BnF ff. MS 419, f. 175r–179v. It has been published in Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, pp. 226–239; and edited with the scriptural and patristic references noted by Paul J[oseph] Landa in his "The reformed theology of Gérard Roussel, Bishop of Oloron (1536–1555), based upon a critical edition of his 'Familiere exposition du simbole, de la loy et oraison dominical en forme d Colloque' and his 'Forme de visite de diocese (c. 1548),' " Ph.D. Thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1976, (Ann Arbor: University Microfilm, 1977) 600–610. All references are made to the manuscript folios.

⁶³ "Nous doibt estre persuadé te du tout notoire que aultre parolle ne doibt estre preschée et annoncée que la pure Parole de Dieu, l'évangille que Jésuschrist a commandé estre presché à toute créature. [Mk 16:15]," *Forme de visite*, fol. 175 r.

should guide public and private prayers. 3) They should see to poor relief, “since as Christian brothers and members of one body, we [ought to] meet the needs of the indigent,”⁶⁴ And 4) He requires that the young should be taught, “since if they are not instructed, there is no great hope for the future.”⁶⁵

Having announced these four principles, Roussel in fact only elaborates on two: how to preach the word of God and how to guide the life of prayer. The sacraments, poor relief, and schools receive no treatment.⁶⁶ The text is as incomplete as the synod at Mauléon was truncated.

On the first issue, preaching the word of God, Roussel distills for his clergy a concise statement of his soteriology. Very simply, he tells them to teach the laity to believe the Word, literally the “parole” spoken word of God, and do what it says. He sums this up in the jingle, “croire et faire,” believe and do. The laity can easily learn this since, “the summary of what one has to believe is contained in the articles of the faith and of what one has to do in the ten commandments of the law.”⁶⁷ Roussel explains that Scripture always assigns a priority to these concepts, which should never be mixed up:

⁶⁴ “Fault aussi adviser à l’hospitalité, si comme frères chrestiens et membres tous d’ung corps subvenons aux nécessitez des indigens,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 175 r.

⁶⁵ “Car si elle [la jeunesse] n’est point instruite, n’y a point grand espoir pour l’advenir,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 175 r.

⁶⁶ Roussel discusses the sacraments at length in the *Famiere exposition* and will be analyzed below. As to his hope for the future, Roussel’s attention to education in Clairac was noted above. In 1554, two years after Roussel had resigned from Clairac, under the leadership of his former vicar Aymérici, the students at the school that Roussel had founded were arrested for putting on a play titled: *La prison de la Réformation*. H. Patry, “La Réforme et le théâtre en Guyenne au XVI^e siècle (2^e article) (Libourne, 155, [suite]. -- Clairac, 1554) *BSFPP* 51(1902), 141-151. The article cites the trial records from the archives.

⁶⁷ “Le sommaire de ce que nous devons croire est contenu aux articles de la foy, et de ce que devons faire es dix parolles de la loy. Parquoy povons bien appeller les articles de la foy et les dix parolles de la loy le vray sommaire et abrégé de toute l’Escripture et Parolle de Dieu, que tous chrestiens doibvent sçavoir les avoir en continuelle mémoire, là s’exercer assiduelement,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 175 r.

“Belief must precede doing, and faith (must) precede works, with the result that a work can not be good if it is not done in faith.”⁶⁸ Roussel then works through a chain of topics explaining: how the justice of faith differs from the justice of the law; how Jesus Christ’s perfect observance of the law completely washes away the consequences of humans’ transgression of the commandments, as well as how Christ’s justice is imputed to humans by grace and faith.

Again, here on the issue of justification, as in his treatment of the Eucharist, Roussel shows his essential difference with the protestant reformers in terms of how these shared doctrines should be applied to the reform of the church. Lest division arise by rejecting the old rites completely, Roussel articulates principles that, if followed, would purify these corrupted practices through a revivifying emphasis on faith.

Roussel’s approach is evident in his teaching about the nature of works. Having clearly stated the priority of faith in the scheme of salvation, he requires his clergy to exhort the laity to do good works. He warns, however, that good works are those which God commands in the Scriptures, not those which humans propose in their particular devotions.⁶⁹ Without noting any specific examples of abuses, he informs his listeners

⁶⁸ “Croire doit précéder faire, la foy précéder l’œuvre, de sorte que l’œuvre ne peult estre bon s’il n’est fait en foy. Et là où la foy est vive, l’œuvre tantost la suy et accompaigne non plus ne moins que le respirer, sentir, mouvoir accompagnent l’homme vivant,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 175 v.

⁶⁹ “Et fault assidueement exhorter faire bonnes oeuvres. Mais les bonnes oeuvres sont celles que Dieu commande, non pointe celles que nous proposons; celles que Dieu en son Escripture approuve, non point celles que l’homme trouve bonnes; celles qui sont faictes en foy, non celles qui sot fondées en dévotion particulière; celles qui sont du vouloir et Esprit de Dieu, non celles qui sont du vouloir et esprit de l’homme,” *Forme de visite*, f. 176v–177r.

that, “to be a good worker, one must withdraw to Jesus Christ... who causes us to love God and our neighbor as well as to do good works.”⁷⁰

When discussing his second theme, prayer, Roussel addresses the issue of purifying the cult even more directly. Prayer, for Roussel, is the activity that above all others allows the sinner to respond to God’s offer of redemption. Roussel wanted all the people to know the Lord’s Prayer since it gives the penitent direct access to God.⁷¹ From this point, Roussel apologetically but aggressively sets out to reform cult of the saints and confession. Stressing that God is always willing to hear every sinner’s petition, Roussel warns: “It would be blasphemy to say that there could be any person near to us who knows more about our indigence and is more willing to provide for it.”⁷²

Roussel immediately takes up the issue that agitated the people of Mauléon. He writes, “it might seem to some that one wants to take away prayer to the saints, to take away all recourse to them and since such propositions are stirred up today and come into

⁷⁰ “Pour estre bon ouvrier, se fault retirer à Jésuschrist et apprendre de luy. C’est luy qui faict les bons ouvriers, qui par foy purge noz cueurs, les embrase d’amour et de dilection, et faict que nous aymons Dieu et nostre prochain et faisons de bonnes oeuvres,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 177 r. Roussel applies his theology to practice more concretely in his discussion of the sacraments where he describes the way to observe them correctly. As to the abuses that occur in “particular” devotions, the sacraments, and the like, Roussel never gives the specifics but he does indicate the principles by which one might identify them. However, this understanding, as will be shown below, allowed evangelicals to suppress some and transform other catholic practices into expressions and aids to a living faith.

⁷¹ “L’oraison composée et ordonnée par Jésuschrist, combien qu’elle soit briefve et de peu de parolles, néamtmoins comprend toute oraison, comprend tout ce que pouvons et debvons requérir et demander....Par ceste oraison nos donne accès su Père et nous donne hardiesse d’appeller Dieu nostre Père, nous met la parolle en la bouche, la lettre en la main,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 177r–v.

⁷² “Ne fault touteffoys qu’estimons ressembler Dieux aux roys, vers lesquelz n’y a facile accès, n’est facile et aisé les aborder, mais fault vers eulx user de plusieurs et divers moyens. Car le bon Dieu est plus prest à nous exaulcer et donner que ne sommes à le prier et demander. Seroit blasphème dire qu’il y ait créature approchée de nous plus congnoissante nostre indigence, ayant meilleur vouloir d’y pourvoir et subenir. Le tout est que foy accompagne nostre oraison...” *Forme de visite*, fol. 177 v.

controversy, I will briefly tell you my opinion in the matter.”⁷³ First, Roussel affirms that it is right to praise and honor the saints. However, he warns that one should laud them according to the forms in Scripture and “not at all presume to work them up from one’s head as in the past, which has been the cause that several superstitions and lies have been introduced.”⁷⁴ Specifically, rather than bending ones knee, doffing one’s hat, or feting the saints, to honor them truly, one should love their virtues and imitate the good use they made of them.

Second, Roussel attacks the practice of praying to the saints as intermediaries between the penitent and God. To combat this notion, Roussel categorically dematerializes the saints in verbal bout of iconoclasm uncommon for him. He writes,

The saints, dead in this world, are stripped of all particular and individual perceptions... Stripped of their bodies they are not in this world to hear and see us, so that we have no access to them through spoken word or writing... Nor are we able to have access to them except through Jesus Christ,... in so far as it pleases Jesus Christ to show them.... For this reason, those who particularize the saints, having them go about in time, space and person believe wrongly and abuse the saints.... It would be good to reform such abuses and superstitions.⁷⁵

⁷³ “Et pource que, par telz propos, pourroit sembler à aucuns qu’on vouldist oster la prière des saintz, oster tout le recours à eulx, et que au jourd’huy telz propos sont agitez et viennent en controverse, je vous en diray brièvement mon advis,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 177 v.

⁷⁴ “Ainsi pour bien and deument louer les saintz se fault retirer à l’Escripture et user des louenges de l’Escripture, non point présumer de son cerveau et de soy, en feindre comme le temps passé qu’a esté cause d’avoir introduict plusieurs superstitions et mensonges,” *Forme de visite*, f. 177v–178r.

⁷⁵ This quotation reorders several nearby sentences, “Davantage, les saintz décédez de ce monde, les corps desquelz reposent icy en terre, sont despouillez de toutes particulières et privées affections, et n’ont leurs affections et désirs ressemblantes aux nostres, mais unys en esprit, vouloir et désir avec leur Chef Jésuchrist, ne veuillent sinon ce que Jésuchrist veult, se confoment à sa prier, ne prient aultre chose que ce que Jésuchrist prie ny pour aultre.... Parquoy sentent mal et abusent des saintz ceulx qui les particularisent, les allient aux temps, lieux et personnes, commes si parfaitement n’estoient unyz avec Jésuchrist et avoient aultre vouloir que Jésuchrist. Et seroit bon reformer telz abuz et superstitions. Au surplus, puis qu’ilz sont despouillez de corps, qu’ilz ne sont en ce monde pour nous ouyr et veoir, que n’avons accez à eulx par parolle ny escripture, n’ayans ouye corporelle pour ouyr. ny veue pour veoir, ne pouvons avoir accès à eulx que par Jésuchrist, ne pouvans congnoistre noz désirs et intentions sinon aultant

If this was indeed the doctrine that Roussel preached at Mauléon, one can see why he angered traditionalists. By spiriting away the saints, Roussel effectively emptied the cult of the physical and psychological proximity that had made them, Mary in particular, the chief objects of lay devotion. Moreover, if Roussel did indeed recommend suppressing a number of saints' days, he did so contrary to the newly printed Customs of Béarn, which reaffirmed the traditional calendar of 36 observed saints' days.⁷⁶ It is important to note that Roussel's reform would have changed many aspects of society including the rituals of corporate piety, the rhythm of work and rest, and, not least, the economic lives of mass priests, merchants, and day laborers.⁷⁷

Roussel's discussion of prayer leads on, quite naturally, to the sacrament of confession. He first affirms that the Lord's Prayer serves as the "sovereign remedy" for sinners. Borrowing from the imagery of indulgences, he advertises that it only costs the effort of praying faithfully to obtain God's pardon, so to speak, the 'good note,' which he extends to the sinner. Roussel continues the comparison, saying "This bull ... is certain and (coming) from our grand master, pontiff, and pope, Jesus Christ, we can and must

qu'il palist à Jésuchrist leur en manifester," *Forme de visite*, fol. 178 v.

⁷⁶See the "Fêtes et jours fériés arrêtés par le nouveau For" in Dartigue-Peyrou, *La vicomté de Béarn*, "pièce justificatives" XXXIV, 596. Scholars have rightly pointed to the fact that, as elsewhere, in the Béarn the number of Saints days was vitally important economic question as well as a religious one. The new *for*, tried to alleviate the burden on those transporting goods to market posed by the prohibition to work on holy days, by explicitly exempting them from all penalties. While merchants might suffer under the regulations, the lower orders of the clergy was largely a proletariat of chaplains, who lived without benefices mainly off of the revenues they received for saying masses during the holy days.

⁷⁷Nicholls, "Heresy and Protestantism, 1520–1542: Questions of Perception and Communication," *French History* 10 (1996) 191, notes that the synod of Rouen in 1522 "reduced the number of feast-days, 'ut mechanici suas operas exercere possent.'"

hold to it with assurance.”⁷⁸ If nothing worse, with regard to Papal indulgences, Roussel was guilty of the old fashion sin of impertinence.

Where, then, does auricular confession to a minister fit in to the remission of sins? Roussel answers that although forgiveness comes from God without intermediaries nevertheless “since (God wishes) to use intermediaries not to use them would be to contravene the will of God and tempt Him.”⁷⁹ The Bishop therefore requires the people to confess to a minister since through him they receive God’s promise of the remission of sins, of which God is the author, the ‘priest’ the only dispenser. However, Roussel demands that a different liturgical form be used to reflect confession’s faith-building purpose. He commands his clergy:

Do not ever say ‘I absolve you in my name,’ rather say, ‘In the name of the Father, of the Son and the Holy Spirit, etc..’ (which is to say), ‘God by my ministry offers and exhibits to you the remission of your sins; embrace and receive this word in faith, and take it from Him through my ministry.’⁸⁰

⁷⁸ “Ceste bulle (contenant que si nous pardonnons, le Père nous pardonnera) est indubitable, et du grand maistre, pontife et pape Jésuchrist, à laquelle nous pouvons et devons seurement arrester,” *Forme de visite*, 179 r.

⁷⁹ “Je dis donc au propos commencé: combien que soit Dieu seul qui, de son auctorité et puissance, remect et pardonne le péché, et que c’est à luy qu’il se fault adresser pour l’impétrer, devant luy fault se recongnoistre pécheur, tel se confesser et accuser en tout temps et lieu, néantmoins qu’il feist bien tout luy seul, sans moyens, puis que son vouloir et ordonnance est user de moyen et qu’il veult honorer ses créatures, usant d’elles n’en vouloir user seroit contrevenir au vouloir de Dieu et tenter Dieu,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 179 v.

⁸⁰ “Aussi ne dict point: Je t’asboubz en mon nom [*ego te absolvo*] , mais : “Au nom du Père, du Filz, et du benoist Sainct Esprit’, aultant que s’il disoit: Dieu par nom ministère t’offre et exhibe rémission de tes péchez embrassant et recepvant cest parolle en foy, et prens de luy par nom ministère,” *Forme de visite*, fol. 179 v. On this specific point and on Roussel’s religious thought in general, one should probably consult the *Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum* (Strasbourg, Johannes Herwagen, 1525), which Bernard Roussel, “Metz,” p. 24 n. 35, says: “... inclut une sorte de liturgie pénitentielle nouvelle: XIII: De poenitentia partibus,” f. 301ss. ; f. 348: “Talis potest esse confessio peccatorum quod ad externa spectant: Frater aut soror in Christo. Ego me...”; f. 350: “Forma autem abosolutionis libera est, modo significat omnia per Christum peccata remitti... Ego te absolvo... vell hoc... vel sic... vel sic..”

It is noteworthy that Roussel's synodal statutes and the confrontation they engendered bear close resemblance to events that occurred during his preaching at Meaux and Paris. In a deposition against Roussel after the defaming of Papal indulgences and prayers to Mary in the winter of 1524-1525, when asked why, in light of recent events, he had not been saying the *Ave Maria*, Roussel responded "if I have exhorted the people to say the *Pater*, it is because I know that the Lord's salutation is as efficacious as the angelic salutation, the *Ave Maria*." The indictment goes on to report that Roussel promised, but subsequently omitted to say the *Ave Maria* during the mass.⁸¹

The Evangelical Eucharist: Sacrament of Unity, Source of Difference

The most divisive religious issue of the reformation era was without doubt the Eucharist. Quite understandably, Charles Schmidt in his biography of Roussel, Francis Higman in *La Diffusion de la Réforme en France*,⁸² along with Maurice Causse in an 1985 article, and Thierry Wanegffelen in a 1994 doctoral thesis at the University of Paris have all zeroed in on Roussel's discussion of 'the sacrament of the body and blood' or 'supper,' as he also names it as the key passages for identifying Roussel's confessional stripes. Their findings differ significantly. He was either a 'Mystical Protestant,'

⁸¹ For the two indictments brought against Roussel, see Charles Schmidt, "G. Roussel, inculpé d'hérésie à Meaux (1525)," *BSHPPF* 10 (1861), 219–221; and for the context see Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 318–321. Veissière seems to have missed the second of the two indictments, which says so much about Roussel's thought on the Virgin Mary and by inference the other saints.

⁸² Higman excerpts passages from Roussel's *Familiere exposition*. Charles Schmidt also appended large sections of the *Familiere exposition*, in *Gérard Roussel* pp. 122–167; Roussel's dedicatory letter to Henri d'Albret appears as 'pièce justificative' XVIII, 223–226; and the *Forme de visite de diocese* as 'pièce justificative' XIX, pp. 226–239.

‘irenicist,’ or ‘authentic pre-Tridentine catholic’ depending on whom you consult.⁸³ Each of these scholars has had to define their position with reference to two facts. As Schmidt first noted, although no one has demonstrated yet this with any rigor, Roussel appears to propound a number of Calvinist doctrines. It would seem fitting then that the Faculty of Theology condemned the *Familiere exposition* on October 15, 1550. However, none of the censured passages come from the section that seems the most heretical in ms. 419, namely, Roussel’s treatment of the two—note only two—sacraments: baptism and the Lord’s supper. Based upon external evidence, it can be shown that the copy of the *Familiere exposition* censured by the Faculty did not contain this section on the sacraments, which is in essence a separate excursus appended to the *Familiere exposition* found in ms. 419. This point, which bears on the history of the dissemination of Roussel’s writings in manuscript, highlights the fact that Roussel likely knew his sacramental theology would not be acceptable to traditional catholics. The controversy on how to interpret Roussel’s doctrine remains.

It is worth revisiting Roussel treatment of the Lord’s Supper since this inquiry will clarify a number of problems not just about Roussel’s thought but also about the way evangelicals, whom Roussel helped to direct, responded to persecution in France and

⁸³ See Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, pp. 58–60, 118–127; Francis M. Higman, *La diffusion de la Réforme en France, 1520–1565* (Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides, 1992) p. 179; Thierry Wanegffelen, *Des chrétiens entre Rome et Genève: Une histoire du choix religieux en France, vers 1520–vers 1610*, 2 vols., typescript dissertation thesis, Université de Paris I, Pantheon-Sorbonne, 1994, p. 159–163. In his 1976 doctoral thesis at the University of Vanderbilt, Paul Landa gave his treatment of Roussel’s eucharistic thought a rhetorically significant place at the end of his thesis, but does little more than summarize Roussel’s exposition at length, which he characterizes as ‘far from clear and hence not simple to grasp.’ He concludes that Roussel’s views on the Eucharist were “Protestant,” of no determinable stripe, but in some respects closer to Luther. See “The Reformed Theology of Gérard Roussel based upon a Critical Edition of

pressure from Calvin abroad during the late 1540s. In particular, reading Roussel's treatment of the Lord's Supper side by side with the equivalent passages in Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*,⁸⁴ reveals clearly that Roussel had digested the Genevan reformer's theological handbook and incorporated many essential elements into his explanation of the doctrine of the Lord's supper.⁸⁵

Roussel's Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood

Roussel's discussion of the Sacrament of the body and blood echoes in its major points Calvin's thought as expressed in the *Institutes*. Moreover, there are many close structural or textual similarities between the two texts. However, this is not another case like that of the Parisian theologian Claude d'Espence who translated Luther's words and passed them off under his own name. Roussel engages Calvin's text but he works it up into his own particular exposition.⁸⁶ This intellectual exchange is at first glance not

His *Familiere Exposition* (c. 1548)," Ann Arbor: University Microfilm, 1977. Thesis (Ph.D.) – Vanderbilt University, 1976, 246-261, esp. 247, and 255-261.

⁸⁴ For this comparison, Jean Benoit's critical edition was used: Jean Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrétienne*, 5 vols, edited by Jean-Daniel Benoit, Bibliothèque des Textes Philosophiques (Paris: J. Vrin, 1957–1963). His notes, index of themes, and apparatus for comparing the different editions were essential for this study. Hereafter cited as *IRC*, volume, chapter, section number (which refer to the divisions in the final 1560 edition), plus the pages references in Benoit's edition: thus for example, *IRC*, IV, XIV, 15, pp. 329–330.

⁸⁵ Charles Schmidt, p. 160, and Maurice Causse, "*Familiere exposition*," 25–27, have suggested such a dependence but do little to substantiate it.

⁸⁶ Florimond de Raemond offers us an intriguing explanation of when this exchange of ideas started. He relates that Calvin gave Roussel some of his writings and a plan or draft [*projet*] of his *Institutes* when he passed through the south of France in 1534. Though there is no proof that Calvin had yet written his *Institutes* at that time or that he actually met Roussel during this journey, the salient point is that Florimond invokes a fact well-known at the time but not well documented now: both men traveled in the same evangelical circles in France during the early 1530s, and had had some contact prior to Calvin's departure from France. Florimond de Raemond, book, 7, Ch. XVII, pp. 921–922 in the 1623 Rouen edition: "Calvin quitte Poitiers, & s'en va en Guyenne pour voir Roussel & le feure... Caluin... coule à Nerac pour voir Roussel & le Feure, tous deux bien aymés & favoris de la Reyne de Nauarre.... Beze... ne dit pas qu'il fut visiter Roussel, comme le valet va recognoistre son maistre: Car ainsi que j'ay dit ci-deuant,

surprising since they had known each other during the early fifteen-thirties in France.

Calvin subsequently made his old friend the principal target, so Beza tells, in the second of his 1537 *Epistolae duae* of his attack against those whom he would later call (pseudo-) Nicodemites. Calvin wrote his letter in response to his Roussel's elevation in 1536.⁸⁷

However the Bishop of Oloron took that chastisement, it did not prevent him borrowing from Calvin's 1543 *Institutes* for his treatment of the Lord's Supper. Roussel's debt to Calvin can be shown with a few examples, but it is the differences that reveal Roussel's independence and pose the problem of evangelicalism's stance vis-à-vis the increasingly organized churches and lucid theology of the reformed tradition.

At the start of his excursus on the sacraments, Roussel declares that they are, after the preaching of the Gospel, the second means by which God declares his will and spreads his grace.⁸⁸ Roussel begins his treatment of the Lord's Supper by quoting the complete words of institution from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and 1 Corinthians. He announces that one should consider three matters when seeking to understand the sacrament, "what our Lord did, what he commanded to be done, and that which is

il auoit esté son seruiteur au voyage d'Alemagne. comme plusieurs qui viuent aujourd'huy. esleués aux lettres, par Roussel, luy ont souuent ouy raconter. Caluin luy communiqua ses escrits. & le projet de son Institution, tiré dans Angoulesme, luy découure le dessein qu'il auoit de restablir l'Eglise en sa premiere pureté, disant qu'il falloir raser tout rese pied, res terre, pour bastir vn nouveau edifice."

⁸⁷ First published in 1537 as one of his *Epistolae Duae*. See Eugénie Droz, *Chemins de hérésie: Textes et documents*, vol. 1 (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970) 134 ff.; and Durengues, "Gérard Roussel," 350, note 3. Text in CO 5, 279–312; later translated as *Sur le devoir de l'homme chrétien en l'administration ou réjection des bénéfices de l'église papale, à un ancien ami de présent évêque*. For the identification of the *ancien ami* referred to by Calvin with Roussel, see Bèze's life of Calvin, CO 21, col. 127, "Interea Calvinus anno videlicet MDXXXVII...duas elegantissimas epistolas edidit...alteram de papisticis sacerdotiis, Gerardo illi Ruffo...quique abbatia quadam ac deinceps epistopatu post editum illum Parisiensem tumultum donatus, non modo postea satis rectum cursum non tenuit, verum etiam heram suam Navarrenam reginam paulatim pessumdedit."

⁸⁸ In an earlier section Roussel defines that the correct administration of the Sacraments is one of

required on our part to participate and receive it to salvation.” This tripartite division structures what follows. The first section presents his eucharistic theology, the second outlines a rite or order for its correct administration, and the third discusses a range of issues concerning who can and how one should commune.

In the first section, Roussel explains that the sacrament of the body and blood is a rite whereby Jesus Christ, whose sacrifice on the cross was the unique redemption and satisfaction for all human sin, offers and exhibits to the elect all the benefits, fruits, and merits of his death, in which they participate by faith.⁸⁹ Each component of this schema appears in Calvin’s *Institutes*, namely that Jesus’ death was a unique sacrifice, that it was for all sin, that only the elect benefit from it, and that they participate by faith.⁹⁰

the marks of the church, *FE*, 23r., 48 ff.

⁸⁹ 1. *FE*, 157r–158r, 374–377; 374: Christ’s words show clearly that he died as a sacrifice ‘for the remission of sins’ for the elect (élus). Cf. *IRC*, IV, XIV, 15, pp. 329–330. Quoting Augustine: “Sacrement n’ont leur effet sinon en les élus,” *IRC*, IV, XVII, 34, pp. 425–426.

2. *FE*, 157r.–157v., 375: Christ’s sacrifice is for all the world, but it is only the elect who are made participants in it by faith. Cf. *IRC*, IV, XIV, 7, pp. 294–295 and again at section 17, p. 305: the sacrament is only ‘efficace’ for those who received it by faith.

3. *FE*, 157v., 376: His death is a free (*gratuite*) ‘redemption’ or ‘satisfaction’ for sin. Cf. “Jésus-Christ seule satisfaction pour les péchés” *IRC* III, IV, 26–27; III, XII, 3; III, XV, 6; II, XVI, 3,6; III, IV, 30; II, XVII, 4.

4. *FE*, 157v.–158r., 376: Christ’s death is for the forgiveness of sins, all of them, of every type, without restriction to original sin, those committed before or after baptism. It is the remissions of sins by the redemption or satisfaction made by Christ alone.

⁹⁰ Roussel’s discussion is structured by a series of questions: what benefits or fruits are given in the sacrament, how, by what external signs, why those signs, why is the sacrament given at all, and to what end. *FE*, 156v.–161r., 374–387. A similar structuring passage appears in Calvin’s treatment of the Sacraments. He explains that beyond the external sign of sacrament, one should consider the significance, the material or substance, and lastly the strength or effect from them both. He elaborates, “The significance is located in the promises, which are imprinted in the sign. I call the material or substance, Jesus Christ, with his death and resurrection. By, the effect, I mean the redemption, justice, sanctification, eternal life, and all the benefits which Jesus Christ conveys to us,” *IRC*, IV, XVII, 11, p. 386 [=1545 version, pp. 885–886; not extant in earlier versions]: “il y a trois pointns à considérer aux Sacremens, outre la signe extérieur, dont il n’est pas maintenant question: assavoir, la signification; après, la matière ou substance, tiercement, la vertu ou l’effect qui procède de l’un et de l’autre. La Signification est stiuée aux promesses, lesquelles sont imprimées au signe. L’appelle La matière ou la substance, Iesus Christ, avec sa mort et résurrection. Par l’effect, i’entens la rédemption, iustice, sanctification, la vie éternelle, et tous les bénéfices que Iesus Christ

Roussel's use of Calvin appears even more explicit when he discusses the crucial issue of how to understand the real presence of Jesus' body and blood. Here, like Calvin, Roussel attacks the problem by considering the special relationship of the sign to the thing signified in the sacrament. Roussel explains that Jesus Christ used the metaphor or similitude of food and drink to show that his body and blood need to be eaten and are necessary for salvation.⁹¹ He uses an analogy that parallels a passage from Calvin.

Roussel writes:

There is in the sacrament this correspondence: just as material bread is necessary and required for corporal life, so also the body of Jesus Christ is necessary and required for spiritual and eternal life. And since material bread, if it is not taken and eaten, does not profit corporal life, if the body of Jesus Christ is not apprehended and eaten, it does not profit spiritual and eternal life.⁹²

Calvin had used the same argument:

When we see that the bread has been presented to us as a sign and Sacrament of the body of Jesus Christ, we must immediately grasp this similitude: just as the bread nourishes, gives substance, and preserves the life of our body, so also the body of Jesus Christ is the flesh, the food and the preservation of our spiritual life.⁹³

nous apporte.”

⁹¹*FE*, 158v., 378: According to John, chapter 6: “[Christ] se condescendant à la capicité nostre, et pour bien et commodément nous enseigner et faire congnoistre de quand grand nécessité et utilité est son corps et son sang, use de la métaphore et similitude de la viande et breuvaige, de manger et boyre, par laquelle nous veult donner à entendre que son corps et sang sont de trop plus grande nécessité et efficace pour la vie spirituelle et éternelle que ne pourroit estre la viande pour la vie coporel.”

⁹²*FE*, 158v.–159r., 379: “Mais en ce est la correspondance que, comme le pain matériel est nécessaire et requis pour la vie corporelle, aussi est nécessaire et requis le corps de Jésus-Christ pour la vie spirituelle et éternelle. Et comme le pain matériel, s’il n’est prins et mangé, ne prouffite pour la vie corporelle aussi le corps, s’il n’est appréhendé et mangé, ne prouffite pour la vie spirituelle et éternelle.”

⁹³*IRC*, IV, XVII, 3, p. 377: “Car quand nous voyons le pain nous estre présenté pour signe et Sacrement du corps de Jesus Christ, il nous fault incontinent prendre ceste similitude, que ainsi que le pain nourrit, substante et conserve la vie de nostre corps, aussi le corps de Jesus Christ est la viande, la nourriture et conservation de nostre vie spirituelle.... Car si nous considereons bien que nous a profité ce que le corps tressacré de Jesus a esté livré, et son sang espandu pour nous, clairement nous verrons que cela

Relying on the same passages from St. Augustine, both Calvin and Roussel go on from these statements to argue at length against the Sacramentarian position. They claim that what is special about this sacramental sign is that the thing signified is actually given with the sign. In other words, that the body and blood are really given with the sacramental signs of the bread and wine. From this it happens, says Roussel, that the signs “are no longer called bread and wine, but the body and blood: thus they truly take the names of the things that through them are offered and exhibited.”⁹⁴

Roussel’s major point in arguing against the Sacramentarians is to point out that the Eucharist’s principal purpose is not simply to preserve the memory of Christ or serve as a mark of membership in Christian society, as they argue,⁹⁵ but rather to nourish the

qu’on attribue au pain et au vin, selon cest analogie et similitude, leur convient tresbien.”

⁹⁴ *FE*, 163r.–164r., 389–391: On the signs and their relationship to the things signified. It bears resemblance to *IRC*, IV, XVII, 20 & 21, 398–403:

1. *FE*, 163r., 390: After giving different types of signs, Roussel notes that some only want to recognize the real presence of the bread and wine and not of the body and Blood: That is from the school of reason, not of the school of faith. It is better to believe in the spirit of faith: “Telle simplicité de foi qui embrasse purement la parole de Jésuschrist et à icelluy s’arreste et contente, pour toute persuasion et raison que le maistre l’a dict, outre ce qu’elle ne fait aulcune ouverture à erreur.”

2. *FE*, 164r., 391: The bread and wine lose their names, “et non plus sont appelez pain et vin, mais corps et le sang: par ainsi prennent vraiment le nom des choses que par eulx sont offertes et exhibées.” Cf. *IRC*, IV, XVII, 21, 402, note a: “1541–1557: “Car si les signes humain, qui sont plustost figurees des choses absentes, qu’enseignes et marques des présentes, et le plus souvent nous abusent en les dénotant, prennent toutesfois le nom d’icelles, par plus forte raison ceux que Dieu a instituez peuvent emprunter le tiltre des choses qu’ilz représentent, desquelles ilz contienent la signification certaine et sans fallace.”

3. *FE*, 164r., 391–392: Roussel quotes the same letter from Augustine as Calvin first used in 1543/1545 to show that the signs by which a sacrament is implemented should be similar. “Si les sacrements... n’avoient quelques similitudes des choses desquelles sont sacrements, du tout ne seroient sacrements.” Cf. *IRC*, IV, XVII, 21, p. 403. See Augustine, *PL*, 33, 364: Ep. 98 (ad Bonif.) The French in Roussel’s text is different than Calvin’s translation. This is a sign that Roussel may be using Calvin’s Latin *Institutes* since he appears to be coming up with his own translations. The fact that he gives the same numeration for the letter “St. Augustine in his 23rd Epistle to Boniface” shows that he is either borrowing from Calvin or reading the same books and structuring his arguments in a similar way with similar references.

⁹⁵ *FE*, 164v., 393: Against the position taken to be Zwingli’s: those who just take the signs for mere symbols: They are wrong. The sacraments are not just for preserving the memory and marking membership in the Christian society. Cf. *IRC*, IV, XIV, 13, 300–302, where Calvin argues against Zwingli.

soul, to make the participant more certain of his or her salvation, and to remove all doubt about the remission of sins.⁹⁶ Roussel writes:

I believe and thus confess that they certainly seem to me to err and abuse themselves greatly who want only to recognize the presence of the sign and not include the presence of the body and blood, as if the showing of the sign was sufficient [*ydoine*] and propitious for confirming and assuring the benefit and fruit of his body and blood that is the real and true showing of the body and blood.⁹⁷

Again, all of these assertions find close parallels in Calvin's *Institutes*. The only significant difference between their two discussions of the benefits and goals of the sacrament is one of emphasis. While Calvin will speak most readily of the confirmation of faith given by the sacrament,⁹⁸ Roussel will emphasize the union of the participants with Jesus Christ, who promised that he would dwell in his followers and they in him.⁹⁹

Again, *FE*, 166v., 398: The point of the real giving of the body and blood is to make communicants certain of their salvation, not simply to preserve a memory and not simply to give entry into Christian society.

⁹⁶ See *FE*, 163v.–166v., 390–398; 391: Roussel on participation in the body and blood: “pour nourrissement et substation de la vie spirituelle et éternelle.” Cf. *IRC*, IV, XIV, 7, pp. 294–296; IV, I, 1, pp. 7–8: “Les Sac. sont pour nourrir, confirmer, et augmenter la foi.” *FE*, 165r., 395–6: The principal goal of the sacrament is to make the participant “certior” more certain of the benefits left as a legacy by Jesus Christ. Cf. *IRC*, IV, XVII, 4, p. 377: same assertion. *FE*, 166r., 397: Christ’s testament is a promise of the remission of sins by his death: The gift of his body and blood in the sacrament is to “oster toute doubte de la rémission des péchez et de la vie éternelle.” *FE*, 166v., 398–399: The point of the real giving of the body and blood is to give certitude of salvation: “ceste légation testamentaire avoir esté par luy faicte pour nous rendre certains de la rémission des péchez, de la grace de rédemption et de tous les biens célestes qu’il nous a aquis et impétrez de Père par le bénéfice de son corps immolé et son sang espandu.” Cf. *IRC* IV, XVII, 3, p. 377: Calvin emphasizes the gift of Christ’s sacrifice, “épandu pour nous.”

⁹⁷ Again *FE*, 166r., 397: Against Sacramentarians who only want to recognize the presence of a sign in the sacrament: “D.: Je le croy ainsi et confesse; et bien me semblent grandment errer et s’abuse ceulx qui ne veulent reconnoistre que la présence du signe, et non mye la présence du corps et sang, comme si l’exhibition du signe estoit ydoine et propice pour certiorer et asseurer du bénéfice et fruit de son corps et sang qu’est l’actuele et vraye exhibition dudict corps et sang.” Cf. *IRC*, IV, XVII, 7, p. 381: same issue.

⁹⁸ Cf. *IRC*, IV, XIV, 1, pp. 289–290: the sacraments, like the preaching of the word of God, will confirm faith in the believer. Again cf. *IRC*, IV, XIV, 7, p. 295: “Les sacrement nourrir, confirme, et augment la foi.”

⁹⁹ *FE*, 160r.–160v., 382: The chief benefit of Christ’s sacrifice: One is made consort to his divine nature; his life, glory, and spirit are communicated; the spirit of faith and love is given; by grace one is unified with him; and his justice is attributed to the sinner. The union with Christ as one’s ‘true chief and spouse’ is more complete than the link between the head and members of the body, the spirit and the body,

In the second section, Roussel describes how to celebrate the sacrament. He asserts that Jesus' words of institution were simple and clear and warns that one should follow only them, deviating neither to the left of the right lest one fall into error. For a second time, he quotes Paul's account of the Last Supper from 1 Cor. 11¹⁰⁰ and explains that the correct celebration of the sacrament has five elements: First, the bread and chalice should be taken and distributed as Christ did with the apostles. Second, thanks should be given. Third, the bread should be broken, divided, and a fraction of it given to the participants. Fourth, everyone should take both elements. Fifth, one should "preach the death of the Lord."¹⁰¹

or could ever be between a woman and her husband in body and temporal goods. Cf. *IRC*, IV, XIX, 35, pp. 502–503: on Christ as spouse. *FE*, 160v., 383: The eating of the sacrament is an allegory for the spiritual union which takes place in the sacrament: "Cest unyon se reconnoist assez bien insinuée et signifiée soubz l'alégorie de la viande par nous mangée et digérée, laquelle par la communication de nostre chair et sang convertissons en nostre substance, l'unissons à nous, la faisons vivre d'une mesme vie avec nous, comme faite par ce moyen vraye partye de nous, d'une mesme ame et vie que les reste. ainsi fault il entendre par la communication de la chair et sang de nostre Seigneur Jésuschrist, que luy mesme exprime par viande et breuvaige; car, par telle communication de sa chair et sang qu'il faict par grace au fidèle (lequel, imbu de foy, est vrayement dict manger sa chaire et boire son sang), il le transforme et luy communique son Esprit et vie, et le faict vivre d'une mesme vie avec luy, comme son vray membre." *FE*, 161r., 384: The utility and profit exhibited by true participation in the sacrament: one is made a new creature, "se reconnoit assez par les fruitz de l'Esprit, lesquelz saint Pol," A key concept for Roussel: the elect live in Christ and he lives in them; that is the great promise of the sacrament: "demurer en luy et luy en nous." Cf. *IRC*, III, I, I: "Pour participer au salut, il faut que le Christ soit fait nôtre et habite en nous, que nous soyons faits un avec lui."

¹⁰⁰ Oddly, this is the second time that he has quoted this exact same passage from Scripture but it differs from the text given at the beginning of his discussion of the Lord's supper in word order, spelling, pronoun usage on at least eight occasions. This is a sign either of sloppy copying, e.g. during dictation, or that Roussel or his editor were using Latin sources and did not translated them exactly the same each time.

¹⁰¹ *FE*, 167v.–168r., 401–2: The sacrament in five points:

[1.] "D.: Premièrement il dict qu'il a prins le pain, puis le chalice, lesquelz deux il a donné à ses apostres. Parquoy, pour nous conformer à luy et faire ce qu'il a faict, faisons le semblable. Puis [2.], il a rendu graces: fault aussi que rendons graces; pourtant est ce que noz anciens l'on appellé 'eucaristie', c'est à dire action de graces." Tiercement [3.] il a rompu le pain et par telle fraction l'a rendu communicable, l'a divisé et départy selon son accousumée." Cf. *IRC*, IV, XVII, 43, pp. 439–440, where Calvin is more expansive. Here, Roussel cites Mark 6 and 8, Luke 24, and John 21. There is no similar grouping of these citations in *IRC*. *FE*, 168r., 402: Acts 2:42 quoted with 1 Cor. 10. Cf. *IRC*, IV, XVII, 44, p. 441 for the first verse. Not the same gloss exactly.

[4.] 402: "Quartement il leur command manger le pain et boyre le calice qu'il leur baille. Parquoy,

The chief elements of this ceremony are clear. Roussel thinks the sacrament should be a public ceremony in which the laity along with the minister communicate with a fraction from a common loaf and drink from the chalice. A liturgy of thanksgiving and preaching ought to sustain this sacral event. However, Roussel gives no examples of the liturgical elements that would flesh out this ceremony as does Calvin in an equivalent passage.¹⁰² Rather, Roussel warns immediately after this Spartan description that by forgetting this simplicity there have arisen “abominations, abuses, irreverence, discords and debates that are an affront to God and dangerous to souls.”¹⁰³ Roussel cites as the principal abuse the idea that the sacrament was perceived as an external work. He writes:

If it was only a question of an external work, you could find no one so wretched that he was not capable of it. [However], our Lord taught that... it is his memory that he wants us to consider and to discuss diligently in the administration and partaking of the sacrament.¹⁰⁴

Behind this allusion to the abominations and abuses of the sacrament, one is tempted to imagine the practices denounced by the reformers such as the reservation of the chalice, the interpretation of the mass as a sacrifice, the adoration of the host, the buying and selling private masses, and the celebration of masses for the dead. However,

obtempérant à son commandement, fault faire l'ung et l'autre. Quintement [5.], quant il dict: 'Touteffoys que mangeres ce pain et bevres ce calice vous annunceres la mort du Seigneur jusques ad ce qu'il vienne,' assez donne il à congnoistre debvoir estre pour nous prescher la mort du Seigneur.”

“Ce sont les cinq choses qui sont dudict passage de saint Pol fidèlement recolligées, et sans y adjouster ny diminuer, et par ainsi que nous avons du mandement de nostre Seigneur par son vaisseau d'élection, saint Pol.”

¹⁰² *IRC*, IV, XVII, 43, pp. 438–440.

¹⁰³ *FE*, 168v., 403.

¹⁰⁴ *FE*, 168v., 403: “D.: S'il n'estoit question que de l'oeuvre externe, nul ne se troueroit, pour mauvais qu'il fust, qu'il n'en fust capable. Parquoy fault il bien regarder le but que prétend l'observation de ceste institution: assavoir pourquoy il a institué et à quelle fin il veult que l'observons. Ce que nostre Seigneur enseigne en peu de parolles, quant il dict: 'Faictes cela en mémoire de moy,' c'est la mémoire de

this would be to put word's in Roussel's mouth. All he says positively is that the sacrament should be public, given to all under both kinds, and accompanied by thanksgiving and preaching the message of Jesus' death. As to the question about these abuses and abominations and their perpetrators, one meets with Roussel's stony silence. He refuses to denounce more specifically the errors lying, as he says, 'to the left or the right' of true doctrine and correct practice.

In the third and final section, Roussel takes up the issue of how one should prepare to participate in the sacrament. The chief item of interest here is that Roussel affirms that no one but the participant can review his or her conscience before communicating. The problem has to do with Paul's injunction that one should not take the sacrament unworthily. Roussel, relates that if one means by this that the participant should be worthy in the sense of meriting the sacrament, then no one ever does or can merit it. However, if one means by worthy, *idone*, meaning capable of or suited to receiving the sacrament to its ordained end, which is only done through faith,¹⁰⁵ then this is the correct criterion for assessing whether one is worthy to participate.¹⁰⁶ In a parallel passage Calvin does not use the word '*idone*' as a synonym for *digne*. In this case, Roussel probably drew on Erasmus' gloss on the use of the word *dignus* in the Vulgate, which served to translate two Greek words, *axios* and *icanos*. It was the later term

luy qu'il veult qu'en l'administration et perception de ce sacrement considérons et traictons diligemment."

¹⁰⁵ See *FE*, 170r.–170v. and 173r.–173v., 408–409 and 415: One does not have to be without sin or be just, merely thirsty for grace. No one should examine the consciences of others, nor should one allow others examine one's conscience, "mais que ung chacun preuve soyemesmes."

¹⁰⁶ Roussel illustrates this notion by introducing a comparison with Jesus' words to his disciples when he sent them out to preach, telling them to abide only with those who were ready to receive their preaching. See Mk 6:10 and Lk 9:4. Calvin does not cite these passages in the equivalent section of this

meaning suited to or capable of, *idone* in French, which helped inform Roussel's thought.¹⁰⁷

However, one does find a similar injunction against letting anyone examine the communicant's conscience in Calvin's *Institutes*.¹⁰⁸ Notably, Calvin's argument comes

Institutes.

¹⁰⁷ Prof. Bernard Roussel kindly pointed out to me the significance of Erasmus' treatment of these terms for Gérard Roussel. [Check the exact reference in the *Novum instrumentum*, gloss on *dignus* and *axios*.]

¹⁰⁸ This ritual re-orientation corresponds to Roussel's reformulation of the sacrament of penance. In his instruction to the 'presbyters' or 'ministers' of his diocese, he enjoins them not to pronounce the words of forgiveness in their own name but in the name of God who alone forgives sins, and distributes the remission of sins through the ministry of the presbyter. See Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, pièce justificative, no. 19, 239; *FE*, 179r, 431. Here Roussel presents an argument for preserving a form of confession to the ministers, though not the sacrament of penance: "Je dis donc au propos commencé: combien que soit Dieu seu qui, de son auctorité et puissance, remect et ardonne le méché, et que c'est à luy qu'il se fault adresser pour l'impétrer, devant luy fault se reconnoistre pécheur, tel se confesser et accuser en tout temps et lieu, néantmoins qu'il feist bien tout luy seul, sans moyens, puis que son vouloir et ordonnance est user de moyen et qu'il veult honorer ses créatures, usant d'elles n'en vouloir user seroit contrevenir au vouloir de Dieu et tenter Dieu, comme feroit celluy qui ne voudroit user du pain, qui ne voudroit use des degrez pour descendre. Fault donc user des ministres et de leur ministère, et recepvoyr par leur ministère la Parolle et sacremens. Parquoy est bonne et louable ordonnance se retirer au presbtre, devant luy se reconnoistre pécheur, s'accuser et confesser pour obtenir par son organe et ministrère la parolle par laquelle est offerte et dispensée la rémission des péchez, de laquelle dieu en est l'auteur; et le prebtre seul dispensateur. Aussi ne dict point: Je t'asboubz en mon nom, au nom du Père, du Filz, et du benoist Sainct Esprit, aultant que s'il disoit: Dieu par nom ministère t'offre et exhibe rémission de tes péchez embrassant et recepvant cest parolle en foy, et prens de luy par mon ministère."

Roussel also has a very different interpretation of the purpose of the 'castigation or satisfaction of sin' than the traditional interpretation. *FE*, 129r–129v., 302–303: Roussel recycles the sacrament of penance in an 'evangelical' fashion. The human invention of the sacrament of penance is wrong. The penalty is not held against the forgiven sinner. However God does chastise his children. The sacrament of penance should be understood as castigation: "M.: Ainsi regardée, n'est point petite et n'est de petite importance; elle surmonte en difficulté et utilité toutes les pénitences que les hommes se pourroient excogiter. Mais que dirons nous icy de la pene infligée à David, que sa maison fut Pugnye après le péché à luy remys, 2 Samu. 12? Feron nous aulcune exception, disant qu'en quelques péche la coulpe est remise et que la peine est réservée: qui ne seroit selon que a esté exposé le debt estre remis, puis que encores seroit exigée solution de peine?

"D.: J'ay apprins de cous de faire différence entre castilgation et satisfaction, et que bien aultre chose est la castigation par laquelle Dieu chastie les sien avec une verge paternelle, et aultre la satisfaction par laquelle on doibt satisfaire à justice divine par juste peine. Ceste peine sest remise avec la coulpe, mais non point la castigation des enfans de Dieu, de laquelle il dict, Pseaulme 88: "Je visiteray avec verges leures iniquitez et avec bastures leurs péchez, mais n'osteray point ma miséricorde." Hébr. 12: "Il laquelle tout enfant qu'il reçoipt." "Suis est le filz que la père ne corrige?" comme dict a esté, nul ne peult satisfiare à la divine justice, voire jusques au moindre péché, mais pouvons bien estre chastiez et battus pour tous délictz, ou avec miséricorde en cest vie, ou par juste jugement en l'aultre."

"M.: Tu dis bien vray, car la castigation ne se faict point que Dieu veuille luy estre satisfait par

explicitly during his attack on the Catholics' claim that the sacrament of confession purifies the sinner, rendering him or her in a state of sacramental grace or perfection, which is the necessary precondition for receiving the sacrament worthily.¹⁰⁹ Roussel also undermines this notion when he asserts that were one perfect, then one would not need the sacrament. But again, Roussel makes no direct attack, nor does he attempt to reconcile his position to accepted practice.

Interpreting Roussel's Confessional Stripes

The object of this exposition of Roussel's eucharistic thought has been to demonstrate one rather precise point. Gérard Roussel is in essential agreement with John Calvin in his theology of the sacrament of the body and blood. Moreover, Roussel structures his arguments, cites passages from Scripture, Ireneus, Chrysostom, and Augustine, and uses analogies, which all find close parallels in Calvin's *Institutes*. Certain of these made their first appearance in Calvin's third 1543 Latin/1545 French edition.¹¹⁰ Charles Schmidt and Maurice Causse have previously suggested that Roussel used the *Institutes* at various points in his *Familiere exposition*. Paul Landa has demonstrated the similarity of Roussel's "reformed theology" with Calvin on several points, though he does not see great similarity between them on the Eucharist. My

icelle, mais pour nous instruire et nous rendre myeulx advisez pour l'advenir; pour estre aussi exemple aux aultres. Telles pouvons nous bien recognoistre les pénitences et satisfactions ecclésiastiques et canoniques vrayes discipline pour l'instructions de nous et des auitres de ne commettre le semblable pour l'advenir." In this case, indulgences are pernicious because they make the children of God negligent.

¹⁰⁹ See *IRC* IV, XVII, 41, p. 436. Moreover, Roussel and Calvin will both immediately proceed to the issue of whether and how those with infirm consciences should participate. See *FE*, 173v.–174r., 416–7 and *IRC*, IV, XVII, 41, pp. 436–437.

¹¹⁰ See above for the Augustine passage first introduced by Calvin to his 1543/1545 edition which

sounding of other parts of the *Familiere exposition* indicates that Roussel used Calvin throughout, though the full comparison has yet to be made.¹¹¹

That said, one should be quick to note that Roussel does consult other “true expositors of Scripture,” as he calls them in his dedicatory letter to Henri d’Albret. His possible use of Erasmus to explain the term *digne* (worthy), was noted above. When in another passage Roussel recounts the various appellations that Scripture gives to the sacrament, such as Eucharist and Communion, he may have been using Bullinger’s *Decades* of 1549 where a similar exposition is found.¹¹² Other times, he uses metaphors and analogies that are common to the exegetical traditions of both confessional camps.

Having surveyed Roussel’s eucharistic theology, what confessional badge should one hang on him? The most recent answer comes from Thierry Wanegffelen. His study concerns ‘The Christians between Rome and Geneva: a History of Religious Choice in France 1520-1610.’¹¹³ In a major section devoted to Roussel’s *Familiere exposition*, he claims that Roussel’s thought on the Eucharist was perfectly Catholic. Concentrating not on his doctrinal definitions, but rather on the affective piety advocated by Roussel’s exposition, Wanegffelen claims that Roussel invites the participant to commune in the ‘old sense’ of taking the mass fervently as opposed to the Tridentine manner of receiving

appears also in Roussel’s *Familiere exposition*.

¹¹¹ Landa does not make a systematic comparison of Roussel’s *Familiar exposition* with Calvin’s *Institutes*. He only appeals to the latter when the echoes seem to him evident. Luther more often serves as the basis of his comparison. Landa’s thesis is a good start in assessing Roussel’s doctrines though much more could be done.

¹¹² *FE*, 172r., 412.

¹¹³ Thierry Wanegffelen, *Des chrétiens entre Rome et Genève: Une histoire du choix religieux en France, vers 1520–vers 1610*. 2 Vols. Typescript Dissertation Thesis, Université de Paris I, Pantheon-Sorbonne, 1994.

the host.¹¹⁴ He criticizes Charles Schmidt and Maurice Causse for having read the *Familiere exposition* selectively, searching for only the passages that sound like Calvin. Moreover, Wanegffelen charges that they have suppressed the places where Roussel makes appeal to the central liturgical gesture that supposed adoration of the sacrament, namely the elevation of the host during the Eucharist.¹¹⁵ Wanegffelen is simply wrong. He cites no passages, nor are there any, in which Roussel invokes, as Wanegffelen would have it, “the adoration of Christ on the Cross at the moment when the host is elevated,” for either recommendation or censure.¹¹⁶ Rather on this issue, one again encounters one of Roussel’s silence. Wanegffelen has been too quick to speak for him. If anything, Roussel de-emphasizes such gestures and their implied adoration. He writes that to communicate worthily and honor the sacrament with true honor, “does not at all lie in outer appearance or in ceremonies, but in the true use of it, which lies in following the intention of the institutor.”¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Wanegffelen, 162–163.

¹¹⁵ Wanegffelen’s whole argument on this point is permeated with factual mistakes. He claims that Florimond de Raemond and, following him, Causse and Schmidt all attributed to Roussel the idea that the elevation of the host should be suppressed. None of them claims this. They were but comparing Roussel’s ideas with the ‘mess à sept points’ which Marguerite de Navarre and her friends, according to Raemond, were using as a the basis for a possible concord with the Lutherans in 153–1534. Florimond de Raemond describes the mass in seven points as: Public mass, without elevation or adoration, under both aspects, to all the people, without commemoration of the virgin or the saints, from a whole loaf, and that the priest does not need to be celibate. It differs from the Lutheran Eucharist only in not being said in French or having wafers. Florimond de Raemond, *Naissance*, book VII, ch. IV, p. 854 in the 1623 Rouen edition.

¹¹⁶ Wanegffelen, 163: No where does Wanegffelen cite Roussel as speaking of the “Adoration du Christ en Croix au moment où l’hostie est élevée.” Roussel does speak of adoration of Christ “in spirit and truth” when partaking of the Eucharist, but not at the elevation of the elements.

¹¹⁷ *FE*, 172v., 413: “... pour dignement recevoir ce sacrement, et honorer de vray honneur, lequel ne gist point en contence du dehors et cérémonies, mais au vray usage, lequel usage gist à suyvre l’intention de l’instituteur.”

The principal problem facing those who want to type evangelicals like Roussel, and all those whom he may have influenced, is how to interpret their silences. His positive statements clearly echo many Protestant doctrines. However, he evidently avoids getting caught up in the doctrinal disputes of Catholics and Protestants. The only group whom he ever names as being in error are the Sacramentarians. They, in any case, lay to the left of Zwingli in the continuum of sacramental positions, and were acceptable to neither Catholics nor the magisterial reformers.

Calvin, Beza, and those scholars who follow their line such as Schmidt, have explained Roussel's silence and his unwillingness to break with the Roman Catholic Church as due to some combination of greed, fear, cowardliness, or misguided mystical tolerance for all things external. For them, he was the classic Nicodemite stuck in papal abomination. Maurice Causse rehabilitates Roussel's silence as a sign of his savvy dissembling, a tactical ploy directed towards overcoming adverse political situations to achieve his hidden Protestant ends. For Causse this is a positive sort of Nicodemism. For Wanegffelen, Roussel is the perfect example of, what he calls, 'the Nicodemite religious sensibility' of those non-confessional Catholics caught between the developing confessional fronts, who united the doctrine of justification by faith alone with a fervent eucharistic devotion. For Francis Higman, Roussel's theology represents "a courageous attempt to find ground for understanding between Catholics and Lutherans (perhaps also with Calvinists), by renewing the terminology, for example on the Eucharist."¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸ "C'est une tentative courageuse de trouver un terrain d'entente entre catholiques et luthériens (peut-être même avec les calvinistes), en renouvelant la terminologie, par exemple sur l'eucharistie,"

Higman's suggestion—do indeed include Calvinist—is the more persuasive way for viewing Roussel's text. There are indications that he has played with the usual terms of debate, for example when he uses the fundamental Aristotelian category of substance. In an antithetical analogy, he emphasizes that the sacral food eats and transforms the substance of the communicant, but he never says a word about transubstantiation.¹¹⁹

Roussel's refusal to engage eucharistic positions other than his own, or rather as he saw it Christ's pure intention, is in essence his declaration of confessional allegiance: He opts to not declare his since he believed that the confessional battles were precisely the obstacle to achieving a true reformation. He specifically notes that there are debates but he refuses to engage them; he warns against the abuses of the sacrament, yet he declines to name them. Playing with the terms that others used in their debates may indeed have complemented this effort to rise above the fray. Chiefly, however, like his former master Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, he feared that debate rather than clarifying the Gospel would prevent it from being heard. Early on at Meaux, Lefèvre and Roussel had commanded the laity to refrain from disputes. Again in the *Familiere exposition* he admonishes that the sacrament of Eucharist is not a matter for the school of human

Francis M. Higman, *La diffusion de la Réforme en France, 1520–1565* (Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides, 1992), 179.

¹¹⁹ *FE*, 160v., 383: The eating of the sacrament is an allegory of the spiritual union which takes place in the sacrament: "Cest unyon se reconnoist assez bien insinuée et signifiée soubz l'alégorie de la viande par nous mangée et digérée, laquelle par la communication de nostre chair et sang convertissons en nostre substance, l'unissons à nous, la faisons vivre d'une mesme vie avec nous, comme faicte par ce moyen vraye partye de nous, d'une mesme ame et vie que les reste. ainsi fault il entendre par la communication de la chair et sang de nostre Seigneur Jésuschrist, que luy mesmes exprime par viande et breuvaige; car, par telle communication de sa chair et sang qu'il faict par grace au fidèle (lequel, imbu de foy, est vrayement dict manger sa chaire et boire son sang), il le transforme et luy communique son Esprit et vie, et le faict vivre d'une mesme vie avec luy, comme son vray membre."

reason, but wholly a matter for the school of faith. His first words on the matter of sacramental disputes are also his last:

If this simplicity had been followed [namely following Christ's words in simple faith], there would not have been introduced the diverse opinions and discord that do great injury to the truly Christian union commanded and required by this sacrament.¹²⁰

By way of conclusion, one should try to balance two images of Roussel at his desk. In the first he sits composing his *Familiere exposition* with Calvin's *Institutes* open for reference. In the second, he writes to the papal curia first to get a dispensation to hold his multiple benefices and again later to confer them on his nephews.¹²¹ Calvin and scholars since have called this a contradiction. Evidence has been presented to show why he considered this the best of the bad options surrounding him for renewing the church in France. In terms of the larger history of French evangelicalism, the important point is that in his teaching, laden as it is with Calvinist, or more broadly Protestant notions, is one root of the rise of the Reformed church in France. Disseminated through the Navarrian court, his friends, his students, and from the pulpits in his diocese, his theology quite

¹²⁰ He begins "I indeed recommend this simplicity [namely following the words of institution] to you as that which makes one walk with confidence without turning to the right or left, without falling into dispute, which engenders and nourishes discord and does not at all edify the true union to which this sacrament tends (with the passage quoted following)." *FE*, 156r., 372: "Si en toutes institutions et ordonnances est requis suyvre l'intention et parole de l'instituteur et ordonneu[x] d'aautant plus au présent sacrement, qui n'est de l'escholle du sens et raison humaine, mais du tout de l'escholle de foy.....Ceste simplicité m'est de par vous la bien recommandée comme celle qui faict cheminer avec confiance sans se destourner ny à dextre ny à sénestre, sans tumber en dispute qui soit pour engendrer et nourrir discorde et non point édifier à vray unyon à laquelle tend le sacrement. M.: Si ceste simplicité eust esté suyvie, n'eussent esté introduictes les diverses opinions et discordes, au grand préjudice de l'union vrayment chrestienne recommandée et exigée par ce sacrement."

¹²¹ A. Degret, "L'évêque d'Oloron, G. Roussel et la curie romaine," *Revue de Gascogne* (1904): 227–228.

probably, though the thesis needs to be tested, prepared the way for the work of Jeanne d'Albret, John Calvin, Theodore de Bèze, and Pierre Viret in France.

Several broad conclusions should be drawn from the examples of Baduel and Roussel's activities. They both taught evangelical doctrines and trained ministers. Their systems were designed to build grass roots foundations for the evangelical cause. In this they recall the efforts of the Meaux group, who sought to provide sustained evangelical preaching and equip the laity to read the Bible, even to serve as lay ministers. They also recall the efforts of the Du Bellay brothers who put a series of young Frenchmen to school at Tübingen and Basel during the course of their diplomatic missions.

This presentation of the episcopacy of Roussel should be followed up with further inquiries into the careers of other prelates who owed their positions to Marguerite and had known evangelical tendencies, including: Michel d'Arande, Jean du Bellay, Antoine Caracciolo, Gabriel de Grammont, René du Bellay, Jean de Monluc, and others.

Baduel's tenure as rector at Nîmes invites further reflection and research on the local evangelical cells anchored by known collaborators with Marguerite. In particular, the question of their complex relations with the Reformed communities in Switzerland needs to be addressed.

To help frame that picture, the following section will summarize the relations of Calvin and the reformed ministers in Switzerland to Marguerite's network. This battle of personas and comportments, to which Baduel gently alludes in his 1550 letter to Melancthon, was crucial in shaping the evangelical communities that would become the foundation of the Reformed churches of the future.

III. The Dynamics of Separation: The Navarrian Network and Calvin

The period 1540-1550 can fairly be described as the period in which Calvin and French reformers in Switzerland attempted to wrest control of the evangelical movement in France from Marguerite and her associates. Their cross-boarder relationship was a long dance of fitful cooperation and increasing criticism that finally led to the coalescing of an opposition church in France under Geneva's leadership out of the evangelical sub-culture.

Barring victory in transforming the French church from within through diplomatic and administrative means, Marguerite and other evangelicals had sought to practice a "living" and "true" faith within the existing structures of church and society. The compromises that they made with the "Devil," the "Antichrist," and "Babylon,"¹²² as they themselves called the Pope and the Roman Church, prompted Calvin to condemn as Nicodemites and Libertines many of the leading evangelicals in France, all of whom were in Marguerite's network: Roussel, Rabelais, Étienne Dolet and the spiritualist Antoine Pocque among others.

Guillaume Farel, John Calvin, and many of their colleagues in Switzerland had traveled part of their road to becoming reformers abroad in the circuit of Marguerite's network. After rejecting France, they nevertheless kept their eyes fixed on their homeland, none with more piercing gaze than Calvin. They maintained long and often

¹²² "Pour ceste cause je proteste./ Que l' Antechrist succombera:/ Au moins, que de brief tombera/ Sur Babylonne quelque orage," *Epistre du coq en l'asne, envoyée à Lyon Jamet de Sansay en Poictou* (late 1535), in Marot, *Oeuvres poétiques* 2, ed. Defaux, 86-91, ll. 178-182.

difficult relations with their former colleagues. Calvin's public mission to France¹²³ began in the mid-1530s, as he rapidly took on the mantle, or rather prophet's cloak, as the leader in exile of French Protestants. The goal here is to come to grips with the extent to which his efforts were directed at firming up and wresting control over French evangelicals from the circles that Marguerite had long been protecting. The main lines of this development will be followed to 1550 the year after Marguerite's death. The topic certainly deserves a more thorough and chronologically extended airing since large numbers of those who had been in Marguerite's network eventually became pillars of the French reformed church, most notably her daughter, Jeanne d'Albret, and grandson, Henry IV.

Calvin's Attack against French Nicodemites

Surveying Calvin's published works to 1550, one sees that aside from his successive editions of the *Institutes*, works of controversy dominate the list. After 1550, Calvin concentrated more fully on his biblical commentaries and other exegetical texts. Among his works of controversy, the majority were directed against members, or former members of Marguerite's network, even if Calvin does not name them overtly. Such works are in bold in the table below.

¹²³ See Heiko A. Oberman, "*Europa afflicta*: The Reformation of the Refugees," *ARG* 83 (1992), 91-111.

Table 3.

Calvin's Controversialist Works to 1550

Work	Date written [Publ.]	Note
Cop's "All Saints Oration," 1 Nov. 1533.	1533 [Never publ.]	Many Scholars attribute authorship or partial authorship to Calvin since a copy exists in his hand and he was an intimate of Cop.
<i>Psychopannychia</i>	1534 [1542]	Directed against the "Spiritual Libertine" Quintin's doctrine that the soul dies at death until resurrection.
Privilege for Olivétan's Bible	1535 [1535]	
Dedication of <i>Institutio</i> to Francis I	1535 [1536]	Written with, most likely, the final chapters of the <i>Institutio</i> in the summer of 1535 at Basel. Responds to the persecution following the 1534 Placards.
<i>Epistolae duae</i> 1. Becomes <i>Petit traicté monstrant</i> ... (1543) with Viret. 2. Becomes <i>Traité des Benefices</i> (1554).	1536 [1537]	Directed against two former friends among French evangelicals who were compromising sinfully with the papal church, the first versus Duchemin, ¹²⁴ the second versus Roussel.
Preface to <i>Catechismus</i>	1538	
<i>Petit traicté de la cene</i>	1539 [1541]	
<i>Response to Sadolet</i> (Latin) French 1540.	1539 [1539]	Against Sadolet's attempt to win Geneva back to Rome. He was a member of the Roman curia and a humanist with whom Bucer and the Du Bellays thought it was possible to work.
<i>Declaration du conte de Furstenberg</i> ; 2 nd Declaration	1539 [1539] 1540	Defenses of Furstenburg, a military leader and one of the most visible Lutherans at the court of Francis I.
<i>Petit traicté monstrant que doit faire un fidele entre les papistes</i> (1543) with Viret.	1543	Anti-Nicodemite tract directed to evangelicals in France. See <i>Epistolae duae</i> (1537) above.
<i>Excuse aux M. les</i>	1544	Response to those incensed by his <i>Petit traicté</i> , with

¹²⁴ The first letter may simply be against 'others' as argued by Christoph Burger, "Calvin comme maître de ses amis dans la première de ses *Epistolae duae* (1537)," in *Calvin et ses contemporains. Actes du colloque de Paris 1995*, ed. Olivier Millet, Cahiers d'Humanisme et Renaissance 53 (Geneva: Droz, 1998), 149–162.

Nicodemites		new attacks against several types of Nicodemites, including, “mignons” of the court. Mignon was Francis I’s pet name for Marguerite.
Breve instruction pour armer contre les anabaptists	1544	
Contre la furious secte des Libertins.	1545	Favorable mention of Estienne de la Forge at whose house in Paris Calvin met Quintin. Cf. 1534 <i>Psychopannycia</i> ; 1541-1544, Poullain and Farel urged Calvin to write against the Libertines; 1545, Calvin’s only surviving letter to Marguerite, in which he explains his condemnation by name of Pocquet an Quintin, member of her household; 1548, Aegidius Michaux warns Calvin that Pocque was preaching against him in Marguerite’s presence. Calvin does not respond.
Pro G. Farello adversus Caroli	1545	Against Pierre Caroli, former Doctor of Theology at Paris, member of the Meaux group, and curate of Alençon, who joined Farel, Viret, and Calvin in exile in 1534, becoming alternately their co-worker and critic, before returning to the Catholic fold. ¹²⁵
Epsitre contre un cordelier de Rouen	1547	Anti-Nicodemite tract.
De Scandalis – Des Scandales (Latin, then French)	1550	Calvin attacks Rabelais (then in exile?), Des Périers (†. 1544?), Dolet (†. 1546), and others evangelical writers by name.
Traité des Benefices	1554	See <i>Epistolae duae</i> (1537) above.

Most of these works have been well studied. The point here to stress is how much Calvin’s writing career during these years was designed to wrest control of the evangelical movement in France from leadership of Marguerite and her network. The output of such a large corpus presupposes an established evangelical audience in France. This point can be substantiated by concentrating at the first and the last works in this series, the *Epistolae duae* et *De Scandalis* in the context of Calvin’s private remarks in his correspondence.

¹²⁵ See further, Viret’s *Diputation chrestiennes*, pp. 149-152, in which he criticizes Caroli.

Calvin against Marguerite's Network

Calvin and many of the ministers in Francophone Switzerland were initially part of the loose network that looked to Marguerite, the Du Bellays, and their allies for political support. Calvin was connected with a whole host of people who were interconnected by religious belief and active collaboration. Besides direct contact with Marguerite, Calvin had many mutual friends and acquaintances over the years: Andrea Alciato, the Daniel brothers, Étienne de la Forge, Pocque and Quintin, Nicolas Cop, Roussel, Lefèvre, Marot, Renée de France, Farel, Caroli, Laurant Meigret, the Du Bellays, Claude Baduel, Antonio Caracciolo, Robert Estienne, Marie Dentièrre, Antoine Fromment, and Morelet du Mouseau, among others. Calvin criticized most of these figures at one point or another for having fallen from what he deemed to be the correct path of righteous comportment. Moreover, Calvin specifically targeted certain members of the network, though not always by name, in his anti-Nicodemite writings: Duchemin, Roussel, Du Tillet, Dolet, Rabelais, and others.

The *Epistolae Duae* of 1537 is Calvin's first controversialist work, or at least the first independent one, should one want to count his preface to Olivétan's Bible (1535) or dedicatory epistle to Francis I heading the *Institutes* (1536). This work commenced his campaign against those whom he would later name "Nicodemites." The second of these letters targeted Gérard Roussel, Marguerite's almoner, who had been named Bishop of Oloron (1536), but had not taken possession yet.¹²⁶ Calvin denies that a Christian

Higman, *Piery*, V 31.

¹²⁶ Beza write in his biography of Calvin, "Interæ Calvinus anno videlicet MDXXXVII, quod

knowing the truth, i.e., one who believed that the traditional catholic rites were corrupt, could accept a position in the Roman Church, lest he pollute himself, dishonor God, and destroy the souls of those in his charge.

Calvin and Roussel, as they say, had history. As a student at Paris, Bourges, and Orleans, Calvin was one of Roussel's admirers, whom a contemporary called Geraldini.¹²⁷ He narrated reports about attacks on Marguerite and Gérard at the University of Paris in the course of 1533. He must have been very deeply integrated in this circle since in a letter from the end of October 1533 from Paris to his friend François Daniel in Orleans, he writes:

I am sending to you the second little summary (*epitome*) by our G., to which, as an appendix, I will shorten to make easier to read what was cut of from those other commentaries (implied, that I already sent),¹²⁸ unless time runs short... I do not need to tell you that the times are turbulent, they speak for themselves. Beware that G's short summary does not fall into the wrong hands.¹²⁹

Calvin reveals here that one or more works by Roussel were circulating in manuscript in evangelical circles during the early 1530s. Soon thereafter, Calvin was

multos in Gallia videret veritatem quidem intus probe noscentes, sibi tamen indulgentes, quasi Christum animo colere satis esset, etiamsi papisticis sacris interessent, duas elegantissimas epistolas editit: ... alteram de papisticis sacerdotiis, Gerardo illi Ruffo cuius antea memini, quique abbatia quadam ac deinceps episcopatu post editum illum Parisiensem tumultum donatus, non modo postea satis rectum cursum non tenuit, verum etiam heram suam Navarrenam reginam paulatim pessumdedit." *CO* 21, 127B.

