PART 3

Censorship and Its Consequences

Lost Issues and Self-Censorship: Rethinking the Publishing History of Guillaume Budé's *De l'Institution du Prince*

Christine Bénévent and Malcolm Walsby

In 1519 Guillaume Budé, “universally acclaimed as the greatest French humanist and recognised as the inspiration behind the Collège de France”, offered a collection of apophthegms to Francis I.¹ Mostly inspired by Plutarch, they had been translated into French by Budé who used them to demonstrate to the King the usefulness of letters and the lettered. Despite the perceived importance of the work, there has been little scholarly research into the different versions of the text. Interest has concentrated on the luxurious original manuscript preserved at the *Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal*. For a long time, it was thought to be the only text that could be attributed to Budé with a degree of certainty.² However, Guy Gueudet has since discovered other manuscripts. One of these, the ‘Colbert’ copy, presents a short version of the text and is almost identical to the original copy.³ In contrast, seven others offer a much expanded version. Over twice the size of the original, they clearly all belong to the same family, though the Rouen manuscript seems to be an intermediary state. Though it is unclear whether the additional material can be attributed to Budé, all the copies were probably created prior to his death in 1540.⁴

- 1 “Unaniment salué comme le plus grand humaniste français, reconnu par l'histoire comme l'inspirateur du Collège de France”: Marie-Madeleine de La Garanderie, ‘Budé (Guillaume) (1468–1540)’, in Colette Nativel (ed.), *Centuria Latinae. Cent une figures humanistes de la Renaissance aux Lumières offertes à Jacques Chomarat* (Geneva: Droz, 1997), p. 221.
- 2 Louis Delaruelle, *Guillaume Budé. Les origines, les débuts, les idées maîtresses* (Paris: Champion, 1907), Chapter VI : ‘Le recueil d'apophthegmes offert à François I^{er}’, pp. 199–220.
- 3 There are a few variations, mainly orthographic, and some omissions. See Guy Gueudet, ‘Guillaume Budé, parrain d’“Encyclopédie”, ou le vrai texte de *L'Institution du prince*’, in *Le Génie de la forme, mélanges de langue et littérature offerts à Jean Mourot*, (Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1982), pp. 87–96.
- 4 Gueudet, ‘Guillaume Budé’ and La Garanderie in her ‘Ce que la culture peut espérer du pouvoir. À propos de *L'Institution du Prince* de Guillaume Budé’, published in Luigi-Alberto Sanchi (ed.) *Guillaume Budé, philosophe de la culture* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2010), pp. 205–219, disagree with Delaruelle and suggest that the additions can be attributed to Budé.

The titles bestowed on the author in the dedicatory epistle would date their composition to 1522.⁵

The number of surviving copies seems to indicate that the text was widely disseminated in manuscript form during the author's lifetime and that he did not wish for the text to be published. It was only once the text was finally printed some years after his death that the short title *De l'institution du prince* was adopted. It has since become accepted practice to use this title, though it is rather misleading: it triggers thoughts of Erasmus's *Institutio principis christiani* when in reality it is closer to his *Apophthegmata*. It does, however, emphasise the importance of the print editions in framing our understanding of the work. Indeed, until the first modern edition of the text was completed in 1965, Budé's text remained mainly accessible to the scholarly public via these print versions – with over 70 surviving copies of the 1547 and 1548 editions, these clearly had an enormous contemporary resonance. Since 1965, Claude Bontems's transcription of the Arsenal manuscript has become the standard text used by academics, despite the fact that it has some major flaws.⁶ It modernises spelling and suffers from a number of errors and omissions. But the main problem is that it simply ignores the longer versions of the text as well as the sixteenth-century print editions.⁷

And yet these print editions are particularly interesting. Not only have they framed scholarly understanding of the work for much of the past centuries and given the work the title by which we know it, but they were also the way in which most sixteenth-century readers accessed the text. As we shall see, copies of these editions made their way into the hands of kings, princes of the royal family, members of the aristocracy, but also the elite of the Catholic Church. It is therefore vital to understand the history of the creation of these editions, especially as this is far from being as obvious as it may seem at first glance.

5 Budé is described as 'secrétaire du roy' and 'maistre de sa librairie', but not as 'maistre des requestes'. Budé was named 'maistre de la librairie' at the beginning of 1522 and became 'maistre des requestes' in August – a position he kept until his death. See Delaruelle, *Guillaume Budé*, p. 232.

6 Published in Claude Bontems, Léon Pierre Raybaud and Jean-Pierre Brancourt, *Le Prince dans la France des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965).

7 This is also a partial edition by Maxim Marin in his *Le livre de l'institution du prince (Kap. I–XX): nach der Ausgabe von Paris 1548 herausgegeben, mit den Ausgaben von l'Arrivour und Lyon (1547) verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1983), which looks at the print editions but with debatable presuppositions. Bruno Petey-Girard used Le Blanc's edition in his 'Libéralité humaniste – mérite humaniste', *Le Verger*, 2 (June 2012), online: <<http://comucopiai6.com/blog/series/le-verger-bouquet-ii-la-liberalite-au-xvie-siecle/>> (accessed 27 February 2014).

Thanks to the use of material bibliography and research conducted not just in French libraries but on copies located throughout the world, we shall show that existing scholarship on these editions presented a completely misleading vision of the early publishing history of the *Institution du prince*. Further, we shall show that this analysis suggests the previously unsuspected involvement of an iconic figure of Renaissance France.

The Print Editions

Current scholarship on the editions of Guillaume Budé's text has sought to present a simple story. Three editions were published in 1547 in three different locations: Paris, Lyon and Larrivour. The tone was set at the beginning of the twentieth century in a book devoted to the life and works of the humanist author by Delaruelle.⁸ Delaruelle's own interest in the text was rather limited: he devoted only a comparatively small section of his volume to the *Institution*. But he did include a separate appendix in which he sought to establish the authenticity of the various surviving manuscript versions before embarking on an analysis of the three earliest print editions. This appendix has proved to be very influential and has been accepted without demur by most subsequent scholars.

Delaruelle identified three editions of the text produced, in his view, almost simultaneously in Paris, Lyon and the monastery of Larrivour, not far from Troyes. All three editions, he asserted, were printed in 1547, but used different manuscripts versions of the *Institution*. He noted some anomalies in the Lyon and Larrivour copies that he had been able to consult, but explained them away succinctly. The colophon of the Lyon edition, he noted, bore the date 1544 instead of 1547 (ill. 11.1). This was simply an error made by the compositor who, during the setting up of the type on the forme, misread the text that he was supposed to be following. As a result, he set up the date "M.D. XLIIII" instead of "M.D. XLVII"; quite simply the first two "I"s of the date should have formed a "v". By this sleight of hand, the correct date was re-established and the problem of the discrepancy resolved.

The bizarre nature of the first gathering of the Larrivour edition received even shorter shrift. Delaruelle did not notice – or at least did not believe it noteworthy – that the first gathering always appeared to be incomplete. Yet the third page of the book was signed at the bottom of the page A₄ rather than the expected A₂. Furthermore, the first gathering's pagination ran [1–6] (unpaginated) and then 15–16, though the second gathering (gathering B) starts with page "13". Finally, the

8 Delaruelle, *Guillaume Budé*.

Lylander.	96	Solon.	99
M		Sylla.	77
Marc Tullies Cicero.	92	T	
Menander.	20	Terpompée.	95
O		Themistocles.	38
Octave César Auguste.		Tite Liue.	14
feuillelet.	60	Tite Quince.	67. 71
Octauia sœur d'Auguste.		V	
ste.	21	Vespasien.	42

I M P R I M E A L Y O N ,
 P A R D E N Y S D E
 H A R S Y .
 M . D . X L I I I I ,

ILLUSTRATION 11.1 *Colophon of the edition printed in Lyon by Denis de Harsy in 1544, f. n₈^r*
 © Bibliothèque de l'École normale supérieure [Rés. xv-x G ip 414 12^o]

last page of the gathering has the header “Epistre.” that makes little sense when the following page has “du prince.” Explaining these inconsistencies was of little interest. The most important conclusion was that all three editions were therefore published in 1547 – a sudden interest in Budé that coincided with the death of Francis I and the accession of Henry II. Delaruelle’s analysis just over a century ago has held sway over all subsequent writing on the first editions of the *Institution*.⁹ The text has been the subject of much scholarly interest and the bibliography of the articles and books that analyse the text is considerable.¹⁰ But

9 For instance, Jeanne Veyrin-Forrer in her overview (with Pierre Gasnault) of Budé’s work for a 1968 exhibition indicated that the book was first published in three simultaneous editions in 1547: *Guillaume Budé* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1968) at pp. x and 20–21.

