

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Penny Roberts

Article Title: The kingdom's two bodies? Corporeal rhetoric and royal authority during the religious wars

Year of publication: 2007

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/fh/crm002>

Publisher statement: This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in French History following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version Roberts, P. (2007). The kingdom's two bodies? Corporeal rhetoric and royal authority during the religious wars. French History, 21, 2, pp. 147-164. is available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/fh/crm002>.

THE KINGDOM'S TWO BODIES? CORPOREAL RHETORIC AND ROYAL
AUTHORITY DURING THE RELIGIOUS WARS

Penny Roberts*

R.J. Knecht's vivid account of the coronation of Francis I highlights both the elevated status of early modern monarchy and the symbolic understanding of the special relationship between the French king and his kingdom. Most striking are the entwined physical and spiritual aspects of the pinnacle of the ceremony: 'Thrusting his hand through specially contrived openings in the king's tunic and shirt, the archbishop anointed his body with the sacred chrism.'¹ Sixteenth-century monarchs drew extensively on a rich medieval heritage which imbued many aspects of kingship with sacred and mystical traits and, by extension, the status of France itself. To take only the most prominent example, again from Knecht: 'the title of "most Christian" was transformed into an ancient privilege exclusively attached to the French king and his realm'.² The king's association with the lands over which he ruled sustained a rhetoric of duality and dependence which took many forms, but will be explored here specifically in relation to how contemporaries viewed the impact of the religious wars of the sixteenth century upon the kingdom. The ultimate consideration will be the importance of this debate to the maintenance of royal authority during the wars, as this pivotal relationship and the unity it evoked was repeatedly tested and challenged. The identification of king and kingdom would ultimately provide a vital bulwark against the forces which assailed the French monarchy during the Wars of Religion.

I

Ernst Kantorowicz's now fifty-year-old classic exposition of the legal metaphor of the king's two bodies has proved influential (though sometimes controversial) to our

understanding of medieval and early modern kingship.³ Historians have long debated the nature of French royal duality, in particular its relationship with the efficacy of monarchical ritual and ceremonial.⁴ Although some sixteenth-century authors wrote of the distinction between the king's two bodies or persons - the royal dignity and the private individual - they were essentially conceived as a single entity.⁵ Furthermore, Alain Boureau tells us that royal duality was a useful fiction of only aesthetic relevance, a concept developed by writers and artists not a generally accepted fact, the result of the increasing use of corporeal discourse in the period.⁶ There seems little doubt, as Kantorowicz himself outlined, that the French king's dignity was not separate; indeed, the French crown was to become increasingly synonymous with the state. This is indicated by the introduction in the sixteenth century of the bestowal of the ring at the coronation, symbolic of the king's marriage to his kingdom with the domain as its dowry.⁷ Putting a slightly different slant on this relationship by reference to the commonweal or public good, the author of the *Discours sur les bruits contraires à l'observation de l'edict de la pacification* (1565) argued that it was essential to guard against the enemies 'du bien & repos de la chose publique, qui doit estre reveree et respectee comme chere & vraye espouse du Roy en mariage politiq'.⁸ Thus, it can be argued that French royal duality resides here, in the relationship between the monarch and his realm, both the territory and its people. This was a lesson not lost on Henry IV, who declared in the preamble to the Edict of Nantes his hope 'que nous et ce royaume puissions tousjours meriter et conserver le tiltre glorieux de Tres Chrestien qui a esté par tant de merites et dès si longtemps acquis', imploring God to bestow his usual protection and favour on France.⁹ Although Henry maintained that he always put his country before himself - 'toujours on verra mon mal, mes dommages, mes afflictions courir devant celles de ma Patrie' - for Colette

Beaune the sixteenth century saw the subordination of the kingdom to the king, as he was elevated to the status not just of spouse but of father of the nation.¹⁰

This patriarchal relationship meant, however, that when the kingdom was threatened the king was held responsible for its defence, when it was injured he was expected to tend its wounds. From the ancient world to the Renaissance, writers commonly described states in terms of such bodily analogies. Sixteenth-century French authors, commentators and preachers made use of corporeal and medical rhetoric, often drawn from biblical and classical sources, when talking about the association between the monarch and his realm. Familiar, too, is the early modern analogy of the king as head of the body politic and the comparison made between the political order and corporeal harmony, as outlined for instance by royal physician Ambroise Paré in 1575.¹¹ The state was much more than the sum of its parts and all needed to (be allowed to) carry out their function if the equilibrium of the whole was to be maintained. Unsurprisingly, such concerns came particularly to the fore during periods of social and political upheaval. Whilst the king remained the undisputed head, and the people were generally relegated to the limbs or feet, different social groups envisaged their role as respective organs within this bodily hierarchy. The importance of being the eyes of the king or of the state is reflected in the competing claims of the clergy and of jurists.¹² Meanwhile, the nobility asserted its position as the heart of the body politic: 'le corps humain ... (a) deux parties principales, la tête, qui nous represente le Roy, & le coeur qui est la partie noble, desquelles si l'un ou l'autre est blessée, il n'est possible que l'homme puisse plus vivre'.¹³ Thus, when the king supports the nobility, it was argued, 'ilz le deffendent, conservent, & sont toujours les premiers à son secours: comme l'on dit vulgairement, Que le bon sang court toujours à la partie blessée'.¹⁴ Whilst the monarch was assigned the role of

primary importance, he was constantly reminded of his dependence on the other parts for the proper functioning of the state. Conversely, the recklessness of challenging the anointed head's primacy was pointed out to those suspected of sedition.

Like the king, the kingdom had a dual identity: both a physical reality and a symbolic status, though its dualities took many other forms. Equally, there was a clear interdependence between the health of the monarch and that of the realm. To threaten one, might well be to risk the dissolution of the other. Of course, it served royal propaganda well to emphasise this convergence of interest between the well-being of the king and of his kingdom. The realm was, after all, explicitly placed in the king's care at his coronation. However, royal ability to provide an appropriate physic or a lasting cure was significant for the maintenance of the king's authority. Worse still, the king was warned, in choosing the wrong remedy he risked not only the death of the patient but incurring God's wrath to the extent of losing his crown. The implication was also that a bad king threatened to drag his realm to perdition. Honoré Bonet, writing in the fourteenth century, likened war to a medicine which might be prescribed to treat an illness but which could affect both good and bad, just as 'through the defect of a king a kingdom will fall to ruin'.¹⁵ Thus, the state of the kingdom – an ailing body in need of succour - became a metaphor for the state of the monarchy. The separation of the corporeal kingdom from the corporeal monarch was a delicate operation, however. Neither could survive without the other, and this symbiosis worked to the crown's advantage in shoring up its fragile authority. Interestingly, and against expectations perhaps, contemporaries rarely made a direct correlation between the actual bodily health of the king and the state of the kingdom. Therefore, it seems the debate existed largely on a metaphorical, if symbolically-charged, plane.¹⁶

