



HAL
open science

Portraits of Mary, Queen of Scots, as an Intellectual in Seventeenth-Century Collective Biographies

Armel Dubois-Nayt

► **To cite this version:**

Armel Dubois-Nayt. Portraits of Mary, Queen of Scots, as an Intellectual in Seventeenth-Century Collective Biographies. Portraits and Poses: Female Intellectual Authority, Agency and Authorship in Early Modern Europe, pp.259-280, 2022, 9789462703308. 10.2307/j.ctv2gmhh99.14 . hal-03265838

HAL Id: hal-03265838

<https://hal.science/hal-03265838>

Submitted on 15 Apr 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Chapter Title: Portraits of Mary, Queen of Scots, as an Intellectual in Seventeenth-Century Collective Biographies

Chapter Author(s): Armel Dubois-Nayt

Book Title: Portraits and Poses

Book Subtitle: Female Intellectual Authority, Agency and Authorship in Early Modern Europe

Book Editor(s): Beatrijs Vanacker, Lieke van Deinsen

Published by: Leuven University Press. (2022)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv2gmhh99.14>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Funding is provided by KU Leuven Fund for Fair Open Access; Dr. C. Louise Thijssen-Schoute Stichting; Dutch-Belgian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies; Fonds P. Druwé; Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek — Vlaanderen (FWO); Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO).



JSTOR

Leuven University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Portraits and Poses*

PART III

**The Diachronic Dynamics of
Female Intellectual Authority**

CHAPTER 11

Portraits of Mary, Queen of Scots, as an Intellectual in Seventeenth-Century Collective Biographies

Armel Dubois-Nayt

By the time Mary Stuart, later to be the queen of Scotland, was born in 1542, many of the humanist treatises advocating some form of education for women, particularly royal women, had been published: from Anne of France's *Enseignements à sa fille* ('Lessons for My Daughter') (ca. 1505) to Erasmus's defence of female education in *Christiani matrimonii institutio* ('The Institution of Christian Matrimony') (1526) and Charles de Sainte-Marthe's *In obitum incomparabilis Margaritae* ('Funeral Oration on the Death of the Incomparable Marguerite') (1509).¹ Thomas More, Erasmus, and Juan Luis Vives might have had their disagreements about the most appropriate curriculum for the female sex and particularly about the skills that had to remain a male preserve, yet they all reached the conclusion that education was the safest way to preserve women's virtue.²

Mary clearly benefitted from the humanist notion that conferring an education on women would improve their own morals and social mores as a whole, and she was among the happy few women who actually received a formal education in the Renaissance. This chapter will first explain why and how Mary benefitted from a humanist education. It will then look at how this extraordinary female education she received affected her life, by investigating the descriptions of her intellectual achievements in the collective biographies of learned women to show how she became a role model for seventeenth-century women.

Collective biographies, or prosopographies, are the earliest genre in defence of the female sex in the *querelle des femmes*. This debate covers the discourses on the inequality or equality between men and women and pitted misogynists against philogynists from the fifteenth century until the end of the eighteenth century, if not longer.³ In fact, Christine de Pizan, who is considered to have launched the oppositional movement against medieval misogyny in general and more specifically against Jean de Meun's *Roman de la Rose* ('The Romance of the Rose'), built her arguments in *La Cité des Dames* ('The City of Ladies') (1405) on 165 exemplary women.⁴ She thus authored the first female collective biography with a clear proto-feminist agenda – contrary to the equivocal Boccaccio, who compiled examples of good and evil women – and turned *accumulation*, typical of lists or catalogues, in favour of women.⁵ The genre of the collective biography developed with the *querelle* and, at the end of the fifteenth century, shifted from virtuous women to learned ladies. Examples of this are the works by Baptiste Fulgose, Barthélémy de Chasseneuz, Caelius Rhodiginus, and Ravisius Textor, who were no longer interested in rehabilitating women per se and thus advocated matrimony, but were eager to defend the virtues of female education.⁶

The role Mary, Queen of Scots, plays in collective biographies focused on learned ladies has never been studied before. Until now, more attention has been paid to her as a *femme forte* or as a competent sovereign in the progressive reappraisal of Agnes Strickland's *Lives of Queens of Scotland*.⁷ This chapter thus intends to fill this gap in studies on Mary, Queen of Scots, by analysing the first four prosopographies of learned ladies in which she features. I will start by looking at a late sixteenth-century collective biography, Brantôme's *Vies des dames illustres* ('Book of Illustrious Ladies'), which dedicated an entry to Mary.⁸ Then, I will consider several prosopographies, or collections of portraits in prose, which associate Mary, Queen of Scots, with a series of learned women with whom she had no apparent connection except her gender. Finally, I will study Jean de La Forge's *Cercle des femmes savantes* ('Circle of Learned Ladies') (1663), Jacqueline Guillaume's *Dames illustres* ('Illustrious Women') (1665), and Marguerite Buffet's *Éloges des illustres savantes anciennes et modernes* ('Laudations of Illustrious Learned Women, Both Ancient and Modern') (1668) to explain how Mary's example functions in these works to demonstrate female intellectual talent and authority.⁹

The fact that Mary only appeared in French collective biographies is noteworthy, but not as surprising as it might seem, for several reasons: first, in the seventeenth century, Mary's son, James I, who ruled over England and Scotland until 1625, thought ill of women who dared to claim male privileges for themselves, starting with education and learning; this remained the rule throughout most of the Stuart era until the Restoration in 1660. Second, as a Catholic charged with high treason against the iconic Elizabeth, Mary, Queen of Scots, was not a likely candidate for English collective biographies of illustrious women when they first appeared.¹⁰

A Humanist Education

The formal education Mary Stuart received while she was residing at the court of France is no doubt ascribable to her status as a ‘crowned queen’, which gave her precedence over the rest of *les Enfants de France* (‘the Children of France’), including the dauphin himself, with whom she eventually shared the royal curriculum.¹¹ When she arrived in France at the age of six, she was taught with Elizabeth of France, the king’s eldest daughter, under the supervision of Diane de Poitiers. The focus was initially put on her cultural conversion and her command of French, which she read and studied for two hours a day.¹² After 1554, the year Mary’s mother officially became regent of Scotland, Diane de Poitiers was succeeded by Mary’s uncle, Charles of Guise. Simultaneously, her education took a new turn to be further enhanced and aligned with the three steps that made up a humanist princely education according to historian Sylvène Édouard: first, learning and mastery of Latin, second, rhetorical education, and finally, introduction to moral philosophy.¹³ Her learning of Latin was initially entrusted to Claude Millet or Millot, who was also Elizabeth’s schoolmaster.