¹²⁷ Jean Dupêbe, "Un document sur les persécutions de l'hiver 1533-1534 à Paris," *BHR* 48 (1986), 405-417.

¹²⁸ Roussel is prolix in the *Familiere exposition*. The young master of Latin and French style—see Francis Higman and Olivier Millet—evidently thought that Roussel's "commentary," whatever it was, could stand some editing.

¹²⁹ Given the context, "G." has to be Gérard [Roussel] since Calvin has just narrated the attacks on Maistre Gérard. "Mitto Epitomen alteram G. nostri, cui velut appendicem assuere decreveram quod ab illis prioribus Commentariis abruptum erat, nisi me tempus defecisset... Ut non dicam haec esse tumultuaria, ipsa de se loquuntur. Epitomen cave temerè divulges." Herminjard 3, no. 437, 103-106; 105; *CO* 10b, no. 18, col. 23-24. Calvin's warning was well-grounded, since shortly thereafter letters to "Lutherans" and "Geraldini" were found in Jean Morand's possession, contributing to the heresy case against him. See

involved in soliciting Marguerite's help to save Nicolas Cop in the fall of 1533. After Cop's All Saint's Day oration, Calvin was a wanted man at Paris and he visited Nérac in 1534 before fleeing to Renée of Ferrara's court, a path well-worn by several of Marguerite's protégés.

During his stay at Strasbourg from 1538 to 1541, through his association with Johannes Sturm, Calvin seems to have played some role, or at least was adopted by association into the Du Bellay diplomatic corps. The Du Bellay's trust in Calvin was probably misplaced, for in 1539 he advised the Protestants not to listen to Marguerite's proposals when negotiating with the French, but to flatter and encourage her in order to get what help out of her they might, without committing themselves to any of her designs.¹³⁰

Then in April 1540, having heard encouraging reports about Gérard Roussel's first steps as bishop of Oloron as well as about another prelate deemed evangelically inclined, Geogres de Selve, Bishop of Lavaur, Guillaume Farel asked Calvin to encourage them both with letters.¹³¹ Calvin had no confidence in these prelates and advised all his

Dupèbe, "Un document sur les persécutions de l'hiver 1533-1534 à Paris, *BHR* 48 (1986), 406 and 414.

¹³⁰ "Si reginam Navarrae convenient [principum legati], erunt admonendi, ne eius consiliis auscultent. Quanquam expediet, illi Evangelii causam in genere commendari, ac indicari sic de eius pietate persuasos esse nostros principes, ut certo sperent sibi in hac legatione suffagaturam, utpote quae pro Christo et regno ipsius suscepta sit. Sic fortasse movebitur, quia spem de se conceptam fallere ipsam pudebit." Calvin to [Johannes or Jacob] Sturm, 1 Nov. 1539, Herminjard 6, no. 833, 121-122.

¹³¹ "Rufus, praeceptor meus, fertur intentus esse Verbo adnunciando, eleemosynis, ac educandis aliquot in literis. Faxit Christus ut sanctè pergat! Vauriensis [Georges de Selve, Bishop of Lavaur (1526-1541)] mirè commendatur ob interpretationem Pauli jugem ac juges conciones. Tu et alii, quos potestis nosse in opere Domini pergere, literis eos debetis sollicitare ut diligentius et purius pergant. Christus Jesus omnes suae gloriae ut ex animo serviamus faciat!" Farel from Neuchâtel to Calvin at Strasbourg, 16 April 1540, Herminjard 6, no. 860, p. 209-210; *CO* 11, no. 215, col. 33. For a report of George de Selve's having remembered the proposed religious concord of 1535 in 1540, see Bernard Roussel, "Martin Bucer et Jacques Sadolet."

friends not to contact them. Thus he called a halt to the practice of Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Capito, Sigismund von Hohenlohe, Melancthon, and others over the past twenty years in giving moral support to the leadership of their persecuted and half-hearted French brethren.¹³²

Despite Calvin's distrust of Marguerite and her prelate, there is evidence that Calvin wrote to her once in 1540, twice in 1541, but only his 1545 letter remains.¹³³ However, along with her one surviving letter to him from 1541 and other circumstantial evidence one can begin to assess their relationship from Calvin's Strasbourg period forward as Calvin simultaneously made his way onto the European political stage as a leading Francophone representative of Protestantism at Worms (1540) and its guiding theologian with his Latin (1536 and 1539) and French (1541) *Institutes*.

On July 25, 1541, Marguerite wrote to him:

Calvin, ... the King [Francis I] is extremely pleased with the good services that you and the others have done for him over there, about which he is well informed. You have just heard about the celebration of the marriage [between] the Duke de Cleves and my daughter. I beg you to believe and to make known to all your friends that the King of Navarre and I consider ourselves very fortunate in this marriage since we think that God has given us a son after our heart and spirit, through whom we hope that we will be able to do something to His honor and glory. I ask you that if you know of any way in which I can do some good that you will not spare me, and I assure you that I will employ myself with a good full heart and will do for you and the others all that I can according to the power that

¹³² "Gallis illis episcopis cur scribendum non putem, coram tibi indicabo. Magnam gratiam habeo fratribus quod meum consilium adeo aequis animis acceperunt. Quoniam tamen periculum est ne alii indignè ferant vos incepisse, non displiceret ut aliquantulum adhuc ea res differatur." Calvin at Strasbourg to Farel à Neuchâtel, circa 13 mai 1540, Herminjard 6, no 863, p. 223; *CO* 11, no. 218, cols. 40-41

¹³³ See Jourda, *Répertoire*, nos. 809, 835, 850, and 871.

God gives me. I beg you to continue to serve the King, as you have done until know... yours truly Marguerite.¹³⁴

The tone of this letter is very familiar and intimates a long-standing relationship. However, Marguerite's words are not to be taken wholly at face value. In the first place, Henry d'Albret, as explained above, hated this marriage that had been forced on him. Marguerite's letter was intended to strengthen the Protestant's trust in the new political union sealed by the marriage of her daughter. So what of her protestations of allegiance and requests for future collaboration?

Marguerite and Francis I certainly regarded this French pastor from Strasbourg as a valuable agent who had helped scuttle the Emperor's plans at Worms in 1540 and could further strengthen French ties with the German Protestants. The problem was whether Calvin and Marguerite would ever work together, as Marguerite put it, with common 'heart and spirit' to the 'honor and glory' of God.

Over the following years Marguerite seems to have been truly interested in maintaining relations with Calvin. She sent a member of her court at Nérac, the spiritualist Antoine Pocque, first to Bucer and then to Calvin from 1541 until Calvin threw him out in 1544.¹³⁵ During that time, Calvin kept tabs on her whereabouts,¹³⁶ but

¹³⁴ Jourda, *Répertoire*, no. 851; *CO*, 11, 62–63. The marriage took place in 1541, so this letter cannot be 1540 as in *CO*.

¹³⁵ George Hunston Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, third edition, Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies 15 (Kirkville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992) 907: Citing Karl Müller, "Libertiner" 2:127, he declares that the Libertine leaders Pocquet, Perceval, and Bertrand were all in Bucer's and then Pierre Brully's homes in Strasbourg between 1541–1543. Pocque was then in Geneva between 1542–1544 but was driven out. The Netherlands caused havoc in Strasbourg and Geneva in 1544.

¹³⁶ On March 24, 1543, Calvin informed Viret where M. de Beaumont could visit Marguerite if he wished: "De Bellomontano nihil scribo, qui si ad Reginam proficisci cogitat, hac iter faciet. Est autem

seems to have stayed aloof from overtures by evangelicals at court who desired his diplomatic services, which might aid the evangelical cause.¹³⁷ In 1545, Calvin attacked Pocque and another spiritualist in Marguerite's household, Quintin, in his *Contra les Libertins* (1545).

Reports about Marguerite's displeasure with this tract prompted Calvin to write the last known and only surviving letter from him to Marguerite. On April 28, 1545, Calvin justifies his treatise saying that it was measured, anonymous, and absolutely necessary because, as God's instrument for the edification of the Church, he had to denounce evil doctrines and men likely to mislead the simple faithful.¹³⁸ If she had harbored blasphemers at her court, he thinks no less of her because Christ too had had his Judas. His purpose in writing is quite simple. He wanted, if possible, to ensure the essential matter: her continuing political commitment to the evangelical cause. He writes in closing:

... after having heard the news of your discontent, I wanted to attempt to satisfy you as much as I am able, for no other reason than to avoid being the cause of your cooling or turning away from the good affection that you have shown up until now towards the poor faithful... I beg the Lord Jesus to maintain you in his guard and to guide you by his spirit as much in prudence as in zeal to follow your

Regina ipsa Neraci." Herminjard 8, no. 1213, p. 298.

¹³⁷ Henry Heller, citing Herminjard 9, 280, notes that "In 1544 the Genevan ambassador reported to the Council of Geneva that '...aujourd'hys Mons Le Cardinal du Bellay moy az tenus propos de Monsr. Calvin pour aller quelque part pour les affaires du Roy. Et si il se faict, j'espayre pourraz prouffiter à nostre religion....'. Heller's argument that Calvin continued to stay interested in helping the faithful in France politically is sound. However, all the evidence that he cites and we can find shows him working through Protestant powers like Basel, not with the hand that was extended to him by Jean Du Bellay or Marguerite. See , *Conquest*, pp. 128-129. In 1544, Du Bellay's 'propos' to the Genevan ambassador to use Calvin quite likely formed part of the evangelical factions attempt to break Francis I's pro-Imperial policy, moving him towards union with the Schmalkald League and England.

¹³⁸ CO 12, no. 634, 64-68; 68 B.

holy vocation. Your very humble and obedient servant in our Lord, Jean Calvin.¹³⁹

Notably, Calvin never attacks Marguerite in this letter for her religious views or for dissimulating them. Calvin's anti-Nicodemite thesis that knowingly participating in the corrupt rites of the traditional church is a sin, should have required him to admonish her if he thought her to be guilty of this. Beza in his life of Calvin certainly takes the view that Marguerite had been essentially corrupted in her faith by Pocque, Quintin, and Roussel.¹⁴⁰ If so, in this letter Calvin was dissimulating his condemnation.

More surprising if he thought her to be thus corrupted, Calvin ascribes a vocation to Marguerite, namely as a political figure who should use her power to further the Church of God. He further praises her for having fulfilled that calling to date, and counsels her to continue with zeal and prudence. 'Prudence' was a loaded and revealing word for him to have used. While Calvin will denounce simulation and dissimulation in all essential matters of religion, he comes close here to invoking as a positive virtue a measured support for reform programs that takes into account of the political circumstances and the political clout of the person he is addressing.¹⁴¹ This is not to say that Calvin is advocating a particular strategy of opportunistic or timely reform. Rather, his call for prudence is one of his few acknowledgments to the difficulties of those who risked having, as he recognized thankfully he did not, to prove their faith with

¹³⁹ CO 12, no. 634, col. 68 B.

¹⁴⁰ See note 126.

¹⁴¹ See Albert Autin, *La crise du nicodémisme (1535-1545): un épisode de la vie de Calvin* (Toulon: Paul Tissot, 1917) on Calvin's special dispensation to nobles allowing them greater mercy for having polluted themselves so long as they use their power to the advancement of God's kingdom.

“examinations or prison” as well as to the need for noble support for the reformed movement.

How Marguerite reacted to Calvin’s letter is not known. A letter from one of Calvin’s partisans in France from 1548, indicates that Pocque went about in Marguerite’s company denouncing Calvin.¹⁴² Aside from Baduel’s letters, there is no evidence that Marguerite’s circle and Calvin’s colleagues were ever again in contact until long after her death when Theodore Beza made a trip to Jeanne d’Albret’s Béarn in 1560. While Calvin and his followers’ opinion of Marguerite may never have improved, both she and her chief preacher Gérard Roussel continued to use Calvin’s exegetical works late in life to enrich their thought.¹⁴³

In adopting the doctrines of Calvin and other protestant theologians, the evangelicals in Marguerite’s circle divorced the Reformers’ positive teachings from their demand to reject the old church, attempting to use them to transform the existing cult. Calvin and Viret defined this as the contradictory and blasphemous life of the Nicodemite, but if Calvin thought this of Marguerite, in his letter of 1545 he was practicing a polite deception, while seeking simultaneously to maintain her active support as well as to win over her protégés to his allegiance.

In 1550, Calvin published his *De Scanalis* [*Des Scandales*], in which he condemned by name for the first time Henry Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, Étienne

¹⁴² Aegidius Michaux to “Monseigneur Monsieur Despeville” [John Calvin], feast of St. Laurence, 1548, *CO* 13: 27-28.

¹⁴³ On the Calvinist tenor of Marguerite’s late poems, see Abel Lefranc, *Idées religieuses*.

Dolet, François Rabelais, Antonio de Gouvea, Bonaventure Des Périers, “and others like them,” writes Calvin, “whom I will not name for the present.”¹⁴⁴

Even if there was some past personal *animus* behind Calvin’s attack on these figures—he had collaborated with Des Périers on Olivétan’s Bible and Dolet printing connections with Geneva—he aimed not just at individuals, but specifically at several of the most famous members of the network, who had propagated the evangelical faith in their literary works and who equally, as well-known figures, served as models for those in France who were attracted to evangelical doctrine.

Two sources offer an index of the importance of these literary evangelicals as the symbolic leaders of French evangelicals as well as obstacles whom Calvin felt he had to knock down in his quest to establish the ‘true church’ in France

First, in 1538, a packet of letters was seized at Lyon. Apprehended were nine missives written by refugees at Geneva to their friends and family at home in Bordeaux. One correspondent included a copy of a letter by Farel to the “brothers at Geneva,” written from Basel shortly after he and Calvin had been rejected as ministers from Geneva. The writer promised to send by separate cover copies of three similar letters by Farel, Calvin, and Viret, all of which he hoped would console and edify the faithful in Bordeaux.¹⁴⁵ The first thing to note is the early influence of this triumvirate of

¹⁴⁴ Fatjo, ed., *De Scandalis*, 137-140; OS 2, 201.

¹⁴⁵ Berthoud, Gabrielle. “Lettres de réformés saisies à Lyon en août 1538.” In *Etudes et documents inédits sur la Réformation en suisse romande*, 87-111. Extracts from *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 1933 and 1936. Lausanne: Imprimerie La Concorde, 1936. 89: One of the Bordelais writers at Geneva thought it proper to send on a copy of a letter from Farel at Basel to Geneva “aux frères de Genève,” (shortly after being expelled) back to the ‘church’ at Bordeaux as a form of consolation. P. 90, note 1: This copy was done at Geneva. There exist two other copies of this letter, see CO 10, 2, col. 210ff;

reformers¹⁴⁶ on the 'faithful' in France, well before Calvin and Viret at least, had established their popular reputations through an imposing list of vernacular publications.

In another letter in the packet, André Zébédée, who had many friends among the evangelicals at the College of Guyenne in Bordeaux, wrote, rather cryptically, "I remember Dolet, Rabelais, and Marot well, but I am confounded when I recall what someone told me about them at Lyon."¹⁴⁷ What exactly astonished or even terrified (*s'estonner*) Zébédée is far from clear. The context seems to indicate that it was something far from laudable, which undermined his former good opinion of these authors. At Geneva, Calvin certainly had grave doubts about these three writers, even Marot, who, despite his signal contribution of his Psalms translations to the reformed tradition, was forced from Genevan at the end of his life and demoted in the memory of the reformed tradition.¹⁴⁸ It is equally striking that these three evangelical authors form a sort of rival triumvirate to Farel, Viret, and Calvin in the letters of these refugees from Bordeaux. It is as if one is witnessing an early *translatio imperii* of leadership among the ranks of religious dissenters within France.

Herminjard 5, 33–37, no. 720. p. 109: Cornelius [Jehan Corneille?] to Monsieur Deffa, 31 July 1538, no. 8. Cornelius sends letters from Farel [x2], Calvin, and Viret to comfort the faithful of Bordeaux, particularly the wife of Deffa [Arnaud de Verteuil, seigneur de Feuillas] "Qua de re mitto ad [te] Farelli litteras communitur ad omnes fratres scriptas, alteras eiusdem et Calvini separatim ad me missas, tertias etiam ecclesiaste Lausannensis nobis redditas."

¹⁴⁶ On the 'triumvirate' of reformers, see Heiko A. Oberman, "Calvin and Farel: The Dynamics of Legitimation in Early Calvinism." *JEMH* 2, no. 1 (1998), 32-60; also *Reformation and Renaissance Review* (1999): 7-40, whose subtitle inspires that of the present section.

¹⁴⁷ "Il me souvient bien de Dolet, Rabelez, et Marot et je m'estonne quant je rememorre ce qu'on m'en dit à Lyon."

¹⁴⁸ See Defaux for Beza's veiled criticism and usurpation of Marot's place in the Geneva editions of the Psalms.

Dolet, Rabelais, et Marot, were, of course, three of the most well-known authors in their day. They were the chief figures in an extended 'pleiade' (before the fact) of poets, writers, notables, and printers, which was centered at Lyon. Most of these "sons of Apollo" were protected or patronized by Marguerite or other nobles in her closest circle of friends, including the Du Bellay brothers. During the 1530s and 1540s, this literary group was responsible for producing dozens of books, which, while they were not written in formally religious genres, were imbued with evangelical doctrine, analysis of events, and sentiment. To the list of authors already mentioned by Calvin in *De Scandalis* and in the 1538 letters, one could add: Nicolas de Bourbon, Jean Visagier ou Voulte, Charles de Sainte-Marthe, Victor Brodeau, J.C. Scaliger, and Jean Boyssonné.

The second revealing source, is a poem by Clément Marot, which he elected never to publish. Of all the writers just mentioned, including Calvin, he is rightly considered the most famous and popular in his day in France.¹⁴⁹ As Gérard Defaux has amply demonstrated in his editions of and commentaries on Marot's literary works, the poet was well aware of his role. The poem in question is his *Epistre du coq à l'asne à Lyon*,¹⁵⁰ which is one of several of his *coq à l'asne*, a genre invented by him for freewheeling commentary on contemporary events and his personal fate. Marot did publish many of these, but they did circulated among his friends in manuscript.

¹⁴⁹ If an author's popularity is to be judged by the number of editions of their works published, then Marot was far more 'popular' than any of his contemporaries, be they poets or religious writers. See Defaux's several studies and edited symposia.

¹⁵⁰ Unpublished, attributed to Marot circa 1540/41 by C. A. Mayer, *Bibliographie des Œuvres de Clément Marot I: Manuscrits*, THR 10, Geneva: Droz, 1954, 78-85. Gérard Defaux date the poem to 1542, see *Oeuvres poétiques* 2, p. 165-171, notes, 943-946.

In this poem from 1542, a date falling between his first and final exile, Marot advocates self-preservation by dissimulating (hiding) one's dissenting religious views, even simulating (conforming outwardly to) the catholic rites. Marot writes nominally to his friend "Lyon," [both Lyon Jamet and the city are meant], but the poem speaks to evangelicals everywhere:¹⁵¹

[l. 6] Il est fol, qui le col se casse
S'il n'en a deux comme le veau.
Et d'alleguer un cas nouveau,
La question n'en est plus bonne.
Pourquoy? notre mere Sorbonne
Faict à tous veaulx avoir deux testes:
Et s'ilz sont sottes comme bestes,
Il faut aprendre les passaiges:
Ung troy foys fol vault ung vray saige....

[l. 24] Ne parles point en genesvoys,
Que la fumée ne t'aveugle....

[l. 45] Ne parlez point de l'Evangille,
Si vous n'avez la langue agile.
Pour Sorbonner, la bonne myne.
Car l'on dict qu'on scent sa farine,
Si l'on ne scet son Pathelin.....

[l. 91] Que fera l'âme pecheresse?
Je croy quel[le] est en grand distresse
Que son miroir est deffendu.
L'antechrist n'est plus attendu:
Nous l'avons, gardons qu'il eschappe.
Baisez la pantoufle du pape
En disant votre patenostre:...

[l. 104] A Paris a l'âne son groing,
La louve aussi, & ses louvetons,
De peur qu'on ne vienne aux sermons
Par le passaige saint Landry.

[l. 116] Il est deffendu de porter
Livres de la sainte escripture:
Cela fera que la friture
Sera fort chere ce Karesme.
Tu payeras tes beurre et cresse,
Pour estre dict bon filz de vache.
Ne souffre jamais qu'on attache
Ta langue pour avoir bien dict,
Car l'Inquisiteur a credit
De nous chanter de profundis.
Lyon, entendz ce que je dictz,
Tu apprendras beaucoup soubz moy;...

[l. 135] Aussi ce n'est pas de merveilles
Si je prens bonnet a oreilles:
Je crains trop le froit aux talons.
L'on faict filer à recullons
La verité par les cordiers,
En faisant pour les Cordeliers.

¹⁵¹ Not only did Marot's poems spread through the many editions of his works, but also orally and through manuscript copies, whence his many complaints about pirate editions that made public poems he did not intent to publish. See Mayer, *Bibliographie des Œuvres de Clément Marot I: Manuscrits*, passim.

In this poem, Marot gives a sort of status report on the evangelical cause. Among other persons and events, he speaks of “*l’âme pécheresse*” (Marguerite after her poem of the same name 1531) as being in danger, and mentions the evangelical preaching of François Landry at Paris, whom both Marguerite and Jean Du Bellay promoted and protected.¹⁵² His over-riding theme is persecution and how he is going to respond to it. He advises his evangelical listener to follow his decision to forgo speaking like the Genevans (*en genevoys*, i.e., like the reformers there), to keep silent about the Gospel, to pull his hat over his ears, and go drinking “*Adieu te diz, je m’en voys boyre*” [final line 234], rather than risk the fires and whips of the Sorbonne, the inquisitor, or the monks.

This poem was not Marot’s final response to the religious situation in France. He would shortly go into exile again at Geneva, where he was well received by Calvin as the useful translator of the Psalms. Marot’s lifestyle soon got him into trouble and he had to leave. In 1544, he died miserably, almost alone, far from his friends and family. Bonaventure Des Périers, Étienne Dolet, François Rabelais, Pierre Caroli, Antoine Pocque, Antoine Caracciolo, and many others whom Marguerite had supported were crushed at home by persecution and denounced from abroad by Calvin and company: they all died similar isolated deaths, either in exile, be it internal or in foreign lands, or on the pyre. They hardly benefited by their religious dissent or were protected by dissembling their views, as alleged by Calvin was their motives. Indeed they suffered much more than

¹⁵² Nathaniel Weiss, “Épisodes de la Réforme à Paris: Maître François Landry curé de Sainte-Croix en la Cité sous François Ier et Henri II (1540-1557),” *BSHPF* 37 (1888), 241-267; Droz, *Chemins de l’hérésie*: 390-394.

Calvin ever did. His attacks on them helped to clear the terrain, 'purifying' the evangelical ranks of those unwilling to raise a separatist church. Moreover, they could not counter his attacks. Aside from a few furtive complaints by Antoine Fumée, Marguerite, Pocque, and Rabelais,¹⁵³ hardly a record survives of their anger at Calvin's denunciations, except for his own avowals in the *Excuse aux Nicodemites*. To deny Calvin's charges of having compromised sinfully, French evangelicals living in France under the 'papists' would have had to admit the premise that would have earned them death.

¹⁵³ For Rabelais's one cryptic response to Calvin, see *Le Quart Livre*, ed. Robert Marichal, TLF 10 (Geneva: Droz, 1947), pp. 151-152, bk. XXXII, ll., 107-123, and introduction, XIII-XVII.

Towards the Wars of Religion

France had a renaissance before the middle of the sixteenth century, but did it have a reformation? In light of this study, the widely accepted answer to this question should change. The period before Calvin's influence waxed should not be seen merely as an anarchic phase of genesis or origins leading to him and the reformed churches of France. Long before them, Marguerite and her network were promoting a reformation much like the "protestant" ones that succeed elsewhere.

Inspired by the example of the German reformers, these evangelicals engaged in a multifaceted program of largely clandestine activities to promote and fix within the realm a true and living faith in the Gospel. In the end they failed to bring about their ultimate goal, the reform of the Gallican church under the king's leadership. This group's thirty-year long campaign is the missing link in the history of the French reformation.

Marguerite and her network were the active proponents within France of the international evangelical movement emanating from Germany. They appropriated its doctrinal core into their own reforming agenda. In trying to effect this renewal of religion, they constructed their program to fit with and draw strength from a variety of indigenous developments: late medieval episcopal reform programs, the laity's burgeoning thirst for works of piety, the new texts and interpretive horizons opened up by humanist scholars, as well as the crown's concerted effort to increase its hold over church and realm.

Marguerite and her network only made limited gains. Far from being fatalists or naïve optimists, they correctly assessed that, given the heavy opposition of conservatives, their prospects for success were limited and rested mainly with the king. As the day kept being put off when God would change the heart of the king, they tried as best they could to sustain a remnant or catacomb church within the corrupt structure of the established church: seeds for its eventual renewal. Unlike Farel, Calvin, and others who fled France, they were willing to accept living under “the torments of tyrants.” Some of these cells and sodalities of humanists, prelates, and nobles whom they nurtured would later participate in the French Wars of Religion. Marguerite and her closest advisors would have seen this event as a bitter turn of events: an undermining of obedience to the Gospel, rather than the means to its restoration.

As a result of their failure to move Francis I and the court to support an evangelical reform, Marguerite and her network had no heirs to guard their memory or to tell their story from a patriotic perspective. At the end of the sixteenth century, the confessional winners looked back on Marguerite and her protégés through the smoke of battles and heresy burnings. As survivors of the horrors of the Wars of Religion, they judged Marguerite and her circle for what they had failed to become.

Modern historians of all confessional and non-confessional stripes have in one way or another reprised the Genevan perspective on Marguerite and her network expressed in Calvin’s anti-Nicodemite tracts, Jean Crespin’s *Histoire des martyrs*, the

Histoire ecclésiastique, as well as Beza's *Vita Calvini* and *Icones*.¹ In this line of interpretation, Marguerite and her immediate satellites were, as Charles Schmidt called them, 'half-protestants.'² From the reformed perspective, early French evangelicals came far enough to see the light and deserved praise for having promoted the first flowering of reform, but equally merited final condemnation for having abandoned it. Translated into the terms of Imbart de la Tour, Lucien Febvre, and recent interpreters following them, these French evangelicals lacked some crucial quality, be it courage, leadership, or a unifying doctrinal system. Such faults explain what has been seen as their half-hearted efforts and lack of success in promoting reformation.

Staunch Catholic and Lutheran historians of the sixteenth century echoed the Genevan view with important differences that have not been accepted by most modern interpreters. Both traditions considered Marguerite and her circle as the leading carriers of the reformation in France without whom the reformed churches would not have risen. In 1580, Johann Sturm, the protestant rector of the gymnasium at Strasbourg and a former agent in the Du Bellay diplomatic corps, claimed that whatever good (i.e., protestant commitment) there was in France was due to a direct transmission from Lefèvre, Roussel,

¹ In book one of the *Histoire ecclésiastique*, which notes several occasions when Marguerite intervened on behalf of the persecuted that have not been discussed in this study, she is not credited with this exalted role. Rather, she like Marot, Guillaume Du Bellay, and other early evangelicals are depicted as having 'fallen back into idolatry,' 'serving the king more than God.' See *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France*, ed. G. Baum and E. Cunitz. 3 vols. (Paris, 1883-9; reprint, Nieukoop: B. de Graaf, 1974), 12-13, 26-29, and especially, 36-37. Beza, however, paints slightly more flattering picture of Marguerite in his *Icones*.

² Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, 6, 126, and passim.

and Marguerite, via her daughter Jeanne d'Albret, to Henry of Navarre.³ Writing in response to the *Histoire ecclésiastique*, the colorful catholic apologist and former reformed protestant from Aquitaine, Florimond de Raemon, attributed the birthing (*naissance*) of the French reformation largely to the efforts of Marguerite and her almoner Gérard Roussel.⁴ Both Sturm and Raemon had access to sources and eye-witnesses reports that the Genevans did not, most of which are now lost. Nevertheless, none of these historians had direct access to the inner circle of Marguerite's network or sought to tell their story from their perspective.

This study has drawn as close to Marguerite's evangelical network as the sources will allow. Its findings largely confirm Sturm and Raemon's view that Marguerite's network were actively trying to promote a reformation. This study goes beyond them by showing with detailed examples their intentions and major projects.

³ "Capitonis vero et Buceris tanta statim fama erat: ut Iacobus Faber Stapulensis, et Gerardus Rufus clam e Gallia profecti, Capitonem et Bucerum audierent: et de omnibus doctrinae praecipuis locis, cum his different, missi a Margareta Francisci Regis sorore, Navarrae Regina, avia huius Henrici Regis: cui mater Ioanna, hanc quam nunc tuetur, haerediatriam doctrinam atque Religionem tradidit. *Quocirca id quod in Gallia in religione boni est, id prope ex hoc fonte derivatum est:* et Evangelica vitis in Gallicis Ecclesiis, aliquid etiam germinis ex nostra urbe accepit, cuius fructus ex illis Ecclesiis non facile deperibit." Jean Sturm, *Quarti antipappi tres partes priores [Antipappus quartus]*, (Neapoli Palatinorum [Neustadt], in officina Matthaei Harnisch, 1580), p. 8 (B1v).

⁴ In a chapter titled, "Les premiers Lutheriens accueillis et fauorisez de la Royne Marguerite soeur du Roy" Raemon summarized how the confessional histories of his day viewed Marguerite; "Cela est notamment marqué par tous les historiens del'un et de l'autre party, que ceste Princesse seule fut cause, sans y penser mal, de la conversation des Lutheriens François, et que l'Eglise qui depuis s'est attribuée le nom de reformée, n'en eut esté estouffée dans le berceau: Car outre qu'elle leur prestoit l'oreille à leur propos, qui du commencement estoient specieux, et non si hardis que depuis." *L'histoire de la naissance... de l'hérésie de ce siècle*. Rouen, 1623, [first edition: Paris: Charles Chastellain, 1605]. In this passage, Raemon exaggerates the role attributed by reformed histories to Marguerite. It was typical of catholics to see her, in exaggerated fashion, as the 'sole' reason that the reformation, unfortunately, was not killed in the cradle. That was not what the *Histoire ecclésiastique* argued but what Raemon, like his conservative forerunners among Marguerite's contemporaries, extrapolated from the evidence of her protection of the heterodox.

In the first place, Marguerite's personal role *as a reformer* has been clarified. Pierre Jourda, like the *Histoire ecclésiastique* and Florimond de Raemon, reprised the opinion of Claude Baduel that late in life Marguerite turned away from reform. Jourda and Raemon assert that she recognized the errors of her ways, re-embracing the catholic faith of her youth. Their interpretations put a positive catholic spin on the views of Baduel and the *Histoire ecclésiastique* who argued that in the 1540s she was corrupted by Roussel, Pocque, and Quintin into participating in catholic rites, which she knew to be false.

Such assertions about Marguerite's final years can not be tested for lack of direct evidence from her or her entourage. What is certain and suspect is that these accounts date Marguerite's supposed conversion or perversion to the mid-to-late 1540s, which was exactly the period when her direct influence at court diminished to be extinguished completely with the ascension Henry II. If, as Claude Baduel claimed, Marguerite's favor towards him and his brethren declined somewhat, the chief reason was not, as he asserted, the influence of "certain wicked men."⁵ Baduel's view, which echoes Calvin's attack on the 'Nicodemites' and 'Libertins' in her entourage, does not square with the evidence. As has been shown in chapter 10, Marguerite played a desperate political game to induced Francis I to break with Rome right up to the end of his reign. Thereafter, in her southern territories, Roussel remained at her side, pursuing his quiet but nonetheless daring reformation of religious education, alms, the cult of the saints, confession, and the mass, for which he drew upon Calvin and other reformers. What Marguerite's reformed critics

interpreted as her loss of ardor was really a loss of power. Their accounts smack of the censorious disrespect of clients who have survived the fall of their patron and lived to tell the tale.

The continuity and importance of Marguerite's support for a reformation is revealed in the deeds of the network that she cultivated. Reconstructing its membership and collective action is a major task. This study has laid the foundations. In looking for evidence, the net has been cast as widely as possible since few sources remain from within the group. Three keys or perspectives have proved essential to reaching a coherent and compelling interpretation of the evidence.

Persecution. Evangelicals lived an embattled existence perpetually under the threat of investigation, trial, loss of goods or honor, even imprisonment, banishment, or death. Any study of this period that does not make this fact a grounding point for interpreting their words and deeds will make nonsense of their careers individually and especially collectively. The result would be akin to writing the history of Marxists agitators under the Czars or democratic dissenters under the Soviet regime as if they operated in a free marketplace of ideas. The comparison may be overdrawn, yet many studies acknowledge the hostile climate in France without ever really taking it into account in their analysis. To complicate matters, persecution was not consistent or ever complete during the reign of Francis I. So long as evangelicals stopped short of 'insurrection,' i.e., attacking the established religious order directly, as did iconoclasts and the placardists of 1534, they stood a chance of surviving. Moreover, they rightly

⁵ See Chapter 2, 66-67.

entertained the hope that they might be able to convince authorities to adopt their vision of renewal, since many of their members already held positions of considerable influence close to the crown. Therefore, one must always be taking a barometer reading of the climate of persecution in order to assess the meaning of the evangelicals' actions and silences.

Politics. The Reformation is rightly described on one level as a political event in as much as it was secular powers that played the preponderant role in either suppressing or institutionalizing reform. No less so in France, Francis I's changing policy and the succession of advisors who shaped it must always be kept in view since royal orders conditioned the climate of persecution more than any other factor. Moreover, international affairs had important effects on the pace and severity of policing against heresy within France. Believing that the political arena was where their fate would ultimately be decided, evangelicals in Marguerite's network sought to address Francis' dynastic ambitions in such a way as to create the conditions for the favorable reception of their views. As they understood it, providing cannons for France's armies and supplying the canon of Scripture in French were equally necessary for the reform to succeed. The network's involvement in shaping and enacting the crown's policy is as essential a part of their story as their publishing of religious books and promoting of evangelical preachers and prelates.

Perception – Self-Perception. Marguerite and her protégés were recognized as a group by their enemies as well as their allies abroad. Moreover, they had a clear self-consciousness as a group. The name given to them in this study, the Navarrian network,

may be a modern invention, but their historical, affective existence was real. This self-identity was further manifest in their use of distinctive evangelical phrases that expressed their guiding ideas and served as a code for mutual identification. The similarity of their lexicon to the one employed by reformers in the Empire and Switzerland, testifies to their common cause with the early Europe-wide evangelical movement. This 'in-group' vocabulary paralleled the abusive out-group terms "heretic," "Lutheran," "Nicodemite" employed against them by their enemies and rivals.

The legacy of Marguerite and her network remains an open question. This study has argued that in nurturing clandestine evangelical cells they established the roots of the future reformed churches. Several reports depict Marguerite's court as a trend-setting example for others. In his funeral oration in honor of Marguerite, her secretary Charles de Ste. Marthe defended her widely noticed practice of discussing doctrine with circles of learned men at her court.⁶ Florimond de Raemonnd reported, based on eye-witness accounts, that Marguerite and her husband used to hold secret "*manducations*" or evangelical Eucharists during which the bread was distributed to all communicants.⁷

⁶ Charles de Ste. Marthe, *Oraison funèbre de la mort de l'incomparable Marguerite, royne de Navarre et duchesse d'Alençon*, in Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaiglon, eds., *Heptaméron des Nouvelles de très illustre princesse Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre*, 4 vols. (Paris: Eudes, 1880), vol. 1, 69-74.

⁷ Discussing a period before 1533 when Marguerite's *Miroir* was censured, Raemonnd writes: "Mais comme des comedies de sa sale, on l'auoit conduit aux exhortation de sa chambre: aussi de ces prieres on le fit descendre aux manducations dans la caue, ou pour le moins és lieux secrets de la monnaoye, qui est sur la pente du taulus du chasteau de Pau. Ainsi apelloient-ils lors leur ceremonie, laquelle à present ils nomment Coene, dont i'escriray la forme cy apres au liure suivant: [In margin: La Royne de Navarre à la Cour. *Le sieur de Burie lieutenant du Roy de Guienne.*]." *L'histoire de la naissance*, 849-50, see further his discussion of other secret meetings by evangelicals, at some of which the King and Queen of Navarre attended, in which participants read confessions of faith from Germany and later Geneva, prayed, sang the

As Calvin argued, their example was an ambiguous one, for in a letter from 1555, Jeanne d'Albret recalled that on one occasion her father interrupted Marguerite while she was in private devotions with Roussel and Farel, slapped her on the cheek, threatened Jeanne with a beating, and forbade them from meddling in doctrine ever again.⁸ That experience, Jeanne explained, was why she had hid her commitment to the reformed cause until the death of her father. This one domestic scene, which contradicts Raemond's depiction of Henri d'Albret's reaction to the religious controversy, epitomizes the whole early reformation: its adherents were forced underground. Even Jeanne, who was professing her adherence to the reformed cause in this letter, would wait another five years, until just after Henry II's death, to declare her faith openly.

The Navarrian network's ambiguous legacy is further revealed when one inspects the long list of those members or their heirs who were active during the Wars of Religion.

Pater Noster and the *Credo* in Latin, and participated in other manducations, in "Chapitre XV, La premiere forme de l'église calvinist, et de leur manducation au lieu de la cène," 910-917.

Marguerite's reputation for holding such '*manducations*' must have circulated widely, suffering the same fate in the transmission as the reports about the first Christians celebration of the Lord's table. By the time the story reached Luther's ears, Marguerite was inviting young men together with whom she fornicated and then had one of them drowned! At table in December 1538, Luther recounted a story which resembles Florimond's [note the mention of the Sr. de Burie]: "Regina Navarrae petulantissima. Mentio fiebat de regina Navarrae in Galliis olim regnante, quae cum in arce munitissima sederet, sub cuius carere fluvius flueret, ea cum multos egregios adolescentes ad se vocasset et post concubitus perpetratum submersisset, ne palam fieret illius scortatio, tandem vocatus nomine Buridanus: is tragoediam sciens substituit suos commilitones, ut illum navibus expectantes exciperent, et ita deiectus est extractus. Tandem iste multis aviculis captis singulis in collo schedulam suspendit in hanc sententiam amphibolam: Reginam Navarrae licet occidere. Tantus homicida est Sathan, qui homines ita dementat." *WA Tr* 4, p. 185, no. 4184.

⁸ Jeanne's letter, which only survives in a letter whose authenticity has been doubted, is the only surviving testimony from her about her mother's religious life or influence on her. See Nancy Lyman Roelker, *Queen of Navarre: Jeanne d'Albret 1528-1572*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 127; and for discussion of the authenticity of the letter, full text and translation, David M. Bryson, "The Vallant Letters of Jeanne d'Albret: Fact or Forgery?" *French History* 13 (1999), 16-186, with further discussion in *idem*, *Queen Jeanne and the Promised Land: Dynasty, Homeland, Religion and Violence in Sixteenth-Century France*, *Studies in Intellectual History* 97 (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

One finds them in both the moderate catholic and Huguenot camps, but rarely among the Guise-led intransigent catholic party. Jeanne d'Albret's eventual leadership among the Huguenots is well known. Marguerite's highest ranking protégé in Francis I's regime, François Olivier (†. 1560), was retired from his post as Chancellor of France by Henry II. After Henry's death, Catherine de Medici brought him back to court, where he and Coligny wrote the amnesty for the Protestants after the "*conjuraton d'Amboise*" (1560). Olivier's younger brother Antoine (†. 1571), Bishop of Lombez, later embraced the reformed faith. At the Colloquy of Poissy (1561) three of the seven moderate bishops participating on the catholic side had strong connections back to the network: Jean de Monluc, Bishop of Valence and Die, Antonio Caracciolo, Bishop of Troyes, and Jean de St. Gelais, Bishop of Uzès.⁹ So too, among the protestant delegates to Poissy was a sizable group whose *alma mater* was Marguerite's city and university of Bourges: Pierre Bouquin, François Perussel, Augustin Marlorat, and Theodore Beza. All of these had long ago passed out of the orbit of Marguerite's network, but they had been formed in the evangelical circles protected by her.

By the end of the reign of Henry II, the religious landscape had altered radically since the days of Marguerite and her network's clandestine campaign for reformation. The advent of crushing persecution as well as of publicly avowed reformed churches and

⁹ Donald Nugent, *Ecumenism in the Age of the Reformation: The Colloquy of Poissy*, Harvard Historical Studies 89, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974).

Among the eight French bishops investigated by the Roman Curia as Calvinists after Poissy, in addition to Monluc, Caracciolo, and St. Gelais, were Claude Régin, Marguerite's former Master of Requests and Roussel's successor at Oloron, and Louis d'Albret, Bishop of Lescar in Jeanne d'Albret's Béarn. Antoine Degert, *Procès de huit évêques français suspects de Calvinisme*. (Paris, 1904); offprint from *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1904.

noble protectors had closed that era, creating the conditions that would soon lead to armed conflict. Marguerite and her network may have seemed a distant memory. When Henry II's fortuitous death, just as he was about to turn even more seriously to eradicating heresy in France, opened a brief period of respite from persecution, their memory was invoked by those seeking a moderate, royal reformation. In 1559, shortly after Henry's death, a former servant of Marguerite appealed to Catherine de Medicis to join the reformed cause telling her to follow Marguerite's example, which, he argued, should be dear to her because the queen had championed her when Henry had been ready to divorce her for failing to produce a child.¹⁰ In 1562, when Johann Sturm appealed to Jean de Monluc, Catherine de Medicis' favorite bishop, to defend the reformed cause, he invoked the days of their youth in 1534 when they had heard the sermons of Gérard Roussel in Paris and Monluc had more boldly embraced 'the truth.'¹¹ But with the outbreak of war in that year, the memory of Marguerite and her network as well as their desire for a moderate, royal reformation was to fade quickly, as a new generation replaced the old guard and the political circumstances changed radically.

¹⁰ Saulnier 1975A.

¹¹ "Novi te anno trigesimo tertio et quarto, quo tempore Gerardus Rufus Lutetiae in aula concionabatur, et tametsi vox tua interquievit aliquot annis, tamen tum libere sonuit veritatem Domini." Jean Sturm to Jean de Monluc, Bishop of Valence et Die, 17 June 1562 [incorrectly dated to 1561], *CO* 18, no. 3420. Noted by Jean Rott, "Le recteur strasbourgeois Jean Sturm et les Protestants français," in *Investigationes Historicae: Eglises et société au XVI^e siècle*, 43-61.

Appendix A. Additions and Corrections to the *Répertoire de la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre*

The correspondence of Marguerite of Navarre has been extensively studied, and yet much remains to be done. Dozens of scholars have edited portions of this corpus with varying precision. In 1930, Pierre Jourda published a quasi-complete listing of her then known epistolary oeuvre, his *Répertoire de la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre*. This work undergirded his monumental study of her life and work. Since then, many more letters have been discovered. Realizing that his extensive search had not closed the subject, he invited scholars to continue his efforts.¹ In some fourteen articles the eminent literary historian, V.L. Saulnier, revised portions of Jourda's *Répertoire* providing "additions and corrections," to the very incomplete notes provided by Jourda and other editors. His detailed articles are *in toto* almost as long as Jourda's biography, and yet only cover a third of Marguerite's known letters. The remainder await similar detailed study.

This appendix provides, in ascending chronological order, a list of all Saulnier's "additions and corrections" plus those that have been made during the research for this study (these 'new' letters are numbered 10000 and higher), totaling some 478 references. An index of the letters known to Jourda that have been assigned a new series number by Saulnier or this study follows these entries. Though not exhaustive—far from it—this appendix should contribute to the publication of a new repertory, or even an edition of Marguerite's unpublished correspondence.

Each entry provides the usual information, when known: author, addressee, date, place, MS location, printed editions, plus cross-reference to Jourda or Saulnier's studies for their fuller notes. To clarify the status of each letter vis-à-vis the *Répertoire*, a Yes or No answer is given to whether the letter is 1) 'New,' i.e., missing in Jourda's *Répertoire* or Saulnier's additions, hence repertoried here for the first time; 2) 'Extant,' in a manuscript or early printed exemplar (as opposed to 'lost' letter, which is only mentioned in some other source); and 3) 'Edited,' (i.e., the letter itself or the source mentioning a lost letter) and thus accessible to scholarship.

The results of this cumulative effort are as follows.

Known Letters. Jourda cataloged 1143 letters from published and manuscript sources, including both extant and lost letters. Saulnier has added another 155 letters to the tally, exclusively from modern editions of sources. He provided notes on the content and historical context of 174 more letters known to Jourda, often leading to their re-dating. This appendix adds further corrections to Jourda and Saulnier plus 95 newly repertoried letters from edited and manuscript sources. The total of Marguerite's known correspondence now stands at about 1385. Slightly over half of these letters are extant.

Edited letters. Marguerite's edited correspondence is scattered in some 150 published works, ranging in scope from journal articles to the monumental 23 volume, 35 tome *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*.² François Génin published a large portion of Marguerite's correspondence, some 322 letters, in his ground-breaking two volume edition of 1841-42. Génin's selection chiefly contains her exchange of missives with Francis I and Anne de Montmorency. After partial publication by Génin, A. J. Herminjard, and Philippe-Auguste Becker, Marguerite's famous

¹ See Jourda, *Répertoire*, xvi-xxxvii, for a discussion and list of the extensive archival and published sources that he consulted. He readily admits that his search has not exhausted all the holdings likely to contain her correspondence. Notably, aside from checking the catalogues for Bern and Munich, he ignored archives in the Germanic speaking countries, relying on but a few published sources. V.-L. Saulnier, on the other hand, has consulted studies that have researched the holding of many archives in the Empire, which most likely to contain letters in Marguerite's correspondence.

² For the complete list of published works see the special section in the Bibliography devoted to Marguerite's correspondence. The most important of these are cited in the notes with abbreviations defined at the head of this work.

exchange with Guillaume Briçonnet from 1521 to 1524, some 123 letters, was published in a critical edition by three scholars, Martineau, Veissière, and Heller. Traces of Marguerite's no doubt massive lost correspondence have been surfacing to the present day in ones, twos, and threes (rarely more) in journal articles and in the correspondence collections of figures such as François Tournon, Martin Bucer, Jean du Bellay, and many ambassadors to and from France. All these printed sources are listed in the References.

Unpublished letters. Of the letters noted by Jourda, Saulnier, and, for the first time, in this appendix, more than 170 extant letters or the primary sources mentioning lost letters remain unpublished. Most of these documents are housed in Parisian archives and have been transcribed for use in this study. Those of historical interest will be published in due course.

Additions and Corrections to the *Répertoire de la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre*

- 10005 – 9 February – Lyon – Marguerite de Navarre to M. le Seneschal – BnF Clairambault 1064, “Melanges”, fol. 182. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 1143 (J: 1143) – 14 February – X to Marguerite – BnF Clairambault 313, f. 76. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10007 – [1515]. 23 August – Amboise – Marguerite d’Alençon to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9322, n. 75. Reference in Clémencet no. 982. p. 170. “Lettre de Marguerite d’Angoulême demandant au Parlement de protéger les religieux Dominicains réformés du Mans contre les religieux non réformés qui cherchent à empêcher la réforme.” Signature autograph. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 5 (J: 5; S: 5) – [1519]. December – Marguerite d’Alençon to Cathedral Chapter of Bourges – Raynal 3, 286. Saulnier 1977, no. 54.1. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 12 (J: 12) – [1520]. 26 December – Blois – Marguerite d’Alençon to Parlement of Paris – BnF n. acq. fr. 8452, fol. 156. Ritter, no. 2. Répertoire, no. 12, 6-7. See no. 14, Clémencet, no. 1080, Marguerite to the Parlement of Paris, 15 January 1521. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 19.1 (S: 19.1) – [1521] – Michel d’Arande to Marguerite d’Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 20. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10008 – [1521]. 5 January – Paris – Marguerite d’Alençon to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9324A, n. 69. Reference in Clémencet 1424. Same as Jourda 13? “Lettre du Parlement à la duchesse d’Alençon, la prévenant que, pour obéir à la déclaration royale réservant aux gens d’Église les offices de conseillers clercs, et en vue du bon fonctionnement de la justice, la cour a différé la réception de Philibert Masurier, déjà marié, à un office de conseiller clerc dont il se prétendait pourvu par le roi.” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10009 – [1521]. 15 January – Romorantin – Marguerite d’Alençon to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9322, n. 202. Reference in Clémencet 1080. Cf. Jourda no. 12 from 26 December 1520 requesting same, and Jourda no. 14, February 10, 1521, thanking the Parlement for granting her wish. See also Clémencet 1078 ter. Chancellor Duprat writes to further the reception of Le Masuyer. “Lettre du Marguerite d’Angoulême invitant le Parlement à cesser de s’opposer à la réception comme conseiller de maître Philibert Le Masuyer, le roi et elle voulant absolument cette réception.” Signature autograph. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 13 (J: 13) – [1521. After 15 January – Paris – Parlement of Paris to Marguerite d’Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in response, no. 14. This letter must be after Marguerite’s letter of 15 January 1521 to the Parlement demanding that they cease their opposition to the reception of Le Masuyer. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.

- 14 (J: 14) – [1521]. 10 February – Marguerite d'Alençon to Parlement of Paris – BnF n. acq. fr. 8452, fol. 163. Ritter, no. 3. Répertoire, no. 14, 7. See AN X 1A, 9322, no. 202, [Clémencet, no. 1080] for Marguerite's previous letter to the Parlement of 15 January 1521, demanding Le Masuyer's reception. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10010 – [1521]. 18 February – Paris – Marguerite d'Alençon to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9324A, n. 73. Reference in Clémencet 1428. "Lettre du Parlement à la duchesse d'Alençon lui annonçant la réception de Philibert Masurier à l'office de conseiller clerc dont le roi l'a pourvu, et la priant d'intervenir auprès du roi pour que soit hâtée l'expédition de l'édit réservant aux gens d'Eglise de tels offices." Cf. Clémencet 1427. – 1521 [28 January?]. – Paris. "Lettres du Parlement au chancelier, lui [Marguerite] annonçant la réception de Philibert Masurier à l'office de conseiller clerc dont le roi l'avait pourvu, et lui demandant de hâter l'expédition de l'édit réservant ces offices aux gens d'Eglise, et de lui envoyer la bulle originale relative aux clercs." Autre destinataire: l'amiral de Bonnivet. X1A 9324A, n. 72. Cf. Clémencet 1426. – 1521, 12 January. – Paris. "Lettre du Parlement au Roi lui annonçant que la cour, pour lui obéir, a décidé de recevoir Philibert Masurier en l'office de conseiller clerc bien qu'il soit marié, et lui demandant de lui envoyer, pour les faire publier, les lettres royaux réservant aux gens d'Eglise les offices de conseillers clercs, afin de remédier à la diminution du nombre de ces conseillers.." – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 16.1 (J: 17; S: 16.1) – [1521]. June – Michel d'Arande to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 18. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 16.4 (J: 17; S: 16.4) – [1521]. June – Michel d'Arande to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 18. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 16.6 (S: 16.6) – [1521]. June – Philiberte de Savoie to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letters. Presupposed because of previous mentions. Saulnier 1977. Saulnier supposes that Marguerite continued to send copies of her spiritual correspondence with Briçonnet to her aunt in Savoie until the latter's death on 4 April 1524. This number stands for all those lost letters. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 15 (J: 15; S: 15) – [1521. 4-10 June] – Dijon – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 1r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 1, 25. Saulnier 1977 for place. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 16 (J: 16; S: 16) – [1521]. 12 June – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 1r - 3v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 2, pp. 26-29. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 16.3 (J: 16; S: 16.3) – [1521. after 12 June] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned, Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 2A, p. 29. Becker, *BSHPF*, 399. Saulnier 1977 for place. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 16.2 (S: 16.2) – [1521. After 12] June – Marguerite d'Alençon to Philiberte de Savoie – Lost letter. Mentioned in 16.3. Saulnier 1977. Date: a few days after the 12th. Allusion in 16.3, Marguerite to Briçonnet telling him that her aunt 'has had her share' of the 'treatises' that B had sent Marguerite sends a copy of letter 16, Briçonnet to Philiberte de Savoie. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 18 (J: 18; S: 18) – [1521. End June] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 3v - 4r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 3, pp. 29-30. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 20.1 (S: 20.1) – [1521]. July – Camp d'Attigny – Clément Marot to Marguerite d'Alençon – Marot, *Epistres*, ed. Mayer, 105. Saulnier 1977. Verse letter "letter mal faicte et mal escripte," from

- Marot to Marguerite from the war front. Originally published as "L'Epistre et odonnance du camp de monseigneur d'Alençon." s.l.s.d. [1521]. See "Musée Condé Imprimés antérieurs au milieu du XVI siècle." – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 20.2 (S: 20.2) – [1521]. July – [Dijon?] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Jacques de Dinteville (Deschenais) – Lost letter. Mentioned in 20.4. Saulnier 1977. Allusion in Marguerite to Montmorency, 20.4. She announced the pending royal visit to Dinteville's property. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 19 (J: 19; S: 19) – [1521]. 10 July – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 4r - 6r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 4, pp. 30-32. Saulnier 1977 for place. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 19.2 (S: 19.2) – [1521]. 10 July – Marguerite d'Alençon to Philiberte de Savoie – Lost letter. Mentioned in 19. Saulnier 1977. Alluded to in 19 Briçonnet to MN. Soon after the 10th. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 16.5 (S: 16.5) – [1521. After 13] July – Marguerite d'Alençon to Philiberte de Savoie – Lost letter. Mentioned in 18. Saulnier 1977. Alluded to in no. 18, Marguerite to Briçonnet. Date: Shortly after the 13th or 14th. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 20 (J: 20; S: 20) – [1521. c. 15 July] – [Dijon?] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 6r - v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 5, pp. 33-34. Saulnier 1977 for date instead of Jourda/Martineau, "Après le 10 Juin." – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 20.3 (S: 20.3) – [1521]. 20 July – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 20.4. Saulnier 1977. Allusion in Marguerite's letter to Montmorency, 20.4. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 20.4 (J: 43; S: 20.4) – [1521]. 25 July – Dijon – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3010, fol. 22. Génin 1, 159, no. 12. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 22 (J: 22; S: 22) – [1521. August] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 6v - 8v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 6, pp. 34-36. Saulnier 1977 dates this to "fin juillet." – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 22.1 (J: 21; S: 22.1) – [1521]. 2 August – Gaspard de Coligny to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in BnF Clairambault ms 319, fol. 180. Saulnier 1977. Alluded to in a letter to Florimond Robertet, BnF Clairambault ms 319, fol. 180. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 22.2 (S: 22.2) – [1521. 31 August-September] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – Supposed lost letter. No textual support for assertion. Saulnier 1977, no. 22.2. Saulnier supposes that Marguerite and Briçonnet must have exchanged at least one small note before her visit in September. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 22.3 (S: 22.3) – [1521]. September – Guillaume de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 24. Saulnier 1977. Middle of September. Allusion in no. 24, Marguerite to Guillaume de Montmorency. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 24 (J: 24; S: 24) – [1521]. 25 September – Meaux – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3025, fol. 85. Génin 1, 148, no. 1. Saulnier 1977. Date: About the 25th. Louise and Marguerite would like to see him at Meaux. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 24.1 (J: 23; S: 24.1) – [1521]. 29 September – Meaux – Marguerite d'Alençon to Florimond Robertet – BnF f. fr. 2971, fol. 4. Summary in Génin 1, 428. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes.

Edited: No.

- 27.3 (S: 27.3) – [1521. October] – [Meaux?] – Denis Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 31. Saulnier 1977. Allusion in Marguerite to Briçonnet, no. 31. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 25 (J: 25; S: 25) – [1521. 13-20 October] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 8v - 9r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 7, pp. 37. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 27.1 (J: 26; S: 27.1) – [1521. 23 or 24?] October – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 9r - 10r; 10r - 19r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 8 & 9, pp. 38-39, 40-48. Saulnier 1977. 27.1 is equal to Jourda nos. 26 and 27. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 27.5 (J: 27; S: 27.5) – [1521. 23 or 24?] October – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – See 27.1 Saulnier 1977, no. 27.1 combines Jourda nos. 26 and 27. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 27.2 (J: 29; S: 27.2) – [1521]. 25 October – Escaudain – Clément Marot to Marguerite d'Alençon – Marot, *Epistres*, ed. Mayer, 280. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 27.4 (S: 27.4) – [1521]. 2 November – Argentan – Marguerite de Lorraine to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in Saulnier 1977. Allusion in Marguerite's "Prisons," indicating that Marguerite de Lorraine wrote to her 'children' from her death bed, among whom Saulnier thinks Marguerite must count. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 28 (J: 28; S: 28) – [1521. c. 5 November] – Compiègne – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 19r - v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 10, pp. 49. Saulnier 1977 dates this to circa 5 November instead of after 24 October as per Jourda/Martineau. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 32 (J: 32; S: 32) – [1521. 10? November] – [near Compiègne] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 40v - 41 r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 13, pp. 64. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 32.1 (J: 31; S: 32.1) – [1521. 10? November] – [near Compiègne] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 40r - v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 12, pp. 63. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 32.2 (J: 30; S: 32.2) – [1521]. 11 November – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 19v - 33v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 11, pp. 50-62. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 33 (J: 33; S: 33) – [1521]. 17 November – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 33v - 40r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 14, pp. 65-70. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 34 (J: 34; S: 34) – [1521. 19-20 November] – [Compiègne] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 44r - 45 r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 15, pp. 70-71. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 35 (J: 35; S: 35) – [1521. 20-21 November] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 45 r - v. Partial letter. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 15A & 15B, pp. 71-72. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date: "Je pense en effet que le texte qui commence 'Je ne sçay ...,' (Corr. Briç. 1, no. 15A, p. 71) n'est pas un P.S. au no. 34, mais un morceau de 35 [thought to be lost] qu'on aurait seul retenu." – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 36.1 (J: 36; S: 36.1) – [1521. 22 November] – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite

- d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 41r - 44r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 16, pp. 72. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. Suppress no. 37. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 36.2 (J: 37; S: 36.2) – [1521. 22 November] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. Suppress no. 37. See 36.1 – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 38 (J: 38; S: 38) – [1521. c. 10 December] – [Compiègne or Paris] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 45v - 46v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 17, pp. 75-76. Saulnier 1977, for new order and date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 39 (J: 39; S: 39) – [1521. c. 15 December] – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 46v - 60v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 18, pp. 76-86. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 40 (J: 40; S: 40) – [1521. c. 18 December] – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 60v - 76v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 19, pp. 86-96. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 41 (J: 41; S: 41) – [1521]. 22 December – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 76v - 99r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 20, pp. 97-113. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 42 (J: 42; S: 42) – [1521]. 31 December – Meaux “de votre hermitaige” – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 99r - 117v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 21, pp. 114-128. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 47 (J: 47; S: 47) – [1522. c. 15 January] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 118r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 22, pp. 132. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 48 (J: 48; S: 48) – [1522]. 17 January – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 118r - 199r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 23, pp. 132-133. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 49 (J: 49; S: 49) – [1522. 18/19 January] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 119r - 120r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 24, pp. 133-134. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 50 (J: 50; S: 50) – [1522]. 20 January – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 120r - 121r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 25, pp. 134-135. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 51 (J: 51; S: 51) – [1522. 21-29 January] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 121r - v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 25, pp. 136. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 52 (J: 52; S: 52) – [1522]. 30 January – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 121v - 123r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 26, pp. 136-137. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 54 (J: 54; S: 54) – [1522. c. 5 February] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 146r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 29, pp. 154. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 54.1 (J: 53; S: 54.1) – [1522]. 5 February – Meaux “de votre hermitaige” – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 123r - 145v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 28, pp. 138-153. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

- 55 (J: 55; S: 55) – [1522]. 6 February – Meaux “de votre hermitage” – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 146v - 155r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 30, pp. 154-160. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 55.1 (S: 55.1) – [1522]. 6 February – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite d’Alençon to Philiberte de Savoie – Lost letter. Mentioned in 54.1. Saulnier 1977. In 54-1, Briçonnet to MN invites her in a postscript to share his letter with Philberte of Savoy. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 56 (J: 56; S: 56) – [1522. 15? February] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 155r -v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 31, pp. 160. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 57 (J: 57; S: 57) – [1522]. 17 February – Meaux “de votre hermitage” – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 155v - 159r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 32, pp. 161-163. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 57.1 (S: 57.1) – [1522]. 17 February – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite d’Alençon to Philiberte de Savoie – Lost letter. Mentioned in 57. Saulnier 1977. In Briçonnet’s letter to Marguerite, no. 57, Briçonnet asks that he be remembered in her and her aunt’s prayers. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 58 (J: 58; S: 58) – [1522. 18-25 February] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 159r - 160r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 33, pp. 164. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 59 (J: 59; S: 59) – [1522]. 26 February – Meaux “de votre hermitage” – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 160v-177r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 34, pp. 165-176. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 60 (J: 60; S: 60) – [1522. After 26 c. 1 March] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 177r - 178r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 35, pp. 177-178. Saulnier 1977 for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 61 (J: 61; S: 61) – [1522]. 6 March – [Meaux or Paris] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 178r - 196r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 36, pp. 178-193. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 62 (J: 62; S: 62) – [1522. c. 10 May?] – [Lyon?] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 196r - v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 37, pp. 193-194. Saulnier 1977, for date instead of Jourda/Martineau “Après Pâques, 20 avril 1522.” – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 63 (J: 63; S: 63) – [1522]. 18 May – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 196v - 211r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 38, pp. 195-214. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 63.1 (S: 63.1) – [1522]. 18 May – [Lyon?] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Philiberte de Savoie – Lost letter. Mentioned in 63. Saulnier 1977. In Briçonnet’s letter to Marguerite, no. 63, he requests that he not be forgotten in her or her aunt’s prayers. An invitation for Marguerite to write her aunt. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 64 (J: 64; S: 64) – [1522. End of May?] – [Lyon?] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 211v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 39, pp. 214. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 65 (J: 65; S: 65) – [1522]. June – Adrian VI to Marguerite d’Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 66. Saulnier 1977. Allusion in her response, no. 66. Dates from the beginning of June or end of May.

- Asks her to help establish peace between Francis and Charles V. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 66 (J: 66; S: 66) – [1522]. 23 June – [Lyon?] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Adrian VI – Lettère di principi I, fol. 102 v. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 68.2 (J: 45; S: 68.2) – [1522]. August – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3025, fol. 121. Génin 1, 160, no. 13; 414 (summary). Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 68.3 (J: 46; S: 68.3) – [1522]. 8 August – [Blois?] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Georges de La Tremoille, (Joinville) – Lost letter. Mentioned in Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 68.1 (J: 44; S: 68.1) – [1522. 22] August – Guillaume de Bonnivet to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 68.2. Saulnier 1977. Allusion in the response, no. 68.2 [Jourda no. 45]. Bonnivet [Gouffier], the admiral of France, writes for Montmorency about August 22. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 68.4 (S: 68.4) – [1522]. September – Georges de La Tremoille (Joinville) to Marguerite d'Alençon – Génin 1, 162, no. 15. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 69 (J: 69; S: 69) – [1522. c. 5 September] – [Paris or St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 212r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 40, pp. 215. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 70 (J: 70; S: 70) – [1522. c. 10 September] – [Meaux?] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 71. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 40A, pp. 216. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 71 (J: 71; S: 71) – [1522. c. 15 September] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 212r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 41, pp. 216. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 72 (J: 72; S: 72) – [1522]. 18 September – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 212r - 213r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 42, pp. 217-218. Saulnier 1977, for date. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 75 (J: 75; S: 75) – [1522. After 22] September – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 78.1. Saulnier 1977. In no. 78-1 (Jourda 77), Marguerite alludes to Anne's letter to which she is responding. Date: after the 22nd. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10011 – [1522?]. 22 September – [Fontainebleau] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Cathedral Chapter of Bourges – AD Chers, 8 G 434. Partial transcription in Michaud-Fréjaville, "Marguerite d'Angoulême...", p. 56, note 36. Date: 22 September or later during one of the stages of Fontainebleau's building? Michaud-Fréjaville, Françoise. "Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre, Duchesse de Berry, 'laquelle a fort humainement traité ses sujets de Berry.'" In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du Colloque international de Pau (1992)*, p. 56, note 36. Edited by Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires, 1995. "Nous avons esté advertie de la mort et trepas de deu doyen de votre église, et pour ce que nous désirons que notre cher et bien amé Me Robert de Cambray, l'un de vous, en soit pourveu en faveur de plusieurs bons, grans et recommandables services qu'il et ses freres ont faicts et fonts chascuns jours, tant à Monseigneur le roy que à nous [...] vous en avons priée bien affectueusement le vouloir eslire.." Fontainebleau, 22 septembre [1522] Wrongly attributed to la reine Margot by a 18th century archivist. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

- 73 (J: 73; S: 73) – [1522. c. 25 September] – [Chantilly?] – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 74. Saulnier 1977. Date: 25 September or the day after, since no. 74 responds to it quickly on the 28th. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 74 (J: 74; S: 74) – [1522]. 28 September – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 2989, fol. 53. Génin I, 156, no. 9. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 75.1 (J: 75; S: 75.1) – [1522]. October – Corbie – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 77. Saulnier 1977. In no. 77, MN alludes to a second letter in which Montmorency complains that she had not responded to his last letter. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 75.2 (J: 79; S: 75.2) – [1522]. 5 October – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – Lost letter. Mentioned in 77. Saulnier 1977. Alluded to in 77. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 75.3 (S: 75.3) – [1522]. 10 October – Corbie – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in 81.1. Saulnier 1977. In 81.1 (Jourda 80), MN mentions this letter, which was written to her and her mother. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 78.1 (J: 77; S: 78.1) – [1522]. 11 October – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3026, fol. 30. Génin I, 157, no. 10. Saulnier 1977. Montmorency mentions having received two letters from MN. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 78.2 (J: 78; S: 78.2) – [1522. c. 12? October] – [St. Germain-en-Laye?] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 218r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 43, pp. 218. Saulnier 1977, for date and order. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 81 (J: 81; S: 81) – [1522]. 20 October – Meaux – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 218r - 220r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 44, pp. 219-222. Saulnier 1977, for order. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 81.1 (J: 80; S: 81.1) – [1522]. 22 October – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3638, fol. 29. Génin I, 162, no. 15. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 84 (J: 84; S: 84) – [1522. Mid November?] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – Lost letter. Mentioned in Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 46A, pp. 228. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 82 (J: 82; S: 82) – [1522. End November] – [St. Germain-en-Laye] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 213r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 45, pp. 222. Saulnier 1977, for order. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 83 (J: 83; S: 83) – [1522. November-December] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 213v - 217r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 46, pp. 223-228. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 85 (J: 85; S: 85) – [1522. End November?] – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 217v - 218r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 1, no. 47, pp. 229-230. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 86 (J: 86; S: 86) – [1522]. 21 December – Lyon – Luigi Alamanni to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in Saulnier 1977. Second author: Zanobi Buondelmonti. They mention this letter in another to Battista della Palla and Guiliano Buonaccorsi. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 87 (J: 87; S: 87) – [1523. Before 16 January] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 220v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 48, pp. 10-11. Saulnier 1977, p. 225. –

New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

88 (J: 88; S: 88) – [1523]. 16 January – Meaux “de votre hermitaige” – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 221r - 223r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 49, pp. 11-15. Saulnier 1977, p. 225. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

100 (J: 100; S: 100) – [1523]. 28 February – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite d’Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 2989, fol. 57. Génin 1, 158, no. 11. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

98.1 (J: 98) – [1523. Lent] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – Lost letter. Mentioned in 106 (Corr. no. 56); Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 54B, pp. 34. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.

101 (J: 101) – [1523]. March – Marguerite d’Alençon to Charles d’Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in Allusion in no. 102, Marguerite to Montmorency. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.

106 (J: 106; S: 106) – [1523. c. Ascension? May 14] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 239v - 241r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 56, pp. 35-38. Saulnier 1977, see notes to no. 74, on Fillon’s election. The date of this letter is difficult to establish, but not likely ‘mid-June.’ It appears in the manuscript between other letters from June, which respond to each other and are full of allusions to the Sorbonne’s investigation of Berquin, Lefèvre, et alii. This letter contains not even a vague allusion to these events. Moreover, its emphasis on the theme of Christ’s body [the church] and ascension puts it after Lent, perhaps near Ascension. The idea of the church = Christ’s body, does rejoin Marguerite’s c. 19-23 June letter on Peter’s full net as a metaphor for gathering the church. The key issue is whether the mention of Fillon at the end of this letter indicates that it dated to 16-19 June, a time when Fillon and Briçonnet were together in Paris, managing the court’s response to the Sorbonne. If so, it is strange that there is not even a hint of this in it. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

104 (J: 104) – [1523]. 23 May – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite d’Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3025, fol. 113; copy BnF Clairambault 323, fol. 323, fol. 276. Summary in Génin 1, 414. Date: a copy of this letter, BnF Clairambault 323, fol. 276, dates this letter to 1523. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.

10006 – [1523. c. 10-16 June] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – Not extant. Allusion in Jourda, no. 110: Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 58, pp. 39-43; 40-41.. This letter is not accounted for by Becker, Jourda, or, following them, Martineau and Veissière, though clearly alluded to in the text. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.