One source of concern about the physical and political well-being of the kingdom was the evident fragility of the body politic. The realm had only recently been brought together under the authority of the crown, and some provinces still remained relatively autonomous and barely absorbed. Alongside this was the geographical and social reality of the impact of civil war: the ruin of the country by marauding troops, the disruption of cultivation and commerce, and the impoverishment of the people through taxation. Indeed, concerns about the health of the kingdom were inevitably bound up with considerations of the well-being of the commonwealth, the people. As Jean Bodin argued, ‘the law says that the people never dies, but that after a lapse of a hundred or even a thousand years it is still the same people ... A commonwealth without sovereign power to unite all its several members, whether families, colleges, or corporate bodies, is not a true commonwealth.’¹⁷ The body politic and the body social therefore represented another form of duality, embodied in the promotion of a renewed role for the estates general which incorporated them both.¹⁸ Furthermore, the association of political stability and economic prosperity with religious unity was characteristic of medieval and early modern thought, influenced by the concept of the so-called *corpus mysticum*, or Christian community, again associated with the estates general in some treatises. The coincidence of religious and civil strife lent the usual corporeal analogies a striking relevance. The language used for the assault on the kingdom was loaded with emotive bodily rhetoric detailing the threat to France and its people. For instance, the nobility declared in its cahier to the king at the Estates General of 1561 that:

We believe the health of our society depends upon one principal point, that is a Reformation, and because the sickness of its limbs causes such alteration commonly to the entire body leading it ultimately to fall into decay and

finally, perdition, it seems necessary to encourage sincerely the preservation of the three column's of your Republic in their purity and splendour, that is our Religion, Justice and Obedience.¹⁹

On the eve of the wars, the need to identify and remedy the ills afflicting the kingdom could not have been more pressing.

II

Despite its conventional nature, the ubiquity of corporeal language in the rhetoric of the crown as well as the spokesmen on either side of the confessional divide during the religious wars is remarkable. The wars cleft the body politic and the body social as well as the *corpus mysticum*. The combined threat from heresy and civil war granted the usual pronouncements a peculiar resonance and a particular urgency. France was personified as a body assailed by injury, infection and corruption; authors referred to the need to purge the bad humours afflicting the realm. Historians have even argued that the conflicts of the wars were fought out within the actual bodies of celebrated possession cases, such as Nicole Orbry in Laon in 1560s and Marthe Brossier under Henry IV.²⁰ Disagreements as to the cause of the kingdom's malady, and its diagnosis, inevitably led to differing conclusions regarding the most appropriate treatment. This could be divided along confessional lines, but was also subsumed into a wider debate regarding the desirability of peace or toleration versus religious unity, the preservation of the integrity of the body versus the amputation of its diseased members, and even medical debates regarding the superiority of empirical over theoretical authority. Whilst on the one hand, the troubles were believed to be a divine punishment for sin - though how best to appease this divine wrath was contested – the French kingdom was also said to be peculiarly favoured by divine protection, so that its cure was inevitable. There was also universal consensus that it

was up to the king, as God's representative, to enact His will in this regard, though again divine intention was hotly disputed.

Like physicians squabbling over the correct diagnosis and therefore best cure for their patient's condition, all could agree on the desirability of religious unity and a lasting peace, but not on the means to achieve them. The Huguenots were frequently accused of infecting the body politic with heresy and bringing about its destruction through civil war. However, by the last stage of the wars, it was the Catholic League that was most readily portrayed as responsible for the disunity of the kingdom, as depicted in an illustration to the politique *Satyre Ménippée* of 1593, where the dismembered body could be understood as symbolising either the king or the realm and is perhaps deliberately (or naturally) ambiguous.²¹ Earlier, this duality had posed a problem for the monarchomachs set on proving the divisibility of the king and his state justified by tyranny and prevarication. Its most vehement restatement, as a number of historians have pointed out, emerged under Henry IV, as in Guillaume Blaignan's *Pourtraict du très-chrestien et très-victorieux Henri IIII* of 1604, with its emphasis on the mystical and metaphorical nature of the king's body.²² This contrasts with the extraordinary bodily depictions of Henry III as an hermaphrodite or diabolical monster produced by the League-controlled Paris presses, as well as the piercing of his body at his assassination by Jean Clément in 1589.²³ The symbolism of hermaphroditism, in particular, became an effective tool for denigrating the ambiguous sexuality displayed at the French court; rulers with disorderly bodies, it was argued, promoted a disorderly society.²⁴

Part of that disorder was the existence, and royal acceptance, of another religion in France. It was opponents of the French Reform in particular who made fiercest use of the traditional analogies of infection and corruption to attack the other

faith. They repeatedly referred to the Protestant heresy as a disease, a plague, a venom, an illness, a poison, a cancer, an affliction which could not be cured unless religious unity was restored.²⁵ This was especially true of Catholic preachers. In the words of Jean Boucher, heresy was ‘this contagion that stinks everywhere, this canker that invades everything, this gangrene that devours all, this leprosy that infects everything’, whilst Maurice Hylaret stated that heresy like ‘cancer or gangrene slides and crawls, and penetrates in order to seduce its hearers, whom it charms, bewitches and enchants’.²⁶ It was a metaphor appropriate not only to the rhetoric of preachers, but just as vehemently to the appeal of the Catholic inhabitants of Mâcon to the crown in opposition to the Edict of Longjumeau of 1568. They insisted that ‘ceste peste ne soit remise en la ville de Mascon ny au pais en consideration que c’est l’une des villes qui a plus souffert par la turbulence de ces nouveulx religieux, et en laquelle on a le plus congneu a quoy tend leur venin’.²⁷ Even when such language was not used, the favoured verb with regard to the spread of heresy was ‘pulluler’: to swarm, to proliferate, to teem, to pullulate, like some kind of infestation. Wounds and other physical injuries sustained also feature in this discourse and, of course, could be equally deadly in their impact. Likewise, for less vehement opponents of the Reform, and even for the Protestants themselves, similar language echoed through their descriptions of the effect of the civil strife on their country. The word ‘troubles’, though relatively neutral, in medical parlance refers to inner distress, turmoil, disorder, similarly with the word ‘crise’. Like heresy, civil war was likened to a ‘plague’ and an ‘illness’, but this time peace was the remedy.²⁸ The use of such terms in close proximity with the stated need for the realm to be ‘purged’ increases the likelihood that authors were well aware of this duality of meaning and that both sides manipulated it in the debate over whether war or peace with their opponents should be

pursued. Plague was a vivid, frightening and ever present danger for everyone in this period, its rapid and random spread making it an effective metaphor which stirred up anxiety. Conversely, whilst Catholics condemned the disease of heresy, Protestants equated their persecution with 'la peste' and a 'grande playe', alongside that 'horrible peste de guerre civile'.²⁹ Furthermore, those who opposed the establishment of peace under the terms of the edicts of pacification were said to be attempting 'cacher la puanteur de la playe decouverte' which would prove detrimental for both the king and for France.³⁰