We know nothing about the textbooks she used, but much can be learned from a small manuscript in her handwriting that was recovered in the nineteenth century in the Imperial Library of Paris and edited by Anatole de Montaiglon. This exercise book gives us an insight into the books she had access to, something we cannot establish from an existing inventory of the library of her schooling years. It contains sixty-four short letters and translations, composed between July 26, 1554 and January 9, 1555. These letters, on the one hand, discuss the importance of the study of good letters for princes and, on the other hand, refute the assumption that women had nothing to do with learning.¹⁴ Based on the references in these letters, it is possible to conclude, with Sylvène Édouard, that Mary was at least familiar with Vives’s *De Ratione Studii Puerilis* (‘On the Right Method of Instruction for Children’), his *Satellitium Animi* (‘The Soul’s Escort’), Aesop’s *Fables*, Plutarch of Chaeronea’s *Moralia* (‘Morals’), the *Manuel Royal* (‘Royal Manual’) by Jean Brèche, and Erasmus’s *Institution principis Christiani* (‘Education of a Christian Prince’), as well as his *Colloquia* (‘Colloquies’).¹⁵ Mirrors of princes was a literary genre Mary Stuart was well versed in, as further evinced by her reading of Guillaume Budé’s *L’Institution du Prince* (‘The Institution of the Prince’), which she brought back with her to Scotland. John Guy also includes among her set texts Cicero’s *De Officiis* (‘On Duties’), Plato’s *Nómoi* (‘Laws’), Aristotle’s *Politiká* (‘Politics’) and *Rhētoriké* (‘Rhetoric’), Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria* (‘Education of an Orator’), and Plutarch’s *Bíoi Parállēloi* (‘Parallel Lives’).¹⁶ Additionally, she continued to study Latin, with Jacques Amyot, the dauphin’s tutor. Once she had mastered the rudiments, she also studied Greek with Pierre Danès and geography, using Ptolemy’s pioneering textbook.

According to Elyot, when the prince reached maturity at the age of fourteen, he entered the second stage of princely education, with instruction in the art of oratory. Mary's syllabus seems to have strictly followed the humanist curriculum, for in 1555, at the age of thirteen, she delivered a deliberative oration of her own composition to the French court. In this public speech, she defended the access of women to literature and the liberal arts. This rhetorical performance was given at the Louvre in presence of the king, Henri II, and his spouse, Catherine de' Medici. The Latin text of the oration has been lost, so it is difficult to assess its quality or argumentation, but we can appreciate her skills in eloquence by reading testimonies that suggest that she had benefitted from the teachings of Antoine de Fouquelin. Fouquelin explained, for instance, how orators should use their voices expressively as if they were playing a musical instrument.¹⁷ Mary's mastery of this skill is obvious from the cheers of the Scottish Parliament witnessed by the Scottish reformer John Knox after a speech she gave there.¹⁸

Her education also clearly involved more womanly undertakings such as dancing, singing, playing the harp and the harpsichord, baking, and embroidering. She perfected this latter skill in Scotland just like her more scholarly ones, for her royal education continued until the day she died. In 1562, just a year after she returned to Scotland, she wrote French and Italian verse to send to Elizabeth of England, with the assistance of the humanist George Buchanan, who acted as her tutor and with whom she also worked on the study of Livy and Sallust. During her reign (1561–1567), she put together a rich library, which encompassed 243 books on moral philosophy, the art of war, history, astronomy, and cosmography.¹⁹ More than fifty of these were in Greek and Latin. In 1574, while imprisoned in England, she was still reading in Latin the long treatise of neo-Stoic and Christian teachings of her spiritual adviser John Leslie, which she adapted in her own poem 'Méditation sur l'Inconstance et Vanité du Monde, Composée par la Reine d'Écosse et Douairière de France' ('Meditation on the Inconstancy and Vanity of the World, Composed by the Queen of Scotland and the Queen Dowager of France').²⁰ For her contemporaries and later generations of philogynists, these were legitimate reasons to consider her a learned lady.

Portraying Mary as a Learned Lady in the Late Sixteenth Century

Brantôme's *Vies des Dames Illustres* can be considered as the initial source for later prosopographers writing on Mary, Queen of Scots. He wrote this collective biography after 1589, because he had retired in Périgord, partly ruined after a career as a soldier and a courtier. It was a rebuttal of bitter attacks on two of the queens who feature in it: Catherine de' Medici, who was the target of a vitriolic pamphlet that bemoaned her accession to power, and Mary, Queen of Scots, whose execution, in 1587, was justified to the French a year

later.²¹ Brantôme, contrary to the Protestant anti-gynaecocrat treatise *Discours Merveilleux* ('Marvellous Discourse'), believed in women's ability to govern and his not-so-hidden agenda was to advocate the repeal of the Salic law to enable Marguerite of Valois to succeed her brother Henri II.²²

Mary, Queen of Scots, is the subject of the third discourse, and she stands therefore at the centre of the collective biography to illustrate the benefits of a princely humanist education for women, particularly the accomplishment that it made their souls more beautiful. In his laudation, Brantôme follows the three-step syllabus identified by Sylvène Édouard and starts with Mary's mastery of Latin before turning to her mastery of the art of public speaking:

She had made herself learned in Latin, so that being between thirteen and fourteen years of age, she declaimed before King Henri, the queen, and all the Court, publicly in the hall of the Louvre, an harangue in Latin, which she had made herself, maintaining and defending against common opinion, that it was well becoming to women to know letters and the liberal arts.²³

He starts, therefore, with Latin and rhetoric, the two subjects that were considered a male preserve at the time, before turning to the study of the French vernacular, which was the actual starting point of Mary's education as future French consort:

Also she made Antoine Fochain, of Chauny of Vermandois, prepare for her a rhetoric in French, which still exists, that she might the better understand it, and make herself as eloquent in French as she had been in Latin, and better than if she had been born in France.²⁴

The emphasis is on the exceptionality of Mary as a learned lady, an exceptionality Brantôme demonstrated with an anecdote based on first-hand experience: 'Think what a rare thing and admirable it was, to see the wise and beautiful young queen thus orate in Latin, which she knew and understood right well, for I was there and saw her.'²⁵ He does not care so much about the details of her learning, which he encapsulates in a global statement: 'there was no human knowledge she would not talk upon.'²⁶

Brantôme then moves to her love of poetry and her patronage of the Pléiade poets. He commends her verse for being 'fine and well done', and he sets it apart from the coarse and ill-polished verses contained in the casket letters.²⁷ When he then returns to her ordinary manner of speech, as opposed to her rhetoric as a public speaker, he complies with early modern gender norms by simultaneously acknowledging her masculine royal majesty and her feminine discretion, modest reserve, and beautiful grace. Brantôme also briefly mentions her skills as learner and speaker of foreign languages. But oddly enough, he does not mention her mastery of Spanish or Italian, both languages held in high

esteem in France. Instead, he pays tribute to her ability to make her 'rustic, barbarous and ill-sounding' native tongue, Scots, seem 'beautiful and agreeable'.²⁸ This confirms, on the one hand, the lack of interest early modern continental Europeans had in northern languages 'viewed askance as being too guttural for delicate throats', and on the other hand, Brantôme's intent to portray Mary as an extraordinary queen whose vocal and instrumental musicality raised her far above her linguistically unpleasant subjects.²⁹

In doing so, Brantôme may have been implicitly responding to the aforementioned attacks on Mary, especially to that by the Scottish reformer John Knox, a fierce opponent to female rule, in his account of Mary's opening speech³⁰ in front of Parliament in 1563. Knox mocked it in the *History of the Reformation*, written between 1559 and 1571, and first printed in London by Thomas Vautrollier in 1586. Brantôme, who started working on his book after 1589, may therefore have been aware of Knox's disparaging remark.