110 (J: 110) – [1523. c. 16/17 June] – [Paris] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 236v - 239r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 58, pp. 39-43. Martineau and Veissière claim the letter was ‘after 18 June.’ I place it 16/17 June, after Artus Fillon had attended the Faculty meeting and likely warned Briçonnet but before the court responded to its investigations via Duprat, Fillon, and Briçonnet on 18 and 19 June. The Faculty’s investigations would seem to have been the subject of Briçonnet’s letters to the protonotaire [Bourdailles, a member of her household, cf. Corr, no. 57, in which Briçonnet mentions having received letters from the protonotaire], which he mentions to Marguerite: “La lumiere je quiers et serche, pour tenebres chasser, que vous supplie très-humblement, Madame, comme indigne ministre, voulloir procurer vers Madame, à la fin que j’escriptz plus amplement à Monsieur le prothonotaire, qu’il vous plaira ouyr.” – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

118 (J: 118) – [1523. c. 24 July] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 247r - 251r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 64, pp. 53-59. Becker, Martineau, and Veissière

- date this letter to after 12 July. Date: as reported in MN's letter to her aunt Philiberte, Francis left Paris (24 July) and Briçonnet accompanied him, but the Bishop sent to her Lefèvre's Translation of the Gospels before leaving Paris. Cf. Letter 105. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 105 (J: 105) – [1523. End July] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Philiberte de Savoie – Collection Benjamin Fillon. *Le Roux de Lincy, Heptaméron*, IV, 187, [facsimile on the preceding two pages.]. Marguerite sends via M. de Villeroy a copy of Lefèvre's translation of the Epistles to 'Madame de Nemours' [Philiberte]. Date: Lefèvre's translation was published on 8 June 1523. Marguerite mentions that Guillaume Briçonnet sent copies to her just before he left to follow the king who was heading south from Paris. Francis I left Paris 24 July 1523, see Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior*, p. 201. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 118.1 (J: 369; S: 118.1) – [1523. August] – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in Saulnier 1977. Letter inferred from 118.2 (Jourda 370). Date: the first days of August. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 118.2 (J: 370; S: 118.2) – [1523]. 7 August – Fontainebleau to Gien – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3024, fol. 165. Génin 1, 400, no. 163. Saulnier 1977. Saulnier argues that Marguerite's encouragement came during Montmorency's mission to Switzerland in 1523. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 132 (J: 132) – [1523]. 23 November – Blois – Marguerite d'Alençon to Jacques Hurault (Sr. de Chiverny) – BnF Dupuy 211, fol. 10 bis. Mentioned Fichier Charavay, no. 121, card 131. Jourda, Rep., 30-31. Jourda, no. 2, 104-105. Reference in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. Fichier Charavay, no. 121, "131. Marguerite d'Angoulême, .. soeur de François Ier. L. sig. avec un post-scriptum de 11 grandes lignes aut., a M. de Cheverny; Blois, 23 nov. 1 p. pll. in-fol. Belle pièce." – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 138 (J: 138) – [1524] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3024, fol. 165. Jourda, Rep., 31-32. Jourda, no. 3, 105-106. Date: Jourda dates this letter to 1524, although the letter contains no datable information besides Montmorency's title. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 139.1 (J: 139) – [1524]. 10 January – [Meaux] – Guillaume Briçonnet to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 271r - v. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 77, pp. 92-93. Martineau and Veissière see two letters where Jourda counted one. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 141 (J: 141) – [1524]. 29 January – Blois – Marguerite d'Alençon to Cathedral Chapter of Bourges – AD Cher, 8 G 434. Reproduced Veissière, CAHB 96 (1989), 14. La Ferrière Percy, Marguerite, 159-160. Jourda counts this letter twice, the first time falsely at no. 89. Marguerite announces the coming visit of 'maitre Michel.' This was Michel d'Arande, not Jean Michel as stated by Raynal and Jourda. See, *Correspondance* 2, 127, for Briçonnet's advice about handling d'Arande's preaching at Bourges. Suppress letter reference 89. Veissière, CAHB 96 (1989), 14: for name of Procureur du Roi à Bourges. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 147 (J: 147) – [1524]. 11 February – Marguerite d'Alençon to Cathedral Chapter of Bourges – Raynal 3, 302. Summarized by Brimont. Jourda counts this letter twice, the first time falsely at no. 95. She thanks the Canons for their reception of her "aulmoner," who had preached before the King and Queen mother. Marguerite was "shocked" at the opposition raised by the Archbishop of Bourges and orders that "Maistre Michel" should recommence his instruction. This was Michel d'Arande, not Jean Michel as stated by Raynal and Jourda. See *Correspondance* 2, 127, for Briçonnet's advice about handling d'Arande's preaching at Bourges. Suppress letter reference 95. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 159 (J: 159) – [1524]. 25 February – Basel – Claude Chansonnette to Marguerite d'Alençon –

- Droz, *Chemins* 1, p. 10-12. Herminjard 5, 377, no. 96a. Dedicatory letter preceding "La Manière de se confesser," [Basel: Cratander, before Easter 1524] translated by Chansonnette from Erasmus of Rotterdam's XX. (Basle: Froben, 1524). – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10084 – [1524. c. 24 March] – Marguerite d'Alençon to St. Victor, Chapter of, Paris – Mentioned in BnF f.fr. 25229. Mentioned in *Chronique de Pierre Driart*, p. 90. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 169 (J: 169) – [1524]. 6 May – [Blois?] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Guillaume Briçonnet – BnF ff. 11495 ff. 311r. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 102, pp. 161. Date in MS appears at before no. 167, but, according to Becker, applies to this no. 169. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10012 – 1524. 31 May – Blois – Marguerite d'Alençon to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9322, n. 208. Reference in Clémencet 1110. 31 May 1524, – Blois. "Lettre de Marguerite d'Angoulême recommandant au Parlement le procès soutenu par le sieigneur de Lorges à cause de baillage d'Orléans." Signature autograph. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 186 (J: 186) – [1524. August] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3024, fol. 129. Summary in Génin 1, 419. Date: Probably August due to mention of Princess Charlotte's illness: "Your little mistress is not healed, but it is better that the king think that she is." – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10013 – 1524. 9 August – Blois – Marguerite d'Alençon to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9322, n. 212. Reference in Clémencet 1114. Clémencet 1113. – 1524, 9 August. – Blois. "Lettre de Louise de Savoie invitant le Parlement à vider au plus tôt le procès du seigneur de Lorge au bailliage d'Orléans, ledit seigneur devant partir avec le roi pour défendre la Provence." Signature autograph. Source: AN X1A 9322, n. 211. Clémencet 1114. – 1524, 9 August. – Blois." Lettre de Marguerite d'Angoulême analogue à la précédente." Signature autograph. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 203 (J: 203) – [1525]. February – Paris – Antoine Du Prat to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in response, *Archives du Prat: Glanes et regains*, p. 15. Date: written before 20 February, date of Marguerite's response. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 204.1 (S: 204.1) – [1525]. 25 February – Pavia – Francis I to Marguerite d'Alençon – Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, 129. Saulnier 1973, 436-438. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 205 (J: 205; S: 205) – [1525]. 28 February – St-Just [Lyon] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6623, fol. 39. Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, no. 46, 134. Poesies, p. 229. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 206 (J: 206; S: 206) – [1525. March] – St-Just [Lyon] – Marguerite d'Alençon and Louise of Savoy to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6623, fol. 38. Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, no. 53, 142; idem, *Poesies*, p. 230. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 206.1 (J: 213; S: 206.1) – [1525. c. 10 March] – Lyon – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 119. Génin 2, 27, no. 2. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 214 (J: 215; S: 214) – [1525]. 4 April – Pizzighettone – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – BnF f. fr. 3087, fol. 33. Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, 165. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 215 (J: 214; S: 215) – [1525. before 11 April] – Lyon – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 41. Génin 2, 29, no. 3. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 217 (J: 217; S: 217) – [1525]. c. 15 April – Francis I to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter.

- Mentioned in no. 218. Génin 2, 30, no. 4. Saulnier 1973. Date: between date of Alençon's death, (11 April and date Marguerite's responds to Francis 20 April). – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 216 (J: 216; S: 216) – [1525]. c. 15 April – Francis I to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in response, no. 218. Saulnier 1973. Date: between date of Alençon's death, (11 April and date Marguerite responded 20 April). – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 10014 – [1525. May] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f.fr. 2936, fol. 34 r. -v. Copy BnF Clairambault ms. 324, fol. 219. Génin 1, 178-179, n° 27; re-dated Génin 2, 34, n° 6. This may not be a new letter, but Jourda does not seem to have repertoried it. Check vs. Incipits. Génin quotes the incipit as Lettre 6, p. 34. He directs the reader: "Voyez Rec. imp., t. I, lettre 27, p. 178. [=Génin 1, 178-179, n° 27]" – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10015 – [1525. Before 24] June – Sigismund von Hohenlohe to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in response, no. 221. Lost letter mentioned in response, letter 221, 24 June 1525, Marguerite de Navarre to Sigismund. "Mais nous vous prions de tenir et croire que vostre lettre a esté très agréable," Génin 1, p. 180, no. 28; Jourda, Rép., n° 221. Beware of Génin's translations. Herminjard's are superior for the other three letters from Marguerite to Sigismund. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 220 (J: 220) – [1525]. 5 June – [Lyon] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Marguerite d'Autriche – Lost letter. Mentioned in Letters & Papers IV, pt. 1, 629-630, no. 1413. Letter carried by Perrot and Warty, delivered on June 13. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 220.1 (J: 230; S: 220.1) – [1525]. 15 June – Lyon – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 176. Génin 2, 37, no. 9. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 226 (J: 226; S: 226) – [1525]. July – Marguerite d'Alençon to Jean de La Barre – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 227.1; Champollion-Figéac, Captivité, 262. Saulnier 1971 and 1973. Mentioned in the response 227.1. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 228 (J: 228; S: 228) – [1525]. July – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 149. Génin 2, 34, no. 7. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 233 (J: 233; S: 233) – [1525]. July – [Lyon] – Marguerite d'Alençon to André de Foix – BnF f. fr. 3087, fol. 12. Champollion-Figéac, Captivité, 304. Saulnier 1973. Marguerite to "M. d'Asparros" mentioned by Odet de Foix in his letter to Louise of Savoy. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 326 (J: 326) – [1525. August-October?] – Sigismund von Hohenlohe to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 340, Herminjard 1, no. 171, p. 420. Received September-December in Spain. First of two letters mentioned in Herminjard, MN to Sigismund: "J'ai reçu en Espagne l'une de vos lettres, et l'autre quand je me suis de nouveau retrouvée après de ma mère [15 Dec. at Roussillon] ..." – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 226.1 (J: 776; S: 226.1) – [1525]. 8 July – Lyon – Marguerite d'Alençon to Jean de Brinon – AN J 966, 33/6. Amada Lopez de Meneses, Nuevos Datos, 5-6. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 227.1 (J: 231; S: 227.1) – [1525]. 19 July – Venyzolo – Jean de La Barre to Marguerite d'Alençon – Champollion-Figéac, Captivité, 262. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 232 (J: 232; S: 232) – [1525]. August – Marguerite d'Alençon to Jan a Lasco (Lascaris) – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 255. Saulnier 1972. Allusion in Erasmus's letter to Marguerite. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.

- 326.1 (J:326.1) – [1525. October -December] – Sigismund von Hohenlohe to Marguerite d'Alençon – Mentioned in no. 340. Received: 15 December 1525 at Roussillon. Second of two letters from von Hohelohe, probably sent after the arrival of the Meaux group at Strasbourg. Herminjard, MN to Sigismund: "J'ai reçu en Espagne l'une de vos lettres, et l'autre quand je me suis de nouveau retrouvée après de ma mère [15 Dec. at Roussillon] ..." – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 234.1 (J: 229; S: 234.1) – [1525]. 10 August – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, no. 180. Génin 2, 36, no. 8. Saulnier 1973. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 235.1 (S: 235.1) – [1525. Circa 20] August – Madrid – François de Tournon and Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in a letter of Tournon to Montmorency, from Madrid, 7 September, 1525. See Marguerite, d'Alençon François, "Corresp. de Fr. de Tournon," 1946, no. 4. Saulnier? – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 239 (J: 239; S: 239) – [1525]. September – Barcelona – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 11. Génin 2, 40, no. 12. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 243 (J: 243) – [1525]. September – Madrid – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 244. Letter carried by Perigort. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 239.1 (J: 242; S: 239.1) – [1525]. 2 September – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 162. Génin 2, 42, no. 13. Saulnier 1977. Marguerite sent this letter with a billet to Montmorency 239.2 [Jourda no. 67]. Thus Jourda no. 68 should be suppressed since it stands in for the letter mentioned in the billet, which is no. 242. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 239.2 (J: 67; S: 239.2) – [1525]. 2 September – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF n. acq. fr. ms 1233, fol. 29-30 and no. 21687. La Ferrière Percy, Marguerite, 2e s., II, 387. Saulnier 1977. La Ferrière mention to 'billets'. Jourda has only found the copy of this one from a manuscript in Petrograd. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 243.1 (J: 1138; S: 243.1) – [1525. Before 19 September] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – Location unknown. S 1975 C quotes letter in full. Fac-simile in "Precieux documents historiques et littéraires," Hotel Drouot, 25 May 1973, no. 42, p. 33. Saulnier 1975 C. Saulnier 1977. Before 19 September, date on which Marguerite arrived in Madrid. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 250.1 (J: 256; S: 250.1) – [1525]. 23 September – Madrid – Marguerite d'Alençon to Louise of Savoy – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 264. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 255 (J: 255) – [1525]. 28 September – Desiderius Erasmus to Marguerite d'Alençon – Allen 6, no. 1615, 174-176. Epistolarum D. Erasmi, 1542, col. 969. Trans. Génin I, 184. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 252 (J: 252) – [1525. near end] September – Marguerite d'Alençon to Charles V – AAE Corr. Pol., Espagne IV, fol. 303 v. Bradford, Corr. of the Emperor, 163. Also in Gaucheron et H. de Rothschild, p. 65, note 1. Date: end of September. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 269 (J: 269) – [1525]. 3 October – Marguerite of Austria to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in Le Glay, Negotiations II, 621. Letter carried by Perrenot. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 263 (J: 263) – [1525. c. 6] October – Lyon – Louise of Savoy to Marguerite d'Alençon – Champollion-Figeac, Captivity, 329. For day of month, see letters by Odet de Foix and Robertet on 6 and 7 Oct, nos. 264 & 265. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

- 265 (J: 265; S: 265) – [1525]. 7 October – Lyon – Florimond Robertet to Marguerite d'Alençon – Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, 356-7. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 276.1 (S: 276.1) – [1525]. November – Madrid – Marguerite d'Alençon to Louise of Savoy – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 279. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 276.2 (S: 276.2) – [1525]. 25 November – [Madrid?] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Louise of Savoy – Lost letter. Mentioned in Sanuto, *Diarii*, XL, 506. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 278 (J: 278) – [1525]. 27 November – Madrid – Francis I to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 281. Letter carried by Guillaume du Bellay. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 279 (J: 279; S: 279) – [1525]. 27 November – Louise of Savoy to Marguerite d'Alençon – Letters and Papers 4, I, no. 1797, 799. Jacqueton, *La politique*, 154. Saulnier 1975 C. Suppress Jourda 274 which is the same as this 279. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 282 (J: 282) – [1525]. 28 November – Marguerite d'Alençon to François de Tournon, Cardinal – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 281. Marguerite also addressed this letter to Jean de la Barre. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 298 (J: 298) – [1525]. 1 December – Madrid – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in nos. 305 and 308. 298 and 298.1 are two letters from Montmorency mentioned in Marguerite's response. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10024 – [1525]. 1 December – Madrid – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in nos. 305 and 308. For the sake of consistency, this second letter mentioned by Marguerite in her response needs to be registered. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 310.1 (J: 294; S: 310.1) – [1525]. 5 December – Madrid – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 313.1. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 313 (J: 313; S: 313) – [1525]. 10 December – Saragosse to Lerida – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 12. Génin 2, 60, no. 25. Saulnier 1975 C and Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 313.1 (J: 302; S: 313.1) – [1525]. 10 December – Between Saragosse et Lerida – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 2982, fol. 83. Génin 1, 201, no. 41. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 321 (J: 321; S: 321) – [1525]. 16 December – Marguerite d'Alençon to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3024, fol. 69. Génin 1, 206, no. 46. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 318.1 (S: 318.1) – [1525]. 18 December – San Celoni – Marguerite d'Alençon to Frederic de Portugal – Lost letter. Mentioned in Academia de la Historia, Madrid, coll. Salazar, A 36, fol. 395. Saulnier 1975 C. Mentioned in a letter from Frederick of Portugal, Bishop of Sigüenza (1519-1532) and Lieutenant of Catalonia, to Charles V, from Barcelona, 22 December 1525. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 318 (J: 318; S: 318) – [1525]. 20 December – Marguerite d'Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 144. Génin 2, 65, no. 27. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10016 – [1526] – Henry Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim to Marguerite de Navarre – Henry Agrippa von Nettesheim, *Brefve declamation du saint sacrement de mariage*. [Claude Nourry dit le Prince, 1526]. Only known copy: BnF rés. D. 65136. See Droz, *Chemins de hérésie* 2, 1-27, text 10-26.

- “Brefve declamation du saint sacrement de mariage: compose en latin per Henricum Cornelium Agrippam et par luy traduit en vulgaire francoys.” s.l., s.d. 8o. [Claude Nourry dit le Prince, 1526] [Only known copy: BnF rés. D. 65136.] See Eugénie Droz, *Chemins de hérésie*, vol. 2, 1-27, text 10-26. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10017 – 1526 – [Lyon] – Jean de Vauzelles to Marguerite de Navarre – Vauzelles’s dedicatory letter to Marguerite in “Hystoire euangelique de quatre euāgelistes en vng fidelement abregee/ recitant par ordre sans obmettre.” Lyon: Gilbert de Villiers, 1526. Vauzelles’s dedicatory epistle to Marguerite de Navarre prefacing his translation of the “Hystoire euangelique de quatre euāgelistes en vng fidelement abregee/ recitant par ordre sans obmettre...” Lyon: Gilbert de Villiers, 1526. See Higman, *Piety*, N 1 and notes in Baudrier 12, “Villiers, Gilbert de” no. 416. E. Picot, *Les français italianisants* I, 119. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10083 – [1526] – Jean Bouchet to Marguerite de Navarre – Bouchet, Jean. *Sensuit le Labyrinht (sic) de fortune et Seiour des trois nobles dames*. Paris: Philippe Le Noir, [c. 1526]. *Mazarine Rés.* 10832. *Dedication to Marguerite d’Alençon,. A3r-A4v. Dated after death of Admiral Gouffier in 1525. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 327 (J: 327; S: 327) – [1526]. January – Montpellier – Marguerite d’Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 57. Génin 2, 78, no. 36. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 333 (J: 333; S: 333) – [1526]. January – Jean de La Barre to Marguerite d’Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 334. Saulnier 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 334.1 (J: 224; S: 334.1) – [1526]. 1 February – Jean de La Barre to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF f. fr. 3087, fol. 13; Clairambault, 324, f. 199. Champollion-Figeac, *Captivité*, 252. Saulnier 1975 C. He sends to her letters from Charles V, which were carried by Brion. Sent shortly after 1 February 1526. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 334.2 (J: 225; S: 334.2) – [1526]. 1 February – Chabot de Brion to Marguerite d’Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 334.1; Champollion-Figéac, *Captivité*, 252. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 334 (J: 334; S: 334) – [1526]. 15 February – Madrid – Jean de La Barre to Marguerite d’Alençon – BnF f. fr. 3087, fol. 9. Génin 1, 436-438. Saulnier 1975 C. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 340 (J: 340) – [1526]. 9 March – Marguerite d’Alençon to Sigismund von Hohenlohe – Herminjard 1, 419, no. 171. Génin 1, 211, no. 48. Original publication in Wibel, p. 62. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 350 (J: 350) – [1526]. 11 May – [Cognac] – Marguerite d’Alençon to Sigismund von Hohenlohe – Herminjard 1, 430, no. 175. Génin 1, 212, no. 49. Original publication in Wibel, p. 64. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 356 (J: 356) – [1526]. June – Marguerite d’Alençon to Clement VII – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 357. This letter has been placed out of chronological order by Jourda. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 354 (J: 354) – [1526]. 5 July – Paris – Marguerite d’Alençon to Sigismund von Hohenlohe – Herminjard 1, 441, no. 179. Génin 1, 214, no. 51. Original publication in Wibel, p. 64. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 357.1 (J: 374) – [1526. After 18] July – Marguerite d’Alençon to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, fol. 16. Génin 2, 80, no. 37. Jourda notes that this letter must be dated after 18 July 1526 when Francis confirmed Marguerite’s right to the usufruct of Alençon, yet he places it with a group of letter that he dates approximately from 6 August 1522 to 23 March 1526. Marguerite’s thanks in this letter

- for the confirmation of the gift of Alençon must have come soon afterwards the gift thus the new number. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 361.1 (J: 361) – [1526. End of year] – Jacques Groslot to Marguerite d'Alençon – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 362. End of the year. The mention comes in letter from the bailli d'Orléans, Jacques Groslot. See Herminjard I, 297 and note 17. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 366.1 (S: 366.1) – [1526. End of year] – Marguerite d'Alençon to Desiderius Erasmus – Lost letter. Mentioned in no. 376. Saulnier 1972. May only have been a verbal message. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10018 – [1527-1539] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3025, fol. 105. Check incipit vs. known letters. Date: 1527-1539 because of Montmorency's title. To "mon neveu monsr le grand maistre." Secretary's hand. Autograph signature. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10019 – [1527] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – Unknown. Reference in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. Check: the date is certainly wrong, because the mention of the birth of Jean d'Albret, which occurred in 1530. This letter is possibly the same as Jourda 454. Fichier Charavay, no. 121, "Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre. L.a. s. à son neveu le Grand-maître (Anne de Montmorency): (Pau, 1527), 1 p. 1/4 in-4. Légers raccommodages. Précieuse lettre, où elle exprime son contentement d'un événement si heureux pour le Roi et le royaume (peut-être le lit de justice où on déclara nul, le 19 décembre 1527, le funeste traité de Madrid, conclu pour tirer Francois Ier de captivité). Ce porteur vous dira combien de larmes de joye il a veu jeter à cete compaignye où ma soeur de Vandosme ne m'abandonne jusques à mes couches, quy seront quand il plaira à Dieu, mes si tout ne sera ce que je n'envoye incontinent ma saige fame à ma nièce.." (Marguerite d'Angoulême, mit au monde, à pau, le 7 janvier 1528, une fille, qui fut l'illustre Jeanne d'Albret). NB: Jourda puts a content summary similar to this one under number 454. However, the actual document to which he refers [BnF ff. 3042, fol. 11 a post-script to a letter by Henri d'Albret] has difference content but the same date which Jourda indicates. The letter mentioned here is from about the same time but it is a separate, new letter. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10020 – [1527-1539] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 2989, fol. 27. Date: 1527-1539. "A Mon neveu, Monsr. le Grand Maistre." Edited elsewhere? Check incipit vs. known letters. Autograph. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10021 – 1527. [Before 16] January – Marguerite de Navarre to Faculty of Theology, Paris – Lost letter. Farge, Registre I, p. 165: 188 B, mention. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 376 (J: 376; S: 37) – [1527]. 13 August – Desiderius Erasmus to Marguerite de Navarre – Epistolarum D. Erasmi Roterdami libri XXXI..., col. 971. Génin, I, p. 229, n°. 60. Saulnier 1972 notes. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 378 (J: 378; S: 378) – [1527. After 5] October – Jean de La Barre and Robertet to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in n°. 379, a letter to the king. See Saulnier 1977, 24.1, for Robertet. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 392 (J: 392) – [1528] – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF f.fr. 6624, fol. 147. Génin 2, p. 85, no. 41. Jourda places this letter in 1528 because, though he doesn't mention it in his summary, she mentions that she is ill. In the next letter, n° 393 to Montmorency, her illness is the excuse for not moving while she ascertains if she is pregnant or not. During Louise's life, Marguerite was only pregnant twice: 1528 and 1529-1530. But the dates of birth of her two children, Jeanne [16 November 1528] and Jean [15 July 1530], should enable us to give more precise dates: either early March 1528 or early December 1529. She also had a brief moment when she thought herself

- pregnant in 1530-1531. The “cœur mort” would seem to date the letter to a time when Marguerite was suffering at the death of someone, when she was also far from the king, and when Louise’s had been ill but was recovering. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 393 (J: 393) – [1528] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3025, fol. 65. Génin, I, p. 225, n° 57. The dating of this letter is tentative. See notes to no. 392. It could be from early 1531 as well. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10022 – 1528. [Before 10] January – Marguerite de Navarre to Dominican Provincial General, Toulouse – Arch. Munic. de Bayonne. See mention in *Registres gascons*, t. II. Bayonne, 1898, in-4o p. 552: no. 266, (page 831 du Manuscrit). Mentioned in: *Archives municipales de Bayonne. Registres gascons*, t. II. Bayonne, 1898, in-4o p. 552: no. 266, (page 831 du Manuscrit). Mentioned in *Archives municipales de Bayonne, Registres gascons*, t. II (Bayonne, 1898), no. 266, 552: (page 831 du Manuscrit): “Mandement de François Ier enjoignant aux officiers royaux et tous autres d’aider le provincial des Frères Prêcheurs de Toulouse à la réforme des couvents de son ordre. 10 January 1528.” – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 412 (J: 412) – [1528. April-November] – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF f.fr. 6624, fol. 136. Génin 2, 93, no. 47. Date: if the baby was kicking inside Marguerite, it must have been at least after her third month of pregnancy, thus April to November 1528. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 401 (J: 401; S: 401) – [1528]. 11 April – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3025, fol. 97. BnF Clair. 172 copy. Génin, I, p. 228, n° 59. See Saulnier 1977, 27-4, for the house of Alençon. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 402 (J: 402; S: 402) – [1528. 11 April] – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF f.fr. 6624, fol. 67. Génin, II, 82, n° 39. See Saulnier 1977, 27-4, for the house of Alençon. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 407 (J: 407) – [1528. May] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 125. Génin I, 242, no. 71. The dating of this letter is tricky, possibly 1529. Marguerite petitions that “Langey,” Guillaume Du Bellay, get paid. She mentions that she thinks that she is pregnant. She would only have been about two months pregnant with Jeanne (born in November) in May 1528, and therefore, she was likely exaggerating the progress of her pregnancy in her letter to Wolsey of the same month. In May 1529, she was seven months pregnant with Jean, who was born in July. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 403 (J: 403; S: 403) – [1528]. 13 May – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite de Navarre to Gonfalonier of Florence – *Bulletin italien*, 1902, 217-218. See Saulnier 1977, 86 for della Palla. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10074 – [1528. Before 8 June] – Strasbourg – Sigismund von Hohenlohe to Marguerite de Navarre – Mentioned in Peter, “Strasbourg et la Réforme française,” 277. Peter, Rodolphe. “Strasbourg et la Réforme française vers 1525.” In *Strasbourg au cœur religieux du XVIe siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre. Actes du Colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975)*, p. 269-283, on p. 274. Ed. Georges Livet and Francis Rapp. Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10075 – [1528]. 8 June – Marguerite de Navarre to Sigismund von Hohenlohe – Arch. du Chapitre de St.-Thomass de Strasbourg, no. 38, carton 20, 1, *Diarium Dr. Nicolai Gerbelii* (49), f. 73bis v. Peter, “Strasbourg et la Réforme française,” 277. Rodolphe Peter, “Strasbourg et la Réforme française vers 1525,” in *Strasbourg au cœur religieux du XVIe siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre, Actes du Colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975)*, ed. Georges Livet and Francis Rapp (Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977), 269-283; 274. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.

- 10023 – 1528. [Before 30] September – Marguerite de Navarre to Faculty of Theology, Paris – Lost letter. Mentioned in Farge Registre I, p. 199-200, 243 A. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 416 (J: 416) – [1528?. Autumn] – [Blois?] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3025, fol. 129. Génin I, 226, no. 58. Date: Jourda gives no justification for dating this letter to her first pregnancy in 1528 as opposed to the second in 1530. The key indicators for the date are: her pregnancy of some months; her taking rest; Henri de Navarre being far from both Marguerite and court. She also recommends a former servant of long-standing of her first husband, Charles d'Alençon and herself. This marginally favors 1528 which is closer to the date of his death. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 429 (J: 429) – [1528]. 9 December – London – Jean Du Bellay to Marguerite de Navarre – Supposed mention in Bourrilly and de Vaissière, *Ambassades de Jean du Bellay*, 486, n° 171. Suppress this number. There is no clear reference to a letter, only to a verbal communication to announce that the boats sent to Bordeaux to find wine for the King of England had returned and that du Bellay had steered them to Marguerite's friends. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10025 – 1528. 12 December – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9322, n. 98. Reference in Clémencet 1118 bis. See: Clémencet 1117. – 1528, 12 December. – St. Germain-en-Laye. "Lettre de François Ier enjoignant au Parlement de juger sans délai le procès pendant depuis 1496 et soutenu par l'évêque de Saint-Malo [Denis Briçonnet] grand archidiacre de Reims contre l'archevêque de Reims, à cause d'une pension qu'il réclame sur l'archevêché de Reims." Source: X1A 9322, n. 215. Cf. Clémencet 1118. – 1528. 12 December. – St. Germain-en-Laye. "Lettre de Louise de Savoie recommandant au Parlement la cause de l'évêque de Saint-Malo [Denis Briçonnet] dans le procès qu'il soutient à cause des droits et de la juridiction du archidiacre de Reims." Signature autograph. Source: X1A 9322, n. 216; Clémencet 1118 bis. – 1528. 12 December. – St. Germain-en-Laye. "Lettre de Marguerite d'Angoulême analogue à la précédente." Signature autograph. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10026 – 1529. 4 May – La Bourdaisière – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Paris – AN X1A 9322, n. 223. Reference in Clémencet 1126. Clémencet 1126. 1529, 4 May. – la Bourdaisière. "Lettre de Marguerite d'Angoulême demandant au Parlement de juger promptement le procès qu'elle soutient contre les blatiers de Passais, dans sa viconté de Domfront." Signature autograph. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 442 (J: 442) – [1529. October] – M. de La Trémoille to Marguerite de Navarre – Allusion in response, no. 443, Chartrier de Thouars, p. 66. Renummer since this letter from October is placed by Jourda after one dated November! – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 440 (J: 440; S: 440) – [1529]. 9 October – Cardinal de Farnese to Marguerite de Navarre – Samaran et Patry, 321, no.1. Saulnier 1974A notes. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 445.1 (S: 445.1) – [1530] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean Poussart, Bally de Berry, (M. de Fors) – Allusion in 446, BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 73. Allusion in Génin I, 243, no. 72. Saulnier 1976. "J'ay aussy escript à M. de Fors y aller..." – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 446.4 (S: 446.4) – [1530] – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – Allusion in 446, BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 73. Allusion in Génin I, 243, no. 72. Saulnier 1976 supposes the existence of this letter, which may or may not correspond to one of the extant letters such as no. 450. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10081 – [1530] – Marguerite de Navarre to Louise of Savoy – Mentioned in Lecoq, "François Premier Imaginaire," 400. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10086 – [1530-1547] – [Lyon] – Jean de Vauzelles to Marguerite de Navarre – Lucien de Samostate, trans. D.V.Z. [D'une vraie zele = Jean de Vauzelles] *Le martire de verité, dialogue de Lucian mis*

- en lumiere. Lyon: François Juste [1530-1547?]. 8°. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 445 (J: 445; S: 445) – [1530. After 8 January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Georges d' Armagnac, Bishop of Rodez – Allusion in BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 73. Génin 1, 243, no. 72. Saulnier 1976. Date of letter, after 8 Jan. before 4 Feb. (date of 446). – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 10027 – 1530. 26 January – Fontainebleau – Marguerite de Navarre to Gilles de La Pommeraye – BnF f.fr. 5116, fol. 17. She addresses Gilles de la Pommeraye as ambassador to “Madame l’archiduchesse”. BnF f.fr. 5116, fol. 17. “Lettre de M. d’Angoulême à Gilles de la Pommeraye, ambassadeur pour le roi devers madame l’archiduchesse.” Fontainebleau, 26 janvier 1530. (fol. 17: Francis I to same, fol. 19 Anne de M. to same). – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 446 (J: 446; S: 446) – [1530]. 4 February – Fontainebleau – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 73. Génin 1, 243, no. 72. Saulnier 1976. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 446.1 (S: 446.1) – [1530. After 4] February – Fontainebleau – Marguerite de Navarre to François Olivier – Allusion in 446, BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 73. Allusion in Génin 1, 243, no. 72. Saulnier 1976. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 446.2 (S: 446.2) – [1530. After 4] February – Fontainebleau – Marguerite de Navarre to X – Allusion in 446, BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 73. Allusion in Génin 1, 243, no. 72. Saulnier 1976. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 446.3 (S: 446.3) – [1530. After 4] February – Fontainebleau – Marguerite de Navarre to X – Allusion in 446, BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 73. Allusion in Génin 1, 243, no. 72. Saulnier 1976. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 454 (J: 454) – [1530]. 28 March – Blois – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – PS to a letter of Henri de Navarre, BnF f.fr. 3042, fol. 11. Mentioned in Génin 1, 248 note. Jourda’s content summary is wrong. This is the same as a letter mentioned in the Fichier Charavay, XXX. [Did I already include this as a new letter?] – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10028 – [1530?]. 10 June – Blois – Marguerite de Navarre to Papal Legate (M. le Légat) – Unknown. Reference in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. Fichier Charavay, no. 121, “Marguerite de Navarre. L.S. à son cousin monsieur le Légat, avec trois lignes et compliment. A. Blois, le 10e de juin.” Cf. letters 467 and 468, both Blois 10 juin 1530. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 472.1 (J: 472) – [1530. July] – [Francis I] to [Marguerite] – Allusion in 474, BnF f.fr. 6624, fol. 74; and in 476, BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 24. Génin 2, 105, no. 57; Génin 1, 258, no. 83. Letter from Francis I alluded to but not repertoried by Jourda. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 493.1 (J: 494) – [1530. October] – M. de La Tremoille to Marguerite de Navarre – Cf. 493, BnF f.fr. 3638, fol. 15. Allusion in no. 494, Chatrier de Trouars, 66. Cf. 493, Ritter, no. 21, Mentioned in Génin, 409. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 501 (J: 501; S: 501) – [1531. Beginning of year] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 89. Génin 1, 271, no. 92. Saulnier 1977, 24-1, for Robertet – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 500.1 (S: 500.1) – [1531. Circa 9 January] – Alençon – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – Lost letter. Allusion in a letter from Jean du Bellay to Anne de Montmorency, J. du Bellay, Corresp. 1, 200. Saulnier 1971. Jean du Bellay was with Marguerite at Alençon. He writes to Montmorency that “Bois-Dauphin (Jean de Laval) a communiqué à Marguerite tout ce qu’il a vu à Montferrat, ‘Sur quoy ladicte dame en escript au Roy quelque mot par luy....’” Saulnier argues this was about the succession of Montferrat, which had just been left vacant by the death of Boniface V. J du B. and Marguerite wanted François de Bourbon (M. de Saint-Pol) to get it. They were not successful.

- New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 499.1 (S: 499.1) – [1531. Circa 10 January] – [St. Germain-en-Laye?] – Philip Babou, M. de la Bourdaisière to Marguerite de Navarre – Allusion in letter of J. du Bellay, R. Scheurer 1, 201. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 499.2 (S: 499.2) – [1531. Circa 10 January] – St. Germain-en-Laye – Louise of Savoy to Marguerite de Navarre – Allusion in letter of J. du Bellay, R. Scheurer 1, 201. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 499.3 (S: 499.3) – [1531. 12 January?] – Alençon – Marguerite de Navarre to Philip Babou, M. de la Bourdaisière – Response to the letter alluded to in letter of J. du Bellay, R. Scheurer 1, 201. Saulnier 1971. Hypothetical letter. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 499.4 (S: 499.4) – [1531. 12 January?] – Alençon – Marguerite de Navarre to Louise of Savoy – Response to the letter alluded to in letter of J. du Bellay, R. Scheurer 1, 201. Saulnier 1971. Hypothetical letter. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 515 (J: 515; S: 515) – [1531]. 1 August – St. Germain-en-Laye – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3024, fol. 113. Mentioned in Génin 1, p. 419. Saulnier 1977, 24-1. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 552 (J: 552; S: 552) – [1531]. 14 December – Amiens – Marguerite de Navarre to Françoise de Dinteville, Bishop of Auxerre – BnF f.fr. 15776, fol. 251. Jourda no. 14, p. 113. Jourda, Répertoire, 123. Saulnier 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10029 – [1532. Before 17] May – Marguerite de Navarre to Lazare de Baïf – Lost letter. Mentioned in response, BnF f.fr. 3941, fol. 272 v - 273 r. Mentioned in Lazare de Baïf to Marguerite de Navarre from Venice, 17 May 1532. BnF f.fr. 3941, fol. 272 v - 273 r. He speaks of international relations with the Turk. More important still, he claims to be sending her a Bible in Italian “Tucsan” in accordance with her express wish. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10030 – [1532]. 17 May – Venice – Lazare de Baïf to Marguerite de Navarre – BnF f.fr. 3941, fol. 272 v. - 273 r. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 560.1 (J: 560) – [1532]. 16 July – Baslon – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – BnF f.fr. 3638, fol. 71. Ritter no. 23. Mention, Génin 1, 411. Saulnier? – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 584.1 (J: 561; S: 584.1) – [1533. End of year] – L. de La Tremoille to Marguerite de Navarre – Mentioned in no. 562. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10004 – [1533-1536] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Albany – Unknown. Reference in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. On date: See Jourda no. 725. This letter probably precedes 725 in which Marguerite offers him thanks and says that he has put ‘them’ under ‘obligation.’ Fichier Charavay, no. 121, “Marguerite d’Angoulême, reine de Navarre. L. aut. sign. à mon cousin le duc d’Albany. s.d. 1 p. in-fol. Très belle pièce. ‘..Jay veu ce que vous n’avez mandé quy me rant tant obligée a vous que je me tiens malheureuse de navoir ocasion de le randre cellon obligation que jy hay mais quant locasion sy donnera vous connoistrez que vous navez point ame personne ingrante. Je parle pour le mary comme pour moy, car je say quil ny a homme au monde a quy il hait plus de fience que a vous et pour cete ocasion a chargé ce porteur vous dire un propos quil luy touche, vous pryant le croire...” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 560.2 (S: 560.2) – [1533]. 13 January – Marguerite de Navarre to Trivulzio – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10031 – 1533. [Before 27] June – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Paris – Lost letter.

- Mentioned in BnF Clairambault 334, fol. 268. "Extrait des Registres du Parlement. Message (with a letter?) from Marguerite de Navarre to the Parlement through the agency of Pierre Viole, 27 Juin 1533. Request for prayers for the King and his entourage during their trip." Quoted in Clairambault 334, fol. 268. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 583.1 (S: 583.1) – [1533. November] – Paris – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean de Lorraine, Cardinal – Mentioned in Bourrilly and Weiss, "Jean du Bellay, les Protestants, et la Sorbonne," *BSHPF*, 335. Saulnier 1971. Mentioned in a letter of Jacques Colin to Jean du Bellay, 11 Dec. 1933. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 583.2 (S: 583.2) – [1533. Mid December] – Paris? – Marguerite de Navarre to Philip Chabot, Sr. de Brion – Mentioned in Corr. de Jean du Bellay 1, 338. Saulnier 1971. Mentioned in a letter of René du Bellay to Jean du Bellay, Paris, 20 December 1533. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 583.3 (S: 583.3) – [1533. Circa 19 December] – Paris – Marguerite de Navarre to François de La Trémoille, Vicomte de Thouars – Mentioned in Marchegay & Imbert, *Lettre missives...de la Trémoille*, 109. Saulnier 1972. Mentioned in a letter sent to François de la Trémoille by his officers Francis d'Availloles, sr. de Roncée, and N. du Boys, sr. de Nailly, Paris, 18-19 December 1533. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10032 – [1533. 19 - 26] December – Paris – René Du Bellay to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Bourrilly, "Jean du Bellay, les Protestants.." *BSHPF* 53 (1904), p. 224. Mentioned in René's letter to Jean du Bellay in which he reports that he stood up to the Parlement of Paris, the Admiral, and the Cardinal of Lorraine. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1110 (J: 1110; S: 1110) – [1534-1535] – Philip Melanchthon to Marguerite de Navarre and Gérard Roussel – Mentioned in Florimond de Raemond, 'Histoire de la naissance, progresz et décadence de l'hérésie de ce siècle (Rouen, 1629), p. 856 (not 865 as per Jourda). Saulnier 197: Based on memory, Florimond de Raemond dates this letter to the period of the negotiations with Melanchthon about a possible religious concord, rather than their subsequent contact in the early 1540s which he also recounts. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10033 – [1534] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean de Lorraine, Cardinal – Lost letter. Mentioned in Bourrilly, V.-L. et N. Weiss. "Jean du Bellay...", *BSHPF* 53 (1904), p. 218-219. On behalf of Nicolas Cop mentioned in a letter by Jacques Colin to Cardinal Jean du Bellay. Cited in Bourrilly, V.-L. et N. Weiss. "Jean du Bellay, les protestants de la Sorbonne (1529-1535). Paris, 1904 (Extrait de la *BSHPF* 53 (1904), p. 218-219, p. 56, no. 3 du tirage à part. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 584.4 (S: 584.4) – [1534. Beginning of year] – Philip of Hesse to Marguerite de Navarre – Minutes of three letters in Staatsarchiv Marbourg, Politisches Archiv Landgraf Philipps des Großmütigen 1858, f. 1; f. 3. Mentioned in Mariotte (1964) referring without specific reference to Seidel. See Seidel, Frankreich, p. 124, note 7. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 584.5 (S: 584.5) – [1534. Beginning of year] – Philip of Hesse to Marguerite de Navarre – Minutes of three letters in Staatsarchiv Marbourg, Politisches Archiv Landgraf Philipps des Großmütigen 1858, f. 1; f. 3. Mentioned in Mariotte (1964) referring without specific reference to Seidel. See Seidel, Frankreich, p. 124, note 7. Saulnier 1972. See no. 584.4. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 584.6 (S: 586.5) – [1534. Beginning of year] – Philip of Hesse to Marguerite de Navarre – Minutes of three letters in Staatsarchiv Marbourg, Politisches Archiv Landgraf Philipps des Großmütigen 1858, f. 1; f. 3. Mentioned in Mariotte (1964) referring without specific reference to Seidel. See Seidel, Frankreich, p. 124, note 7. Saulnier 1972. See no. 584.4. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.

- 584.2 (S: 584.2) – [1534. Before 14 January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Paris – Marchegay, 113. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 584.3 (J: 562; S: 584.3) – [1534]. 13 January – Vincennes – Marguerite de Navarre to François de La Trémoille, Vicomte de Thouars – Chartrier de Thouars, 66. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 585 (J: 585) – [1534]. 25 April – Geneva – Guillaume Farel to Marguerite de Navarre – Herminjard 3, 169, no. 463. Quadroni, Farel Répertoire, no. 127; cf. no. 126, same day as Farel to Etienne de la Forge. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 585.1 (S: 585.1) – [1534. Beginning of May] – Marguerite de Navarre to Faculty of Medicine, Paris – Mentioned in Concasty, *Commentaires de la Fac. de médecine...de Paris*, 232; copied in S 1971. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 600 (J: 600) – [1534. Summer] – Marguerite de Navarre to Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 2989, fol. 31. Génin 1, 296, no. 109. Why is 599 not the same as this one? – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 585.2 (S: 585.2) – [1534. Mid June] – Marguerite de Navarre to Clement VII – Mentioned in Corr. de Jean du Bellay 1, 400. Saulnier 1971. Mentioned in a letter of Nicolas Raince to Jean du Bellay, from Rome, 1 July 1534. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 585.3 (J: 1119; S: 585.3) – [1534]. 25 June – Paris – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean Bertrandi, President – AD Pau E 557 (Original). Pomés, *Une carta inedita de Margarita de Angulema*, p. 541-542. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10034 – [1535] – Jean Barril to Marguerite de Navarre – Barril, Jean. *A tres illustre et puissante princesse et dame, Marguerite de France, Royne de Navarre, Duchesse d'Alençon, et de Berry. Toulouse: Eustache Mareschal, [1535]. Dedicatory epistle to Marguerite de Navarre, heading the "Traité composé pour Suzanne de Bourbon, par sa mère Anne de Beaujeu."* (1535). See Baudrier, 11: 371. no. 28. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10035 – 1535. [Before 19] February – Parlement of Bordeaux to Henry and Marguerite of Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Métivier p. 320-321. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 602.1 (S: 602.1) – [1535]. 1 March – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Charles de Chabot, Baron de Jarnac – Private collection. Saulnier, "Marguerite de Navarre et le baron de Jarnac," 93-109. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 605 (J: 605) – [1535]. 15 September – Winchester – X to Marguerite de Navarre – BnF f.fr. 3014, fol. 98; Clairambault 312, fol. 150. Letters & Papers 9, no. 378. I believe that anonymous author is François Olivier, Marguerite's Chancellor of Alençon, who became Maître de requêtes, 16 Jan. 1536. [He was on mission to England at this time?]. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 605.1 (S: 605.1) – 1535. [Beginning of October] – Strasbourg – Council of Strasbourg (Martin Bucer) to Marguerite de Navarre – Archives du Chapitre de St.-Thomas, AM de Strasbourg 42, no. 22, f. 1, 4 fols. Mentioned in Pollet, Martin Bucer 2, 508, n. 3. Reference in Pollet, *Itinéraire*, p. 298. AST (Archives du Chapitre St. Thomas, Strasbourg) 42, Cart. 22, 1. 4 fols. Photocopy in Orleans with Pollet's papers. Saulnier 1971. Archives du Chapitre St. Thomas, Strasbourg, 42, Cart. 22, 1. 4 fols. Not mentioned in Rott, *Correspondance Bucer: Liste alphabétique* (1977). – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10037 – 1535. [Before 16] December – Francis Bryan to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Brewer and Gairdner, *Letters and Papers*, vol. 9, p. 328-329, no. 980: Bryan's letter to Cromwell of 16 Dec. 1535. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.

- 10038 – [1536?] – Marguerite de Navarre to Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara – Unknown.
Reference in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. Date: See Jourda nos. 609, 610, 613 on the proposed visit of Renée and her daughter to France. Fichier Charavay, no. 121, “Marguerite de Valois. – L. a. s. à Renée de France, duchesse de Ferrare. “Elle l’invite à venir en France, au nom du roi, son frère, qui en sera tressais de lui fera bonne chère. La voyage sera fort avantageux au duc, son mari. Félicitations sur la naissance de sa fille.” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10078 – [after 1536] – Marguerite de Navarre to John Calvin – Mentioned in Florimond de Raemond, 922-923. No other testimony about this letter. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10062 – [1536. c. 18 February] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean Du Bellay, Cardinal – J. Pierpont Morgan Library. R-V, Rulers of France – Francis I no. 53.MA. 1346-174 (original). BnF f.fr. 19577, f. 189v-190r (copy). Scheurer, Du Bellay 2, no.336, 259-260. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 613 (J: 613; S: 613) – [1536. May-June] – Marguerite de Navarre to Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara – Modena, Archivio di Stato, Lettere di principi esteri. Francia. Bonnet, *BSHPF* 15 (1866), 128 & 37 (1888), 117. Saulnier 1977, no. 54.1 for the Abbé Turpennay, who was Jean de Selve, nephew of Jean de Selve, First President of the Parlement of Paris and Marguerite’s almoner. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 614 (J: 614) – [1536. May-June] – [Tournon] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3638, fol. 5. Jourda, no. 17, 115-116; Répertoire. See Mémoires du Bellay, vol. 3, 42 for Henri de Navarre’s trip to Tournon. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10039 – 1536. [3 July] – Martin Bucer to Marguerite de Navarre – Archives du Chapitre de St.-Thomas, AM de Strasbourg. Mentioned in Rott, *Correspondance* Bucer: Liste alphabétique (1977), 60. Pollet, Bucer 2, 9, note, 3 mentions “3 lettres de 1536-38: AST 167, no. 16, fol. 284; 152, fol. 335-347; 391-396. Either 3 VII or 31 XII 36. Mentioned in Jean Rott, *Correspondance* de Martin Bucer: Liste alphabétique des correspondants, Association des Publications de la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l’Université des Sciences humaines de Strasbourg, Bulletin no. 1, Strasbourg: Palais Universitaire, 1977, 60. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 622 (J: 622; S: 622) – [1536. 22-23 July] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f.fr. 3005, fol. 17; Clairambault 335, fol. 61. Génin 1, 316, no. 122. Saulnier 1975A for day of month. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 621 (J: 621) – [1536]. 24 July – Lyon – Marguerite de Navarre to M. de Rochepot, [Montmorency] – BnF f.fr. 3062, fol. 24. Jourda, 117-118, no. 20; Répertoire. Date noted by another hand on verso. Dictated. Autograph signature. Jourda’s transcription is faulty for “...esté requise (de personne?) fors...” read “...esté requise de ce faire fois...” – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 638 (J: 638; S: 638) – [1536. 23-24 August] – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF f.fr. 3021, fol. 55; Clairambault 335, fol. 62 [Vol. 85, 55]. Génin 1, 325, no. 127. Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 639.1 (S: 639.1) – [1536. Beginning of September] – [Between Nîmes and Lyon] – Marguerite and Henri II de Navarre to Jacques de Pons – Mentioned in a letter from Jacques de Pons to Charles Chabot, “L’abbaye, bull. 61, no. 81: original.”. Saulnier 1971 – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 646.2 (J: 646; S: 646.2) – [1536. 8 October-4 December] – Nîmes – Consuls and Bishop of Nîmes to Marguerite de Navarre – Archives de l’hôtel de Ville, registre du XVI^e siècle, délibérations, fols. 50-51. Mentioned in L. Ménard, *Histoire de la ville de Nîmes*, 4, 132-133. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.

- 646.1 (J: 1100; S: 646.1) – [1536]. 28 October – Lyon – Marguerite de Navarre to Antoinette de Bourbon – Collection de M. Meaume (olim). Pimodan, *La mère de Guises, Antoinette de Bourbon, 1494-1583*, new ed., 1925, 320. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 646.4 (J: 1015; S: 818.01) – [1536?]. 9 December – Fontainebleau – Marguerite de Navarre to Chancellor of Navarre – AD Basses-Pyrénées E 572. *Documents historiques inédits* 3, p. 575. Saulnier 1980 superseding Saulnier 1974A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 646.3 (S: 646.3) – [1536. End of year] – [Avignon?] – Marguerite de Navarre to Consuls of Nîmes – Archives de l'hôtel de Ville, registre du XVI^e siècle, délibérations, fols. 50-51. L. Ménard, *Histoire de la ville de Nîmes*, 4, 132-133. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 650 (J: 650) – [1537] – Alençon – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, f. 39. Génin 2, p. 131, no. 80. Date approximate. Jourda dates 650 and 651 to 1537 because in the latter Marguerite claims to have been in possession of the Duchy for 12 years. She came into possession of them after her husband's death in 1525, thus, 1537 for the letter. However, see no. 651. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 651 (J: 651) – [1537] – Alençon – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF f. fr. 6624, f. 17. Génin 2, 131, no. 81. Date approximate. The reference to her 12 years of control over the duchy (since husband's death in 1525) is the only datable item in the letter. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 707.2 (S: 707.2) – [1537] – Bordeaux – Parlement of Bordeaux to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 707.3 (S: 707.3) – [1537] – Marguerite de Navarre to Hughes Casaux – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 707.4 (S: 707.4) – [1537] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 707.5 (S: 707.5) – [1537] – Marguerite de Navarre to Mme. de Ribérac – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10040 – [1537?] – Bonaventure Des Périers (Maistre Sarcomoros) to Marguerite de Navarre – Maistre Sarcomoros, *Pronostication des pronostications*. Jehan Morin [Lyon], 1537. For reference, see: Bonaventure de Périers, "Le Cymbalum mundi," introduction and notes by Yves Delègue (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995), 106. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 685.1 (S: 685.1) – [1537] – Marguerite de Navarre to Michel Briçonnet, Bishop of Nîmes – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 685.2 (S: 685.2) – [1537] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean Albenas – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 695.1 (S: 695.1) – [1537] – Marguerite de Navarre to President of the Parlement of Paris – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 707.1 (S: 707.1) – [1537] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 771.1 (S: 771.1) – [1538] – Marguerite? to Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara? – Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 771.2 (S: 771.2) – [1538] – Marguerite? to Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara? – Saulnier 1977. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 772.1 (S: 772.1) – [1538] – Claude de Bectoz to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1974 B. – New:

No. Extant: No. Edited: No.

- 772.2 (S: 772.2) – [1538] – Denis Faucher to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1974 B. A poem. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1099 (J: 1099; S: 1099) – [1538?] – Marguerite de Navarre to Renée de France, Duchess of Ferrara – Modena, Archivio di Stato. Lettere di principi esteri. Francia. Saulnier 1980: possibly the same as 771.2. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10002 – [circa 1538] – Denis Faucher to Marguerite de Navarre – Barrali, Vincentio. *Chronologia sanctorum & aliorum virorum Illustrium, ac Abbatum Sacrae Insutæ Lerinensis*. Lyon: Petri Rigaud, 1613. 2nd part, p. 393. Poem by Denis Faucher to Marguerite. See Saulnier 1974 B and numbers 771.1 and 771.2. In Barrali, Vincentio [Barral, Vincent or Barrali, Vincenzio]. *Chronologia sanctorum & aliorum virorum Illustrium, ac Abbatum Sacrae Insutæ Lerinensis*. Lyon: Petri Rigaud, 1613. 2nd part, p. 393: Poem by Denis Faucher: “Margaritam candens rutilo si iungitur auro.” BnF 4-1k7-3870. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10041 – 1538. 28 February – Fontainebleau – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – Unknown. Reference in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. Fichier Charavay, no. 121, “189. Marguerite de Valois, soeur de François Ier. L. aut. sur parch. sig. Fontainebleau, 28 février 1538. “Elle fait remise au sgr. de Beulle des droits relief qu’il devait pour une terre relevant d’elle.” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 774.1 (S: 774.1) – [1538. July?] – [Georges d’Armagnac?] to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1970. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 784.1 (S: 784.1) – [1538] – Marguerite de Navarre to Cardinal de Farnese – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 784.2 (S: 784.2) – [1538] – Marguerite de Navarre to Papal Nuncio in Spain – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 788.1 (S: 788.1) – [1539] – Cardinal de Farnese to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 789.1 (S: 789.1) – [1539] – Marguerite de Navarre to Mateo Bandello – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 789.2 (S: 789.2) – [1539] – Marguerite de Navarre to Cesare Fegoso [Fregoso?] – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 791.1 (S: 791.1) – [1539] – Marguerite and Henri II de Navarre to Charles V – Saulnier 1971 and 1972 – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 793.1 (S: 793.1) – [1539] – Cardinal de Farnese to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 793.2 (S: 793.2) – [1539] – Marguerite de Navarre to Filiberto Ferrero, Papal nuncio in France – Saulnier 1971, no 977, no. 24.1 for Robertet. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10042 – 1539. 16 March – Noyon – Marguerite de Navarre to Cardinal of Nycastre – Unknown. Reference and summary in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. Fichier Charavay, no. 121, “Marguerite de Valois, reine de Navarre. L. avec la souscription d’une lig. aut. sig. à mon cousin, M. le cardinal de Nycastre. Noyon, le sixième jour de mars mil cinq cens trente neuf. 1 p. in-4. Cachet. Belle pièce bien conservée. Deux portr. gravés in-8°. “Elle écrit à son frère le légat en faveur des abbés religieux, et convent de l’abbaye de Grantmont, située en pays de limosin es terres et sujétions du roi de Navarre, pour les protéger contre les torts et griefs des doyens et chanoines de Thudelles, sur la possession du prieuré de Saint-Martial dépendant de la dite abbaye; elle le prie d’en écrire au

- pape.” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10043 – 1539. [Before 19 June] – Marguerite de Navarre to Gérard Roussel – Lost letter. Mentioned in Lestocquoy, *Correspondance des nonces en France Carpi et Ferrerio* (1535-1540) p. 463-4, no. 440: Ferrerio à Paul III, Paris, 19 June 1539. Second letter of Marguerite to Roussel mentioned in Ferrerio à Paul III, Paris, 19 June 1539, in J. Lestocquoy, ed., “*Correspondance des nonces en France Carpi et Ferrerio* (1535-1540),” no. 440, 463-4. Source: Naples, Arch. di Stato, Cart. Farn., fasc. 1337. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10044 – 1539. [Before 19 June] – Marguerite de Navarre to Gérard Roussel – Lost letter. Mentioned in Lestocquoy, *Correspondance des nonces en France Carpi et Ferrerio* (1535-1540) p. 463-4, no. 440: Ferrerio à Paul III, Paris, 19 June 1539. Mentioned in Ferrerio à Paul III, Paris, 19 June 1539, in J. Lestocquoy, ed., “*Correspondance des nonces en France Carpi et Ferrerio* (1535-1540),” no. 440, 463-4. Source: Naples, Arch. di Stato, Cart. Farn., fasc. 1337. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 788.01 (S: 788.01) – 1539?. 20 July – Castelfoffredo – Matteo Bandello to Marguerite de Navarre – Bibl. Vatic. Reg. 1395. Guglielmo Manzi, ed., *L’Ecuba, tagedia di Euripide*, trans. Mateo Bandello (1813), p. 11 ff. Saulnier 1972. Bandello’s dedicatory epistle to Marguerite of his translation of Euripides’ “Hecuba” remained in manuscript until published by Manzi. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10045 – [1539. September] – Claude Baduel to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Puech, *Le Renaissance et Réforme à Nîmes*, clii. Puech, *Le Renaissance et Réforme à Nîmes*, clii, “..il [Baduel] se contente de lui écrire qu’il va ‘par delà pour aider’ les consuls ‘à faire l’institution d’un collègue.’” – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 796.1 (S: 796.1) – [end of 1539] – Matteo Bandello to Marguerite de Navarre – Mateo Bandello, “Novelle,” *Scrittori d’Italia* 5 (1912), p. 233. Saulnier 1972. Dedicatory epistle at head of “Novelle,” IV, 19 (20). – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 800.1 (S: 800.1) – [1540] – Marguerite de Navarre to Paul III – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 800.2 (S: 800.2) – [1540] – Paul III to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 817.1 (S: 817.1) – [1540] – Marguerite de Navarre to Cardinal de Farnese – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10046 – [1540-1549] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean de Frotté – Private collection of Le Marquis Edouard de Frotté. Bruyère, Pierre. “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre.” *Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne* 112 (1993), 139-151; 148-149. Date: after 1540 when he became one of Marguerite’s secretaries. See Pierre Bruyère, “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre,” *Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne* 112 (1993), 139-151; 148-149. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10047 – [1540] – Worms – Piero Paulo Vergerio to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. *Lettere Volgari di Diversi Nobilissimi Huomini et Eccellentissimi ingengi scritte in Diverse materie*. Book I. Aldus: in vinegia, 1543, 104 r^o-104 v^o. Fix date more precisely based upon dates of Diet of Worms and the content of letter. “*Lettere Volgari di Diversi Nobilissimi Huomini et Eccellentissimi ingengi scritte in Diverse materie*,” book I, (Aldus: in vinegia, 1543), 104 r^o-104 v^o. From the Diet of Worms. Cf. Jourda 820. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10079 – [1540] – Wittenberg – [Martin Luther or Philip Melanchthon?] to Marguerite de Navarre – Zerbst GUR V, fol. 194, fol. 191. WA Br 9, no. 3565, 299-301. Enders 18, 54. The editors of the

- WA Br feel that this letter could also be by Melanchthon. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10082 – [1540] – Victor Brodeau to Marguerite de Navarre – Victor Brodeau, “Les Louange de Jesus Christ Nostre Sauveur,” 1540. Jourda, vol. 2, 1076. Higman, Piety, B 266-270. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10085 – 1539 [1540 n.s.]. 28 [Before 1 March] – [Lyon] – Jean de Vauzelles to Marguerite de Navarre – Trois livres De l’Humanite de Jesuchrist: divinement descrite, et au vif representée par Pierre Aretin Iltaien. Nouuellement traductz en Francois 1539 Auec priuillage pour III ans. Date: book finished 1 March 1539 [1540 n.s.]. Émile Picot, “Les français italianisants” I, p. 134-137; 136-137. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10048 – [1540]. 26 March – Jean Frotté to Marguerite de Navarre – Destroyed letter. Mentioned in Bruyère, Pierre. “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre.” Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne 112 (1993), 139-151; 146-147: Marguerite to Frotté. Pierre Bruyère, “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre.” Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne 112 (1993), 139-151; 146-147: “Frotte, Jay receu la lectre que du xxvime jour de mars mavez escripte auecques la billet qui estoit dedans qui ma este bien grant plaisir, et apres lavoit lue Je lay mis au feu.” – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10049 – [1540. 7] April – Mont-de-Marsan – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean de Frotté – Private collection of Le Marquis Edouard de Frotté. Bruyère, Pierre. “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre.” Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne 112 (1993), 139-151; 146-147. Pierre Bruyère, “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre.” Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne 112 (1993), 139-151; 146-147. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 802.1 (S: 802.1) – [1540. May] – Marguerite de Navarre to Vittoria Colonna – Saulnier 1980. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10050 – 1540. [Before 1 July] – Marguerite de Navarre to Faculty of Theology, Paris – Lost letter. Mentioned in Farge, Registre II, p. 166, 195 A. Marguerite asks the Faculty to receive a Dominican as a supernumerary student. Farge, “Registre” 2, p. 166, 195 A. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 804.1 (S: 804.1) – [1540. July] – Marguerite and Henri II de Navarre to Duke of Cleves – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10051 – 1540. [Circa 1] July – Paris – Faculty of Theology, Paris to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Marguerite’s response Farge, Registre II, p. 168, 201 A. The Faculty refused her request that they receive a Dominican student (received by Marguerite de Navarre before 8 August 1540) and send her copies of the king’s letters forbidding them to take too many students. See mention in her unpublished response Farge, “Registre” 2, p. 168, 201 A. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10052 – 1540. 8 August – Marguerite de Navarre to Faculty of Theology, Paris – Lost letter. Mentioned in Farge, Registre 2, p. 168, 201 A: 1 September 1540. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10053 – [1540?]. 22 August – [Périgord] – Marguerite de Navarre to President of the Parlement of Bordeaux – AD Pyrénées-Atlantiques, E. 676. AD des Pyrénées-Atlantiques, E. 676. (Carton.) 9 pièces parchemin; 24 pièces papier, 1540-1552. Catalogue “lettre originale de Marguerite de Valois à un président du parlement de Bordeaux touchant la surveillance de l’administration de la justice en Périgord et en Limousin..” Archivists hand: Périgord, v. 1540. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 807.1 (S: 807.1) – [1540. September] – Vittoria Colonna to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1980.

- New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10054 – [1540-1549]. 14 September – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean de Frotté – Private collection of Le Marquis Edouard de Frotté. Bruyère, Pierre. “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre.” *Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne* 112 (1993), 139-151; 150-151. Pierre Bruyère, “Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre,” *Société historique et archéologique de l’Orne* 112 (1993), 139-151; 150-151. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 811.1 (S: 811.1) – [1540. October] – Sebastiano Serlio to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1980. See no. 811. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 818.1 (S: 818.1) – [1540. December] – Marguerite de Navarre to X – Saulnier 1971. Check vs. 818.01 = 646.4 = 1015. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 819.1 (S: 819.1) – [1540. December] – Marguerite de Navarre to Paul III – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 819.15 (S: 819.15) – [1540. December] – Sebastiano Serlio to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1980. Saulnier numbers it 819-1bis. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 819.2 (S: 819.2) – [1540. December] – Georges d’Armagnac to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 819.3 (S: 819.3) – [1540. December] – Jean de Monluc to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 820.1 (S: 820.1) – [1540. December] – Worms, Diet of – Barnabé de Voré to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972 and 1976. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 821.1 (S: 821.1) – [1540. December] – Cardinal de Farnese to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 821.2 (S: 821.2) – [1540. December] – Marguerite de Navarre to Georges d’Armagnac – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 821.3 (S: 821.3) – [1540. December] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean de Monluc – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 830.1 (S: 830.1) – [1541] – Marguerite de Navarre to Philip of Hesse – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 833.1 (S: 833.1) – [1541] – Marguerite de Navarre to Hieronimo Dandino – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 833.2 (S: 833.2) – [1541] – Marguerite de Navarre to Hieronimo Dandino – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 833.3 (S: 833.3) – [1541] – Duke of Cleves to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 857.1 (S: 857.1) – [1541] – Duke of Cleves to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10003 – [1541?] – Charles Du Bois to Marguerite de Navarre – Düsseldorf Archives, Julich-Berg, no. 17, fol. 335. Reference in Ruble, *Mariage de Jeanne d’Albret*, p. 157, note 2. Check vs. Bers. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 10073 – [1541?] – Charles Du Bois to Marguerite de Navarre – Düsseldorf Archives, Julich-Berg, no. 17, fol. 324. Reference in Ruble, *Mariage de Jeanne d’Albret*, p. 157, note 2. Check vs. Bers. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.

- 822.1 (S: 822.1) – [1541. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Philip of Hesse – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 822.2 (S: 822.2) – [1541. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Cleves – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 822.3 (S: 822.3) – [1541. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Cleves – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 823.1 (S: 823.1) – [1541. January] – Philip of Hesse to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10055 – 1541. [Before 5] January – Marguerite de Navarre to Faculty of Theology, Paris – Lost letter. Mentioned in Farge, *Registre II*, p. 174, 209 A. She writes another letter on behalf of a Dominican student. Farge, *Registre* 2, p. 174, 209 A, 5 January 1541. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10056 – [1541. Before 7] May – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Lost letter. Mentioned in Métivier, *Chronique du Parlement de Bordeaux*, vol. 1, pp. 360-361. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10057 – [1541]. 7 May – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Lost letter. Mentioned in Métivier, *Chronique du Parlement de Bordeaux*, vol. 1, pp. 360-361. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 853.1 (S: 853.1) – [1541] – Marguerite de Navarre to Paul III – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 856.1 (S: 856.1) – [1541. September] – Marillac to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10058 – [1541. Before 13] September – Marguerite de Navarre to James V of Scotland – Lost letter? See source of information: BM. Add. MS. 19, 401, f. 35. Mentioned in Brewer and Gairdner, vol. 16, p. 548-549, no. 1178, Cardinal of St. Andrews to James V. 13 Sept. 1541. Mention of letter from Marguerite to James V and his wife that was sent with letters of Francis I to same. Mentioned in letter from the Cardinal of St. Andrews. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10059 – 1541. 27 September – Lyon – Marguerite de Navarre to Treasurers of the Duchy of Alençon – Unknown. Reference in Fichier Charavay, no. 121. Fichier Charavay, no. 121, “181. Marguerite de France, reine de Navarre, .. P. s. sur vélin; Lyon, 27 septembre 1541, 1 p. in-4, sceau sur queue de parchemin en partie brisé. Mandement aux gens tenant sa cour des comptes à Alençon pour les aviser que son très ami cousin François, seigneur de La Trémoille, lui a fait l’hommage qu’il lui doit pour ses seigneuries de Condé et de Saint-Léger, tenant et mouvant d’elle à cause de la grosse tour d’Issoudun.” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 858.2 (S: 858.2) – [1541. October] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Cleves – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 858.3 (S: 858.23) – [1541. October] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Saxony – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 858.4 (S: 858.4) – [1541. October] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Saxony – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 858.5 (S: 858.5) – [1541. October] – Duke of Saxony to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 858.6 (S: 858.6) – [1541. October] – Marillac to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New:

No. Extant: No. Edited: No.