The invasive metaphor of disease for the spread of the Reform was the most telling and effective, however, and thus Protestant declarations failed to match the vehemence of Catholic rhetoric on this issue. Barbara Diefendorf demonstrates this in her examination of the use of corporeal metaphors to justify the elimination of heresy in the sermons of Simon Vigor. His opinions are typical of Catholic preachers during the religious wars, who argued that heresy threatened not just individual salvation but the entire social order and punishment for its toleration would be collective. In particular, they maintained, the casting out of 'the putrid infection of heresy' was the king's responsibility, reinforced by heresy's link with sedition.³¹ Amputation was a favoured treatment if the realm was to be cured; thus argued René Benoist in a treatise dedicated to Charles IX, written in August 1562 but republished at the time of the third war (1568-70), which concluded that the king 'need not fear "to remove and destroy the corrupt elements (*humeurs*) in order to cure the body of [his] kingdom". Heresy is a "pernicious and contagious cancer" for which there is no remedy but the knife.'³² Similarly, Christopher Elwood has demonstrated how the Reformers' attack on the real presence in the Eucharist, and therefore the tearing asunder of Christ's mystical body, became symbolic of their general rejection of hierarchy and authority

and propensity to disobedience and rebellion against the body social and the body politic.³³ ‘Catholic writers like Gentian Hervet warning of a diabolical plot to dismember the social body had good reason to feel the French nation imperiled’ by the presence of the Huguenots.³⁴ In 1561, the Venetian ambassador Suriano commented that in France, due to the Huguenot challenge, ‘nature is turned upside down; where the head was wont to rule the members, the members now rule the head’.³⁵ Vigor predicted in 1570 that the Huguenots would not rest until they had ruined the kingdom, so they had to be destroyed first, justifying, indeed necessitating, war. Finally, in a direct challenge to royal authority and to the preferred policy of pacification, he asserted that only God had the right to pardon heretics, and if the king did so he would risk forfeiting his kingdom.

However, it was not just preachers like Vigor who proclaimed that war was necessary to restore peace by annihilating the Huguenot rebels. This argument was very much to the fore in the royal clerk, Jean du Tillet’s, *Esript touchant la paix des secondz troubles* of 1568.³⁶ Once again divine preference for the restoration of religious unity justified such a course of action. Quoting the prophet Jeremiah, du Tillet noted, ‘nous avons attendu la guerison de nostre mal et voicy troubles!’ He blamed the Protestant enemies of the realm ‘quj entretiennent la maladie’ and asserted that the proposed remedies ‘ne sont Remedes de guerison’.³⁷ Neutrality was not an option: the king must require his subjects to be joined to the monarchy like the body’s members to its head, as neither could survive without the other. He concluded that, ‘La medicine du mal present avec le tempz deviendra poison mortel’.³⁸ Du Tillet is also believed to have had a hand in the 1562 remonstrance of the parlement of Paris against the Edict of January, with its reference to avoiding the spread of contagion and disease, because of its similarity to a tract he wrote in that year in

which he called for an immediate remedy ‘before the evil becomes incurable and ruinous’.³⁹ Despite these examples, du Tillet’s editor, Elizabeth Brown, maintains that he makes far less use of corporeal rhetoric than most of his contemporaries, notably the author of the *Advertissement à la noblesse tant du party du Roy, que des rebelles & conjurez* which is often attributed to him. Here the wars were blamed on ‘une grande superfluité de mauvaises humeurs, qui auroyent peu à peu disposé le corps de cest estat à recevoir & endurer le changement & alteration, dont depuis il a esté, & est encores maintenant si griesvement travaillé & affligé en tous ses membres’.⁴⁰ Interestingly, the 1562 remonstrance of the Paris parlement echoed this concern, in a thinly veiled reference to the English stating that, ‘Le peuple François est d’autre nature et humeur, que plusieurs nations, que l’on a veu changer, et rechanger leur religion en un moment’.⁴¹ Therefore, the humoral makeup of the kingdom made religious change antithetical to Frenchness. Similarly, the declaration of the League at Péronne in 1585 described France ‘for twenty four years tormented with the plague of rebellion’ (note here the use of this more neutral political term rather than heresy), and the estates general as an ‘ancient remedy for domestic wounds’, whilst good and loyal Catholic subjects represented ‘the better and sounder part of this kingdom’.⁴²

III

Charlotte Wells has demonstrated how the leech or blood-sucking parasite metaphor was used in the propaganda of both sides to emphasise the danger posed by their opponents to the health of the nation.⁴³ This time Catholic bodily rhetoric was matched by Huguenot pronouncements on the harm posed by Catholic extremism. In a letter of 1568, the Cardinal de Châtillon referred to the necessity of observing the recent peace edict ‘in this poor kingdom already drowned in blood, cruelty, affliction

and deformity', for the hearts of certain Catholics around the king 'were so poisoned with hatred for the good and repose of the kingdom'.⁴⁴ Others suggested how the divisions might be overcome and the unity of the kingdom preserved. Admiral Coligny's memorandum of the summer of 1572, reflecting on the possibility of invading the Netherlands, is saturated with medical imagery, with God as the practitioner:

Sire, though the conflicting humours of the French and the long relapses of this old malady caused by differences over religion could but indicate the likely ruin of your state or at least the partial loss of its territory and strength, nevertheless God, the only physician who in this desperate illness can provide a remedy, does Your Majesty the grace to see it cured, refreshed and on its feet again [note à la Vigor Coligny's stress on divine responsibility, of which the king was merely an instrument]. It remains to preserve it from a relapse and maintain it in health by all means possible. For this, there is nothing more suitable than timely exercise ... This is to undertake a foreign war in order to maintain peace at home ...⁴⁵

The promotion of internal peace as the best means to remedy the bodily discord of France was a common theme. In his speech to the Estates General in 1576, Henry III asserted that 'une bonne paix ... (est) le remede seul & unicque, pour conserver le salut de cet estat'.⁴⁶ Geoffroy Camus de Pontcarré, commissioner for the enforcement of the Edict of Nantes, recalled that the pacification was 'Ce remède (qui) délivre d'une grande fièvre le corps de cet Etat. Cet antidote (qui) le préserve de très pernicieuse pestes, de factions et de rebellions qui autrement seraient inevitables aux humeurs qu'il y a encore dans ce royaume'.⁴⁷ A stark warning to all of the danger of continuing the civil war is contained in the treatise, *Francogallia*. Here the

internecine violence is described as an attack on the bodies of all Frenchmen and on the state, ‘even as our own bodies decay (whether by external blows and shocks, or by the inward corruption of humours, or by old age), so, too, do commonwealths perish, some by hostile attack, some by internal dissension, and some by senescence’.⁴⁸