Such stinking pride of women as was seen at that Parliament, was never seen before in Scotland. Three sundry days the queen rode to the Tolbooth. The first day she made a painted orison; and there might have been heard among her flatterers, 'Vox Dianæ! The voice of a goddess (for it could not be Dei), and not of a woman! God save the sweet face! Was there ever orator spake so properly and so sweetly!'³¹

In this passage, Knox is irritated by the positive reaction of Mary's audience, who lauded her oratory skills in clearly gendered terms ('properlie', 'sweetlie'). He thus counters those praises by a similarly gendered equation between female eloquence and stinking pride, a fault he systematically blamed on women who assumed a position of power.³² Brantôme, on the contrary, is eager to stress the beauty and the agreeableness of Mary's voice as she delivers speeches, not as a sign of her femininity, but of her royalty. It can be contended that by contrasting 'an extraordinary queen' to her 'linguistically unpleasant subjects' through her voice and her eloquence in Scots, Brantôme adopts the contemporary conception of the two voices of the king shared by Jacques Amyot, Cardinal du Perron, and Germain Forget. These three men, who advised Henry III on his public speaking, believed that the king's royal voice, as opposed to his personal voice, was a tool he should sharpen to command well.³³ Du Perron, for instance, wrote: 'It is [eloquence] which leads entire assemblies of men just through words, directs their wills wherever it pleases, and redirects them when it disapproves of their inclinations.'³⁴ Based on Brantôme's testimony, Mary, who had been taught by Fouquelin, preceded her former brother-in-law in acquiring that particular skill in the art of ruling.

All in all, Brantôme's point is clearly to illustrate that Mary, Queen of Scots, had received the classical education that a future queen needed at the Valois court just like the other queens he portrayed – namely Anne of Brittany, Catherine de' Medici, Élisabeth of France, and Marguerite of Valois – had. Brantôme is not interested in women as a category but in queens as a category

and learning is, along with beauty, one of the features that elevate these extraordinary women above their subjects. Combined, these two recurring features in the portraits he draws mirror the royal magnificence that justifies the positions of authority held by Mary and her equals. This is also why Brantôme decided, in the opening of the discourse that deals with Mary's education, to ignore the people who made that education possible, namely the king of France and her tutors. This was a way to empower her further: 'she had made herself learned in Latin,' 'she had made herself [...] her harangue in Latin,' and 'she had made Antoine Fochain [Fouquelin] [...] prepare for her a rhetoric in French.'³⁵ But could this extraordinary empowerment of an early modern queen, taking charge of her own education, survive in the following century? Or was it perhaps bound to evolve, when female education in general became the principal topic of discussion, as opposed to female princely education? To answer these questions, we will turn first to three texts printed in the 1660s in the wake of the golden age of women's salons between 1630 and 1650, which cover the regency of Anne of Austria in the 1640s and the Fronde.³⁶

La Forge's 'Precious' Portrait

In this context, Mary first appears in *Le Cercle des femmes savantes* ('Circle of Learned Women'), a dialogue between Mécène, Livie, the wife of the Roman emperor, and the poet Virgile, which was published in 1663 by Jean de La Forge, about whom very little is known.³⁷ Some have assumed that he was the brother of Louis de La Forge, the French philosopher and friend of Descartes.³⁸ This would suggest that Jean belonged to a family of men of letters, although he did not produce a treatise on the human mind like his Cartesian brother but lighter pieces such as a romantic comedy, *La Joueuse dupée ou l'intrigue des Académies* ('The Jolly Betrayed, or the Intrigue of the Academies'), a heroic poem, *La Hongrie secourue* ('Hungary Assisted'), and his *Cercle des femmes savantes*.³⁹ La Forge, who lived in Paris, according to the *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne*, was nevertheless famous enough for his heroic poem to be presented to the king in 1664, as indicated on the title page.⁴⁰ His two other works show that he had at least two patrons, the marquis de Dubois, to whom he dedicated his *Joueuse dupée*, and the comtesse de Fiesque, to whom he dedicated his *Cercle des femmes savantes*.

The countess had a renowned literary salon, which, according to Léon Bredif, was the most prestigious after the Hotel of Rambouillet ran by Catherine de Vivonne.⁴¹ It seems, therefore, that La Forge was admitted to the comtesse de Fierque's *ruelle* – literally the space between the bed of the hostess and the wall of her bedroom – along with many fashionable social and literary figures of the day. Visitors included, for instance, Mademoiselle de Scudéry, who tells about the love story between the comte de Fiesque and Gilonne

d'Harcourt, the future countess, in her romance *Artamène ou le Grand Cyrus* ('Artamenes, or the Grand Cyrus') through the characters of Pisistrate and Cléorante.⁴² As for La Forge, he took part in the defence of the *précieuses* – women who claimed an access to culture – after they were satirised by Molière in *Les Précieuses ridicules* ('The Affected Ladies') (1659).⁴³

The nineteenth-century biographer Victor Fournel claims that La Forge's *Cercle* is a 'genuine supplement to the great dictionary of Somaize', which presented the fashionable language used by the *Précieuses* as well as the sociable practices and the main figures who gathered in the salons in the early 1660s.⁴⁴ But, while Somaize's 1661 *Grand dictionnaire des précieuses, historique, poétique, géographique, cosmographique, cronologique et armoirique* ('Great Dictionary of the Affected Ladies, Historical, Poetical, Geographical, Cosmographical, Chronological, Armorial') comes after a first satirical version entitled *Grand Dictionnaire des précieuses ou la clef de la langue des ruelles* ('Great Dictionary or the Affected Ladies of the Key to the Language of the Bedside') (1660), which was entirely based on Molière's play, La Forge unreservedly supported women's access to intellectual life – be it simply games of wit – through gatherings presided over by a woman.⁴⁵ His theme, however, just like the title of his work, is hardly new, and he was still relying on the *précieuse* 'vogue', as Christophe Schuwey puts it, with a by-product that comes after Samuel Chappuzeau's plays *Le Cercle des femmes* ('The Circle of Women') (1656) and *Académie des Femmes* ('Academy of Women') (1661). The first play defends the *précieuse* women in their salons; the latter mocks them.⁴⁶

The paratext of the *Cercle* – which includes lines by nine male readers who praise La Forge, as well as his patron and the learned ladies mentioned – suggests that these learned men, some of whom were lawyers at Parliament, may have been part of the comtesse de Fiesque's literary circle. This paratext also illustrates how the ladies' bedsides were the tribunals where books were judged, as Adrien Baillet wrote, but it is worth underlining that only male written opinions on the *Cercle* ended up in print.⁴⁷

La Forge, on the contrary, builds around Fiesque a 'troop of illustrious women' to pay tribute to her patronage of learned men.⁴⁸ And although the paratext seems to show that the *Cercle* was read by men, the foreword claims that it is aimed almost exclusively at women, whom he addresses with authorial humility. In his foreword 'to the female readers', he concedes in fact that, if he has left out the names of some learned ladies by ignorance, he will revise his text if the book meets with enough success to be reprinted.⁴⁹ La Forge shows no inclination to enter the debate about women's access to culture in a confrontational manner. By arguing that he is mostly writing for a female readership, he is in fact adopting the private tone of the feminocentric salon as opposed to the public discursive space of the academy or university conference.