10 See for instance Gueudet, ‘Guillaume Budé’, pp. 87–92; Marie-Madeleine de La Garanderie, ‘Guillaume Budé, prosateur français. À propos de l’*Institution du Prince*’, in *Prose et prosateurs de la Renaissance* (Paris: CDU-SEDES, 1988), pp. 39–47; Mireille Huchon, ‘Rabelais, les universités et la mobilité: les phantasmes du Pantagruel à des fins de propagande’, in Michel Bideaux and Marie-Madeleine Fragonard (eds.), *Les échanges entre universités européennes à la Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 2003), pp. 143–158. A number of M. Huchon’s other articles also refer to this.

few deal with the publishing history in any detail. The 'errors' present in both the Lyon and Larrivour editions seem to be proof of the poor quality of some of the work carried out outside Paris.

The problem is that this is simply not true. The printers were Denis de Harsy in Lyon and Nicole Paris in Troyes, both well-established master typographers. The abnormalities noted by scholars should not simply be seen as indicative of poor practice. The discrepancies between what one might have expected to find in the Lyon and Larrivour editions and what is actually to be found should be treated as clues. That they have not been analysed fully until now is symptomatic of the limited impact of material bibliography in the world of franco-phone scholarship. By gathering together these clues and delving into the context of the editions' production, we can use bibliographic analysis to help us interpret and rewrite comprehensively the earlier publishing history of Guillaume Budé's *Institution du prince*.

The Denis De Harsy and Guillaume Gazeau Lyon Edition

Tesmoignage de || TEMPS, OV ENSEI- || GNEMENS ET ENHOR- || TEMENS
POVR L'IN- || STITVTION || D'VN || PRINCE. || [Fleuron] || Composé par Feu
maistre Guillaume BVDE' || Conseiller du Roy, & Maistre des Re- || questes ordi-
naire de son Hostel. || A LYON, || PAR GVILLAVME GAZEAV. || M.D. XLVII.

80; ff. 103 [1]; a-n⁸.

The Lyon edition of Budé's work exists in only one variant that names the printer Denis de Harsy in the colophon (ill. 11.1) and bookseller Guillaume Gazeau on the title page (ill. 11.2).¹¹ It was printed in octavo and required thirteen sheets of paper per copy.¹² This edition is known thanks to seven surviving copies spread throughout Europe and in one copy in the British Library that is now unfortunately destroyed.¹³ All the surviving copies, with the exception of the Aberdeen copy that is incomplete, have the exact same title page. The only exception would seem to be the copy held in the University library of the

11 USTC 306; see also Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby and Alexander Wilkinson, *FB: French Vernacular Books. A Bibliography of Books Published in the French Language Before 1601* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), no. 7814.

12 The signatures run from a through n in eights, and the book is foliated from 2 through 103 with a blank at the end.

13 Aberdeen University Library, Drummond 816; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Pol g 139; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Rés. P F 21; Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 80 S 3873; Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, Lettres Ulm, Rés. xv-x S G ip 414 120; Reims, Bibliothèque municipale, Rés. P 312 and Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, *35 S 125. London, British Library, 8009 a 39.

ILLUSTRATION 11.2 Title page of the Guillaume Gazeau issue of 1547

© Bibliothèque de l'École normale supérieure [Rés. xv-x G ip 414 12°]

Sorbonne as its online catalogue states that their copy is dated 1544. Inspection of the copy, however, reveals the date on the title page of the Sorbonne copy has been tampered with. The original ink has been scratched out and rather crudely replaced with the earlier date. There can be no doubt that the Sorbonne exemplar is exactly similar to all other surviving copies of the Lyon edition of the text and that the title page originally bore the date 1547.

As mentioned earlier, this date contrasts with that indicated in the colophon of the edition on n_8r which states that the book was: “IMPRIME A LYON, PAR DENYS DE HARSY. M.D. XLIIII”. Delaruelle’s suggestion that the compositor in charge of setting up the colophon simply misread his orders and prepared “M.D. XLIIII” instead of “M.D. XLVII” is visually clever and superficially attractive. But the proposed explanation does not hold up to scrutiny. By assigning the same date to both the title page and the colophon, Delaruelle implies that there was a single issue of the text. The book would have been printed in its entirety by Denis de Harsy in 1547. An examination of the typographic elements of the surviving editions, however, leads us to question this conclusion.

The vast majority of the edition is typographically coherent. From gathering b onwards, the printer set up the edition using a modest set of characters and ornate letters. This uniformity in presentation and typography was applied to most of the prologue and all the text of the *Institution*, here split up into chapters that present the constituent apophthegms by author, and a short index. In all these parts, the printer selected a small type, corresponding in contemporary French nomenclature to a Roman letter *Cicero* of 82 mm for twenty lines.¹⁴ This choice of a dense and small type allowed the printer to set up the text using as little paper as possible for each copy, though this did not mean that the book was produced without care. The printer employed a selection of ornate letters, integrated some Greek type and included numerous marginal comments to facilitate the reader’s perusal of the text. Additionally, he often ended chapters by carefully laying out the text in a V shape in order to fill the bottom of a page and ensure that the following chapter began at the top of a subsequent page.¹⁵

14 On these typefaces see the work of Hendrik D.L. Vervliet: *French Renaissance Printing Types. A Conspectus* (London: Bibliographical Society, 2010) and his *The Palaeotypography of the French Renaissance. Selected Papers on Sixteenth-century Typefaces* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

15 See, for instance, the final page of the prologue on d_3v or the end of the chapters devoted to Philipp of Macedonia (f_5r) or Antioch, King of Syria (h_2r). In all, this V-shaped layout occurs thirteen times.

The first gathering is very different. The dedication is printed in a much larger font than that used in the rest of the volume. The printer chose a Roman type that covered 16 mm per twenty lines, making this text stand out compared to the denser main text. Even in the first four pages of the author's prologue, the type chosen was different to that of the rest of the prologue. Here the smaller *Cicero* type enabled the printer to insert twenty lines every 90 mm. The choice of this slightly larger type meant that it was impossible to accommodate as many lines per page; the last four pages of the first gathering comprise 30 lines of text, whilst the pages in the body of the text have 32. In order to include as many characters on the initial pages of the prologue as on the later pages, this loss was compensated by the widening of the column devoted to the text; the width of the column in the gathering a was three millimetres longer than in gathering b.¹⁶

This change in typography and page layout is particularly visible in the prologue. The inevitable juxtaposition of the type used on *a_sv* and *b₁r* makes the changes obvious to the naked eye (ill. 11.3). A further discrepancy between the first gathering and the rest of the volume is the choice of ornate letters. The later letters are woodcuts with the shape of the letter cut out from the woodblock so that they were not inked. In contrast, the two ornate letters in the first gathering were made by following a different process. Though they both sought to match the later initials by presenting the letter in white, they were metalcuts, the background being created by *manière criblée* obtained by using a hand punch (ill. 11.4).

All of these differences mark out the first gathering as abnormal. The first thing to note is that it was undoubtedly printed some time later than the rest of the book. The printer of the gathering was clearly trying to mimic the layout, type and ornate letters used during the creation of the original volume. Here, the fact that he did not have access to the same material as the first printer made his attempt somewhat clumsy and left sufficient clues for the modern bibliographer. This evidence is reinforced by the change in the quality of the paper that had been selected. Though the format of the book has made the identification of the papermaker impossible, we are clearly dealing with reams from different paper mills.¹⁷ The paper used to print the first gathering is softer and less rigid than that employed in the rest of the volume.

16 The measurements are respectively 77 and 74 mm.

17 The paper's watermark would have given the bibliographer a clear indication of by whom and where the paper had been made. Unfortunately, as the book is an octavo, the watermark would have been situated in the corner of the folded paper and in the process of binding it has been cut off. This is a common problem for this type of format; see Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), p. 106.

ILLUSTRATION 11.3 *Pages a₈v and b₁r of the Guillaume Gazeau issue*
 © Bibliothèque de l'École normale supérieure [Rés. xv–x G ip 414 12°]

The materials used offer incontrovertible proof that the two parts of the book were not printed together. But there is also convincing proof that the initial gathering was printed by another workshop. The clues left by the compositorial habits of the workshops show that the formes were set up differently. In the printing of the body of the text, the compositor used catch words sparingly: they are only to be found at the bottom of the last page of each gathering. The compositor of the preliminary gathering was far more enthusiastic and included them on every page. Similarly, they had a different approach with regard to orthography and the use of abbreviations. The first compositor made abundant use of them, whilst the second chose to omit letters far more infrequently. The comparative size of the printed marginalia highlights another difference of approach: in the first gathering the marginalia are of the same size as the main type, but in the rest of the volume considerably smaller. Finally, as we have noted, the first compositor adopted a V-shaped end to his chapters when he wished to make the text spread further down a page. Yet in the first

gathering, the compositor chose to employ an hour glass layout – the only time this is done in the volume.