- 858.1 (J: 875; S: 858.1) – [1541]. 8 [October] – Marguerite de Navarre to Marillac – Kaulek, p. 347; Letters & Papers, 16, p. 582, no. 1241. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 861.1 (S: 861.1) – [1541. November] – Marguerite de Navarre to Ghogreve – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 883.1 (S: 883.1) – [1542. January?] – Marie de Navarre to Marguerite – Saulnier 1971. Check if this is no. 883.1 or 833.1 – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 888.1 (S: 888.1) – [1542] – Marguerite de Navarre to Paul III – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 891.01 (S: 891.01) – [1542] – Pfalz-Neuburg to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 891.02 (S: 891.02) – [1542] – Marguerite de Navarre to Serrnat – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 891.03 (S: 891.03) – [1542] – Serrnat to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 891.04 (S: 891.04) – [1542] – Serrnat to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 891.05 (S: 891.05) – [1542] – Serrnat to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 896.1 (J: 895; S: 896.1) – [1542] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Ferrara – Modena, Archivio di Stato, Lettere di principi esteri. Francia. Jourda, Rép., no. 895, p. 197-198, *ibid*, “Lettres inédites,” no. 26, p. 126. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10060 – [1542] – Claude Baduel to Marguerite de Navarre – Baduel, Claude. Oratio funebris in funere Floretae Sarrasiae habita. Lugd., ap. Steph. Doletum, 1542. Dedicatory epistle prefacing Baduel’s “Oratio funebris in funere Floretae Sarrasiae habita.” Lugd., ap. Steph. Doletum, 1542. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 881.1 (S: 881.1) – [1542. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Duke of Cleves – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10061 – 1542. 17 January – London – Marillac to Bonnavet (Admiral) and Marguerite de Navarre – Paris, Archives du Ministère des Affaires étrangères. Kaulek, *Correspondance* politique de Ms. de Castillon et de Marillac, 384-385. Marillac asks that the letter be shared with Marguerite in the margin of letter. Kaulek, *Correspondance* politique de Ms. de Castillon et de Marillac, pp. 384-385, no. 389. “Inventaire analytique des archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères. *Correspondance* politique. Angleterre, 1537-1542.” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10080 – [1542. February?] – Marguerite de Navarre to Philip Melanchthon – Mentioned in Franz Burkhard to Melanchthon, Speyer, 11 March 1542, Zerbst, “Abschrift in Weyrau-Klitschdorf.” Mentioned in WA Br X, no. 3565, 300. WA Br X, no. 3565, 300: “Das umgekehrt auch Margarete mit Melanchthon korrespondiert hat, ergift sich aus seinem Briefe Franz Burkhardts an Melanchthon, Speyer 11. März 1542 (Original in Zerbst, Abschrift in Weyrau-Klitschdorf): “Mitto tibi literas ex Gallia missas et aliorum bonorum virorum, ac scripsit tibi quoque regina Navarrae, quas literas a principe nostro haud dubie accipes.” – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 891.1 (J: 1139; S: 891.1) – [1542]. 1 July – La Chaise Dieu – François de Tournon, Cardinal to Marguerite de Navarre – BnF f.fr. 2968, f. 50; Clairambault 312, f. 3. Saulnier 1971. – New:

- No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 879.2 (S: 879.2) – [1542. November] – Bordeaux – Parlement of Bordeaux to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 879.3 (S: 879.3) – [1542. November] – Henri de Valois, Dauphin to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 897.1 (S: 897.1) – [1542. November] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10063 – [1542. Before 15 November] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Lost letter. Mentioned in Métivier, p. 370. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 904.1 (S: 904.1) – [1542. December] – Francis I to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 914.1 (S: 914.1) – [1542. December] – Marguerite and Henri II de Navarre to Francis I – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 919.1 (S: 919.1) – [1543] – Marguerite de Navarre to René de Brinon – Saulnier 1971 and 1572. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 919.2 (S: 919.2) – [1543] – Marguerite de Navarre to François Belcier – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 919.3 (S: 919.3) – [1543] – René de Brinon to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 919.4 (S: 919.4) – [1543] – François de Belcier to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 927.1 (S: 927.1) – [1543] – Jean Du Bellay, Cardinal to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1970. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 935.1 (S: 935.1) – [1543] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 938.1 (J: 917; S: 938.1) – [1543] – Marguerite de Navarre to Mme. de La Tremoille – Chartier de Thouars, p. 72. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 938.3 (J: 918; S: 938.3) – [1543] – Mme. de La Tremoille to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. Allusion in the response, 938.4 [=919]. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 938.4 (J: 919; S: 938.4) – [1543] – Marguerite de Navarre to Mme. de La Tremoille – Chartier de Thouars, p. 73. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 941.1 (S: 941.1) – [1543] – Marguerite de Navarre to Geoffroy de la Chassagne – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 941.2 (S: 941.2) – [1543] – Marguerite de Navarre to Geoffroy de Pompadour – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 941.3 (S: 941.3) – [1543] – Duke of Saxony to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10064 – [1543?] – Protonotary of Orthe to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Jourda 924. Check date of Francis forgiveness to the Rochellois. Letter or verbal communication. Mentioned in Jourda 924. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 926.1 (S: 926.1) – [1543. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Charles de Chabot, Baron de Jarnac –

- Saulnier 1970. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 933.1 (J: 1022; S: 933.1) – [1543. March] – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF 6624, f. 24. Génin 2, p. 126, no. 76. Saulnier 1971 and 1972. *Registre de Frotté*, 1830, f. 128, March 1543, mention of Fr. Seillenard, on mission to Spain, paid by Marguerite. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 933.2 (J: 1017; S: 933.2) – [1543. March] – Jean Du Bellay, Cardinal to Marguerite de Navarre – Allusion in 933.1 [1022]. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10065 – [1543]. 4 April – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Lost letter. Mentioned Métivier p. 376. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 942.1 (S: 942.1) – [1543. 20 Summer] – Philip Melanchthon to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Gaullieur, *Histoire de la réformation à Bordeaux*, p. 71. Check vs. the catalogue of Melanchthon's correspondence. Gaullieur mentions 2, not one, letters as having been sent by Melanchthon to Marguerite de Navarre. Cf. letter 1110, Florimond de Raemond, 856. Saulnier 1971 wrong. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 938.2 (S: 938.2) – [1543]. 25 June – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Laval – Arch. La Trémoille. Extr. Marchegay, p. 146. Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10066 – [1543. After 31 July] – Charles de Gramon to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Implied in Métivier p. 390-391. Gramon informs Marguerite that the trial of André Melanchthon had been suspended. Cf. Jourda 943-4. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 953.1 (S: 953.1) – [1543. End] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971 and 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 953.2 (S: 953.2) – [1543. End] – Marguerite de Navarre to Paul III – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 955.1 (S: 955.1) – [1543. End] – Philip Melanchthon to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971 and 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 976.1 (S: 976.1) – [1544] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 976.2 (S: 976.2) – [1544] – Paul III to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 976.3 (S: 976.3) – [1544] – Marguerite de Navarre to City Council of La Rochelle – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 976.4 (S: 976.4) – [1544] – Marguerite de Navarre to Charles de Chabot, Baron de Jarnac – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 956.1 (S: 956.1) – [1544. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to M. de La Vauguyon – Saulnier 1971 – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 956.2 (S: 956.2) – [1544. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Charles de Chabot, Baron de Jarnac – Saulnier 1971 – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 956.3 (S: 956.3) – [1544. January] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971 – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 961.1 (S: 961.1) – [1544. February] – Marguerite de Navarre to Parlement of Bordeaux – Saulnier 1971 and 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 961.2 (S: 961.2) – [1544. February] – Bordeaux – Parlement of Bordeaux to Marguerite de Navarre

- Saulnier 1972. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 975.1 (S: 975.1) – [1544. March] – Marguerite de Navarre to Geoffroy de Caumont, Abbé d’Uzerche – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 975.2 (S: 975.2) – [1544. March] – Marguerite de Navarre to François de Caumont – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 975.3 (S: 975.3) – [1544. March] – Marguerite de Navarre to Charles de Chabot, Baron de Jarnac – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 975.4 (S: 975.4) – [1544. March] – Marguerite de Navarre to Charles de Chabot, Baron de Jarnac – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10068 – 1544. 4 March – Charles Chabot to Marguerite de Navarre – Thomas, Danièle, ed. Documents officiels et correspondances. Collection “Documents inédits”, vol. 1. Pau: Société des Amis du Château de Pau, 1996, 26-27, n° 13. Danièle Thomas, ed., “Documents officiels et correspondances (du 12 juillet, 1508 au 26 mars 1789),” Collection “Documents inédits”, vol. 1. Pau: Société des Amis du Château de Pau, 1996, 26-27, n° 13. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 978.1 (J: 1088; S: 978.1) – [1544. April] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean Du Bellay, Cardinal – Fiches Charavay. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10076 – [1544. April-May] – Paris – Etienne Dolet to Marguerite de Navarre – Etienne Dolet, “Le Second Enfer,” Lyon, Etienne Dolet, 1544. Longeon, ed. Le Second Enfer, pp. 116-118. Longeon, Préfaces, p. 28, dates Dolet’s letter to April-May. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10069 – [1544]. 31 August – Antoine Du Moulin to Marguerite de Navarre – Du Moulin’s dedication “ce dernier jour d’aoust 1544” to Marguerite de Navarre in Antoine Du Moulin, *Récueil des oeuvres de Bonaventure Des Périers*, Lyon, 1544. Partially quoted in Bonaventure de Périers, “Le Cymbalum mundi,” ed. Yves Delègue (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995), 114. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10070 – [1545?] – Marguerite de Navarre to Marguerite de Navarre – Boccaccio. Decameron. Lyon, Guillaume Rouille, 1551. Date: Similar date as Emilio Ferretti’s letter to Marguerite de Navarre in the same volume?: Lyon, 11 May 1545. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10067 – [1545. Beginning] March – Greenwich – Paget or Henry VIII to Marguerite de Navarre – Lost letter. Mentioned in Paget to Petre of same date in B&G, vol. 20, 1, p. 155, no. 342; see also 151, no. 334. Jourda only counts one, when there were two letters sent. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10000 – [1545. Before 10] March – Marguerite de Navarre to Paget or Henry VIII – Lost letter. Mentioned in B&G, vol. 20, 1, p. 151, no. 334, Paget to Henry VIII letter of that date; see also p. 155, no. 342. Jourda only counts one, when there were two letters sent. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 995.1 (S: 995.1) – [1545. April] – Paul III to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10071 – 1545. 1 May – Lyon – Emilio Ferretti to Marguerite de Navarre – Boccaccio. Decameron. Lyon, Guillaume Rouille, 1551. See Maçon in same volume. – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1014.1 (S: 1014.1) – [1546] – Marguerite de Navarre to Paul III – Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.

- 10072 – [1546] – François Rabelais to Marguerite de Navarre – “Le Tiers Livre,” critical edition and commentary by M.A. Screech (Paris: Droz, 1995). – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1050.1 (S: 1050.1) – [1547] – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 10001 – [1547-1549] – Marguerite de Navarre to Henry II – BnF Gaignières no. 409, fol. 100. La Ferrière Percy, Marguerite d’Angoulême, p. 113-114. Date: somewhat before the marriage of Jeanne d’Albret. La Ferrière Percy, Marguerite d’Angoulême, p. 113-114; p. 114, note 1, “Bibliothèque impériale, fonds Gaignières, vol. 409, f. 100. Cette lettre est inédite et avait échappé aux recherches de M. Genin.” – New: Yes. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1063.1 (J: 954; S: 1063.1) – [1547. Before January 8] – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – Allusion in 1063.4 [=956]. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1063.2 (J: 955; S: 1063.2) – [1547. Before January 8] – Izernay to Marguerite de Navarre – Allusion in 1063.4 [=956]. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1063.3 (S: 1063.3) – [1547. Before January 8] – Marguerite de Navarre to Henry II – Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1063.4 (J: 956; S: 1063.4) – [1547]. 8 January – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – BnF f. fr. 3638, f. 69. Jourda, Rép., pp. 212-213, *ibid*, “Lettres inédites,” no. 29, p. 125-6. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1063.5 (J: 1066; S: 1063.5) – [1547]. 10 January – Fontainebleau – Izernay to Marguerite de Navarre – Mentioned in response, no. 1063.6 [=1067]. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: Yes.
- 1063.6 (J: 1067; S: 1063.6) – [1547]. 21 January – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – BnF f. fr. 3638, f. 67. Génin I, p. 390, no. 158. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1035.1 (S: 1035.1) – [1547. April] – Cardinal de Farnese to Marguerite de Navarre – Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1036.1 (S: 1036.1) – [1547. April] – Marguerite de Navarre to Cardinal de Farnese – Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1054.1 (J: 1052; S: 1054.1) – [1547. July] – Marguerite de Navarre to Henry II – BnF Dupuy 569. Génin I, p. 387, no. 155. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1056.1 (J: 1055; S: 1056.1) – [1547. August] – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – BnF f. fr. 3024, f. 21. Génin I, p. 388, no. 156. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1059.1 (J: 1102; S: 1059.1) – [1547. September] – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – BnF f. fr. 3035, f. 79. Saulnier 1974 A; Génin I, p. 427 mention. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1069.1 (J: 1140; S: 1069.1) – [1548] – Prouille – Marguerite de Navarre to François de Tournon, Cardinal – Allusion in no. 1069.2 [=1141]. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1069.3 (J: 722; S: 1069.3) – [1548] – Marguerite de Navarre to Le Comte de Villars – BnF f. fr. 3043, f. 4. Génin I, p. 430. Saulnier 1974A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1069.4 (J: 1070; S: 1069.4) – [1548] – Marguerite de Navarre to Diane de Poitiers – Allusion in letter of Diane de Poitiers, G. Guiffrey, *Lettres inédites*, p. 28. Saulnier 1974A. – New: No. Extant:

No. Edited: No.

- 1067.1 (J: 1064; S: 1067.1) – [1548. February] – Mont-de-Marsan – Marguerite de Navarre to Henry II – BnF f.fr. 3132, f. 15. Génin 1, p. 396, no. 161. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1068.1 (J: 1121; S: 1068.1) – [1548. May] – Marguerite de Navarre to Mme. de La Rochefoucault – BnF f.fr. 3081, f. 2. Génin 1, p. 222, no. 55. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1068.2 (S: 1068.2) – [1548. May] – X to X – Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1122 (J: 1122) – [1548. May] – Marguerite de Navarre to Francis I – BnF f.fr. 3021, fol. 58. Mentioned in Génin 1, p. 412. Jourda gives the same manuscript reference as the one cited for letter 1021 but a different description of the contents. Different letter or reduplicated entry? – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1069.2 (J: 1141; S: 1069.2) – [1548]. 25 June – François de Tournon, Cardinal to Marguerite de Navarre – BnF f.fr. 3081, f. 9. M. François, Corr. de Fr. Tournon, p. 246. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1069.5 (J: 617; S: 1069.5) – [1548. After 5 August] – Marguerite de Navarre to François de Tournon, Cardinal – Mentioned in response no. 618, BnF f.fr. 3081, fol. 7. *Correspondance de Tournon*, p. 247. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1069.6 (J: 618; S: 1069.6) – [1548. Circa 10-15 August] – François de Tournon, Cardinal to Marguerite de Navarre – BnF f.fr. 3081, fol. 7. *Correspondance de Tournon*, p. 247. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 10077 – [1548. Before 19 August] – Marguerite de Navarre to Diane de Poitiers – Mentioned in Diane de Poitiers to M. d'Aumale, Moulins, 19 August [1548], BnF Gaigniers 425, f. 32. Guiffrey, ed., Dianne de Poytiers. *Lettres Inédites*, 28-29. – New: Yes. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.1 (S: 1071.1) – [1548]. after the 20th] October – [Bordeaux] – Anne de Montmorency to Marguerite – Allusion in Charles de Lorraine to Anne de Montmorency, October 1548: de Ruble, Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret 1, 9; S. C. Gigon, "La révolte de la gabelle en Guyenne, 1906, 166; Cuisiat, Corr. Ch. Lorraine. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1073.1 (J: 1038; S: 1073.1) – [1549] – X to X – Mentioned in no. 1073.5 [=1046]. Saulnier 1974 A and 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1073.2 (J: 1038; S: 1073.2) – [1549] – X to X – Mentioned in no. 1073.5 [=1046]. Saulnier 1974 A and 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1073.3 (J: 1038; S: 1073.3) – [1549] – X to X – Mentioned in no. 1073.5 [=1046]. Saulnier 1974 A and 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1073.4 (J: 1038; S: 1073.4) – [1549] – X to X – Mentioned in no. 1073.5 [=1046]. Saulnier 1974 A and 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1073.6 (J: 1044; S: 1073.6) – [1549] – Marguerite de Navarre to Diane de Poitiers – Mentioned in no. 1073.5 [=1046]. Saulnier 1974 A and 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1073.7 (J: 1045; S: 1073.7) – [1549] – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean Bertrandi, President – Mentioned in no. 1073.5 [=1046]. Saulnier 1974 A and 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1073.8 (J: 1045; S: 1073.8) – [1549] – Marguerite de Navarre to Margat – Mentioned in no. 1073.5

- [=1046]. Saulnier 1974 A and 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.11 (J: 1078; S: 1071.11) – [1549]. 20 March – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1071.12 (S: 1071.12) – [1549. c. 22 March] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Henry II – Allusion in 1071.11. BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. For 1071.11, see Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.13 (J: 1080; S: 1071.13) – [1549. c. 22 March] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Diane de Poitiers – Allusion in 1071.11. BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. For 1071.11, see Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.14 (J: 1082; S: 1071.14) – [1549. c. 22 March] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean de Lorraine, Cardinal – Allusion in 1071.11. BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. For 1071.11, see Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.15 (J: 1081; S: 1071.15) – [1549. c. 22 March] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to M. de St-André – Allusion in 1071.11. BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. For 1071.11, see Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.16 (S: 1071.16) – [1549. c. 22 March] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to X – Allusion in 1071.11. BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. For 1071.11, see Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.17 (J: 1079; S: 1071.17) – [1549. c. 22 March] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Anne de Montmorency – Allusion in 1071.11. BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. For 1071.11, see Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1071.18 (J: 1083; S: 1071.18) – [1549. c. 22 March] – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Jean Bertrandi, President – Allusion in 1071.11. BnF f.fr. 3638, f. 73. For 1071.11, see Ritter, no. 40; mention Génin 1, p. 411. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1072 (J: 1072; S: 1072) – [1549]. Easter – Marguerite de Navarre to Mme. de La Rochefoucault – BnF f.fr. 2972, f. 3. Jourda, no. 34, 130-131; Jourda, “Rép.,” 240. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1071.2 (S: 1071.2) – 1549. 1 April – Marguerite to – Collection Alfred Bovet, no. 2032. Saulnier 1971. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: No.
- 1073 (J: 1073; S: 1073) – [1549]. 22 April – Pau – Marguerite de Navarre to Mme. de La Rochefoucault – BnF f.fr. 3081, f. 1. Génin 1, p. 394, no. 160. Saulnier 1974 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1073.5 (J: 1046; S: 1073.5) – [1549]. 13 June – Paul – Marguerite de Navarre to Izernay – BnF f.fr. 3035, f. 80; Clairambault 313, f. 356. Génin 1, p. 383, no. 153. [not p. 183, no. 353 as Jourda]. Saulnier 1974 A, notes 1975 A. – New: No. Extant: Yes. Edited: Yes.
- 1130 (J: 1130) – Suppress letter, Jourda incorrectly states that there are 8 verse-lettres addressed by Francis I to Marguerite Champollion-Figeac, Poésies de François Ier, 198-199, nos. 16-23, which he numbers, without date, 1130-1137. Only Champollion-Figeac nos. 16 and no. 20 are definitely ascribed as from Francis to Marguerite. Moreover, the volume contains many other letters from Marguerite’s correspondence that need to be checked against her extant correspondence as well as her literary oeuvre. All of these need to be thoroughly researched before they can be assigned a serial number and tentative date. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
- 1131 (J: 1131) – Suppress letter, see 1130. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.

- 1132 (J: 1132) – Suppress letter, see 1130. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
 1133 (J: 1133) – Suppress letter, see 1130. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
 1134 (J: 1134) – Suppress letter, see 1130. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
 1135 (J: 1135) – Suppress letter, see 1130. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
 1136 (J: 1136) – Suppress letter, see 1130. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.
 1137 (J: 1137) – Suppress letter, see 1130. – New: No. Extant: No. Edited: No.

Appendix A: Index 1. Changes to Jourda's Repertory Numbers

Jourda	Saulnier	New Register	Jourda	Saulnier	New Register
			67	239.2	239.2
16	16.3	16.3	75	75.1	75.1
17	16.4	16.4	77	78.1	78.1
17	16.1	16.1	78	78.2	78.2
21	22.1	22.1	79	75.2	75.2
23	24.1	24.1	80	81.1	81.1
26	27.1	27.1	98		98.1
27	27.5	27.5	139		139.1
29	27.2	27.2	213	206.1	206.1
30	32.2	32.2	214	215	215
31	32.1	32.1	215	214	214
36	36.1	36.1	224	334.1	334.1
37	36.2	36.2	225	334.2	334.2
43	20.4	20.4	229	234.1	234.1
44	68.1	68.1	230	220.1	220.1
45	68.2	68.2	231	227.1	227.1
46	68.3	68.3	242	239.1	239.1
53	54.1	54.1	256	250.1	250.1

Jourda	Saulnier	New Register	Jourda	Saulnier	New Register
294	310.1	310.1	1015	646.4	818.01
302	313.1	313.1	1017	933.2	933.2
326		326.1	1022	933.1	933.1
361		361.1	1038	1073.1	1073.1
369	118.1	118.1	1038	1073.2	1073.2
370	118.2	118.2	1038	1073.4	1073.4
374		357.1	1038	1073.3	1073.3
472		472.1	1044	1073.6	1073.6
494		494.1	1045	1073.8	1073.8
560		560.1	1045	1073.7	1073.7
561	584.1	584.1	1046	1073.5	1073.5
562	584.3	584.3	1052	1054.1	1054.1
617	1069.5	1069.5	1055	1056.1	1056.1
618	1069.6	1069.6	1064	1067.1	1067.1
646	646.2	646.2	1066	1063.5	1063.5
722	1069.3	1069.3	1067	1063.6	1063.6
776	226.1	226.1	1070	1069.4	1069.4
875	858.1	858.1	1078	1071.11	1071.11
895	896.1	896.1	1079	1071.17	1071.17
917	938.1	938.1	1080	1071.13	1071.13
918	938.3	938.3	1081	1071.15	1071.15
919	938.4	938.4	1082	1071.14	1071.14
954	1063.1	1063.1	1083	1071.18	1071.18
955	1063.2	1063.2	1088	978.1	978.1
956	1063.4	1063.4	1100	646.1	646.1

Jourda	Saulnier	New Register
1102	1059.1	1059.1
1119	585.3	585.3
1121	1068.1	1068.1
1138	243.1	243.1
1139	891.1	891.1
1140	1069.1	1069.1
1141	1069.2	1069.2

Appendix B: Books Related to the Navarrian Network

Part I of this appendix contains a bibliography of some two hundred evangelical books in over four hundred and fifty editions that the Navarrian network likely produced or used. The list is based on much hard fact and is intended to stimulate further research to test and expand the findings of this study. It aims to provide a profile of the Navarrian network's public campaign to promote its evangelical agenda.

Which books have been included and why? The core of the bibliography centers on the works written, edited, dedicated, or printed by known members of the Navarrian network. Other treatises make the list because they share some salient characteristics with the foregoing. 'Damned by association' (which is exactly how 16th century censors located and why they condemned such books), these works have some connection with the Navarrian network in particular, or the evangelical movement as a whole. For example, the catalogues of printers whom Marguerite protected, such as Simon Du Bois or Antoine Augereau, or with whom authors from the network habitually printed, or who reprinted books first published by the foregoing have been culled for other likely sounding titles on the principle that one good heretical book often deserved another. However, no book has merited entry based on its printer alone. All exhibit some evangelical or reformist orientation.

What books does the list not contain that may belong? The full bibliographies of certain evangelical authors are not included. For instance, not every reprint of Rabelais's works is included, only the first editions and some significant reprints: enough to frame his contribution, which is listed in full in Higman. The same procedure applies to Clément Marot's literary oeuvre, which appeared in over 200 editions during the first half of the century. For these, consult C.A. Mayer's bibliography. Certainly not all of Marot's writings and translations were 'religious' in the strict sense of the word. The same arguments apply to a group of less well known literary figures who gravitated in Marguerite's orbit such as the Neo-Latin poets Jean Salmon, known as "Macrin," Jean Visagier, and Nicolas Bourbon. After the work of scholars such as Lucien Febvre and Gérard Defaux, who now would still maintain there was a clear distinction between '*amour profane*' and '*amour divine*' in the writings of French evangelicals? That demarcation line, if it must be drawn, should be rather more inclusive than less to begin with and then established through further research. Too narrow an initial focus will inevitably distort the image of the evangelical movement. French evangelicals wove their religious thought into nominally 'secular' topics, whether French love poetry or neo-classical Latin *epigrammata*. Their use of primarily in literary genres after 1535 is a hallmark of the early French reformation. Catholic censors concentrated on the usual 'religious' genres, such as biblical commentaries and devotional tracts.

Francis Higman's bibliography of religious books the French language, *Piety and the People 1511-1551*, has served as the basis for this selection. Approximately two-thirds of the works listed below can be found in Higman's work and are so indicated at the far right of the first line of the entry by his letter-number reference, e.g., B 69. Consult his valuable work for the abbreviations and short titles used in the notes to each entry and location of exemplars. To this core have been added more notes to the titles repertoried by Higman as well as other works in French and Latin that merit inclusion based on the criteria outlined above. The entries are ordered by year and within each year by author, then title. The notes contain references to modern editions and selected secondary studies. A working list of authors who were part of Marguerite's network precedes the bibliography. A model entry precedes the table.

Part II of this appendix lists manuscripts written or edited by network members from circa 1520-1550, many of which never made it to print and are not extant, but are clearly attested in the sources.

Part III enumerates works read or sought by members of the Network in 1524, which are discussed in chapter 7.

Part IV provides a working list of books dedicated to Marguerite with extensive notes, augmenting the one dressed by Pierre Jourda in 1929. Marguerite's persona as patron of letters and as patron of religious reformers elided.

Authors Published by Navarrian Network

Agrippa, Henri Cornelius.
 Arande, Michel d'.
 Augustine, St.
 Baduel, Claude.
 Berquin, Louis de.
 Bigot, Guillaume.
 Bodius, Herman [Martin Bucer?].
 Bourbon, Nicolas.
 Branteghem, Guillaume.
 Briçonnet, Guillaume.
 Brodeau, Victor.
 Brunfels, Otto.
 Campen, Jean de.
 Caroli, Pierre.
 Carraciolo, Antoine.
 Coct, Anémond de.
 Columbi, Jean.
 Cop, Nicolas.
 Dentièrre, Marie.
 Dolet, Étienne.
 Du Bellay, Guillaume.
 Du Bellay, Jean.
 Dumolin, Guillaume.
 Farel, Guillaume.
 Gringore, Pierre.
 John Chrysostom, St.
 Lambert, François.
 Landry, François.
 Le Sueur, Nicolas.
 Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.
 Malingre, Matthieu.
 Marguerite de Navarre.
 Marot, Clément.
 Mazurier, Martial.
 Meigret, Aimé.
 Papillon, Antoine.
 Poc [Pocquet], Antoine.
 Rabelais, François.
 Roussel, Gérard.
 Salomon, Jean, Florimond.
 Salmon, Jean, Macrin.
 Saunier, Antoine.
 Sleiden, Johann.
 Ste-Marthe, Charles de.
 Sturm, Johannes.
 Vauzelles, Jean de.
 Visagier, Jean.

Appendix B I: A Checklist of Books Related to the Navarrian Network

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

Quincuplex Psalterium: Gallicum, Romanum, Hebraicum, Vetus, Conciliatum.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 31 July 1509.

Rice no. CCXXIX. Bedouelle, THR, fac-simile of 1513 edition.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Epistola ad Rhomanos. Epistola prima ad Corinthios ... Epistola ad Hebraeos. Ad has 14 adiecta intelligentia ex Graeco: Epistola ad Laodicenses. Epistolae ad Senecam sex. Commentariorum libri quatuordecim.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 15 December 1512.

Rice no. CCXLV. Panzer 7, p. 565, no. 557. Renouard, Estienne, 10. Mortimer 1, no. 61.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

Quincuplex Psalterium: Gallicum, Romanum, Hebraicum, Vetus, Conciliatum.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 13 June 1513.

Rice no. CCXXX.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Contenta. Epistola ad Rhomanos ... In hac secunda emissione obiter relegendo commentarios: castigata sunt nonnulla: aut quia deravata, aut quia minus placebant subtracta etiam nonnulla aut immutata, sed haec pauca.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 1515.

Rice no. CCXLVI. Panzer 8, p. 24, no. 800. Renouard, Estienne, 16.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

Quincuplex Psalterium: Gallicum, Romanum, Hebraicum, Vetus, Conciliatum.

Rouen: Pierre Olivier for Michel Angier, 15 May 1515.

Rice no. CCXXXI. Delisle, Caen, no. 336, pp. 310-311.

Baston pour chasser les loups.

Le Baston pour chasser les loups.

[Lyon]: s.n., 1517-1522.

Berthoud, Marcourt, p. 151. Naef, Origines I, 419.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Commentarii in Pauli epistolas.

Paris: Regnault, 1517.

[Erasmus, Desiderius]

Julius exclusus.

[Paris: Jean de Gourmont, c. 1518].

Moreaux, "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'Epistola Luciferi," 343-359; 346 n. 32, 351.

[Erasmus, Desiderius]

Julius exclusus.

[Paris: Jean de Gourmont, c. 1518].

Moreaux, "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'Epistola Luciferi," 343-359; 346 n. 32, 351.

[Hutten, Ulrich von.]

Nemo [Ontis].

[Paris: Jean de Gourmont, c. 1518].

Moreaux, "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'Epistola Luciferi," 343-359; 346 n. 31, 351.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

De Maria Magdalena et triduo Christi disceptatio, ad clarissimum virum D. Franciscum Molineum, Christianissimi Francorum Regis Francisci Primi magistrum.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 1517 [1518 n.s.].

Rice no. CCLVIII. Renouard, Estienne, 19. B. Belg. L 594.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

De Maria Magdalena, triduo Christi, et ex tribus Maria disceptatio: ad clarissimum virum D. Franciscum Molinum, Christianissimi Francorum Regis Francisci Primi magistrum. Secunda emissio.

Paris: Henri Estienne, [before 22 July] 1518.

Rice no. CCLIX. Renouard, Estienne, 20. B. Belg. L 596.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Iacobi Fabri Stapulensis, de Maria Magdalena et triduo Christi, disceptatio, concionatoribus verbi Divini ad prime utilis.

Hagenau: Thomas Anshelm Badensis, December 1518.

Rice no. CCLX. Rép. bibl., Hagenau: T. Anshelm 20. B. Belg. L 595. Ritter 2 (20), p. 550, no. 833.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Agones martyrum mensis ianuarii libro primo contenti.

[Paris: Henri Estienne, c. 1519].

Rice, CCLXXV. Renouard, Estienne, 23.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

De Maria Magdalena, triduo Christi, et una ex tribus Maria, disceptatio: ad clarissimum virum D. Franciscum Molinum, Christianissimi Francorum Regis Francisci Primi magistrum. Tertia emissio.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 1519.

Rice no. CCLXI. Renouard, Estienne, 21. B. Belg. L 597.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

De Tribus et unica Madgalena disceptatio secunda: ad reverendum in Chrsito Patrem D. Dionysium Bricconnetum Episcopum Maclouiensem apud Leonem X. Pontificem Max. Christianissimi Francorum Regis Francisci I oratorem.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 1519.

Rice no. CCLXII. Renouard, Estienne, 21. B. Belg. L 598.

Nesen, Wilhelm.

Dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium.

Paris: Conrad Resch, 1519.

Longeon, *Farce des Theologastres*, 46. Text: Henry de Vocht, *History of the foundation and the rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517-1550*, Louvain, 1951, pp. 548-573.

Briçonnet, Guillaume.

Sermo Synodalis R.. in Christo patris D. Guillermi Meldensis Episcopi, habitus Meldis, anno 1519, die 13 Octobris.

Paris: Henri Estienne, 1520.

Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales... (1519 et 1520)," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27 (1978), 86-127, Henri Tardif, "Un discours synodal..." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* 71 (1976), 91-108.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Georges, d'Halewijn, trans.

E 26

De la declamation de louenges de folie, stille facessieux et profitable pour congnoistre les erreurs et abuz du monde.

Paris: Pierre Vidoue for Galliot du Pré, 2 August 1520.

Moreau 2, no. 2324.

Nesen, Wilhelm.

Epistola de magistris nostris Lovaniensibus, quot et quales sint, quibus debemus magistralem illam damnationem Lutherianam. [et sequitur vita sancti Nicolai sive stultitiae exemplar].

[Schlettstadt: Lazarus Schürer, 1520].

ZW 7, no. 111, pp. 378-401, with text. Longeon, *Farce des Theologastres*, 46. Henry de Vocht, *History of the foundation and the rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517-1550* (Louvain, 1951), pp. 585-596, with text.

Determinatio secunda almae facultatis Parisiensis

Determinatio secunda almae facultatis Parisiensis.

[Before 1 August 1521].

Epistolae Luciferi

Epistolae Luciferi. Isthec ipistola fuit a paucis diebus casu rep[er]ta ... hanc ad verbu fideliter describi suravi nihil ommittens dictorum luciferi.

[Paris: Jean de Gourmont, 1521?].

Moreaux, Brigitte. "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'Epistola Luciferi," 343-359.

La Détermination de Luther

"La Détermination de Luther."

[Paris?]: s.n., Before 31 August 1521.

Weiss, "Poursuites contre les Hérétiques (1522-1589)," *BSHPF* 80 (1931), 506.

Litanea Germanorum.

Litanea Germanorum.

Paris: Pierre Vidoue, [1521].

Moreau 3, no. 166.

Melanchthon, Philip.

Adversus furiosum parisiensis theologastroum decretum, Philippi Melanchthonis pro Luthero apologia.

[Basel: Adam Petri, 1521].

VD16: M2432.

Neuen, Wilhelm.

Epistola de magistris nostris Lovaniensibus... quibus debemus... illam damnationem Lutheranam [et Sequitur Vita sancti Nicolai sive stultitiae exemplar].

[Paris: Michel Lesclencher, c. 1521].

Moreau 3, no. 186bis. Longeon, *Farce des Theologastres*, 46. Published in : ZW 7, no. 111, pp. 378-401. Henry de Vocht, "History of the foundation and the rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517-1550," Louvain, 1951, pp. 585-596.

Roussel, Gérard.

Divi Severini Boetii arithmetica duobus discreta libris edente.

Paris: , 1521.

[Carlstadt (Karlstadt), Andreas. "Pastor Combergensis"]

Contra papisticas leges sacerdotibus prohibentes matrimonium Apologia pastoris Combergensis qui nuper suae ecclesiae consensu uxorem duxit.

[Paris: Jean de Gourmont, Before 21 March 1522].

Moreau 3 no. 342. Moreau, "Une impression clandestine," 347 and note 33, p. 351. U. Baurmeister, "Eine unbekannte Ausgabe der verteidigungsschrift," in "Gutenberg Jahrbuch (1977), pp. 127-133.

Augustine, Saint.

A 30, B 7

Le Mirouer des vanitez et pompes du monde.

Paris: [Pierre Vidoue] for Galliot du Pré, [1522?].

Moreau 3, no. 367.

Baston pour chasser les loups.

B 2

Le Baston pour chasser les loups.

[Geneva: Jaques Vivian, 1522?].

Briçonnet, Guillaume.

Alter Sermo Synodalis R. ... in Christo patris D. Guillermi, Meldensis Ministri, habitus Meldis, anno 1520, Mense Octobri.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 1522.

Veissière, "Duo sermones synodales... (1519 et 1520)." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 27 (1978), 86-127.

Tardif, "Un autre discours synodal..." *R. des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 60 (1976), 419-445.

Carlstadt (Karlstadt), Andreas.

De celibatu et viduitate, auctore Andrea Carlestadio.

[Before 21 March 1522].

Erasmus, Desiderius.

Paraphrases

1522.

Bedouelle and Roussel, "La lecture de la Bible en langue vivante" p.62.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Commentarii Initiatorii in Quatuor Evangelia. In evangelium secundum Matthaeum. In evangelium secundum Marcum. In evangelium secundum Lucam. In evangelium secundum Ioannem.

Meaux: Simon de Colines, June 1522.

Rice no. CCLXXVI. Herminjard I. Olin, *Catholic Reformation*, 107-118, English trans. of Preface.

Rép. bibl.: Meaux: S. de Colines, 2. Renouard, Colines, 36-38. A. Endrew, "Les débuts de l'imprimerie à Meaux." *Positions luthériennes*, 12 (1964) 95-104.

Oecolampadius, Johannes.

Quod expediat Epistolae et Evangelii lectionem in Missa vernaculo sermone plebi promulgari.

[Augsburg: S. Grimm & M. Wirsung], 1522.

Oekol. bibl. no. 66. Bedouelle and Roussel, "La lecture de la Bible en langue vivante" p.62.

Oecolampadius, Johannes.

Quod expediat epistolae et evangelii lectionem in Missa, vernaculo sermone plebi promulgari.

Oecolampadii ad Hedionem Epistola. Legat, expendat, quisquis sacra complectitur: Est, quod pectus vere Christianum delectet.

[Strasbourg: Ulrich Morhart, 1522].

Oekol. bibl. no. 67. Bedouelle and Roussel, "La lecture de la Bible en langue vivante" p.62.

Roussel, Gérard.

In hoc libro contenta: Opus magnorum moralium Aristotelis, duos libros complectens. G. Rufo interprete.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 20 September 1522.

Rice, no. 136, 445-449.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 152

Les choses contenues en ce present livre. Une epistre exhortatoire. La S. Evangile selon S. Matthieu. La S. Evangile selon S. Marc. La S. Evangile selon S. Luc. La S. Evangile selon S. Jehan. aucunes annotations. [Part 2: Epistres, Actes...

Paris: Simon de Colines, 8 June 1523.

Chambers no. 31. Rice nos. CCLXXXI & CCLXXXVIII. Herminjard I, no. 69, 132. Facs. reprod. ed.

M.A. Screech. Renouard, Colines, 51-52. Van Eys 2, no. 3. Darlow and Moule, no. 3705.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Commentarii Initiatorii in Quatuor Evangelia. In evangelium secundum Matthaum. In evangelium secundum Marcum. In evangelium secundum Lucam. In evangelium secundum Ioannem. Iacobo Fabro Authore.

Basel: Andreas Cratander, March 1523.

Rice no. CCLXXVII. Panzer 6, p. 239, no. 497.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Über die wortt Christi. Mat. xvi. Ir kindt urtailen die gestalt des himels, aber die zeichen der zeit mügt ir nit erkennen. Ain erklerung Jacobi Fabri Scapulensis, darinn angezeigt und probiert wirt, das der recht Messias kommen sei, aber die Juden ...

[Augsburg: Melchior Rammingen], 1523.

Moore, 484, no. 175. VD16: 11, L 963.

Ten commandments and Creed.

"Commandements des Hébreux et des chétiens, le Symbole de Nicea"

[Paris?: s.n., before 22 Aug. 1523].

Clerval, "Registres," 22 August 1523, p. 380, note, 60, p. 421.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 154

Les choses contenues en ce present livre. La S. Evangile selon S. Matthieu, Marc, Luc, Jehan. [II]:

- Epistres, Actes, Apocalypse.*
[Paris: Antoine Couteau], 12 October 1524.
Chambers no. 35
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 155**
Les choses contenues en ce present livre. La S. Evangile selon S. Matthieu, Marc, Luc, Jehan. [II]: Epistres, Actes, Apocalypse.
Paris: [Antoine Couteau], for Simon de Colines, 12 October 1524.
Chambers no. 36.
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 156**
Les choses contenues en ce present livre. La S. Evangile selon S. Matthieu, Marc, Luc, Jehan. [II]: Epistres, Actes, Apocalypse.
Antwerp: Guillaume Vorsterman, 22 November 1524 - 4 January 1525.
Chambers no. 38. NK no. 2503.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 71**
Les choses contenues en ce present livre: une epistre comment on doit prier Dieu, le psaultier de David, pour trouver les sept psaulmes accoustumez, qui a devotion de les dire. Arguement brief sur chascun pseaulme pour Chrestienement prier et ...
Paris: Simon de Colines, 16 February 1523 [1524 n.s.].
Rice, nos. 139 & 142, CCCXII-CCCXV. Moreau 3, no. 427. Renouard, Colines, 53. See Veyrin-Forrer, BHR, precision to Defaux's article on Marot
- St. John Chrysostom. Oecolampadius, Johannes, trans.. Nicolas Bérault, ed.**
Divi Joannis Chrysostomi Psegmata quedam nuperrime a Joanne Oecolampaido in Latinum vesa.
Paris: Jean Petit, September 1524.
Stehelin.
- St. John Chrysostom. Oecolampadius, Johannes, trans.**
Divi Joannis Chrysostomi... in totum Geneseos librum homiliae sexagintasex a Joanne Oecolampadio hoc anno versae.
Paris: Jean Petit, July 1524.
Oekol. Br. 1, no. 204, for prefatory epistle.
- Coct, Anémond de. Luther, Martin. Zwingli, Ulrich.**
In hoc libello contenta. Annemundi Cocti Equitis Galli ad lectorem Epistola. Christianissimi doctoris Martini Lutheri ad illustrissimum principem Carolum Sabaudiae ducem Epistola. Huldrici Zuinglii Tigurini Episcopi vigilantissimi ad Petrum Sebivillam.
[Zurich: Christoph Froschauer], February [1524].
WA 3, no. 657, 148-154. ZW, 8, no. 325, 142-147; Herminjard 1, no. 76, 151-153; no. 82, 173-177; and no. 86, 184-186.
- Erasmus, Desiderius.**
"Paraphrases d'Erasme sur les évangiles de Luc et de Marc."
[Paris: s.n., 1524].
- Erasmus, Desiderius.**
Exomolgesis sive modus confitendi.
Basel: Froben, 1524.

- Allen EE 5, no. 1426, 411-412. for the preface.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Chansonette, Claude, trans.** E 36
Maniere de se confesser.
 Basel: [Andreas Cratander], 26 February 1524.
 Moore no. 135. Bietenholz no. 241. Condemned in the Paris Index I no. 88 (Latin), 92 (Latin and French), 259 (Latin, anonymous), 322 (Fr.), 390 (Fr., anonymous). Droz, Chemins I, 6-41, with text.
- [Farel, Guillaume and Strasbourg reformers?]**
Determinatio Facultatis Theologie Parisiensis, super aliquibus propositionibus, certis à locis [De quibus Ptolomeus 19 tabula Africe] nuper adeam delatis, de veneratione sanctorum, de canone missae [Expositio].
 Basel: Andreas Cratander, [March] 1524.
 Gilmont, no. 20-1 puts this among the doubtful attributions to Farel. *Weiss, N. "Guillaume Farel: Ses premiers Travaux 1521-1524," BSHPF 68 (1919) 179-214; extracts of preface and text, 203-209.
- [Farel, Guillaume?]** F 7
Epistre chrestienne.
 [Basel]: s.n., 1524.
 Gilmont, Farel, no. 21-1, puts this among the doubtful attributions to Farel. Tricard, APR, 4-13.
 Droz,
 Chemins I, 45n.
- Farel, Guillaume.**
Gulielmus Farellus christianis lectoribus. Februar [1524].
 [Basel: Andreas Cratander], February 1524.
 Gilmont, "Oeuvre imprimé Farel," no. 1-1, 113. Herminjard I, no. 91, 193-195.
- [Farel, Guillaume.] [Luther, Martin.]** F 24
Le Pater noster, et le Credo en françois, avec une tresbelle, et tresutile exposition, et declaration sur chascun faicte en forme de contemplation et oraison fort proufitable pour enflamber le cuer.
 [Basel: Andreas Cratander, Beginning August] 1524.
 Higman, ed., TLF. Gilmont, Farel, no.2-1. Herminjard I, no. 109, p. 252.
- Lambert, Francois.**
In Cantica canticorum Salomonis, libellum quidem sensibus altiss in quo sublimia sacri Coniugii mysteria, quae in Christo et Ecclesia sunt, pertractantur, Francisci Lamb. Auenionensis Comentarii, Wittembergae praelecti.
 Strasbourg: [Johannes Herwagen, August] 1524.
 Bodenman, 6.a?
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.**
Psalterium David, Argumentis fronti cuiuslibet psalmi adiectis, Hebraica et Chaldaica multis in locis tralatione illustratum.
 Paris: [Simon de Colines, <1 May 1524].
 Rice, no. 140, 470-477 (Latin). Herminjard 4, no. 99a, 431-435 (partial Latin); Bedouelle, 213-217 (partial Latin and French translation).
- Meigret, Aimé.** M 58
Epistre en Latin de maistre Aimé Meigret Théologien, à messeigneurs du Parlement de Grenoble.

Plus un Sermon en Francois presché à Grenoble par l'edicté Meigret le jour saint Marc Evangeliste, l'an de grace mil cinq cens vingtquatre.

[c. 21 Nov. 1524].

Moore, no. 185. Henri Guy, "Le Sermon d'Aimé Meigret." *Annales de Univ. de Grenoble* 5 (1928).

Nathaniel Weiss, "Les débuts de la réforme en France d'après quelques documents inédits. VII. Amié Meigret..." *BSHPF* 74 (1925), 1-20.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 159

Le nouveau testament contenant ce qui est declare en la page subseuente.

"Turin"[Lyons?]: "François Cavillon"[Claude Nourry?, François Carcan?, 1525?].

Chambers no. 41. Baudrier III, 8. Droz, APR 50-5 (reprod. t.p.)

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 153

Les choses contenues en ce present livre. La S. Evangile selon S. Matthieu, Marc, Luc, Jehan. [II]: Epistres, Actes, Apocalypse.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 12 April [1524/5].

Chambers no. 34. Rice no. CCLXXXII & CCXC. Renouard, Colines, 65-66. Van Eys 2, no. 4.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 158

Les choses contenues en ce present Livre. La S. Evangile selon S. Mathieu, Marc, Luc, Jehan. [II]: Epistres, Actes, Apocalypse.

Paris: Simon Du Bois, 6-19 October 1525.

Clutton no. 1. Chambers no. 40. Higman, Censorship, 78. Cat. Rothschild no. 2738.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 157

Les choses contenues en ceste partie du nouveau testament.

Basel: [Andreas Cratander, for Johann Schabler], 1525.

Chambers no. 39.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Ailly, Pierre d', commentator. [Caroli, Pierre trans.?] B 73

Les sept pseaulmes du royal prophete David, exposees: puis nagueres divulgues.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1525?].

Moreau 3, no. 896bis. Clutton no. 29. Index no. 469. N. Weiss *BSHPF* (1902) p. 436. Brunet 5, 297.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 72

Le psaultier de David. Arguement brief sur chascun pseaulme.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 20 June 1525.

Rice, no 142, 487-493, cf. no. 139.

St. John Chrysostom.

"Homelies."

[Meaux/Paris?: Simon de Colines?, before August 1525].

AN X1a, 8 342, 255v., cited in Veissière, *BSHPF*, 1986, p. 549. Moreau and Rep. Bibl. have no references for any such edition.

Epistolae Luciferi

Epistolae Luciferi. Isthec ipistola fuit a paucis diebus casu reperta... hanc ad verbu fideliter describi curavi nihil ommittens dictorum luciferi.

[Antwerp?: s.n., 1525?].

Moreaux, Brigitte. "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'Epistola

- Luciferi," 343-359.
- Erasmus, Desiderius.** **E 35**
Exhortation au peuple. Achevez de lire: et puis juges
 [Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1525?].
 Moore no. 136. NK no. 2984.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans.]** **E 27**
Declamation des louenges de mariage.
 [Paris: Simon Du Bois, After May 1 1525].
 Clutton no. 38. Facsimile edition, Telle, TLF, 225. Moore no. 134. Moreau 3, no. 816.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans.]** **E 57**
Le symbole des apostres (qu'on dict vulgairement le Credo) contenant les articles de la foi: par maniere de dialogue: par demande et par response. La pluspart extraict d'ung traicte de Erasme de Rotterdam intitule "Devises familiares."
 [Paris: Simon Du Bois, After May 1 1525].
 Clutton no. 39. Telle, TLF 271 for facimile edition. Moreau 3 no. 819.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans.] [Farel, Guillaume].** **E 15**
Brefve admonition de la maniere de prier: selon la doctrine de Jesuchrist. Avec une brefve explanation du Pater noster. Extrait des paraphrases de Erasme sur saint Matthieu et sur saint Luc.
 [Paris: Simon Du Bois, After May 1 1525].
 Moore no. 134. Clutton no. 37. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 321. Moreau 3, no. 813. Bibliotheca Belgica. fasc. 212, p. 31 seq. Telle, TLF no. 271.
- Exhortation sur ces saintes parolles de nostre segneur Jesus.** **E 71**
Exhortation sur ces saintes parolles de nostre segneur [sic] Jesus "Retournes vous, et croyes à l'evangile" prinse sur la sainte escripture, en laquelle est declaire l'efficace de l'evangile, c'est le grand bien qu'il en advient à l'homme.
 [Basel: Andreas Cratander, 1525?].
- [Farel, Guillaume.] [Luther, Martin.] [Et al.]** **F 25 [inc. L 85 & L 117]**
L'Oraison de Jesuchrist, qui est le Pater noster, et le Credo, avec la declaration d'iceulx. La saluation angelique. Les dix commandemens. Les sept pseaulmes: et autres choses tresutiles.
 [Paris: Simon de Colines, 1525?].
 Gilmont, Farel, 2-2. Higman, Palaestra, with modern edition of the "Declaration." Partial ed. of "Dec." in Higman, "La Diffusion." NK 1632 attributes this to Antwerp, Martin de Keyser, beware.
- [Farel, Guillaume?]** **F 8**
Epistre Chrestienne tresutile à ceulx qui commencent lire la sainte parolle de Dieu, ilz soient edifiez, congnoissant la consummation de toute l'escripture.
 [Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1525?].
 Gilmont 'Farel' 21-1 (dubious attrib.). Moore no. 130. Tricard APR 4-12. Bujanda, Index 1, 419. Moreau 3, no. 811.
- [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, et al.]** **L 19**
Les choses contenues en ce present livre. Épistres et Évangiles pour les cinquante et deux semaines de l'an: commenceans au premier dimenche de Laduent... Apres chascune epistre et evangile briefue

exhortation selon l'intelligence d'icelle.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1525].

Rice no. CCCXVII. Clutton no. 32. Facs. ed. by Screech, THR 1963. Index I no. 401. Moreau 3 no. 861.

[Luther, Martin].
25]

L 117 [in F

La Maniere de mediter et penser à la passion de nostre sauveur Jesuchrist.

[Paris: Simon de Colines, 1525?].

Machiels no. 077. NK no. 1632. Gilmont 'Farel' 2-2.

[Luther, Martin].

L 81

Brief racueil des oeuvres des dix commandemens.

[Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1525?].

Moore, no. 5. Benzing, Luther, no. 812. NK, no. 3470.

[Luther, Martin.]

L 85 [in F 25]

Declaration d'aucuns motz desquelz use souvent saint Pol en ses epistres.

[Paris: Simon de Colines, 1525?].

Gilmont, Farel, 2-2. Higman, Palaestra, with modern edition of the "Declaration." Partial ed. of "Dec." in Higman, "La Diffusion."

[Luther, Martin.]

L 86

Des bonnes oeuvres sus les commandemens de Dieu.

[Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1525?].

Moore no. 4. Benzing, 'Luther,' no. 648. NK no. 3469.

[Luther, Martin.]

L 91

Exposition sur les dix commandemens de la loi.

[Paris: Simon de Colines, 1525?].

Moreau 3, no. 821.

Luther, Martin.

L 88

Une exposition sur le Magnificat.

[Paris: Simon de Colines?, 1525?].

[Luther, Martin.]

L 89

Une exposition sur le Magnificat.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1525].

Clutton no. 44. Moore no. 9.

[Luther, Martin]. [Lambert, François, trans.?)

L 113

Livre tresutile de la vraie et parfaite subjection des chrestiens, et ensemble de la sacrée franchise et liberté qu'ilz ont en Saint-Esperit.

[Strasbourg: Johann Schott for Wolfgang Köpfel, before July 1525].

Peter, "Prem. ouvrages, suite 2," 1980, no. 0a, 36-38. Bujanda, Index I, no. 488. Higman, Censorship, 83, 141, and 156. Bodenmann, p. 162.

[Melanchthon, Philip]

R 38

Brief recueil de la substance et principal fondement de la doctrine Evangelique.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, c. September 1525].

Clutton no. 46. Tricard APR, pp. 12-17. Moreau 3, no. 775. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 479. Higman, Censorship, p. 84. BSHPF (1896), 165.

Petit livre de la loy et de l'Evangile avec la force d'iceux. L 67

Petit livre de la loi et de l'évangile, de l'effect et force des deux, et de la difference diceux.

Responses

à quinze obiections de predestination.

[Paris?: Simon de Colines?, 1525?].

Index 2, no. 1546.189. Clarion 27.

Zwingli, Ulrich.

De vera et falsa religione Commentarius.

Zurich: Christophe Froschouer, April 1525.

Text: ZW 3, 590-912. ZW 9, no. 600, p. 74, n. 5. Roussel, in *Le Livre et la Réforme*, for French trans. of dedicatory epistle. P. Feret, "La faculté de théologie de Paris II" (1901), p. 30 ff.

Agrippa von Nettesheim, Heinrich Cornelius.

Brefve declamation du saint sacrement de mariage: compose en latin per Henricum Cornelium Agrippam et par lui traduit en vulgaire françois.

[Lyon]: "Le Prince" [Claude Nourry], 1526.

Droz, Chemins 2, 1-27, with major portions transcribed, including dedicatory letter to Marguerite.

Picot: Prost, Corneille Agrippa, II, 506.

Ammonius of Alexandria. Nachtigall, Ottomar, trans. Vauzelles, Jean de, trans. N 1

Histoire evangelique des quatres evangelistes un ung, fidelement abregee, recitant par ordre sans obmettre ni adouster Les notables faictz de nostre seigneur Jesuchrist ...

Lyon: Gilbert de Villiers, 1526.

Moore, no. 84, p. 155. Cat. Coste, no. 25. Brunet, III, 203. E. Picot, *les Français italianisants*, I, p. 119.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Ailly, Pierre d', commentator. [Caroli, Pierre trans?] [B 73bis]

Les sept pseaulmes du royal prophete David, exposees: puis nagueres divulguees.

Paris: Jerome Denis, [After 1525].

Babelon, no. 209, 196-197. Brunet 5, 297.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 74

Les choses contenues en ce present livre. Une epistre comment on doit prier Dieu. Une table pour facilement trouver les pseaulmes. Le psaultier de David. Arguement brief sur chascun pseaulme.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 17 February 1526.

Moreau 3, no. 766.

[Heyden, Sebald.] [Luther, Martin.] H 12 [incl. L 121]

D'ung seul mediateur entre Dieu et les hommes, Jesuchrist ... Ung sermon de mammone iniquitatis, c'est à dire des richesses d'iniquité.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1526?].

Clutton no. 45. Moore no. 62. Benzing, Luther, no. 1441. Moreau 3, no. 852.

[Luther, Martin.] L 121 [in H 12]

Ung sermon de mammone iniquitatis.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1526?].

Moore no. 62. Benzing Luther no. 1441. Moreau 3, no. 852. Clutton no. 45.

Misocacus, civis Utopiensis.

Misocacvs civis vtopiensis Philaetis ex sorore nepotis, Dialogi tres. Apud Utopiae avrotuman aedibus Philagathi bibliopolae diligentissimi. Sapiente Orbe.

[Paris: Pierre Vidoue, 1526?].

Moreau 3, no. 1063. Longeon, *La Farce des Théologastres*, p. 30 note 61.

Schuch, Wolfgang. [Lambert, François?]

S 8

Epistre chrestienne envoyee à tresnoble Prince monseigneur le duc de Loraine.

[Strasbourg: Johann Pruss, Jr.] [Johann Knobloch, Sen., 1526?].

Moore, no. 198. Peter, 'Prem. ouvr.' no. 1. Bodenmann, p. 161. Text in: *Peter, R., "Le Martyr Alsacien Wolfgang Schuch." 1987.

Traité du souverain bien.

T 15

La Traicté du souverain bien, par lequel le vrai chrestien pourra apprendre (à l'aide des saintes Escriptions) à contemner la Mort: mesmes icelle desirer, pour avoir claire vision de Dieu, par nostre seigneur Jesuchrist.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1526?].

Clutton no. 47. Tricard, APR, 18-21. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 3. BSHPF (1902) 437.

Augustine, Aurelius.

Divi aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi de Contemptu mundi ad clericos Libellus, nihil esse eis in terra possidendum demonstrans. Plaude, sacerdotum exploditur philargyria.

s.l.: s.n., [c. 1527?].

Find in Migne. Not in Moreau? FRB???

[Berquin, Louis de?].

B 22

La Farce des theologastres à six personnages.

[Lyon: Jean Cantarel, Vve Barnabé Chaussard, 1527? 1523-25].

Longeon, Claude, ed. [Berquin, Louis de?]. "La Farce des Théologastres." TLF 366. Geneva: Droz, 1989. Garside for English translation.

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?]

B 209

L'Union de toutes discordes: qui est ung livre tres utile à tous amateurs de paix et de verite: extraict des principaulx docteurs de l'eglise chrestienne: par le venerable docteur Herman Bodium.

[Antwerp]: Martin Lempereur, 1527.

*Robert Peters, *Studies in Church History* 2 (1965); *J. Trapman in NAKG 63 (1983); *Blouw, *Quaerendo* 1996, 26,2.

Brenz, Johannes.

Hiob cum piis et eruditis Johannis Brentii commentariis, ad Hebraicam veritatem ita [!] translatus, ut nulla porro obscuritas Lectorem possit offendere. Haganoae, per Ioahn. Sece. anno M. D. XXVII.

Cum Privilegio.

Hagenau: Johannes Secerius, 1527.

Köhler, W., "Bibliographi Brentiana," no. 21 [1529 ed., no. 36].

[Dumolin, Guillaume].

D 97

Le traicte de l'utilite et honneste de mariage. Et s'il est licite aux prestres de soi marier. Hebr. 13.

"Mariage est honnorable en tous et la couche sans macule, mais les fornicateurs et adulteres Dieu les jugera." Psal. 85. "Verite se produira hors ..."

Strasbourg: Johann Pruss, 4 April 1527.

Peter, 'Prem. ouvr.,' no. 4. Moore, p. 79 ref. to Brunet II, 878. Ritter, no. 1528.

Dumolin, Guillaume. [Adapted from Heyden, Sebald.]

D 99

Notable et utile traicte Du zele et grant desir que doibt avoir ung vrai l'empereur christien pour garder à Jesuchrist son honneur entier.

Strasbourg: Johanne Pruss, 28 January 1527.

Peter, 'Prem. ouvr.,' no. 3. Moore, p. 126. Ritter no. 1526

Dumolin, Guillaume. [adapted from Bugenhagen, Johann.]

D 98

Tresutile traicte, du vrai regne de antechrist maintenant revele et cogneu, à treshault et trespuissant seigneur, Philippe Marquis d'Arrescot, Conte de Portian et de Beaumont etc. et Capitaine general de l'Empereur nostre sire au pais de Hainault.

Strasbourg: Johann Pruss. [Johann Knobloch, Sen.], 6 January 1527.

Peter, 'Prem. ouvr.,' no. 2. Moore, p. 127. Ritter no. 1527.

[Berquin, Louis de?] [Lefèvre d'Étaples?] Erasmus, Desiderius.

Duodecim Articuli infidelitatis magistri Natalis Bedae, Doctoris in facultate Theologiae Parisiensis: et eiusdem facultatis syndici. Ex libro suarum annotationum (similibus haeresibus et articulis infidelitatis referto & blasphemiiis quae plurimis scatente)

[Paris: Josse Bade, 1527?].

Moreau 3, no. 1135. Longeon, Farce des Theologastres, 45. E.V. Telle, "Declamation de Louange," 42-44, no. 25 and 26. Higman, Censorship, 29-30.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Iacobi Fabri Stapulensis, Theologi Celeberrimi, Commentarii in Epistolas Catholicas, Iacobi I. Petri II. Ioannis III. Iudae I. Nunc primum ab autore emissi et aediti.

Basel: Andreas Cratander and Johannes Behelius, July 1527.

Rice, no. 141, 478-483, no. CCXXI. French translation in Herminjard 2, no. 202, 34-37 (French translation).

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Commentarii in Pauli epistolas.

Basel: Andreas Cratander and J. Bebel, 1527.

[Luther, Martin.]

L 120

Sermon au jour de l'ascension.

[Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1527?].

Moore no. 20. Benzing, Luther, no. 1356. NK no. 3471.

[Luther, Martin.]

L 122

Sermon de la maniere de prier Dieu et comment on doit faire processions et rogations.

[Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1527?].

Moore no. 2. Benzing, Luther no. 391. NK no. 3472.

[Luther, Martin]. [Lambert, François, trans.?]

L 118

Prophetie de Iesie de l'enfant nouveau en Jesuchrist. Avec les annotations du docteur de Cleremont. Lisez chrestiens, et jugez. Pol. I. Corinth. 14. Que deux ou trois prophetes parlent, et les autres en jugent. 1527.

[Strasbourg: Johann Pruss], 1527.

Moore no. 25. Benzing Luther no. 2266. Peter, 'Prem. ouvr.' no. 5. Bodenmann, p. 162.

Pseudo-Seneca (Lucius Annaeus). Courtecuisse, Jean, trans. Seyssel, Claude de, trans.

Des motz dorez, des quatre vertus cardinales.

Paris: Simon Du Bois for the widow of Antoine Vérard, 12 April 1527.

Clutton, no. 3. Brunet V. col. 281. Moreau 3, no. 1333.

Sentence de frere Jehan Guibert.

S 11

Sentence de frere Jehan Guibert hermite de Livry. Tous mes os diront Seigneur Dieu qui est ce qui est

semblable à toi? Qui delivre le paoure de la main des puissantz son indigen et paoure de ceusz qui le deschirent. Pseaul. xxxviii.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois, 1527].

Clutton no. 40

Bible. O.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 66

Le dernier volume de l'anchien testament contenant les prophetes: ascavoir, Esaïas: Jeremias: Hezechiel: Daniel: Oseas: Joel: Amos: Abdias: Johas: Micheas: Naum: Habacuc: Saphonias:

Aggeus:

Zacharias: et Malachias.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 19 September 1528.

Chambers no. 43.

Bible. O.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 62

Le premier volume de l'anchien testament contenant les chinq livres de Moise: ascavoir Genese: Exode: Levitique: Les Nombres: et Deuteronomie translatez en françois selon la pure te entiere translation de sainte Hierosme.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 30 April [1528-1532].

Chambers no. 43.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. and commentary.

Liber Psalmorum cum tenoribus ad rectè profèrendum aptissimis.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 1528.

Rice no. CCCXXVII. Renouard, "Colines, 424.

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?]

B 210

La seconde partie de l'union de toutes discordes: livre tres utile à tous amateurs de verite, extraict des principaulx docteurs de l'eglise de la foi Catholique.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1528.

Moore no. 42. NK no. 2524.

Erasmus, Desiderius & Germain Brixius

Epistolae duae, Germani Brixii altera, altera Erasmi.

Paris: Simon Du Bois for Christian Wechel, 1528.

Clutton no. 15. Panzer, 1844.

[Gaigny, Jean de (Johannes Gagnaeus)].

G 6

Le livre faisant mention des sept parolles nostre benoist sauveur et redempteur Jésuschrist dit en l'arbre de la croix... avec aulcunes expositions et contemplations sur icelles extraictes de dictz et sentence des docteurs autentiques et approuvez de

Paris: Simon Du Bois for Chrestien Wechel., 1528.

Clutton no. 16. Despierres, p. 250. Moreau 3, no. 1467. P. Renouard, 'Le Livre des sept parolles (1528)' in *Byblis* 8 (1929).

**[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 97
trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan]. [Et. al.]**

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison. "Omnia que desyderantur huic non valent comparari."
Prover.iii. Cum privilegio.

Paris: Simon Du Bois (with Chrestien Wechsel), July 1528.

Moreau 3, no. 1545. Higman, RHPR (1983).

Badet, Arnaud de.

Margarita virorum illustrium de futura temporis dispositione praeoscenda.
[1529?].

Mentzer, Heresy trials in Languedoc, 20-21. Du Verdier, *Bibliothèques*, 6:27. Loirette, "Badet,"
"Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique," 6, 140-141. Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores*,
2:
96.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 162

La premiere [-seconde] partie du nouveau testament.

[Lyon: Pierre de Vingle, 1529?].

Chambers no. 50. Droz APR 44-46 (reprods.).

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 160

*Les choses contenues en ce present livre. une breve instruction, pour deuement lire l'escriptures
sainte. Le S. Evangile selon S. Matthieu. Le S. Evangile selon S. Marc. Le S. Evangile selon S. Luc.
Le S. Evangile selon Jehan. "Jehuchrist dit..."*

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois], November 1529.

Chambers no. 47. Clutton no. 31. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 4. Van Eys no. 15.

Bible. O.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 65

*Le troisieme volume de l'ancien testament contenant le livre de Tobie, de Judith, de Hester, de Job:
et les trois livres de Salomon, ascavoir les Paraboles, Ecclesiaste, et les Cantiques des cantiques avec
le livre de Sapience et Ecclesiastique et ...*

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 12 August 1529.

Chambers no. 43.

[Brunfels, Otto]. B 271

*Les Prieres et oraisons de la Bible, faictes par les saintz peres, et par les hommes et femmes
illustres:*

tant de l'ancien que du nouveau testament.

Antwerp: Guillaume Vorsterman, Martin Lempereur, 18 August 1529.

Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans?] E 28

*Enchiridion [sic] (ou Manuel) du chevalier Chrestien: aorne de commandemens tressalutaires ...
avec un prologue merueilleusement utile et de nouveau adjouste.*

[Antwerp]: Martin Lempereur, 1529.

NK no. 880. Machiels no. E 419. Marcel Coll. Eras. Tur. II, 634 sqq.

[Farel, Guillaume.] F 26

Summaire, et brieve declaration d'aucuns lieux fort necessaires à un chascun Chrestien.

[Lyon: Pierre de Vingle], 1529.

Gilmont, Farel 3-1.

[Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.]

Grammatographia ad prompte citoque descendam grammaticen.

Pairs: Simone de Colines, October 1529.

Rice no. CCCXXIX. Renouard, Colines, 135-136, 424, 472-473.

[Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.] [Dedicatory epistle by Martin Bucer].

L 26

Vocabulaire du psautier exposé en François. Vocabularium Psalterii pro ingenue indolis adolescente D. Angolimensi, et sorore eius D. Magdalena modestissima adolescentula, liberis regiis, ac denique pro cunctis rudibus, primum in grammaticis initiandis.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 1529.

Rice no. CCCXXXI. Moreau 3, no. 1818. Renouard, "colines, 146.

**[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 98
trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]**

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Paris: Simon Du Bois for Chrestien Wechel, April 1529.

Moore no. 18. Clutton no. 17. Moreau 3, no. 1831. Gilmont, Farel, no. 18.1. BSHPF (1888), 135.

Higman, RHPR (1983).

[Luther, Martin]

L 115

Breve Instruction pour deuement lire l'escripture.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois], 1529.

Rice, no. 146, 502-511 has the full text. Chambers no. 47.

[Luther, Martin.]

L 114

La Maniere de lire l'evangile et quel profit on en doit attendre.

[Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1529?].

Moore no. 12. Benzing, Luther no. 2003. NK, no. 3468. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 4. Chambers no. 47.

Valla, Lorenzo.

Laurentz Valle Poete et Orateur Romain sur la Donation de Constantin Empereur.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1529-1534?].

Clutton no. 48. Rép. bib. "Du Bois" no. 13.

Almanach spirituel et perpetuel

A 5

Almanach spirituel et perpetuel necessaire à tout homme sensuel et temporel.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1530].

Clutton no. 26. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 8. BSHPF (1902) 437, no. 32. Moore no. 97. Tricard, 33-35.

Badet, Arnaud de.

Margarita sacrae scripturae.

[after 1529].

Mentzer, Heresy trials in Languedoc, 20-21. Du Verdier, Bibliothèques, 6:27. Loirette, "Badet,"

"Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique," 6, 140-141. Quetif and Echard, Scriptores, 2:

96.

Bible. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.**B 35**

La Saint Bible en Francois, translatee selon la pure entiere traduction de Saint Hierome, conferee et entierement revisitee ... sus ung chascun chapitre est mis brief argument.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 10 December 1530.

Chambers no. 51. Rice no. CCCXXXII. Van Eys I, no. 33. Darlow and Moule, no. 3708. NK, no. 417.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.**B 163**

La premiere [-seconde] partie du Nouveau Testament.

[Lyon: Pierre de Vingle, 1530?].

Chambers no. 53.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.**B 161**

Le Nouveau Testament, contenant les quatre Evangelistes...avec les faitz des Apostres et les Epistres de Saint Paul, de Saint Jaques ... et avec l'Apocalipse ...

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, Guillaume Vorsterman, 18 January 1529 [1529 n.s.].

Chambers no. 48, 49. NK no. 2505, 2506.

Bible. O.T. Solomon. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.**B 145**

Les Sentences de Solomon, doctrine tressalutaire à tous vrais enfans de Dieu, desirans estre instruitz en toutes bonnes meurs: selon la verite Hebraique.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, [1530?].

No Chambers no. .

Bourbon, Nicolas.

N. Burbo. Vandoperani, camani, Epigrammata, ad R. D. Carolum Turonium episc. Vivarien. designatum. politorum literarum immoratalem decus. Item Eiusdem N. Burbo. Ad generosos adolescentes Jacobum et Justum Turnonios. Item alia quedam lectu non indigna.

Lyon: Laurent Hyllaire, February 1530.

Breve Instruction pour soy confesser.**I 57**

Breve Instruction pour soi confesser en verite.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1530?].

Droz, Chemins I, 52-78, with full text. Clutton no. 42. BSHPF (1902), 437. Moore no. 165.

Tricard, APR, pp. 29-33. Bujanda, Index I, , no. 445. Higman, Censorship, 70, C 182 = D 335. Cf. B 123 = D 332.

[Brunfels, Otto].**B 272**

Les oraisons de la Bible faictes par les Peres et par les Femmes fideles, tant de l'Ancien que du Nouveau Testament, avec plusieurs introductions.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1530.

[Brunfels, Otto]. Marcourt, Antoine, preface?**B 273**

Les Prieres et oraisons de la Bible, faictes par les saintz peres, et par les hommes et femmes illustres:

tant de l'Ancien que du Nouveau Testament.

[Lyon: Pierre de Vingle], 19 August 1530.

*Droz, BHR 1958, 158-169, with partial ed. of the text. Baudrier 12. Berthoud, 'Marcourt.'

Le combat chrestien**C 124**

Le combat chrestien I. Timothee chap. vi. Bataille la bonne batille de Foi: prens la vie eternelle en laquelle tu es apelle. ii a Timothee chap. iiii. "J'ay bataille bonne bataille j'ay acheve mon couis j'ay

garde la foi." I. de S. Pierre chap. iiii. ...

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1530?].

Clutton no. 35. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 10. BSHPF (1902), 437. Tricard p. 24.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Chansonette, Claude, trans.**E 37**

Maniere de se confesser.

1530.

Mégret, BHR 4, p. 124.

Exposition on Lord's Prayer.**E 75**

Brefve et devote exposition par maniere d'exhortation et d'oraison, faicte sur le Pater noster: et autres parolles de nostre Seigneur Jesuchrist recitees au .vi. chapitre de saint Mattheu.