La Forge, however, acknowledges that his collection of portraits in verse belongs to the tradition of collective biographies by male authors to which

he refers his readers for information about learned ladies of ancient times: Hilarion de Coste (1595–1661), Louis Jacob de Carme (1608–1670), Buxtor (*sic*) (1564–1629), and others.⁵⁰ La Forge states that his intent is to praise women for their learning or their patronage of learned men without ranking them in any way and with no consideration for their other achievements. He then explains that he has changed their proper names, which are insufficiently poetic for French verse. That is his excuse for giving them aliases that were, in fact, a feature of *préciosité* as a literary style.

In the case of women, these aliases or pseudonyms also corresponded to the discretion that was still expected of learned ladies, who were discouraged from making their writings public by having them printed. The secrecy surrounding the salon was indeed a way for seventeenth-century *précieus* women, who might have felt they deserved a place in the cultural scene, to keep complying with the social demands of silence and humility imposed on them. As Erica Harth has shown, ‘many women of the salons if they wrote at all did so anonymously or pseudonymously. Similarly, it was not unusual for women to pursue their studies under a strict veil of secrecy and to hide their learning.’⁵¹ There is therefore undoubtedly more than poetic ambition behind La Forge’s renaming of the learned ladies in his portraits. This literary device can be attributed to the ‘euphemisation’ that characterises the salon speech, according to Alain Viala.⁵² This process of self-censorship, when applied to gender issues, suggests, however, a willingness to compromise more than to confront.

La Forge’s humbleness is in keeping with that of his character Virgile in the dialogue between Mécène, Livie, and Virgile. In this text, Livie complains about the recent praise of her learning by the poet, which she judges excessive and undeserved. Mécène asks Livie to forgive Virgile, who then profusely apologises by means of a catalogue of learned ladies whose learning also commands admiration. Mary, Queen of Scots, is one of them and features in the list of sixteenth-century marvels next to Anne de Marquets (Mélinte), the Dominican nun who wrote religious sonnets, Margaret More (Macarise), and two Parisian learned ladies who died in the year of Mary’s execution, Mesmoiselles Diane and Lucrece Morel (the Marphises).

La Forge does not, however, clearly refer to Mary Stuart’s learning or literary works. Instead, he comments in the key to the names of all the learned ladies in his book that the Queen of Scots is rather well known and adds, ‘to make his metrical line long enough’, that although her life was ended by the hand of an executioner, she died as a queen and lost none of her dignity nor of her glory.⁵³ If one is to make sense of the portrait of Mary as a learned lady hinted at by La Forge, one is therefore left with her alias, that of Mariane. La Forge is making a connection here between the Scottish queen and Mariamne the Hasmonean, wife of Herod I, who became the victim of her husband’s passion. His sister Salome slandered her and accused her of adultery and high treason, two crimes that corresponded to those with which Mary, Queen of

Scots, was charged between 1564 and 1587. Mary was indicted for complicity in the Babington plot to kill her cousin Elizabeth and, before that, had been tried for committing adultery and plotting with her lover, Bothwell, to assassinate her second husband, the king consort Henry Darnley. By choosing the pseudonym Mariane for Mary, La Forge is clearly absolving her from those crimes.

Mariamne's story was very popular in the second half of the seventeenth century, and in France, her tragedy was dramatised successively by Alexandre Hardy (*Mariamne*, 1625) and François Tristan L'Hermite (*La Mariane*, 1636). She also featured in another collective biography, *La Cour sainte* ('The Holy Court'), by the Jesuit Nicolas Caussin, which also includes Mary, Queen of Scots, in the list of martyrs.⁵⁴ By the middle of the seventeenth century, Mariamne was therefore an established model of virtue, persecuted innocence, and the importance of being true to oneself. As a wife, she also claimed a degree of empowerment and more specifically the right not to comply with her husband's desire. It is difficult to draw a definite conclusion as to what Mary's portrait by La Forge, in the guise of Mariamne, may represent in terms of female knowledge, apart from the notion that knowledge is not, like virtue, an end in itself. It can also support the idea that women can and should be assertive in both their marital and their spiritual lives.

La Forge's portrayal of Mary as a learned lady is therefore a long way removed from Brantôme's initial praise. Moreover, while the sixteenth-century prosopographer represented less than a score of learned ladies in richly detailed portraits, La Forge sketched sixty-seven early modern women, and a few more from ancient times, each in a few lines. In Mary's case, the sober depiction takes less than two lines and points out her 'fate', 'her beautiful days', and her 'beautiful death'.⁵⁵ La Forge's economical style therefore requires the reader/viewer to look at the gallery from a distance to make sense of the whole and of its parts. Each individual exemplum becomes clear when considered in the light of the surrounding characters. When looking at Mary from that perspective, she becomes the reflection of the 'dazzling beauty' and 'double charm' of her contemporaries (Mélinte, Macarise, and the Marphises) but also of Ronsard's Héléne, mentioned a few lines before her.⁵⁶ This is where La Forge's vision of female education coincides with that of Brantôme, for both consist of a combination of female beauty and learning, a learning that 'will bewilder all together heart and mind' and 'inspire science and learning' in others.⁵⁷ One difference remains, though: La Forge envisions a broader spectrum of female learning, both geographically (from the Seine to the Thames) and socially, since he is not merely concerned with the privileges of royal women but wants to see them granted further down the social hierarchy. It is therefore no longer royal magnificence that is at stake but a brilliance achievable by the *salonnières* whose side La Forge took in his dialogue. His ideas were not intended for ordinary women. A Scottish queen was still a relevant model to emulate.

Mary's Place and Role in Guillaume's Gallery

The next gallery in which Mary is featured with others to jointly represent female learning was the *Dames illustres*, composed by Jacqueline Guillaume. Guillaume is another enigmatic author among collective biographers of women, for nothing has been written about her apart from references to her in later collective biographies of women from Buffet's to Fortunée Briquet's and Elizabeth Elstob's.⁵⁸ From Buffet's testimony, it has been assumed that Guillaume's prosopography was initially well received – although it enjoyed only one edition. Buffet praises its merits and expresses her admiration for the woman who managed to 'shut the mouths of those who do not want them to equal men in skill'.⁵⁹ A century later, Elstob is still complimentary about Guillaume, whom she acknowledges as one of the four sources for her workbook of sketches of learned women.⁶⁰

When we turn to eighteenth-century French dictionaries, however, it transpires that the appreciation of Guillaume's audacity has suffered: both Fortunée Briquet and Jean-François de La Croix are critical of her antagonistic attitude towards men. The former considers Guillaume 'one of the women who had pushed the love of her sex too far', along with Lucrèce Marinelli.⁶¹ The latter reckons that 'the arguments of this work and of all those that championed this cause have not been found very compelling'.⁶² This leaves us to consider what she could have done to go down in history as an overenthusiastic portraitist of her sex and how this impacted the portrait of Mary, Queen of Scots, as an educated lady. In fact, Guillaume claims to be a portraitist, explaining in her epistle: 'I have applied myself to lend them the brightest colour and I have adorned them with the richest ornaments'.⁶³

Guillaume produced her voluminous tome, which she divided into two parts, in 1665. The first part, 181 pages long, accumulates evidence to support the argument that men surpass women in mischief, foolishness, and impertinence, while women outdo men in faithfulness, benevolence, gentleness, and generosity. Having belittled men, particularly those who 'belittle the merits of learned ladies', to praise women, Guillaume then tries to comprehend and explain why women's superiority has not resulted in a better social status and why women still find themselves subordinated.⁶⁴ She believes that the answer lies in female education or the lack of it, and thus, in the second part of the book, she builds a gallery of learned ladies, both pagan and Christian, to prove that women's knowledge has a long history and that this history has been continuous.⁶⁵ Each of them individually, but more importantly all of them considered in connection, prove that women have consistently distinguished themselves in science, eloquence, wisdom, prudence, or good behaviour and are tributes to what women can achieve given the opportunity of an education.

