Chartier’s influence on *rhétoriqueur* writing has been widely acknowledged from two very different perspectives. At a global level, scholars have noted that the political and didactic authors of the late 15th and early 16th centuries broadly derive their conception of the poet’s mission from Chartier, whom they consider as part of a canon of illustrious vernacular precursors. Simultaneously, at the level of textual minutiae, editors and philologists have identified the debts owed by various *rhétoriqueur* compositions to one or other of Chartier’s works. In what follows I develop and synthesize these approaches, not to provide a complete map of Chartier’s legacy to the *rhétoriqueurs* but to show how the later poets tackled that legacy in assertively interventionist ways. In reshaping the techniques and preoccupations that they have inherited, individual *rhétoriqueurs* do not necessarily adopt a richer or more sophisticated practice. Invariably, however, they subject Chartier’s production to their own aesthetic and ideological concerns, and thereby differentiate themselves both from their ostensible model and from each other.

Chartier pioneers the notion of the poet as a public servant, whose work not only bears witness to events and situations but helps to shape opinions and behaviour. While the *Quadrilogue* *invectif* encapsulates the principle most obviously, it is also apparent in much of his courtly poetry.\(^1\) It is precisely this view of public eloquence that underpins much of the *rhétoriqueurs’* work, and indeed

---

characterizes them as a group regardless of their diverse political affiliations. Admittedly none of the rhétoriqueurs quite match Chartier’s direct contribution to political life, as a royal notary and secretary and occasional ambassador. Nevertheless, the first official historians of the Dukes of Burgundy came to enjoy a significant institutional standing as ducal counsellors. But it is not only in respect of current affairs and power structures that Chartier and the rhétoriqueurs have a common understanding of the relationship between the poet and his environment. Their understanding also embraces the treatment of other poets’ work. Chartier’s use of rhetoric, in particular his construction of open-ended debates, appears to initiate the practices of close intertextual engagement through which the rhétoriqueurs assimilate and respond to pre-existing compositions—not least those of Chartier himself. This shared ethos informs the range of phenomena that I consider below. I begin by reflecting on Chartier’s standing in the eyes of both the rhétoriqueurs and their readers, as attested respectively by the poet’s presence in enumerations of notable past authors and by his works’ inclusion in manuscript anthologies that also contain rhétoriqueur pieces. My attention then turns to particular
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compositional techniques that the *rhétoriqueurs* adapt from Chartier, from stanzaic forms to personifications. Finally, I review a number of *rhétoriqueur* texts that engage in sustained fashion with Chartier’s works.

From the mid-15th century onwards, the *rhétoriqueurs* were fond of producing laudatory catalogues of vernacular authors within their own poems. Chartier’s canonical standing is obvious from his regular appearance in these catalogues. Although the references are brief, and afford no particular insights into what Chartier’s successors value in his work, his place in the enumerations is revealing. In many cases Chartier is chronologically the second author to be commemorated, after the foundational figure of Jean de Meun and before *rhétoriqueurs* of different generations, of which George Chastelain is normally the earliest to be mentioned. The implication is that he plays a key role in the transmission of Francophone poetic craft, from its ostensible origins with the *Roman de la Rose* to its most recent refinements: his work is an authoritative body which posterity has honoured not only by reading it, but by drawing on it in producing further poetry. Chartier plays an especially interesting part in one early *rhétoriqueur* pantheon, Simon Gréban’s *Complainte pour Jacques Milet* (1466). Gréban recounts an allegorical ceremony, involving the personified Rhetoric, the Muse Calliope, and a host of ancient and medieval authors and composers, at which the recently-deceased poet Milet is

---


buried. Jean de Meun delivers the eulogy for Milet, whose epitaph is then composed and inscribed on his tombstone by none other than Chartier:

Et lors vint maistre Alain Chartier,
Sans nul autre historiographe,
Qui sur sa tombe vint traitier
En lectre d’or ceste epitaphe.

_Epitaphium._

Cy gist maistre Jaques Millet,
Notable homme et scientifique,
Lequel famé entre mil est,
Filz a ornee Rethorique,
Qui par le regard basilique
De la mort fut rendu transiz,
A Paris, la ville autentique,
Mil quatre cens soixante et six.⁸

---

[Then Master Alain Chartier arrived--no other historian was present--and began to write\(^9\) this epitaph on his tomb in golden characters: *Epitaph*. Here lies Master Jacques Milet, a son of ornate Rhetoric and an eminent expert with the very highest reputation. Death’s basilisk stare made him pass away in the glorious city of Paris in 1466.]

While the rather anodine epitaph does scant justice to Chartier’s own verse, his privileged role at Milet’s funeral says a great deal about his prestige. He is responsible for immortalizing Milet, for producing an inscription that is destined to endure after Jean de Meun’s prelection has been forgotten.\(^10\) Gréban’s Chartier, in other words, plays a role in the process of canon formation. We would be justified in seeing here a powerful metaphor for Chartier’s real influence on the reputations of later poets: it is by partaking of his eloquence, and being seen to do so, that *rhétoriqueurs* stake their claim to immortality.