[Lyon: Pierre de Vingle, 1530?].

Higman 'Theology' p. 113 and no. 9.

Exposition on Lord's Prayer.**E 74**

Brefve exposition sur la treschrestienne et tresparfaicte oraison du Pater noster.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1530?].

Clutton no. 43. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 9. Moore no. 140. Tricard, p. 22-24. Higman, "Theology," p. 113, and no. 8.

[Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.] [Joannis Archerius Campanus? Thomas Chalcographus?]

Clavis tesserarum Grammatographiae.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 1530.

Missing in Rice.

[Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, et al.] Additions by Gérard Roussel?**L 20**

Epistres et evangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an, avecques briefves et tresutiles expositions dycelles, necessaires et consolables pour tous fideles Chrestiens, nouvellement reveues et augmentees par gens doctes en la sainte escripture.

[Lyon: Pierre de Vingle, 1530?].

Rice no. CCCXIX. Ed. Bedouelle and Giaccone, Brill, 1976

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]**L 99**

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Paris: Jean Kerbriat for Chrestien Wechel., April 1530.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Moore no. 18. Moreau 3, 2187. Gilmont, Farel, no.18.2.

[Luther, Martin]**L 96**

La Fleur des commandementz et declaration des bonnes euvres. Ecclesiaste 12: "Crains Dieu et observe les commandementz dicellui, car appartient egalement à tous hommes."

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1530?].

Clutton no. 51. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 15. Moore no. 4.

- [Luther, Martin].** **L 116**
La Maniere de lire l'evangile et quel proffit on en doibt attendre ... et aussi la maniere de mediter et penser à la passion de nostre saulveur Jesuchrist, fort consolatoire à toute personne qui a quelque tribulation.
 [Lyon: Pierre de Vingle, 1530?].
 Brunet 3, 1366. Benzing 'Luther' no. 2004. Th. Dufour, Not. cat. p. 127.
- Salmon, Jean, dit 'Macrin.'**
Jo. Salmonii Materni Lodunatis Elegiarum triumphalium Liber.
 [Paris]: Egidium Gormontium, [c. 1530].
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** **B 164**
Le nouveau Testament, auquel est demonstre Jesu Chrsit sauver du monde estre venu: annonce de Dieu à noz Peres anciens des le commencement du monde, et en plusieurs lieux predict par les Prophetes.
 Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1 July 1531.
 Chambers no. 57.
- Bible. O.T. Ecclesiastes. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. J. Brenz, comm.** **B 68**
L'Ecclesiaste preschant que toutes choses sans Dieu sont vanite. Tout est vanite. Sap. viii. "Vains sont tous hommes qui n'ont congnoissance de Dieu."
 [Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1531?].
 Clutton no. 30. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 14. Roussel, BTT 5, 165. Köhler, W., "Bibliographi Brentiana," nos. 28 & 32.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément.** **B 77**
Le .VI. Pseaulme de David qui est le premier Pseaulme des sept Pseaulmes translate en françois.
 [Lyon?]: ?, [1531?].
 Babelon.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans.** **E 24**
La Complainte de la paix.
 [Lyon: Pierre de Vingle, 1531?].
 Higman, Censorship, 75-77. Emile V. Telle, ed. La Complainte de la Paix, TLF 248. Walsh, 'Harvard Ly Bull 17 (1969).
- Hallewijn, Georges, sr. de.**
"Les erreurs de Luther."
 1531?.
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.**
Commentarii in Pauli epistolas.
 Paris: Jean Petit and F. Regnault, 1531.
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.**
Commentarii initiatorii in quatuor evangelia.
 Cologne: Eucharius Cervicornus for Gottfried Hittorp, [1531?].
- Lucian of Samostate. [Vegio, Maffeo, trans.] [Vauzelles, Jean de, trans.]**
Le Martire de verite, dialogue de Lucian mis en lumiere Francoise.
 Lyon: François Juste, [1531-1547].

FRB 8408. Perrière, Y. de la. Supplément provisoire à la Bibliographie Lyonnaise du Président Baudrier. Fasc. I. Centre Lyonnais d'Histoire et de Civilisation du Livre. Paris: BnF, 1967: "François Juste," 85-106, 93, no. 9. Brunet 5, 1114.

[Marguerite de Navarre]. [Heyden, Sebald].

M 34

Le miroir de l'ame pecheresse. ouquel elle recongnoist sese fautes et pechez. aussi les graces et benefices à elle faictz par Jesuchrist son espoux. La Marguerite tresnoble et precieuse, sest proposee à ceulx qui de bon cueur la cerchoient.

Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1531.

Clutton no. 21. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 5. Cioranexco 14078. Despierres p. 250. Lepreux III/2: 45. Moore 183.

Saulnier, Antoine.

S 2

Chanson nouvelle composee sur les dix commandemns de Dieu extraicte de la saincte Escripiture. [1531?].

Bordier Ch. Hug. 1-10.

Vauzelles, Jean de.

Police subsidiaire à celle qui si infinie multitude des povres survenuz à Lyon sur le Rosne, l'an mil cinq cens XXXI. Avec les graces que les povres en rendent à Dieu et à messieurs de l'eglise et aux notalbes de la ville.

Toulouse, 1531.

Vauzelles, Jean de.

Theatre de Francoise desolatione sur le trespas de la tresaugust Loise: louable admiration de Savoie et de feminine gloire: represeante d'une vrai zele.

Lyon: , [10 November 1531?].

Baudrier, vol. 12, p. 168-169. J. Babelon, La bibliothèque françoise de F. Colomb, no. 232. Émile Picot, les Français italianisants, I, 122.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 166

Le nouveau Testament, contenant les quatre Evangelistes...avec les fiactz des Apostres: et les Epistres saint Paul, les Epsitres Canoniques, et l'Apocalypse: auquel est demonstre JesuChrist...

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 10 April 1532.

Chambers no. 59.

Bible. O.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 63

Le second volume de l'ancien Testament contenant pour sa premiere partie le Livre de Josue, le Livre des Juges, et le Livre de Ruth.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1532.

Chambers no. 43.

Bible. O.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 64

Le second volume de l'ancien Testament, contenant pour la seconde partie les quatre livres des Roix, les deux livres de Paralipomenon, et les quatre livres de Esdras.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1 July 1532.

Chambers no. 43.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. Luther, Martin, pref. Bucer,

B 78

Martin, comm.

Le livre des Psalmes. Misericorde environnera celui qui espere au Seigneur Dieu. Psal. xxxii.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1532?].

Rice, Prefatory Epistles, no. 149, 517-523. Clutton no. 28. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 16. *BSHPP (1893), 98-104; (1902) 434 no. 16. Despierres p. 251. Lepreux III/2: 45. Moore no. 28.

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?]

B 211

La Premiere [-seconde] partie de Lunion de toutes discordes: qui est ung livre tres utile à tous amateurs de paix et de unite, extraict des principaulx docteurs de l'eglise Catholique Hermann Bodius Reviste.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1532.

Moore p. 154. NK no. 2525.

Erasmus, Desiderius.

Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clithoveus scripsit adversus Declamationem Des. Erasmi Roterodami suasoriam matrimonii.

Basel: Froben, February 1532.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans?

E 29

Enchiridion (ou Manuel) du Chevalier Chresien: aorne de commandemens tressalutaires...avec un prologue merueilleusement utile et de nouveau adjouste.

[Lyon: Pierre de Vingle, 1532?].

Droz APR, 61-4. Moore no. 133. Tricard APR, TP, p. 62.

[Farel, Guillaume.]

F 27

Summaire et briefve declaration daulcuns lieux fort necessaire à ung chascun chrestien pour mettre sa confiance en Dieu et ayder son prochain. Jaques Chap. 1. En mansuetude et douclceur recepez la parolle de Dieu laquelle est puissante de sauluer nos.

"Turin"[Alençon: Simon Du Bois], "1525" [1532].

Clutton no. 49. Piaget, 1935.

[Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, et al.]

L 21

Les choses contenues en ce present livre. Epistre et Evangiles pour les cinquante et deux sepmaines de l'an commenceans au premier dimenche de Laduent....Après chascune Epistre et Evangile briefve exhortation selon l'intelligence d'icelle.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1532?].

Rice no. CCCXVIII. Clutton no. 33. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 11. BSHPP (1902) 434, no. 18. Moore no. 175.

[Luther, Martin.] [Berquin, Louis, trans. ?] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. ?]

L 82

Consolation chrestienne, contre les afflictions de ce monde et scruplues de conscience. O seigneur Dieu faiz que ton nom soit magnifie en tous lieux eternellement.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1532?].

Clutton no. 36. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 17. BSHPP (1887), 165; (1902) 437, no. 31. Despierres p. 251. Lepreux III/2: 45. Moore p. 152 and no. 3. Rép. Fr.

[Luther, Martin].

L 119

Quatre instructions fideles pour les simples et les rudes. La premiere. L'homme fidele visitant. La seconde. L'homme fidele catechisant. La tierce. L'homme fidele introduisant à l'Evangile. La quarte. L'homme fidele psalmodiant Jehan iii.

[Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1532].

Clutton no. 42. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 12. BSHPF (1888 [1902?]), 432. Despierres p. 251.
Lepreux III/2: 45. Moore no. 29. Benzing Luther no. 2665. Bujanda, Index I, no. 446.

[Rabelais, Français]

R 1

Pantagruel. Les horribles et espoventables faictz et prouesses du tresrenomme Pantagruel Roi des Dipsodes, filz du grand geant Gargantua.

Lyon: Claude Nourry, [1532?].

NRB 1. TLF 2.

Somme de l'écriture. [Luther, Martin, ch. 26 on secular gov't.]

S 26

La Summe de l'escripture sainte, et l'ordinaire des chrestiens, enseignant la vraie foi Chrestienne: par laquelle nous sommes tous justifiez. Et de la vertu du baptesme, selon la doctrine de l'Evangile, et

des Apostres. Avec une information comment

"Basel" [Alençon]: "Thomas Wolf"[Simon Du Bois, "1523" but 1532?].

Moore no. 22. Clutton no. 50. Bietenholz no. 4014. *J. Trapman (1978). Bujanda, Index I, no. 487. Weiss, BSHPF 68 (1919), 63-79.

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?]. Saulnier, Antoine, dedication.

B 213

La seconde partie de Union de plusieurs passages de l'escripture sainte: Livre tresutile à tous amateurs de verite, extraicte de principaulx docteurs de l'eglise de la foi Catholicque ... reveu et corrige.

[Geneva: Pierre de Vingle], 12 June 1533.

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?]

B 212

La premiere partie de union de plusieurs passaiges de l'escripture sainte. Livre treutile à tous amateurs de paix: Extraict des autentiques docteurs de l'eglise chrestienne... reveu et corrige.

[Geneva: Pierre de Vingle], 10 June 1533.

NK no. 4127. M.E. Kronenberg in *Het Boek* (1938-9), 257-65.

Bourbon, Nicolas.

Nic. Borbonii Vandoperani nugae.

Paris: Michel Vascosan, 1533.

Nicolas de Bourbon, *Nugae*, ed. V.L. Saulnier (Paris, 1945).

[Brunfels, Otto]. [Luther, Martin.] [Erasmus, Desiderius]. [Brenz, Johannes].

B 274

Les Oraisons de la Bible Faictes par les Peres et femmes fideles, tant de Lancien comme du Nouveau Testament: avec plusieurs Introductions.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 9 January 1533.

NK no. 2578. Febvre, 'Dolet propagateur de l'évangile,' BHR 6 (1945), 98-170; 110. Higman RHPR (1983), p. 106.

Chansons. Malingre, Matthieu, ed.

C 101

Sensuivent plusieurs belles et bonnes chansons, que les chrestiens peuvent chanter en grande affection de cuer: pour et affin de soulager leurs esperitz et de leur donner repos en dieu.

[Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle], 1533.

Moore no. 110. Th. Dufour, *Not. cat.* pp. 108-110.

Erasmus, Desiderius.

Des. Erasmi Roterodami Liber de sarcienda Ecclesiae concordia, deque sedandis opinionum dissidiis, cum aliis nonnullis lectu dignis Omnia recens nata et nunc primum typis excusa.

Strasbourg: Nicolaus Faber, October 1533.

Eusebius of Caesarea. Seyssel, Claude de, trans. Colin, Jacques ed?

L'Histoire ecclesiastique de Eusebe de Cesare, tranlatee de Latin en Francois, par Messire Claude de Seyssel, evesque lors de Marseille, et depuis Archevesque de Thurin

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1533.

Exposition on Lord's Prayer.

E 78

Cy commence ung devot et nouveau Traicte contenant plusieurs expositions utiles sur l'oraison dominicale, aultrement dicte la Patinostre.

Paris: Vve Jean Saint Denys?, 1533.

Renouard Mss. Brunet.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Commentarii in Pauli epistolas.

Venise: Garupha and Sabio, January 1533.

[Malingre, Matthieu.]

M 8

Moralite de la maladie de Chrestiente, a. xiii. personnages: en laquelle sont monstrez plusieurs abus, aduenz au monde, par la poison de peche et l'hypocrisie des hereticques. Foi. Esperance. Charite. Chrestiente. Bon oeuvre. Hyposrisie. Peche.

[Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle], 1533.

Moore no. 188. Th. Dufour, Not. cat. p. 110. Berthoud APR, pp. 143 sqq.

Marguerite de Navarre

M 31

Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne entre tresnoble & excellente princesse ma dame Marguerite de France soeur unique du Roi nostre sire par la grace de Dieu Roine de Navarre duchesse d'Alençon et Berry et l'ame sainte de defuncte madame...

Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1533.

Clutton no. 22 & 23. Chantilly Cat. no. 1181 & 1182. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 6. Cioranescu 14081. Despierres p. 251. Jourda, p. 212-213. Lepreux III/2: 45.

[Marguerite de Navarre]. [Heyden, Sebald].

M 36

M 33

Le miroir de lame pecheresse. Auquel elle reconnoist ses fautes et pechez. aussi les graces et benefices à elle faictz par Jesuchrist son espoux.

[Paris: Antoine Augereau, 1533?].

Veyrin-Forrer no. 22. Moreau 4, no. 762. Jourda pp. 213-14. Clive BI4.

[Marguerite de Navarre]. [Heyden, Sebald].

M 35

M 33

Le miroir de lame pecheresse: ouquel elle reconnoist ses fautes et pechez. aussy les graces et benefices à elle faictz par Jesus Christ son espoux. La Marguerite tresnoble et precieuse, sest proposee à ceulx qui de bon cueur la cerchoient.

Alençon: Simon Du Bois, 1533.

Clutton no. 23. Chantilly Cat. no. 1182. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 6.

Marguerite de Navarre. [Heyden, Sebald]. Marot, Clément.

M 37

Le Miroir de treschrestienne Princesse Marguerite de France, Roine de Navarre, Duchesse D'alençon

et de Berry: auquel elle uoit et son neant, et son tout. Imprimé à paris par Antoine Augereau,

demourant en la rue S. Jacques, à l'image saint lacques,

Paris: Antoine Augereau, [November?] 1533.

See Kemp article. Veyrin-Forrier no. 23. Moreau 4, no. 763. Sales Pichon no. 997. Ruble no. 163. Jourda, pp. 214-15. Clive B13.

Marguerite de Navarre. [Heyden, Sebald]. Marot, Clément.

M 38

Le Miroir de treschrestienne Princesse Marguerite de France, Roine de Navarre, Duchesse D'Alençon

et de Berry: auquel elle voit & son neant, & son tout. Imprimé à Paris par Antoine Augereau, demourant en la rue S. Jacques, à l'image saint lacques,

Paris: Antoine Augereau, December 1533.

See Kemp article. Veyrin-Forrier no. 24. Moreau 4, no. 764. Jourda pp. 214-15. Clive B15.

[Olivétan, Pierre Robert].

O 5

L'Instruction des enfans, contenant la maniere de prononcer et escrire en françois. L'Oraison de Jesu Christ. Les articles de la foi. Les dix commandemens. La salutation angelique. Avec la declaration d'iceux, faicte en maniere de recueil des seules...

[Geneva: Pierre de Vingle], 1533.

Moore no. 162. Berthoud, APR pp. 143 sqq. Higman, 'Spiritualité'. See Baddeley, 'Orthographe.'

Pardon

P 3

Les grans pardons et indulgences, le tresgrand Jubile de plainiere remission de peine et de coulpe à tous les confaires de la tressacree confrairie du sainte esperit.

[Geneva: Pierre de Vingle, 1533].

Droz, APR, PP 155-66. See Bujanda, Index 1, no. 476.

[Rabelais, François]

R 3

Pantagruel. Les horribles et espoventables faictz et prouesses du tresrenomme Pantagruel Roi des Dipsodes filz du grand geant Gargantua.

[Paris?: Jean et Enguilbert de Marnef], 1533.

Salomon, Jean dit 'Florimond.' Clément Marot.

F 44

Epistre familiere de prier Dieu. Aultre Epistre familiere d'aimer chrestienement.

Paris: [Antoine Augereau], December 1533.

Kemp. Veyrin-Forrier no. 19. Moreaux 4, no. 684.

Salomon, Jean dit 'Florimond.' Clément Marot.

F 43

Epistre familiere de prier Dieu. Aultre epistre familiere d'aymer Chrestienement.

[Paris: Antoine Augereau], 1533.

Kemp. Veyrin-Forrier no. 18. Moreaux 4, no. 683.

Salomon, Jean dit 'Florimond.' Clément Marot.

F 42

Epistre familiere de prier Dieu. Aultre Epistre familiere d'aymer chrestienement.

Paris: [Antoine Augereau], 1533.

Kemp. Veyrin-Forrier no. 20. Moreaux 4, no. 685.

Vérité cachée.

V 8

La Verite cachee, devant cent ans faicte et composee à six personnages: nouvellement corrigee et augmentee avec les autoritez de la sainte escripture.

[Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 1533?].

Th. Dufour Not. cat. pp. 113-15. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 507.

Agrippa von Nettesheim, Heinrich Cornelius.

Henrici Cornelii Agrippae de beatissimae Annae monogamia, ac unico puerperio propositione abbreviatae et articulatae iuxta disceptationem labobi Fabri Stapulensis in libro de tribus et una intitulato.

[Antwerp?]: s.n., 1534.

Bible. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 39

La saint Bible en Francois, translatee selon la pure entiere traduction de Saint Hierome, derechief conferee et entierement revisitee ... sus ung chascun Chapitre est mis brief argument.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 6 April 1534.

Chambers no. 62. Rice, no. CCXXXIII. Van Eys 1, no. 29. NK no. 417.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 167

Le nouveau testament de nostre seigneur et seul sauveur Jesus Christ... Ce nouveau testament a este de nouveau imprime en telle grosse lettre que vous voyez, pour plus aysement et facilement lire.

Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 27 March 1534.

Chambers no. 64. Dufour Not. cat. 120-2.

Bible. O.T. Job. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans? "Le Viateur," comm.

B 69

Texte de Hiob translate selon la verite hebraique. Et bref commentaire du Viateur sur icellui. Si nous avons receu bien du seigneur Dieu pourquoi aussy ne recepurons nous le mal? Le seigneur Dieu la donne le seigneur Dieu la oste...

[Paris?: Simon Du Bois, 1534?].

Clutton no. 27. Rép. bibl. "Du Bois" no. 7.

Campen, Jean van. [Preface adapted from Bucer and Zwingli.]

C 83

Paraphrase, c'est à dire, Claire translation faicte jouxte la sentence non pas jouxte la Lettre, sur tous les Psalmes, selon la verité Hebraique.

[Paris: Simon Du Bois], 17 June 1534.

Roussel, 'Les nouveaux Jérôme.'

Chansons. Malingre, Matthieu, ed.?

C 98

Chansons nouvelles demonstrantz plusieurs erreurs et faulsetez: desquelles le paovre monde est remply par les ministres de Satan.

[Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 1534?].

Moore no. 111. Higman Censorship no. C 186. Th. Dufour, Not. cat. pp. 104-5.

Dialogus de vanitate scientiarum et ruina christianae religionis.

Dialogus de vanitate scientiarum et ruina christianae religionis per quendam relligiosum Patrem Ordinis Cisterciensis Monachum recenter editus. M. D. XXXIII.

s.l.: s.n., 1534.

Erasmus, Desiderius.

Des. Erasmi Roterodami Liber de sarcienda Ecclesiae concordia, deque sedandis opinionum dissidiis, cum aliis nonnullis lectu dignis Omnia recens nata et nunc primum typis excusa.

Basel: H. Froben & N. Episcopium., 1534.

Exhortation sur ces saintes parolles de nostre segneur Jesus.

E 72

Exhortation sur ces saintes parolles de nostre Seigneur Jesu. Retournez vous, et croyes à l'evangille:

Prinse sur la sainte escripture, en laquelle est declare lefficace de l'evangile.

[Neuchâtel?: Pierre de Vingle, 1534?].

Brunet 3, 1367. Droz, APR, p. 71. Berthoud, APR, p. 143. Sales La Vallière (1784), Du Fay (1725) and Gaignet (1769). Th. Dufour Not. cat. pp. 127-8.

[Farel, Guillaume.]

F 28

Summaire et briefve declaration d'aucuns lieux fort necessaire à ung chascun chrestien pour mettre sa confiance en Dieu et ayder son prochain. ... Item ung traite du Purgatoire nouvellement adiousté sur la fin.

[Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 23 December 1534.

Gimont, Farel, no. 3-3. Facs. de Geneva, 1867. Transcription & Adaptation, A-L. Hofer (1980), Edition Belle Rivière.

Introduction pour les enfants.

I 48

Introduction pour les enfans.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, [1534?].

Index I no. 361.

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 100
trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Brenz, Johannes]. [Et. al.]

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, July 1534.

Higman, Francis M. "Luther et la Piété de l'Église Gallican: le Livre de Vraie et Parfaicte Oraison." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* (1983), 91-111. Moore no. 18. NK no. 3414. Benzing, "Luther," no. 813. Gilmont, "Farel," no. 18.3.

[Luther, Martin]. woodcuts copied from Lucas Cranach.

L 94

Les faictz de Jesus Christ et du Pape, par lesquelz chascun pourra facilement congnoistre la grande difference de entre eulx: nouvellement reveuz, corrigez, et augmentez, selon la verite de la sainte Escripiture, et des droictz canons, par le lecteur...

[Neuchâtel: Pierre de Vingle, 1534?].

Berthoud, 'Michel' pp. 64-7. Bujanda, Index I, no. 426, 508 [this or L 95].

Numerus et tituli cardinalium,

Numerus et tituli cardinalium, ... Taxae et valor beneficiorum.

Paris: Antoine Augereau, 1534.

Renouard, "Imprimeurs", Augerau, no. 578.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 168

Le nouveau Testament, auquel est demonstre Jesu Chrsit sauver du monde, estre venu annonce de Dieu à noz Peres anciens des le commencement du monde, et en plusieurs lieux predict par les Prophetes.

Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1535.

Chambers no. 68.

Chansons. Malingre, Matthieu, ed.?

C 99

Chansons Nouvelles demonstrantz plusieurs erreurs et faulsetez, desquelles le paovre monde est remply par les ministres de Satan.

[Geneva: Wigand Koeln, 1535?].

Th. Dufour Not. cat. p. 131. BG 35/3.

[Gaigny, Jean de (Johannes Gagnaeus)].

G 8

Le livre de nouvel reimprime faisant mention des sept parolles que nostre sauveur ... dit en l'arbre de la croix: avec aulcune expositions et contemplations sur icelles: ...

Paris: Chrestien Wechel, 1535.

Moreau 4, no. 1316.

[Marguerite de Navarre.]

Le caresme prenant du cueur bienheureux [sic].

s.l.: s.n., [1535?].

Babelon no. 126, pp. 120-121. Clive BM7.

Marguerite de Navarre. [Heyden, Sebald]. Marot, Clément.

M 39

Le miroir de treschrestienne princesse Marguerite.

[Paris: Nicolas Buffet, 1535?].

Moreau 4, no. 1367. Jourda p.215. Clive B16. FRB [17635].

Rabelais, François.

R 14

Gargantua.

[Lyon: François Juste, 1535?].

NRB 19. TLF 163.

Dentière, Marie.

D 5

La Guerre et deslivrance de la ville de Geneve.

[Geneva: Wigand Koeln?, 1536?].

Th. Dufour Not. cat. pp. 134-6. BG 36/4. Re-ed. Fick, 1863. A. Pilliet, ed., *Mémoires et documents publiées par la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, 20 (1881).

Zwingli, Ulrich.

Christianae fidei Huldrycho Zwinglio praedicatae, brevis et clara expositio ab ipso Zuinglio paulo ante mortem eius ad Regem Christianum scripta, hactenus a nemine excusa et nunc primum in lucem aedita. Matth. 11. Venite ad me omnes qui laboratis et

Zurich: Christopher Froschover, 1536.

ZW 6, pt. 5, 1-163. Ulrich Zwingli, 'On Providence and other essays,' ed. for Samuel Macauley Jackson by William John Hinke (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press), 1983, 235-293.

Campen, Jean van. [Preface adapted from Bucer (and Zwingli?), text by Athanasius.]

C 84

Paraphrase, c'est à dire, Claire et succincte Interpretation juxte la sentence, non pas juxte la lettre, sur tous les Psalmes, selon la verité Hebraique... Traictie du saint Athanase.

Antwerp: Widow of Martin Lempereur, 1537.

NK no. 3260.

[Des Périers, Bonaventure].

La Prognostication des Prognostications, non seulement de ceste presente annee M.D.XXXVII. Mais aussi des aultres à venir, voire de toutes celles qui sont passees, Composee par Maistre Sarcomoros, natif de Tartarie, et Secretaire du tresillustre et

[Paris: Jean Morin], 1537.

[Erasmus, Desiderius], trans. Pierre Saliat.

E 25

Declamation contenant la maniere de bien instruire les enfans ... avec ung petit traicté de la civilité

puerile.

Paris: Simon de Colines, 2 August 1537.

Moore no. 137.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Morin, Guy, trans.

E 42

Le Preparatif à la mort Livre tres utile et necessaire à chascun Chrestien.

Paris: Olivier Mallard, for Galliot Du Pré., 1537.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Anonymous translator.

E 41

Prepartation à la Mort.

Lyon: François Juste, 1537.

Dagens.

Fontaine, Charles.

Les disciples et Amys de Marot contre Sagon, La Hueterie, et leurs adherentz.

Paris: Jean Morin, 1537.

Marot, Clément.

Le Dieu gard de Marot à son retour de Ferrare en France avecques la triumphe des tiroletz ou est compris les neuf preuses. Les devis de deux amans et plusieurs ballades rondeaux, espitres, disains, huictains et quatrains ensemble la chanson de Hesdin ...

Paris: , [1537].

Marot, Clément.

Le Valet de Marot contre Sagon, Cum Commento.

Paris: Jean Morin, 1537.

[Olivétan, Pierre Robert].

O 6

L'instruction des enfans, contenant la maniere de prononcer et escrire en françois. L'oraison de Jesus Christ. La salutation angelique. Avec la declaration d'iceux, faicte en maniere de recueil des seules sentences de l'escriure sainte. Item, lés...

Geneva: Jean Girard, 1537.

Moore no. 162. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 435. BG 37/4. Th. Dufour Not.cat. pp. 144-5.

Responce a l'Abbé des Conars de Rouen.

Responce à l'Abbe des Conars de Rouen. On les vend en la rue saint Jacques par Jehan Morin. M.D.XXXVII.

Paris: Jean Morin, 1537.

Roussel, Gérard.

Opus magnorum Moraliū Aristotelis, duos libros completens, Girardo Ruffo Vacariensi Interprete, cum annotationibus, doctissimi viri Iodoci Clichtovei Neoportuensis, nunc vigilanter aliquot in locis mendis purgatum, ...

Paris: Prigent Calvarini, 1537.

Salmon, Jean, dit 'Macrin.'

Hymnorum libri sex, ad Jo. Bellaium.

Paris: Robert Estienne, 1537.

Visagier, Jean.

Epigrammatum libri IIII.

Lyon: Michel Parmanteri, 1537.

- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** **B 173**
Le nouveau Testament, auquel est demonstre Jesu Chrsit sauuer du monde estre venu annonce de Dieu à noz Peres anciens des le commencement du monde ... Avec la declaration des oeuvres par lesquelles l'home peult estre congneu.
 Antwerp: Jean Steelsius, 1538.
 Chambers no. 75.
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** **B 172**
Le Nouveau Testament, de nostre Seigneur Jesu Christ seul sauuer du monde ... avec lés figures dès Actes dès apostres et de l'Apocalypse. Item ... lés Epistres du vieil testament.
 Antwerp: Guillaume Du Mont, 1538.
 Chambers no. 74.
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** **B 171**
Le Nouveau testament, de nostre Seigneur Jesu Christ, seul sauuer du monde.
 Antwerp: Widow Martin Lempereur, 1538.
 Chambers no. 73.
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** **B 170**
Le nouveau Testament, de nostre Seigneur Jesu Christ.
 Antwerp: Matthieu Crom, 1538.
 Chambers no. 72.
- Bourbon, Nicolas.**
Vandoperani Lingonensis, Nugarum Libri Octo. Ab autore recens aucti et recogniti.
 Lyon: Sebastian Gryphe, 1538.
 Nicolas de Bourbon, Nugae, ed. V.L. Saulnier (Paris, 1945)? La Ferrière-Percy, "Son livre de dépenses," p. 18 n. 2. Péicaud, Documents sur l'histoire de Lyon.
- Cymbalum Mundi. [Des Périers, Bonaventure?]** **C 137**
Cymbalum mundi en françois contenant quatre Dialogues Poetiques, fort antiques, joeux, et
 Lyon: Benoist Bonnyn, 1538.
- Cymbalum Mundi. [Des Périers, Bonaventure?]** **C 138**
Cymbalum mundi en françois, contenant quatre Dialogues Poetiques, fort antiques, joeux, et facetieux.
 Paris: Jean Morin, [February] 1538.
 Peach/Brunel no. 182. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 386. Facs. reprod. 1914, ed. Pierre-Paul Plan [= BnF num.]. Modern ed. P. Nurse, TLF, 1983.
- Dolet, Estienne**
Carminum Libri Quatuor
 Lyon: Sebastien Gryphius for Estienne Dolet, 1538.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Anonymous translator.** **E 43**
Preparation à la mort.
 Lyon: Jean Barbou for Guillaume de Guelques, 1538.
 Baudrier 5, 293 < Brunet 2, 1044.
- Farel, Guillaume.** **F 20**
L'Ordre et maniere qu'on tient en administrant les saintz sacremens: assavoir, le Baptesme, et la

Cene de nostre Seigneur. Item, en la celebration du mariage, et en la visitation des malades.

[Geneva]: Jean Michel, 1538.

Gilmont, Farel, 4-2. Moore no. 145. BG 38/5. Berthoud 'Michel' no. 1. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 491.

[Heyden, Sebald.]

H 13

D'ung seul mediateur et advocat entre Dieu et les hommes nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ.

Geneva: Jean Girard, 1538.

Moore no. 62. Index I, no. 453. BG 38/6.

Images de la mort. Holbein, Hans. Vauzelles, Jean de.

I 6

Les simulachres et faces hystoriées de la Mort.

Paris: Denis Janot, [1538?].

Rawles no. 343.

Images de la mort. Holbein, Hans. Vauzelles, Jean de.

I 5

Les simulachres et historiees faces de la mort, autant, elegamment pourtaictes, que artificiellement imaginées

Lyon: Melchior and Gaspar Trechsel for Jean and François Frellon., 1538.

Bnf Numérisé N070259. Baudrier 5, 175. Mortimer no. 284. Rothschild no. 237. G. Franz.

Instruction des enfants. [Luther, Martin. Farel, Guillaume.]

I 49

Introduction pour les enfans. Recogneue et corrigee à Lovain.

Antwerp: Widow Martin Lempereur, 1538.

NK no. 3235. Het Boek 1929, p. 162.

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]

L 101

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Antwerp: Jean Steelsius, 1538.

Higman, RHPR (1983). NK no. 3415. Gilmont, "Farel," no. 18.4.

Marguerite de Navarre. [Heyden, Sebald]. Marot, Clément.

M 40

Le miroir de treschrestienne princesse Marguerite de France ... auquel elle voit et son neant, et son tout.

Lyon: Pierre de Sainte-Lucie, 1538.

Baudrier 12, 173. Jourda, p. 220. Clive BI7.

Marot, Clément.

Les Oeuvres de Clement Marot.

[Lyon: Sébastien Gryphe, 1538].

See Lyon copies in Clarion/FRB.

[Saulnier, Antoine].

S 4

L'Ordre et maniere d'enseigner en la ville de Genève, au College. Description de la ville de Genève.

Geneva: Jean Girard, 12 January 1538.

Moore no. 190.

Bandello, Matteo.

Ecuba.

[1539?].

Fichier Picot.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 175

Le Nouveau Testament auquel est demonstre Jhesu Christ nostre Sauveur, eten plusieurs lieu predict par les prophetes, avec la declaration des oeuvres et myracles qu'il a fait.

Antwerp: Jean de Liesvelt, 13 November 1539.

Chambers no. 77. Adams B 1761. NK no. 2511.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément. Calvin, Jean. B 82

Aulcuns pseaulmes et cantiques mys en chant.

Strasbourg: [Johann Knobloch Jr.], 1539.

R. Peter, "Prem. ouvr."no. 6. Mayer, Marot, 382. Pidoux 39/1. Bujanda, Index I, no. 519. Facs. repr.

Geneva 1919.

Bible. O.T. Solomon. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 147

Les sentences de Solomon, doctrine tressalutaire à tous vrais enfans de Dieu, desyrans estre instructiz en toutes bonnes meurs: translatez selon la verite Hebraicque.

Antwerp: Widow Martin Lempereur, 1539.

No Chambers no. .

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?]. Saultier, Antoine, dedication. B 215

La seconde partie de Union de plusieurs passages de l'escripture sainte: Livre tresutile à tous amateurs de verite, extraicte de principaulx docteurs de l'eglise de la foi Catholicque.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 31 July 1539.

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?] B 214

La premiere Partie de Union de plusieurs passaiges de l'escripture sainte. Livre treutile à tous amateurs de paix: Extraict des autenticques docteurs de l'eglise chrestienne... reveu et corrige.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 1539.

Moore p. 159. Adams B 2254. Th. Dufour, Not.cat. p. 159. Berthoud 'Michel,' no. 5. Cat. Drilhon no. 13 (this ed.). Higman, Censorship, A 27.

Bourbon, Nicolas.

Tabellae elementariae pueris ingenuis pernecessariae, apud Joann. et Franc. Frellaeos [sic] fratres. [Paris: s.n., 1539].

La Ferrière-Percy, "Son livre de dépenses," p. 18 n. 2. Péricaud, Documents sur l'histoire de Lyon.

Bourbon, Nicolas.

Tabellae elementariae pueris ingenuis pernecessariae, apud Joann. et Franc. Frellaeos [sic] fratres. [Lyon]: Jean and François Frellon, [1539].

La Ferrière-Percy, "Son livre de dépenses," p. 18 n. 2. Péricaud, Documents sur l'histoire de Lyon.

Breve Instruction pour soy confesser. I 58

Breve instruction faicte par maniere de Lettre missive: pour se confesser en verité.

[Geneva: Jean Girard], 1539.

Moore no. 164. Droz 'Chemins' I, 56-8 and 77-8. BG 39/6. Index no. 442.

Confession de foi. C 128

La confession de Foi faicte par le Chrestien joieux en Christ: laquelle il tient pour son testament et ordonnance de derniere volonte.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 1539.
Berthoud 'Michel' no. 6 and p. 74.

Dentière, Marie.

D 4

Epistre tresuite envoyée à la Roine de Navarre seur du Roi de France, contre les Turcz, Juifz, Infideles, Faulz Chrestiens, Anabaptistes, et Lutheriens.

"Antwerp" [Geneva]: "Martin Lempereur" [Jean Girard], 1539.

Moore no. 131. Th. Dufour Not. cat. pp. 155-9. BG 39/8. Kemp, "Marie d'Ennetières et la petite grammaire hébraïque..." ?BHR 1997? [I must have the off-print somewhere.]

[Du Pinet, Antoine], adapted from François Lambert, Seb. Meyer.

D 100

Familiere et briefve exposition sur l'apocalypse de Saint Jehan l'apostre

Geneva: Jean Girard, 1539.

Moore no. 172. BG 39/9. Bodenmann no. 17bis a et b. Droz, Chemins 2, 56-60

Erasmus, Desiderius. Morin, Guy, trans.

E 44

Le Preparatif à la mort... Adjoustee une instruction chrestienne pour bien vivre, et soi preparer à mourir.

Paris: Galliot Du Pré, 1539.

Peach/Brunel no. 524.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Morin, Guy, trans.

E 45

Le Preparatif à la mort... Adjoustée une instruction chrestienne pour bien vivre, et soi preparer à mourir.

Paris: Vincent Sertenas, Jean Longis, 1539.

Adams E 614. Renouard MSS.

Exposition on Lord's Prayer. Luther, Martin 2nd part.

E 76

Breve exposition faicte par mainere d'exhortation et d'oraison prinse sur le Pater noster, et aultres parolles de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ, recitées au 6. chapitre de saint Mattheu.

[Geneva: Jean Girard], 1539.

Moore no. 19. Benzing Luther no. 1441. BG 39/5. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 415.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques/ Liege, Jean, trans.

L 18

Comtemplations tres salutaires d'innocence perdue, de vraie patience, du conflit continuel de la chair et l'ame, de la Vierge Marie, avec une oraison à Dieu pour la paix et union de nostre mere l'eglise.

Lyon: François Juste, 1539.

Baudrier Suppl. no. 88, citing Frankfurt catalogue of 1610. Du Verdier II, p. 451.

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Lalande, Matthieu de.] [Et. al.]

L 102

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Paris: Jean Foucher, Vivant Gaultherot, Nicolas Gilles, 1539.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Gilmont, "Farel," no. 18.5.

[Luther, Martin]. trans. Antoine Du Pinet from Bucer's Latin version.

L 87

Exposition de l'histoire des dix Lepreux, prinse du dixseptiesme de Saint Luc. Ou est amplement traicté de la confession auriculaire: et comme on peut user d'allegories en la sainte Escripiture.

[Geneva: Jean Girard], 1539.

Moore no. 10. Benzing Luther no. 995. Bujanda, Index I, no. 430. Droz 2, 55-144, with text.

Marguerite de Navarre. [Heyden, Sebald]. Marot, Clément. M 41

Le miroir de treschrestienne princesse Marguerite de France ... auquel elle voit et son neant, et son tout.

Geneva: Jean Girard, 1539.

Rothschild no. 2860. Jourda p. 221. Clive B18. BG 39/12. Adams M570.

[Marot, Clément?]. M 43

La Bergerie du bon pasteur.

[Geneva: Jean Michel, 1539?].

See Defaux. Mayer, Marot, no. 84. Moore p. 181. Berthoud, 'Michel,' no. 3. BG 9/1.

Sermon pour le jour de la Dedicace. [Marot, Clément?]. S 14

Sermon notable pour le jour de la Dedicace.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 1539.

See, Defaux. Rothschild no. 3246. Th. Dufour Not.cat. pp. 162-3. Moore no. 200. Mayer, Marot, no. 83. Berthoud, 'Michel,' no. 7. BG 39/14. Index I, no. 395.

Somme de l'écriture. [Luther, Martin.] S 27

La Somme de l'escripture sainte, enseignant la vraie foi, par laquelle sommes justifiez. Et de la vertu du baptesme, selon la doctrine de l'evangile et des Apostres. Avec une information comme tous estatz doivent vivre selon l'Evangile.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 5 May 1539.

Weiss, BSHPF 68 (1919), 63-79. Adams S 1421. Berthoud, 'Michel,' no. 5.

Zwingli, Ulrich. Z 1

Brieve et claire exposition de la Foi Chrestienne <> escripte Au Roi Chrestien.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 1539.

Roussel, ed. Le Livre et la Réforme. Berthoud, 'Michel,' no. 8. BG 39/16. Bujanda, Index I, no. 360.

Arétin, Pierre. Vauzelles, Jean de, trans. A 13

La Passion de Jesuschrist, vifvement descript par le Divin engin de Pierre Aretin Italien: et Nouvellement traduite en Francois. Avec privilege pour .III. ans.

Lyon: Melchior & Gaspar Trechsel, 1 March 1539 [1540 n.s.].

Bauderier 12, 249. Émile Picot, les Français italianisants, I, 137-138.

Arétin, Pierre. Vauzelles, Jean de, trans. A 12

Trois livres de l'Humanite de Jesuchrist: divinement descripte, et au vif representée par Pierre Aretin Illaien. Nouvellement traduitz en Francois 1539 Avec privilege pour III ans.

Lyon: Melchior et Gaspar Trechsel, 1 March 1539 [1540 n.s.].

Baudrier XIII, 249. Brun.

Bandello, Matteo.

Novelle.

[1540s?].

Fichier Picot.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 179

La premiere [-seconde] partie du Nouveau Testament.

Lyon: Nicolas Petit, 1540.

Chambers no. 84.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 178

Le nouveau Testament de nostre Seigneur Jesu Christ, seul sauver du monde ... avec les figures des Evangiles, et des Actes et de L'apocalypse. Item ... les Eipstres du vieil Testament.

Antwerp: Guillaume Du Mont, 1540.

Chambers no. 83.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Arétin, Pierre, comm. Vauzelles, Jean de, trans. B 83

Les sept Pseaulms de la penitence de David.

Lyon: Sebastien Gryphe., 1540.

Baudrier 8, 128.

Brodeau, Victor. B 267

Les Louanges de JesuChrist nostre Sauveur. Oeuvre tresellegant et Divin.

Lyon: Sulpice Sabon, for Antione Constantin., 1540.

Ed. Tomlinson TLF (1982). Baudrier II.31. Du Verdier, p. 1188.

Brodeau, Victor. B 266

Les louanges de Jesus Nostre Saulueur Oeuvre tresexcellent Divin. et elegant. Compose par Maistre Victor Brodeau Secretaire et Varlet de chambre du Treschrestian Roi de France, Francois premier de ce nom.

s.l.: s.n., 1540.

Christie p. 551.

[Bucer, Martin]. B 278

Exposition de l'Evangile de nostre seigneur Jesus Christ, selon S. Matthieu.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 6 June 1540.

Moore no. 46. Berthoud, 'Michel,'no. 9. BG 40/3. Courvoisier, Cahiers RHPR 1933 (ed. of the text).

Bujanda, Index 1, no. 414. Cat. Drihlon no. 8. FRB [17666]

[Calvin, Jean.] [Marot, Clément.]

"La Manyere de faire prieres aux eglises Françoises, tant devant la predication comme apres, ensemble pseaulmes et cantiques françois qu'on chante aux dictes eglises."

[Strasbourg?]: Johann Knobloch, Jr.?, 1540.

Moore no. 180. Peter, Prem. ouvr., no. 9. Ritter no. 1267. Mayer, Marot, no. 103. Pidoux 42/1.

Instruction des enfants. I 51

Instruction pour les Chrestiens.

?: ?, [1540?].

Adams I 141.

Instruction des enfants. [Luther, Martin. Farel, Guillaume.] Manuce, Alde. Marot, Clément. I 50

Introduction pour les enfans, recogneue et corrigee à Louvain: Lan M.CCCCC. et xxxviii. Ou sont adjoustees de nouveau, une tresutile maniere de scavoir bien lire, et orthographier, par Alde. Et la doctrine pour bien et deuement escrire selon ...

Antwerp: Antoine Des Gois, 1540.

NK no. 3236. Het Boek 1929 pp. 161-8.

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.

Commentarii in epistolas catholicas.

Antwerp: Johannes Crinitus for Johannes Gymnicus, 1540.

Rice no. CCCXXII.

Lunette des Chrétiens.

L 78

La Lunette des Chrestiens par laquelle ils pourront facilement voir les raisons pour... moult miseres et calamitez.

?: ?, ?.

Du Verdier ('lutheriqu').

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 103 trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]

Le livre de vraie et parfaite oraison.

Paris: Gilles Corrozet, 1540.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Gimont, "Farel," no. 18.6. Adams O 228.

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 104 trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]

Le livre de vraie et parfaite oraison.

Paris: Jean Foucher, 1540.

Higman, RHPR (1983).

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 105 trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]

Le livre de vraie et parfaite oraison.

Paris: Vve Jean de Brie, 1540.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Gilmont, "Farel," no. 18.7. Moore no. 18.

[Luther, Martin].

L 92

Exposition sur le deux Epistres de S. Pierre, et sur celle de S. Jude: en laquelle tout ce qui touche la doctrine Chrestienne est parfaitement compris. Avec un Sermon du vrai usage de la loi, auquel la plus grande partie du premier chapitre...

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 1540.

Moore no. 24. Benzing, Luther, no. 1732. BG 40/5. Berthoud, 'Michel,' no. 10. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 408.

[Luther, Martin]. woodcuts copied from Lucas Cranach.

L 95

Les faictz de Jesus Christ et du Pape, par lesquelz chascun pourra facilement congnoistre la grande difference dentre eulx: nouvellement reveuz, corrigez, et augmentez selon la verite de la sainte Escripiture, et des droictz canons, par le lecteur ...

[Geneva: Jean Michel, 1540?].

Berthoud, 'Michel' no. 25. BG/ 44/16. Higman, Censorship A 32. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 426, 508 [this or L 94]. Cat. Drilhon no. 9.

[Maiingre, Matthieu.]

M 9

Moralite de la maladie de Chrestiente, a. xiii. personnages: en laquelle sont monstrez plusieurs abuz, aduenz au monde, par la poison de peche et l'hypocrisie des hereticques.

[Geneva: Jean Michel, 1540?].

Berthoud 'Michel' no. 28. BG 44/21.

[Oecolampadius, Johann].

O 4

Exposition sur la premier epistre de S. Jehan Apostre, divisee par sermons tresutiles à tous amateurs de vraie et chrestienne predication.

[Geneve: Jean Michel], 1540.

BG 40.8. Berthoud, 'Michel,' no. 12. Cat. Drilhon no. 11, 26. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 320. FRB [17664]

[Saulnier, Antoine].

S 3

Chanson nouvelle. Composee sus les dix commandemens de Dieu extraicte de la sainte escripture.

[Lyon: Jacques Moderne, 1540?].

Rothschild no. 3299. Bordier Ch. hug. p. xxiv.

Ste. Marthe, Charles de.

La Poesie françoise de Charles de Sainte Marthe, natif de Fontenault en Poictou, Divisee en trois livres. Le tout adressé à tresnoble et tresillustre Princesse, Madame la Duchesse d'Estempes, et contesse de Poictieure plus un Libre de ses Amys.

Lyon: "Le Prince" [Claude Nourry], 1540.

Fichier Picot.

Bible. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 44

La saint Bible en François.

Antwerp: Antoine Des Gois. Antoine de la Haye, 12 January 1541.

Chambers no. 85. Rice no. CCCXXXIV.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 181

La premiere [-seconde] partie du Nouveau Testament de Jesu Christ, extraicte de mot à mot de la Sainte Bible.

Antwerp: Widow of Martin Lempereur, 1541.

Chambers no. 92.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 180

La premiere [-seconde] partie du Nouveau Testament de Jesu Christ, extraicte de mot à mot de la Sainte Bible.

Antwerp: Widow of Martin Lempereur, 1541.

Chambers no. 91.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 182

La Premiere [-seconde] partie du Nouveau Testament.

Lyon: Thibaud Payen, 1541.

Chambers no. 93.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Arétin, Pierre, comm. Vauzelles, Jean de, trans.

B 88

Les sept Pseaulms de la penitence de David.

Paris: Denis Janot, 1541.

Rawles no. 132.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément.

B 85

Psalmes de David, Translatez de plusieurs Autheurs, et principalement de Cle. Marot. Veu ... et corrigé par les theologiens.

Antwerp: Antoine des Gois, 1541.

Mayer, Marot, no. 93. Picoux 41/1. Higman, Censorship, A8. See Bujanda, Index 1, no. 415.

- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément.** **B 86**
Psalmes de David, Translatez de plusieurs Autheurs, et principalement de Cle. Marot... Sermon du bon et mauvais pasteur.
 Antwerp: Antoine des Gois, 1541.
 Mayer, Marot, no. 94. Picoux 41/I bis. Higman, Censorship, A8.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément.** **B 90**
Trente Pseaulmes de David mis en françois par Clement Marot.
 Paris: Estienne Roffet., [1541?].
 Mayer, Marot no. 101. Pidoux 41/II.
- Epistle of Saint James.** **E 12**
L'Epistre Catholique de Saint Jacques Apostre. Avec une exposition breve, en bien facile.
 Geneva: Jean Girard, 1541.
 BG 41/6. Index no. 406, 407. FRB [17665].
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Morin, Guy, trans.** **E 46**
Le Preparatif à la mort.
 Paris: Denis Janot, 1541.
 Rawles no. 144. Brunet 2, 1044. Biblio. belf. 2e série XN. E 1203 no. 47.
- Exhortation sur ces saintes parolles de nostre segneur Jesus.** **E 73**
Exhortation tresutile sur les saintes parolles de nostre Seigneur Jesus, Retournez vous et croyez à l'evangille. Aussi comment on doit faire les bonnes oeuvres, et qu'elles sont les bonnes oeuvres.
 [Geneva: Jean Girard], 1541.
 Bujanda, Index 1, no. 416 and 468. BG 41/7.
- Exposition des articles.** **E 80**
Exposition Sur les Articles de la Foi et Religion chrestienne, qu'on appelle communement le Symbole des Apostres. Contenant le sommaire de la doctrine apostolique.
 [Geneva: Jean Girard], 1541.
 Moore no. 141. Higman, 'Theology' no. 15. BG 41/8.
- Arétin, Pierre. Vauzelles, Jean de, trans.** **A 11**
La Genese de M. Pierre Aretin, avec la vision de Noë, en laquelle il veit les mysteres du Vieil et Nouveau testament.
 Lyon: Sebastian Gryphe, 1542.
 Dagens. Émile Picot, les Français italianisants, I, 147-148.
- Baduel, Claude.**
Oratio funebris in funere Floretae Sarrasiae habita.
 Lyon: Estienne Dolet., 1542.
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** **B 186**
La Premiere [-seconde] partie du Nouveau Testament.
 Lyon: Thibaud Payen, 1542.
 Chambers no. 97.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément, trans. Scève, Maurice, trans.** **B 92**
"Psaumes de Clement Marot. Sermon du bon et mauvais pasteur."

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

Longeon, Dolet, no. 155. Mayer, Marot no. 112.

Bref Disours

B 261

Brief Discours de la Republique françoise desirant la lecture des livres de la sainte Escripiture lui estre loisible en sa langue vulgaire.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

Christie, Dolet, no. 51. Longeon, Dolet, no. 225. <Du Verdier, (who gives '1544').

Brodeau, Victor. Gaigny, Jean de, translator of some Sermons.

B 268

Les Louanges Du saint nom de Jesus, avec la correspondence des figures à la verité <> Six sermons des six parolles de nostre Seigneur en croix.

Paris: Estienne Roffet., 1542.

Ed. Tomlinson.

[Brunfels, Otto].

B 275

Les Prieres et oraisons de la Bible, faictes par les Saintz peres, et par les hommes, et femmes illustres:

tant de l'Ancien que du nouveau Testament.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

Longeon, Dolet, no. 233. Christie, Dolet, no. 52. Febvre BHR 6 (1945), 160. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 462. Cat. Drilhon no. 12.

Campen, Jean van.

C 87

Paraphrase, c'est à dire claire et briefve interpretation sur les psalmes ... et sur l'Ecclesiaste.

Geneva: Jean Girard, [1542?].

BG 42/7. Cartier Arrêts 377-8.

Campen, Jean van.

C 86

Paraphrase. C'est à dire, claire, et briefve interpretation sur les Psalmes de David. Aultre interpretation Paraphrastique sur l'Ecclesiaste de Salomon.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

Longeon Dolet no. 229. Mayer BHR 1855, p. 406.

Campen, Jean van.

C 85

Paraphrase. C'est adire, claire, et briefve interpretation sur les Psalmes de David. Item, Aultre interpretation Paraphrastique sur l'Ecclesiaste de Salomon.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

Longeon Dolet no. 230. Cartier, Arrêts, p. 377n.

Erasmus, Desiderius.

E 47

Preparation à la mort.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet., 1542.

Longeon, Dolet, no. 233.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans?

E 32

Le Chevalier Chresien, Composé en Latin par Erasme, et puis traduit en langue Francois.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1542.

Cartier, De Tournes no. 3. Rothschild no. 2748.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans?

E 30

- Le Chevalier Chresien. Premièrement composé en Latin par Erasme: et depuis traduit en Francois.*
Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.
Christie, Dolet, no. 48. Longeon, Dolet, no. 215. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 323.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans? E 31**
Le Chevalier Chresien. Premièrement composé en Latin par Erasme: et depuis traduit en Francois.
Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.
Longeon, Dolet, no. 216.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Chansonette, Claude, trans. E 38**
Le Vray moyen de bien et catholiquement se confesser.
Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.
Christie, Dolet, no. 49. Longeon, Dolet, no. 217. Mégret BHR 4 (1944), 129-137. Index 1 no. 390 as in this edition.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Vienne, Philibert de, trans. E 54**
Le sermon de Jesus enfant.
Paris: Galliot Du Pré., 1542.
Dagens. Du Verdier.
- Anonymous. Jean Chrysostom. E 69**
Exhortation à la lecture des saintes lettres. Avec suffisante probation des Docteurs de l'Eglise, qu'il est licite, et necessaire, icelles estre translattées en langue vulgaire.
Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.
Christie, Dolet, no. 50. Longeon, Dolet, no. 218. See Longeon, Étienne Dolet, Préfaces Françaises, 143-145, for Dolet's prefatory epistle. Bujanda, Index 1, 3315.
- Exposition on Lord's Prayer. E 79**
Traicte contentant plusieurs expositions utiles et salutaires sur l'oraison dominicale aultrement dicte la Patinostre.
[Lyon: Olivier Arnoullet, 1542?].
Baudrier 10, 50.
- Fontaine de vie. Instruction pour les enfans. F 46**
La Fontaine de Vie de laquelle resourdent tresdoulces consolations, singulierement necessaire aux cueurs affligez. Plus y est adjouste l'instruction pour les enfans.
Paris: Estienne Caveiller, for Arnoul Langelier., 1542.
Moore no. 151. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 361. Droz, Chemins 1, 298-319 avec texte.
- Images de la mort. Holbein, Hans. Vauzelles, Jean de. Rhegius, Urbanus. St. Cyprian. I 7**
St. John Chrysostom.
Les Simulachres et historiees faces de la mort, contenant La medecine de l'ame, utile et necessarie non seulement aux Malades, mais à tous qui sont en bonne disposition corporelle. D'avantage, La Forme et maniere de consoler les malades...
Lyon: Jean and François Frellon., 1542.
Baudrier 5, 186. Franz. no. 5.10. Cat. Drilhon no. 1. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 489.
- [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, et al.] L 22**
Les Epistres et Evangiles des cinquante, et deux Dimenches de lan, Avecques briefves, et tresutiles expositions d'ycelles.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 3 May 1542.

Rice. no. CCCXX. Index I no. 319.

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.] **L 106**

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Poitiers: Enguilbert and Jean de Marnef, 1542.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Gilmont, "Farel," no. 18.9.

[Rabelais, François] **R 19**

La Plaisante, et joyeuse histoire du grand Geant Gargantua. Prochainement reveue, et de beaucoup augmentée par l'Autheur mesme.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

NRB 24.

[Rabelais, François] **R 13**

Pantagruel, Roi des Dipsodes, restitué à son naturel: avec ses faictz, et prouesses espouventables.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

NRB 13.

[Sleidan, Jean]. **S 18**

Escript adresse aux Electeurs Princes, et aultres Estatz de Lempire. Contenant comme et par quelz moyens sest esleve la Papalte, la decadence dicelle, ses merueilleuses praticques, et en somme ce qu'on en peult esperer de ce temps. D'ung chef nouveau...

Strasbourg: [Johann Knobloch, Jr.], 1542.

Peter 'Prem. ouvr.' no. 9a.

Sommaire de la Bible. **S 21**

Le Sommaire des livres du Vieil, et Nouveau Testament. Les Dix parolles, ou Commandements de Dieu.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1542.

J. Mégret, BHR 1944, pp. 129-37 (with text). Longeon, Dolet, no. 221. Index I no. 495, 496.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. **B 191**

La premiere [-seconde] Partie du Nouveau Testament.

Lyon: Jacques Crozet, 1543.

Chambers no. 107.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. **B 192**

La Premiere [-seconde] Partie du Nouveau Testament.

[Lyon: [Thibaud Payen], 1543.

Chambers no. 108.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. **B 189**

Le Nouveau Testament de nostre Seigneur Jesu Christ, seul sauveur du monde ... avec les figures des Evangiles et des Actes et de L'apocalypse. Item ... les Epistres du vieil Testament.

Antwerp: Jean Richard, 1543.

Chambers no. 104.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. **B 188**

Le Nouveau Testament de nostre Seigneur Jesu Christ, seul sauveur du monde ... avec les Figures des

- Evangelies, et de L'apocalypse. Item ... les Epistres du vieil testament.*
 Antwerp: Henry Pierre de Middelburch, 1543.
 Chambers no. 103.
- Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** **B 187**
Le Nouveau Testament de nostre Seigneur Jesu Christ, seul sauveur du monde ... avec les Figures des Evangelies, et des Actes et de L'apocalypse. Item ... les Epistres du vieil testament.
 Antwerp: Guillaume Du Mont, 31 March 1543.
 Chambers no. 102.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément. Calvin, Jean, preface.** **B 96**
Cinquante Pseaumes.
 [Geneva: Jean Girard], 1543.
 BG 43/1.
- Brodeau, Victor.** **B 270**
Les Louanges du saint nom de Jesus. Avec la correspondance de Figures, à la verite <> Plus une Epistre d'un pecheur à Jesus Christ.
 Lyon: Olivier Arnoullet., 20 October 1543.
 Brunet I, 1273. Baudrier X, 78-9.
- Brodeau, Victor.** **B 269**
Les Louanges du saint nom de Jesus... plus Une epistre d'un pecheur à JesuChrist.
 Lyon: Estienne Dolet, [1543?].
 Christie, Dolet, no. 82. Longeon Dolet no. 226. Bujanda, Index I, no. 279.
- [Brunfels, Otto].** **B 276**
Les Prieres et oraisons de la Bible, Faictes par les Saintz Peres, tant du Vieil, que du Nouveau Testament.
 Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1543.
 Cartier De Tournes no. 12.
- Campen, Jean van. Athanasius, a treatise.** **C 88**
Paraphrase sur les Psalmes par le tres savant M. Jean Campensis. Saint Athanase sur le livre des Pseaumes. L'Interpretation sur l'Ecclesiaste. Oraisons pour le temps daffliction.
 Antwerp: Jean Steelsius, 1543.
 Cartier, Arrêts 378n < Brunet 4, 928.
- Dolet, Estienne** **D 38**
Sommaire et recueil des faictz et gestes, du Roi François premier de ce nom, tant contre l'empereur que ses subjectz, et autres nations estranges ... depuis 1513 jusques à present.
 Paris: Alain Lotrian, 1543.
 Longeon Dolet no. 121. Rothschild no. 2117.
- Dolet, Estienne** **D 39**
Sommaire et recueil des faictz et gestes, du Roi François premier de ce nom, tant contre l'empereur que ses subjectz, et autres nations estranges ... depuis 1513 jusques à present.
 Rouen: Jean Petit, Nicolas de Burges, 1543.
 Longeon no. 123.
- [Du Pinet, Antoine], adapted from François Lambert, Seb. Meyer.** **D 101**

Exposition sur l'Apocalypse de Saint Jehan l'Apostre, extraicte de plusieurs docteurs tant anciens que modernes: reveuë, et augmentée de nouveau

Geneva: Jean Girard, 1543.

Cat. Drillhon no. 2. BG 43/15. Bodenmann 17bis c. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 363.

Erasmus, Desiderius. **E 48**

La Preparation à la mort.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1543.

Cartier De Tournes no. 5.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans? **E 33**

Enchiridion, ou manuel du chevalier chrestien, avec des commandemens tressalutaires ... avec ung prologue merveilleusement utile et de nouveau adjousté.

Antwerp: Antoine Des Gois, 1543.

Cartier De Tournes 1, p. 159. Bull. du bibliophile 1845.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Vienne, Philibert de, author and trans. **E 55**

Le sermon de Jesus enfant. Avec le songe du combat entre le corps et l'esprit.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1543.

Cartier De Tournes no. 6. Sale Behagne (1880) no. 67.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Vienne, Philibert de, trans. **E 56**

Le sermon de Jesus enfant.

Lyon: Thibaud Payen, 1543.

Frankfurt cat. 1610.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Anonymous translator. **E 49**

Preparation à la mort.... Avecques aucunes Prieres et Pseaulmes de la Sainte escripture moult prouffictables à tous Chrestiens.

[Antwerp?]: ?, 1543.

Exposition des articles. **E 81**

Exposition des articles de la Foi et Religion Chrestienne, qu'on appelle communement le Symbole des Apostres: contenant le sommaire de la doctrine Apostolique.

[Geneva: Jean Girard], 1543.

BG 43/16.

Instruction des enfants. **I 52**

An Instruction for chyldren, l'Instruction des enfans.

London: John Roux, 1543.

STC 14106.2.

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.] **L 107**

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1543.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Cartier, De Tournes, no. 16. Gilmont, "Farel," no. 18.11.

[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.] **L 108**

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte oraison.

Paris: Nicolas Buffet, for Jacques Regnault and Antoine Foucault., 1543.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Gilmont, 'Farel' no. 18.10.

**[Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 109
trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]**

Le livre de vraie et parfaite oraison.

Lyon: Olivier Arnoullet, 1543.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Moore no. 18. Cartier de Tournes I, 177. Gilmont, "Farel,"no. 18.8.

[Luther, Martin.] L 83

Les quatorze miroirs pour consoler la creature en Dieu.

[Geneva: s.n., 1543?].

Cartier, "Arrêts," p. 410. BG 43/21. Bujanda, Index I,329.

Marguerite de Navarre.

Epistre envoyee au roi par sa soeur unique, la roine de Navarre.

Rouen: Jehan Lhomme., 1543.

Clive BT2, citing Frank, "Dernier voyage de la reine de Navarre," Revue des Pyrénées 8 (1896), 591-624; 9 91897), 32-76.

[Marguerite de Navarre.]

Le Fable du faulx cuider, contentant l'histoire des nymphes de Dyane transmüees en saulles, fadicte par une notable dame de la court, envoiee à Madame Marguerite, fille unique du roi de France.

[Paris]: Adam Saulnier, [1543].

FRB SN 8442.

Marot, Clément.

Les Oeuvres de Clement Marot de Cahors, Valet de Chambre du Roi. Augmentees d'ung grand nombre de ses compositions nouvelles, par cy devant non imprimées. Le tout soigneusement par lui mesmes reveu, et mieulx ordonné, comme lon voira cy apres.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1543.

[Sleidan, Jean.] S 19

D'un nouveau chef qui au temps des empereurs s'esleva à Rome. Livre contenant comment et par quelz moyens s'est eslevé la Papaute: La decadence d'icelle, Ses merveilleuses pratiques, et en somme

ce qu'on en peut esperer de ce temps.

[Geneva: Jean Girard], 1543.

Bujanda, Index I, no. 388.

Sommaires de la Bible. Estienne, Robert. S 23

Le Sommaire des livres du Vieil et Nouveau testament. Les dix parolles, ou commandemens de Dieu.

[Paris: Robert Estienne, 1543?].

Bujanda, Index I, no. 495, 496.

Ste-Marthe, Charles de.

In Psalmum septimum et psalmum XXXIII, paraphrasis per Carolum Samarthenum Fontebraldensem.

Lyon: Pierre de Ste. Lucie, called "Le Prince", 16 May 1543.

Baudrier, XII, p. 182.

Bible. N.T. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. B 193

Le nouveau Testament auquel est demonstre Jesu Crist nostre Sauver, et en plusieurs lieu predict par les Prophetes, avec la declaration des oeuvres et myracles qu'il a fait.

Antwerp: Jacques de Liesvelt, 1544.

Chambers no. 111.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément, trans.

B 98

Les psalmes du royal prophete David, traduitz par Clement Marot. Avec autres petits Ouvrages par lui mesme.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1544.

Longeon, Dolet, no. 156. Mayer, Marot no. 130.

Bible. O.T. Solomon. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.

B 150

Salomon. Les Proverbes. Ecclesiastes. Les Cantiques. Sapience. Ecclesiastique.

Antwerp: Jean Loe, 1544.

[Brunfels, Otto].

B 277

Les Prieres et Oraisons de la Bible.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1544.

Ginzburg Nicod. p. 100n. Bujanda, Index I, no. 462.

Caracciolo, Antoine.

C 90

Le mirouer de vraie religion.

Paris: Simon de Colines Regnault Chaudiere, 1544.

Caracciolo, Antoine.

C 91

Le mirouer de vraie religion.

Paris: Simon de Colines Regnault Chaudiere, 1544.

Des Périers, Bonaventure.

Recueil des Oeuvres de feu Bonaventure des Periers.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1544.

Dolet, Estienne

Le Second Enfer d'Estienne Dolet natif d'Orleans. Qui sont certains compositions faicte par lui mesmes, sur la justification de son second emprisonnement. A Lyon, 1544. Avec Privilege pour dix ans.

Lyon: Estienne Dolet, 1544.

Brunet II, col. 798. Complay Christie III, no. 80 (1).

Dolet, Estienne

Le Second Enfer d'Estienne Dolet natif d'Orleans. Qui sont certaines compositions faictes par lui mesmes, sur la justification de son second emprisonnement. A Troies, Par mistre Nicole Paris. 1544.

Troyes: Nicole Paris, 1544.

Brunet 2, col. 798. Cristie 3, 80 (2).

Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans?

E 34

Le Chevalier Chrestien. Composé en Latin par Erasme, et puis traduit en langue François.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1544.

Cartier de Tournes no. 22.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Morin, Guy, trans.?

E 51

- Preparation à la mort.*
Paris: ?, 1544.
Renouard MSS < Brunet Suppl. 2, 549.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Saliat, Pierre, trans. E 19**
La Civilité puerile.
Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1544.
Cartier De Tournes no. 33.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Anonymous translator. E 50**
De la preparation à la mort, traduit en François d'Erasme avec une instruction chrestienne par Guy Morin, sieur de Loudon.
Lyon: François Juste, 1544.
Baudrier suppl. no. 122 < Brunet 2, 1045, Du Verdier 2, 160. La Croix, no. 38.
- Anonymous. Jean Chrysostom. E 70**
Exhortation à la lecture des Saintes Lettres. Avec suffisante probation de Docteurs de l'Eglise, qu'il est licite, et necessaire, icelles estre translatées en Langue vulgaire: et mesmesent en la François.
Lyon: Balthazar Arnoullet, 1544.
See Longeon, Étienne Dolet, Préfaces Françaises, 143-145, for 1542 edition. FRB SN 8445.
- Guingant, Julien.**
Le Relief de l'ame pecheresse.
1544?
Higman, Censorship, 100. d'Argentré 1, Index. xiv.
- [Heyden, Sebald.] H 14**
D'un seul mediateur, advocat, et intercesseur entre Dieu et les hommes, notre Seigneur Jesus Christ. Ou est aussi démontré comment la Vierge Marie doit estre honorée.
[Geneva: Jean Girard], 1544.
Moore no. 62. BG 44/19.
- [Landry, François]. L 13**
La declaration de la Foi chrestienne, faicte par ung bachelier en theologie ... touchant aucuns articles à lui imposez Lesquelles de point en point à confessees et confirmees en la presence de la faculte de theologie.
[Rouen]: Jean Lhomme, 1544?
Rép. Bib. [Rouen?] no. 42.
- [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, et al.] L 24**
Epistres et evangiles des cinquante et deux dimenches de l'An. Avecques briefves, et tresutiles expositions d'icelles.
Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1544.
- [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, et al.] L 23**
Epistres et Evangiles des cinquante et deux Dimenches de l'An. Avecques briefves, et tresutiles expositions d'ycelles.
Lyon: Balthazar Arnoullet, 1544.
- [Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, L 110
trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]**

Le livre de vraie et parfaicte Oraison avec le Sermon que nostre Seigneur feist en la montagne, et l'exposition contenant les huict beatitudes, deux Homelies de S. Jean Christostome pour apprendre la maniere de prier Dieu, Les Pseaumes penitentialx ...

Paris: Charles Langelier, 1544.

Higman, RHPR (1983). Du Verdier.

St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, St. Gergory Naziansus, Guillaume Chrestien.

Q 1

Quatre homelies de trois antiques et excellens Theologiens ... S. Gregoire Nazianzene, S. Jean Chrysostom, S. Basile.

Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1544.

Cartier De Tournes no. 24.

Somme de l'écriture. [Luther, Martin.]

S 28

La Somme de l'escripture sainte, enseignant la vraie foi, par laquelle sommes justifiez. Et de la vertu du baptesme, selon la doctrine de l'Evangile et des Apostres. Avec une information comme tous estatz

doibvent vivre selon l'Evangile.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 1544.

Th. Dufour Ms.Fr. 3807 no. 126. Weiss, BSHPF 68 (1919), 63-79, p. 64. Berthoud, 'Michel,' no. 18.

Cat. Drihlon no. 24 (this ed.).

Vallambert, Simon, author and trans. Phocylides. Linus. Marguerite de Navarre.

NAYMAXI'OY [=Naumachios]... Simonis Vallamberti Hedui Aualonensis, Institutio puellæ, ex Naumachio. Natura mulierum, ex Phocylide. Exhortatio ad prudentim et ad spem è Lini fragmentis

...