The originality of Guillaume's contribution to seventeenth-century collections devoted to famous women lies in the talking portraits of named learned

ladies (like Anna-Maria van Schurman and Christina of Sweden) and nameless ones, who were learned in theology, gemology, ornithology, geography, and so on. Guillaume relied on talking portraits so much that *Dames illustres* has been considered the first anthology of scientific texts written by women in the wake of François Dinet's chapter on 'Dames Françaises illustres en Science' ('French Ladies Illustrious in Science'), published in his *Théâtre françois des seigneurs et des dames illustres* ('French Theatre of Illustrious Gentlemen and Ladies').⁶⁶ As for the talking portraits, they clearly echo the conversations in the learned circles of the time, for Guillaume gathered each woman in a virtual literary circle around Élisabeth d'Orléans.⁶⁷ They also mirror both the learning of the dedicatee and that of the female author.

Unlike the anonymous contemporary learned ladies of the second part, Mary, Queen of Scots, features under her own name in the third and last part about unfortunate ladies. At first glance, there is no reference to her humanist education or her achievements in public speaking or writing in Guillaume's portrayal of the Scottish queen as a victim of men's vices. She writes: 'Marie Stuard, Queen of Scots, left [her head] on the scaffold, for having been suspected of intelligence with the Spanish. Most men only fill their brains with suspicion, nonsense and stupid ideas, which makes almost all women unhappy'.⁶⁸

Yet this portrayal clearly fits with the general theme of the book. First, as Beaulieu contended, Mary, Queen of Scots, just like the other unfortunate ladies, is a reminder that sometimes there is a price to pay for wanting to distinguish oneself as a virago or simply as a learned lady.⁶⁹ Second, one can easily explain Guillaume's decision to pass over Mary's humanist education in silence. This can be ascribed to the more general loss of interest for the humanist ideal of scholarly erudition at the time Guillaume was writing, as well as the tendency of aristocratic circles to turn to a more 'vernacular culture, acquired through oral conversation'.⁷⁰ As Linda Timmermans has concluded, by the middle of the seventeenth century, the cultivated but not scholarly gentleman became the new ideal, and the humanist learned lady became a phenomenon of the past.⁷¹ Language skills were still important, as discussed earlier, but not so much public speaking in the form of the ability to give Latin orations as the one Mary gave for the court in the Louvre. Mentioning Mary giving that speech would have been counterproductive and tantamount to depicting her as a 'burlesque figure', that of the *femme savante* who would not be able to hold her own among seventeenth-century society. This was indeed a social crime for which women were heavily sanctioned, as was also obvious from Mademoiselle de Scudéry's advice to women 'to hide part of the treasures they possess' for fear of falling into public disgrace.⁷²

A contemporary reader might also be puzzled by Guillaume's absence of any reference to Mary's Catholicism and defence of her faith, considering that Guillaume viewed Christianity as 'the rule of the genuine science'.⁷³ For instance, she presents Christina of Sweden as a defender of her faith, relating how she

confronted Protestant ministers on the Mass and confession among other theological matters. In the case of Mary Stuart, Guillaume only points out the political crime with which she was wrongly charged and turns what she describes as an unfair accusation into another illustration of men's fake knowledge. One can thus assume that, with Mary, Guillaume not only refused to repeat herself by representing Mary as another queen who argued with Protestant theologians, a fact the reformer John Knox acknowledges in *History of the Reformation*.⁷⁴ Instead, Guillaume sought to broaden the scope of women's potential.

In fact, Guillaume postulates that knowledge can be read in actions that in the case of some women – and Mary, Queen of Scots, is one of them – meant that she does not need to go into detail about their already established learning. Instead, she could introduce new material and a new perspective, which is characteristic of her work that also singularly ignores women's physical and moral qualities. This explains why, in *Dames illustres*, Mary, Queen of Scots, ends up being depicted as a victim of the English intelligence service, an all-male institution, which Guillaume aims to ridicule to enhance the straightforward intelligence of the Scottish queen.

All this means that to see Mary properly in Guillaume's, as in La Forge's, gallery, the reader/viewer is again expected to take a broader perspective. As a sad reminder of the perils women achievers faced in their quest for knowledge as in other endeavours, she becomes part of a wider community that includes women whose names have not even gone down in history. This might be read as a hint that even commoners could become extraordinary through their learnedness and as a step towards a more comprehensive, if not universal, claim to education for women.

Buffet's Gallery

Three years later, Mary entered the gallery of portraits drawn by grammarian Marguerite Buffet, another mysterious early modern French female author. As Lynn S. Meskill has pointed out, we only know what Buffet cared to disclose: that she was a gentlewoman of noble birth and that she needed to work to support herself financially, which led her to teach French as a first language and as a foreign language to aristocratic women.⁷⁵ This explains why she wrote her collective biography after a grammar book for the French language. The latter places Buffet in the controversy about the proper way of speaking for educated women at the core of the seventeenth-century literary assaults on supposed female *préciosité*.

Buffet was eager to teach women how to effectively write and speak in public but, like Guillaume, she disapproved of excessive speech. All the women she portrayed to demonstrate the equality of the sexes in terms of learning, however, were chosen 'for their intelligence and command of language specifically in the

art of persuasion.⁷⁶ This also applied to Mary, Queen of Scots, who appears in the list of ancient examples, after Sappho and Erinna, and before six medieval saints. Buffet considered language accuracy a key skill for those who wanted to elevate themselves in society:

Since men are born to be in society, and since society can function only by means of language, it should come as no surprise that the greatest minds, not only of our own time, but also of times past, have praised those wishing to learn languages correctly.⁷⁷

This emphasis on language is unique, but Buffet's work stands out among early modern collective biographies of learned women on other grounds. First, contrary to other seventeenth-century writers, she does not hide her characters (as La Forge or Guillaume did), or herself behind pseudonyms or anonymity. On the contrary, she proudly claims to be acknowledged as an author through the king's privilege and the dedication to the queen, Marie-Thérèse, the consort of Louis XIV. This is something she shares with Guillaume, who also made a statement about the female quest of authorship through her own privilege and dedication. Second, she breaks away from the tradition of lengthy 'tedious and dizzying' digressions and writes directly and concisely.⁷⁸ In this regard, she is simply following her own advice in the *Éloges des illustres savantes anciennes et modernes*: 'the real secret of speaking and writing well is knowing how to express much with few words.'⁷⁹

This is where, however, she still complies with the imposition of modesty on seventeenth-century women: Buffet is cautious not to display too much of her learning or that of her characters. She aims to portray them as cultivated women in terms of her contemporaries and only allows the reader glimpses of their extraordinary knowledge and achievements. References to public demonstrations of their mastery of Latin are thus absent and she only cursorily mentions the proficiency in Latin of some of her characters.⁸⁰ Mary, Queen of Scots, is not among them.