The first gathering was therefore printed after the rest of the volume and by a different workshop. In this regard, we should be inclined to follow the printed evidence and conclude that the vast majority of the text, from gathering b onwards, was printed by Denis de Harsy in 1544.¹⁸ This is confirmed by an analysis of the typographic material, as the ornate letters employed here are also to be found in other Harsy imprints.¹⁹ The first gathering, on the other hand, was printed for the Lyon bookseller Guillaume Gazeau three years later by a different printer; Gazeau was the publisher but did not print the work himself. The clues as to the identity of the second printer are also hidden in the bibliographical analysis of the material used and the compositorial practices. Together, they offer a strong indication of who had undertaken the job of creating the sixteen new pages that Gazeau needed to sell Budé's text under his own name.

The clearest indication of who might have printed the first gathering comes from the two ornate letters. The metalcut H and S that appear respectively on a₇r and a₂r belong to the alphabets cut for the Lyon printer Jean I de Tournes (1504–1564) (ill. 11.4).²⁰ The set comprised three different sizes, 57 × 57, 41 × 41 and 26 × 26 millimetres; our two initials belong to the smallest alphabet.²¹ The identification of the printer is consistent with the date of the title page.

18 This variant is enumerated separately in the USTC under the number 79980 (see also Pettegree, Walsby and Wilkinson, *FB: French Vernacular Books*, no. 7809). This is also the case in Yvonne de la Perrière, *Supplément provisoire à la bibliographie lyonnaise du président Baudrier, fasc. 1*, (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1967) no. 65, p. 19 and in Sybille von Gültlingen, *Bibliographie des livres imprimés à Lyon au seizième siècle* (Baden-Baden: V. Koerner, 1992–2012), vol. IV, p. 137, no 124.

19 For instance see the A on E₆ and F₃r that is also in Josse Clichove's *Introductiones artificiales in logicam collectae, ac familiari commentatio declaratae* (Lyon: Denis de Harsy for the heirs of Simon Vincent, 1538) (USTC 157252) at e₃r or the C on k₃v that is also in Nicolas de Bohier's *Prima pars aurearum decisionum in sacro Burdegalsium Senatu seu Regio parlamento olim discussarum ac promulgatarum quae diligentia et opera nuper recognitae, summaris quoque et indice* (Lyon: Denis de Harsy for Michel Parmentier and Jean-François de Gabiano, 1544) (USTC 149233) on c₅r.

20 This identification was made by using the BaTyR (Base de typographie de la Renaissance) database developed by Rémi Jimenes and hosted by the website of the "Bibliothèques Virtuelles Humanistes" of the CESR (University François-Rabelais, Tours), online: <http://www.bvh.univ-tours.fr/materiel_typo.asp>. The ornate S is identical to the one used in the edition of Jean Froissart's chronicles printed by Jean I de Tournes, a multivolume work published between 1559 and 1561 (see USTC 1171).

21 See Alfred Cartier, *Bibliographie des éditions des de Tournes, imprimeurs lyonnais* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1937–1938), I, pp. 58–59.

LE PROLOGVE⁷

DE L'AVTHEVR.

HESIODE Grec Poëte fort ancien, au Liure, qui est intitulé, des Oeuures & des Iours dit, quil est trois manieres de gens: les vns (dit il) sont, qui ont tel, & si grand entendement, & telle science, quilz peuuent entendre d'eux mesmes, & soy aduiser des choses, qui sont meilleures, & plus conuenables, tant pour le present, que pour l'aduenir: & ceux là sont excellens entre les hommes. Les autres sont, qui ne scauent cōprendre les choses dessus dites, & en faire bon iugement par eux mesmes: mais ilz ont seulement ceste prudence, quil est bon, & vtile de croire conseil, demander, & suyuir lopinion des Sages: & ceste seconde maniere de gens est à louer, comme dit Hesiodé: combien quilz ne soyent si excellens, que les premiers. Les derniers sont, qui nentendent par eux mesmes ne comprennent quand on les enhorté de cause, ou filz entendent, si nen croient ilz rien, & nen font de rien plus Sages: & ceux là, dit il, sont gens inutiles, tant à eux mesmes comme à autrui. A ceste cause les aucuns Philosophes, & autres hommes réputés sages, voyant, que tout homme, auquel il ny ha faculté notable de nature, soit capable de raison, & ayt entende

Trois manieres
gens.

ILLUSTRATION 11.4 Ornate letter from the Guillaume Gazeau issue, f. a₇r

© Bibliothèque de l'École normale supérieure [Rés. xv-x G ip 414 12°]

The ornate letters were used by Jean I de Tournes in other volumes he printed in this period: the H is to be found in his edition of Claude Paradin's *Memoriae nostrae* and the S in Charles Fontaine's translation of Artemidorus Daldianus's *Oneirocritica*.²²

The dating is also consistent with what we know about the printer and the publisher. Jean I de Tournes's career as a master printer began in 1542 in Lyon where, over the following decades, he set up one of the most successful printing and publishing businesses of the mid-sixteenth century. Guillaume Gazeau, on the other hand, was principally known as a publisher and a bookseller. His career as a publisher began in 1547 and was dominated by his partnership with the de Tournes workshop which accounted for over 90% of his production. His marriage to Jean de Tournes's daughter in 1545 in part explains the strength of this relationship.²³ Gazeau did on occasion work with other printers during this period, but such partnerships remained very much the exception rather than the rule.²⁴ All this reinforces our previous conclusions, but also adds a further dimension: Guillaume Gazeau could not have been involved in the original 1544 edition. At that date he was not active as a publisher. He must have simply bought up the stock and had Jean I de Tournes print a new first gathering in order to market the volumes as a new edition.

Denis de Harsy therefore undertook the printing for a different publisher. Unfortunately, there are very few clues as to who this might have been. Harsy was a prolific printer and, between 1522 and 1555, he is known to have been involved in the production of over two hundred editions. During these three decades, he produced both large Latin scholarly works and more literary vernacular texts. The importance and variety of his output meant that he was willing to work with a great many different booksellers; only occasionally did he seek to market directly the volumes that he printed.²⁵ In 1544, year in which he printed Budé's text, Harsy provided books for Jean and François Frellon (1 title), Antoine Vincent (4 titles), Michel Parmentier and Jean-François de Gabiano

22 Claude Paradin, *Memoriae nostrae libri quatuor* (Lyon: Jean I de Tournes, 1548) (USTC 150083) and Artemidorus Daldianus, *Epitome des trois premiers livres d'Artemidore traitant des songes* (Lyon: Jean I de Tournes, 1546) (USTC 39229).

23 Cartier, *Bibliographie des éditions des de Tournes*, I, p. 8.

24 We have only been able to identify eight instances in which this happened: USTC 6771, 37878, 79597, 130013, 150622, 151062, 154723 and 199838.

25 On the diversity and varying nature of Harsy's output, see Clément Brot, 'Quand la "presse" écrit : l'officine lyonnaise de Denys de Harsy, imprimeur libraire à la marque de Dédale', in Edwige Keller-Rahbe (ed.), *Les Arrière-boutiques de la littérature. Auteurs et imprimeurs-libraires aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles* (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2010), pp. 23–36.

(3 titles). All these were religious or legal texts printed in Latin; the only other vernacular imprints that year were two histories of Troy that Harsy produced for his own account.²⁶

Could Denis de Harsy have envisaged marketing Budé's text himself? It seems unlikely that, having printed the text himself, he then decided to sell his stock and did not offer to print a new first gathering for Guillaume Gazeau. It is perhaps more pertinent to look at Harsy's main partner when printing in French: the bookseller Romain Morin. As a bookseller, Morin seems to have worked principally as a subsidiary shop for the successful Parisian bookseller Galiot du Pré, but he also had a modest career as a publisher.²⁷ This began in 1516 and, over the following three decades, he is known to have been associated with the production of approximately 70 editions. From 1531 onwards, he worked exclusively in Lyon with Denis de Harsy and commissioned only works in French. The relationship was also important for Harsy: he worked for Morin more than for any other publisher when printing in French, though their total output remained relatively modest. Their business ties went beyond those shared by a printer and a publisher since there is archival evidence that Harsy lived in a house owned by Morin.²⁸

The publications that were produced by this partnership share some of the physical characteristics of Harsy's edition of the *Institution du prince*. The books were all printed in an octavo format and contained approximately the same number of gatherings.²⁹ The main difference is that these collaborative editions were richly illustrated with woodcuts.³⁰ Perhaps the most interesting circumstantial evidence with regard to the Budé edition derives from the date

26 These titles were *La destruction de Troye la grande* and *Le recueil des histoires de Troye*, respectively USTC 40379 and 24288. Both title pages indicate that the copies were to be sold by Harsy: "On les vend à Lyon chez Denys de Harsy".

27 See Lucien Febvre, 'Une histoire obscure, la publication du "Cymbalum Mundi"', *Revue du seizième siècle*, 17 (1930), pp. 1–41.