Affiliations of this kind are apparent in various manuscript anthologies, where material by Chartier appears alongside *rhétoriqueur* compositions. The importance of such anthologies must not be exaggerated, for they are relatively few in number. Nevertheless, they indicate that Chartier’s work was still read and valued by audiences who were familiar with *rhétoriqueur* poetry. One of these

\(^9\) The verb *traitier* in this collocation may mean either “to compose” or “to trace, inscribe” (more typically *traire*); it may of course bear both meanings simultaneously. See the entry for *traiter* in ATILF CNRS/Nancy Université, *Dictionnaire du Moyen Français*, 2010 version: [http://www.atilf.fr/dmf](http://www.atilf.fr/dmf).

\(^10\) On “prelection,” the late medieval practice of reading a text aloud to an audience, see Joyce Coleman, *Public Reading and the Reading Public in Late Medieval England and France* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 35.
audience postdates Chartier’s death by over a century: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. fr. 2206, from the mid-16th century, includes excerpts from the Breviaire des Nobles as well as work by Jean Molinet, Jean Bouchet, and Jean Meschinot, much of which has been similarly extracted from longer works. Significantly, Molinet’s poem Le Temple de Mars appears in three anthologies where Chartier’s verse and prose loom large. An extract from the Temple figures in Stockholm, Royal Library, V.u.22 alongside six pieces by Chartier, while Molinet’s complete text is included in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. fr. 1642, the first half of which is dominated by Chartier’s work, and in Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 3521, which contains eight Chartier poems. Co-textual relationships accentuate key features of Molinet’s piece: its anti-war message resonates with the Lay de paix (present in all three manuscripts) and Quadrilogue (present in the first two), while its use of architectural allegory in the eponymous Temple recalls the Quadrilogue’s celebrated image of


the crumbling House of France. The connections between Molinet and Chartier poems are looser in Arnhem, Bibliotheek, 79, containing the Belle Dame, some of its continuations, and the Debat de Reveille matin, to which the Burgundian poet’s Naufrage de la Pucelle is added on a separate quire (fols. 60r-69r); and in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. fr. 25434, which includes the Breviaire des Nobles (fols. 41r-55r) as well as a verse passage from Le Trosne d’Honneur ascribed to George Chastelain (fols 80r-84v). The processes of excerption and juxtaposition in BnF, ms. fr. 25434 accentuate the intricate versification that characterizes both the Breviaire and the verse of Molinet’s Trosne. In Arnhem 79 the clearest co-textual affiliations involve female characters: the Pucelle in the Naufrage, who represents Mary of Burgundy at a time of extreme vulnerability after Charles the Bold’s death at Nancy, recalls not so much the Belle Dame of Chartier’s poem but her tearful avatar in Baudet Herenc’s Accusations contre la Belle Dame sans mercy (fols. 17r-26r).

Two other anthologies offer more precise co-textual connections, in different ways. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 3391 is a large anthology produced in a Burgundian milieu in the early 16th century: the Breviaire des Nobles and one of Chartier’s ballades, as well as the French Curial that most early audiences erroneously ascribed to Chartier himself, appear in the volume
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alongside works by Molinet, Jean Lemaire de Belges, and Olivier de La Marche. The *Curial* (fols. 134r-140v) is positioned between two substantial *rhétoriqueur* pieces: *L’Abuzé en court*, ascribed by the compiler to René d’Anjou (fols. 90r-133r), and La Marche’s *Chevalier deliberé* (fols. 142r-191r). It consequently forms the central part of a didactic triptych: the *Abuzé* tells a cautionary tale of court life, on the risks of which the *Curial* offers sustained reflections, before the *Chevalier* offers an alternative model of public life in the form of chivalric virtue as a preparation for death. The compiler has thus shaped Chartier and his successors into a community of moral commentators, whose ethical stances transcend any political allegiances they may have: Chartier’s allegiance to Charles VII does not make his work unacceptable to a Burgundian public. This might appear surprising, but we must remember that the *Curial* has no explicit political orientation in its own right, and hence lends itself to re-use in this context more readily than an overtly “French” work such as the *Quadrilogue*. The same principle is manifested in Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, 21521-31, a composite manuscript of three parts--each dating from the 15th century--of which the third contains the French *Curial* and the *Breviaire*, another piece whose ethical argument has no political underpinning. The *Curial* (fols. 144r-149r) is included among a body of educational letters that Jean de Lannoy, a major Burgundian lord, addressed to his son in 1464-65. Lannoy’s career attests to the shifting nature of Franco-Burgundian relationships: he played an important political role under Philip the Good but also enjoyed the favour of Louis XI, as a result of which he was exiled by


Charles the Bold. Changing attitudes are also apparent in the work by Burgundian rhétoriqueurs that appears in this portion of Brussels 21521-31. Chastelain, whose stance towards France was largely conciliatory, is accompanied by Molinet, who was much more explicitly anti-French; the Lyon coronné, which commemorates Philip the Good; and anonymous poems supporting Charles the Bold’s suppression of the Liège revolt of 1466-68. These processes of anthologization remind us that it is unwise to polarize “French” and “Burgundian” ideological positions, and indicate that Burgundian audiences did not hesitate to recontextualize Chartier’s moral writing when circumstances permitted.