The sparse style characteristic of Buffet's praises is also illustrated by her paragraph on the Scottish queen, which can be better understood if we keep in mind that Buffet did not establish a hierarchy between women's abilities and argued that all their achievements, whatever shape or form they took, were evidence of female erudition. This applies to ruling with prudence, keeping the people loyal to their sovereign, abdicating to protect the monarchy, demonstrating personal strength and courage, or speaking and writing in prose and verse.

Mary's learning is thus demonstrated obliquely through her capacity to remain clear-headed and unshaken at all times despite her misfortune, a point Buffet stresses three times in less than three lines without a single pleonasm, a figure against which she had advised in the *Éloges des illustres savantes anciennes et modernes*: 'Even in the midst of her numerous misfortunes, this illustrious

and virtuous princess never lost her senses. Her mind was always clear and never fluctuated before the fury of her enemies.⁸¹ Mary thus became a model for those around her in her lifetime:

After a long time in prison, the invincible queen arrived at the moment when she must die. Her constancy and virtue revived the drooping spirits of those who sought to console her and even gave them a desire to die with her in order to find a happier life than here.⁸²

Buffet even makes Mary a role model for the Scots: 'The Scottish people still revere her memory. She will never die among these people who have always loved her.'⁸³ This point could be qualified in the light of her black legend in Scottish historiography. Yet it suggests that Buffet is trying to gather a crowd of admiring viewers, both contemporaries and later readers, around the 'crowned head [...] unjustly persecuted' and 'unable to defend [...] herself'.⁸⁴

It is only in her final words on Mary that Buffet mentions that 'she applied her excellent brain to acquiring knowledge' and was fluent in 'many different languages'.⁸⁵ The reference to the queen's intellect points to the new fields of knowledge and interest that seventeenth-century women were keen to discover. It is equally representative of the new scientific arguments brought into the debate about gender differences. Buffet had mentioned such arguments in her apology of the female sex: 'now our adversaries state that the ventricles, the seams in the skulls, and the brains of the female are smaller and narrower than those of the male'.⁸⁶ To debunk this argument and prove that size does not matter, she borrowed from natural philosophy and gave the examples of asses and oxen, 'which even though they have huge heads, have neither brain nor spirit in them'.⁸⁷ By referring to Mary's 'excellent brain', Buffet was both modernising the defence of female intelligence and ability to learn, and drawing a negative portrait of men's fake knowledge, just as Guillaume had done before her. Buffet was also, like her predecessors, making Mary more attainable as an ideal and taking her as her own role model. With the same constancy as the steadfast queen, Buffet encouraged her female readers to 'let men brag as much as they like and let them glory in the greatness of their body and the largeness of the heads. They have this in common with the stupidest animals and the heaviest beasts'.⁸⁸ And this is how she turns Mary into the epitome of men's unjust attacks on the female sex, the latest being those of Molière and his likes.

This is definitely the key topos in Mary's representations in the three seventeenth-century female biographies that mention her. At first glance, none of them have much to say about her learnedness per se. But we should not ignore her portraits in these works, because they consist in mere fading shadows; that would amount to misunderstanding how these prosopographies work as artistic constructions and neglecting a part of Mary's legacy that has been left out for

too long. This untapped legacy is crucial, for it offers a counterimage to the die-hard clichés of Mary as a failed queen undone by her passion.

To conclude, it seems therefore that none of the four portraits of Mary, Queen of Scots, as a learned lady that have been studied in this chapter intend to draw a full-blown picture of her humanist education. This was left to professional historians, who are still gathering evidence and debating her talents.⁸⁹ Brantôme's sixteenth-century portrait highlights her exceptional learning – including Latin and rhetoric – as a feature of Mary's identity as a reigning monarch, who was in charge even of her own education as a child. That sense of empowerment survives in La Forge's portrayal of Mary through Mariane's features, which grants seventeenth-century women aspiring to an intellectual life the right to be assertive. Guillaume shares La Forge's vision of Mary as an exemplum of men's vindictiveness towards intellectually ambitious women, but she is far more critical of masculine domination. Buffet's representation of Mary's learning is still a gendered diptych, with a touch of scientificity. It contrasts Mary's fruitful brain to the impaired brains of beastlike men. Like her three predecessors, therefore, Buffet conforms to what seems to be a persisting element in Mary's portrayal as a learned lady in the seventeenth century, namely that of the counterimage of men's prejudice, that is unreasonable opinion formed without enough thought or knowledge, as defined by the Cambridge dictionary.

It is through this *mise en abyme* that the four texts examined here manage most effectively to promote the idea that universal education is necessary and that men need it just as much as women are in want of it. As works of history making up for the 'great forgetting' of women in traditional narratives, these female biographies have contributed to broaden knowledge in two ways.⁹⁰ First, they have recovered part of the female past, and second, in the specific case of Mary, Queen of Scots, they have changed the paradigm of her representation in historiography from saint or evil woman to learned lady.

Notes

1. Anne de France, Tatiana Clavier, and Éliane Viennot (eds.), *Enseignements à sa Fille; Suivis de l'Histoire du Siège de Brest*, Saint-Étienne, Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 2006; Erasmus, *Christiani Matrimonii Institutio*, Basel, apud Joannem Frobenium, 1526; Charles de Sainte-Marthe, *Oraison Funèbre de l'Incomparable Marguerite, Royne de Navarre, Duchesse d'Alençon*, Paris, Regnault Ier et Claude Chaudière, 1550.
2. Thomas More, *Utopia*, London, 1551 [Latin edition 1516]; Desiderius Erasmus, 'Colloquies and Writings: Marriage', in David Englander et al. (eds.), *Culture & Belief in Europe: 1450–1600*, Cambridge, Blackwell Publishers, 1990, 58–65; Juan Luis Vives, *A Very Fruteful and Pleasant Boke Called The Instruction of a Christen Woman [...] Tourned out of Latyne into Englishe by Richard Hyrde*, London, 1557.
3. Eliane Viennot, 'Revisiter la « querelle des femmes »: mais de quoi parle-t-on?', in Viennot, *Revisiter la querelle des femmes. Discours sur l'égalité/inégalité des femmes et des hommes, de 1750 aux lendemains de la Révolution*, Saint Étienne, Publications de l'université de Saint Étienne, 2012, 7–29.
4. Christine de Pizan, *La Cité des Dames*, BnF, MS Français 607; Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun, *Le Roman de la Rose*, BnF, MS Français 25526.
5. Giovanni Boccaccio, *Livre des femmes nobles et renommées [De Claris mulieribus]*, BnF, MS Français 598.
6. Baptiste Fulgose, *Factorum dictorumque memorabilium libri X*, Antwerp, apud J. Bellerum, 1565; Barthélémy Chasseneuz, *Catalogus Gloriarum Mundi*, Frankfurt, impensis S. Feyerabendii, 1579; Caelius Rhodiginus, *Antiquae lectiones*, Venices, Aldus and Andrea Torresani, 1516; Jean Tixier de Ravisi ('Textor'), *Officina*, Basel, apud N. Bryling, 1552. For an in-depth analysis of their works, see Jean Céard, 'Liste des femmes savantes au XVIe siècle', in Colette Nivel (ed.), *Femmes savantes, savoirs des femmes; du crépuscule de la Renaissance à l'aube des lumières. Actes du colloque de Chantilly, Septembre 1995*, Geneva, Droz, 1999, 85–94.
7. Marie-Félicie Perez and Bruno Saunier, 'Une série des femmes illustres ou femmes fortes par Guy François (1578?–1650)', in *In Situ*, 2009, 10, [online] <<http://journals.openedition.org/insitu/4514>>; Nicole Cadène, 'L'histoire au féminin: la « vie » de Marie Stuart par Agnès Strickland', in *Romantisme*, 2002, 115, 41–52.
8. References to Brantôme's *Vies des Dames Illustres, Françaises et Étrangères* will be made in Katharine Prescott Wormely's translation, *The Book of Ladies by Pierre de Bourdeille Abbé de Brantôme*, Boston, Hardy and Pratt & Company, 1899.
9. Jean de La Forge, *Le Cercle des Femmes Sçavantes*, Paris, Jean-Baptiste Loyson, 1663; Jacqueline Guillaume, *Les Dames Illustres*, Paris, Thomas Jolly, 1665; Marguerite Buffet, *Nouvelles Observations sur la Langue Française [...] avec les Éloges des Illustres Sçavantes tant Anciennes que Modernes*, Paris, Jean Cusson, 1668.
10. The only collection in which she features is Nathaniel Crouch's *Admirable Curiosities Rarities and Wonders in England, Scotland and Ireland* (London, Tho. Snowden, 1682), a popular work that does not specifically deal with learned ladies and was published only in 1682.
11. John Guy, *'My Heart is My Own': The Life of Mary Queen of Scots*, London, Fourth Estate, 2004, 68.
12. Aysha Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 211.
13. Sylvène Édouard, *Les Devoirs du Prince – l'Éducation Princière à la Renaissance*, Paris, Garnier, 2014, 41.