28 See the registers of the possessions of the inhabitants of Lyon, AM Lyon, CC 24 (cited in Paul Ducourtieux, *Les Barbou imprimeurs, Lyon-Limoges-Paris (1524–1820)* (Limoges: Ducourtieux, 1896), p. 71). Romain Morin paid the considerable sum of 100 *livres* in tax in 1545 when the city needed to raise 48 000 *livres*, AM Lyon, CC 40.

29 On average, their editions required just fewer than 15 sheets of paper – the Lyon edition of Budé's text required 13 sheets.

30 Most of these editions are included in William Kemp's analysis of Morin's output: 'Les petits livres français illustrés de Romain Morin (1530–1532) et leurs dérivés immédiats' in Antonio Possenti and Giulia Mastrangelo (eds.), *Il Rinascimento a Lione. Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Macerata, 6–11 maggio 1985* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1988), 1, pp. 465–525.

at which Romain Morin ceased to be active as a publisher (1547). Though he only died in 1560, it offers a narrative that can explain the timing of the reuse of the gatherings b through n by Guillaume Gazeau: Gazeau could have bought the sheets from the bookseller. But none of Morin's production dealt with texts similar to the *Institution* and the partnership with Harsy was heavily dominated by a much earlier flurry of publications. Certainly, it seems highly unlikely that Morin was the main instigator behind the choice of this text and the necessary editorial work.

The Nicole Paris Larrivour Edition

[Ornate frame] || DE || Linstitution du || Prince || Liure contenant plusieurs Histoires, En- || seignements, & saiges Dicts des Anciens || tant Grecs que Latins: || Faict & composé par Maistre Guil- || laume Budé, lors Secretaire & mai- || stre de la Librairie, & depuis Maistre || des Requestes, et Conseiller du Roy. || Reueu, enrichy d'Arguments, diuisé par || Chapitres, & augmenté de Scholies & An- || notations, Par hault & puissant Seigneur, || Missire Iean de Luxembourg, Abbé d'Iury || Imprimé à l'Arriuour Abbaye dudict Seigneur, || Par Maistre Nicole Paris. || 1547 || Auec priuilege du Roy, pour cinq ans. (ill. 11.5) 20; pp. 204 [12]; A-S⁶.

In many respects the edition of Budé's *Institution du prince* printed by Nicole Paris is very different to the Lyon edition printed by Denis de Harsy. Though the meaning of the text is the same, the wording has been completely revised. This version is further from the earlier known manuscript copies of the *Institution* than the Lyon edition. Delaruelle was dismissive of its intellectual value and, as such, only devoted limited space to its analysis.³¹ And yet, for scholars who wish to gauge the impact of the text, this is a mistake. Whatever its literary merits, the Nicole Paris edition was far more influential than any other version of the text. This edition has a far better survival rate than other contemporary impressions: we have been able to track down no fewer than 47 extant copies in public libraries. In addition, analysis of the provenance of these volumes demonstrates that this was the edition that was owned (and possibly read) by the most influential and powerful in early modern Europe.

The relative importance of this edition was obvious from the speed at which it was acquired by individuals as powerful as the king of England. The British Library has a copy bound in a beautiful Renaissance polychrome binding

31 He wrote that the edition should be "rejetée dans l'ombre": Delaruelle, p. 245.

ILLUSTRATION 11.5 *Title page of the 1547 Nicole Paris issue*
 © Folger Shakespeare Library [217–125f]

executed for Edward VI.³² The Larrivour edition retained its importance into the seventeenth century as is demonstrated, for instance, by the exemplar bound for Henry IV's second son, Gaston d'Orléans. His copy, now in the *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, has the arms of the Duke and, from the early institutional stamp, seems to have entered the royal collection soon after.³³ A further copy, now in an undisclosed private library, was originally owned by Louis XIII as is testified by the book's binding that features the king's arms as well as those of his mother, Marie de Medici.³⁴ The dating of the binding to 1620–1630 as well as the presence of both the arms of the king and of his mother would indicate that the book was bought in Louis's formative years and could have played a role in his education. Another seventeenth-century figure at the head of the French state to own a copy was Cardinal Mazarin whose copy is still in his collection today.³⁵ Other copies undoubtedly made their way into the hands of the early modern European aristocracy and ecclesiastical hierarchy, as is illustrated by the exemplars owned in the late sixteenth century by Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford (1539–1621), Arthur Throckmorton (–1626), councillor of Elizabeth I, and Cardinal Girolamo Della Rovere (1528–1592).³⁶

If the Lyon and the Larrivour editions have different texts and experienced varying levels of success both quantitatively (in terms of extant copies) and qualitatively (with regard to provenance marks from members of Europe's ruling elite), they do have one thing in common: their publishing history is surprisingly complex. And yet if one is to look at all extant scholarship mentioning the Larrivour edition, one finds a very simple story: there was a single issue which, bibliographically, has never attracted much attention. Close bibliographic analysis, however, reveals that the story of the Larrivour edition is far more complicated.

Hitherto scholars only knew of one version of the Larrivour edition that was dated 1547. During the research undertaken for the publication of the short title bibliography, *French Vernacular Books*, a variant was unearthed

32 This volume, shelfmark C 81 i 11, also features other less distinguished provenances (with thanks to David Shaw for sending on the book's bibliographical details). Edward died in 1553.

33 This exemplar is kept at the shelfmark Rés. E* 47.

34 See the description and the photo of the binding given in the catalogue of the *Vente Pierre Berès. 80 ans de passion. 4^{ème} vente: Le cabinet des livres. Mardi 20 juin 2006* (Paris: Drouot Richelieu, 2006), pp. 28–30.

35 Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 3713(1).

36 Respectively now in Cambridge, Emmanuel College Library (shelfmark 302 5 12), Magdalen College Library, Oxford (Arch B III 3 12) and in the university library in Turin (Biblioteca dell'Istituto di storia del diritto italiano Federico Patetta della Facoltà di giurisprudenza, 36 B 05).

in Leiden University Library with a different title page and the date 1546 (ill. 11.6).³⁷ Further research since then has led to the identification of a second copy in Turin.³⁸

DE || LINSTITVTION || DV PRINCE, || Liure Contenant plusieurs Histoires tant Grecques || que Latins: Ensemble plusieurs enseignemens, & || saiges dictz des Anciens: || Faict & composé par Maistre Guillaume || Budé, Secretaire & Maistre de la Librairie || du Roy, Et reueu, & diuisé par Chapitres, & || augmenté d'Annotations, Par hault & || puissant Seigneur, Missire Jean de Luxem- || bourg, Abbé d'Iury, de la Riuou, & de || Salmoisy. || [device: ASCENDAM, ET APPRAEHENDAM FRVCTVS EIVS.] || A LA RIVOV, || Par le commandement dudict Seigneur. || 1546

In both cases, the colophon and the main text of the copies dated 1546 and 1547 were the same; only the preliminaries had changed. All the sheets involved in these variant versions were printed by Nicole Paris and, unlike the Harsy and Gazeau edition, there was only one printer involved in the Larrivour issues. This is confirmed not just by the consistency in the typeface employed and the layout of the pages, but also, for the 1546 issue, by the use of Paris's device on the title page. In the 1547 issue, the ornate letter H on [A₁v] and the ornamental header on the title page can also be found in his 1545 antiphonary.³⁹

It was common practice in the sixteenth century for booksellers saddled with too much stock to reissue an edition with a more recent publication date in order to revive flagging sales. In the case of the Larrivour edition of Budé's text, there is evidence to prove that this was not the rationale that led to the creation of these different issues. First, the comparative survival rates are not consistent with such practice. Had the book simply been reissued, one would normally assume that the initial publication would have outsold (and therefore out-survived) the second issue. Certainly, one would not expect to find what we have in this case: two copies dated 1546 and 45 dated 1547.⁴⁰ Second, the differences are not limited to a change of date on the title page. If the mainstay of the text is the same (gatherings B through S), the first gathering of 1547 contains a preliminary poem absent in the 1546 issue (ills. 11.7 and 11.8). The final two pages of the preliminary address were completely reset, as was the title

37 Pettegree, Walsby and Wilkinson, *FB: French Vernacular Books*, no. 7811. The copy is to be found in Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek at 20643 B 19 (2). Pierre Bayle, in his *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (Rotterdam: R. Leers, 1697), referred to this issue, but this was dismissed by Delaruelle ("elle ne s'est pas retrouvée de nos jours"): *Guillaume Budé*, p. 234.

38 Turin, Biblioteca dell'Istituto di storia del diritto italiano Federico Patetta della Facoltà di giurisprudenza dell'Università degli studi di Torino, 36 B 05.

39 See respectively folios 22 *recto* and 78 *recto* in his *Antiphonarium de tempore*.

40 This arithmetic includes the known private copy and two copies lacking their title pages but containing the same initial gathering as the 1547 edition.