In the same way, Jean Lemaire de Belges sent a copy of the Curial to Jean de Marnix, a minister of Margaret of Austria, in 1511. By contrast, Chartier’s overtly political work does not appear in surviving anthologies alongside anti-French material by Burgundian rhétoriqueurs—as opposed to, say, Molinet’s Temple de Mars, which is hardly a partisan composition. Chartier’s name and reputation, then, are no obstacle to his works’ being reproduced together with those of Burgundian authors; but the compatibility of those works’ political content seems to preclude certain combinations.

Nevertheless, with the right kind of framing, even the Quadrilogue could be disseminated in the midst of outright conflict. The Bruges printer Colard Mansion published an edition while the Burgundian

---

17 On Jean de Lannoy, and the three other manuscripts that transmit the French Curial among his letters, see Oeuvres latines, ed. Bourgain-Hemeryck, pp. 146-48.

Netherlands was suffering a French invasion and urban revolts after Nancy, adding a prologue that compared the region’s plight to that of Chartier’s France.¹⁹

If the co-textual resonances in these manuscripts are primarily thematic, much of the rhétoriqueurs’ work carries formal echoes of Chartier. In respect of versification, however, it is difficult to identify specific debts beyond a widespread use of the octosyllabic stanza rhyming \textit{ababb\textipa{c}c}, a common \textit{ballade} form whose first use in non-lyric contexts is now ascribed to Oton de Grandson but was most commonly credited to Chartier in the late Middle Ages.²⁰ Jean Molinet’s \textit{Art de rhétorique} notes that this stanzaic form is used in “pluiseurs livres et traittiez” [many books and treatises], citing a number of examples, of which the \textit{Belle Dame} is the earliest.²¹ More significant than particular verse forms is Chartier’s attitude toward formal rigour, which successive later poets—not only the rhétoriqueurs—would adopt and develop. Chartier’s verse is characterized by high rhyme quality and, where the chosen form permits it, complex stanzaic patterning. Subsequent generations of Francophone poets take these tendencies further, raising the ambitions of their versification and eventually reaching the extreme sophistication of various (but by no means all) rhétoriqueur
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compositions. It is Chartier’s approach to verse, rather than the verse he produces, that leaves its mark on the rhétoriqueurs.

At a higher level of composition, Chartier’s construction of debate poems establishes a range of organizational and discursive possibilities to which Jean Molinet, in particular, responds creatively. In accordance with the general practice in literary debates, Chartier does not offer explicit resolutions, while his interlocutors vary in number and their speech varies in form: eight-line stanzas alternating between two speakers in the Belle Dame and Débat de Reveille matin; continuous verse shared between two and four speakers in the Débat des deux fortunés d’amours and Livre des quatre dames respectively; and flexible alternations of eight-line stanzas between three speakers in the Débat du Herault, du Vassault et du Villain. In each case a framing narrator opens and closes the exchange. Of all the rhétoriqueurs, Molinet makes most use of poems whose structures and/or titles explicitly constitute them as debates: a total of eight poems fall into this category, constituting a corpus that positively invites comparisons with that of the earlier poet. Like Chartier, Molinet is relatively unusual in composing a number of debates that involve more than two speakers. All Molinet’s debate poems are stanzaic, though each has a distinctive verse form. They range over more diverse themes than do Chartier’s debates: Le Hault Siege d’Amours is amatory, while other pieces are political (Le Debat de l’aigle, du harenc et du lyon; Le Debat des trois nobles oiseaux; Ung dictier de Renommée, Vertus et

22 Armstrong, The Virtuoso Circle, outlines these processes; on the versification of selected Chartier poems, see especially pp. 22-24, 37-39, and 46-49.

23 Johnson, Poets as Players, pp. 122-42 delineates the formal and thematic range of Chartier’s debate poems. On poetic debates more generally, see Cayley, Debate and Dialogue, pp. 12-51.

Victoire), didactic (Le Debat du leup et du mouton), bawdy (Le Debat du viel gendarme et du viel amoureux), religious (Le Debat du poisson et de la chair), or festive (Le Debat d’April et de May). In the latter four poems, which all involve two interlocutors, responses are organized in alternating stanzas; but the patterns are more varied when three speakers interact. Le Debat des trois nobles oiseaux, Ung dictier de Renommée, Vertus et Victoire, and Le Hault Siege d’Amours each comprise a sequence of stanzas that alternate between two speakers, followed by the intervention of the third; this basic schema is preceded, followed, or interrupted by one or more further speeches. In Le Debat de l’aigle, du barenc et du lyon the allegorical eagle (representing Emperor Frederick III) delivers the odd stanzas, to which the herring (Louis XI) and lion (Philip the Good) respond in alternate even stanzas. Yet the most significant contrast between Molinet’s and Chartier’s debate poems lies in the distinctive theatrical dimension of the former. Molinet’s debates are much more performative in character than Chartier’s: whether or not any of them were actually staged, they all lend themselves to performance. Some of them lack a framing narrator, and thus appear more obviously dramatic. More importantly, most of Molinet’s pieces use the technique of mnemonic rhyme--where a rhyme is shared by the last line of one speech and the first line of the next--that is characteristic of French-


26 The presence or absence of a narrator does not in itself indicate whether a debate was destined for performance, however. On the nebulous distinctions between performed and non-performed debates, see Claude Thiry, “Débats et moralités dans la littérature française du XVe siècle: intersection et interaction du narratif et du dramatique,” Le Moyen Français 19 (1987), 203-44.
language theatre in the late Middle Ages, and that thereby inscribes performance into the poems’ formal texture. Hence Molinet appears to follow Chartier’s lead in his approach to debate poetry; he seeks, like his predecessor, to extend the genre’s structures beyond their habitual parameters, most strikingly by imbuing debates with specifically performative qualities.