14. Anatole de Montaiglon, *Latin Themes of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots*, London, printed for the Warton Club, 1855.
15. Sylvène Édouard, 'Un Exercice Scolaire et Épistolaire: les Lettres Latines de Marie Stuart, 1554', in *Cour de France.fr*, 2013, [online] <<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00942437>>.
16. Guy, 'My Heart is My Own', 68.
17. Xavier Le Person, *Pratiques et Praticqueurs – La Vie Politique à la Fin du Règne de Henri III (1584–1589)*, Geneva, Droz, 254.
18. John Knox and William Croft Dickinson (ed.), *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, vol. 2, London, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1949, 77–78.
19. Julian Sharman, *The Library of Mary, Queen of Scots*, London, Elliot Stock, 1889; John Durkan, 'The Library of Mary Queen of Scots', in Michael Lynch (ed.), *Mary Stewart: Queen in Three Kingdoms*, Oxford and New York, Basil Blackwell, 1988, 71–104.
20. Joannis Leslaei, [...] *Libri duo quorum uno, piae afflicti animi consolationes, divinae remedia, altero, animi tranquilli munimentum & conservatio, continentur; ad serenissimam principem D. Mariam Scotorum reginam*, Parisiis, P. Lhuillier, 1574; Mary Queen of Scots, 'Meditation in Verse', in P. Stewart-Mackenzie (ed.), *Queen Mary's Book*, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1907, 106–110.
21. Anonymous, *Discours Merveilleux de la vie, Actions & Deportemens de Catherine de Medicis Royne Mere*, 1575; Anonymous, *Apologie ou Defense de l'Honorable Sentence et très Juste Execution de Defuncte Marie Steuard*, 1588.
22. Eliane Viennot, 'Échos de la Propagande en Faveur de la Loi Salique dans les Textes Favorables aux Femmes des Dernières Décennies du XVIe Siècle', in Pascale Mounier and Colette Nativel, *Copier et Contrefaire à la Renaissance. Faux et Usage de Faux*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2014, 89–102.
23. Brantôme, *The Book of Ladies*, 90.
24. *Ibid.*; Brantôme, moreover, refers here to Antoine de Fouquelin's (?–1561) *La Rhétorique*, [...] *Nouvellement reveüe* (Paris, A. Wechel, 1557).
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*, 90–91.
27. *Ibid.* The Casket Letters were eight letters found in a silver casket after the arrest of Mary, Queen of Scots, by the Scottish rebels. The casket was in possession of her third husband Lord Bothwell. The letters were accompanied by twelve sonnets. The defenders of Mary claimed that both the letters and sonnets were forged.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Wendy Gibson, *Women in Seventeenth Century France*, Basingstoke and London, Macmillan, 1989, 36.
30. Cf. note 18.
31. Knox and Dickinson (ed.), *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, vol. 2, 77–78.
32. On this, see, for instance, Armel Dubois-Nayt, 'Le statut sémiologique du personnage de Marie Stuart dans l'œuvre de John Knox: la séduction et la sédition', in François Laroque and Franck Lessay, *Enfers et délices à la Renaissance*, Paris, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2003, 102–115; Armel Dubois-Nayt, 'La différence des sexes dans le *Premier coup de trompette contre le monstrueux gouvernement des femmes*: Construction et fonction du « genre » dans la pensée politique de John Knox', in *Revue cités*, 2008, 2(34), 157–169; Armel Dubois-Nayt, 'The Black Legend of Mary of Guise', in Christine Sukic, Bruno Maes, and Annette Bäschstädt (eds.), *Les Annales de l'Est, dossier « Marie de Lorraine-Guise (1515–1560), un itinéraire européen*, 2017, 1, 137–150.
33. On this, see Roxanne Roy, 'L'institution oratoire du Prince ou le savoir au service du bien dire', in *Renaissance and Reformation*, 2008, 31(4), 85–96.