Many contemporary treatises made use of the language of ‘mal’ and ‘remède’ in their exploration of how best to secure peace.⁴⁹ The *Exhortation aux princes et seigneurs du conseil privé du roy*, even prior to the wars, rejected discussion of the merits of either religion in the hope that it would ‘apporter remede à la maladie’ for ‘au contraire, c’est un r’engrement de playe’.⁵⁰ In exasperation, the author of the *Discours sur la pacification des troubles de l’an 1567* remarked that, ‘A la verité nous sommes bien malades: puisque ny la guerre ny la paix ne nous est propre, & que nous ne pouvons porter ny le mal ny le remede’.⁵¹ Conversely, *La Manière d’appaier les troubles qui sont maintenant en France & pourront estre ci-apres*, recommended that ‘il faut ensuivre les bons medecins, qui advisent soigneusement les causes des maladies, puis y appliquent les remedes convenables’, but that they had an advantage in already knowing the cause of the illness unlike the doctors who sometimes kill their poor patients by a mistaken diagnosis and treatment.⁵² Common opinion upheld this sceptical view of the medical profession: ‘& comme vulgairement est dict, la multitude des medecins, tue plus-tost que ne guerist le mallade’.⁵³ Nevertheless, both God and king could play the metaphorical role of the good physician. In the *Remontrance aux Etats pour la paix* of 1576, Duplessis-Mornay praised God that ‘après tant de maladies et de rechutes l’une sur l’autre, qui selon toute raison devaient mettre ce pauvre royaume en terre’ it had been granted some respite. In particular, the king was seeking a cure:

autant digne de sa grandeur, que grand est le mal qui l’afflige ... Mais comme

en vain le médecin ordonne, et pour néant se font les consultations, si le patient veut faire des excès à sa tête, au lieu d'aider lui même à se guérir: En vain aussi notre Roi a-t-il ordonné la paix, et convoqué les Etats, qui sont les deux remèdes propres, l'un pour étancher le sang, et l'autre pour consolider la plaie ...

Unless they embrace peace, 'toutes les ordonnances des Etats, et toutes les recettes, et régimes, qu'on nous saurait prescrire' would yield nothing, emphasising once again the ideal role for the estates general.⁵⁴ Medical analogies were well-suited to the imagery of healing and division conjured up by the devastating impact of civil strife, and the king's duty to his people was like the duty of the doctor towards his patient and the duty of a father to his child:

Vray est qu'il faut retrancher le member pourri, quand il n'y a plus d'esperance de guerison: mais tandis qu'il y a tant soit peu de lumiere d'amendement, le Medecin seroit meurtrier, si laissant les remedes propres, il usoit des extremes. Il faut donc premierement enquerir si le mal des sugets est incurable, pour user des remedes selon le besoin: autrement ce seroit comme qui enterreroit vif son enfant malade, sans essayer le moyen de le guerir.⁵⁵

Perhaps unsurprisingly, medical practitioners made use of similar corporeal analogies in describing the state of the nation during the wars. Jacob Soll has recently pointed out that 'at the close of the religious wars, royal doctors shared this vision of a wounded, unbalanced body politic', that they not only administered to the king's person but suggested ways in which he could treat and regulate his kingdom.⁵⁶ Soll attributes this trend to the convergence of the religious wars and the rise of empirical medicine. The royal doctors believed that the study of nature would aid governance and heal the body politic ravaged by the potentially mortal wounds of war. Rodolphe

Le Maistre, physician to Henry IV and his family, emphasised in his *La Santé du Prince* of 1614, the importance of observation and proper diagnosis.⁵⁷ Soll argues that the revolution in anatomical medicine encouraged medical men to use their professional judgement as the basis for giving political advice. But this emphasis on experience over theory also appears in the parlance of the layman. Du Tillet's son in 1590, in the dedication of one of his father's unpublished works, notes his surprise that, 'the doctors who were in charge of curing the illness did not make use of the same treatments' drawn from experience which his father had recommended.⁵⁸

Princes were commonly portrayed in the guise of physicians to the state, but in France it was not forgotten that the king also possessed powers more profound than those represented by a simple medical cure, the spiritual touch of a healer. Thus, it became a commonplace for theorists to argue that the king's traditional thaumaturgical powers, themselves associated with royal clemency, could be extended to the healing of divisions within the kingdom.⁵⁹ It is argued for the twelfth century that the sacrality of the French king was taken far more seriously than in the English case precisely because the state was more politically fragmented and lords in their disparate territories wanted to assert their own authority and so sought to bolster that of the king.⁶⁰ Adopting the healing metaphor, Charles IX urged in 1571 that 'par le benefice de la paix, je peux guarir et ressouder les playes faites par l'injure des troubles'.⁶¹ In 1576, Henry III declared his intention 'donner remede aux maux, dont tout le corps de cest estat est tellement ulceré, qu'il n'a membre sain ny entier' and 'repurger les mauvaises humeurs de ce Royaume, pour le remettre en sa bonne santé, vigueur & disposition ancienne' through a lasting peace.⁶² Just as peace was the cure for the kingdom's ills so it was the duty of the monarch to resolve conflict within his lands.⁶³ In 1561, Jacques de Silly, sieur de Rochefort, proclaimed to the king that,

‘fortifierons ce corps de France, & la verrons plus que jamais florissante, pourveu que par votre reiglement vous nous ostés les causes des seditions ... La paix & le repos publicq ... sont les nerfs du Prince’.⁶⁴ The anonymous *Apologie de la Paix* of 1585 likewise asserted, in a oft-used bodily metaphor, that ‘la paix est le vray ciment, pour joindre et affermir par ensemble les membres de la République avec le chef, pour construire le corps Politique’.⁶⁵

IV

Crown officials, upholding the royal policy of pacification, made extensive use of corporeal analogies and again gave particular emphasis to the role of the king as doctor who could cure the illness of civil strife. In 1573, Pomponne de Bellièvre, minister of finance, stated that the realm was ‘un corps bien malade et abbattu’; ‘le médecin a réduit la maladie’, but the patient ‘ne s’est peu guéri tout à coup’ and needed further treatment and convalescence. Paul de Foix, clerical parlementaire and royal commissioner, remarked before the Protestant delegates gathered at Nérac in 1579 that ‘le bon médecin n’ordonne point selon le gout et pour plaire au malade, mais plutôt ce qu’il cognoist lui estre nécessaire pour sa santé’; the king and the queen mother were the doctors and the Protestants were the patients, for whom restrictions were prescribed for their own good.⁶⁶ More controversial was the application of medicines in the form of royal fiscal exactions to fund the war, as Estienne Pasquier wrote: ‘Medecines, que quelques-uns n’estiment pas de moins dangereux effect, que la maladie qu’on veut guerir.’⁶⁷