In many respects it is Chartier’s prose and prosimetrum, rather than his poetry, which influence the rhétoriqueurs most decisively through their use of political and didactic allegory. A number of major rhétoriqueur works deploy a cast of characters in ways that transpose not only the Quadrilogue’s personifications of France and the three estates, but also its essential structure whereby one character’s lament is followed by the conflicting perspectives of other speakers. The complaints of Dame Chrestienté [Lady Christianity] in André de La Vigne’s Ressource de la Chrestienté, for instance, give way to the interventions of Dame Noblesse [Lady Nobility], Magesté Royalle [Royal Majesty], Je-ne-sçay-qui [Someone or Other], and Bon Conseil [Good Counsel] in a discussion of the merits of an anti-Turkish crusade that will justify the text’s real, unspoken preoccupation: Charles VIII’s 1494-95 campaign against Naples. Similar structures appear in a number of Molinet’s prosimetrum texts on political subjects: the eponymous personification in the Complainte de Grece initiates discussion by lamenting her suffering under Ottoman Turkish rule, while Justice and the Petit Peuple [Ordinary People] in the Ressource du petit peuple recall Chartier’s figures of France and the

---


third estate. Molinet’s *Naufrage de la Pucelle* adapts the *Quadrilogue*’s personified estates in particularly arresting fashion, subtly transforming what they represent and setting them in an eventful narrative in which their actions are as important as their words. Chartier’s clergy, who conveys the real thrust of the *Quadrilogue*’s political argument, becomes Coeur Leal [Loyal Heart], an image of the courtiers and counsellors who had remained loyal to Mary of Burgundy after the disaster of Nancy. Coeur Leal consoles the beleaguered Pucelle through historical exempla of women who triumphed over adversity—including that other Pucelle, Joan of Arc—which he enumerates and interprets in ways that closely resemble the rhetoric of his counterpart in the *Quadrilogue*. The knight and the third estate from Chartier’s work are feminized as Noblesse Deblitee [Feeble Nobility], who stands for that portion of the Burgundian aristocracy whose allegiance was currently undecided between Burgundy and France; and Communauté Feminine [The Womenfolk], who is violent and disruptive but
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faithful to her sovereign. Chartier’s aristocracy, then, has been divided into reliable and unreliable elements: Coeur Leal takes on the clerical role of consoling and reflecting, while Noblesse Debilitee inherits the undesirable qualities of Chartier’s knight. These changes to the personifications’ gender, referents, and roles suggest strongly that Molinet is distinguishing his allegorical scenario from Chartier’s, in ways that a well-informed audience would readily recognize.

Chartier’s narrative presentation of his major personifications also has a significant effect on rhétoriqueur allegory. France in the *Quadrilogue* is described in some detail before she is named, while Foy [Faith] and Esperance [Hope] in the *Livre de l’esperance* are endowed with symbolic attributes whose meaning is not immediately made clear. By gradually unfolding the figures’ significance in this way, Chartier tacitly encourages his audience to reflect on and interpret their appearance and attributes. In doing so, readers become disposed to engage actively with Chartier’s ethical arguments. Various rhétoriqueurs employ this technique to present key figures or scenes: Dame Chrestienté in La Vigne’s *Ressource de la Chrestienté*, Tirannie [Tyranny] in Molinet’s *Ressource du petit peuple*, Sensualité [Sensuality] and Raison [Reason] in Octovien de Saint-Gelais’s *Séjour d’Honneur*, and the allegorical tableaux witnessed by the narrator of Jean Bouchet’s *Regnars traversant*, to name but a few, are all described before they are clearly identified. However, the content of the *Esperance*’s descriptions does
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33 Octovien de Saint-Gelais, *Le Séjour d’Honneur*, ed. Frédéric Duval (Geneva, 2002); Jean Bouchet, *Les Regnars traversant* (Paris, [1503-04]). References to the *Regnars* are provided in the text; punctuation and orthography in this and other early printed sources are normalized in line with standard editorial practice. On Molinet’s and Bouchet’s techniques, see Adrian Armstrong, “The
not significantly influence the ways in which the rhétoriqueurs present the same personifications.

Chartier’s brief portrait of Desesperance [Despair] in the *Livre de l’esperance* leaves no trace in the equivalent figure of Desespoir in Jean Meschinot’s *Lunettes des princes*; nor are his Foy and Esperance recognizable in the Foy and Bonne Esperance of Saint-Gelais’s *Séjour*.34