Elegia de amore divino et humano ex Gallico Reginæ Navarrorum.

Paris: Christian Wechel, 1544.

Vérité cachée.

V 9

La Verite cachee, devant cent ans faicte et composee à six personnages: nouvellement corrigee et augmentee avec les autoritez de la sainte Escripiture.

[Geneva: Jean Michel], 1544.

Moore no. 206. Berthoud 'Michel' no. 23. BG 44/33. Bujanda, Index I, no. 511 (specifying the date 1544).

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. and commentary.

Liber Psalmorum cum tenoribus ad rectè profèrendum aptissimis.

Lyons: Matthieu Bonhomme, 1545.

Rice no. CCCXXVIII. Baudrier 10, 213.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément. Le Maistre, Claude. Pasquier, Estienne. Des

B 102

Périers, Bonaventure.

Cinquante deux Pseaumes de David, Traduitz en rithme François selon la verité Hebraique, par Clement Marot.

Paris: Jacques Bogard, Jean Ruelle., 1545.

Bourbon, Nicolas.

Tabella elementaria pueris.

Lyon: , 1545.

La Ferrière-Percy, "Son livre de dépenses," p. 18 n. 2. Péricaud, Documents sur l'histoire de Lyon.

- Campen, Jean van.** **C 89**
Paraphrase ou priefve interpretation sur les Psalmes de David. Plus, Autre interpretation Paraphrastique sur l'Ecclesiaste de Salomon.
 Lyon: Balthazar Arnoullet, 1545.
 Cartier Arrêts 378n. Baudrier 10.
- Chansons. Malingre, Matthieu, ed. Cordier, Mathurin.** **C 102**
Chansons spirituelles, pleines de louenges à Dieu: de sainte doctrine et exhortations, pour edifier le prochain, tant vieilles que nouvelles.
 [Geneva: Jean Girard], 1545.
 Cat. Drilhon no. 7 and 20 (the latter dated 1544). Bujanda, Index I, no. 379. BG 45/22.
- Chansons. Malingre, Matthieu, ed.? Calvin, Jean. Marot, Clément.** **C 95**
Chanson spirituelle sur la sainte Cene de nostre Seigneur... avec le Deviz consolatif d'un Chrestien affligé, et un D'eglogue rustic d'un Pastoureau Chrestien et la Confession d'un chascun fidelle.
 [Lyon?]: ?, 1545.
- [Du Pinet, Antoine], adapted from François Lambert, Seb. Meyer.** **D 102**
Exposition sur l'apocalypse de Saint Jehan l'apostre, extraicte de plusieurs Docteurs tant anciens que modernes: reveue, et augmentée de nouveau.
 [Geneva: Jean Girard], 1545.
 BG 45/16. Bodenmann 17bis d. Bujanda, Index I, no. 420.
- [Gaigny, Jean de (Johannes Gaguacus)].** **G 12**
Le livre de nouvel reimprime faisant mention de sept parolles que nostre benoist sauveur >> dit en l'arbre de la croix: avec aulcune expositions et contemplations sur icelles.
 Paris: Chrestien Wechel, 1545.
- [Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan] [Et. al.]** **L 111**
Le livre de vraie et parfaite oraison.
 Antwerp: Jean de Grave, Guillaume Vissenaken, 1545.
 Higman, RHPR (1983). Gimont, "Farel," no. 18.13. Index 2, no. 1546.187.
- [Luther, Martin]. [Farel, Guillaume]. [St. John Chrysostom] [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.] [Gregoire, Jehan]. [Vitrier, Jean]. [Et. al.].** **L 112**
Le livre de vraie et parfaite oraison. Avec le Sermon que nostre Seigneur feist en la montagne, et l'exposition contenant les huit beatitudes, prinses du .v. vi. et vii. Chapitres de saint Matthieu.
 Paris: Charles Langelier, 1545.
 Higman, RHPR (1983). Benzing, Luther, no. 814a. Droz, Chemins I, 332-338. Gilmont, "Farel," no. 18.12.
- [Luther, Martin].** **L 93**
Exposition sur le deux Epistres de S. Pierre, et sur celle de S. Jude: en laquelle tout ce qui touche la doctrine Chrestienne est parfaitement comprins.
 Geneva: Jean Girard, 1545.
 BG 45/21. Bujanda, Index I, no. 422.
- [Mantova, Benedetto da]. [Flaminio, Marcantonio]. [Calvin, Jean]. Le Maistre, Claude,** **B 18**
 trans.
Traité du benefice de Jesus Christ crucifié envers les chrestiens, traduit de l'italien. Ensemble la 16.

- homelie de S. Jean Chrysostom.*
Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1545.
Cartier De Tournes no. 41. Droz, Chemins, III. 111-183. Vinay. Bujanda, Index I, no. 375 specifies this ed.
- [Marguerite de Navarre.]**
Le Fable du faulx cuider, contentant l'histoire des nymphes de Dyane transmüées en saulles, faicte par une notable dame de la court, envoyée à Madame Marguerite, fille unique du roi de France.
Toulouse: G. Boudeville, [1545].
- [Papillon, Almanque?] [Marot, Clément?]** **M 44**
Bergerie. Du bon pasteur et du mauvais.
[Lyon: J. & F. Frellon, 1545?].
See Defaux: Rothschild IV no. 3247. Mayer, Marot, no. 139. Index no. 332.
- Ponisson, François.** **P 24**
Le miroir du pauvre pecheur penitent sur le pseume de David L.
Toulouse: Jean Lemosin., 1545.
Du Verdier I, 668. Frankfurt cat. Rép. bibl. Boudeville, no. 149.
- Baduel, Claude. Rozel, Charles, trans.**
Oratio funebris in funere Floretae Sarrasiae habita. [French translaton]
1546.
- Chansoas. Malingre, Matthieu, ed.? Calvin, Jean. Marot, Clément.** **C 96**
Chansons spirituelles sur la sainte Cene de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ.
?: ?, 1546.
Bordier, Chans. Hug., p. xxix < Brunel I, 1791.
- Le Discours du voyage de Constantinople.**
Le Discours du voyage de Constantinople envoié dudit lieu à une damoiselle de France par le seigneur de Borderie. La Fable du faulx cuider envoyee à madame Marguerite, fille du roi ... avec aultres compositions.
Paris: Gilles Corrozet; Arnoult l'Angelier, 1546.
Clive BG3.
- [Luther, Martin.]** **L 90**
Exposition sur le cantique virginal, Magnificat, lequel nous apprent la maniere de bien louet et remercier Dieu de ses graces.
Agen: A. Villotte, 1546.
Bujanda, Index I, no. 423.
- Malingre, Matthieu. Marot, Clément** **M 5**
L'Epistre <> envoyee à Clement Marot: en laquelle est demandee la cause de son departement de France. Avec la responce dudit Marot.
Basel: Jacques Estauge, 1546.
See Defaux. Mayer Marot no. 268. Rothschild no. 3248. Facs. ed. Paris, 1868.
- Pasquille d'Allemagne** **P 8**
Le Pasquille Dallemaigne. Auquel l'histoire de laevangile de nouveau retourne en lumiere, et la cause de la guerre presente sont touchees, Aucuns Princes, Estatz, et Citez, sont admonnestez de leur

- condition et office. Aucuns aussi sont painctz au vif,*
[Basel?: Jacques Estauge?], 31 October 1546.
Moore no. 191.
- Rabelais, François.** R 22
Tiers livre des faictz et dictz Heroïques du noble Pantagruel.
Paris: Chrestien Wechel, 1546.
NRB 28. TLF 102.
- Roussel, Gérard. Clichtove, Josse.**
Magnorum Moraliū Aristotelis libri duo, Gerardo Ruffo Vaccariensi interprete.
Paris: J. Barbaei, 1546.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément. Le Maistre, Claude. Pasquier, Estienne. Des Périers, Bonaventure. M.C. [= Cordier, Mathurin].** B 115
Cinquante deux Pseaumes de David, Traduitz en rithme François selon la verité Hebraique, par Clement Marot.
Paris: Charles Langelier, 1547.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Macnalt, Antoine, trans. Marot, Clément.** E 17
Les Apophthegmes, c'est à dire prompt, subtilz, et sententieux dictz de plusieurs rois, cheffz d'armées, Philosophes et autres grans personnaiges, tant Grecz que Latins
Paris: Charles Langelier., 1547.
- Images de la mort. Holbein, Hans. Vauzelles, Jean de. Rhegius, Urbanus. St. Cyprian. St. John Chrysostom.** I 8
Les Images de la mort, auxquelles sont adjoustées douze figures. Davantage, La Medecine et l'Ame.
La Consolatoin des Malades. Un Sermon de Mortalité, par saint Cyprian... Un sermon de Patience, par saint Jehan Chrysostome.
Lyon: Jean Frellon, 1547.
Baudrier 5, 210. Mortimer no. 289. Franz no. 5.11.
- [Luther, Martin.] Espence, Claude de, trans.** L 84
Consolation en adversité.
Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1547.
Cartier, De Tournes no. 82. Bujanda, Index 1, no. 528.
- [Marguerite de Navarre.]**
Le Fable du faulx cuider, contentant l'histoire des nymphes de Dyane.
[Lyon]: Jean de Tournes, 1547.
- Marguerite de Navarre.** M 32
Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses, tres-illustre Roine de Navarre.
Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1547.
FRB 6642
- Sommaires de la Bible. Estienne, Robert.** S 25
La Doctrine des Chrestiens extraicte du vieil et nouveau Testament. Les dix parolles ou commandemntz de Dieu. Les commandementz de nostre mere sainte Eglise. Les sept sacrements...
?: ?, [1547?].

- Sommaires de la Bible. Estienne, Robert.** S 24
Le Sommaire des livres du Vieil et Nouveau testament. Les dix parolles, ou Commandemens de Dieu.
 Paris: Robert Estienne, 1547.
- Beaulieu, Eustorg de. Gueroult, Guillaume, liminary poem.** B 4
L'Espinglier des filles.
 Basel: s.n., 1548.
 Haag, Fr. prot.
- Bible. Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans.** B 56
La sainte Bible en François, translatee selon la pure entiere traduction de Saint Hierome, derechief conferee et entierement revisitee selon les plus anciens et plus correctz exemplaires.
 Antwerp: Jean Loe, 1548.
 Chambers no. 136. Rice no. CCCXXXV.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Marot, Clément, trans.** E 20
Colloque d'Erasme ... intitulé Abbatis et Eruditae.
 [Paris?]: ?, [1548?].
 Mayer, Marot, no. 166.
- [Mantova, Benedetto da]. [Flaminio, Marcantonio]. [Calvin, Jean]. Le Maistre, Claude, trans.** B 19
Du Benefice de Jesuchrist crucifié, envers les Chrestiens. Traduit de culgaire Italien ... Avec une traduction de la XVI. Homelie de saint Jean Chrysostome, de la femme Cananée.
 Paris: Antoine Jurie, 1548.
 Droz, Chemins 3, facs. reprod.
- Marguerite de Navarre.** M 42
Le Triumphe de l'agneau de tresillustre Princesse Marguerite de France Roine de Navarre. Plus une oraison de l'Ame fidele à son Seigneur Dieu.
 Rouen: Robert and Jean Dugort, 1548.
- Rabelais, François** R 32
Le quart livre des faictz et dictz Heroiques du noble Pantagruel.
 Lyon: [Pierre de Tours], 1548.
 NRB 41. TLF 10.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément.** B 124
Cinquante Pseaumes de David. Traductz en rithme François selon la verité Hbraique <> Avec le latin en marge. A iceulx sont adjoustez autres Pseaumes et Cantiques.
 Paris: Gilles Corrozet, 1549.
 Cat. Libr. de la Seine, 1995.
- Bourbon, Nicolas.**
Conjugum illustrios Antonii a Borbonis ... et Janae Navarrorum principis Epithalamion.
 [1549].
 Picot.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Marot, Clément, trans.** E 21
Deux colloques d'Erasme ... Abbatis et Eruditae, l'autre Virgo Misogamos.

- Lyon: Jean Le Converd., 1549.
Mayer, Marot, no. 168. Baudrier 1, 103.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Marot, Clément, trans.** E 22
Deux colloques d'Erasmus plus le Balladin du mesme Marot.
Paris: Guillaume Thibout., 1549.
Mayer, Marot, no. 167.
- [Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, et al.]** L 25
Les Epistres et evangiles des cinquante, et deux Dimenches de l'An. Avecques breves et tresutiles expositions d'icelles.
"Rouen"[Lyon?]: "Claude Treset", 1549.
- [Marguerite de Navarre.]**
Le Livre de plusieurs pieces, c'est à dire faict et recueilly de divers auteurs, comme Clement Marot et autres.
Lyon: Thibauld Payen, 1549.
Clive BG7.
- Marguerite de Navarre.** M 33
Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses.
Lyon: Simon Du Bois dit de la Haye, Guillaume Rouillé, Pierre de Tours, Thibaud Payen, 1549.
- Moyeu de parvenir.** M 83 [= E 69]
Le Moyen de parvenir à la congnoissance de Dieu, et consequemment à salut.
?: ?, ?.
Bujanda, Index 1, no. 456.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Clément Marot, Gilles d'Aurigny.** B 136
Cent Psalmes de David Traduictz ... selon la verité Hebraique, Par Clement Marot, Giles Aurigny, Et autres.
Rouen: Robert and Jean Du Gort, 1550.
- Bible. O.T. Psalms. Marot, Clément. Cordier, Mathurin.** B 130
Cinquante deux Pseames de david.
Paris: Guillaume Merlin, 1550.
Mayer, Marot no. 181. Rothschild no. 619.
- Brief Discours** B 262
Brief discours de la republique françoise, desirant la lecture des livres de la sainte Escripiture (et iceulx approuvés par les docteurs de l'eglise) lui estre loisible en sa langue vulgaire.
Caen: Martin & Pierre Philippe, [1550?].
Longeon, Dolet, no. 225.
- Mazarier, Martial.** M 50
Instruction et doctrine à se bien confesser, et prier Dieu pour ses pechez, extraicte des saintes escriptures: tant du vieil que du nouveau testament.
[Paris]: ?, 1550.
Bujanda, Index 1, no. 334; d'Argentré 1, Index, p. xvii.

[Sleidan, Jean].

S 20

D'un nouveau chef qui au temps des Empereurs s'esleva à Rome. Livre contenant comment et par quelz moyens s'est eslevée la Papauté, la decadence d'icelle, ses merveilleuses pratiques, et en somme

ce qu'on en peut esperer de ce temps.

Geneva: Adam and Jean Rivery, 1550.

Adams R 736. CDM p. 16.

Ste. Marthe, Charles de.

In obitum incomparabilis Margaritae, illustrissimae Navarrorum Reginae, Oratio fuebris per Carolum Sancto-Marthanum, eiusdem Reginae, dum illa viveret, apud Alençonenses Consiliarium et Supplicum libellorum Magistrum.

Paris: Regnault & Claude Chauldiere, 1550.

Ste. Marthe, Charles de.

Oraison funebre de l'incomparable Marguerite, roine de Navarre, duchessse d'Alençon. Composée en latin par Charles de Sainte Marthe et traducte par lui en langue françoise. Plus epitaphes de ladite dame par aucuns poetes françoise.

Paris: Regnault & Claude Chauldiere, 1550.

[Vergerio, Pietro Paulo.]

V 6

La Declaracion du jubilé qui doit etre à Rome l'an M.D.L.

[Basel: Jacques Estauge, 1550?].

Bodius, Hermann. [Bucer, Martin?]

B 216

La premiere [-seconde] partie de l'union de plusieurs passges de l'Escriture sainte: extraite des docteurs autentiques de l'Eglise Chrestienne. Revue et corrigée.

[Geneva: Philibert Hamelin], 1551.

Bujanda, Index 1, no. 510. CDM p. 17. Index Aurel. no. 120.888.

Bucer, Martin. [Baduel, Claude, trans.?]

Deux livres du Royaume de Jesus Christ nostre sauveur, composez par Martin Bucer peu de temps avant sa mort, et dediez à Edouard VI. Roi d'Angleterre: fort utiles et necessaires non seulement à tous Theologiens et Jurisconsultes, mais aussi à tous ceux..

[Lausanne: Richard Mendin, after 17 February] 1558.

François Wendel, ed. Eugénie Droz, "Claude Baduel: Traducteur de Bucer," BHR 17 (1955), 347-350.

Bucer, Martin. [Baduel, Claude, trans.?]

Du Royaume de Jesu Christ nostre sauveur. Par M. Martin Bucer. Au Roi d'Angleterre Edouard, sixième de ce nom. II. Livres tres-utile et necessaires non seulement à tous Theologiens et jurisconsultes, mais aussi à tous ceux qui sont commiz au ...

Geneva: Jaques Berthet, 17 February 1558.

François Wendel, ed. Eugénie Droz, "Claude Baduel: Traducteur de Bucer," BHR 17 (1955), 347-50.

Appendix B II. Manuscript Books of the Navarrian Network

1523

- Berquin, Louis de. *Epistola apologetica*. [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. xi [no. 16 Q in Berquin's library].
- Berquin, Louis de. *Speculum Theologastorum*. [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. 405B; 2, p. xi [no. 21 X].
- Berquin, Louis de. "*Apologia*." [Paris] June 1523 or before. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A; vol. 2, p. xi [no. 4 D].
- Berquin, Louis de. "*Iuri canonico et toti ecclesiasticae libertati scandalose detrahens, consitutionum ecclesiasticarum fideles obligantium sub alio nomine est enervativus, praelatis item eccleiae, praesertim Romanis tyrannidem contumeliose impingens...*" [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. xi [no. H E].
- Berquin, Louis de. "*Rationes Lutheri, quibus omnes Christianos esse sacerdotes molitur suadere*." [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405B; vol. 2, p. xi [no. T].
- Berquin, Louis de. *De usu et efficacia missae*. [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. xi [no number].
- Berquin, Louis de. *Le Catholique du Pape et de Moise*. [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. 405A-B; 2, p. xi. Higman, *Censorship*, 74.
- Berquin, Louis de. "*Le Debat de pieté et superstition*." [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. xi. Higman, *Censorship*, 74.
- Berquin, Louis de. "*Rationes propter quas Lutherus Decretales caeterosque Juris Canonici libros igni publicè tradidit [in French]* ." [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405B; 2, p. xi [no. 18 S]. Higman, *Censorship*, 74.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans. *Le Paradis du Pape Jule [Julius exclusus]*. [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. Ever published? d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. xi. Higman, *Censorship*, 74.
- Hutten, Ulrich. Berquin, Louis de, trans. *La Tirade Romaine [Trias Romana]*. [Paris], before June 1523. Lost work. d'Argentré 1, pt. 2, p. 405A-B; vol. 2, p. xi. Higman, *Censorship*, 74.
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. *L'Evangile de saint Mathieu traduit en françois*. [After 1523]. Location unknown. Fichier Picot no. 690. Catalogue of the library of the late George Offor, 1865. p. 261. 3060. Delisle, Cabinet des MSS 1, p. 187.
- Mazurier, Martial. "*Unnamed 'opusculum'*." [Paris], submitted for censure before 30 July 1523. Lost work. Clerval, 373

1524

Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques. "*Les Epistres de St. Paul.*" [Paris], sent 10 January 1524. Lost manuscript? Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no.77, pp. 92-93.

Briçonnet, Guillaume. "*Letter on the Ethiopian.*" 6 May 1524. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, nos. 95 and 102, p. 161

Farel, Guillaume, ed. "*Livres françois.*" Before 18 November 1524. Lost works. Herminjard 1, no. 128, 306.

Farel, Guillaume. "*Antichristi.*" [Basel?], before 2 September 1524. Lost work. Herminjard 1, no. 120, 281-3.

Farel, Guillaume. "*Dialogue between Erasmus and Farel.*" [Basel?], Before 27 October 1524. Lost work. Herminjard 1, no. 121, 286.

Farel, Guillaume. "*Treatise against Erasmus.*" Before 27 October 1524. Lost work. Herminjard 1, no. 121, 286 and no. 126, 300.

Lambert, François. *Centum sexdecim conclusiones Francisci Lamberti* [for a disputation at Metz in 1524]. Written 1524, seized 1531. Lost work. German translation extant. Bodenmann, "*Bibliotheca Lambertiniana,*" 26. Higman, *Censorship*, 83. [d'Argentré].

Le Sueur, Nicolas. *De vana rei Christianae (quam publicam vocant) administratione*. First mentioned 15 May 1524. Lost work, conceivably the same as E 71 or T 15. Herminjard 1, no. 102, 216-219. *Oekolampads Briefe*, 1, no. 203, 289 (exerpt). Roussel to Le Sueur, December 1525: Herminjard 1, 414-415.

Luther, Martin. [Berquin, Louis de or Papillon, Antoine, trans]. *Des voeux monastiques* [French translation of *De votis monasticis*]. [1524]. Lost manuscript. Herminjard 1, no. 132, 313-316, 314-315. Zw. E2. 346. CAF 7, p. 418.

Luther, Martin. Marguerite de Navarre, trans. *Le pater noster composé par Madame la duchesse. [Le pater noster faict en. translation et dialogue par la Roine de Navarre]*. [1524?]. Paris, Bibl. Arsenal 3458; Paris BnF ms. 1723 (posterior). Translation of "Explanatio dominicae orationis," (1520), trans. Georg Spalatin?, WA no. 30, esp. 79ff. Moore, App. 1, 431-441 for text (compared with German original not Latin translation). M. Paturier, 1905. Cf. Briçonnet, *Correspondance* 2, no. 103, 162. Giaccone, "Le Premier Ouvrage de Marguerite de Navarre."

Luther, Martin. Oraison, Antoin d', trans. *De la préparation à la mort*. [1524?]. Bibliothèque de Carpentras, ms. 117. Robert Marichal, "Antoine d'Oraison, premier traducteur français de Luther," BHR 9 (1947), 78-108.

Marguerite of Navarre. "*Four rondeaux on the death of Charlotte Valois.*" [c. September 1524]. See Salminen, *Discord*, pp. 7-12.

"*Placard against Papal Jubilee Indulgence.*" Meaux, posted December 1524. Lost work.

Roussel, Gérard. "*Commentary on Romans.*" Meaux, before 5 October 1524. Lost work. Herminjard 1, no. 124, 291-294.

Ulich of Wurtemberg. Coct, Anémond de, trans. "*Ulric de Wurtemberg aux gouverneurs de Besançon.*" Before September 1524. Lost work. German and Latin editions extant. Herminjard 1, no. 116, no. 120, 280-284; 283: De Coct to Farel, September 1524.

1525

- Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans]. *Brieve admonition de la maniere de prier*. Before 1 May 1525. Lost work. Published 1525 by Du Bois. d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42. Farge, *Registre* 1, 94 A - 95A. Higman, *Censorship*, 74-76.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans]. *Declamation des Louanges de mariage*. [Before 1 May 1525. Lost work. Published 1525 by Du Bois. d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42. Farge, *Registre* 1, 94 A - 95A. Higman, *Censorship*, 74-76.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans]. *Le Symbol des apostre, qu'on dit vulgairement le Credo, contnant les articles de la. Foi*. Before 1 May 1525. Lost work. Published 1525 by Du Bois. d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42. Farge, *Registre* 1, 94 A - 95A. Higman, *Censorship*, 74-76.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. [Berquin, Louis de, trans]. *La Declamation de la paix, se complaignant de ce qu'elle est de chacun deboutée et chassée*. Before 1 June 1525. Lost work. Published 1531 by Vinglé. d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42. Farge, *Registre* 1, 94 A - 95A. Higman, *Censorship*, 74-77. Facsimile of the printed edition (1531?), Telle, TLF, 1978.
- Farel, Guillaume. "Index." Before 18 September 1525. Lost work. Herminjard 1, no. 160 , 385.
- Farel, Guillaume, Martin Luther, et al. *Livre de prières, avec les Sept psaumes de la pénitence*. [1525-1538]. BnF MS f.fr. 19246. Francis Higman, "Farel et Luther dans la Bibliothèque d'Anne de Montmorency?" BHR 53 (1991): 415-418. Presentation manuscript copy of *L'Oraison de Jesuchrist, qui est le Pater noster, et le Credo, ... Les sept pseaulmes: et autres choses tresutiles*. Higman, *Piety*, F 25.
- Saulnier, Matthieu. "Defense of Pauvan." Meaux, before 9 December 1525. Lost work. Farge, *Registre* 1, p. 120, no. 133A [144B]; 1526 note 47. d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, p. 30.

1526

- Arande, Michel d'. "Commentary on the Psalms." [1526]. Lost work. As reported by Heller in COE article.
- Berquin, Louis de. *Combien que l'homme soit justifié*. Before 1 March 1526. Lost work. Farge, *Registre* 1, 2, 6, 12 March 1526; d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42.
- Berquin, Louis de. *Ludovici a Berquin adversus calumnias quorundam Epistolas Apologetica ad amicum*. Before 1 March 1526. Second manuscript of same lost work seized from Berquin in 1523 and burned. Farge, *Registre* 1, 2, 6, 12 March 1526; d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42.
- Berquin, Louis de? *Passio Lutheri*. Before 1 March 1526. Lost work. Farge, *Registre* 1, 2, 6, 12 March 1526; d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42.
- Roussel, Gérard, trans. "Le Pentatuque." Presented to Marguerite of Navarre before 27 August 1526. Lost work. Herminjard 1, no. 182, 448-451; Schmidt, *Gérard Roussel*, no. 9, 197-198
- Jerome, St. Berquin, Louise de, trans. *Epistre de Saint Hierosme contre Vigilance*. Before 1 March 1526. Lost work. Farge, *Registre* 1, 2, 6, 12 March 1526; d'Argentré 2, pt. 1, 40-42.

1528–1532

- Placard at Meaux *Pseudo-Papal Bull*: “*faisant croire que le pape avait enjoint ‘de lire, relire et faire lire. des livres de Luther’.*” Meaux, before 12 January 1528. Lost work. Mention in AN X1a 1531, fol. 80 (13 janv. 1528). Imbart 3, 268; Veissière, *Guillaume Briçonnet*, 393.
- Brenz, Johannes. [Roussel, Gérard?]. [Du Bois, Simon]. [“Claudius”]. *Initiatore instruction en la religion chrestienne pour les enffans*. [After July 1529?]. Paris BA ms 5096 réserve. Articles by Venard, Orth, and Reid (forthcoming). W. Köhler, “*Bibliographi Brentiana*,” nos. 30 and 35.
- Caroli, Pierre. *Tout en un mot*. 1530. Vatican Library. Piaget, “*Documents inédits sur la Réformation dans le Pays de Neuchatel*,” vol. 1, 493-507.
- Zwingli, Ulrich. *Christianae fidei brevis et clara expositio ad regem Christianum*. [Fidei expositio]. Zurich, July 1531. Paris BnF MS latin 3673. ZW 6, pt. 5, 1-163. Ulrich Zwingli, ‘On Providence and other essays,’ ed. William John Hinke (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1983), 235-293.
- Zwingli, Ulrich. *Christianae fidei brevis et clara expositio ad regem Christianum*. [Fidei expositio]. Zurich, July 1531. Zurich. ZW 6, pt. 5, 1-163. Ulrich Zwingli, ‘On Providence and other essays,’ ed. William John Hinke (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1983), 235-293.
- Zwingli, Ulrich. *Christianae fidei brevis et clara expositio ad regem Christianum*. [Fidei expositio]. 1532. Copy extant. ZW 6, pt. 5, 1-163. Ulrich Zwingli, ‘On Providence and other essays,’ ed. William John Hinke (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1983), 235-293.

1533 – 1540

- Morand, Jean. *Dialogue Lutheri et Anti-Lutheri*. 1533. Lost work. d’Argentré 2, pt. 1, 102-119.
- “*Placards against indulgences*.” Posted 29 March 1533. Lost works. Farge, *Registre*, I, p. 284-285, 377 A & B. Herminjard 3, 54-61. with a responding placard hostile to the ‘heretics’ printed in Crouzet, *Genève*, 220-221.
- Roussel, Gérard or Calvin, Jean? “*Commentary on ?*” Before 27 October 1533. Lost work. Herminjard 3, no. 437, p. 105.
- Roussel, Gérard. “*Epitome*.” Before 27 October 1533. Lost work. Herminjard 3, no. 437, p. 105.
- L’arbre de la Foye chrestienne*. Submitted for censure 15 December 1534. Lost work. d’Argentré 1, index, p. viii-ix. Higman, *Censorship*, 85. Bujanda, *Index* 1, no. 366.
- La Remonstrance de la vertu insuperable et fruits inestimables de la foi chrestienne*. Submitted for censure 15 December 1534. Lost work. d’Argentré 1, index, p. VIII-IX. Higman, *Censorship*, 85. Bujanda, *Index* 1, no. 366.
- Les Sept Assaults*. Submitted for censure 15 December 1534. Lost work. d’Argentré 1, index, p. VIII-IX. Higman, *Censorship*, 85. Bujanda, *Index* 1, no. 366.
- Farel, Guillaume and Pierre Viret. “*Request to German Princes for intervention on behalf of the Vaudois of France*.” 4 August 1535. Herminjard 3, no. 521, 327-332. *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* (1852), p. 252 ff.
- German princes? “*Supplication to Francis I on behalf of the Vaudois*.” September 1535. Lost work. Herminjard 3, no. 530, 356-362.
- Vaudois of Provence. “*Confession de Foi des Vaudois*.” c. August 1535. Lost work. Herminjard 3, no. 530, 356-362.

Thiboust, Jacques, ed. *L'Ordre de la Triomphante et Magnifique monstre du Mystere des saints actes des. Apostres, faite à Bourges, le dimanche, dernier jour d'avril, 1536.* c. 1536. Bourges BM MS 317, bound with Imprimés, D 1088.

1540s

Bizet, Tristan de. Bishop of Saintes. *Exposition de l'oraison de nostre Seigneur Jesus, de laquelle il a commandé es siens estre prié; avec l'exposition du symbole apostolique, divisé en douze articles de nostre foi catholique: et une exposition sur les dix commandements de la loi.* 1540s? Paris BSG 8° 600 INV 193 Rés. Causse, "Familière exposition."

Instruction et salutaire admonition pour parfaitement vivre en ce monde, et comment en toute nostre adversité serons patients. Lost work. Higman, *Piety*, I 53: "J. Calvin, CO VII, 242: title of one of the 'libertin' texts, 'seulement d'une feuille', refuted by Calvin in 'Contra la secte...' [C 68] (1545). No other trace apart from this mention by Calvin." Higman says this is a printed book, but it may just be a manuscript.

Pocque, Antoine. "Spiritualist tracts." [1540s]. Lost works, partially quoted in Calvin's response. See CO [12], Poullain to Calvin and CO 7, *Contra la furieuse secte de Libertins Spirituels*.

Roussel, Gérard. "Livre sur S. Sacrement." [1540s]. Lost work, one of several on the Eucharist. Florimond de Raemond, 850, cf. 921-922.

Roussel, Gérard. "Memoires de Gérard Roussel sur l'opinion de Calvin, touchant la Cene." [1540s]. Lost work. Florimond de Raemond, 921-922, cf. 850.

C'est la bonne coustume. Censured 1 June 1541. Lost work. Higman, *Censorship*, 86-87. d'Argentré I, index, xi-xii.

Ce sont les grands pardons et indulgences. Censured 1 June 1541. Lost ms. Higman suggests that it may be the same as "Les grans pardons et indulgences" [Geneva: Vingle, 1533]. Higman, *Censorship*, 86-87. d'Argentré I, index, xi-xii.

"*Epistola ad Fratrem qui incipit 'La grace, paix et misericorde de Dieu.'*" Censured 1 June 1541. Lost work. Higman, *Censorship*, 86-87. d'Argentré I, index, xi-xii

Introduction familiere à facilement et en peu de temps apprendre la grammaire latine, faite en forme de dialogue, auquel sont introduits les personnages. Censured 1 June 1541. Lost work. Higman, *Censorship*, 86-87. d'Argentré I, index, xi-xii

Les Arrestz et ordonnances de la cour celeste. Censured 1 June 1541. Higman, a similarly titled work by Jean Girard from 1550 is in the BL. Higman, *Censorship*, 86-87. d'Argentré I, index, xi-xii.

Roussel, Gérard. *Familiere exposition and Forme de visite de diocèse.* [Between 1546-1550]. BnF f.fr. 419. Landa. Causse

Farel, Guillaume. *Epistre à tous seigneurs, et peuples et pasteurs à qui le Seigneur m'a donné accez, qui. m'ont aidé et assisté en l'oeuvre de nostre Seigneur Jesus, et enuers lesquels Dieu s'est. servi de moi, en la predicatoin de son saint Evangile.* [1548?]. Copy extant. Gilmont, "Farel," 27. Fick, 1865, pp. 162-186. Louis Aubert, "Un opuscul de Farel."

Appendix B III. The Navarrian Network's Reading List 1524

Listed below are the books that members of the Navarrian Network in France read or sought to acquire during 1524, including those of network members outside the realm (Coct, Lambert, and Farel). This working library is discussed in chapter 7.

These titles have been reconstituted from more or less explicit references in the letters of network members from 1524, see Herminjard 1, nos. 83-133. Herminjard missed some allusions, and many of his bibliographical citations have been completed below. Further bibliographical research should produce exact titles and dates for the remaining short titles and "allusions" to works mentioned in the sources.

1. Bible. Ximenes, ed., Polyglot Bible of Alacala.
2. Bible. Latin, Wittenberg edition "in two columns."
3. Bible. Luther's German translation: *Das Bible Deutsch*.
4. Bible. Old Testament. Job and Psalms in German.
5. Bible. Old Testament. Psalms and Prophets. Aramaic [Chaldean] edition.
6. Brunfels, Otto. *De ratione decimarum Othonis Brunfelsii propositiones. Hierony. Quicquid habent clerici, pauperum est. August. Et eleemosynae pauperum, sunt decimae*. [Strasbourg: Johann Schott, 1524].
7. Brunfels, Otto. *Othonis Brunfelsii pro Ulricho Hutten vita defuncto, ad Erasmi Roterod. Spongiam Responsio, ab autore recognita*. (Strasbourg: Jean Schott, March 1524).
8. Bugenhagen, Johannes. Pomerani hypothesin libri.
9. Bugenhagen, Johannes. *Joannis Pomerani Bugenhagii in librum Psalmorum interpretatio, Wittembergae publice lecta*. Basel: Adam Petrus, March 1524.
10. Bugenhagen, Johannes. Scholia Pomerani in 10 Epistolas Pauli. [pub. before 8 April 1524].
11. Clichtove, Josse. *Antilutherus Iudoci Clichtovei Neoportuensis Doctoris Theologi, tres libros complectens*. Paris: Simon de Colines, 13 October 1524.
12. Coct, Anémond de. Luther, Martin. Zwingli, Ulrich. *In hoc libello contenta. Annemundi Cocti Equitis Galli ad lectorem Epistola. Christianissimi doctoris Martini Lutheri ad ilustrissimum principem Carolum Sabaudiae ducem Epistola. Huldrici Zuinglii Tigurini Episcopi vigilantissimi ad Petrum Sebevillam Gratianopolitanum Ecclesiasten Epistola*. [Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, February 1524].
13. De instituendis pueris. A work by either Zwingli, Erasmus, or possibly Otto Brunfels, *De disciplina et institutione puerorum*.
14. Erasmus, Desiderius. *Exomologensis sive modus confitendi*. Basel: Froben, 1524.
15. Erasmus, Desiderius. *Brevis admonitio de modo orandi*.
16. Farel, Guillaume. "Libellus against Erasmus." [French manuscript or lost work].
17. Farel, Guillaume. Antichristi. [Manuscript reply to Clichtove's *Antilutherus*?].
18. Farel, Guillaume. "Dialogue between Erasmus and Farel." [Manuscript or lost work, Latin?].
19. Farel, Guillaume. *Epistre Chrestiene*. [Basel]. No copy extant.

20. Farel, Guillaume. *Le Pater noster, et le Credo en françoys, avec une tresbelle, et tresutile exposition, et declaration sur chascun faicte en forme de contemplation et oraison fort proufitable pour enflamber le cuer.* [Basel: Andreas Cratander, August 1524].
21. Farel, Guillaume? *Determinatio Facultatis Theologie Parisiensis, super aliquibus propositionibus, certis à locis (De quibus Ptolomeus 19 tabula Africe) nuper ad eam delatis, de veneratione sanctorum, de canone missae (Expolitio).* Basel: Andreas Cratander, [March] 1524.
22. Hess, Johannes. "Theses from Breslau." [=? *Apologia inclyti senatus populi que Vratislaviensis pro novi pastoris nova electione.* Breslau: Kaspar Libisch, 1523.]
23. Hesshus, Simon. *Apologia Simonis Hessi adversus dominum Roffensem.* [s.l.s.d.].
24. Lambert, François. "Commentary on Hosea and Malachai."
25. Lambert, François. *De fidelium vocatione in renum Christi, id est ecclesiam. De vocatione ad ministeria eius, maxime ad Episcopatum. Item de vocatione Matthiae per sortem, ac similibus. Et ibi multa de sortibus. Francisco Lamberto autore.* [Strasbourg: Johann Hervagen the elder, 1525].
26. Lambert, François. *Commentariorum Francisci Lamberti Avenionensi Theologi De Sacro Coniugio, et adversus pollutissimum Regni perditionis caelibatum, Liber, in LXLIX Positiones divisus, quibus quicquid ad Matrimonium spectat, complexus est.* Strasbourg: Johannes Herwagen, May 1524. Dedicated to Francis I.
27. Lambert, François. *In cantica canticorum Salomonis, libellum quidem sensibus altiss. in quo sublimia sacri coniugii mysteria, quae in Christo et ecclesia sunt, pertractantur, Francisci Lamb. avionensis comentarii, Wittembergae praelecti.* Strasbourg: [Johannes Herwagen], [August] 1524. Dedicated to Francis I.
28. Lonicer, Johannes. *Catechesis de bona Dei voluntate, erga quemvis Christianum, deque sanctorum cultu et invocatoine. Io. Loniceri.* [Strasbourg: Johann Schott, 1523].
29. Luther, Martin. *De instituendis ministris ecclesiae, ad clarissimum senatum Pragensem Bohemiae.* Wittenberg: [Lukas Cranach and Christian Döring], 1523.
30. Luther, Martin. *Formula missae et communionis pro ecclesias Vuittembergensi.* "Wittenberg" [Strasbourg: Wolfgang Köpfel], 1523.
31. Luther, Martin. *De votis monasticis. Martini Lutheri iudicium.* Wittenberg: [Melchior Lotter the younger, 1521]. Translated by Antoine Papillon and dedicated by him to Marguerite of Navarre. Manuscript, 1524.
32. Luther, Martin. *Enarrationes Martini Lytheri in Epistolas D. Petri duas, et Iudae unam, in quibus quicquid omnino ad Christianismum pertinet, consumatiss. digestum leges.* Trans. Martin Bucer for the use of the "brothers in France." Strasbourg: Johannes Herwagen, 4 July 1524.
33. Luther, Martin. *Adversus falso nominatum ordinem episcoporum.* Wittemberg: [Johann Rhau-Grunenberg], 1523.
34. Luther, Martin. *Epistola Lutheriana ad Leonem Decimum summum Pontificem. Tractatus de libertate Christiana.* Wittemberg, 1520.
35. *Paquillus Marranus exul, lectroi salutem. Vidisti saepiuscule lector labores nostros quibus hactenus contra corruptos nostri aevi mores sudavimus. Nunc cognosce quid in novos illos Theologistas adulatores, ausi fuimus. Quidve Marforio nostro auspice obtinuerimus a pontifice Romana versa pagella quae sunt ostendet. Lege, et probabis.*
36. Melanchthon, Philip. Annotata quaedam Melanchthonis in Paulum, Lucam et Joannem.

37. Melanchthon, Philip. *Adversus furiosum parisiensis theologastrorum decretum, Philippi Melanchthonis pro Luthero apologia*. [Basel: Adam Petri, 1521].
38. Myconius, Oswald. *Ad sacerdotes Helvetiae, qui Tigurinis male loquuntur suasoria, ut male loqui desinant*. Zürich: Christoph Froschauer the elder, 1524.
39. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *De erogatione eleemosynarum*. 1523.
40. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *De passione Domini, de venerando et laudando Deo in Maria, de invocatione Divorum contra [Joannem] Fabrum*. 1523.
41. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *De risu paschali, Oecolampadii, ad V. Capitonem theologum epistola apologetica*. Basel: Johann Froben, 1518.
42. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *Enchiridion graecae literaturae*. 1523.
43. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *Quod non sit onerosa Christianis confessio paradoxon Ioannis Oecolampadii. Experire lector, quam leve sit onus Domini, quam ubique diligenter curet Ecclesia, ne suos oneret. Rara, erudita, grata, et necessaria reperies*. Basel: Andreas Cratander, 1521.
44. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *De non habendo pauperum delectu, Io. Oecolampadii Epistolas utilissima*. Basel: [Andreas Cratander], 1523.
45. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *Sermones de gaudio resurrectionis et mysterio tridui*. 1521.
46. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *Textus libri Geneseos secundum LXX. interpretes*. 1523.
47. Oecolampadius, Johannes. *In epistola Joannis apostoli catholicam primam Joannis Oecolampadii demegoriae, hos est: homiliae una et XX*. Basel: Andreas Cratander, June 1524.
48. Oecolampadius, Johannes. "Commentaries on Isaiah." [Pub. 1525, thus a prepublication manuscript based on lectures at the University of Basel in 1523?].
49. Pelikan, Conrad. "Works shown to Erasmus."
50. University of Paris, Faculty of Theology. *Determinatio Facultatis theologiae Parisiensis super aliquibus propositionibus certis e locis nuper ad eam delatis, de veneratione sanctorum, de canone missae deque sustentatione ministrorum altaris et caeteris quibusdam*. Paris: Jean Petit [& Pierre Vidoue], [c. 2 December 1523].
51. Ulich of Wurtemberg. "Ulric de Wurtemberg aux gouverneurs de Besançon." Trans. Anémond de Coct. Manuscript.
52. Zwingli, Ulrich. *De canone missae*. Zurich, 1523.
53. Zwingli, Ulrich. "Apologiam [for his treatise on the Mass]."
54. Zwingli, Ulrich. *Pastor, quo docetus quibus notis veri pastores a falsis discerni possint, et quid de utrisque sit sentiendum*. [Zurich, 1524].

References A. Abbreviations and Short Titles

- AD Archives Départementales
- AK Alfred Hartmann, et al., eds., *Die Amerbachkorrespondenz*, 7 vols., (Basel: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek, 1942-1967).
- Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, 12 vols., ed. P.S Allen et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906-1958).
- AN Archives Nationales, Paris
- ARG *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte/Archive for Reformation History*
- BHR *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*
- BM Bibliothèque Municipale
- BnF Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris
- BPF Bibliothèque de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français
- Briçonnet, *Correspondance* Guillaume Briçonnet and Marguerite d'Angoulême, *Correspondance (1521-1524)*, 2 vols., ed. Christine Martineau and Michel Veissière with Henry Heller, THR 141 and 173 (Geneva: Droz, 1975 and 1979).
- Brief Oekolampads* Oecolampadius, Johannes. *Brief und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads*. 2 vols. Ed. Ernst Staehelin. *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte* 10 & 19. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger Eger and Sievers, 1927 & 1934; New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1971.
- BSHPF *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*
- Bucer Corr. *Correspondance de Martin Bucer*, 4 vols. to date, ed. Jean Rott et al., *Martini Buceri Opera Omnia*, ser. 3, SMRT (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979 – in continuation).
- CAF *Catalogue des actes de François I^{er}*, 10 vols., Collection des Ordonnances des Rois de France (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1887-1910).
- CE *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, 3 vols., ed. Peter G. Bietenholz (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).
- Clémencet, *Parlement* Suzanne Clémencet and Michel François, eds., *Lettres reçues et envoyées par le Parlement de Paris 1376-1596: Inventaire analytique* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1961).
- Clerval, *Registres* Jules-Alexandre Clerval, ed., *Registres des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris, tome I: de 1505 à 1523*, Archives de l'Histoire religieuse de la France (Paris: Lecoffre & Gabalda, 1917).
- CO Jean Calvin, *Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*, 59 vols., ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss, *Corpus Reformatorum* 29-87 (Brunswick: Schwetschke, 1863-1900).
- d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum* Charles Duplessis d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum de novis erroribus*. 3 vols. (Paris, 1728; reprint, Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1963).

- Droz, *Chemins* Eugénie Droz, *Chemins de l'hérésie: Textes et documents*, 4 vols. (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970–1976).
- Farge, *Biographical Register* James K. Farge, *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology, 1500–1536*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies: Subsidia Mediaevalia 10 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980).
- Farge, *Orthodoxy* James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543*, SMRT 32 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985).
- Farge, *Registre 1* James K. Farge, ed., *Registre des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de théologie de l'Université de Paris: de janvier 1524 à novembre 1533* (Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres, 1990).
- Farge, *Registre 2* James K. Farge, ed., *Registre des conclusions de la Faculté de théologie de l'Université de Paris. Tome II du 26 novembre 1533 au 1er mars 1550* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1994).
- Génin 1 F. Génin, *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François I, Reine de Navarre* (Paris: Renouard, 1841; reprint New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1965).
- Génin 2 F. Génin, *Nouvelles lettres de la Reine de Navarre, adressées au Roi François Ier, son frère* (Paris: Renouard, 1842; New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1965).
- Herminjard A.-L. Herminjard, ed., *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*, 9 vols. (Geneva: H. Georg & Paris: Michel Levy, 1866–1897; reprint, Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1965).
- Higman, *Piety* Francis M. Higman, *Piety and the People: Religious Printing in French, 1511–1551*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot, England: Scolar Press, 1996).
- Imbart, *Origines* Pierre Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1905–1944; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978).
- Jourda, *Marguerite* Pierre Jourda, *Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse d'Alençon, reine de Navarre (1492–1549): Étude biographique et littéraire*, 2 vols., Bibliothèque Littéraire de la Renaissance, new ser., no. 19 (Paris: Champion, 1930; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978).
- Jourda, *Répertoire* Pierre Jourda, *Répertoire analytique et chronologique de la correspondance de Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse d'Alençon, reine de Navarre (1492–1549)* (Paris: Champion, 1930; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1973).
- Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior* R.J. Knecht, *Renaissance Warrior and Patron: The Reign of Francis I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Lestocquoy 1 J. Lestocquoy, ed. *Correspondance des nonces en France Carpi et Ferrerio, 1535–1540*, Acta nuntiaturae gallicae 1 (Rome: Presses de l'Université Grégorienne/ Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1961).
- Lestocquoy 2 J. Lestocquoy, ed., *Correspondance des nonces en France: Capodiferro, Dandino et Guidiccione (1541–1546)*, Acta nuntiaturae gallicae 3 (Rome: Presses de l'Université Grégorienne/ Paris: Éditions E. de

- Boccard, 1963).
- Lestocquoy 3** J. Lestocquoy, ed., *Correspondance des nonces en France: Dandino, Della Torre et Trivultio (1546–1551), avec des Documents relatifs à la rupture des relations diplomatiques 1551–1552*, Acta nuntiaturae gallicae 6 (Rome: Presses de l'Université Grégorienne/ Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1966).
- Letters and Papers** John Sherren Brewer and James Gairdner, eds., *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum and elsewhere in England*, 22 vols. (1st ed. 21 vols. London, 1862–1910; 2nd ed., 22 vols., London, 1920–1932).
- Ordonnances** *Ordonnances des rois de France: règne de François I^{er}*, 9 vols., (Paris, 1902–89 in continuation).
- Quadroni, Farel Corr.** Dominique Quadroni, "Répertoire de la correspondance de Farel," in *Actes du colloque Guillaume Farel, Neuchâtel 29 septembre–1^{er} octobre 1980*, ed. Pierre Barthel, Rémy Scheurer, and Richard Stauffer, *Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 9, 2 (1983), 3–104.
- Saulnier 1954** V.-L. Saulnier, "Une épître inconnue de François I^{er} à Marguerite de Navarre," *Bulletin du Bibliophile et du Bibliothécaire* (1954), 176–186.
- Saulnier 1959** V.-L. Saulnier, "Martin Pontus et Marguerite de Navarre: La réforme lyonnaise et les sources de l'*Heptaméron*," *BHR* 21 (1959), 577–594.
- Saulnier 1964** V.-L. Saulnier, "Maurice Scève et Marguerite de Navarre. A propos de poésies apocryphes," *Bulletin de l'association Guillaume Budé*, 4th ser., 1 (1964), 111–115.
- Saulnier 1970** V.-L. Saulnier, "Marguerite de Navarre et le Baron de Jarnac: d'après une correspondance inédite de la reine," in *De Jean Lemaire de Belges à Jean Giraudoux: Mélanges d'histoire et de critique littéraire offerts à Pierre Jourda* (Paris: Nizet, 1970), 93–109.
- Saulnier 1971** V.-L. Saulnier, "La correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre. Complément au répertoire," *BHR* 33 (1971), 571–604.
- Saulnier 1972** V.-L. Saulnier, "Recherches sur la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre," *BHR* 34 (1972), 283–336.
- Saulnier 1973** V.-L. Saulnier, "Marguerite loin du roi blessé: Sur la correspondance de Marguerite d'Angoulême aux lendemains de Pavie," in *Missions de démarches de la critique: Mélanges offerts au Professeur J.A. Vier* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1973), 435–453.
- Saulnier 1974 A** V.-L. Saulnier, "Marguerite de Navarre en ses derniers temps. Sur des lettres de 1547–1549," *BHR* 36 (1974), 533–572.
- Saulnier 1974 B** V.-L. Saulnier, "Troubles au couvent de Tarascon (Marguerite de Navarre, Guillaume du Maine, Claude de Bectoz et Denys Faucher)," in *French Renaissance Studies in Honor of Isidore Silver*, ed. Frieda S. Brown, *Kentucky Romance Quarterly* 21, Supl. 2 (1974), 309–317.

- Saulnier 1975 A V.-L. Saulnier, "Marguerite de Navarre, Catherine de Médicis et les Psaumes de Marot. Autour de la lettre dite de Villemadon," *BHR* 37 (1975), 349–376.
- Saulnier 1975 B V.-L. Saulnier, "Le parti Du Bellay devant l'affaire de Nicolas Cop. Ou de quelques fonctions du silence," in *Actes du colloque Renaissance-classicisme du Maine (1971)* (Paris: Nizet, 1975), 19–34.
- Saulnier 1975 C V.-L. Saulnier, "Sur des lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême aux temps d'Espagne," *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 13, no. 2 (1975), 31–45.
- Saulnier 1976 V.-L. Saulnier, "Intrigues pour un évêché: Marguerite de Navarre et le siège de Sarlat (1530)," *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* (1976), 208–216.
- Saulnier 1977 V.-L. Saulnier, "Marguerite de Navarre aux temps de Briçonnet. Étude de la correspondance générale (1521–1522)," *BHR* 39 (1977), 437–478; 40 (1978), 7–47 and 193–237.
- Saulnier 1980 V.-L. Saulnier, "Marguerite de Navarre, Vittoria Collona et quelques autres amis italiens de 1540," in *Mélanges à la mémoire de Franco Simone: France et Italie dans la culture européenne. I. Moyen Age et Renaissance* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1980), 281–295.
- SCJ *Sixteenth Century Journal*
- SMRT *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*
- THR *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance*
- TLF *Textes Littéraires Français*
- uncataloged Designates a letter not catalogued in Jourda or Saulnier's lists. Look in "Appendix A. Additions and Corrections" by date and sender for full bibliographical information.
- WA *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 61 vols. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883–1983).
- WA Br *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Briefwechsel*, 18 vols. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1930–1985).
- ZW *Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke*, 14 vols., ed. Emil Egli et al., *Corpus Reformatorum* 88–101 (Berlin: Schwetschke, 1905 – Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991).

References B. Manuscript Sources

Manuscripts consulted for the Correspondence of Marguerite of Navarre

Paris, Archives Nationales

X^{1A} 9322, nos. 75, 92, 93, 98, and, 202.

X^{1A} 9324^A, nos. 69, 71, 72, and 73.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

Clairambault 312, 313, 319, 323, 324, 325, 328, 333, 334, 335, 458, and 1064.

Dupuy 153, 211, 273, and 569.

ff. 2888, 2934, 2936, 2971, 2979, 2989, 2991, 3005, 3014, 3021, 3024, 3025, 3026, 3035, 3036, 3042, 3045, 3062, 3087, 3094, 3095, 3260, 3638, 3941, 4658, 4711, 5116, 5152, 8746, 15629, 15632, and 25455.

nouv. acq. fr. 1233, 1471, 3092, 7666, 7685, and 23006.

Fichier Charavay 121.

Pau, Archives départemental, Pyrénées-Atlantiques

E. 567, E. 572, E 574, E. 676, and E. 690.

Cambridge MA, Harvard Houghton Library

f MS Fr. 258.

New York, Pierpont-Morgan Library.

R-V, Rulers of France – Francis I nos. 51, 52, and 53.

Other MSS Sources Consulted

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal

MS. 5096, *Initiatoire instruction en la religion chrestienne*:

IA. *Initiatoire instruction en la religion chrestienne, pour les enffans. Interlocuteurs Theolophile, et Theodidacte, dont le premier signifie amateur ou aymé de Dieu, et l'autre, enseigne, ou disciple de Dieu. (2r–13v);*

IB: *Perfectoire instruction pour les enffans apres qu'ilz seront deuenuz plus aagés (14r–34r);*

II. *LE SEIGNEUR. NRE. DIEU* au viii^e. chap. de *Isaye son prophete. Nous commande que si nous voulons congoistre en quelle sorte il nous fault instituer nre vie, pour viure selon sa volonte, quil nous fault incontinent auoir recours a la loy et sainte parolle...* (35r–55v)
[=Breue instruction pour soy confesser en verite [Alençon: Simon Du Bois, c. 1530].

Paris, Bibliothèque de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français

MS. 140, "Table analytique des Registres du Parlement de Paris (1523-1643)."

MS. 186/1, "Transcription des principaux fragments d'un manuscrit, contenant des lettres et des discours de Cl. Baduel. Tome deuxième. (Lettres)."

MS. 186/2, "Transcription des principaux fragments d'un manuscrit, contenant des lettres et des discours de Cl. Baduel. Précédée d'une lettre sur le manuscrit, et d'une table des matières contenues dans le 1^{er} tome. (Discours et lettres)."

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France

MSS. 1830 and 1831, Jean de. Frotté, "Registre de la maison de Marguerite de Navarre. Livres de dépenses de Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre." 19th century copies.

I. (1830): "Premier registre des finances (1540-1548)."

II (1831): "Deuxième registre des finances (1548-1549)."

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine

MS. 2647 (anc. 3054), "Extraits du Grand Conseil (1423-1625)."

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

Clairambault 312.

Clairambault 333, fol. 2, Jean du Bellay, Bishop of Bayonne to Montmorency, 17 June 1530 from court at Bordeaux. Published in Scheurer, *Corr. Jean du Bellay*, vol. 1, no. 78, pp. 167-171.

Clairambault 334, important documents from court on political and religious affairs during from 1531–1534.

Clairambault 335, important documents from court on political and religious affairs during from 1535–1536.

Dupuy 103, fol. 7, Gérard Roussel to G. Farel, 24 August 1524, Meaux. "Doleret plurimum..."
Herminjard, I, no. 117, p. 270-273. Quadroni, *Farel Corr.*, no. 17.

Dupuy 153, fol 71, "Instruction de Henri II, roi de Navarre, à Jean Doucet, chargé de négocier avec le pape la nomination de Gérard Roussel à l'évêché d'Oloron, 1542 (*sic*)."

Dupuy 153, "Mémoires et Titres Pour la Principauté de Béarn, de 1286 environ à 1632."

Edited as: *Mémoire du R. Henri de Navarre pour l'expédition en cour de Rome de l'Évêché d'Oloron en faveur de M. Gérard Roussel* in Menjoulet, *Chronique du diocèse et du pays d'Oloron*, 1869, t. II, p. 482. Also reproduced by Dubarat in *Doc. and Bibliographie sur la Réforme en Béarn*.

ff. 419, Gérard Roussel, *Familiere exposition du simbole, de la loy, et Oraison dominicale, en forme de colloque*. [1^r-174^r]; *Forme de visite de diocese*. [175^r - 179^v].

ff. 4317, fol. 109, copy of an account of the death of Marguerite of Navarre and the baptism of Henri IV by the Bishop of Oloron. Attributed to Gérard Roussel in the BnF catalogue, the Bishop of Oloron in question was really Claude Régis de Sainte-Colonne, Roussel's successor.

ff. 8249, "Recueil de pièces sur Lescun et Oloron... Requête, enquête, déclarations, etc., relatives aux droits de la baronnie de Lescun et de la viguerie d'Oloron. (XVI^e-XVII^e siècles)."

Latin 12,556, "Acta consistoralia."

Latin 15,445 [Microfilm 6150], mention of Gérard Roussel's preaching during Easter 1532 (n.s. 1533).

Moreau 787, extracts from diocesan registers of ... Lescar and Oloron.

Moreau 820, extracts from the diocesan records of Oloron.

n.a.fr. 23245 [Microfiche 18], "Fichier Picot."

Geneva, Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire

Latin 106, letters of Pierre Toussaint (1539-1571).

Latin 111a, fol. 50, a letter from [Gérard Roussel] to [the Bishop of Meaux], Published by Herminjard 1, no. 167.

Latin 112, a letter by Roussel from 1525.

Latin 113, letters of Michel d'Arande.

References C. The Correspondence of Marguerite of Navarre: Printed Sources

- Agrippa von Nettesheim, Henry Cornelius. *Brefve declamation du saint sacrement de mariage: compose en latin per Henricum Cornelium Agrippam et par luy traduit en vulgaire francoys*. [Lyon: Claude Nourry, 1526]. In Eugénie Droz, *Chemins de hérésie*, vol. 2, 1-27, text 10-26.
- L'Amateur d'Autographes*. Paris, 1868.
- Archives municipales de Bayonne. Délibérations du corps de ville. Registres gascons*. Vol. 2. Bayonne, 1898.
- Baduel, Claude. *Oratio funebris in funere Floretae Sarrasiae habita*. Lyon: Étienne Dolet, 1542.
- Bandello, Matteo. *La quarta parte de le novelle*. Ed. Delmo Maestri. Alessandria: Ed. dell'Orso, 1996.
- Bandello, Matteo. *L'Ecuba, tragedia di Euripide*. Ed. Guglielmo Manzi. Rome, 1813.
- Barral, Vincent [Vincenzio Barrali]. *Chronologia sanctorum & aliorum virorum illustrium, ac abbatum Sacrae Insulae Lerinensis*. Lyon: Petri Rigaud, 1613.
- Barril, Jean. *A tres illustre et puissante princesse et dame, Marguerite de France, Royne de Navarre, Duchesse d'Alençon, et de Berry*. Toulouse: Eustache Mareschal, [1535].
- Becker, Philippe-Auguste. "Marguerite de Navarre, duchesse d'Alençon, et G. Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, d'après leur correspondance manuscrite (1521-1524), suivi d'une tableau chronologique." *BSHPF* (1900) 393-477, 661-667; offprint, Paris, 1901.
- Becker, Philippe-Auguste. "Tableau chronologique des lettres de Marguerite et de Briçonnet," *BSHPF* 49 (1900): 661-687.
- Benoit, F. *La légation du cardinal Sadolet auprès de François Ier en 1542*. Monaco-Paris, 1928.
- Bers, Günter Ernst. *Die Allianz Frankreich-Kleve während des Geldrischen Krieges (Jähliche Fehde), 1539-1543: Urkunden und Korrespondenzen*. Cologne: J. Gouder, 1969.
- Bonnet, Jules. "Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre, et Renée de France (1535-36)." *BSHPF* 37 (1888): 113-123.
- Bonnet, Jules. "Marguerite de Valois, reine de Navarre." *Revue chrétienne* 8 (1861): 179-215; 252-289; 320-366.
- Bonnet, Jules. "Quatre lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre, sœur de François I^{er} à Renée de France, duchesse de Ferrare, 1529-1536." *BSHPF* 15 (1866): 125-31.
- Bourdon, Pierre. "Nouvelles recherches sur Lodovico Canossa, évêque de Bayeux, 1516-1531." *Bulletin historique et philologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1911): 260-301.
- Bourrilly, V.L. and Nathaniel Weiss. "Jean du Bellay, les protestants et la Sorbonne (1529-1525)" *BSHPF* 52 (1903): 193-231; 53 (1904): 97-143.
- Bourrilly, V.L. and P. de Vaissière. *Ambassades en Angleterre de J. du Bellay: La première ambassade (septembre 1527 – février 1529). Correspondance diplomatique*. Archives de l'histoire religieuse de la France. Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1905.
- Bousse, A. "Une lettre inédite de Marguerite de Navarre à Charles-Quint." *Archives, bibliothèques et musées de Belgique [Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique]* 23 (1952): 173-177.

- Bradford, William. *Correspondance of the Emperor Charles V and his Ambassadors at the Courts of England and France (together with the Emperor's Itinerary from 1519-1551)*. London: Richard Bentley, 1850.
- Brewer, John Sherren et al., eds. *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*. 21 vols. London, 1862—1910; 2nd ed., 22 vols., London, 1920-1932.
- Briçonnet, Guillaume and Marguerite d'Angoulême. *Correspondance (1521-1524)*. Ed. Christine Martineau and Michel Veissière with Henry Heller. 2 vols. THR 141 and 173. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1975 and 1979.
- Brimont, M. Le Vicomte de. *Le XVI^e Siècle et les guerres de la Réforme en Berry*. 2 vols. Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1905.
- Bruyère, Pierre. "Trois lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre." *Société historique et archéologique de l'Orne* 112 (1993): 139-151.
- Buisson, Albert. *Le chancelier Antoine du Prat*. Coulmiers – Paris: Brodard et Turpin; Paris: Hachette, 1935.
- Calvin, John. *Joannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*. Ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. Brunswick: C.A. Schetschke, 1863-1900.
- Carteggio di Vittoria Colonna marchesa di Pescara. Ed. Ermanno Ferrero and Guisepppe Müller. Torino: Ermanno Loescher 1889 & 1892.
- Catalogue de la belle et importante collection de lettres autographes de feu M. de Lajarriette, ancien receveur des finances de Nantes, dont la vente aura lieu le jeudi 15 novembre 1860 et les 19 jours suivants*. Paris: Charavay frères, 1860.
- Catalogue de la collection Benjamin Fillon*. Ed. Étienne Charavay. Paris: Charavay frèses, 1877-1883; 1878-1891.
- Catalogue des actes de François I^{er}*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1887-1908.
- Catherine de Médicis. *Lettres*. Ed. Hector de La Ferrière (Comte de) and Gustave Baguenault de Puchesse. 11 vols. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1880-1943.
- Champollion-Figeac, Jean-Jacques, ed. *Documents historiques inédits tirés des collections manuscrites de la Bibliothèque royale et des archives ou des bibliothèques des départements*. 5 vols. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1841-1848.
- Champollion-Figeac, Aimé, ed. *Captivité de François I^{er}*. Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France, 1^{re} series. Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1847.
- Champollion-Figeac, Aimé, ed. *Les Poésies du roi François I^{er}*. Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1847.
- Charavay, Étienne, ed. *Lettres autographes composant la collection de M. Alfred Bovet*. 2 vols. Paris: Charavay frères, 1885 & 1887.
- Chartrier de Thouars. Documents historiques et généalogiques*. Ed. M. le duc de La Trémoille & Paul Marchegay. Paris, 1877.
- Concasty, Marie-Louise, ed. *Commentaires de la Faculté de médecine de l'Université de Paris (1516-1560)*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1964.
- Cornuau. "Autographes précieux provenant de la collection de Madame Whitney-Hoff." Auction Catalogue Hôtel Drouot, 31 May 1949.
- Cuisiat, D. ed. *Correspondance de Charles de Lorraine*. Thèse, Nancy, 1970.

- Dartigue, Ch. "Les séjours de Marguerite de Navarre à Bordeaux." *Annales du Midi* 62 (1950): 278-285.
- Des Périers, Bonaventure. *Le Cymbalum mundi*. Ed. Yves Delègue. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995.
- Des Périers, Bonaventure, "Maistre Sarcomoros." *Pronostication des pronostications*. Jehan Morin [Lyon], 1537.
- Desjardins, Abel, ed. *Négociations diplomatiques de la France avec la Toscane*. 6 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1861.
- Dianne de Poytiers. *Lettres inédites: Publiées d'après les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale avec une introduction et des notes*. Ed. Georges Guiffrey. Paris, 1866; reprint Geneva: Slatkine reprints, 1970, 28-29.
- Du Prat, Antoine. *Glanes et regains récoltés dans les archives de maison Du Prat*. Ed. the Marquis Du Prat. Versailles: Beau jeune, 1865.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Epistolarum D. Erasmi*. 2 vols. London: M. Flesher & R. Young, 1652.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*. 12 vols. Ed. P.S Allen et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906-1958.
- Farge, James K., ed. *Registre des conclusions de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Paris. Tome II du 26 Novembre 1533 au 1er mars 1550*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1994.
- Farge, James K., ed. *Registre des Procès-Verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Paris: de janvier 1524 à novembre 1533*. Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres, 1990.
- Fontana, Bartolommeo. "Nuovi documenti Vaticani intorno a Vittoria Colonna." *Archivio della societa romana di Storia patria* 10 (1887): 595ff.
- Fontana, Bartolommeo, ed. *Renata di Francia, duchessa di Ferrara, sui documenti del archivio Estense, del Mediceo, del Gonzaga e dell'archivio segreto Vaticano*. 3 vols. Rome: Forzani, 1889-1899.
- Fraikin, J. *Nonciatures de Clément VII*. 2 vols. Paris: Firmin Didot et Cie & J. Gabalda, 1906 & 1926.
- François, Michel, ed. *Correspondance du Cardinal François de Tournon (1521-1562)*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1946.
- Frank, Félix. "Dernier voyage de la reine de Navarre, Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François Ier, avec sa fille Jeanne d'Albret aux bains de Cauterets (1549). Trois épîtres en vers inconnues des historiens de ces deux princesses et des éditeurs de leurs oeuvres. Étude critique et historique." *Revue des Pyrénées* 8 (1896): 591-624; 9 (1897): 32-76.
- Frémy, Édouard. "Les poésies inédites de Catherine de Médicis." *Le Correspondant* 130 (1883): 858-89, 1094-1117; 131 (1884): 507-34, 694-709; issued as a separate monograph: Paris, Techener, 1884.
- Gaucheron, Roger, ed. *Lettres, autographes et manuscrits de la collection Henri de Rothschild*. Vol 1. Mâcon: Imprimerie Protat frères; Paris: Francisque Lefrançois, 1924.
- Gaufres, Mattieu-Jules. *Claude Baduel et la réforme des études en France au XVI^e siècle*. Paris: Hachette, 1880.
- Gaullieur, Ernest. *Histoire de la réformation à Bordeaux et dans le ressort du parlement de Guyenne*. Vol. 1. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1884.
- Génin, F., ed. *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François I, reine de Navarre*. Paris: Renouard, 1841; reprint New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1965.

- Génin, F, ed. *Nouvelles lettres de la reine de Navarre, adressées au roi François Ier, son frère*. Paris: Renouard, 1942; New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1965.
- Gigon, Stephan C. *La révolte de la gabelle en Guyenne 1548-1549*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1906.
- Hauvette, Henri. "Une nouvelle lettre de Marguerite de Navarre en italien." *Bulletin Italien* 2 (1902) 217-218; offprint Bordeaux: Feret et fils, s.d.
- Hauvette, Henri. *Un exilé florentin à la cour de France au XVI^e siècle. Luigi Alamanni (1495-1556)*. Paris: Hachette, 1903.
- Herminjard, A.-L., ed. *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*. 9 vols. Geneva: H. Georg & Paris: Michel Levy, 1866-1897; reprint, Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1965.
- Jacqueton, Gilbert. *La politique extérieure de L. de Savoie: relations diplomatiques de France et de l'Angleterre pendant la captivité de François I^{er} (1525-1526)*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Philologique et Historiques 88. Paris: E. Bouillon, 1892.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Marguerite de Navarre: Dialogue en forme de vision nocture." *Revue du seizième siècle* 13 (1926), 177-204; offprint Paris: Honoré Champion, 1926.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Marguerite de Navarre: Épitres et comédie inédites." *Revue du seizième siècle* 13 (1926), 177-204; offprint Paris: Honoré Champion, 1927.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Marguerite de Navarre. Lettres inédits." *Revue du seizième siècle* 15 (1928), 100-133; Paris: Honoré Champion, 1928.
- Jourda, Pierre. *Répertoire analytique et chronologique de la correspondance de Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse d'Alençon, reine de Navarre (1492-1549)*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1930; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1973.
- Kaulek, Jean, ed. *Correspondance politique de Ms. de Castillon et de Marillac, ambassadeurs de France en Angleterre, 1537-1542*. Paris, 1885.
- La Ferrière-Percy, Hector Artaud de, Comte de. *Le XVI^e siècle et les Valois d'après les documents inédits du British Museum et du Record Office*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1879.
- La Ferrière-Percy, Hector Artaud de, Comte de. *Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François I^{er}. Son livre de dépenses (1540-1549). Étude sur ses dernières années*. Paris: Aubry, 1862.
- Labande, Léon-Honoré, ed. *Correspondance de J. de Matignon (1516-1548)*. Monaco: Imprimerie de Monaco, 1914.
- Laurent, Eugène. *Histoire de Marguerite de Lorraine*. Argentan: Imprimerie de Barbier, 1854.
- Le Glay, André, ed. *Négociations diplomatique entre la France et l'Autriche durant les trente premières années du XVI^e siècle*. 2 vols. Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, 1^{re} series. Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1845.
- Lestocquoy, J. ed. *Correspondance des nonces en France Carpi et Ferrerio (1535-1540)*. *Acta nuntiaturae gallicae* I. Rome: Presses de l'Université Grégorienne; Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1961.
- Lestocquoy, J. ed. *Correspondance des nonces en France: Capodiferro, Dandino et Guidiccione (1541-1546)*. *Acta nuntiaturae gallicae* III. Rome: Presses de l'Université Grégorienne; Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1963.
- Lettere volgari di diversi nobilissimi huomini et eccellentissimi ingegni, scritte in diverse materie con la giunta del terzo libro nuovamente ristampate et in piu luoghi corrette*. Venice: Aldus, [1543]; 2nd ed. 1575.