It is evident that corporeal rhetoric and bodily metaphor became a mainstay for those who promoted the cause of peace. Mark Greengrass describes the lawyer Antoine de Loisel, as a ‘médecin manqué’, in his galenic characterisation of the badly regulated humours in the body politic which had resulted in an illness that was

complex and difficult to treat.⁶⁸ As we have seen, this was a commonplace humanist analogy. Loisel considered that a strong remedy, such as purgation or bleeding, especially if applied by the state, might not aid a cure but rather give free rein to private vendetta. Rather he advocated a mild treatment in the interests of the general good, promoting the royal policy of *oubliance* (literally the forgetting of past crimes) which, he argued, would reunite the people in the recognition that they were all subjects of the same king. Thus, an amnesty for offences committed on both sides was advocated, otherwise it would be ‘aigrir & augmenter le mal & renouveler les playes, et au contraire l’estat qui pratique ce remede, se remet peu à peu, & à la parfin se retrouve en son premier estat’.⁶⁹ The Huguenot commander, François de La Noue, echoed this opinion stating that, although it was sometimes justified, war risked being ‘une remede très violent et extraordinaire, lequel en guarissant une playe en refait d’autres’.⁷⁰ Similarly, in his *Congratulation de la Paix* of 1570, Estienne Pasquier remarked that Christianity is not advanced by the sword and the bad medicine of a general bloodletting: ‘il y fault toute autre medecine’.⁷¹ He carried this analogy further:

Vous avez veu qu’ainsi comme la main prudente
 De l’expert medecin parfois la veine esvente,
 Tirant tantost de l’un, tantost de l’autre flanc,
 Le bon, pour espuser aussi le mauvais sang,
 Mais qui à tous propos, comme d’une fontaine
 Vouldroit du patient evacuer la veine,
 Ce seroit l’affoiblir de tant, qu’à la parfin
 En le voulant guerir on luy donroit sa fin.⁷²

To ruin the Protestants would be to ruin the kingdom, for ‘Quand il y ha quelque member pourry au corps humain, il le faut desmembrer de bonne heure avant que son mal croisse, & nuise davantage’.⁷³ Huguenots upheld the view that an attack on them would damage both the bodies politic and social to no-one’s benefit. In his letters to the king in 1585, trying to avert disaster for his coreligionists in the face of League insistence on the suspension of the edicts of pacification, Philippe Duplessis-Mornay pleaded:

Les remedes, Sire, doivent avoir une analogie & une proportion avec les maux et les maladies. La force de sa nature gagne sur les corps, le son sur l’aureille, la raison sur l’ame. Appliquez la force sur les ames, elle ne peut faire aucun effect, aussi peu que la raison sur l’aureille, & le son sur la masse du corps. C’est donc un moyen, non de reunir l’Eglise, mais de ruiner l’Estat de ce Royaume: non d’attirer & convertir, mais de subvertir & destruire. Et comme rien au monde ne peut faire mal qu’il n’en souffre sa part, la ruine d’un parti couste celle de l’autre: la ruine & extermination de ceux de la Religion ... est la confusion & desolation de tout l’Estat.⁷⁴

As an integral part of the state, for the king to reject the Huguenots was to assault himself, it was a form of self-harm which would leave the kingdom desolate. Yet at other times, and in other circumstances, it was the actions and rhetoric of the Huguenots which appeared most to threaten the unity of the body politic.

A striking contemporary assertion of the two bodies metaphor involves not the duality of the king’s person but of the realm due to its division into confessional groups. The coincidence of the French term ‘corps’ in distinguishing such interests is crucial here. In the spring of 1578, Jean de Monluc, bishop of Valence and royal commissioner for the promotion of the Peace of Bergerac, made a speech before the

assembled estates of Languedoc at Béziers. Aside from the usual references to peace as ‘le remede’ and continuing hostilities as ‘la maladie ... contagieuse’ and ‘le mal ... incurable’, Monluc expressed his displeasure that the Protestants referred to themselves as ‘ung corps’.⁷⁵ He continued: ‘Si les reformez font ung corps & les catholicques ung autre, si le Roy est chef des deux partiz ce sera ung chef monstrueux’.⁷⁶ The idea of two separate bodies conjoined to the same head was not just monstrous, but shattered the corporeal unity of the kingdom to which all its parts and members were supposed to contribute. It provided a graphic reminder of the danger which religious division posed to the harmonious relationship between king, kingdom and people. It elevated the importance of retaining the essential unity which was to the benefit of all and which none should be allowed to threaten through religious or political schism, a favourite theme of neo-stoicists such as Michel de Montaigne in the 1570s and 1580s.⁷⁷ It was an understanding that not just Monluc, but Duplessis Mornay, Pasquier and others exploited in presenting the case for the maintenance of religious coexistence and confessional peace.

Whereas good kingship sought peace, in contrast, tyranny was said to be perpetuated through bloodshed. In particular, the crown’s policy of conciliation through the edicts of pacification was upheld as a mild but ultimately effective medicine. In view of its ready association with the restoration of the kingdom’s health, it is unsurprising that the preambles of the edicts allude to such analogies. That of the Edict of January 1562 refers to the remedies that the king’s predecessors had tried, which were rigorous but gentle, ‘selon leur accoustumée et naturelle benignité et clemence’.⁷⁸ Likewise, the 1563 Edict of Amboise stated that war had led:

à la diminution et dommage de nostre royaume, et ... tel remede n’y estre

propre ny convenable, estant la maladie cachée dedans les entrailles et espritz de nostre peuple, avons estimé que le meilleur et plus utile que y pouvions appliquer estoit, comme prince tres chrestien, dont nous portons le nom, avoir recours à l'infinie grace et bonté de Nostre Seigneur et, avecques son bon ayde, trouver moien de pacifier par nostre douceur l'aigreur de ceste maladie (for the sake of the) bien, salut et conservation de cestuy nostre royaume ...⁷⁹

The Edict of Nantes of 1598 concurred regarding the damaging effects of war and the need for a gentle cure, referring to 'les maux particuliers des plus saynes parties de l'Estat, que nous estimions pouvoir bien plus aysement guerir après en avoir osté la cause principale, qui estoit en la continuation de la guerre civile'.⁸⁰

V

The metaphor of the body had multiple applications which could be both inclusive, incorporating all social and confessional groups, and exclusive, rejecting those who endangered the state through religious or political difference. At the centre of the discussion was the king as undisputed head of the body politic and *corpus mysticum*, but the obligation imposed by this role was perceived from opposing standpoints. On the one hand, the debate over whether peace was the most appropriate physic for the confessionally-divided and war-torn kingdom bolstered the favoured royal policy of toleration which was central to the crown's attempts to bring a resolution to the conflict. However, it also provided powerful arguments for those who favoured a more radical treatment in order to eradicate those whose presence they believed threatened the physical and spiritual health of France. The duality of the relationship between the king and his kingdom, and the monarch's role as protector, provider and physician for the realm, allowed for both opinions to coexist. Yet, although the

metaphor of disease was powerful, the duty of the doctor to seek a cure for his patient ultimately proved more effective. Thus, despite the challenges it faced, the crown was able to withstand the pressures on, and threats to, its authority, however unpalatable the medicine it prescribed for the kingdom's ills. Duality may have been a fiction, but the language and imagery of corporeal rhetoric had their own power to influence both the acceptance of, and the challenge to, royal authority within a multiple discourse regarding how best to maintain the kingdom's future well-being. The identification of the king with his kingdom ensured that, however battered the sacred aspects of monarchy during the religious wars, the relationship was too important to shatter the survival and corporeal unity of France.