Similarly, though the combination of verse and prose in the *Esperance* has been widely regarded as foundational for the rhétoriqueurs’ use of prosimetrum, Chartier’s influence lies primarily in the principle of allocating complementary functions to the two media, rather than in fixing their respective roles.35 Prose and verse in the *Esperance* are affiliated with the contingent and the transcendent respectively: prose conveys almost all the narrative action and discursive argument, while the verse sections (most of which have no identifiable speaker) play a more affective role. The verse itself adopts forms that mimic divine order through their symmetrical organization, and
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Christian teleology through their rhyming patterns. All these tendencies are apt to change in the work of later poets. Although Molinet’s prosimetrum works broadly maintain Chartier’s functional distribution of prose and verse, their verse sections are always delivered by a determinate voice, whether this be the narrator, a personification, or a collective speaker. In the Séjour d’Honneur and Lunettes des princes, verse plays a much more important narrative and pedagogical role, while André de La Vigne allocates prose to his narrator and verse to his personifications within the allegorical dream in the Ressource de la Chrestienté. Moreover, the verse sections in these poets’ prosimetrum adopt forms that differ significantly from those of the Esperance. Most of Chartier’s verse is in heptasyllables, an unusual metre in this period, and is organized in stanzas that bear little resemblance to those used elsewhere in his poetry. By contrast, the prosimetrum of the rhétoriqueurs tends to use continuous or stanzaic forms that are more apt to be found in contemporary poems, and that often have connotative values of their own. Molinet uses an eight-line stanza with internal rhyme in his most serious works, and heterometric verse to suggest emotional disorder, while circular and heterometric
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forms in the Séjour d’Honneur are associated with the seductions of empty rhetoric.\textsuperscript{39} In the hands of Chartier’s successors, prosimetrum thus remains a highly unstable genre on which individual poets each seek to make a distinctive mark.

The measure of the rhétoriqueurs’ diversity and distinctiveness emerges most clearly through those compositions that quote, rewrite, or otherwise engage closely with Chartier’s verse, prose, or prosimetrum. George Chastelain offers an early but striking example of inventive recomposition. When he responded to a mixture of effusive compliments and professional challenges from Jean Robertet, in the poetic exchange generally known as the Douze Dames de Rhétorique (1462-63), he sent his correspondent a set of twelve short poems. Each poem or enseigne is voiced by one of the eponymous Ladies of Rhetoric, who personifies a desirable aspect of literary craftsmanship such as Science [Knowledge] or Profundité [Profundity].\textsuperscript{40} Chastelain’s selection of personifications proclaims his adherence to an ideal of ethically-grounded public eloquence that sets him clearly in Chartier’s lineage. Yet he is not simply espousing a global principle; in personifying twelve elements


of a larger concept, he is adopting and reworking the structural schema of Chartier’s *Breviaire des Nobles.* The resemblance between the two compositions is accentuated by the form of Chastelain’s *enseignes:* these may be regarded as loosely affiliated to the ballade, in that they each comprise three stanzas, though they lack refrains and *envoi,* and the two sequences have a rather different internal organization. The intricate play of parallels and contrasts between the *Breviaire* and *enseignes* was clear to at least one early reader: Aymon de Montfalcon, the prince-bishop of Lausanne, who had Chartier’s and Chastelain’s virtues depicted in frescoes on opposite sides of a corridor in the Château Saint-Maire.

Meschinot’s *Lunettes des Princes* is broadly contemporary with the *Douze Dames,* but presents a very different response to Chartier. Broad parallels between the *Lunettes* and the *Espérance* are easy to identify: both are *prosimetrum* works in which a first-person narrator is brought to the brink of suicide by despair, and is then consoled and educated by a number of virtues. Each narrative, indeed, begins with a nod to the Boethian ancestry of *prosimetrum,* by contrasting the narrator’s happy past with his unhappy present. Yet Meschinot organizes his material in ways that diverge very significantly from Chartier’s piece. Whereas the *Espérance* is dominated by prose, verse is overwhelmingly preponderant

41 This account is indebted to Jean-Claude Mühlethaler, “Un manifeste poétique de 1463: les ‘Enseignes’ des Douze Dames de Rhétorique,” in *Actes du Vᵉ Colloque International sur le Moyen Français, Milan, 6–8 mai 1985,* 3 vols. (Milan, 1985), 1:83-101 (pp. 85-90 and 101), which outlines the interplay between the *Breviaire* and *Douze Dames* more fully.

42 On these frescoes see Chastelain et al., *Les Douze Dames,* ed. Cowling, pp. 48-49.

43 Meyenberg, *Alain Chartier prosateur,* pp. 179-80, and Johnson, *Poets as Players,* pp. 184-85, discuss the openings of the *Espérance* and *Lunettes* respectively.
in the *Lunettes*.\(^{44}\) None of Meschinot’s verse forms have precedents in the *Esperance*; what is more, some stanzas of the *Lunettes* are marked by particularly intricate formal patterning of a kind that is alien to Chartier’s poetry.\(^{45}\) Meschinot’s narrator acts on his own behalf throughout, while Chartier’s is to a large extent doubled by the figure of Entendement [Understanding]. Spiritual rescue and consolation are vouchsafed by Nature and the theological virtues in the *Esperance*, but by Raison [Reason] and the cardinal virtues in the *Lunettes*. Chartier’s theological virtues interact with Entendement through dialogue, while Meschinot’s cardinal virtues “speak” to the narrator only via a book that he finds by his bedside after waking from a dream. There is a very strong impression that, within a common global framework of Boethian consolation and doctrinal exposition, Meschinot has made a set of compositional choices that systematically differ from Chartier’s. The *Lunettes*, then, offers an inverted image of the *Esperance*: the didactic *prosimetrum* that Chartier could have written, but didn’t. Conversely, of course, the *Esperance* looms in the background, for each of Meschinot’s decisions invites knowledgeable readers to measure the contrast with the earlier work. Paradoxically, by striving to make the *Lunettes* as unlike the *Esperance* as possible, Meschinot has revealed the extent of his dependence on Chartier.