- Livet, Charles. "Rapport sur les documents relatifs à l'histoire de France conservés aux archives de La Torre do Tombo, à Lisbonne." In *Archives des missions étrangères*, 2nd series, vol. 5 (1868): 63-137; 73.
- López de Meneses, Amada. "André Mélancthon et le Parlement de Bordeaux." *Revue historique de Bordeaux et du département de la Gironde* 33 (1940): 41-51.
- López de Meneses, Amada [pseudonym Madelena Pomés Sáez]. "Una Carta Inedita de Margarita de Angulema." *Principe de Viana* 7 (1946): 541-542.
- López de Meneses, Amada. "Marguerite de Navarre et le Parlement de Bordeaux (1537-1544)." *Revue historique de Bordeaux et du département de la Gironde* 34 (1941): 36-42.
- López de Meneses, Amada [pseudonym Madelena Pomés Sáez]. "Margurita de Angulema y Enrique de Labrit en Prató." [1946].
- López de Meneses, Amada. "Nuevos Datos sobre la Correspondencia de Margarita de Angulema." *Bulletin Hispanique* 37 (1935): 5-9.
- Maçon, Antoine, trans. *Le Decameron de M. Jean Bocace florentin, nouvellement traduit d'Italien en François par maistre Antoine le Maçon conseiller du Roy, & tresorier de l'extra-ordinaire de sesguerres*. Lyon: Guillaume Rouille, 1551.
- Marchegay, Paul and H. Imbert, eds. *Lettres missives originales du seizième siècle ... tirées des archives du duc de la Tremoille*. Niort: L. Clouzot, 1881.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Epistre envoyee au roy par sa soeur unique, la royne de Navarre*. Rouen: Jehan l'Homme, 1543.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Heptaméron*. Ed. A. Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaiglon. 4 vols. Paris: A Eudes, 1880.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Les Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses. Texte de l'édition de 1547 publié avec introduction, notes et glossaire*. Ed. Félix Frank. 4 vols. Cabinet du bibliophile 16. Paris: Libraire des Bibliophiles, 1873; reprinted in one volume Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.
- Mariotte, Jean-Yves. "Une correspondance entre Marguerite de Navarre et le Landgrave de Hesse (1541)." *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 14 (1964): 110-122.
- Martelli, N. *Il primo libro delle lettere di N. Martelli*. Florence, 1546.
- Matter, M. "Lettre de Marguerite de Valois." In *Lettres et pièces rares ou inédites*. Paris: Amyot, 1846.
- Mémoires de Condé*. Ed. Denis-François Secouss. 5 vols. London: C. Du Bosc et G. Darres, 1763.
- Ménard, Léon. *Histoire ... de la ville de Nîmes*. 7 vols. Paris: H. D. Chaubert, 1753; reprints: Nîmes: Imprimerie de Clavel-Ballivet, 1873-1875; Marseille: Laffitte, 1975; Nîmes: Lacour, 1988-1989.
- Métivier, J. J. de. "Trois lettres de Marguerite, reine de Navarre, soeur de François Ier, au conseillers de Lecture." *Documents historiques inédits* 4 (1848): 406-408.
- Métivier, Jean de. *Chronique du parlement de Bordeaux*. Ed. Arthur de Brezet and Jules Delpit. 2 vols. Publications de la Société des Bibliophiles de Guyenne. Bordeaux: Société des Bibliophiles, 1886-1887.
- Miglioranza, Corinna. *Lodovico di Canossa, ricerca storica con documenti inediti*. Citta del Castello: S. Lapi, 1907.
- Nolhac, Pierre de. *Lettres de Marguerite de Navarre au Pape Paul III*. Versailles: Cerf et fils, 1887.

- Paris, Paulin and Gaston Paris. *Études sur François I^{er}, roi de France, sur sa vie privée et son règne*. 2 vols. Paris: Léon Techener, 1885.
- Pimodan, Gabriel de [Raoul Fortunat]. *La mère des Guises, Antoinette de Bourbon, 1494-1583*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1889; new ed. Paris: Édouard Champion, 1925.
- Politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation*. Ed. Hans Vrick, Otto Winckelmann, Harry Gerber, and W. Friedensburg. 6 vols. *Urkunden und Akten der Stadt Strassburg*. Strasbourg; Trübner, 1882-1898, Heidelberg: Winters, 1928-1933.
- Pollet, J.V. *Martin Bucer: Études sur la correspondance avec de nombreux textes inédits*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958.
- Précieux autographes composant la collection du Président Robert Schuman, deuxième partie. Vente Hôtel Drouot, 24-25 juin 1965*. Paris, 1965.
- Puchesse, G. Baguenault de. *Jean de Morvilliers*. Paris: Didier, 1870; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine – Megarotis, 1977.
- Puech, Albert. *La Renaissance et la Réforme à Nîmes: d'après des documents originaux inédits*. Nîmes: Gervais-Bedot, 1893.
- Rabelais, François. *Le Tiers Livre*. Ed. M.A. Screech. Geneva: Droz, 1995.
- Raemon, Florimond de. *Naissance et progrès de l'hérésie*. Rouen: J. Berthelin, 1623 [first ed. 1605].
- Raynal, Louis-Hector Chandru de. *Histoire de Berry depuis les temps les plus anciens jusqu'en 1789*. 3 vols. [numbered 2-4]. Bourges: Vermeil, 1844-1847.
- "Registre secret du Parlement de Bordeaux, 13 novembre - 6 septembre 1582." BnF Rés. Z Payan 1393, in-fol. (manuscript). Coll. Verthamon, IV.
- Richard, Abbé. "Le Pape Paul III et Jeanne d'Albret." *Annales de Saint-Louis des Français* (1904): 197-211.
- Ritter, Raymond, ed. *Lettres de Marguerite de Valois-Angoulême*. Paris: Édouard Champion; Toulouse: Édouard Privat, 1927.
- Ruble, Alphonse de. *Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret (Suite de Le Mariage de Jeanne d'Albret)*. 4 vols. Paris: Adolphe Labitte, 1881-1886.
- Ruble, Alphonse de. *Le mariage de J. d'Albret*. Paris: Adolphe Labitte, 1877.
- Ruscelli, Girolamo, ed. *Lettere di principi le quali osi scrivono da principi, o a principi, o ragionano di principi*. 3 vols. Venice: F. Ziletti, 1581.
- Samaran, Charles and H. Patry. "Marguerite de Navarre et le Pape Paul III." *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 68 (1907): 320-XXX.
- Sanuto [Sanudo], Marino. *Diarii*. Ed. Guglielmo Berchet. 58 vols. Venice, 1879-1903.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "La correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre. Complément au répertoire." *BHR* 33 (1971): 571-604.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre aux temps de Briçonnet. Étude de la correspondance générale (1521-1522)." *BHR* 39 (1977): 437-478; 40 (1978): 7-47 and 193-237.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre en ses derniers temps. Sur des lettres de 1547-1549." *BHR* 36 (1974): 533-572.

- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre et le Baron de Jarnac: d'après une correspondance inédite de la reine." In *De Jean Lemaire de Belges à Jean Giraudoux: Mélanges d'histoire et de critique littéraire offerts à Pierre Jourda*, 93-109. Paris: Nizet, 1970.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre, Catherine de Médicis et les Psaumes de Marot. Autour de la lettre dite de Villemadon." Appendix: "Addenda à la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre." *BHR* 37 (1975): 349-376.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre, Vittoria Collona et quelques autres amis italiens de 1540." In *Mélanges à la mémoire de Franco Simone: France et Italie dans la culture européenne. I. Moyen Age et Renaissance*, 281-295. Geneva: Slatkine, 1980.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite loin du roi blessé: Sur la correspondance de Marguerite d'Angoulême aux lendemains de Pavie." In *Missions de démarches de la critique: Mélanges offerts au Professeur J.A. Vier*. Paris, Klincksieck, 1973.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Recherches sur la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre." *BHR* 34 (1972): 283-336.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Troubles au couvent de Tarascon (Marguerite de Navarre, Guillaume du Maine, Claude de Bectoz et Denys Faucher)." In *French Renaissance Studies in Honor of Isidore Silver*, ed. Frieda S. Brown, 309-317. Special issue of the *Kentucky Romance Quarterly* 21 (1974), Supplement II.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Une épître inconnue de François Ier à Marguerite de Navarre." *Bulletin du Bibliophile et du Bibliotécaire* 11th series (1954): 176-186.
- Scheurer, Rémy, ed. *Correspondance du Cardinal Jean du Bellay*. 2 vols. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1969 and 1973.
- Solente, Suzanne. "Une lettre inédite de Marguerite de Valois." Brussels, 1947. Extrait de la *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 25, nos. 3 & 4.
- Spont, Alfred. *Semblançay (?-1527): la bourgeoisie financière au début du XVI^e siècle*. Paris: Hachette, 1895.
- Tausserat-Radel, Alexandre, ed. *Correspondance politique de Guillaume Pellicier, ambassadeur de France à Venise (1540-1542)*. 2 vols. Paris, 1899.
- Telle, E.V. "Un document sur le mécénat de Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre." *BHR* 34 (1972): 279-281.
- Thomas, Danièle, ed. *Documents officiels et correspondances (du 12 juillet, 1508 au 26 mars 1789)*. Société des Amis du Château de Pau: Collection "Documents inédits" 1. Pau: Société des Amis du Château de Pau, 1996.
- Thomas, Danièle, ed. *Inventaires mobiliers et pièces annexes: Château de Pau – Château de Nérac (XVI^e – XVII^e siècles)*. Société des Amis du Château de Pau: Collection "Documents inédits" 2. Pau: Société des Amis du Château de Pau, 1996.
- Tournon, François de. *Correspondance du Cardinal François de Tournon (1521-1562)*. Ed. Michel François. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1946.
- Trois cents autographes de la donation de Henri de Rothschild*. Catalogue de l'exposition (1933). Paris: éditions de la bibliothèque nationale de France, 1933.
- Vindry, Fleury. *Les Parlementaires français au XVI^e siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: Champion, 1909-1912.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "L'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet, François I et sa soeur Marguerite. Deux lettres inédites de février 1522." *BSHPF* 37 (1888): 191-203.

References D. Printed Primary Sources and Secondary Literature

I. Dictionaries, Encyclopedias, and Research Tools

- Artonne, André, Louis Suizard and Odette Pontal. *Répertoire des statuts synodaux des diocèses de l'ancienne France du XIII^e à la fin du XVIII^e siècle*. Documents, Études et Répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 8. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1969.
- Audisio, Gabriel & Isabelle Bonnot-Rambaud. *Lire le français d'hier: manuel de paléographie moderne XVe-XVIII^e siècle*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1991.
- Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*. 3 vols. Ed. Peter G. Bietenholz. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Cottineau, L.H. *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés*. 3 vols. Mâcon: Portât, 1935, 1939, 1970.
- Dictionnaire d'histoire et géographie ecclésiastiques*. 25 vols. to date. Ed. A. Baudrillart et seq. Paris: Letouzey, 1912-.
- Dolet, Étienne. *Correspondance: Répertoire analytique et chronologique suivi du texte de ses lettres latines* THR 188. Ed. Claude Longcon. Geneva: Droz, 1982.
- Eubel, Conrad et al., ed. *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi*. 7 vols. Münster: Libraria Regensbergiana, 1918-36.
- Farge, James K. *Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology, 1500-1536*. Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies: Subsidia Mediaevalia 10. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980.
- Gams, Boniface. *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae*. Ratisbonne, 1873.
- Gougenheim, Georges. *Grammaire de la langue française du XVI^e siècle*. Paris: Picard, 1974.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien and Teresa Mary Keane. *Dictionnaire du moyen français: la Renaissance*. Paris: Larousse, 1992.
- Haag, Eugène and Émile. *La France protestante*. 10 vols. Paris: Bureaux de la Publication Cherbuliez, 1846-59; reprint, Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970; 2nd ed. Ed. Henri-Léonard Bordier. 6 vols. [A-Gas].
- Huguet, Edmont. *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*. Paris: Champion; Paris: Didier, 1925-1967.
- Jourda, Pierre. *Répertoire analytique et chronologique de la correspondance de Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse d'Alençon, reine de Navarre (1492-1549)*. Paris: Champion, 1930; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1973.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Tableau chronologique des publications de Marguerite de Navarre." *Revue du seizième siècle* 12 (1925); Paris: Edouard Champion, 1925.
- Lefranc, Abel and Jacques Boulenger, eds. *Comptes de Louise de Savoie (1515, 1522) et de Marguerite d'Angoulême (1512, 1517, 1524, 1529, 1539)*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1905.
- Litttré, P.-Émile. *Dictionnaire de la langue française*. Paris-Londres-Leipzig, 1863; reprint Chicago, 1982.

- Mirot, Léon and Albert. *Manuel de géographie historique de la France. 1. L'Unité française. 2. Les Divisions religieuses et administratives.* 2 vols. Paris: Picard, 1947; reprint, 2 volumes in one 1979.
- Moréri, Louis, Abbé Goujet, and M. Drouet. *Le grand dictionnaire historique, ou le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane.* 2nd ed. Paris, 1759; Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1995.
- The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation.* Ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand. New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Répertoire des visites pastorales de la France.* 4 vols. Première série: Anciens Diocèses (Jusqu'en 1790). Ed. Gabriel Le Bras et al. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1977-1985.

II. Bibliographies

- Babelon, Jean. *La bibliothèque de Fernand Colomb.* Revue des Bibliothèques, suppl. 10. Paris: Champion, 1913.
- Baudrier, Henri. *Bibliographie lyonnaise.* Lyon and Paris: Société des amis de la bibliothèque, 1895-1921, 12 vols.
- Benzing, Josef et al. *Lutherbibliographie: Verzeichnis der gedruckten Schriften Martin Luthers bis zu dessen Tod.* 3 parts. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 10, 16, and 19. Baden-Baden: Heitz, 1965-66.
- Benzing, Josef. *Bibliographie strasbourgeoise: Bibliographie des ouvrages imprimés à Strasbourg au XVI^e siècle.* Vol. 1. Répertoire bibliographique des livres imprimés en France au seizième siècle, 148. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana 80. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 1981.
- Bodenmann, Reinhard. "Bibliotheca Lambertiana." In *Pour retrouver François Lambert: Biobibliographie et études*, 9-213. Ed. Pierre Fraenkel. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana 108. Baden-Baden & Bouxwiller: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 1987.
- Chambers, Betty T. *Bibliography of French Bibles. Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century French-Language Editions of the Scriptures.* THR 197. Geneva: Droz, 1983.
- Clive, H. P. *Marguerite de Navarre: An Annotated Bibliography.* London: Grant and Cutler, 1983.
- Geisenhof, Georg. *Bibliographie der Druckschriften des D. Joh. Bugenhagen.* Bibliotheca Bugenhagiana, vol. 1. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1908.
- Gilmont, Jean-François et al., eds. "Bibliotheca gebennensis: Les livres imprimés à Genève de 1535 à 1549." *Musée d'art et d'histoire de Genève*, new series, 28 (1980): 229-251.
- Hauser, Henri. *Les sources de l'histoire de France, XVI^e siècles (1494-1610).* Manuels de Bibliographie Historique 3. Paris: Libraire Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1909; Reprint Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprints, 1967.
- Higman, Francis M. *Piety and the People: Religious Printing in French 1511-1551.* St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1996.
- Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle.* Ouvrage publié d'après les manuscrits de Philippe Renouard. Histoire Générale de Paris: Collection des Documents publiée sous les auspices de l'édilité parisienne. 3 vols. to date. Paris: Service des travaux historiques de la ville de Paris, 1964-.

- Keen, Ralph. *A Checklist of Melancthon Imprints through 1560*. Sixteenth Century Bibliography 27. St. Louis: Center for Reform and Renaissance, 1988.
- Moreau, Brigitte. *Inventaire chronologique des éditions parisiennes du XVI^e siècle (d'après les manuscrits de Philippe Renouard)*. 4 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Municipale, 1972 and 1977; Abbeville: F. Paillart, 1985, 1992.
- Mortimer, Ruth. *Harvard College Library, Department of Printing and Graphic Arts. Catalogue of Books and Manuscripts. Part I: French 16th-century Books*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Muller, Jean. *Bibliographie strasbourgeoise: Bibliographie des ouvrages imprimés à Strasbourg au XVI^e siècle*. Vols. 2 & 3. Répertoire bibliographique des livres imprimés en France au seizième siècle. 148. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana 90 & 105. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 1985 & 1986. See Benzing for vol. 1.
- Répertoire bibliographique des livres imprimés en France au seizième siècle*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana. 30 vols; vol. 30 Tables. Baden-Baden: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 1968-1980.
- Saulnier, V.-L., ed. *Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1959.

III. Printed Primary Sources

- Backus, Irena and Claire Chimelli, eds. *"La Vraie piété": Divers traités de Jean Calvin et confession de foi de Guillaume Farel*. Histoire et Société 12. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1986.
- Barrillon, Jean de. *Journal de Jean de Barrillon: secrétaire du Chancelier Duprat 1515-1521*. 2 vols. Ed. Pierre de Vaissière. Paris: Renouard, 1897-1899.
- Baum, J.-G. *Procès Baudichon de la Maison Neuve, accusé d'hérésie à Lyon (1534)*. Geneva: J.-G. Fick, 1873.
- Besson, Ed. "Jean Lecomte de la Croix: un réformateur peu connu." *Berner Taschenbuch aus das Jahr 1887* 26 (1876): 139-168.
- Bèze, Théodore, de. *Histoire ecclésiastique de églises réformées au royaume de France*. Édition nouvelle avec commentaire, notice bibliographique et table des faits et des noms propres par feu G. Baum et par Ed. Cunitz. 3 vols. Reprint, Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1974.
- Bindseil, Heinrich Ernst. *Philippi Melancthonis Epistolae, Iudicia, Consilia, Testimonia aliorumque ad eum Epistolae quae in Corpore Reformatorum disderantur*. Halle: G. Schwetschke, 1874; reprint with forward by Robert Stupperich, Hildesheim – New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1975.
- Blaurer, Ambrosius and Thomas. *Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer, 1509-1548*. Ed. Badischen Historischen Kommission, dir. Traugott Schieß. 2 vols. Frieburg-im-Brisgau: Friedrich Ernst Fehsenfeld, 1908 & 1910.
- Bonaventure Des Périeres. *Cymbalum Mundi en françoys, contenant quatre dialogues poetiques, fort antiques, joyeux et facétieux*. Paris: Jean Morin, 1537/1538. 2nd edition, Lyon: Benoît Bonyn, 1538. Critical edition with introduction by Michael Screech, Geneva: Droz, 1983.
- Bonaventure Des Périeres. *Le Cymbalum Mundi*. Introduction and annotations by Yves Delègue. Textes de la Renaissance 4. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995.
- Bonnet, Jules, ed. *Lettres de Jean Calvin*. 2 vols. Paris: Meyrucis, 1854.

- Bouchet, Jean. *Les annalles d'Aquitaine jusques en l'an 1537*. Paris, Denis Janot, 1537.
- Bourdigné, Jean de [& 'Le Viateur']. *Hystoire agrégative des Annalles et cronicques D'Anjou [et du Maine] ... recueillies par Jehan de Bourdigné... reveues et additionnees par le Viateur*. [Paris: Anthoine Couteau & Galliot du Pré; Angers: Clément Alexandre & Charles de Bougne. 1530].
- Bradford, W. *Correspondence of the Emperor Charles V and his ambassadors at the Courts of England and France*. London, 1850.
- Brantôme, P. de Bourdeille, abbé de. *Oeuvres complètes*. Ed. L. Lalanne. 11 vols. Paris, 1864-82.
- Brewer, John Sherren et al. *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*. 21 vols. London, 1862—1910; 2nd ed., 22 vols., London, 1920-1932.
- Buche, Joseph. "Lettres inédites latine de Jean de Boyssoné et de ses amis." *Revue des Langues romanes* 37 (1893-1894) 323-329; 38 (1895) 176-190, 269-278; 39 (1896) 71-86, 138-143, 355-372; 40 (1897) 177-197.
- Bujanda, J. M. de, Francis M. Higman, and James K. Farge, eds. *Index de l'Université de Paris: 1544, 1545, 1547, 1549, 1551, 1556*. With the assistance of René Davignon and Ela Stanek. *Index des Livres Interdits*, vol. 1, directed by J.M. de Bujanda. Sherbrooke, Canada: Centre d'Études de la Renaissance; Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1985.
- Bujanda, J. M. de. *Thesaurus de la littérature interdite au XVI^e siècle: Auteurs, ouvrages, éditions avec addenda et corrigenda*. With the assistance of René Davignon, Ela Stanek, and Marcella Richter. *Index des Livres Interdits*, vol. 10, directed by J.M. de Bujanda. Sherbrooke, Canada: Centre d'Études de la Renaissance; Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1996.
- Bulaeus. *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*. Paris, 1673.
- Calvin, Jean. *Calvin Opera Selecta*. Ed. P. Barth and W. Niesel. 2nd ed. 5 vols. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1926-1952, 1: 4-10.
- Calvin, Jean. *Oeuvres choisies*. Ed. Olivier Millet. Collection Folio Classique 2701. Paris: Gallimard, 1995.
- Calvin, John. *Défense de Guillaume Farel et de ses collègues contre les calomnies du théologastre Pierre Caroli par Nicolas Des Gallars (Pro G. Farelllo et collegis eius adversus Petri Caroli theologastri calumnias defensio Nicolai Galasii)*. Ed. Jean-François Gounelle. *Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 73. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994.
- Calvin, John. *Œuvres de Jean Calvin III. Sermons: sur la nativité, la passion, la résurrection et le dernier avènement de Notre-Seigneur Jesus-Christ*. Ed. Albert-Marie Schmidt. Paris: Société Commerciale d'Édition et de Librairie; Geneva: Labor, 1936.
- Calvin, John. *Plaidoyers pour le Comte Guillaume de Fürstenberg*. Ed. Rodolphe Peter. *Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 72. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994.
- Carteggio di Vittoria Colonna marchesa di Pescara*. Ed. Ermanno Ferrero and Guisepppe Müller. Torino: Ermanno Loescher 1889 & 1892.
- Catalogue des actes de François I^{er}*. 10 vols. Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques: Collection des Ordonnances des Rois de France. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1887-1910.
- Champollion-Figeac, M. Aimé. *Captivité de François I^{er}*, 129. Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France, 1st series. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1847.

- Champollion-Figeac, M. Aimé. *Poésies du roi François I^{er}, de Louise de Savoie, duchesse d'Angoulême, de Marguerite, reine de Navarre, et correspondance intime du Roi avec Diane de Poitiers et plusieurs autres Dames de la cour*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1847.
- Chassaing, Augustin. *Le livre de Podio ou chroniques d'Étienne de Médicis, bourgeois du Puy*. Le Puy-en-Lay: M.-P. Marchessov, 1874.
- Chronique parisienne de Pierre Driart chambrier de Saint Victor (1522-1535)*. Ed. Fernand Bournon. In *Mémoires de la Société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Île-de-France* 22 (1895): 97-178.
- Clemen, Otto. "Zwei Briefe von Basilius Mourner." *Mitteilungen der Vereinigung für Gothaische Geschichte und Altertumsforschung*, 1912.
- Compendium Universitatis Parisiensis*. Trans. Robert B. Burke. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1928.
- Correspondance politique d'Odet de Selve (1546-1549)*. Ed. G. Lefèvre-Pontalis. Inventaire analytique des archives du ministère des affaires étrangères. Paris, 1888.
- Correspondenz des Kaisers Karl V.* Ed. Karl Lanz. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1844-1846.
- Coyecque, Ernest. *Recueil d'actes notariés relatifs à l'histoire de Paris et de ses environs au XVI^e siècles*. 2 vols. Paris, 1905-1923.
- Crespin, Jean. *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France*. Ed. G. Baum and E. Cunitz. 3 vols. Paris, 1883-1889.
- Crespin, Jean. *Histoire des martyrs persecutéz et mis à morts pour la vérité de l'évangile, depuis le temps des apostres jusques à présent (1619)*. Ed. Daniel Benoît. 3 vols. Toulouse, 1885-1889.
- Cronique du roy François Premier de ce nom*. Ed. Georges Guiffrey. Paris: Renouard, 1860.
- Cuisiat, Daniel, ed. *Lettres du Cardinal Charles de Lorraine (1525-1574)*. Geneva: Droz, 1998.
- Delisle, Léopold. "Notice sur un registre des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris (1501-1533)." *Notices et extraits des manuscrits* 36 (1899): 315-407.
- Desjardins, Abel. *Négociations diplomatiques de la France avec la Toscane*. 6 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1861.
- Dolet, Étienne. *Correspondance: Répertoire analytique et chronologique suivi du texte de ses lettres latines*. Ed. Claude Longeon. THR 188. Geneva: Droz, 1982.
- Dolet, Étienne. *Préfaces françaises*. Ed. Claude Longeon. TLF 272. Geneva: Droz, 1979.
- Du Bellay, Jean. *Correspondance du Cardinal Jean du Bellay*. Ed. Rémy Scheurer. 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck, 1969.
- Duplessis d'Argentré, Charles. *Collectio Iudiciorum de Novis Erroribus*. 3 vols. Paris, 1728; facsimile reprint, Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1963.
- Emmelius, Egenolphus ed. *Discursus epistolares politico-theologici de statu reipublicae Christianae degenerantis: tum de reformandis moribus et abusibus ecclesiae, cum Christianissimi Galliarum Regis Francisci I. et Cardinalis Sadoleti Epistolis*. Frankfurt: E. Emmelius, 1610.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans. *Briefve admonition de la manière de prier & le Symbol des Apostres de Jésuschrist [1525]*. Ed. Émile V. Telle. TLF 271. Geneva: Droz, 1979.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans. *Declamation des louenges de mariage [1525]*. Ed. Émile V. Telle. TLF 225. Geneva: Droz, 1976.

- Erasmus, Desiderius. Berquin, Louis de, trans. *La complainte de la paix* (1525). Ed. Émile V. Telle. TLF 248. Geneva: Droz, 1978.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clithoveus scripsit adversus Declamationem Des. Erasmi Roterodami Suasoriam Matrimonii*. Ed. Émile V. Tell. Paris: J. Vrin, 1968.
- Fagniez, Gustave, ed. *Le livre de raison de Nicolas Versoris, avocat au Parlement de Paris (1515-1530)*. In *Mémoires de la Société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Ile-de-France* 12 (1885): 99-222; published as a separate off-print, Paris, 1885.
- Farel, Guillaume. *Du Vrai Usage de la croix de Jésus-Christ*. Geneva: J.G. Fick, 1865.
- Farel, Guillaume. *Du Vrai Usage de la croix et autres traités*. Ed. Edouard Urech. La Chaux-de-Fonds, Switzerland: Editions G. Saint-Clair, 1980.
- Farel, Guillaume. *Le Pater Noster et le Credo en françoys*. Ed. Francis Higman. Geneva: Droz, 1982.
- Farel, Guillaume. *Le Sommaire de Guillaume Farel. Réimprimé d'après l'édition de ... 1534*. Geneva: J.G. Fick, 1867.
- Farel, Guillaume. *Sommaire et brève déclaration* (1525). Neuchâtel, 1980.
- Farge, James K. *Le Parti conservateur au XVI^e siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme*. Paris: Documents et inédits du Collège de France, 1992.
- Fontaine, Simon. *Histoire catholique et ecclésiastique... de notre temps (1517-1540), enrichie... de 1546-1550*. Paris and Anvers, 1558.
- Fraikin, Abbé J. "La nonciature de France de la délivrance de Clément VII à sa mort (1534)." *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome* 30 (1910).
- Fraikin, J. *Nonciatures de France: Nonciatures de Clément VII*. Vol. 1: Depuis la bataille de Pavie jusqu'au rappel d'Acciaiuoli (25 février 1525-juin 1527). Paris, 1906.
- Fraikin, J. *Nonciatures de France: Nonciatures de Clément VII*. Vol. 2. *Supplément à la Nonciature ordinaire d'Acciaiuoli*. Paris: Lecoffre, 1926.
- François, Michael. "Lettre de Jacques Grosloot, bailli d'Orléans au Cardinal Jean du Bellay." *BHR* 1 (1941): 193-196.
- Fromment, Antoine. *Les actes et gestes merveilleux de la cité de Genève: nouvellement convertie à l'Évangille, faictz du temps de la Réformation et comment ils l'ont receue, redigez par escript en fourme de chroniques annales ou hystoires commençant l'an 1532*. Ed. Gustave Revilliod. Geneva: Jules Guillaume Fick, 1854.
- Garanderie, M.-M. de la, ed. *La correspondance d'Erasme et de Guillaume Budé*. Paris, 1967.
- Garside, Charles, Jr. "La Farce des théologastres: Humanisme, Heresy, and the Sorbonne, 1523-1525." In *Rice University Studies*, 60 (1974): 45-82.
- Gatien-Arnoult. "Cinq lettres de Boyssoné à J. de Coras." *Revue du Département du Tarn* 3 (1881): 180-184.
- Geisendorf, Paul. F., ed. *Livre des habitants de Genève*. 1. 1549-1560. 2 vols. Geneva, 1957-1963.
- Guy, Henri, ed. "Le sermon d'Aimé Meigret." *Annales de l'Université de Grenoble, n.s., Lettres-Droits* 5 (1928): 181-222.
- Hartmann, Alfred, ed. *Die Amerbachkorrespondenz*. 5 vols. Basel: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek, 1942-1958.

- Herminjard, A.-L. *La Réforme à Metz: six lettres inédites de Farel et de Pierre Toussain (1525-1526)*. Paris: Ch. Noblet, 1876.
- Herminjard, A.-L., ed. *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*. 9 vols. Geneva: H. Georg & Paris: Michel Levy, 1866-1897; reprint, Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1965.
- Higman, Francis M. *La diffusion de la Réforme en France, 1520-1565*. Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides, 1992.
- Huguenin, J.-F. *Les chroniques de la ville de Metz (900-1552)*. Metz: S. Lamort, 1838.
- Jacoubet, Henri. "La correspondance de Jehan de Boyssoné." *Annales du Midi* 42 (1930): 382-408; 41 (1929): 168-179; 42 (1930): 257-294, 382-408; 43 (1931): 40-85.
- Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris sous le règne de François Ier (1515-1536)*. Ed. V.L. Bourrilly. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et fils, 1910.
- Joutard, Philippe, ed. *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris sous François I^{er}. "Le livre de raison de Maître Nicolas Versoris, avocat au Parlement de Paris (1519-1530)*. Paris: Union générale d'Éditions, 1963.
- Kaulek, Jean, ed.. *Correspondance politique de Ms. de Castillon et de Marillac, ambassadeurs de France en Angleterre, 1537-1542*. Paris, 1885.
- La Marck, Robert de, seigneur de Fleuranges. *Histoire des choses mémorables*. Ed. Michaud et Poujoulat. Paris: Guyot et frères, 1838.
- Le Grand, Joachim. *Histoire du divorce de Henry VIII, roy d'Angleterre, et de Catherine d'Aragon*. 3 vols. Paris: M.G. Baguenault, 1688.
- Le Roux de Lincy, ed. *Recueil de chants historiques depuis le XII^e jusqu'au XVIII^e siècle avec des notices et une introduction*. 2 vols. Paris: Gosselin, 1841-1842, reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.
- Longeon, Claude, ed. Berquin, Louis de? *La farce des théologastres*. TLF 366. Geneva: Droz, 1989.
- Louise de Savoie. "Journal de Louise de Savoye." In *Nouvelle collection de mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, 1^{re} series, vol. 5, pp. 83-93. Ed. Michaud & Poujoulat. Paris: Guyot frères, 1851.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Chansons spirituelles*. Ed. Georges Dottin. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1971.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne*. Ed. Renja Salminen. *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Ser. B, Vol. 227. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1985.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Heptaméron des nouvelles de très illustre Princesse Marguerite d'Angoulême, Reine de Navarre*. Ed. Le Roux de Lincy and Anatole de Montaiglon. 4 vols. Paris: Eudes, 1880.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Heptaméron*. Ed. Simone de Reyff. Paris: Flammarion, 1982.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *La Coche*. Ed. Robert Marichal. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1971.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *La Navire ou consolation du roi François Ier à sa soeur Marguerite*. Ed. Robert Marichal. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1956.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Le Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*. Ed. Renja Salminen. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.

- Marguerite de Navarre. *Le Miroir de l'âme pécheresse. Discord etant en l'homme par contrariete de l'esprit et de la chair. Oraison a Nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ*. Ed. Joseph L. Allaire. Humanistische bibliothek: Abhandlung und Texte, Reihe II, 10. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1972.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Le Miroir de treschrestienne Princesse Marguerite de France, Duchesse d'Alençon & de Berry: auquel elle voit & son neant, & son tout [Le Miroir de l'âme pécheresse]*. Paris: Antoine Augereau, 1533 (2nd, printing).
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Le Théâtre profane*. Ed. V.-L. Saulnier. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1965.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Les dernières poésies de Marguerite de Navarre*. Ed. Abel Lefranc. Paris: Armand Colin, 1896.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Les Marguerites de la Marguerite des princesses. Texte de L'édition de 1547 publiés avec introduction, notes et glossaire*. Ed. Félix Frank. 4 vols. Paris, 1873; Reprinted in one volume Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Les Prisons: A French and English Edition*. Ed. Claire Lynch Wade. American University Studies, Ser. II vol. 99. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Miroir de Jhesus Christ crucifié*. Edition critica a cura di L. Fontanella. Alessandria: Edizioni dell' Orso, 1984.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Oraison à Nostre Seigneur Jésus Christ*. Ed. Renja Salminen. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, Vol. 215. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1981.
- Marguerite de Navarre. *Petit œuvre dévot et contemplatif: Neuedition und Versuch einer Erklärung*. Ed. Hans Sckommodau. Frankfurt am Main: Bittorio Klostermann, 1960.
- Marichal, Robert. "Antoine d'Oraison, premier traducteur français de Luther." *BHR* 9 (1947): 78-108.
- Marot, Clément. *Oeuvres poétiques*. Ed. Gérard Defaux. 2 vols. Paris: Classiques Garnier 1990 and 1993.
- Mayer, C.A., ed. *Clément Marot: Les Épitres*. Paris: A.G. Nizet, 1977.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Melanchthons Briefwechsel: kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe*. Ed. Heintz Schieble. 2 vols. to date. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1978-.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl*. Ed. Robert Stupperich. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1951-1955.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Philippi Melanchthonis Opera quae supersunt omnia*. Ed. C. Gottlieb and C. G. Bretschneider. Halle, Saxony: C.A. Schwetschke and sons, 1834-1860; reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1963.
- Mémoires de Martin et Guillaume du Bellay*. Ed. V.-L. Bourrilly and F. Vindry. 4 vols. Paris: Renouard, 1908-1919.
- Menot, Michel. *Sermons choisis de Michel Menot (1508-1518)*. Ed. Joseph Nève. New ed. Bibliothèque du XVe siècle 29. Paris: Édouard Champion, 1924.
- Mentz, Georg. *Johann-Friedrich der Grossmütige*. 3 vols (one band, three teils). Beiträge sur neuen Geschichte Thüringens, I. Jena: Fischer, 1903-1908.
- Millet, Olivier. *Correspondance de Wolfgang Capiton (1478-1541)*. Analyse et Index (d'après le Thesaurus Baumianus et autres sources). Publications de la Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire de Strasbourg VIII. Strasbourg: Bibliothèque de la Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire, 1982.

- Oecolampadius, Johannes. *Brief und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads*. 2 vols. Ed. Ernst Staehelin. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte 10. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger Eger and Sievers, 1927 & 1934; New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1971.
- Olin, John C. *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola: Reform in the Church 1495-1540*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Ordonnances des rois de France: règne de François Ier*. 9 vols. to date. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1902-.
- Piaget, Arthur. "Deux 'Mémoires' sur la Réformation à Orbe (juillet 1531)." In *Études et documents inédits sur la Réformation en suisse romande*, 87-111. Lausanne: Imprimerie La Concorde, 1936; offprint from *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 1933 and 1936.
- Piaget, Arthur. "Épître de Pierre Caroli à François I^{er}." In *Documents inédits sur la Réformation dans le Pays de Neuchâtel*. Neuchâtel: Archives de l'État, 1909, 493-507.
- Picot, Émile. *Chants historiques français du XVI^e siècle*. 1903.
- Picot, Émile. *Recueil général des sotties*. 3 vols. Paris: Firmin Didot et Cie, 1902-1912.
- Politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation*. Ed. Hans Vrick, Otto Winckelmann, Harry Gerber, and W. Friedensburg. 6 vols. Urkunden und Akten der Stadt Strassburg. Strasbourg; Trübner, 1882-1898, Heidelberg: Winters, 1928-1933.
- Raemond, Florimond de. *L'Histoire de la naissance... de l'hérésie de ce siècle*. Rouen, 1623 [1st ed. 1605].
- Reuchlin, Johannes. *Johann Reuchlins Briefwechsel*. Ed. L. Geiger. Tübingen, 1975 [1875!].
- Rhenanus, Beatus. *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus*. Ed. Adalbert Horawitz and Karl Hartfelder. Leipzig: B. O. Teubner, 1886.
- Ribier, Guillaume, ed. *Lettres et mémoires d'estat, de roys, princes, ambassadeurs et autres ministres, sous les regnes de François premier, Henri II et François II*. 2 vols. Paris, 1666.
- Sainte-Marthe, Denis de, ed. *Gallia Christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa, qua series et historia archiepiscoporum, episcoporum et abbatum Franciæ vincinarumque, ditionum, ab origine ecclesiarum ad nostra tempora deducitur*. 16 vols. Paris: J. Coignard, 1715-1865.
- Seyssel, Claude de. *The Monarchy of France*. Trans. J.H. Hexter and ed. D.R. Kelley. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Sleidan, Jean. *De Statu Religionis et Reipublicae Carlo Quinto Caesare Commentarii*. New ed. 1785-1786; fac-simile Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1976.
- Sturm, Jean. *Quarti antipappi tres partes priores: 1. Commonitio. 2. Antiprooemium. 3. Anthosiander [Antipappus quartus]*, (Neapoli Palatinorum, in officina Matthaei Harnisch, 1580).
- Tausserat-Radel, Alexandre. *Correspondance politique de Guillaume Pellicier, ambassadeur de France à Venise (1540-1542)*. 2 vols. Paris, 1899.
- Tommaso, N., ed. *Relations des ambassadeurs vénitiens sur les affaires de France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1838.
- Tournon, François de. *Correspondance (1521-1562)*. Ed. Michel François. Paris: Champion, 1946.
- "Une chronique de l'établissement de la Réforme à Saint-Seurin-d'Uzet et Saintonge: le registre de baptêmes de Jean Frèrejean (1541-1564)." *BSHPF*, 50 (1901): 135-157
- Vaissiere, Pierre de. *Charles de Marillac, ambassadeur et homme politique sous les règnes de François I^{er}, Henry II et François II, 1510-1560*. Paris: H. Welter, 1896; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine, 1971.

- Volcyr de Sérrouville, Nicolas. *L'histoire et Recueil de la triumpante et glorieuse victoire obtenue contre les seduyctz et abusez Lutherines mescreans du pays Daulsays et autres par tres hault te tres puissant prince et seigneur Anthoine, par la grace de Dieu duc de Calabre, de Lorraine et de Bar.* 1526?
- Weiss, Charles. *Papiers d'État du cardinal de Granvelle (1516-1565)*. 9 vols. Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France. Paris, 1841-52. Aubert, Louis. "Un opuscul de Farel." *Musée neuchâtelois* (1930): 167-179.
- Wibel, Johann Christian. *Merckwürdige Lebens-Geschichte des Grafen Sigmunds von Hohenlohe*. Frankfort & Leipzig, 1748.
- Zeller, Jean. *La Diplomatie français vers le milieu du XVI^e siècle, d'après la correspondance de Guillaume Pellicier, évêque de Montpellier, ambassadeur de François I^{er} à Venise, 1539-1542*. 2 vols. Paris: Hachette, 1881, reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.

IV. Secondary Studies

- "Autour de Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse de Berry et reine de Navarre, 1492-1549." *Cahiers d'archéologie et d'histoire du Berry* 96 (1989).
- Allaire, Joseph Leo. "L'évangélisme de Marguerite de Navarre." Ph.D. thesis, Wayne State Univ., 1966.
- Allmand, Christopher, ed. *Power, Culture, and Religion in France, c. 1350-1550*. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1989.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth. *Before Copyright. The French Book-Privilege System 1498-1526*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Autin, M. Albert. *La crise du nicodémisme (1535-1545): un épisode de la vie de Calvin*. Toulon: Paul Tisot, 1917.
- Barnaud, J. "Lefèvre d'Étaples et Bédier. Les premiers assauts donnés à la Réforme française." *BSHPF* 85 (1936): 251-79.
- Barnaud, J. *Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, son influence sur les origines de la Réformation française*. Cahors: Imprimerie de A. Coueslant, 1900.
- Bartuel, Pierre, Remy Scheurer, and Richard Stauffer, eds. *Actes du colloque Guillaume Farel: Neuchâtel, 29 septembre - 1er octobre 1980*. 2 vols. Cahiers de la Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 9, nos. 1 and 2 (1983). Geneva: Revue de la Théologie et de Philosophie, 1983.
- Baumgartner, Frederic J. *Change and Continuity in the French Episcopate: The Bishops and the Wars of Religion, 1547-1610*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1986.
- Baux, E. "Louise de Savoie et Claude de France à Lyon. Étude sur la première régence, 1515-1516." *Revue d'Histoire de Lyon* 1 (1902): 390-407, 447-484.
- Becker, Philippe-Auguste. "Les idées religieuses de Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux," *Revue de Théologie et de Questions Religieuses* 9 (1900): 318-358, 377-416.
- Becker, Philippe-Auguste. "Marguerite de Navarre, duchesse d'Alençon, et G. Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, d'après leur correspondance manuscrite (1521-1524), suivi d'une tableau chronologique." *BSHPF* (1900) 393-477, 661-667; offprint, Paris, 1901.
- Bedos-Rezak, Brigitte. *Anne de Montmorency, seigneur de la Renaissance*. Paris: Éditions Publisud, 1990.

- Bedouelle, Guy and Bernard Roussel. "La lecture de la Bible en langue vivante au XVI^e siècle: chronologie de quelques textes et faits marquants." In *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse*, ed. Francis Higman, 61-76. Geneva: Droz, 1990.
- Bedouelle, Guy and Bernard Roussel. *Le temps des Réformes et la Bible*. Bible de tous les Temps, 5. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.
- Bedouelle, Guy and Patrick le Gal. *Le "Divorce" du Roi Henry VIII: Études et documents*. Geneva: Droz, 1987.
- Bedouelle, Guy. "Le débat catholique sur la traduction en langue vulgaire." In *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse*, ed. Francis Higman, 39-59. Geneva: Droz, 1990.
- Bedouelle, Guy. "Lefèvre d'Étaples et Erasme: une amitié critique." In *Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (1450?-1536): Actes du colloque d'Étaples les 7 et 8 novembre 1992*, ed. Jean-François Pernot, 23-42. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995.
- Bedouelle, Guy. "Lefèvre d'Étaples et Luther. Une recherche de frontières, 1517-1537." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 63 (1983): 17-31.
- Bedouelle, Guy. "Lefèvre et ses disciples." *BSHPF* 134 (1988): 669-672.
- Bedouelle, Guy. "Une adaptation des *Epistres et Evangiles* de Lefèvre d'Étaples et de ses disciples." *BHR* 48 (1986): 723-734.
- Bedouelle, Guy. *Le Quincuplex Psalterium de Lefèvre d'Étaples. Un guide de lecture*. Geneva: Droz, 1979.
- Bedouelle, Guy. *Lefèvre d'Étaples et l'intelligence des Écritures*. THR 152. Geneva: Droz, 1976.
- Belle, Edmond. "La Réforme à Dijon des origines à la fin de la lieutenance générale e Gaspard de Saulx-Tavanes (1530-1570)." *Revue Bourguignonne* 21 (1911): 1-245.
- Benedict, Philip. "French cities from the sixteenth century to the Revolution: An overview," in *Cities and Social Change in Early Modern France*, 7-68. Routledge, 1989.
- Benedict, Philip. "Settlements: France." In *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, vol. 2, 417-454. 2 vols. Ed. Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Benedict, Philip. *Rouen during the Wars of Religion*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Bense, Walter. *Noël Beda and the Humanist Reformation at Paris, 1504-1534*. 3 vols. Dissertation: Harvard Divinity School, 1967.
- Berger, Samuel. "Le procès de Guillaume Briçonnet au Parlement de Paris, en 1525." *BSHPF* 44 (1895): 7-22.
- Bernard, Robert W. "Platonism—Myth or Reality in the *Heptaméron*?" *SCJ* 5, 1 (April 1974): 3-14.
- Berthoud, G. and A. Labhardt, "Lettre de Lefèvre d'Étaples à Guillaume Farel du 13 janvier 1524. Présentation et traduction." *Librarium [Zürich]* 26 (1983): 216-217.
- Berthoud, Gabrielle. "La *"Confession"* de maître Noël Béda et le problème de son auteur." *BHR* 29 (1967): 373-397.
- Berthoud, Gabrielle. "Les 'Ajournés' du 25 janvier 1535." *BHR* 25 (1963) 307-324.

- Berthoud, Gabrielle. "Lettres de réformés saisies à Lyon en août 1538." In *Études et documents inédits sur la Réformation en suisse romande*, 87-111. Lausanne: Imprimerie La Concorde, 1936; extracts from *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 1933 and 1936.
- Berthoud, Gabrielle. *Antoine Marcourt, réformateur et pamphlétaire du "Livre des marchans" aux placardes de 1534*. THR 129. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1973.
- Berthoud, Gabrielle et al. *Aspects de la propagande religieuse*. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1957.
- Bietenholz, Peter G. *Basle and France in the Sixteenth Century. The Basle humanists and printers in their contacts with Francophone culture*. THR 112. Geneva: Droz, 1971.
- Bietenholz, Peter G. "'Simulatio': Érasme et les interprétations controversées de Galates 2: 11-14." In *Actes du colloque international Érasme (Tours, 1986)*, ed. Jacques Chomarat, André Godin, and Jean-Claude Margolin, 160-169. Geneva: Droz, 1990.
- Biondi, Albano. "La giustificazione della simulazione nel cinquecento." In *Eresia e riforma nell'Italia del cinquecento, miscellanea I*, 7-68. Florence: C. C. Sansoni; Chicago: The Newberry Library, 1974.
- Blaisdell, Charmarie J. "Renée de France between Reform and Counter-Reform." *ARG* 63 (1972): 196-226.
- Blaisdell, Charmarie Jenkins. "Calvin's Letters to Women: The Courting of Women in High Places." *SCJ* 13 (1982): 67-84.
- Blaisdell, Charmarie Jenkins. "Marguerite de Navarre and Her Circle." In *Female Scholars: A Tradition of Learned Women Before 1800*, ed. J.R. Brink, 40-41. Montreal, 1980.
- Blind, Henri-Albert. *Marguerite de Navarre dans ses rapports avec la Réforme*. Thèse présentée à la Faculté de Théologie Protestante... pour obtenir le Grade de Bachelier en Théologie. Strasbourg: Imprimerie de Jean-Henri Edouard Heitz, 1868.
- Bloch, Marc. *Les rois thaumaturges*. Strasbourg: Imprimerie alsaciennes, 1924. Trans.: *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Block, Joseph S. *Factional Politics and the English Reformation 1520-1540*. Royal Historical Society Studies in History 66. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1993.
- Boinet, Amédée. "Le livre d'heures de Marguerite de Valois soeur de François I, conservé au musée du Louve." Paris, Nogen le-Rotrou, impr. de Daupéley-Gouverneur, 1906. Extract from *Mémoires de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France*, T. LXV, 274-290.
- Bonnet, Jules. "La jeunesse de Renée de France." *BSHPF* 15 (1866) 65 et 175.
- Bonnet, Jules. "Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre, et renée de France (1535-36)." *BSHPF* 37 (1888): 113-123.
- Bonnet, Jules. "Quatre lettres inédites de Marguerite de Navarre, soeur de François I^{er} à Renée de France, Duchesse de Ferrare, 1529-1536." *BSHPF* 15 (1866): 125-31.
- Bonney, Richard. *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660*. The Short Oxford History of the Modern World. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Bordenave, N. de. *Histoire de Béarn et Navarre*. Ed. P. Raymond. Société de l'Histoire de France. Paris: Vve. J. Renouard, 1873.
- Bordier, Henri-Léonard. *Le chansonnier huguenot du XVI^e siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: Tross, 1870; reprint Geneva: Slatkine, 1969.

- Boulay [Bulaeus], César-Égasse. *Historia Universitatis Pariensis*. 6 vols. vol. 6: 16th century. Paris: Petrus de Bresche, François Noël, 1665-1673; reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1966.
- Boulet, M. "Les élections épiscopales en France au lendemain du concordat de Bologne (1516-1531)." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 58 (1940): 190-324.
- Bourrachot, Lucile, Jean Burias, and Anne Marie Labit. "Marguerite d'Angoulême et la cour de Nérac." In their *Histoire du protestantisme en Agenais: Musée d'Agen, 12-12-65 au 31-3-66*. Agen, 1965.
- Bourrilly, V. L. "Correspondance de Guillaume du Bellay." *Revue de la Renaissance* 5 (1904): XX-XXX; 6 (1905): 45-50, 106-110, 243-246, and 282-292.
- Bourrilly, V. L. "François I^{er} et les Protestants: les Essais de Concorde en 1535." *BSHPF* 49 (1900): 337-365, 477-495.
- Bourrilly, V. L. "Jean Sleidan et le Cardinal du Bellay: Premier séjour de Jean Sleidan en France (1533-1540)." *BSHPF* 50 (1901): 225-242.
- Bourrilly, V. L. "Le cardinal Jean Du Bellay en Italie." *Revue des études rabelaisiennes* 5 (1907): XX-XX.
- Bourrilly, V. L. "Une lettre inédite de Louis de Berquin (26 décembre 1526)." *BSHPF* 51 (1902): 634-637.
- Bourrilly, V.L. *Guillaume du Bellay, seigneur de Langey, 1491-1543*. Paris: Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition, 1905.
- Bourrilly, V.L. and Nathaniel Weiss. "Jean du Bellay, les Protestants et la Sorbonne (1529-1535)." *BSHPF* 52 (1903): 193-231; 53 (1904): 97-143.
- Bourrilly, V.L. and P. de Vaissière. *Ambassades en Angleterre de J. du Bellay: La première ambassade (septembre 1527 – février 1529). Correspondance diplomatique*. Archives de l'histoire religieuse de la France. Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1905.
- Boutry, L. "Les chartes de charité de Henri et de Marguerite de Navarre." *Revue internationale de sociologie* 8 (1900): 867-876.
- Bouwsma, William. *John Calvin: A Sixteenth Century Portrait*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Boyer, "Un ménage littéraire en Berry au XVI^e siècle." In *Mémoire de la Commission d'histoire du Cher*, vol. 1, 2nd part, (1860): 99-174.
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr. *Protestant Politics: Jacob Sturm (1489-1553) and the German Reformation*. Studies in German Histories. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1995.
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr. *Ruling Class, Regime, and Reformation at Strasbourg, 1520-1555*. SMRT 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, eds. *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994-1995.
- Brandi, Karl. *The Emperor Charles V*. London: Cape, 1939.
- Bretonneau, Guy. *Histoire généalogique de la maison des Briçonnet*. Paris, 1620.
- Brimont (de). *Le XVI^e siècle et les guerres de la réforme en Berry*. Paris, 1905.
- Brothwood, Maureen. "Marguerite de Navarre: The *Via crucis* and 'Reno-Flamand' Influences." *BHR* 58 (1996): 597-610.

- Broutin, Paul. *L'évêque dan la tradition pastorale du XVI^e siècle: Adaptation française de "Das Bishofsideal der katholischen Reformation" par Hubert Jedin*. Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer & Cie, 1953. French trans. with additions of Hubert Jedin. "Das Bishofsideal der katholischen Reformation." *Sacramentum Ordinis: Festschrift zum 60. Priesterjubiläum des Kard. Bertram*. Breslau: E. Prisk and K. Kriss, 1942.
- Brown, Cynthia J. "Text, Image, and Authorial Self-Consciousness in Late Medieval Paris." In *Printing the Written word. The Social History of Books, circa 1450-1520*, 103-142. Ed. S. Hindman. Ithaca, N.Y. and London: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Brush, John Woolman. "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples: Three phases of his life and work." In *Reformation Studies: Essays in Honor of Roland Bainton*, ed. F. H. Little, 117-128. Richmond, 1962.
- Bryson, David M. "The Vallant Letters of Jeanne d'Albret: Fact or Forgery?" *French History* 13 (1999): 16-186.
- Bryson, David M. *Queen Jeanne and the Promised Land: Dynasty, Homeland, Religion and Violence in Sixteenth-Century France*. Studies in Intellectual History 97. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Buisson, Albert. *Le Chancelier Antoine Duprat*. Paris: Hachette 1935.
- Burger, Christoph. "Calvin comme maître de ses amis dans la première de ses *Epistolae duae* (1537)." In *Calvin et ses contemporains. Actes du colloque de Paris 1995*, ed. Olivier Millet, 149-162. Cahiers d'Humanisme et Renaissance 53. Geneva: Droz, 1998.
- Cabantous, Marius. *Marguerite d'Angoulême et les débuts de la Réforme: Étude historique*. Thèse de la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de Montauban, 1989.
- Cadier, Léon et Henri Courteault. *Le livre de syndics des États de Béarn*. Archives Historiques de la Gascogne 18. Paris-Auch: Champion-Cocharaux, 1889-1906.
- Cameron, Euan. *The Reformation of the Heretics: The Waldenses of the Alps, 1480-1580*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Cameron, Richard M. "The Attack on the Biblical Works of Lefèvre d'Étaples, 1514-1521." *Church History* 38 (1969): 9-24.
- Cameron, Richard M. "The Charges of Lutheranism brought against Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples." *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 119-49.
- Carley, James P. "'Her moost lovyng and fryndely brother sendeth gretyng' Anne Boleyn's Manuscripts and Their Sources." In *Illuminating the Book: Makers and Interpreters. Essays in Honour of Janet Backhouse*, ed. Michelle P. Brown and Scot McKendrick, 261-280. London & Toronto: The British Library and University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Cartier, Alfred and Adolphe Chenevière. *Antoine Du Moulin, valet de chambre de la reine de Navarre*. Paris, 1896, 69 p. *RHLF*, II (1895): 468-90; III (1896): 90-106, 218-44.
- Caumont, C.R. de. *Histoire de Marguerite de Valois, Reine de Navarre, soeur de François I*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: J.L. Lorme & Est. Roger, 1696. 12°.
- Causse, Maurice. "'La Familière Exposition' de Gérard Roussel et l'aventure 'nicodémite' en Guyenne." *BSHPF* 131 (1985): 5-33.
- Causse, Maurice. "Les dissimulations de Marguerite de Navarre et l'aventure nicodémite." *BSHPF* 132 (1986): 347-390.
- Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du Colloque international de Pau (1992)*. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.

- Cazauran, Nicole. "Les citations bibliques dans l'*Heptaméron*." In *Prose et Prostateurs à la Renaissance, Mélanges offerts à R. Aulotte*, 153-63. 1988.
- Cazaux, Yves. "Les sources septentrionales, méridionales et orientales de la pensée de Marguerite d'Angoulême." In *Arnaud de Salette et son Temps: le Béarn sous Jeanne d'Albret. Colloque International d'Orthez* (16, 17, 18 février 1983), 55-65. Orthez: Per Noste, 1984.
- Chambers, Betty T. *Bibliography of French Bibles. Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century French-Language Editions of the Scriptures*. THR 197. Geneva: Droz, 1983.
- Chareyre, Philippe. "'The Great Difficulties One Must Bear to Follow Jesus Christ': Morality at Sixteenth-Century Nîmes." In *Sin and the Calvinists: Morals Control and the Constitutory in the Reformed Tradition*, ed. Raymond A. Mentzer, 63-96. Sixteenth Century Essays Studies 32. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Essays Studies, 1994.
- Chartier, Roger. *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Chartron-Le Clech, Sylvie. *Chancellerie et culture: Au XVI^e siècle (les notaire et secrétaire du roi de 1515 à 1547)*. Toulouse: Presses Universitaire du Mirail, 1993.
- Chevalier, Bernard and Robert Sauzet, eds. *Les réformes enracinement socio-culturel. XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1er-13 juillet 1982*. Paris: Editions de la Maisnie, 1982.
- Chevalier, Bernard. "France from Charles VII to Henry IV." In *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, ed. Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, vol. 1, 369-401. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Christiani, Louis. "Josse Clichtove et son *Antilutherus*." *Revue des questions historiques* 89 (1911): 120-134.
- Clemen, Otto. "Die Schmalkaldener und Frankreich im Mai 1543." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 37 (1940): 222-227.
- Clemen, Otto. "Zwei Briefe von Basilius Murner." *Mitteilungen der Vereinigung für Gothaische Geschichte und Altertumsforschung* (1912): 109-111.
- Clément Marot "prince des poètes françois": *Actes du colloque international de Cahors-en-Quercy, 21-25 Mai, 1996*. Paris: H. Champion, 1997.
- Clerval, Abbé J.-A. *Iudoci Clichtovei Neoportuensis Vita et Operibus 1472-1543*. Paris: Alphonse Picard and sons, 1894.
- Clouzot, Henri. "Marguerite de Navarre et Rabelais." *RSS*, 15 (1932-1933) 300-1.
- Clutton, George. "Simon du Bois of Paris and Alençon" *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* (1937): 124-130.
- Colletet, Guillaume. *Vie d'Étienne Dolet. Édition établie par Michel Magnien d'après le ms. BN n.a.fr. 3073*. Geneva: Droz, 1992.
- Colloque Marguerite de Navarre. *Colloque Marguerite de Navarre* (15-16 février, 1992). Nice: Faculté des Lettres, Artes et Science Humaines, 1993.
- Cooper, Richard. "Humanism and Politics in Lyon in 1533." In *Intellectual Life in Renaissance Lyon. Proceedings of the Cambridge Lyon Colloquium 14-16 April 1991, Cambridge French Colloquia*, ed. Philip Ford and Gillian Jondorf, 1-31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Cooper, Richard. "Marguerite de Navarre et la réforme italienne." In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du Colloque international de Pau (1992)*, 159-188. Ed. Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Cooper, Richard. "Marguerite de Navarre et ses poètes italiens." In *Les Visages et les voix de Marguerite de Navarre: actes du colloque international sur Marguerite de Navarre, Duke University, 10-11 avril 1992*. Ed. Marcel Tetel. Paris: Klincksieck, 1995.
- Cooper, Richard. *Litterae in Tempore Belli: Études sur les relations littéraires italo-françaises pendant les guerres d'Italie*. THR 308. Geneva: Droz, 1997.
- Copley Christie, Richard. *Étienne Dolet*. Revised ed. London 1899; French trans. Casimir Stryienski. Paris, 1886; Reprint, Geneva, Slatkine, 1969.
- Cottret, Bernard. *Calvin: Biographie*. Paris: Jean-Claude Lattès, 1995.
- Couture, Léon de. "Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre et Vittoria Colonna." *Revue de Gascogne* 18 (1877): 408-422.
- Crouzet, Denis. *La genèse de la Réforme française, 1520-1562*. Regards sur l'histoire, Histoire Moderne 109. Ed. Jean-Pierre Poussou. Paris: SEDES, 1996.
- Crouzet, Denis. *Les guerriers de Dieu. La violence au temps des troubles de religion vers 1525 – vers 1610*. 2 vols. Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 1990.
- Dardier, Charles. "Origines de la Réforme à Nîmes jusqu'à l'établissement d'un consistoire (1532-1561)." *BSHPF* 29 (1880): 481-499.
- Darmesteter, Mary James. *La reine de Navarre*. Paris, 1900.
- Dartigue-Peyrou, Charles. *Jeanne d'Albret et le Béarn, d'après les délibérations de États et les registres du Conseil Souverain (1552-1572)*. Mont-de-Marsan: Jean-Lacoste, 1934.
- Dartigue-Peyrou, Charles. *La Vicomté de Béarn sous le règne d'Henri d'Albret*. Le Puy: Imprimerie la Haute-Loire; Paris: Société d'édition de Belles Lettres, 1934.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. "The Sacred and the Body Social in Sixteenth-Century Lyon." *Past and Present* 90 (1981): 40-70.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1975.
- Decrue, Francis. *Anne de Montmorency, Grand Maître et Connétable de France à la Cour, aux Armées, et au Conseil du Roi François Ier*. 2 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1885-89; reprint in one vol. Geneva: Mégariotis Reprints 1978.
- Defaux, Gérard and Frank Lestringant. "Marot et le problème de l'évangélisme: À propos de trois articles récents de C.A. Mayer." *BHR* 54 (1992): 125-130.
- Defaux, Gérard, ed. *La génération Marot: Poètes français et néo-latins (1515-1550). Actes du colloque international de Baltimore, 5-7 décembre 1996*. Colloque, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance 11. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997.
- Defaux, Gérard. *Le poète en son jardin: étude sur Clément Marot et "l'Adolescence clémentine"*. Collection Unichamps 51. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1996.
- Déjean, J.L. *Marguerite de Navarre*. Paris, 1987.
- Delisle, Léopold. "Notice sur un registre des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris (1501-1533)." *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, vol. 36, 1 (1899): 315-407.

- Delumcau, Jean and Thierry Wanegffelen. *Naissance et affirmation de la Réforme*. 14th edition. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1997.
- Desjardins, E. *Anne de Pisseleu duchesse d'Étampes et François Ier*. 1904.
- Desnos, Odolant. *Mémoires historiques sur la ville d'Alençon*. 2 vols. 1787.
- Despierres, G. "L'imprimerie à Alençon de 1529 à 1575." *Bulletin historique et philosophique du Comité des travaux historique et scientifique*. 1893.
- Diefendorf, Barbara, B. *Beneath the Cross: Catholic and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Diefendorf, Barbara. *Paris City Councilors in the Sixteenth Century: The Politics of Patrimony*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Doucet, Roger. *Étude sur le gouvernement de François Ier dans ses rapports avec le Parlement de Paris*. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Édouard Champion, 1921-26.
- Doucet, Roger. *L'état des finances de 1523*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1923.
- Doucet, Roger. *Les bibliothèques parisiennes au XVI^e siècle*. Paris: Picard, 1956.
- Doucet, Roger. *Les institutions de la France au XVI^e siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: Picard, 1948.
- Douen, O. "Le réformateur Pierre Caroli et l'imprimeur Simon Dubois." *BSHPF* 45 (1896): 200-212.
- Douen, O. "Les premières professions de foi des protestants français: Robert Estienne, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Calvin," *BSHPF* 43 (1894): 449-454.
- Douglass, Jane Demsey. "Marie Dentièr's Use of Scripture in her Theology of History." In *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective: Studies in Honor of Karlfried Froehlich on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Mark S. Burrows and Paul Rorem, 227-244. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Douglass, Jane Demsey. *Women, Freedom & Calvin*. The Annie Kinkcad Warfield Lectures. Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1985.
- Doumergue, Émile. *Jean Calvin: Les hommes et les choses de son temps*. Lausanne: Georges Bridel et cie., 1899.
- Droz, Eugénie. "Claude Baduel: Traducteur de Bucer," *BHR* 17 (1955): 347-350.
- Droz, Eugénie. "La reine Marguerite de Navarre et la vie littéraire à la cour de Nérac." *Bulletin de la Société des Bibliophiles de Guyenne* 33 (1964): 77-120.
- Droz, Eugénie. "Une impression inconnue de Pierre de Vingle: Les Prières et Oraisons de la Bible [Lyon], 19 août 1530." *BHR* 20 (1958): 158-169.
- Droz, Eugénie. *Chemins de hérésie: Textes et documents*. 4 vols. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970-1976.
- Dupêbe, Jean and Philippe Hamon. "Humanistes en famille: Les Meigrets." *BHR* 52 (1990): 333-344.
- Dupêbe, Jean. "Un document sur les persécutions de l'hiver 1533-1534 à Paris." *BHR* 48 (1986): 405-417.
- Duval, F. "Essai sur Marguerite d'Angoulême et Charles d'Alençon." *Positions des thèses soutenues par les élèves de l'Ecole des Chartes*. 1901.
- Edelstein, Marilyn M. "Church Patronage in France on the Eve of the Reformation." In *Renaissance Society and Culture: Essays in Honor of Eugene F. Rice, Jr.*, ed. John Monfasani and Roland G. Musto, 33-49. New York Italica Press, 1991.

- Edelstein, Marilyn M. "Foreign Episcopal Appointments during the Reign of Francis I." *Church History* 44 (1975): 1-10.
- Edelstein, Marilyn M. "The Social Origins of the Episcopacy in the Reign of Francis I." *French Historical Studies* 8 (1974): 377-92.
- Eire, Carlos M. N. "Calvin and Nicodemism: A Reappraisal." *SCJ* 10 (1979): 41-69.
- Eire, Carlos M. N. "Prelude to Sedition? Calvin's Attack on Nicodemism and Religious Compromise." *ARG* (1985?): 120-146.
- Eire, Carlos M.N. *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Elwood, Christopher Lee. *The Body Broken: The Calvinist Doctrine of the Eucharist and the Symbolization of Power in France, 1530-1570*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Engammaire, Max. *Le Cantique des Cantiques de Salomon. Translaté d'ebrieu en francoys par Olivetan, (1535-1538)*. Memoire de Licence. Université de Lausanne, Faculté de Théologie, 1987.
- Estèbe (Garrisson), Janine. "Vers une autre religion et une autre église (1536-1598)?" In *Histoire des protestants en France*, 45-116. Toulouse: Edward Privat, 1977.
- Eurich, A. Amanda. *The Economics of Power: The Private Finances of the House of Foix-Navarre-Albret during the Religious Wars*. Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies 24. Kirksville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.
- Farel, Guillaume. "Épître à tous seigneurs, et peuples et pasteurs." In *Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse*, ed. Abraham Ruchat, vol. 2, 528ff.
- Farge, James K. "Censorship in Paris: The Roles of the Parlement of Paris and King Francis I." *Renaissance and Reformation*, new series, 13 (1989) 173-183.
- Farge, James K. "Marguerite de Navarre, Her Circle, and the Censors of Paris." In *International colloquium celebrating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Marguerite de Navarre. April 13 & 14, 1992*, ed. Régine Reynolds-Cornell, 15-28. Birmingham, AL: Summa, 1995.
- Farge, James K. *Le Parti conservateur au XVIe Siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme*. Documents et inédits du Collège de France, 1992.
- Farge, James K. *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500-1543*. SMRT 32. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.
- Farinelli, A. "Dante e Margherita di Navarra." Roma, 1902. Estratto dal fascicolo di Febbraio 1902 della Rivista d'Italia.
- Favyn, A. *Histoire de Navarre*. Paris, 1612.
- Febvre, L. and H. J. Martin. *L'apparition du livre*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1958.
- Febvre, Lucien. "Dolet, propagateur de l'évangile." *BHR* 6 (1945): 98-170.
- Febvre, Lucien. *Amour sacré, amour profane: Autour de l'Heptaméron*. Paris: Gallimard, 1944.
- Febvre, Lucien. *Au coeur religieux du XVIe siècle*. 2nd ed. Paris: Le Livre de Poche, 1983 [1st edition 1957].

- Febvre, Lucien. *Le problème de l'incroyance au XVI^e siècle: La religion de Rabelais*. Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1942, 1968; *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century: The Religion of Rabelais*. Trans. Beatrice Gottlieb. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Febvre, Lucien. *Life in Renaissance France*. Trans. Marian Rothstein. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Ferguson, Gary. "Now in a Glass Darkly: The Textual Status of the *je parlant* in the *Miroirs* of Marguerite de Navarre." *Renaissance Studies* 5 (1991): 398-411.
- Ferguson, Gary. *Mirroring Belief: Marguerite de Navarre's devotional poetry*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1992.
- Firpo, Massimo. "The Italian Reformation and Juan de Valdés." *SCJ* 27 (1996): 353-364.
- Ford, Philip and Gillian Jondor, eds. *Humanism and Letters in the age of the François Ier*. Cambridge: 4th Cambridge French Renaissance Colloquium. Cambridge: Cambridge French Renaissance colloquia, 1996.
- Fraenkel, Pierre, ed. *Pour retrouver François Lambert: Biobibliographie et études*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana 108. Baden-Baden & Bouxwiller: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 1987.
- François, Michel. *Le cardinal François de Tournon: Homme d'état, diplomate, mécène et humaniste (1489-1562)*. Paris: Boccard, 1951.
- Frank, Félix. "Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François Ier, reine de Navarre et l'esprit nouveau en France au XVI^e siècle." *Revue Moderne* 38 (1866): 220-242.
- Frederichs, J. "Un luthérien français devenu libertin spirituel: Christophe Hérault et les Loïstes d'Anvers (1490-1544)." *BSHPF* 41 (1892): 250-269.
- Frederichs, Julius. *De Secte der Loïsten op Antwerpsche Libertijnen (1525-1545): Eligius Pruystinck (Loy de Schaliendecker) en zijne Aanhangers*. Gent: J. Vuylsteke, 'S-Gravenhage [la Haye]: Martinus Nijhoff, 1891.
- Freer, Martha Walker. *The Life of Marguerite d'Angoulême*. 2 vols. London, 1898.
- Fumaroli, Marc. *L'âge de l'éloquence: rhétorique et "res literaria" de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique*. Geneva: Droz, 1980; paperback reprint, Paris, Albin Michel, 1994.
- Gäbler, Ulrich. "Zum Abschluss des Edition von Zwinglis Reformationsschriften." *Zwingliana* 21 (1994): 99-106.
- Gadoffre, Gilbert. *Du Bellay et le sacré*. Paris, Gallimard, 1978.
- Gadoffre, Gilbert. *La révolution culturelle dans la France des humanistes: Guillaume Budé et François I^{er}*. Titre Courant 8. Geneva: Droz, 1997.
- Galpern, A.N. *The Religions of the People in Sixteenth-Century Champagne*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Ganoczy, Alexandre. *Le jeune Calvin: Genèse et évolution de sa vocation réformatrice*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische geschichte Mainz 40. Wiesbaden: Franz Stiner Verlag, 1966.
- Gaufres, M. J. *Claude Baduel et la réforme des études au XVI^e siècle*. Paris: Hachette, 1880.
- Gaullieur, Ernest. *Histoire de la Réformation à Bordeaux et dans le ressort du Parlement de Guyenne*. 2 vols. Paris-New York-Bordeaux, 1884.