* Penny Roberts is Associate Professor in History at the University of Warwick.

¹ R.J. Knecht, *Renaissance warrior and patron: the reign of Francis I* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 46. More generally on the coronation ceremony, see R.A. Jackson, *Vive le Roi! A history of the French coronation from Charles V to Charles X* (Chapel Hill, 1984).

² Knecht, *Renaissance warrior and patron*, p. 88; on the historical development of this relationship, see C. Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France* (1985), ch. 6.

³ E.H. Kantorowicz, *The king's two bodies. A study in medieval political theology* (Princeton, 1957).

⁴ Notably a student of Kantorowicz, R. Giesey, *The royal funeral ceremony in Renaissance France* (Geneva, 1960), and Giesey's students, S. Hanley, *The lit de justice of the kings of France: constitutional ideology in legend, ritual and discourse* (Princeton, 1983), Jackson, *Vive le Roi!*, and L.M. Bryant, *The king and the city in the Parisian royal entry ceremony: politics, ritual and art in the Renaissance* (Geneva, 1986).

⁵ D. Potter, *A history of France, 1460-1560: the emergence of a nation state* (1995), p. 31.

⁶ A. Boureau, *Le simple corps du roi. L'impossible sacralité des souverains français, XVe-XVIIIe siècle* (1988), pp. 19-23, and on corporeal discourse, pp. 45-63.

⁷ R. Descimon, 'Les fonctions de la métaphore du mariage politique du roi et de la république en France, XVe-XVIIIe siècle', *Annales*, 47 (1992), 1127-47.

⁸ '... of the welfare and repose of the commonweal, which must be revered and respected as the King's dear and true spouse in political marriage', in *Mémoires de Condé ou Recueil pour servir à l'histoire de France; contenant ce qui s'est passé de*

plus memorable dans ce royaume, sous les règnes de Francois II & de Charles IX, 6 vols. (Amsterdam, 1740), vi, p. 564.

⁹ ‘... that we and this realm may always deserve and retain the glorious title of Most Christian which has been so much merited and long ago acquired’, in

<http://elec.enc.sorbonne.fr/editsdepacification/edit12.php>. On the use of this

commonplace since the thirteenth century, see Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France*, pp. 283-313.

¹⁰ ‘... my misfortune, my injuries, my afflictions will occur before those of my country’, from ‘Lettre du roi de Navarre aux trois etats (4 mars 1589)’, printed in A. Stegmann, *Les édits des guerres de religion* (1979), p. 219. Beaune, *Naissance de la nation France*, pp. 424-9; the epithet ‘père du peuple’ was particularly associated with Louis XII, see L. Avezou, ‘Louis XII père du peuple: grandeur et décadence d’un mythe politique du XVIe au XIXe siècle’, *Revue historique*, 308 (2003), 95-125.

¹¹ A-M. Brenot, ‘Le corps pour royaume. Un langage politique de la fin du XVIe siècle et début du XVIIe’, *Histoire économie et société*, 10 (1991), 442.

¹² On the clergy as the eyes, see J. Krynen, *L’empire du roi. Idées et croyances politiques en France XIIIe-XVe siècle* (1993), p. 246; J. Parsons, *The church in the republic: gallicanism and political ideology in Renaissance France* (Washington, 2004), pp. 249-50, and on jurists, p. 60.

¹³ ‘... the human body ... (has) two principal parts, the head, which represents to us the king, and the heart which is the noble part, which if one or other is injured, it is no longer possible for the man to live’, in J. de Silly, seigneur de Rochefort, *La harangue de par la noblesse de toute la France, au roy tres-chrestien Charles neufiesme* (Lyon, 1561), p. 12.

¹⁴ ‘... they defend and preserve him, and are always the first to assist him: as is commonly said, the good blood always flows to the injured part’, in Silly, *Harangue de par la noblesse*, p. 13.

¹⁵ G.W. Coopland (ed.), *The Tree of battles by Honoré Bonet* (Liverpool, 1949), p. 125.

¹⁶ Although there was plenty of opportunity to make such a correlation in view of the sickliness of both Charles IX and Henry III. On the latter’s poor health see D. Potter, ‘Kingship in the wars of religion: the reputation of Henri III of France’, *European History Quarterly*, 25 (1995), 493. The sterility of the late Valois also caused comment, but not in direct relation to the state of their realm.

¹⁷ J. Bodin, *Les six livres de la République* (1576), Bk 1, ch. 2 (quotation from the translation by M.J. Tooley (ed.), *Six books of the commonwealth* (Oxford, 1967), p. 7). I am indebted to Mack Holt for this reference.

¹⁸ For a fuller discussion of this point, see P. Roberts, ‘The myth and reality of consultative monarchy: the Estates-General and the “père du peuple”, 1560-1614’, in M. De Waele (ed.), *Lendemain de guerre civile: la France sous Henri IV* (Québec, forthcoming).

¹⁹ Quoted and translated in M.C. Armstrong, *The politics of piety: Franciscan preachers during the wars of religion, 1560-1600* (Rochester, N.Y., 2004), p. 192, and the original French in n. 25.

²⁰ On Nicole Orbry in Laon, see D. Crouzet, ‘A woman and the devil: possession and exorcism in sixteenth-century France’, in M. Wolfe (ed.), *Changing identities in early modern France* (1997), pp. 191-215; on Marthe Brossier, see A. Walker and E. Dickerman, ‘“A woman under the influence”: a case study of alleged possession in sixteenth-century France’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22 (1991), 535-54.