ILLUSTRATION 11.6 *Title page of the 1546 Nicole Paris issue*
© Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek [20643 B19 (2)]

ILLUSTRATION 11.7 *End of gathering A and start of gathering B in the 1547 Nicole Paris issue*
© Bibliothèque municipale de Saint-Quentin [5944]

ILLUSTRATION 11.8 *End of gathering A and start of gathering B in the 1546 Nicole Paris issue*
© Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek [20643 B19 (2)]

ILLUSTRATION 11.9 *Ff. A₁v and A₄r in the 1546 Nicole Paris issue*
 © Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek [20643 B19 (2)]

page. The *verso* of the title page was blank in the 1546 issue, but the 1547 issue contained a royal privilege obtained by the printer (ills. 11.9 and 11.10). It is clear that the 1547 issue was a conscious attempt to change the content and the presentation of the initial gathering and not simply a commercial reissue of an edition that had failed to meet the sales expectations of a publisher.

In such circumstances, the A gathering requires close examination.⁴¹ The first thing that strikes the modern bibliographer is the irregular structure of the gathering. In all surviving variations of this edition, it comprises only four folios despite the fact that the register printed above the colophon indicates that it should have six.⁴² The signatures run [A¹], A⁴, [A⁵], [A⁶], suggesting that there should have been two additional folios of paper inserted between the title page and A₄. This is further confirmed by the pagination which starts on

41 The peculiarities of the Larrivour edition are so numerous that they comfortably exceed the scope of this article and will be analysed in a further publication.

42 On S₆v, the register lists all the gatherings before indicating that they are 'Touts Ternes': i.e. using three sheets of paper, the equivalent of 6 folios or 12 pages when dealing with a folio format.

ILLUSTRATION 11.10 *Ff A₁₇ and A_{4r} in the 1547 Nicole Paris issue*
© Folger Shakespeare Library [217–125F]

B_{1r} at '13' as one would expect when following a gathering with six leaves, not four. In other words, two folios undoubtedly signed A₂ and A₃ have been removed from all existing issues. This suggests that there was an initial state with six folios and that, therefore, the 1546 issue was undoubtedly, at best, a second issue of the edition.

The plot thickens further when the binding of this gathering is considered. In surviving copies it is clear that A₄ and [A₅] are part of the same sheet that has been folded over to create the two folios (ill. 11.11). This sheet was part of the earlier issue and was reused in the 1546 and 1547 issues even though the signature given on the first page was clearly wrong. They are the only pages that have survived from an earlier version of the preliminary texts.⁴³ The fact that they are part of the same sheet poses a problem: in a folio book, a gathering bound in six should have the first and last, the second and fifth and the

43 All copies have two watermarks one with the arms of Troyes (Briquet 1038 to 1055) for gathering B to K and Q to S, the other with a crowned pot under a fleur-de-lys and a *quadrifolium* in gatherings K to P (similar to Briquet 12789). The first watermark was also used for paper of the title page and A_{6/8} in the 1546 issue, but in the 1547 issue the printer used a watermark bearing the name of J. Nivelles under a fleur-de-lys (Briquet 7079), common in Troyes in 1547–1551.

ILLUSTRATION 11.11 *Ff. A_{4v} and A_{5r} in the 1547 Nicole Paris issue*
 © Le Mans, Médiathèque Louis Aragon [SA fol 893]

third and fourth folios on the same sheet so that the gathering could be sown and added to the rest of the volume. The fourth and fifth sheets are only found together in a gathering with eight folios, not six (fig. 11.1).

This seems to indicate that a first version of the initial gathering was created with six folios (as indicated by the colophon), a second with eight, and then the 1546 and 1547 issues with four. Following this logic, two versions of the preliminaries might have been lost. Workshop practice in the sixteenth century suggests another solution. The preliminaries were, traditionally, the final part of the book to be completed.⁴⁴ It was possible to print the entirety of the rest of the volume before not only printing the preliminary material, but even before having all the text ready for the initial gathering or gatherings. It was therefore necessary to estimate the number of pages that would be covered by this material, in such circumstances, errors were easy to make.⁴⁵ With this in

44 This was, for instance, the case with Bertrand d'Argentré's *Histoire de Bretagne*: when the censors stopped the presses the edition had been entirely printed with the exception of the preliminary matter. On this work's publication see Malcolm Walsby, *The Printed Book in Brittany, 1484–1600* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 117 and 132–133.

45 See for instance the first edition of Scévole de Sainte-Marthe's *Poemata* (Poitiers: Jean Blanchet, 1596) (USTC 110484). The pagination begins with the figure nine even though

FIGURE 11.1

Structure of three sheet and four sheet gatherings

mind, it is possible that, despite what was suggested by the colophon, the initial gathering never did have six folios – the first version having eight instead. This would seem to be confirmed by the 1546 issue: if the initial few folios are not numbered, the folio [A₆] was numbered '15' and '16'.

The date of the original version of the Larrivour Budé is difficult to determine. The publication of the 1546 issue gives us a definite, if approximate, *terminus ante quem*, but a more precise dating we must turn to circumstantial evidence of Nicole Paris and Jean de Luxembourg's activity. After studying at the University of Paris, Nicole Paris spent the entirety of his career in Troyes.⁴⁶ Active as early as 1542, he initially concentrated production on well-known works, before later expanding his repertoire to include new texts. Paris was keen to make the most of local business opportunities, working in particular with members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to produce a breviary for the use of Troyes as well as texts for the province of Sens.⁴⁷ He also worked for the Cistercians, printing a hugely ambitious antiphonary commissioned by the abbot of Clairvaux in 1545 – a large volume that employed rubricated printing throughout.⁴⁸ It was undoubtedly his proximity to the Cistercian order and the quality of this production that first brought him into contact with Jean de Luxembourg. Luxembourg was abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Larrivour,

there are twelve unpaginated pages (*4-**2) of preliminary material. This indicates that initially the publisher expected to have just eight pages worth of text.

46 See the entry on Paris in Georges Lepreux, *Gallia typographica ou répertoire biographique et chronologique de tous les imprimeurs de France depuis les origines de l'imprimerie jusqu'à la Révolution. Tome II. Provinces de Champagne et de Barrois* (Paris: H. Champion, 1911), p. 185.

47 *Breviarium Trecense* (Troyes: Nicole Paris, 1543) (USTC 111172) and *Decreta provincialis concilii Senonensis* (Troyes: Nicole Paris, 1546) (USTC 111176).

48 *Antiphonarium de tempore et de sanctis per totum anni circulum secundum usum Cisterciensis ordinis* (Troyes: Nicole Paris, 1545) (USTC 111175).

close to Troyes. An ambitious man, he had real pretensions as an author and sought to attach Paris to his cause.

The first tangible signs of this partnership come in the colophon of a book published in 1546 in which Paris describes himself as having recently become Luxembourg's official printer.⁴⁹ Luxembourg's interest in printing was such that he convinced Paris to print at his monastery. The title pages and colophons of a number of editions indicate that the printer made at least one prolonged visit to the abbey in the months that followed.⁵⁰ It has been suggested that this address was simply a mark of politeness on Paris's behalf and that the books were in reality printed in Troyes.⁵¹ However, there is no evidence whatsoever that this was the case and the idea seems to be entirely based on an anachronistic understanding of the relationship. The fact that Paris also printed works for Luxembourg which he indicated had been printed in Troyes should suffice to refute this idea.⁵² Paris seems to have spent part of 1546 in Larrivour before returning to Troyes where he continued his activity the following year.

This peripatetic period in Paris's career is very important to this study because Budé's *Institution du prince* was printed in Larrivour and this helps us date the initial issue. We know that Nicole Paris finished printing the Cistercian antiphonary in April 1545. At some time in 1546, he went to the abbey of Larrivour at Luxembourg's behest, but we do not know precisely when. The only accounts for the monastery that survive run from October 1546 to October 1547, though they do not refer to any printing activity there.⁵³ This in itself

49 The original phrase is "Imprimeur à present de hault et puissant seigneur, missire Jean de Luxembourg": [Jean de La Roche], *La vie, et actes triumphans d'une illustre, et renommée damoiselle, nommé Catherine des Bas Souhaiz, femme d'un riche conseiller, au Parlement de Bordeaux* (Troyes: Nicole Paris, 1546) (USTC 57218).

50 See for instance Jean de Luxembourg's *L'oraison et remonstrance de haulte et puissante Dame, Dame Marie de Cleves* (Larrivour: Nicole Paris, 1546) (USTC 27342).

51 Alexis Socard, *Promenade à la bibliothèque de Troyes* (Troyes: Dufour-Bouquot, 1869). This point of view has, unfortunately, been repeated on a number of occasions.