Dependence on the *Esperance* is much more explicit in Jean Lemaire de Belges’s *Traicté de la différence des schismes et des conciles de l’Église*, a polemical prose treatise of 1511 that promotes the value and authority of ecclesiastical councils and of the Gallican Church in particular. Lemaire composed this and other works to contribute to Louis XII’s propaganda offensive against Pope Julius II, in


response to military actions by Julius that jeopardized French interests in Italy. He supports his arguments through ostentatious references to various authorities, among whom Chartier plays an important part. Two sections of the Esperance that criticize ecclesiastical abuses supply Lemaire with material: Prose VIII, in which Foy interprets the suffering of clerics as divine punishment for the Church’s misuse of the Donation of Constantine (a temporal gift to the early Church that polemicists often regarded as having encouraged clerical corruption); and Prose XVI, in which Esperance explains the value of prayer and attacks unworthy priests. Prose VIII provides the basis for a brief comparison between the martyrs of the early Church and the rather less illustrious history of the Papacy after Constantine (pp. 107-08). A lengthy passage from Prose XVI is reproduced verbatim towards the end of the Traicté (pp. 232-35), but is announced much earlier, when Lemaire sets out his contention that three factors have particularly harmed the Church: ambition, and the avarice that results from it; failure to hold General Councils; and clerical celibacy. In support of this claim Lemaire adduces authoritative Latin quotations from Pope Pius II, Robert Gaguin, and Platina (Bartolomeo Sacchi). He continues:

46 See Jean Lemaire de Belges, Traicté de la difference des schismes et des conciles de l’Église, ed. Jennifer Britnell (Geneva, 1997), pp. 11-47. References to the Traicté itself are provided in the text.

Lesquelles dessusdictes veridiques sentences ce tresnoble orateur de la langue françoise, maistre Alain Charretier, en la fin de son livre appellé L’Exil, a exprimé si bien que on ne sçauroit mieulx, dont le texte de mot à mot touchant ce passaige sera mis en la fin de la troisiesme partie de ce traictié (p. 97).

[These reliable precepts have been expressed incomparably well by that most eminent exponent of oratory in French, Master Alain Chartier, at the end of his Livre de l’Esperance. What he says about the issues mentioned above will be quoted word for word, at the end of the third part of this treatise.]

In this way Lemaire primes his audience to expect an eloquent extract that encapsulates his initial assertions. But the passage that he quotes meets these expectations only in part. It focuses on clerical celibacy, and to a lesser extent on corruption; no reference is made to councils. There is a striking gap between what Chartier says and what Lemaire implies that he says, in remarks that immediately precede and follow the extract:

[C]y après est mis le recueil et la substance de tout le dessus narré, lesquelles choses declaire treselegamment ce noble poete et orateur maistre Alain Charretier en la fin de son livre

---

48 The Esperance was sometimes entitled Exil by its first generations of readers: see, for example, Chartier, Le Livre de l’espérance, ed. Rouy, pp. xxii, xxiv, xxxi, and xxxiii. The text as quoted by Lemaire resembles that of Pierre Le Caron’s Parisian editions: Lemaire, Traité, ed. Britnell, pp. 232-33 n. 334.
The claim that the *Esperance* lends authority to the whole of Lemaire’s argument is not borne out in practice: Chartier provides nothing that explicitly supports the *Traicté*’s stated aim, “de montrer combien il y a de difference entre scismes et concilles, et aussi la preeminence et utilité des concilles de la saincte Eglise gallicane” [to show how different schisms and councils are, and that the councils of the Holy Gallican Church are paramount and constructive] (p. 236). But argumentative coherence isn’t really the point: Chartier’s high style is at least as important as his argument.49 The rhetorical questions and figurative language of Esperance’s diatribe contrast with Lemaire’s matter-of-fact historical account:

> Que apporte la constitution de non marier les prestres synon tourner et eviter legitime generation pour convertir en advoultrerie, et l’honneste cohabitation d’une seule espouse en multiplication de eschauldée luxure? […] La nef qui porte trop grand voile single en grand peril, et nulle riviere ne dure long temps hors de son canal (pp. 234-35).

---

[What does the ban on clerical marriage achieve, besides twisting and blocking legitimate procreation by transforming it into adultery, and transforming morally appropriate intercourse with a single wife into a proliferation of burning lust? [...] A ship whose sail is too large is in great danger on the seas, and no river can last long outside its channel.]

The *Esperance*, then, adds an emotive complement to the *Traicté*’s historically grounded case for the value of councils.