-
- ²¹ Brenot, 'Le corps pour royaume', 445-9.
- ²² Brenot, 'Le corps pour royaume', 451-61. See also A. Finley-Croswhite, 'Henry IV and the diseased body politic', in M. Gosman et al (eds), *Princes and princely culture, 1450-1650* (Leiden, 2003), pp. 131-46.
- ²³ See the reproduction of these depictions in K. Cameron, *Henry III: a maligned or malignant king?* (Exeter, 1978).
- ²⁴ On this point, see K.P. Long, *Hermaphrodites in Renaissance Europe* (Aldershot, 2006), esp. pp. 189-213; also M. Wintroub, 'Words, deeds, and a womanly king', *French Historical Studies*, 28 (2005), 387-413.
- ²⁵ A-M. Brenot, 'La peste soit des huguenots. Etude d'une logique d'exécration au XVIe siècle', *Histoire, économie et société*, 11 (1992), 553-70.
- ²⁶ Boucher quoted and translated in Finley-Croswhite, 'Henry IV and the diseased body politic', p. 134, and the original French in n. 12; Hylaret quoted and translated in Armstrong, *The politics of piety*, p. 238, and the original French in n. 27.
- ²⁷ 'this plague must not be restored to the town of Mâcon nor its region because it is one of the towns which has most suffered from the disturbances caused by these new religious, and in which it is best known where their venom leads', in AD Saône et Loire: AC, GG 122, no. 30, fol. 2.
- ²⁸ See, for example, *Mémoires de Condé*, ii, ps; v, pp. 118-30, 141-51.
- ²⁹ Quotations from *Mémoires de Condé*, i, p. 2; vi, p. 577; ii, ps.
- ³⁰ '... to hide the stench of the uncovered wound', in 'Discours sur les bruits contraires à l'observation de l'edict de la pacification, 1565', in *Mémoires de Condé*, vi, p. 575.
- ³¹ B. Diefendorf, *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 153-7, quotation p. 153.

³² Ibid., pp. 151-2, quotation p. 152.

³³ C. Elwood, *The body broken: the Calvinist doctrine of the Eucharist and the symbolization of power in sixteenth-century France* (New York and Oxford, 1999), esp. pp. 137-65.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 112.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 164.

³⁶ E.A.R. Brown (ed.), *Jean du Tillet and the French wars of religion: five tracts, 1562-1569* (Binghamton, New York, 1994), pp. 144-63.

³⁷ ‘... we waited for the time of healing, and behold trouble!’ (Jeremiah, 14: 19); ‘... who prolong the illness’, ‘... are not cures’, in *ibid.*, pp. 154, 156-7.

³⁸ ‘The medicine for the present sickness with time will become mortal poison’, in *ibid.*, p. 163.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 22.

⁴⁰ ‘... a great superfluity of bad humours, which have little by little disposed the body of this state to receive and endure change and alteration, from which ever since it has been, and is now still, so grievously tormented and afflicted in all its members’, in *ibid.*, pp. 57-60.

⁴¹ ‘The French people are of a different nature and humour than several nations that have changed, and changed their religion again in a moment’, in *ibid.*, p. 58 n. 135.

⁴² ‘Declaration of the League, Péronne, 31 March 1585’, quoted in D. Potter (ed.), *The French wars of religion: selected documents* (1997), pp. 190-1.

⁴³ C. Wells, ‘Leeches on the body politic: xenophobia and witchcraft in early modern French political thought’, *French Historical Studies*, 22 (1999), 351-77.

⁴⁴ ‘Cardinal de Châtillon’s treatise on the renewal of the wars’, quoted in Potter (ed.), *The French wars of religion*, p. 107.

⁴⁵ ‘Coligny’s memorandum on war’, quoted in Potter (ed.), *The French wars of religion*, p. 134.

⁴⁶ ‘a good peace ... (is) the only and unique remedy for preserving the safety of this state’, in *Harengue du roy nostre sire, faicte en l’assemblee des estatz* (Lyon, 1576), p. 10.

⁴⁷ ‘This remedy (which) delivers the body of this state from a great fever. This antidote (which) preserves it from the pernicious plagues of faction and rebellion which otherwise would be inevitable among the humours which persist in this realm’, in M. Greengrass, ‘Amnistie et oubliance: un discours politique autour des édits de pacification pendant les guerres de Religion’, in P. Mironneau and I. Pébay-Clottes (eds), *Paix des armes, paix des âmes* (2000), p. 118.

⁴⁸ Quoted in J. Soll, ‘Healing the body politic: French royal doctors, history, and the birth of a nation 1560-1634’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 55 (2002), 1260.

⁴⁹ For example, *Brief discours sur l’estat present, et des moyens pour remedier aux troubles qu’on peut craindre ci apres*, and *Brief discours de l’occasion des troubles et dissensions du jourd’huy au fait de la religion, et moyen d’obvier*, both in *Mémoires de Condé*, v, pp. 118-51.

⁵⁰ ‘... remedy the illness’ for ‘on the contrary, it is a reopening of the wound’, in *Exhortation aux princes et seigneurs du conseil privé du roy, pour obvier aux seditions qui occultement semblent nous menacer pour le fait de la religion* (1561), p. 4.

⁵¹ ‘In truth we are very ill: since neither war nor peace are ours, and we can bring neither illness nor cure’, in *Discours sur la pacification des troubles de l’an 1567. Contenant les causes & raisons necessaires du traitté de la paix, avec le moyen de reconcilier les deux parties ensemble, & les tenir en perpetuelle concorde: composé*

par un grand personage, vray suget & fidele serviteur de la couronne Françoise

(Antwerp, 1568), D.

⁵² ‘... we should follow good doctors, who carefully work out the causes of the illnesses, then apply suitable remedies to them’, in *Mémoires de Condé*, i, pp. 342-3; interestingly, ‘La Manière’ is a common opening for the title of French medical treatises.

⁵³ ‘... and as is commonly said, the vast majority of doctors kill rather than cure the sick’, in Silly, *Harangue de par la noblesse*, pp. 22-3.

⁵⁴ ‘... after so many illnesses and relapses one after another, which should reasonably have killed this poor kingdom’, a cure ‘... as worthy of his grandeur, as the illness which afflicts it is great ... But like the doctor who prescribes in vain, and gives consultations for nothing, if the patient takes it into his head to indulge, instead of helping to cure himself: In vain also our King has prescribed peace, and convoked the Estates, which are the two proper remedies, one to staunch the blood, and the other to knit the wound’, ‘... all the ordinances of the Estates, and all the recipes and regimens prescribed to us’, in ‘Remontrance aux etats de Blois pour la paix, sous la personne d’un catholique romain, l’an 1576’, in Stegmann, *Les édits*, p. 125.

⁵⁵ ‘The truth is that the rotting member must be removed, when there is no more hope of a cure: but whilst there is even a little glimmer of improvement, the Doctor would be a murderer if, abandoning the proper remedies, he resorted to such extremes. First, it must be found out if the illness of the subjects is incurable, so as to apply the remedies according to need: otherwise it would be like burying alive one’s sick child without trying the means to cure him’, in *Discours sur la pacification des troubles de l’an 1567*, D2v.

⁵⁶ Soll, ‘Healing the body politic’, 1259-86.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 1269.