52 See for instance Colin Royer's *Nouvelle d'un reverend pere en Dieu et bon prelat de nostre mere sainte Eglise demorant en Avignon, et le moyen comme il resuscita de mort à vie* (Troyes: Nicole Paris, 1546) (USTC 40548), which was long attributed to Jean de Luxembourg: Corrard de Breban, *Recherches sur l'établissement et l'exercice de l'imprimerie à Troyes* (Paris: Chossonnery, 1873), pp. 163–164. Mireille Huchon maintains this attribution in her 'Pour une histoire du genre de la nouvelle. *La vie et actes triumphants de Catherine des Bas Souhaiz et La Nouvelle d'un reverend pere en Dieu* de Jean de Luxembourg (1546)' in *Esculape et Dionysos. Mélanges en l'honneur de Jean Céard* (Geneva: Droz, 2008), pp. 1013–1028. This attribution is based on a manuscript note in the copy of the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Rés. Y2 799).

53 See the "Compte des receptes et mises du revenu de l'eglise et abbaye nostre dame de Larrivour, ordre de Cisteaulx faictes par frere Claude Bourbon religieux et receveur d'icelle

might be a clue: the accounts do mention an impressive cross-section of the Abbot's undertakings in the abbey. They include such fairly insignificant costs as repairs to the chimney in Luxembourg's bedroom (5 *sous*) or mundane investments such as improvements to the windows and doors of his study.⁵⁴ They also report costs not involving the abbey directly, such as a debt incurred with a merchant tanner of Troyes, but nothing about printing.⁵⁵ The arrival of a press in the abbey should have generated sufficient costs to be mentioned in this register. This would seem to indicate that the press was active there before October 1546, which is consistent with the fact that all the other surviving Larrivour imprints were produced in 1546.⁵⁶ The two other books produced for Luxembourg in 1546 were printed in Troyes and could have easily been published after the printer had returned from Larrivour.⁵⁷

The reasons for these different issues are difficult to ascertain. A couple of clues are perhaps given in the variations in this preliminary matter from one copy to the next. In certain exemplars, [A_{6/8}] *recto* has a printed note in the margin that reads "La Langue Grecque introduicte en France, par le Roy Francois premier de ce nom." (ill. 11.12) The absence of the marginalia is significant: could it have been construed as being controversial?⁵⁸ Interestingly, the text was removed by the compositor during the printing process rather than added as an afterthought. This is shown by the blanks inserted by the compositor to fill the space initially occupied by the note in the frame. He had selected blocks that protruded slightly and that are therefore visible in certain copies – sometimes slightly inked, sometimes as ghost printing.⁵⁹

abbaye pour hault et puissant seigneur monseigneur Jehan de Luxembourg", 1 October 1546 to 1 October 1547, Archives Départementales de l'Aube, 1J 832.

54 *Ibidem*, f. 93^{rv}.

55 *Ibidem*, f. 100^r.

56 La Croix du Maine indicated in his *Bibliothèque* (p. 239) the existence of a book authored by Jean de Luxembourg titled *Oraison funebre contenant les louanges de Henri II du nom très chrestien roi de France* which would have also been printed in Larrivour by Nicole Paris but this time in 1547 (see USTC 40574). Until a copy has been seen, however, one must treat La Croix du Maine's imprint details with circumspection.

57 See the aforementioned editions of Royer, *La nouvelle du reverend pere en Dieu* (USTC 40548) and La Roche, *La vie, et actes* (USTC 57218).

58 This issue is debated in Jean-Christophe Saladin, *La Bataille du grec à la Renaissance* (Paris: les Belles lettres, 2000), but see also the translation of Guillaume Budé's, *De Studio Literarum* by Marie-Madeleine de La Garanderie: *L'Étude des lettres: principes pour sa juste et bonne institution* (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1988), p. 56.

59 This is, for instance, the case in the copies preserved in the *Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève* (Fol R 207 Inv. 225 Rés.), the *Médiathèque Louis Aragon* in Le Mans (SA fol 893) and the Mazarine in Paris at 3713(2).

ILLUSTRATION 11.12 *Final recto of gathering A in the 1547 Nicole Paris issue*
 © Bibliothèque municipale de Saint-Quentin [5944]

Further proof is provided by the fact that the note is present in both copies of the 1546 issue.

The note is fully consistent with the content of the dedication to Francis I; it celebrates his credentials as a Humanist king by linking him to the introduction of the Greek language in his kingdom. This was not strictly correct: after all Budé himself knew the language before Francis's accession; rather the king had helped its teaching by setting up the *College de France* and had encouraged the printer Robert Estienne to acquire the typography so that he could print the language. Furthermore, the 1547 issue was published after the death of Francis I (the privilege is dated 9 May 1547), and it is possible that being overly complimentary to his father was seen as being slightly disrespectful of the new monarch, Henry II. But the most convincing explanation revolves around the perceived connection between Greek scholars and Protestant heretics. In this case, the death of a king traditionally seen as generous to humanist scholars and the accession of a less literary monarch could have been a further incentive to make this point more discreetly.

If this explains the disappearance of the marginal note, the appearance of a stanza in the 1547 issue poses another problem (see ill. 11.7). The additional verse encourages the reader to read all the work ("veoy-le au long") rather than make a snap judgement. Why was it necessary to defend the publication of the

book? This is all the more surprising as when comparing the 1546 and 1547 issues it seems clear that the 1547 issue was the one that was most widely circulated. This can be inferred from the survival rate of extant copies but also from contemporary references. In their entries on Jean de Luxembourg, the sixteenth-century bibliographers La Croix du Maine and Antoine du Verdier only acknowledge the existence of the 1547 Larrivour issue.⁶⁰ The obvious conclusion is that the initial version was seen as being problematic but the 1547 version was not. In such circumstances, the missing content seems to have been at least part of the problem. The preliminary pages that were removed from the extant copies must have been considered too tainted to include.

After the publication of Budé's work, Nicole Paris and Jean de Luxembourg both disappeared from view. Having been named bishop of Pamiers in 1547, Luxembourg died on the way to Rome.⁶¹ Nicole Paris's disappearance was equally rapid. His activity in 1547 is the last we hear of him and, unlike all other printers and booksellers, he is not mentioned in the tax register of Troyes in 1548.⁶² The last document we have that mentions his name is in a new privilege obtained by Nicole Paris for the *Institution du prince* in September 1547 but, bizarrely, this was printed in an edition that was not produced on his presses but in Paris for Jean Foucher. It is now to this edition that we shall turn our attention.

The Jean Foucher Paris Edition

LE LIVRE DE || L'INSTITVTION DV || Prince, au Roy de France treschrestien || Francoys premier de ce nom, fait & || composé par M. Guillaume Bu- || dé son secretaire & maistre || de sa librairie || [Jean Foucher's device] || Avec Priuilege du Roy pour cinq ans. || A PARIS, || Chez Iehan Foucher, a l'escu de Florẽ- || ce, en la rue Saint Iacques. || 1547. || (ill. 11.13)

80; ff. [8] 192; ã⁸ a-z⁸ A⁸.

The Jean Foucher edition of the *Institution du prince* is generally thought to be the closest to the long manuscript version of the text. Printed by the successful master printer Jacques Bogard for Foucher, the text is presented in

60 François Grudé, lord of La Croix du Maine, *Premier volume de la bibliotheque* (Paris: Abel L'Angelier, 1584), p. 239 and Antoine du Verdier, *La bibliotheque* (Lyon: Barthélemy Honorat, 1585), pp. 716–717.

61 See Verdun-Léon Saulnier, 'Quel poète pour le Grand-Maître? Jean de Luxembourg et Montmorency', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 35 (1976), pp. 386–400.

62 Register of taxation for June 1548, Archives Municipales de Troyes, F 232.

ILLUSTRATION 11.13 Title page of the 1547 Jean Foucher issue

© Bibliothèque de l'École normale supérieure [Rés. xv-x S G ip 443 12°]

an octavo format – as was the case for the Lyon edition – but with the same title as the Larrivour edition.⁶³ This volume was targeting a different market to the more luxurious Larrivour edition, but the differences were not just commercial: the text itself was very different from the one rewritten by Jean de Luxembourg. The editor, Richard Le Blanc, noted in the dedication that the book had been passed on to him by Jean Foucher, though the text had been “copié de quelque ignorante personne en sorte qu’il n’y avoit aucune observation d’orthographe, ny forme de distinction, par quoy l’on peust cognoistre le sens, et sentence du texte”.⁶⁴

Was Le Blanc referring to the Larrivour edition? He certainly knew of the text: not only did he keep a similar title but on the verso of the title page, the publisher included the privilege obtained by Nicole Paris. This was not the initial privilege obtained in May 1547, but a second privilege requested just a few months later and dated 13 September 1547. This double privilege can seem surprising. The length of the privileges were the same; the only substantive difference was the phrasing with regard to the object of the privilege. In the first case, the letters seemed only to refer to the precise version Paris had already printed (“qu’il a puis nagueres faict imprimer”), whilst the second adopted a more inclusive phraseology referring to his rights over the text (“faculté et pouvoir d’imprimer”). What this text does show is that, despite what has previously been suggested, the Parisian edition was made available no earlier than September 1547 and was, therefore, the last of the three editions.⁶⁵

The Foucher edition exists in two different versions, the first bearing the date 1547 on the title page and the second 1548. Close examination of copies of both variants indicate that they are two issues of the same edition: the type is set out in exactly the same manner in both cases and a page from one issue can be perfectly superposed on the corresponding page from the other. Furthermore, the title pages themselves show that the 1548 issue was prepared and printed at the same time as the 1547 issue: the layout is precisely the same, the figure eight in the date simply replacing the figure seven. In this case, the publisher’s motives in producing two issues seem to have been purely

63 See the section dedicated to Bogard in Sylvie Postel-Lecocq and Marie-Josèphe Beaud’s *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle. Tome V, Bocard-Bonamy* (Paris: Service des travaux historiques de la ville de Paris, 1991). The attribution to Bogard is made by the *Bibliothèque nationale de France*’s Renouard team on the basis of the type employed.