Lemaire is not the only *rhétoriqueur* whose debt to Chartier does not quite match what he claims. Pierre Gringore’s *Menus propos* collection, first printed in 1521, contains a stanzaic poem entitled *Le Curial*.50 While its title recalls Chartier, there is no explicit reference to the earlier author; yet the poem is effectively a versified version of the French *Curial*.51 Previous scholars have amply demonstrated the extent of Gringore’s borrowing, without identifying the crucial effects he achieves by transposing his source into verse. One of these effects is conveyed by Gringore’s choice of versification: nine-line stanzas of decasyllables, rhyming *aabaabbc*. Gringore had used this relatively unusual form in other poems, as had Jean Robertet and André de La Vigne: the stanza seems to have a particular significance for *rhétoriqueurs* working within the kingdom of France, for it adds an initial line to an eight-line stanza that is closely associated with Chastelain and Molinet. The nine-line form, in other words, enables French *rhétoriqueurs* to adapt and surpass the formal achievement of their Burgundian counterparts, in a display of competitive virtuosity that typifies these poets’


interactions. Although politicized oneupmanship of this kind is not an issue in the *Menus propos*, the nine-line stanza remains associated with a certain compositional ambition—all the more so because Gringore ends each stanza with a proverbial expression, employing the technique of *epiphonema* through which *rhétoriqueurs* often sought to add a further layer of formal complexity and sententiousness to their verse. Gringore’s versification has important implications for our understanding of what he has made of the *Curial*. He has not rendered it into straightforward decasyllabic couplets, or a “classic” stanzaic form such as the eight-line octosyllabic stanza rhyming *ababcbcb*. By adopting a more challenging stanza and adorning it through *epiphonema*, he calls attention to the formal texture of his verse, to the gap that separates it from the prose of his source, and consequently to his achievement in transforming the one into the other. This is not so much a homage to Chartier as an assertive, even aggressive, act of appropriation and self-promotion.

In addition, Chartier’s *Curial* undergoes some significant ideological shifts at Gringore’s hands. Chartier, followed by his French translator, addresses his *Curial* to an individual who has ostensibly sought the author’s help to gain access to a court; he draws on what he claims to be his own experience when advising his addressee to renounce this aspiration (pp. 347-49). Hence Chartier’s work is set in a context of personal communication, regardless of its biographical veracity. Gringore’s *Curial*, by contrast, is more impersonal. Until the closing stanzas, which have no basis in Chartier’s work, there is no first-person voice beyond sporadic metadiscursive formulations such as “je prends le cas” [I’ll assume] (fol. b4v). Nor is there a determinate second-person addressee:

---

52 See Armstrong, *The Virtuoso Circle*, pp. 127-28 n. 27, 159, and 167-68.

Gringore’s lessons are directed first towards a plural vous (e.g. fol. b1v), then towards a singular tu (e.g. fol. b2v) whose status is purely generic: “you” means Gringore’s putative readership, not an individual correspondent. The depersonalized quality of Gringore’s Curial is accentuated by the technique of _epiphonema_, which mobilizes common wisdom rather than named _auctoritates_. At the same time, the two authors conceive of court life quite differently. For Chartier it is a form of public service, not simply dependence on princely patronage. Gringore offers a much more conventional satirical image of courts, as essentially venal institutions. There is no precedent in the French Curial, for instance, for his reference to princely largesse:

Aucunefois le prince te veult faire
Presens et dons, pensant à ton affaire,
Quant il te voit en bien morgané (fol. b2v).

[Sometimes the prince will want to give you presents and gifts, when he thinks about your circumstances and sees that you’ve acquired plenty of good qualities.]

Moreover, in the tailpiece of his own invention, Gringore defuses his criticism by assuring his audience that his own experience of court life has been rather different:

Mes familiers et mes loyaulx amys

---

54 Gringore indeed makes fewer references to specific authors than does his source: the references to Juvenal and Cato in the French Curial (p. 363) are absent from the versified text.

Me ont demandé pourquoi je me y suis mis,
Veu que nul ne me y vouloir contraindre.
Je leur réponds que je me y suis transmis
Affin de voir gens en la court commis
Qui sçaivent bien dissimuller et faindre. […]
Je n’ay désir ceste court despri,
Car je me y voy assez favoriser
Et bien traiter par grace liberalle.
Cinq filz de roy ensemble deviser
Je y voy souvent […].
En ceste court outrageux on repugne:
Justice y tient ung siege nompareil (fols. c1r-c2r).

[My loyal friends, and those who are close to me, have asked me why I went there [i.e. to court], as nobody was seeking to force me. My answer is that I went to see people with roles at court who are well-versed in the arts of concealment and deception. […] I don’t wish to denigrate this court, for I’ve enjoyed plenty of favour there and been well treated with affection and generosity. I often see five king’s sons talking together there. […] At this court they abhor people who are too bold, and Justice presides with supreme authority.]

Two things are happening at this point. On the one hand, Gringore is reinscribing the subjectivity that is so strong in his source, but that has been practically absent in his verse thus far. On the other hand, he is divorcing his personal experience from the insights that he has proffered, and thereby
reinforcing the impression that his Curial is a literary exercise in multiplying anti-courtly commonplaces. Gringore has rendered Chartier’s moral discourse both more public and more banal.