⁵⁸ Brown (ed.), *Jean du Tillet*, p. 24.

⁵⁹ See A. Lebigre, *La Justice du roi: La vie judiciaire dans l'ancienne France* (1988), p. 225; B. Cottret, *1598, L'Édit de Nantes* (1998), p. 131; D. Crouzet, *La Nuit de la Saint-Barthélemy. Un rêve perdu de la Renaissance* (1994), p. 197; Finley-Crosswhite, 'Henry IV and the diseased body politic'.

⁶⁰ G. Koziol, 'England, France, and the problem of sacrality in twelfth-century ritual', in T.N. Bisson (ed.), *Cultures of power: lordship, status, and process in twelfth-century Europe* (Philadelphia, 1995), pp. 124-48.

⁶¹ '... by the benefit of peace, I can cure and heal the wounds made by the troubles', in *La harangue que fait le roy a messieurs de la court de Parlement en son palais a Paris* (1571), quoted in S. Daubresse, 'Charles IX et le parlement de Paris: à propos de cinq discours de pouvoir', *Revue historique*, 297 (1997), 450.

⁶² 'to remedy the ills, from which the body of this state is so ulcerated, that no member is healthy and complete', 'to repurge the bad humours of this Kingdom, to return it to its former good health and vigorous disposition', in *Harangue du roy nostre sire*, pp. 3-4, 11.

⁶³ M-M. Fragonard, 'Donner toute priorité à la paix du Royaume: un argument des Politiques?', in T. Wanegffelen (ed.), *De Michel de L'Hospital à l'Édit de Nantes. Politique et religion face aux églises* (Clermont-Ferrand, 2002), pp. 425-6, 432-3.

⁶⁴ '... (we) would fortify this body of France, and would see it flourish more than ever, provided that by your ruling you remove the causes of sedition ... Peace and public repose ... are the nerves of the Prince', in Silly, *Harangue de par la noblesse*, pp. 25-6.

⁶⁵ ‘... peace is the true cement to join together and strengthen the members of the commonwealth with its head, to construct the body politic’, in *Apologie de la paix* (Paris, 1585), p. 46; also discussed in A. Jouanna, ‘Idéologies de la guerre et idéologies de la paix en France dans la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle’, in M. Yardeni (ed.), *Idéologie et propagande en France* (1987), p. 95.

⁶⁶ ‘... a sick and battered body’, ‘the doctor has lessened the illness’, but the patient ‘is not cured immediately’; ‘the good doctor does not prescribe according to the taste and pleasure of the patient, but rather what he knows is necessary for his health’, both examples taken from Greengrass, ‘Amnistie et oubliance’, p. 118.

⁶⁷ ‘Medicines which some consider have no less dangerous an effect than the illness that requires a cure’, in E. Pasquier, *Lettres historiques pour les années 1556-1594*, ed. by D. Thickett (Geneva, 1966), letter xiii, book xi (1586), p. 266.

⁶⁸ Greengrass, ‘Amnistie et oubliance’, pp. 116-18.

⁶⁹ ‘... to aggravate and increase the illness and reopen the wounds, whereas the state which practices this remedy restores itself little by little and in the end regains its original condition’, in A. Loisel, *Amnestie ou de l’oubliance des maux faicts et receus pendant les troubles & à l’occasion d’iceux* (1595), p. 19.

⁷⁰ ‘... a violent and extreme remedy, which whilst healing one wound reopens others’, in F. de La Noue, *Discours politiques et militaires*, ed. by F.E. Sutcliffe (Geneva, 1967), p. 787. Also discussed in Fragonard, ‘Donner toute priorité à la paix du Royaume’, p. 426.

⁷¹ ‘it requires a quite different medicine’, in E. Pasquier, *Au roy congratulation de la paix faite par sa majesté entre ses subjectz l’unziesme jour d’aoust 1570*: the text is reproduced in V.E. Graham and W. McAllister Johnson (eds), *The Paris entries of*

Charles IX and Elisabeth of Austria, 1571 (Toronto, 1974), p. 254; J. Hutton, *Themes of peace in Renaissance poetry* (Ithaca, 1984), pp. 149-50.

⁷² ‘You have seen that, like the expert doctor who sometimes carefully opens the vein, drawing from one side then the other the good blood so as to also expel the bad, but who at every turn, like a fountain, seeks to drain the patient’s vein, this would weaken him so much that, in the end, while attempting to cure him he is finished off’, in Pasquier, *Au roy congratulation de la paix*, p. 257.

⁷³ ‘When a human body has a rotting member, it must be removed quickly before the infection spreads and harms (it) further’, in the *Exhortation aux princes et seigneurs du conseil privé*, p. 14.

⁷⁴ ‘Remedies, sire, must be analogous and proportionate to the infection or illness. Force by its nature overcomes the body, sound the ear, reason the mind. To apply force to minds will have no effect, any more than reason to the ear, and sound to the body mass. It is therefore not a means to reunite the church but to ruin the kingdom: not to attract and convert but to subvert and destroy. And since nothing in the world can inflict pain without suffering itself, the ruin of one part affects the others: the ruin and extermination of those of the Religion ... will result in the confusion and desolation of the whole state’, in Duplessis Mornay, *Lettres écrites au Roy par le sieur Du Plessis, sur la pacification des presens troubles de la France, en l’an M.D.LXXXV* (n.p., 1586), pp. 5-7.

⁷⁵ BN Ms. fr. n.a. 22071, fol. 93-8 (fol. 93r, 94r, 96r, 97r for references).

⁷⁶ ‘If the Reformed constitute one body and the Catholics another, if the King is head of the two parts this would be a monstrous head’, in *ibid.*, fol. 97r.

⁷⁷ For further discussion of this point see P. Roberts, ‘The languages of peace during the French religious wars’, *Cultural and Social History*, 4 (2007), forthcoming.

⁷⁸ ‘... according to their customary and natural benevolence and clemency’, in <http://elec.enc.sorbonne.fr/editsdepacification/edit1.php>; Stegmann, *Les édits*, p. 8.

⁷⁹ ‘to the diminution and destruction of our kingdom, and ... such a remedy is neither proper nor suitable, since the disease is hidden in the guts and spirits of our people, we have decided that the best and most useful course of action, as most christian prince, the name we bear, is to have recourse to the infinite grace and goodness of Our Lord and, with his help, find the means to pacify through our gentleness the bitterness of this illness (for the sake of the) welfare, safety and conservation of this our realm’, in <http://elec.enc.sorbonne.fr/editsdepacification/edit2.php>; Stegmann, *Les édits*, pp. 32-3.

⁸⁰ ‘... the particular ills of the healthiest parts of the State, that we believe can be more easily cured after having removed the principal cause, which is the continuation of the civil war’, in <http://elec.enc.sorbonne.fr/editsdepacification/edit12.php>.