64 The dedication is to Claude de Lorraine, duke of Guise. The quote is taken from $\hat{a}_2v$.

65 Delaruelle conjectured that this edition was completed before the Larrivour edition on the basis of the chapter headings.

commercial and his approach in line with existing practices in the Parisian book world. Publishers adapted their output to integrate such commercial strategies, either having different initial sheets printed with another date on the title page or leaving the final number of the date blank so that it could be filled in later.

As the privilege obtained by Nicole Paris was dated September 1547, the edition must have been published in the final months of the year. It was therefore highly unlikely that all the copies produced for Jean Foucher would have been sold before the end of the calendar year. In such circumstances, the production of a 1548 variant appears to have been a wise marketing strategy. By producing the 1547 and 1548 issues of the title page simultaneously, the publisher was reducing costs.⁶⁶ Fig. 11.2 summarises the new chronology of the three editions as established in this article.

Understanding the Evidence

The new chronology of the three editions casts new light on the publication of Budé's *Institution du prince*. Far from being a simple affair, it highlights the difficulties faced by the publishers as they sought to make the text more widely available. This is all the more interesting as quite separately the Lyon and Larrivour editions faced the same problems. If the privilege was to be believed, the Larrivour edition was produced without knowledge of the 1544 Lyon version as it indicated that the work had hitherto not been published ("qui par cy devant n'avoit esté mis en lumiere"). And yet in both cases text was undoubtedly suppressed. In the Lyon edition, the larger font of the dedication as compared to the rest of the work might have been a manner of using less text to cover a larger area, i.e. to fill an entire gathering. It is also worth noting that the entire first gathering was reprinted and not just the title page. This suggests that part of the original text was removed. In the Larrivour version an even more radical approach was adopted: entire sheets were taken out. The key to understanding these developments lies in the analysis of the circumstantial evidence surrounding these editions' publication.

66 This type of strategy was commonplace in the Parisian print world; Guillaume Cavellat published editions with an incomplete date to be filled in later: Isabelle Pantin (ed.), *Imprimeurs et libraires parisiens du XVI^e siècle. Fascicule Cavellat, Marnefet et Cavellat* (Paris: Service des travaux historiques de la ville de Paris, 1986), p. 161, no. 191.

FIGURE 11.2 Chronology of the printed editions of Budé's Institution du Prince (with terminus post quem dates)

As we have now ascertained that the Lyon edition was printed as early as 1544 and that the Larrivour was first in 1546 at the latest, the context of their publication has changed radically. Certainly, the death of Francis I on 31 March 1547 can no longer be used to explain why the text was finally printed. Instead, it is necessary to concentrate on the final years of his reign – a period characterised by the monarch's illness and by rising factionalism, in particular after 1544.⁶⁷ Within the kingdom, the fight against Protestantism became increasingly violent and was directly affecting the book world. The promulgation of the 25 articles of the faith by the Faculty of Theology of the Sorbonne was followed by the publication of two editions of the index of banned books in 1544 and 1545.⁶⁸ The dangers for booksellers and printers in these final years of Francis's reign were emphasised by Dolet's arrest, trial and execution. Was there a clear relationship between these difficult times and the fate of the 1544 and 1546 Budé editions?

The first edition came off the presses in Lyon in 1544, the second was produced near Troyes in 1546, and the third in Paris in 1547. One man made the same journey at roughly the same time: Étienne Dolet. Dolet was a controversial printer and author who had, by 1544, already been arrested twice; he had spent five months in prison in 1542 and ten in 1543.⁶⁹ It was only the personal intervention of the King that had saved him on these occasions. Ordered to stand trial in Paris, Dolet escaped from Lyon in January 1544 and sought refuge in Piedmont. Over the following four months, he wrote the epistles that would form part of the *Second Enfer*. In May, he decided to return to France and, if the *Second Enfer* is to be believed, visited Lyon where he perhaps published some of his texts. He did not, however, stay in the city very long and soon fled to Troyes where he had a better version of his text published by none other than

-
- 67 See Nathanael Weiss, *La Chambre ardente* (Paris: Fischbacher 1889) (on the seven last years of the reign); Robert J. Knecht, *Un prince de la Renaissance. François Ier et son royaume*, (Paris: Fayard, 1998), in particular Chapter 25 ('Les années sombres (1544–1547)'), pp. 495–519.
- 68 Weiss, *La Chambre ardente* and 'La Sorbonne, le Parlement de Paris et les livres hérétiques', *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire du Protestantisme français*, 34 (1885), pp. 19–28; Francis Higman, *Censorship and the Sorbonne. A bibliographical study of books in French censured by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, 1520–1551* (Geneva: Droz, 1979), Chapter IV; Jesús Martínez De Bujanda (ed.), *Index de l'Université de Paris 1544, 1545, 1547, 1548, 1551, 1556* (Sherbrooke, Québec: Université, Centre d'Études de la Renaissance – Geneva: Droz, J.-M. de Bujanda, 1985).
- 69 On Dolet see Claude Longeon, *Bibliographie des œuvres d'Étienne Dolet: écrivain, éditeur, imprimeur* (Geneva: Droz, 1980) and, most recently, Michèle Clément (ed.) *Étienne Dolet, 1509–2009* (Geneva: Droz, 2012).

the printer of the *Institution du Prince*: Nicole Paris.⁷⁰ This escapade did not last long. The Lyon authorities soon caught up with the fugitive, who was rearrested at the end of the August and rapidly transferred to Paris. Imprisoned at the *Conciergerie* for almost two years, Étienne Dolet was burnt on the Place Maubert on 3 August 1546.⁷¹

The similarities between the route followed by both Dolet and Budé's text, the connection between the Lyon printer and Nicole Paris, and the coincidence in the dates at which Dolet started his journey and the suppression of the Harsy edition are all intriguing and merit closer examination. The Lyon edition of the *Institution* was printed not just in the same year as Dolet's escape, but also at a time when the Sorbonne decreed that certain of his books would be burnt.⁷² The Larrivour edition was printed in 1546, when Dolet was executed. There would have been good reasons for not disseminating them immediately if they referred to Dolet at all. All three editions seem only to have been widely distributed in 1547: there are no references to there being a 1544 title page for the Harsy edition and the Nicole Paris version was first advertised at the Frankfurt Fair in 1547.⁷³ Furthermore, the two privileges we know of all postdate Francis I's death. But such circumstantial evidence alone, whilst highly suggestive, would be insufficient to implicate Dolet in the first editions of Budé's *Institution du prince*.

70 Of the three known issues, two bear the printer's address whilst the third indicates "Lyon" despite clearly belonging to the same edition. Longeon, *Bibliographie des œuvres d'Étienne Dolet*, nos. 250 to 253; André Jammes, 'À propos de l'édition originale (?) du *Second Enfer* d'Étienne Dolet', in Nico Israel, Anthonie Rutger, Alexander Croiset van Uchelen, Koert van der Horst and Günter G Schilder, *Theatrum orbis Librorum Liber amicorum Presented to Nico Israël on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Utrecht: HES Publishers, 1989), pp. 224–229; Guillaume Berthon, 'Quelques nouveautés bibliographiques autour d'Étienne Dolet et Jean de Tournes: les *Psaumes* de Marot et le *Benefice de Jesuchrist* traduit par Claude Le Maistre (1544–1545)', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 158 (2012), p. 676 and no. 22.

71 See Longeon's introduction to the *Second Enfer* (Geneva: Droz, 1978).

72 Criminal registers of the Paris Parlement, 14 February 1544. Archives nationales X2a96, ff. 455v–456v (see Longeon, *Documents*, p. 59). A first ruling of 13 October 1543 had already banned these works: Higman, *Censorship and the Sorbonne*, pp. 96–99.