Notwithstanding Gringore’s wholesale recasting of the Curial, Jean Bouchet’s Regnars traversant offers the most extensive and complex rhétoriqueur treatment of Chartier’s didactic prose and prosimetrum. First published in an unauthorized edition by Anthoine Vérard, the Regnars combines prose, verse, and woodcut illustrations to condemn contemporary vices through the metaphor of foxes.56 Bouchet’s principal debt to Chartier concerns the Esperance, which provides material on government, ecclesiastical corruption, and divine anger and punishment for seven of the Regnars’ 13 chapters. While retaining Chartier’s oratorical style, which lends a prophetic quality to the moralizing first-person voice of the Regnars, Bouchet thoroughly revises his expression and often develops arguments in particular directions.57 Church institutions, for instance, are not challenged as strongly as in the Esperance: the problems resulting from compulsory celibacy are blamed not on the principle itself (a verdict that Lemaire also adopts in his Traicté, as we have seen), but on morally weak priests.58 Bouchet also draws on the French Curial, for warnings about the deceptive artifice of court life in Chapter 6 of the Regnars.59 His use of the Quadrilogue is less extensive, and has not previously been identified, but involves key metadiscursive passages in each text. Towards the end of

56 See especially Britnell, Jean Bouchet, pp. 81-89; Armstrong, Technique and Technology, pp. 159-74.

57 Britnell, Jean Bouchet, pp. 84-86, discusses Bouchet’s treatment of the Esperance, particularly in Chapter 10 of the Regnars.

58 See Britnell, Jean Bouchet, pp. 157-59.

59 Smith, The Anti-Courtier Trend, pp. 65-68, notes the extent of Bouchet’s borrowings here and in his later Panegyric du Chevalier sans reproche (1527).
Chapter 2, where he explains why he has composed the *Regnars*, Bouchet urges his readers to consider the work as a whole:

En priant ceulx qui liront ce livre, que je nomme *Les Renars du monde*, qu’ilz ne lisent une partie sans l’autre, car ilz trouveront finalement que l’iniquité de tous les estas est reciproque et cause, c’est assavoir l’une du mal de l’autre (fol. a4v).

[And I request those reading this book, which I entitle *The Foxes of the World*, not to read one part without the other, for they will eventually find that the iniquities of each estate are reciprocal; that is, one results from the harm done by another.]

The formulation derives from Chartier’s preface to the *Quadrilogue*: “Si ne vueille aucun lire l’une partie sans l’autre, afin que l’en ne cuide que tout le blasme soit mis sur ung estat” [Nobody should read one part without the other, so as not to think that all the blame is imputed to one estate].

Chapter 6 (fols. b4v-c1v), on the theme of false hope, is a particularly interesting example of Bouchet’s reworking and its implications. Bouchet adopts the fourfold distinction made by Chartier’s personified Esperance between different kinds of false hope: “presumptive” [presumptuous], which involves passive expectation unaccompanied by appropriate action; “defective” [defective], an erroneous faith in evanescent worldly goods and qualities; “opinative” [opinionated], a misplaced confidence in the powers of human reason; and “frustrative” [futile], which relies on unpredictable fortune (pp. 101-32). However, the *Regnars* significantly reorientates

---


the discussion of all four varieties. Its treatment of presumptive hope (fol. b5v) concentrates more upon its material and secular manifestations, such as unearned wealth and indolence, than on theological questions: Bouchet has no use for Esperance’s explanation of the relationship between hope and fear. Opinionated hope (fols. b5v-b6r) is dealt with much more briefly in the Regnars. Bouchet touches only in passing on its relevance to government, to which Chartier had devoted more sustained attention (p. 105), and not at all on Judaism, on which Chartier had expatiated at length (pp. 106-10). Similar selectivity is at work in the account of futile hope (fol. b6r-v): whereas Chartier had discussed pagan idolatry, sacrifices, and heresy (pp. 113-30), Bouchet prefers to reflect on astrology and its negation of free will. Defective hope, by contrast, is expanded in the Regnars (fols. b6v-c1v). Bouchet moves the topic from its second position in Esperance’s typology (pp. 103-04) to the emphatic final position in his own, and adds further comments on secular and material themes: hope in God-given talents such as eloquence, and hope in advancement at court (it is here that he adapts material from the French Curial). He also inserts various historical examples of “la ruîne des bien fortunez” [the downfall of those who had enjoyed good fortune] (fol. c1r), mainly drawn from later in the Esperance (pp. 140-41). This chapter, then, attests to an attentive, systematic rewriting and interweaving of passages from the Esperance, which effectuates a pronounced shift from theology to practical morality.

From Chastelain and Gréban in the 1460s to Gringore in the 1520s and beyond, Chartier is a major influence on the rhétoriqueurs’ understanding of themselves, individually and collectively—and also on their audiences’ understanding, for his work lends itself to recontextualization in similar ways to rhétoriqueur writing. His poetic structures, allegory, and use of prosimetrum serve less as templates to follow than as a body of knowledge, which later poets can assimilate and reshape in line with their aesthetic and ideological priorities and the cultural capital that they seek to acquire. Some of this capital is Chartier’s own, for rhétoriqueurs are apt to trade on his reputation for eloquence and moral
authority; some of it is generated by the rhétoriqueurs themselves, when they ostentatiously rework or depart from their illustrious predecessor’s work. The balance between these forms of capital varies from one rhétoriqueur composition to another.

If Chartier is the père de l’éloquence française, then, his fatherhood can be understood in various senses. It is not solely a matter of genetic filiation, of the patrilineal transmission of themes and techniques. It also involves an inheritance over which the heirs squabble, as they turn it to very varied purposes; and it involves a near-mythical patriarch towards whom later poets adopt different stances, from dutiful reverence to adolescent resentment. Chartier’s legacy to the rhétoriqueurs is substantial, multifaceted, and diversely understood.

Adrian Armstrong