- Giacone, Franco. "Le premier ouvrage de Marguerite de Navarre: *Dialogue en forme de vision nocturne ou Pater Noster*?" In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, 261-289. Ed. Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Gilmont, Jean-François, ed. *La Réforme et le livre: l'Europe de l'imprimé (1517-v.1570)*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990.
- Gilmont, Jean-François. *Jean Calvin et le livre imprimé*. Geneva: Droz, 1997.
- Gilmont, Jean-François. *Palaestra Typographia: Aspects de la production du livre humaniste et religieux au XVI^e siècle*. Aubel, Belgium: P.-M. Gason, 1984.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. *Il niocdemismo. Simulazione e dissimulazione religiosa nell'Europa de l'500*. Turin: Einaudi, 1970.
- Gohin, F. "Huitains inédits de Marguerite de Navarre et d'un amant platonique." *Mélanges offerts à M. Émiles Picot par ses amis et ses élèves*. 2 vols. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969 [1913], 395-407.
- Graf, Charles Henri. *Essai sur la vie et les écrits de Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples*. Strasbourg, 1842; Reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.
- Graves, William Lamar. "The Politics of Reform: Marguerite of Navarre, 1521-1535." Ph.D. thesis, Texas Christian University, 1979.
- Greengrass, Mark. "France." Ch. 3 in *The Reformation in National Context*, ed. Bob Scribner, Roy Porter, and Mikuláš Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Greengrass, Mark. "Property and Politics in sixteenth-century France: the Landed Fortune of Constable Anne de Montmorency." *French History* 2 (YEAR): 371-398.
- Greengrass, Mark. *The Reformation in France*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Griffiths, Gordon. "Louise of Savoy and the Reformation of the Church." *SCJ* 10 (1979): 29-36.
- Guérin, (Chanoine). *La bienheureuse Marguerite de Lorraine*. Paris: Téqui, 1921.
- Guérin, P. "Poursuites contre les réformés d'Alençon, 1533-1534." *BSHPPF* 33 (1884) 112 and 162.
- Guillaume Farel, 1489-1565: *biographie nouvelle écrite d'après les documents originaux par groupe d'historiens, professeurs et pasteurs de Suisse, de France et d'Italie*. Neuchâtel et Paris, 1930; reprint Geneva: Slatkine, 1978.
- Gundersheimer, Werner L., ed. *French Humanism, 1470-1600*. London: Macmillan, 1969.
- Hall, Basil. *John Calvin: Humanist and Theologian*. Historical Association Publications, General series 33. London: The Historical Association, 1956.
- Hamon, Philippe. "Messieurs des finances:" *Les grand officiers de finances dans la France de la Renaissance*. Paris: Comité pour l'histoire économique et financière de la France, 1999.
- Hamon, Philippe. *L'argent du roi: Les finances sous François Ier*. Paris: Comité pour l'histoire économique et financière de la France, 1994.
- Hanley, Sarah. *The Lit de Justice of the Kings of France: Constitutional Ideology in Legend, Ritual, and Discourse*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Harding, Robert. *Anatomy of a Power Elite: The Provincial Governors of Early Modern France*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

- Hauréau, B. "Louis de Berquin, 1523-1529: la poursuite de l'hérésie, l'alliance du Parlement et de la Sorbonne." *Revue des deux mondes* 79 (1869): 454-481.
- Hauser, Henri and Augustin Renaudet. *Les débuts de l'âge moderne. Peuples et Civilisations VIII*. 4th ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1956.
- Hauser, Henri. "Étude critique sur le *Journal de Louise de Savoie*." *Revue Historique* 86 (1904): 280-303.
- Hauser, Henri. "Lettres closes de François Ier sur les protestants de Savoie (1538): conservées aux archives de Riom." *BSHPPF* 43 (1894): 594-598.
- Hauser, Henri. *Études sur la Réforme française*. Paris: Picard, 1909.
- Hauser, Henri. *Les sources de l'histoire de France, XVI^e siècle*. 4 vols. Paris, 1906-1915.
- Heller, Henry. "An Unknown Letter from Clement VII to Gérard Roussel," *BHR* 38 (1976): 489-492.
- Heller, Henry. "Famine, Revolt and Heresy at Meaux: 1521-1525." *ARG* 68 (1977): 133-157.
- Heller, Henry. "Les artisans au début de la Réforme. Hommage à Henri Hauser." In *Les Réformes enracinement socio-culturel, XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1^{er}-13 juillet 1982*, 327-335. Ed. Bernard Chevalier et Robert Sauzet. Paris: Éditions de la Maisnie, 1985.
- Heller, Henry. "Marguerite of Navarre and the Reformers of Meaux." *BHR* 33 (1971): 279-310.
- Heller, Henry. "Nicholas of Cusa and early French Evangelicism." *ARG* 63 (1972): 6-21.
- Heller, Henry. "The Briçonnet Case reconsidered." *Journal of Mediaeval and Renaissance studies* (1972): 223-258.
- Heller, Henry. "The Evangelicism of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, 1525." *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972): 42-77.
- Heller, Henry. *Reform and Reformers at Meaux, 1518-1525*. Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, New York, 1969. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms.
- Heller, Henry. *The Conquest of Poverty: The Calvinist Revolt in Sixteenth Century France*. SMRT 35. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986.
- Hémardinquer, J. J. "A propos du procès d'hérésie contre Aimé Meigret (Grenoble, 1524)." *BHR* 19 (1957): 480-481.
- Hempsall, David S. "Martin Luther and the Sorbonne, 1519-1521." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 46 (1973): 28-40.
- Hempsall, David S. "Measures to suppress 'la peste luthérienne' in France, 1521-1522." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 49 (1976): 296-29.
- Hempsall, David S. "The Languedoc 1520-1540: A Study of Pre-Calvinist Heresy in France." *ARG* 62 (1971): 225-244.
- Henry-Bordeaux, Paule. *Louise de Savoie, régente et 'roi' de France*. Paris: Plon, 1954; New ed., *Louise de Savoie, 'roi' de France*. Paris: Perrin, 1971.
- Higman, Francis M. "Bibliographie matérielle et histoire intellectuelle: Les débuts de la Réforme française." The Cassal Bequest Lecture delivered before the University of London on 29 April 1986. University of London, 1986.

- Higman, Francis M. "Bucer et les nicodémistes." In *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)*, 2 vols. Ed. Christian Krieger and Marc Lienhard, vol. 2, 645-658. SMRT 52 & 53. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.
- Higman, Francis M. "Genevan Printing and French Censorship, 1520-1551." In *Cinq siècles d'imprimerie Genevoise: Actes du colloque international sur l'histoire de l'imprimerie et du livre à Genève 27-30 Avril 1978*, ed. Jean-Daniel Candaux and Bernard Lescaze, 31-53. Geneva: Société d'histoire et d'archéologie, 1980.
- Higman, Francis M. "Le domaine français, 1520-1562." In *La Réforme et le livre: l'Europe de l'imprimé (1517-v.1570)*, ed. Jean-François Gilmont, 105-154. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1990.
- Higman, Francis M. "Le levain de l'évangile." In *Historie de l'édition française. Le livre conquérant du moyen âge au milieu du XVII^e siècle*, ed. Bernard Chevalier and Herni-Jean Martin, 305-325. Paris: Promodis, 1982.
- Higman, Francis M. "Les débuts de la polémique contre la messe: *De la tressainte cene de nostre Seigneur et de la messe qu'on chante communement*." In *Le livre et la Réforme*, ed. Rodoloph Peter and Bernard Roussel, 35-92. Bordeaux: Société des Bibliophiles de Guyenne, 1987.
- Higman, Francis M. "Les traductions françaises de Luther, 1524-1550." In *Palaestra Typographia: Aspects de la production du livre humaniste et religieux au XVI^e siècle*, ed. Jean-François Gilmont, 11-54.
- Higman, Francis M. "Luther et la piété de l'église gallicane: le *Livre de vraye et parfaicte oraison*." *Révue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* 63 (1980): 91-111.
- Higman, Francis M. "Premières réponses catholiques aux écrits de la Réforme en France, 1525-c.1540." In *Le livre dans l'Europe de la Renaissance*, ed. P. Aquilon et Henri Jean Martin, 361-377. Actes du XXVIII^e colloque international d'études humanistes de Tours. Paris: Promodis, 1988.
- Higman, Francis M. "The Question of Nicodemism." In *Calvinus Ecclesiae Genevensis Custos*, ed. Wilhelm H. Neuser, 165-170. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1984.
- Higman, Francis M. "Theology for the Layman in the French Reformation 1520-1550." *The Library*, 6th ser., 9 (1987): 105-127.
- Higman, Francis M. "Theology in French: Religious Pamphlets from the Counter-Reformation." *Renaissance and Modern Studies* (1979): 128-146.
- Higman, Francis M. *Censorship and the Sorbonne. A Bibliographical Study of Books in French Censured by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, 1520-1551*. THR 172. Geneva: Droz, 1979.
- Higman, Francis M. *La diffusion de la Réforme en France, 1520-1565*. Geneva: Éditions Labor et Fides, 1992.
- Higman, Francis M. *Piety and the People: Religious Printing in French, 1511-1551*. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Aldershot, England: Scolar Press, 1996.
- Higman, Francis. "De l'affaire des Placards aux Nicodémistes: le mouvement évangélique français sous François I^{er}." *Études théologique et religieuses* 70 (1995): 359-366.
- Higman, Francis. "Farel et Luther dans la bibliothèque d'Anne de Montmorency?" *BHR* 53 (1991): 415-418.
- Hindman, Sandra. "Introduction." In *Printing the Written word. The Social History of Books, circa 1450-1520*, 1-18. Ed. S. Hindman. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.

- Hoffman, Philip T. *Church and Community in the Diocese of Lyon, 1500-1789*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Holban, Maria. "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," *Humanisme et Renaissance* II (1935): 26-43, 147-171.
- Holban, Maria. "Le journal de Louise de Savoie." *Revue Roumaine d'histoire* 28 (1989): 451-464.
- Holban, Marie. "Autour du livre d'heures de Marguerite de Valois." In *In Memoria Lui Vasile Pârum*, 168-180. Bucharest: Vasile Parvan, 1934.
- Holban, Marie. "François Du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine." *BHR* 2 (1942): 26-43, 147-171.
- Holt, Mack P. "Wine, Community, and Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Burgundy." *Past and Present* 138 (1993): 58-93.
- Holt, Mack P. *Society and Institutions in Early Modern France*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1991.
- Holt, Mack P. *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629*. New Approaches to European History 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Hours, Henri. "Procès d'hérésie contre Aimé Maigret (Lyon-Grenoble: 1524)." *BHR* 19 (1957): 14-43.
- Hufstadter, Anselm. "Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Magdalen." *Studies in the Renaissance* 16 (1969): 31-60.
- Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe. *Lefèvre: Pioneer of Ecclesiastical Renewal in France*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Huppert, Georges. "Classes dangereuses: École et Réforme en France, 1530-1560." *Les réformes enracinement socio-culturel, XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1^{er}-13 juillet 1982*, ed. Bernard Chevalier et Robert Sauzet, 327-335. Paris: Éditions de la Maisnie, 1985.
- Huppert, Georges. *Les Bourgeois Gentilshommes: An Essay on the Definition of Elites in Renaissance France*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Huppert, Georges. *Public Schools in Renaissance France*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- Hyrvoix de Landosle, Albert. "François Ier et la première guerre de religion en Suisse." *Revue des Questions historiques* 71 (1902): 464-537.
- Hyrvoix de Landosle, Albert. "Nôel Bédier d'après des documents inédits (1533-34)." *Revue des Questions historiques* 72 (1902): 578-91.
- Idéologie et propagande en France. Colloque organisé par l'Institut d'histoire et de civilisation française de l'Université de Haïfa, sous la direction de M. Yardeni*. Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1987.
- Imbart de la Tour, Pierre. *Les origines de la Réforme*. 4 vols. Paris, 1905-1944; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978.
- Jacquart, Jean. *François Ier*. Paris: Fayard, 1981.
- Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (1450?-1536): Actes du colloque d'Étaples les 7 et 8 novembre 1992*. Colloques, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance 5. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995.
- Jouanna, Arlette. *La France du XVI^e siècle*. 2nd ed. Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 1997 [1996].

- Jourda, Pierre. "François du Moulin de Rochefort et la querelle de la Madeleine," *Humanisme et Renaissance*, II (1935): 26-43, 147-171.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Le mécénat de Marguerite de Navarre." *Revue du Seizième Siècle* 18 (1931) 253-271; Paris: Honoré Champion, 1931.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Lettres inédits de Victor Brodeau." In *Mélanges offerts à Abel Lefranc*, 155-160. 1936.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Marguerite de Navarre: Épître et comédie inédites. *Revue du Seizième Siècle* 13 (1926): 177-204.
- Jourda, Pierre. "Victor Brodeau." *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* (1921).
- Jourda, Pierre. *Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse d'Alençon, reine de Navarre (1492-1549): Étude biographique et littéraire*, 2 vols. Bibliothèque Littéraire de la Renaissance, new ser., no. 19. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1930; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978.
- Kelley, Donald R. *The Beginning of Ideology: Consciousness and Society in the French Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Kemp, William. "Marguerite of Navarre, Clément Marot, and the Augereau Editions of the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*," *Journal of the Early Book Society* 2 (1999): 113-156.
- Kingdon, Robert M. *Church and Society in Reformation Europe*. Variorum Reprints, 1985.
- Knecht, R. J. "Francis I, 'Defender of the Faith.'" In *Wealth and Power in Tudor England: Essays Presented to S. T. Bindoff*, ed. F. W. Ives, R. J. Knecht and J. J. Scarsbrick, 106-27. London: University of London, Athelone Press, 1978.
- Knecht, R. J. "The Concordat of 1516: A re-assessment." *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 9 (1963-1964): 16-32.
- Knecht, R. J. *Francis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Knecht, R. J. *French Renaissance Monarchy: Francis I & Henry II*. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1996 [1984].
- Knecht, R. J. *Renaissance Warrior and Patron: Reign of Francis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- La Ferrière-Percy, Le Comte H. de. *Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François I^{er}. Son livre de dépenses (1540-1549). Étude sur ses dernières années*. Paris, 1862.
- Landa, Paul J. "The Reformed Theology of Gerard Roussel, Bishop of Oloron (1536-1555), based upon a critical edition of his *Familiere exposition du simbole de la loy et oraison dominical en forme de Colloque* and his *Forme de visite de diocese* (c. 1548)." Ann Arbor: University Microfilm, 1977. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Vanderbilt University, 1976.
- Laprade, J. de et P. Bayayd. "Richesses anciennes du château de Pau: Un inventaire des bijoux, joyaux, bibelots précieux de Marguerite d'Angoulême (1535). Extrait du *Bulletin des amis du château de Pau*, no. 12 (1961).
- Larcher, Charles. "Marguerite d'Angoulême dans ses rapports avec la Réforme. Étude historique." Thèse Montauban, 1883.
- Larmat, Jean. "L'image de la société française au début du XVI^e siècle dans les sermons de Michel Menot." In *Études de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offertes à Jules Horrent à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire*, ed. by Jean Marie d'Heur and Nicoletta Cherubini, 715-725. Liège: J.-M. d'Heur and N. Cherubini, 1980.

- Lauvergnat-Gagnière, C. "Un peu de nouveau sur Nicolas Bourbon l'ancien." *BHR* 53 (1991): 663-693.
- Le Béarn sous Jeanne d'Albret 1583-1588: 4^e centenaire de la publication des Psaumes en béarnais par Arnaud de Salette*. Exposition organized by Per Noste and the Bibliothèque Municipale de Pau, 1984. Nîmes: Imprimerie bernier, 1984.
- Le Clech-Chartron, Sylvie. "Jacques Thiboust, Notaire et secrétaire du Roi et Familier de Marguerite de Navarre: Amitiés Littéraires dans le Berry du 'Beau Seizième siècle.'" "Autour de Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse de Berry et reine de Navarre, 1492-1549." *Cahiers d'archéologie et d'histoire du Berry* 96 (1989): 17-27.
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel. *Les paysans de Languedoc*. Paris: SEVPEN, 1966; *The Peasants of Languedoc*. Trans. John Day. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois press, 1976.
- Lebeau, Jean and Jean-Marie Valentin. *L'Alsace au siècle de la Réforme, 1482-1621. Textes et Documents*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1985.
- Lecoq, Anne-Marie. *François I^{er} imaginaire. Symbolique et politique à l'aube de la Renaissance française*. Paris: Macula, 1987.
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques et al. *Épîtres & Évangiles pour les cinquante & deux semaines de l'an. Fac-simile de la première édition Simon du Bois*. Ed. M.A. Screech. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1964.
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques et al. *Epîtres et Évangiles pour les cinquante et deux dimanches de l'an. Texte de l'édition Pierre de Vingle*. Ed. Guy Bedouelle et Franco Giaccone. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, trans. *Le Nouveau Testament. Fac-simile de la première édition Simon de Colines, 1523*. Ed. M.A. Screech. 2 vols. *Classiques de la Renaissance en France*. East Ardsley, England: S.R. Publishers; New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1970.
- Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques. *Quincuplex Psalterium. Fac-similé de l'édition de 1513*. Ed. Guy-Thomas Bedouelle. Geneva: Droz, 1979.
- Lefranc, Abel and Jacques Boulenger. *Comptes de Louise de Savoie (1515, 1522) et de Marguerite d'Angoulême (1512, 1517, 1524, 1529, 1539)*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1905.
- Lefranc, Abel. "Un nouveau registre de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris au XVI^e siècle." *BHSPF* 51 (1902): 14-19.
- Lefranc, Abel. *Histoire du Collège de France depuis ses origines*. Paris: Hachette, 1893.
- Lefranc, Abel. *Les idées Religieuses de Marguerite de Navarre d'après son œuvre poétique (Les Marguerites et Les Dernières Poésies)*. Paris, 1898; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.
- Lemaître, Nicole and Michel Veissière. "Lefèvre d'Étaples, Marguerite de Navarre, et les évêques de leur temps." In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, 109-134. Ed. Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Lemaître, Nicole. *Le Rouergue flamboyant: Le clergé et les fidèles du diocèse de Rodez, 1417-1563*. Paris: Cerf, 1988.
- Lembrigh, Robert. "Le mécénat de Marguerite de Navarre." *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente* 149 (1993): 132-159.
- Lembrigh, Robert. "Louise de Savoie et Marguerite d'Angoulême. Renaissance Patronage and Religious Reform." Ph.D. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1974.

- Léonard, Émile G. *Histoire général du protestantisme*. 3 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1961; 2nd ed, Paris: P.U.F., 1980; first ed. trans. *A History of Protestantism*. Trans. Joyce M.H. Reid. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1968.
- Leroy, P.-E., ed. *Le beau XVI^e siècle troyen: Aspects de la vie politique, économique, artistique, littéraire et religieuse à Troyes de 1480 à 1550*. Troyes: Centre Troyen de Recherche et d'Études Pierre et Nicolas Pithou, 1989.
- Les dominicains en France devant la Réforme, 1520-1563*. Special edition of *Mémoire dominicaine: Histoire, Documents, et Vie dominicaine* 12. Paris: Cerf, 1998.
- Lestocquoy, J. "Les évêques français au milieu du XVI^e siècle," *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 45 (1959): 25-40.
- Levi, A. H. T. "Humanist Reform in sixteenth century France." *Heythrop Journal* 6 (1965): 447-464.
- Levi, A. H. T., ed. *Humanism in France at the End of the Middle Ages and in the early Renaissance*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970.
- Lindsay, Robert O. and John Neu. *French Political Pamphlets 1547-1648: A Catalog of Major Collections in American Libraries*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Livet, Georges and Francis Rapp. *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVI^e siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre. Actes du colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975)*. Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977.
- López de Menses, Amada. "Nuevos datos sobre la correspondencia de Margarita de Angulema." *Bulletin Hispanique* 37 (1935): 5-9.
- Lovy, René-Jacques. *Les origines de la Réforme française: Meaux, 1518-1546*. Paris: Librairie Protestante, 1959.
- MacNeil, D.O. *Guillaume Budé and Humanism in the Reign of Francis I*. Geneva: Droz, 1975.
- Magnier, Michael. "Charles de Sainte-Marthe et son *Oraison funèbre de la mort de l'incomparable Marguerite, royne de Navarre (1550)*." *Travaux de Littérature* 7 (1994): 65-90.
- Maitre, H.B. "Les théologastres de l'Université de Paris au temps d'Érasme et de Rabelais." *BHR* 27 (1965).
- Major, J. Russell. "The Crown and Aristocracy in Renaissance France." In *Lordship and Community in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Frederic L. Cheyette, 240-254. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Mandrou, Robert. "Le renouvellement de l'historiographie de la Réforme: Lucien Febvre et la Réforme." In *Historiographie de la Réforme*, ed. Philippe Joutard, 339-351. Paris-Neuchâtel-Montreal: Delachaux & Niestlé S.A., 1977.
- Mandrou, Robert. "Pourquoi se réformer?" In *Histoire des Protestants en France*. Toulouse: Edward Privat, 1977.
- Mandrou, Robert. *Introduction à la France moderne (1500-1640). Essai de psychologie historique. L'Évolution de l'humanité* 36. Paris: Albin Michel, 1961, 1974; *Introduction to modern France, 1500-1640: An essay in historical psychology*. Trans. R.E. Hallmark. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1975.
- Mann-Phillips, Margret. "Louis de Berquin et l'*Enchiridion* d'Érasme." *Revue du Seizième Siècle* (1931): 89-103.

- Mann-Phillips, Margret. "Louis de Berquin, traducteur d'Erasmus." *Revue du Seizième Siècle* 18 (1931): 308-23.
- Mann-Phillips, Margret. *Érasme et les débuts de la Réforme française (1517-1536)*. Paris, 1934; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978.
- Martin, Hervé. *Le métier de prédicateur en France septentrionale à la fin du Moyen Age (1350-1520)*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Martin, M. *Guillaume Budé, le livre de l'Institution du Prince*. Europäische Hochschulschriften, 20th ser., Philosophie 120. Berne: P. Long, 1983.
- Martin, Victor. *Le gallicanisme politique et le clergé de France*. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1929.
- Martin, Victor. *Les origines du gallicanisme*. 2 vols. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1939; reprint in one vol. Geneva: Mégariotis Reprints 1978.
- Martineau, Christine, and Michel Veissière. "Une édition de la correspondance de Guillaume Briçonnet et de Marguerite d'Angoulême (1521-1524)." *Revue Française d'Histoire du Livre*, new. ser., 10 (1976): 195-203.
- Martineau, Christine. "La lectio divina dans l'Heptaméron." In *Colloque Marguerite de Navarre (15-16 février, 1992)*, 21-42. Nice: Faculté des Lettres, Artes et Science Humaines, 1993.
- Martineau, Christine. "La voix de l'Évangélisme dans l'Heptaméron de Marguerite de Navarre. *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de Nice* 39 (1983) *Mélanges Jean Lamart*, 385-391.
- Martineau, Christine. "Le platonisme de Marguerite de Navarre?" *RHR* 4 (1976): 12-35.
- Massaut, Jean-Pierre. "Thèmes ecclésiologiques dans les controverses antiluthériennes de Clichtove: pouvoir, ordre, hiérarchie." In *Les réformes enracinement socio-culturel, XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1^{er}-13 juillet 1982*, ed. Bernard Chevalier et Robert Sauzet, 327-335. Paris: Éditions de la Maisnie, 1985.
- Massaut, Jean-Pierre. *Critique et tradition à la veille de la Réforme en France: Étude suivie de textes inédits traduits et annotés*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1974.
- Massaut, Jean-Pierre. *Josse Clichtove, l'humanisme et la réforme du clergé*. 2 vols. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège; Paris Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres," 1968.
- Matheson, Peter. "Martyrdom or Mission? A Protestant Debate." *ARG* 80 (1989): 154-172.
- Mayer, C.A. "Anne Boleyn et la version originale du 'Sermon du bon pasteur' d'Almanque Papillon." *BSHPF* 132 (1986): 337-346.
- Mayer, C.A. "Clément Marot et Marguerite d'Angoulême." *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 86 (1986): 813-30.
- Mayer, C.A. "The Problem of Dolet's Evangelical Publications." *BHR* 7 (1955): 405-414.
- McCrie, C.G. *Contemporary Portraits of Reformers of Religion and Letters: Being Facsimilie Reproductions of the Portraits in Beza's "Icones" (1580) and in Goulard's Edition (1581)*. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1906.
- McNeil, David O. *Guillaume Budé and Humanism in the Reign of Francis I*. Geneva: Droz, 1975.
- Mégret, Jacques. "Deux impressionnes retrouvées d'Étienne Dolet." *BHR* 4 (1944): 123-137.

- Mellinghoff-Bourgerie, Viviane. "L'échange épistolaire entre Marguerite d'Angoulême et Guillaume Briçonnet: Discours mystiques ou direction spirituelle?" In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du Colloque international de Pau (1992)*, 135-157. Ed. Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Mentzer, Raymond A., Jr. *Heresy Proceedings in Languedoc, 1500-1560*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 74, part 5, 1984. Philadelphia, PA: The American Philosophical Society, 1984.
- Meschinet de Richemond, (L. de). "Marguerite d'Orléans, soeur de François I, Henry d'Albret, roi de Navarre, et leur chapelain G. Roussel à la Rochelle." Paris, 1878.
- Métivier, Jean de. *Chronique du Parlement de Bordeaux*. Ed. Arthur de Brezet and Jules Delpit. 2 vols. Publications de la Société des Bibliophiles de Guyenne. Bordeaux: Société des Bibliophiles, 1886-1887.
- Meyer, Barbara Hochstetler. "Marguerite de Navarre and the Androgynous Portrait of François Ier." *Renaissance Quarterly* (1995): 287-325.
- Meyer, Judith Pugh. *Reformation in La Rochelle: Tradition and Change in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1568*. THR 298. Geneva: Droz, 1996.
- Meylan, Henri. "Farel et Bucer: Les dernières lettres (1550)." *Musée neuchâtelois* (1965): 15 pp.
- Meylan, Henri. "Lefèvre d'Étaples: Les thèmes théologiques de les Épîtres et Évangiles." In *Colloque de Tours: L'humanisme français au début de la Renaissance, 185-192*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1973.
- Michaud-Fréjaville, Françoise. "L'entrée dans sa capitale [Bourges] de Marguerite d'Angoulême, duchesse de Berry." *Cahiers d'archéologie et d'histoire du Berry* 96 (1989) 7-10.
- Michaud-Fréjaville, Françoise. "Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre, duchesse de Berry, 'laquelle a fort humainement traité ses sujets de Berry.'" In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*. Ed. Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Millet, Olivier. *Calvin et la dynamique de la parole. Étude de rhétorique réformée*. Paris, 1992.
- Molinier, E. and F. Mazerolles. *Inventaire des meubles du château de Pau, 1561-1562*. Paris: Morgand, 1892.
- Montaignon, A de. "Antoine Augereau, natif du Poitou, d'après la *Liste des hérétiques ajournés par les gens du Roi*. (Bibl. Munic. de Soissons, ms. 189, fol. 79)." *BSHPF* 11 (1862): 354-258.
- Montaigne. "L'âme de Marguerite de Navarre: Petit essai de psychologie." *Revue Historique et Archéologique du Béarn et du Pays Basque* 1931, 132-139.
- Monter, William E. *Calvin's Geneva*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.
- Monter, William. *Judging the French Reformation: Heresy Trials by Sixteenth-Century Parlements*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Moore, W. G. *La Réforme allemande et la littérature française: Recherches sur la notoriété de Luther en France*. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg 52. Strasbourg: Publication de la Faculté des Lettres, 1930.
- Moreau, Brigitte. "Une impression clandestine à Paris au temps du concile de Sens, l'*Epistola Luciferi*." In *Le livre dans l'Europe de la Renaissance*, ed. P. Aquilon et H. J. Martin, 343-359. Actes du XXVIII colloque international d'études humanistes de Tours. Paris: Promodis, 1988.
- Mours, Samuel. *Le protestantisme en France au XVIe siècle*. Paris: Librairie Protestante, 1959.

- Mours, Samuel. *Les églises réformées de France*. Paris, 1958.
- Mousseaux, M. *Aux sources françaises de la Réforme: La Brie protestante (Textes et faits)*. Paris: Librairie Protestante, 1968.
- Muchembled, Robert. *Popular Culture and Elite Culture in France, 1400-1750*. Trans. Lydia Cochrane. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985.
- Muller, Ernst. "Les cantiques de Luther dans les recueils de langue Française." *BSHPF* 129 (1983): 47-72.
- Naphy, William G. *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Nicholls, David J. "France." In *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed. Andrew Pettegree, 120-141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Nicholls, David J. "Heresy and Protestantism, 1520-1542: Questions of Perception and Communication." *French History* 10 (1996): 182-205.
- Nicholls, David J. "Inertia and Reform in the pre-tridentine French Church: the Response to Protestantism in the Diocese of Rouen, 1520-1562." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 32 (1981): 185-197.
- Nicholls, David J. "Looking for the Origins of the French Reformation." In *Power, Culture, and Religion in France, c. 1350-c. 1550*, 131-144. Ed. Christopher Allmand. Woodhouse, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1989.
- Nicholls, David J. "Sectarianism and the French Reformation." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 70 (1988): 35-44.
- Nicholls, David J. "Social Change and Early Protestantism in France: Normandy, 1520-62." *European Studies Review* 10 (1980): 279-308.
- Nicholls, David J. "The Nature of Popular Heresy in France, 1520-1542." *The Historical Journal* 26 (1983): 261-275.
- Nicholls, David J. "The Social History of the French Reformation: Ideology, Confession and Culture." *Social History* 9 (1984): 25-43.
- Nicholls, David J. "The Theatre of Martyrdom in the French Reformation." *Past and Present* 121 (1988): 49-73.
- Nugent, Donald. *Ecumenism in the Age of the Reformation: The Colloquy of Poissy*. Harvard Historical Studies 89. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966 and 1981.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *Initia Calvini: The Matrix of Calvin's Reformation*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1991.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *Luther: Man between God and the Devil*. Trans. Eileen Walliser-Schwartzbart. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989; original German, Berlin: Severin und Seidler Verlag, 1982.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963; 3rd edition, Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth Press, 1983.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications*. Trans. Andrew Colin Gow. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1994.

- Oberman, Heiko A. "Calvin and Farel: The Dynamics of Legitimation in Early Calvinism." *JEMH* 2, no. 1 (1998), 32-60; also *Reformation and Renaissance Review* (1999): 7-40.
- Oberman, Heiko A. "Europa afflicta: The Reformation of the Refugees." *ARG* 83 (1992): 91-111.
- Oberman, Heiko A. "John Calvin: The mystery of his Impact." *Calvin Studies VI*, 1-14. Presented at a Colloquium on Calvin Studies at Davidson College and Davidson College Presbyterian Church, Davidson, North Carolina. Ed. John H. Leith. January, 1992.
- Oberman, Heiko A. "Subita Conversio: The Conversion of John Calvin." In *Reformiertes Erbe*, vol. 2, 279-295. Festschrift für Gottfried W. Locher zu seinem 80. Geburtstag, ed. Heiko A. Oberman, Ernst Saxer, Alfred Schindler and Heinzpeter Stucki. Zurich, 1993.
- Oberman, Heiko A. "The Impact of the Reformation: Problems and Perspectives." In *Politics and Society in Reformation Europe*, ed. E. I. Kouri and Tom Scott, 3-31. London: The Macmillan Press, 1987.
- Olive, S. *Succession d'Armagnac. Procès de la maison de Lévis-Mirepoix*. Toulouse: Privat, 1925.
- Oria, Yon. "Platonic symbolism of Marguerite d'Angoulême in the royal Courts of France and Navarre (1492-1549)." *Principe de Viana* 47 (1986): 319-329.
- Orth, Myra D. "'Madame Sainte Anne': The Holy Kinship, the Royal Trinity, and Louise of Savoy," in *Interpreting Cultural Symbols: Saint Anne in Late Medieval Society*, ed. K. Ashley and P. Sheingorm, 199-227. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1990.
- Orth, Myra D. "Manuscrits pour Marguerite." In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du Colloque international de Pau (1992)*, ed. Nicole Cazauran and James Dauphiné, 85-105. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Orth, Myra D. "Radical Beauty: Marguerite de Navarre's Illuminated Protestant Catechism and Confession." *SCJ* 24 (1993): 383-427.
- Orth, Myra Dickman. "François du Moulin and the *Journal* of Louise de Savoie." *SCJ* 13 (1982): 56-66.
- Oursel, Ch. "Étude historique sur la réforme en Normandie... au temps de François I^{er}." *Positions des thèses de l'Écoles des Chartes* 1899, 105.
- Oursel, Ch. "Quelques notes sur la Réforme à Alençon et dans le diocèse de Sées au temps de François I^{er}." *Revue normande et percheronne* XX (1899); Alençon: Imprimerie de A. Herpin, 1900.
- Oursel, Ch. *Notes pour servir à l'histoire de la Réforme en Normandie au temps de François I^{er}, principalement dans le diocèse de Rouen*. Mémoire de l'Académie Nationale des Sciences, Artes et Belles-Lettres de Caen (1912): 103-256, separately paginated 1-156 at top of page; Caen: Delesque, 1913.
- Oursel, Ch. *Quelques notes sur la réforme à Alençon... au temps de François I^{er}*. Alençon, 1900.
- Paravy, Pierrette. *De la Chrétienté romaine à la Réforme en Dauphiné. Évêques, fidèles et déviants (vers 1340-vers 1530)*. Collection de l'École française de Rome 183. Rome: École française de Rome; Paris: Boccard, 1993.
- Pariset, Jean-Daniel. *Les relations entre la France et l'Allemagne au milieu du XVI^e siècle*. Société savante d'Alsace et des Régions de l'est, 'Grandes Publications' 19. Strasbourg: Istra, 1981.
- Parker, L.S. "The 'False Prophets' of Lefèvre d'Étaples." *BHR* 45 (1983): 473-485.
- Patry, H. *Les débuts de la Réforme protestante en Guyenne, 1523-1559. Arrêts du parlement*. Bordeaux, 1912; also printed in *Revue historique* (de Bordeaux) 110 (1912): 291-321.

- Peter, Rodolphe. "La réception de Luther en France du 16^e siècle." *RHPR* XX (1983): XX-XX.
- Peter, Rodolphe. "Le martyr alsacien Wolfgang Schuch." *Revue d'Alsace* (1987): 91-127.
- Peter, Rodolphe. "Les premiers ouvrages français imprimés à Strasbourg; suite; 2e suite; et 3e suite." *L'Annuaire des Amis du Vieux-Strasbourg* (1974): 73-108; (1978): 11-75; (1980): 35-46; (1984): 17-28.
- Peter, Rodolphe. "Strasbourg et la Réforme française vers 1525." In *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVI^e siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre. Actes du colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975)*, ed. Georges Livet and Francis Rapp, 269-283. Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977.
- Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Phillips, Margret M. "Marguerite de Navarre et Érasme: Une reconsideration." *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 52 (1978): 194-201.
- Picot, Émile. *Les Français italianisants au XVI^e siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1906.
- Piton, M. "L'idéal épiscopal selon les prédicateurs français de la fin du XV^e siècle et du début du XVI^e." *Revue d'histoire Ecclésiastique* 61 (1966): 77-118, 393-423.
- Polizzotto, Lorenzo and Caroline Elam. "La unione de'gigli con gigli: Two Documents on Florence, France and the Savonarolan Millenarian Tradition." *Rinascimento* 2nd ser., 31 (1991): 239-259.
- Pollet, J. V. *Itinerarium Germanicum. Collection de manuscrits du XVI^e siècle allemand reproduits en photocopie et conservés au CNRS/IHRT Paris*. Orléans: La Source, 1986.
- Pollet, J. V. *Martin Bucer: Études sur la correspondance avec de nombreux textes inédits*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958.
- Potter, D.L. "Foreign Policy in the Age of the Reformation: French Involvement in the Schmalkaldic War, 1544-1547." *The Historical Journal* 20 (1977): 525-544.
- Potter, David. *A History of France, 1460-1560. The Emergence of a Nation State*. Houndsills: MacMillan, 1995.
- Prenout, H. "La Réforme en Normandie et les débuts de la Réforme à l'université de Caen." *Revue historique* 114 (1913): 285-305.
- Prestwich, Menna, ed. *International Calvinism, 1541-1715*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Puech, Albert. *La Renaissance et la Réforme à Nîmes: d'après des documents originaux inédits*. Nîmes: Gervais-Bedot, 1893.
- Rapp, Francis. "Caractères nationaux au sien de la Chrétienté. III. La France." Ch. in *De la Réforme à la Réformation (1450-1530)*, ed. Marc Venard, 341-367. *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours*, vol. 7. Paris: Desclée, 1994.
- Rapp, Francis. "L'humanisme et le problème de l'église." In *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVI^e siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre*, eds. Georges Livet and Francis Rapp, 45-49. Actes du Colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975). Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977.
- Reinburg, Virginia. *Popular Prayers in Late Medieval & Reformation France*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Renaudet, Augustin. "Marguerite de Navarre. A propos d'une biographie." Ch. in *idem, Humanisme et Renaissance*, 217-235. Geneva, 1958; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1981.

- Renaudet, Augustin. *Humanisme et Renaissance: Dante, Pétrarque, Standonck, Érasme, Lefèvre d'Étaples, Marguerite de Navarre, Rabelais, Guichardin, Giordano Bruno*. Geneva, 1958; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1981.
- Renaudet, Augustin. *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494-1517)*. 2nd ed. Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953; first edition Paris: Édouard Champion, 1916.
- Reynolds-Cornell, Régine, ed. *International colloquium celebrating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Marguerite de Navarre. April 13 & 14, 1992*. Birmingham, AL, 1995.
- Rice, Eugene F., Jr. "Humanist Aristotelianism in France." In *Humanism in France at the end of the Middle Ages and in the early Renaissance*, ed. A.H.T. Levi, 132-149. Oxford: Manchester University Press; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970.
- Rice, Eugene F., Jr. "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Medieval Christian Mystics." In *Florilegium Historiale. Essays presented to Wallace K. Ferguson*, 89-124. Ed. J.G. Rowe and W.H. Stockdale. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Rice, Eugene F., Jr. "The Patrons of French Humanism." In *Renaissance Studies in honor of Hans Baron*, ed. A. Molho and J. A. Tedeschi, 687-702. Florence, 1971.
- Rice, Eugene F., Jr., ed. *The Prefatory Epistles of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and Related Texts*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Richet, Denis. *De la Réforme à la Révolution: Études sur la France moderne*. Paris: Aubier, 1991.
- Ripart, Laurent. "Les mariages de Marguerite." In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, 45-57. Ed. Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Ritter, Raymond. *Les solitudes de Marguerite de Navarre (1527-1549)*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1953.
- Robbins, Kevin C. *City on the Ocean Sea: La Rochelle, 1530-1650: Urban Society, Religion, and Politics on the French Atlantic Frontier*. SMRT 64. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Robert, Benjamin. "Les débuts du protestantisme à Alençon." *BSHPF* 85 (1936): 365-390.
- Roberts, Penny. *A City in Conflict: Troyes during the French Wars of Religion*. Manchester and New York, 1996.
- Rodocanachi, E. *Une protectrice de la Réforme en Italie et en France: Renée de France, Duchesse de Ferrare*. Paris, 1896; Reprint Geneva: Slatkine, 1970.
- Roelker, Nancy Lyman. "The Appeal of Calvinism to French Noblewomen in the Sixteenth Century." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2 (1972): 391-418.
- Roelker, Nancy Lyman. "The Role of Noblewomen in the French Reformation." In *ARG* 63 (1972): 168-195.
- Roelker, Nancy Lyman. *One King, One Faith: The Parlement of Paris and the Religious Reformations of the Sixteenth Century*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.
- Roelker, Nancy Lyman. *Queen of Navarre: Jeanne d'Albret 1528-1572*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Roger, J. M. and M. Veissière. "Le dossier du procès devant l'Officialité de Troyes de Nicolas Boivin, soupçonné d'hérésie luthérienne (9 août 1528 – 5 février 1529)." In *Le Beau XVI^e Siècle troyen: Aspects de la vie politique, économique, artistique, littéraire et religieuse à Troyes de 1480 à*

- 1550, ed. P.-E. Leroy, 415-37. Troyes: Centre Troyen de Recherche et d'Études Pierre et Nicolas Pithou, 1989.
- Rolland, Romain. "Le dernier procès de Louis de Berquin, 1527-1529." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 12 (1892): 314-325.
- Romier, Jean-Baptiste-Lucien. *Le royaume de Catherine de Médicis. La France à la veille es guerres de religion*. 2 vols. Paris, 1925; reprint in one vol. Slatkine Reprints, 1978.
- Romier, Jean-Baptiste-Lucien. *Les origines politiques des guerres de religion, d'après des documents originaux inédits*. Paris: 1913-1914; reprint Slatkine Reprints, 1974.
- Rotondo, Antonio. "Atteggiamenti della vita morale italiana del cinquecento: la pratica nicodemitica." *Rivista storica italiana* 79 (1967): 991-1030.
- Rott, Edouard. *Histoire de la représentation diplomatique de la France auprès des Cantons Suisses*. 10 vols. Berne/Paris: 1900-1935. Vol. 1 (1430-1559). Paris, 1900.
- Rott, Jean. "L'église des réfugiés de langue française à Strasbourg au XVI^e siècle: aperçu de son histoire, en particulier de ses crises à partir de 1541." *BSHPPF* 122 (1976): 525-550.
- Rott, Jean. *Correspondance de Martin Bucer: Liste alphabétique des correspondants*. Association des Publications de la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université des Sciences humaines de Strasbourg, Bulletin no. 1. Strasbourg: Palais Universitaire, 1977.
- Rott, Jean. *Investigationes Historicae: Églises et société au XVI^e siècle. Gasammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchen- und Sozialgeschichte*. 2 vols. Ed. Marijn Kroon and Marc Lienhard. Strasbourg: Librairie Oberlin, 1986.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Bucer Exégète." In *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)*, 2 vols., ed. Christian Krieger and Marc Lienhard, vol. 1, 39-54. SMRT 52 & 53. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Claude Guillaud, un théologal pris en flagrant délit de dissidence (1542-1548)." In *Les Dissidents du XVI^e siècle entre l'humanisme et le catholicisme: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (5-6 février 1982)*, ed. Marc Lienhard, 127-138. Bibliotheca Dissidentium: Scripta et Studia, no. 1. Baden-Baden: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 1983.
- Roussel, Bernard. "François Lambert, Pierre Caroli, Guillaume Farel, et Jean Calvin (1530-1536)." In *Calvinus Servus Christi: International Congress on Calvin Research, 25-28 August 1986*, ed. Wilhelm H. Neuser, 35-52. Budapest: Presseabteilung des Raday-Kollegiums, 1988.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples et ses 'retours' aux écritures'." In *Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (1450?-1536). Actes du colloque d'Étaples les 7 et 8 novembre 1992*, 43-54. Ed. Jean-François Pernot. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995.
- Roussel, Bernard. "La formation biblique du clergé d'Autun entre 1540 et 1550: Bucer plagié, le chanoine Guillaud censuré. Recherches nouvelles sur Claude Guillaud (1493-1551), théologal d'Autun." In *Horizons européens de la Réforme en Alsace*, 313-337. Ed. Marijn de Kroon et Marc Lienhard. Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1980.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Les 'Nouveaux Jérôme'(1525-1535): les Psaumes traduits en français iuxta hebraicam veritatem." In *Les réformes enracinement socio-culturel, XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1^{er}-13 juillet 1982*, ed. Bernard Chevalier et Robert Sauzet, 327-335. Paris: Éditions de la Maisnie, 1985.

- Roussel, Bernard. "Les premières dissidences religieuses du XVI^e siècle à Metz (Hiver 1523 - Été 1525)." In *Les Réformes en Lorraine (1520-1620)*, ed. Louis Châtelier 11-45. Centre de Recherches en Histoire sociale et religieuse 2. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1986.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Marguerite de Navarre: Les débuts de la Réforme et les troubles d'Alençon, 1530-1534." *Société historique et archéologique de L'Orne* 105 (1986): 87-106.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Martin Bucer et Jacques Sadolet: La concorde possible (Automne, 1535)?" *BSHPF* 122 (1976): 507-524.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Olivetan 'corbeau enroué'? La traduction française d'Ephésiens 1 et Esaie 3." In *Olivetan, traduction de la Bible*, ed. A. Casalis and Bernard Roussel, 77-88, 191-196. Actes de Colloque Olivetan, Nyon, Mai 1985. Paris: Cerf, 1987.
- Roussel, Bernard. "Traducteurs de la Bible comme exégètes." In *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse*, ed. Francis Higman, 141-154. Geneva: Droz, 1990.
- Royannez, M. "L'eucharistie chez les évangéliques et les premiers réformés français." *BSHPF* 125 (1979): 548-76.
- Ruble, Alphonse de. *Le mariage de J. d'Albret*. Paris: Adolphe Labitte, 1877.
- Ruble, Baron Alphonse de. *Antoine de Bourbon e Jeanne d'Albret, suite de "Le mariage de Jeanne d'Albret."* 4 vols. Paris: A. Labitte, 1881-1886.
- Ruchat, Abraham. *Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse (1516-1556)*. 6 vols. Geneva: M.M. Bousquet, 1727-1728.
- Sage, Pierre. "La Sainte Vierge dans l'œuvre de Marguerite de Navarre." *Bulletin de la Faculté catholique de Lyon nouvelle série* 16 (1954) 17-27.
- Salefranque, Pierre de. *Histoire de l'hérésie en Béarn*. Ed. Victor-Pierre Dubarat. *Bulletin de la société des sciences, lettres et arts de Pau* (1921): 39-40, 68-69, 74-80.
- Salmon, J. H. M. *Renaissance and Revolt: Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Salmon, J. H. M. *Society in Crisis: France in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.
- Sandret, L. "Marguerite d'Angoulême...Projets de mariage et négociations." *Revue des Questions historiques* 14 (1873) 205.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Intrigues pour un évêché: Marguerite de Navarre et le siège de Sarlat (1530)." *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* (1976): 208-216.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "La correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre. Complément au répertoire." *BHR* 33 (1971): 571-604.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Le parti Du Bellay devant l'affaire de Nicolas Cop. Ou de quelques fonctions du silence." In *Actes du colloque Renaissance-Claissicisme du Maine (1971)*, 19-34. Paris: Nizet, 1975.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Le soliloque françois, œuvre inédite de Jean Lucas de La Fons: Une apologie de l'alliance Turque inspirée par Marguerite de Navarre." In *Mélanges... Henri Chamard*, 211-225. Paris: Nizet, 1951.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre aux temps de Briçonnet. Étude de la correspondance générale (1521-1522)." *BHR* 39 (1977): 437-478; 40 (1978): 7-47 and 193-237.

- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre en ses derniers temps. Sur des lettres de 1547-1549." *BHR* 36 (1974): 533-572.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre et le Baron de Jarnac: d'après une correspondance inédite de la reine." In *De Jean Lemaire de Belges à Jean Giraudoux: Mélanges d'histoire et de critique littéraire offerts à Pierre Jourda*, 93-109. Paris: Nizet, 1970.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre, Catherine de Médicis et les Psaumes de Marot. Autour de la lettre dite de Villemadon." *BHR* 37 (1975): 349-376.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite de Navarre, Vittoria Collona et quelques autres amis italiens de 1540." In *Mélanges à la mémoire de Franco Simone: France et Italie dans la culture européenne. I. Moyen Age et Renaissance*, 281-295. Genève: Slatkine, 1980.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Marguerite loin du roi blessé: Sur la correspondance de Marguerite d'Angoulême aux lendemains de Pavie." In *Missions de démarches de la critique: Mélanges offerts au Professeur J.A. Vier*, 435-453. Klincksieck, 1973.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Martin Pontus et Marguerite de Navarre. La réforme lyonnaise et les sources de l'Heptaméron." *BHR* 21 (1959): 577-594.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Maurice Scève et Marguerite de Navarre. A propos de poésies apocryphes." *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 4th series, 1 (1964) 111-115.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Recherches sur la correspondance de Marguerite de Navarre." *BHR* 34 (1972): 283-336.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Sur des lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême aux temps d'Espagne." *Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature* 13, no. 2 (1975): 31-45.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Troubles au couvent de Tarascon (Marguerite de Navarre, Guillaume du Maine, Claude de Bectoz et Denys Faucher)." In *French Renaissance Studies in Honor of Isidore Silver*. Ed. Frieda S. Brown. *Kentucky Romance Quarterly* 21, Supplement II, (1974): 309-317.
- Saulnier, V.-L. "Une épître inconnue de François Ier à Marguerite de Navarre." *Bulletin du Bibliophile et du Bibliothécaire* 1954: 176-186.
- Schmidt, Charles, ed. *Les libertins spirituels: Traités mystiques écrits dans les années 1547 à 1549*. Paris: Henri Georg, 1876.
- Schmidt, Charles. "Die Unions-Versuche Franz des I. zwischen katholischer und protestantischer Kirche." *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* (1859): 25-69.
- Schmidt, Charles. "Gérard Roussel, Inculpé d'Hérésie à Meaux, 1525." *BSHPF* 10 (1861): 219-221.
- Schmidt, Charles. "Le mysticisme quiétiste en France au début de la Réformation sous François I^{er}: G. Roussel." *BSHPF* 6 (1858): 449-64.
- Schmidt, Charles. *Gérard Roussel: Prédicateur de la reine Marguerite de Navarre. Mémoire, servant à l'histoire des premières tentatives faites pour introduire la Réforme en France*. Strasbourg, 1845; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.
- Schmidt, Charles. *La vie et les travaux de Jean Sturm: premier recteur du gymnase et de l'académie de Strasbourg*. Strasbourg/Paris/Leipzig, 1855.
- Screech, Michael A. "La littérature française et la Bible." In *Le Temps des Réformes et la Bible*, ed Guy Bedouelle and Bernard Roussel, 613-634. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.
- Seidel, Karl Josef. *Frankreich und die deutschen Protestanten: die Bemuhungen um ein religiose Konkordie und die französische Bündnispolitik in den Jahren 1534/35*. Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, no. 102. Munster: Aschendorff, 1970.

- Shennan, J.H. *Government and Society in France 1461-1661*. New York: Barnes and Noble; London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969.
- Simone, Franco. *The French Renaissance*. London, 1969.
- Smith, M.C. "A Sixteenth-Century Anti-Theist (on the *Cymbalum mundi*)." *BHR* 53 (1991): 593-618.
- Sommers, Paula. "Le Miroir de l'âme pécheresse Revisited: Ordered Reflections on a Biblical Mirror." *Modern Language Studies* 16 (1986): 101-108.
- Sommers, Paula. *Celestial Ladders: Readings in Marguerite de Navarre's Poetry of Spiritual Ascent*. THR, no. 203. Geneva: Droz, 1989.
- Sozzi, Lionello and V.-L. Saulnier, eds. *La nouvelle française à la Renaissance*. Geneva-Paris: Slatkine, 1981.
- Stauffer, Richard. "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples: Artisan ou spectateur de la Réforme?" *BSHPF* 113 (1967): 405-23.
- Stauffer, Richard. "Strasbourg et la Réforme française vers 1525." In *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVIe siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre*, 269-295. Actes du colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975). Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977.
- Stauffer, Richard. *La Réforme*. 6th ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1996.
- Stocker, Christopher W. "The Politics of the Parlement of Paris in 1525." *French Historical Studies* 8 (1973): 191-212.
- Stupperich, Robert and Erwin Steinborn. "Bibliographia Buccrana." In *Martin Bucers Bedeutung für die europäische Reformationsgeschichte. Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte* no. 169, 2. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1952.
- Sutherland, N.M. "Was There an Inquisition in Reformation France?" *Les Réformes enracinement socio-culturel, XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1^{er}-13 juillet 1982*, ed. Bernard Chevalier et Robert Sauzet, 327-335. Paris: Éditions de la Maisnie, 1985.
- Sutherland, N.M. *Catherine de Medici and the Ancien Régime*. Historical Association, General Series 62. London: The Historical Association, 1966.
- Sutherland, N.M. *The French Secretaries of State in the Age of Catherine de Medici*. University of London Historical Studies 10. University of London: The Athlone Press, 1962.
- Sutherland, N.M. *The Huguenot Struggle for Recognition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Taber, Linda L. "Religious Dissent within the Parlement of Paris in the Mid-Sixteenth Century: A Reassessment." *French Historical Studies* 16 (1990): 684-699.
- Tallon, Alain. *Le France et le Concile de Trente (1518-1563)*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 295. Rome: École française de Rome; Paris: Boccard, 1997.
- Tardif, Henri et Michel Veissière. "Un autre discours synodal de Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux (octobre 1520)." *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 60 (1976): 419-445.
- Tardif, Henri et Michel Veissière. "Un discours synodal de Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux (13 octobre 1519)." *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 71 (1976): 91-108.
- Taylor, Larissa. *Soldiers of Christ: Preaching in Late Medieval and Reformation France*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Telle, E.V. "Un document sur le mécénat de Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre." *BHR* 34 (1972): 279-271.
- Telle, Émile. *L'œuvre de Marguerite d'Angoulême, reine de Navarre, et la Querelle des Femmes*. Toulouse: Lion, 1937; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.
- Terrasse, Charles. *François Ier: Le Roi et le règne*. Paris: Grasset, 3 vols, 1943-70.
- Tetel, Marcel, ed. *Les visages et les voix de Marguerite de Navarre. Actes du colloque international sur Marguerite de Navarre (Duke University) 10-11 avril 1992*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1995.
- Théon, Olivier. "Contraste et Cohabitation de Deux Duchesses d'Alençon: Marguerite de Lorraine et Marguerite de Navarre." *Société historique et archéologique de l'Orne* 112 (1993): 127-137.
- Tholin, G. "La ville d'Agen pendant les Guerres de Religion du XVI^e siècle. Les catholiques et les protestants dans l'Agenais avant la guerre (1525-1560)." *Revue de l'Agenais* 14 (1887): 101-13.
- Thomas, Danièle, ed. *Inventaire mobiliers et pièces annexes: Château de Pau – Château de Nérac (XVI^e-XVII^e siècles)*. Société des Amis du Château de Pau. Collection "Documents inédits", vol. 2.
- Thomas, Jules (l'Abbé). *Le Concordat de 1516: Ses origines, son histoire au XVI^e siècle*. 3 vols. Paris: A. Picard, 1910.
- Thysell, Carol. "Gendered virtue, vernacular theology, and the nature of authority in the Heptaméron." *SCJ* 29 (1998): p. 39-53.
- Tilley, Arthur. "The literary circle of Marguerite de Navarre." In *A Miscellany of Studies presented to Leo Kastner*, 518-31. Ed. Mary Williams and James A. de Rothschild. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1932; reprint, Port Washington, New York: Kennicott, 1971.
- Toussaints Du Plessis, Dom [Micheal Chrétien]. *Histoire de l'église de Meaux: avec des notes ou dissertations; et les pièces justificatives*. 2 vols. Paris: Juilin-Michel Gandouin, 1731.
- Tracy, James D. "Humanists among the Scholastics: Erasmus, More, and Lefèvre d'Étaples on the Humanity of Christ." *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* (1985): 30-51.
- Tricard, Annie. "La propagande évangélique en France: L'imprimeur Simon Du Bois (1525-1534)." In *Aspects de la propagande religieuse*, 1-37. *THR* 28. Geneva: Droz, 1957.
- Tuchetti, Mario. *Concordia o tolleranza? François Bauduin (1520-1573) e i "Moyenneurs"*. Geneva: Droz, 1984.
- Tucoc-Chala, Pierre. "Pau au temps de Marguerite de Navarre." In *Marguerite de Navarre, 1492-1992: Actes du colloque international de Pau (1992)*, 25-43. Ed. Cazauran, Nicole and James Dauphiné. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1995.
- Tuety, A. "Marguerite de Navarre, bienfaitrice de l'Hôpital des Enfants Rouges." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France* 43 (1916): 48-50.
- Valois, 'Noël' (Joseph-Marie). *Étude historique sur le conseil du roi, introduction à l'inventaire des arrêtes du conseil d'État*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1886.
- Veissière, Michel Chanoine. *Autour de Guillaume Briçonnet (1470-1534)*. Provins: Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie, 1993.
- Veissière, Michel. "Croyances et pratique religieuse à Meaux au temps de Guillaume Briçonnet." *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 67 (1981): 55-59.
- Veissière, Michel. "Dédicace d'une édition de Raymond Jordan à Guillaume Briçonnet (1521)." *BHR* 58 (1996): 141-149.

- Veissière, Michel. "Denis Briçonnet, évêque de Saint-Malo (1513-1535)." *Annales de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Saint-Malo* (1992): 105-114.
- Veissière, Michel. "Duo sermones synodales Guillermi Briçonnet, Meldensis Episocopi (1519 et 1520)." *Humanistica Lovaniensia: Journal of Neo-Latin Studies* 27 (1978): 86-127.
- Veissière, Michel. "Guillaume Briçonnet, d'après sa correspondance avec Marguerite d'Angoulême (1521-1524)." *Information Historique* 41 (1979): 34-37.
- Veissière, Michel. "Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, et la réforme de son clergé." *RHE* 84 (1989): 657-672.
- Veissière, Michel. "La chrétienne Marguerite d'Angoulême d'après sa correspondance avec l'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1521-1524)." *Cahiers d'archéologie et d'histoire du Berry* 96 (1989): 11-16.
- Veissière, Michel. "La jeune Marguerite d'Angoulême, d'après sa correspondance spirituelle avec l'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1521-1524)." *Bulletins et Mémoires, Société Archéologique et Historique de la Charente* (1977-78): 51-60.
- Veissière, Michel. "La prédication dans le diocèse de Meaux au temps de Guillaume Briçonnet (1515-1534)." *Les réformes enracinement socio-culturel, XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1^{er}-13 juillet 1982*, ed. Bernard Chevalier et Robert Sauzet, 327-335. Paris: Éditions de la Maisnie, 1985.
- Veissière, Michel. "La vie chrétienne dans le diocèse de Meaux entre 1493 et 1526 d'après les synodes diocésains: Continuités et innovations." *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 77 (1991): 71-81.
- Veissière, Michel. "Le procès de Guillaume Bricolent au Parlement de Paris en 1525." *BSHPF* 130 (1984): 5-27.
- Veissière, Michel. "Le procès de Guillaume Bricolent au Parlement de Paris en 1525 II: Quelques Textes." *BSHPF* 132 (1986): 543-560.
- Veissière, Michel. "Les citations Bibliques de Marguerite d'Angoulême dans sa Correspondance (1521-1524)." *Nouvelle Revue du Seizième Siècle* 8 (1990): 111-119.
- Veissière, Michel. "Préréforme catholique à Angoulême et à Meaux au temps d'Antoine d'Estaing. D'après les statuts synodaux (1493-1526)." *Bulletin et mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente* 4 (1989): 247-258.
- Veissière, Michel. "Revenus de Guillaume Briçonnet Évêque de 1489 à 1534." *Nouvelle Revue du Seizième Siècle* 2 (1984): 23-42.
- Veissière, Michel. "Un écho à 'Marguerite de Navarre aux temps de Briçonnet.'" In *Mélanges sur la littérature de la Renaissance à la mémoire de V.-L. Saulnier*, 189-195. Geneva: Libraire Droz, 1984.
- Veissière, Michel. "Une dédicace de Jean Chéradame à Guillaume Briçonnet (1528)." *BHR* 53 (1991): 379-403.
- Veissière, Michel. "Une dédicace de Pierre Richard à Guillaume Bricolent (1519)." *BHR* 49 (1987): 121-128.
- Veissière, Michel. *L'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet (1470-1534): Contribution à la connaissance de la Réforme catholique à la veille du Concile de Trente*. Provins: Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie, 1986.

- Venard, Marc, ed. *De la Réforme à la Réformation (1450-1530)*. Vol. 7 in *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours*. Paris: Desclée, 1994. "Le foisonnement de la Réformation. IV. La filière française: de Meaux à Neuchâtel." 830-841.
- Venard, Marc, ed. *Le temps des confessions (1530-1620/30)*. Vol. 8 in *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours*. Paris: Desclée, 1992.
- Venard, Marc. "France." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand, vol. 2, 123-131. New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Venard, Marc. "France: XVI^e siècle." Article in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*. Paris: 1973.
- Venard, Marc. "L'abjuration de Claude d'Espance (1543)." In *Les dissidents du XVI^e siècle entre l'humanisme et le catholicisme: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (5-6 février 1982)*, ed. Marc Lienhard, 111-126. Bibliotheca Dissidentium: scripta et studia, no. 1. Baden-Baden: Editions Valentin Koerner, 1983.
- Venard, Marc. "La grande cassure, 1520-1598." In *Histoire de la France religieuse*, ed. Jacques le Goff and René Remond, vol. 2, 185-319. Paris: Seuil, 1988.
- Venard, Marc. "Les 'notes' de l'hérésie au début du XVI^e siècle, selon les visites pastorales françaises." *Les réformes enracinement socio-culturel, XXVe colloque international d'études humanistes Tours, 1^{er}-13 juillet 1982*, ed. Bernard Chevalier et Robert Sauzet, 327-335. Paris: Éditions de la Maisnie, 1985.
- Venard, Marc. "Réforme, pré-réforme, contre-réforme ... Étude de vocabulaire chez les historiens récents de langue française." In *Historiographie de la Réforme*, ed. Philippe Joutard, 352-365. Paris: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1977.
- Venard, Marc. "Un catéchisme offert à Marguerite de Navarre." *BSHPF* 142 (1996): 5-32.
- Venard, Marc. *Réforme protestante, réforme catholique dans la province d'Avignon au XVI^e siècle*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1993.
- Veyrin-Forrer, Jeanne. *La lettre et le texte: Trente années de recherches sur l'histoire du livre*. Collection de l'École Normale Supérieure de Jeunes Filles 34. Paris: École Normale Supérieure de Jeunes Filles, 1987.
- Vindry, Fleury. *Les Parlementaires français au XVI^e siècle*. 2 vols. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1909-1912.
- Vogelstein, Ingeborg Berlin. *Johann Sleidan's Commentaries: Vantage Point of a Second Generation Lutheran*. New York: University of Rochester, 1986.
- Vose, Heather M. "A Sixteenth-century Assessment of the French Church in the Years 1521-4 by Bishop Guillaume Briçonnet of Meaux." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 39 (1988): 509-519.
- Vose, Heather M. "Marguerite of Navarre: That 'Righte English Woman.'" *SCJ* 16 (1985): 315-333.
- Vose, Heather M. "Marguerite of Navarre's theology of the Cross." *Colloquium*, 15 (1982): 6-16.
- Vose, Heather M. "More Light on Sixteenth-Century Evangelism: A Study in Cross and Spirit." *Journal of Religious History* [Australia] 14 (1987): 256-268.
- Vuilleumier, H. "Quelques pages inédites d'un réformateur trop peu connu." *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* (1886): 313-339.
- Wanegffelen, Thierry. "La controverse entre Robert Cénéau et Martin Bucer sur l'eucharistie (septembre 1534 – janvier 1535)." *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 77 (1991): 341-349.

- Wanegffelen, Thierry. "Un sorbonniste contre Bucer: La réfutation des idées de Martin Bucer par l'évêque d'Avranches Robert Céneau (Septembre 1534)." *Revue d'histoire et de Philosophie religieuses* 73 (1993): 23-37.
- Wanegffelen, Thierry. *Ni Rome ni Genève: Des fidèles entre deux chaires en France au XVI^e siècle*. Bibliothèque Littéraire de la Renaissance série 3, tome 36. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Arrêt inédit de Parlement de Paris contre 'Institution chrestienne'. 1 July 1542." *BSHPF* 33 (1884): 15-21.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Comment on interrogeait et jugeait les accusés d'hérésie: Feuille d'audience de François de Fénin, d'Amiens (11 juillet 1544)." *BSHPF* 43 (1894): 35-38.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Conférence sur Paris et la Réforme sous François Ier (1515-1547)," *BSHPF* 43 (1894): 242-270.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Épisodes de la Réforme à Paris: Maître François Landry curé de Sainte-Croix en la Cité sous François Ier et Henri II (1540-1557)." *BSHPF* 37 (1888): 241-267.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Étienne Lecourt, curé de Condé-sur-Sarthe, brûler à Rouen le 11 décembre 1533." *BSHPF* 36 (1887) 299-314.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "François Lambert, d'Avignon: à propos du quatrième centenaire de la Réformation de la Hesse." *BSHPF* 75 (1926): 477-486.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Guillaume Farel, la dispute de Bâle, le conflit avec Erasme (1524): (d'après quelques documents inédits)." *BSHPF* 69 (1920): 115-145.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Guillaume Farel: Ses premiers travaux 1521-1524." *BSHPF* 67 (1919): 179-214.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "L'évêque Guillaume Briçonnet, François I et sa soeur Marguerite. Deux lettres inédites de février 1522. *BSHPF* 37 (1888) 191-203.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "La littérature de la Réforme française: Notes sur les traités de Luther en Français et imprimés en France entre 1525 et 1534." *BSHPF* 36 (1887): 664-671; 37 (1888): 155-163, 432-439, 500-503.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "La réforme à Bourges au XVI^e siècle." *BSHPF* 53 (1904): 307-359, 474-478.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "La Reforme du XVI^e siècle: Son caractère, ses origines et ses premières manifestations jusqu'en 1523." *BSHPF* 66 (1917): 178-332.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "La Sorbonne et la librairie Parisienne: Requête des vingt-quatre libraires jurés de l'Université, au Parlement 29-30 juin 1545." *BSHPF* 40 (1891): 634-638.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "La Sorbonne, le Parlement de Paris et les livres hérétiques de 1542 à 1546." *BSHPF* 34 (1885): 19-28.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Le premier traité Protestant en langue française: La *Summe de l'Escripture Sainte*, 1523." *BSHPF* 67 (1919): 63-79.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Le réformateur Aimé Maigret, le Martyr Étienne de la Forge et Jean Kleberg." *BSHPF* 39 (1890): 245-269.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Le *Sommaire* de Roberte Estienne: Icy est brièvement compris tout ce que les livres de la Sainte Bible enseignent à tous Chrétiens; Le *Sommaire* primitif de Robert Estienne (1532) *Haec docent sacra biblicorum scripta*," *BSHPF* 43 (1894): 75-79, 461-464.

- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Les débuts de la réforme en France d'après quelques documents inédits, les premiers missionnaires. Pierre de Sibiville, Michel d'Arande, Aimé Maigret (1523-1524)." *BSHPF* 70 (1921): 197-212.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Les premières professions de foi des protestants français (1532-1547)," *BSHPF* 43 (1894): 57-74, 455-460.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Louis de Berquin, son premier procès et sa rétractation d'après quelques documents inédits (1523)." *BSHPF* 67 (1918): 162-183.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Notes et documents sur la Réforme en Brie." *BSHPF* 46 (1897): 631-647, 658-665.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Paris et la Réforme sous François I^{er}." *BSHPF* 43 (1894): 242-270.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Pourquoi Mélanchton ne vint pas à Paris en 1535: d'après un texte contemporain inédit." *BSHPF* 46 (1897): 311-313.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Poursuites contre les hérétiques." *BSHPF* 80 (1931): 502-509.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Réforme et pré-réforme: Jacques Lefèvre d'Étapes." *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* 25 (1918): 647-667.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Un hérétique Luthérien à Dijon en 1529." *BSHPF* 55 (1906): 111-113.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. "Une victime du *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* de Marguerite d'Angoulême, soeur de François I^{er}: L'imprimeur Antoine Augereau et sa famille (1534-1559)." *BSHPF* 42 (1893): 242-47.
- Weiss, Nathaniel. *La chambre ardente: Étude sur la liberté de conscience en France sous François I^{er} et Henri II (1540-1550)*. Paris: Fischbacher, 1889; reprint Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.
- Wendel, François. *Calvin: Source et évolution de sa pensée religieuse*. 2nd ed. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1985 [1950].
- Wibel, Johann Christian. *Merckwürdige Lebens-Geshichte des Grafen Sigmunds von Hohenlohe*. Frankfurt & Leipzig, 1748.
- Williams, George Hunston. *The Radical Reformation*. 3rd edition. Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 15. Kirksville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992.
- Winn, Colette H. "'La loi du non-parler' dans l'*Heptaméron* de Marguerite de Navarre." *Romance Quarterly* 33 (1986): 157-168.
- Wolff, Christian. "Strasbourg, cité du refuge." In *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVI^e siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre*, eds, Georges Livet and Francis Rapp, 321-330. Actes du colloque international de Strasbourg (25-29 mai 1975). Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1977.