73 *Bibliotheca exotica, sive Catalogus officinalis librorum peregrinis linguis usualibus scriptorum, videlicet Gallica, Italica, Hispanica, Belgica, Anglica, Danica, Bohemica, Ungarica, etc. omnium, quotquot in officinis bibliopolarum indagari potuerunt, et in nundinis Francofurtensibus prostant, ac venales habentur* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Kopf, 1610) (USC 2054632), at p. 85.

There is, however, some stronger proof that points more decisively in his direction. Foremost in this regard is the manifest admiration that Dolet had for Guillaume Budé and the strong intellectual bonds between the two men. In Dolet's *Epistolae*, there was not only an exchange between Budé and the printer, but also some verse dedicated to Budé.⁷⁴ Dolet further championed him in his *Dialogus de imitatione Ciceroniana adversus Desiderium Erasmus* published in 1535. Nor was the friendship between the two men confined to the world of letters. If Dolet is to be believed, they met at a banquet given in honour of Francis I's pardon in the Compaing affair in February 1537. He described the meeting in some detail in his long poem at the start of the second book of his *Carmina*. More interestingly, perhaps, in the two volumes of the *Commentarii Linguae Latinae*, published in 1536 and 1538 respectively, Dolet indicated that he wished to follow in Budé's footsteps. Their title, method and ambition are similar to that of Budé. Each tome is preceded by a letter and a poem to the author of the *De Asse* and scholars have identified a number of instances of plagiarism of the *Annotations aux Pandectes*.⁷⁵ Further, Dolet expressed the wish to become the king's official historiographer in his prefaces and appealed to Budé's for his support, not least as Budé had emphasised the importance of the position in the *Institution*.⁷⁶ After 1540, Dolet actively promoted the use of French, a 'conversion to the vernacular' that is particularly obvious in his dedication to three treatises that demonstrate this growing preoccupation. Gathered under the title *L'Orateur françoys*, they were entitled *La maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre*, *Les accents de la langue françoysse* and *La punctuation de la langue françoysse*.⁷⁷ In this text, he indicated that Budé was one of the authors that he wanted to imitate.⁷⁸

74 Étienne Dolet, *Orationes duae in Tholosam. Epistolarum libri ii, carminum libri ii, ad eundem epistolarum amicorum liber* (Lyon: Sébastien Gryphe, 1533) (USTC 146636). *Poemata*, 1534, I, 6; and in the *Carmina*, I, XXXVII. See the critical edition by Catherine Langlois-Pézeret: *Carmina* (1538) (Geneva: Droz, 2009). *Dialogus, de imitatione Ciceroniana, adversus desiderium Erasmus Roterodamum, pro Christophoro Longolio* (Lyon: Sébastien Gryphe, 1535) (USTC 146891).

75 See Catherine Pézeret, 'Étienne Dolet lecteur des *Verrines* dans l'article *Institutum* des *Commentaires de la langue latine*', *Camena*, 6 (2009), pp. 1–20, online: <<http://www.paris-sorbonne.fr/IMG/pdf/Pezeret.pdf>>.

76 For a detailed analysis of these texts and of the intellectual similarities between Budé and Dolet, see Christine Bénévent, Gwladys Brizard et al., *L'Institution du Prince* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, forthcoming).

77 Michel Jourde, 'Étienne Dolet et Jean de Tournes' in Michèle Clément (ed.), *Étienne Dolet, 1509–2009* (Geneva: Droz, 2012), pp. 289–307, at p. 298.

78 Claude Longeon wondered if Dolet 'fait allusion au recueil d'apophtegmes de Budé, encore à l'état de manuscrit en 1540, dont on tira en 1547 l'*Institution du Prince*': Étienne Dolet, *Préfaces françaises*, Claude Longeon (ed.), (Geneva: Droz, 1979), p. 88, note 5.

The most convincing connection between Dolet and the *Institution* comes from the text of the Lyon edition. The analysis of the written forms is particularly revealing. First, the punctuation is distinctive, with an overabundance of commas that are invariably present before each occurrence of 'qui' or 'que' (as a relative pronoun or a conjunction of subordination) and each conjunction of coordination such as 'et', 'ou' and 'ne'. Second, the orthographic choices are peculiar. Masculine past participles finish with 'és', whilst the morphologic final consonants are systematically preserved in the plural form: 'touts', 'gents' and 'ants'. There are also archaic and pseudo-etymologic forms of words such as 'aultre', 'memoyre' and 'autorité'. All of these distinctive choices coincide perfectly with those made by Dolet in his own imprints. These are particularly interesting as they are not used in the first gathering – the gathering that was not printed by Harsy.

We have no proof that Dolet asked Harsy to print the book, but we can conclude that he seems to have prepared the copy. Certainly, the involvement of Dolet makes sense of the bibliographic anomalies that have been identified in the Lyon and Larrivour editions. In both cases, the publishers could have used laudatory texts by Dolet praising Budé. Certainly, we know of a number of editions in which the name of Dolet was explicitly removed. Compellingly, this was sometimes done by reformatting or reprinting the first gathering.⁷⁹ A case in point is the *Questions Tusculanes*: Guillaume Berthon has proved that the versions published under Dolet's name in 1543 and under Sabon and Constantin's names in 1549 (and as an undated issue) are in fact the very same edition. The first gathering was simply reprinted in order to remove Dolet's epistle to Francis I and replaced with a table of contents.⁸⁰ In other words, Sabon and Constantin used the very same strategy as Gazeau.

A final element of proof comes from the fact that Dolet is known to have delegated the printing of some of his works to other printers during his final troubled years in Lyon. This is all the more interesting as it has recently been confirmed that the printer of the replacement first gathering of the 1547 Lyon edition of the *Institution*, Jean de Tournes, intervened in this process.⁸¹ Jean

79 Thus the *Exhortation à la lecture de la sainte escripture* (Lyon: Étienne Dolet, 1542) is printed without Dolet's preface by Balthasar Arnoullet in 1544; the same is true of *Les prières et oraisons de la Bible* (Lyon: Étienne Dolet, 1542), reprinted by Jean de Tournes in 1543 and 1544 without the original preface.

80 See Guillaume Berthon, 'Sulpice Sabon, Clément Marot et l'enseigne du Rocher (Lyon, 1542–1544): découvertes, énigmes, enjeux', forthcoming. We would like to thank the author for having very kindly agreed to share his text pre-publication.

81 The hypothesis was first suggested by Maurice Escoffier in his *Autour d'une supercherie de librairie. Clément Marot, Étienne Dolet, Heluyn Dulin*, (Trévoux, [1965]). See also Gérard

de Tournes is known to have stepped into the breach following the arrest, condemnation and execution of Dolet, and republished works that had previously been part of Dolet's repertoire. The sole difference between the originals and the Tournes reprints was that the latter never named Dolet in the text and systematically removed the preliminary texts written by the condemned humanist.⁸²

Conclusions

The bibliographical anomalies in the first editions of Guillaume Budé's *Institution du prince* have allowed us thoroughly to reevaluate the work's early publishing history. The text was first printed in Lyon in 1544 and not in 1547 as has previously been assumed by scholars. Further, the most influential of the editions, the Larrivour publication, was not initially printed in 1547, but in 1546 at the latest. In both cases, some of the original preliminary text that accompanied these two editions was suppressed by the publishers – presumably because it contained material that could have attracted unwanted attention from the authorities. In one case this meant completely reprinting the first gathering, in the other mixing some of the original sheets with newly printed ones. In this context, the Parisian edition published by Jean Foucher was a later attempt to offer an improved version of the *Institution* in a very different political and intellectual context from the Lyon and Larrivour imprints.

By analysing the chronology of the works' publication, the language of the Lyon edition, and the manner in which his works were published after his arrest, it is possible to identify Étienne Dolet as the source of the suppressed texts. They were undoubtedly either his work or directly associated with him. The proximity of Dolet to Nicole Paris, his visit to Troyes just months before the presumed date of publication of the first edition of the Larrivour edition, and the coincidence of the suppression of preliminary texts in both editions represent particularly suggestive evidence. The fall from grace of

Morisse, 'Dolet et son entreprise d'édition', in *Étienne Dolet*, pp. 395–396, Berthon, 'Quelques nouveautés bibliographiques autour d'Étienne Dolet et Jean de Tournes' and Jourde, 'Étienne Dolet et Jean de Tournes', pp. 303–306.

82 Jourde, 'Étienne Dolet et Jean de Tournes', p. 303. Unlike Claude Longeon who saw this as aggressive competition against Dolet, Jourde prefers to see it as a form of continuity, of cooperation.

the famed printer, publisher, author, editor and translator of humanist works had a profound impact on the sixteenth-century French book world. Self-censorship by contemporary publishers of Dolet's texts is a recognised phenomenon, but one that is particularly difficult to identify. Here, thanks to careful bibliographical analysis, not only has it been possible to rethink when the editions were printed but also to establish the role played by a major figure of Renaissance French printing at the heart of this influential treatise.