34. 'C'est elle qui meine les assemblées des hommes toutes entieres par la parole, se rend maistresse de leurs affections, tourne leurs volonteز où bon luy semble, et les retire de là où il ne lui plaist pas qu'elles soient inclinées' (Jacques Davy du Perron, *L'avant-discours de rhétorique, ou traité de l'éloquence*, Paris, Pierre Chaudière, 1633, 759).
35. Brantôme, *The Book of Ladies*, 90.
36. The Fronde was a series of civil wars between 1648 and 1653 that took place during the minority of Louis XIV. It was triggered by the opposition of the discontented Parliament and nobility to the policies of the Queen-Regent Anne of Austria and her chief minister, Mazarin.
37. La Forge, *Le Cercle des femmes sçavantes*, 9.
38. Louis de La Forge, *Traité de l'esprit de l'homme, de ses facultez & fonctions*, Amsterdam, Abraham Wolfgang, 16.
39. Jean de La Forge, *La Joueuse dupée ou l'intrigue des Académies, Comédie*, Paris, A. de Sommaville, 1664; Jean de La Forge, *La Hongrie secouruë, poème héroïque présenté au Roy*, Paris, J. Du Brueil et P. Collet, 1664.
40. *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne ou dictionnaire de tous les hommes*, Brussels, H. Ode, 1843–1847, 35.
41. Léon Brédif, *Segrais - Sa vie et ses oeuvres*, Geneva, Slatkine Reprints, 1971, 9.
42. Madeleine de Scudéry, *Artamène, ou le Grand Cyrus*, Paris, A. Courbé, 1650–1653.
43. Molière, *Don Juan. Les Précieuses ridicules*, Paris, J. Tallandier, n.d.
44. 'Notice sur J. de La Forge de Victor Fournel (1875)', in *Théâtre classique*, [online] <http://theatre-classique.fr/pages/programmes/edition.php?t=../documents/LAForge_JOUEUSEDUPEE.xml>
45. Delphine Denis, 'Ce que parler "prétieux" veut dire: Les enseignements d'une fiction linguistique au XVIIe siècle', in *L'Information grammaticale*, 1998, 78, 53–54.
46. Christophe Schuwey, 'Une trajectoire exemplaire au début des années 1660: Antoine Baudeau de Somaize', in *XVIIe siècle*, 2019, 71(3), 540–545; Dominique Lanni, 'La Critique des Femmes Savantes. La Satire des Salons Littéraires dans le Théâtre Antiphilosophique de la Fin de l'Ancien Régime', in Isabelle Brouard-Arends (ed.), *Lectrices d'Ancien Régime*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003, 1–8.
47. Adrien Baillet, *Jugements des savants sur les ouvrages des principaux auteurs*, vol. 1, Paris, 1685–1686, 75–77, in Linda Timmermans, *L'Accès des femmes à la culture*, Paris, Champion, 1993, 154.
48. La Forge, 'Epistre à Madame la Comtesse de Fiesque', in *Le Cercle des femmes sçavantes*, f. Aij.v.
49. 'Que si j'en ay oublié quelques-unes de ce temps icy, dont le mérite qui ne cède pas à celui des autres, ne m'a pas été connu, ce n'a point été dans le dessein de faire tort à leur réputation mais parce que le bruit de leur nom n'est pas encore parvenu à mes oreilles, & que si ce livre réussit assez bien pour m'obliger d'en donner une seconde impression, je ne manqueray pas de réparer mon silence & de leur rendre justice' (La Forge, *Le Cercle des Femmes Sçavantes*, f. B.r-v).
50. Hilarion de Coste, *Les Éloges et les vies des reynes, des princesses et des dames illustres en piété, en courage et en doctrine*, Paris, S. Cramoisy, 1647; Louis Jacob, *Éloge de Mademoiselle Anne Marie de Schurman*, Paris, Rolet le Duc, 1646. I am grateful to Line Cottegnies for suggesting that Buxtor is most likely Johannes Buxtorf, who collects quotes about women, although not always positive ones, in his *Florilegium hebraicum: continens elegantes sententias, proverbia [...]*, Basel, impensis L. König, 1649, 205–221.
51. Erica Harth, *Cartesian Women: Versions and Subversions of Rational Discours in the Old Regime*, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1992, 24.
52. Alain Viala, *La Naissance de l'Écrivain: Sociologie de la Littérature à l'Âge Classique*, Paris, Minuit, 1985, 121–122.

53. 'Mariane, Marie Stuard. Elle est assez connuë dans le monde, & je ne diray seulement pour justifier un de mes vers, que bien qu'elle ait perdu la vie par la main d'un boureau, elle mourut en reyne, & ne perdit rien de sa dignité ny de sa gloire' (La Force, *Le Cercle des Femmes Sçavantes*, 'clef des noms des sçavantes de France', n.p.).
54. Parisien, *Le Théâtre d'Alexandre Hardy*, vol. 2, Paris, Jacques Quesnel, 1625; François L'Hermitte, *La Mariane*, Paris, Augustin Courbé, 1636; Nicolas Caussin, *La Cour sainte, ou l'institution chrestienne des grands*, Paris, S. Chappelet, 1624.
55. 'Telle Mariane en dépit de son sort, finira de beaux jours par une belle mort' (La Forge, *Le Cercle des Femmes Sçavantes*, 9).
56. Ibid.:
 Du célèbre Ronsard, Hélène les délices,
 appliquera ses soins aux mesmes exercices,
 Et sur un double charme appuyant son crédit
 surprendra tout ensemble et le cœur et l'esprit.
 Comme l'on vit jadis les beautez de la Grèce,
 joindre aux autres vertus la science & l'adresse,
 et comme l'on verra dans l'Italie un jour
 de célèbres beautez éclater à leur tour,
 telles on pourra voir Mélinte & Macarise,
 annoblir en naissant la Seine et la Tamise.
57. 'auront l'art d'inspirer la science et l'amour' (ibid.).
58. Elizabeth Elstob was an eighteenth-century woman scholar who translated Madeleine de Scudéry's *Discours de la gloire* ('Essay upon Glory') (1708) and published a grammar book, like Buffet, entitled *the Rudiments of Grammar for the English-Saxon Tongue* (1715). She was a friend of George Ballard, who made use of Elstob's preliminary research to write his *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain* (1752).
59. 'de fermer la bouche à ceux qui ne veulent pas qu'elles égallent les hommes en tout ce qui les rend habiles' (Buffet, *Éloges des illustres sçavantes*, 276; translation by L. S. Meskill). I am grateful to Lynn S. Meskill for letting me use a typescript of Marguerite Buffet and Lynn S. Meskill (ed. and trans.), *New Observations on the French Language with Praises of Illustrious Learned Women*, forthcoming in the series *The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe: The Toronto Series*.
60. Maureen E. Mulvill, 'Jacquette and Marie-Anne Guillaume', in Katharina M. Wilson (ed.), *An Encyclopedia of Continental Women Writers*, vol. 1, New York and London, Garland Publishing, 502.
61. 'GUILLAUME, (Jacquette) du 17ème siècle, est une des femmes qui ont porté trop loin l'amour de leur sexe. Elle a marché sur les traces d'une Vénitienne, Lucrece Marinelli, auteur d'un ouvrage où elle soutient que, pour le mérite, les femmes sont supérieures aux hommes' (Fortunée Briquet, *Dictionnaire Historique, Biographique et Littéraire des Françaises et Étrangères Naturalisées en France*, Paris, Treuttel and Würtz, 1804, 165). Lucrezia Marinella or Marinelli (1571–1653) is an Italian proto-feminist who took part in the *querelle des femmes* and answered the attacks launched on her sex by Giuseppe Passi in *Dei donneschi difetti* ('Women's Defects') (Venetia, Iacobo Antonio Somascho, 1599). Her defence is entitled *La nobiltà et l'eccellenza delle donne co' difetti et mancamenti de gli uomini. Discorso di Lucrezia Marinella in due parti diviso* ('The Nobility and Excellence of Women, and the Defects and Vices of Men') (Venice, Giovan Battista Ciotti Senese, 1600).
62. 'Les raisons de cet ouvrage & de tous ceux qui défendent la même cause n'ont pas été trouvées fort convaincantes' (Jean-François de La Croix, *Dictionnaire Portatif des Femmes Célèbres*, vol. 2, Paris, Belin, 1788, 325).
63. 'ie me sois étudiée à leur donner la teinture du plus éclatant coloris, & [...] ie les ayes parées de leurs plus riches ornemens' (Guillaume, *Les Dames Illustres*, f. aiiij).

64. Jean-Philippe Beaulieu, 'Jacquette Guillaume et Marguerite Buffet: vers une Historiographie du Savoir Féminin ?', in Sylvie Steinberg and Jean-Claude Arnould (eds.), *Les Femmes et l'Écriture de l'Histoire*, Rouen, Presses Universitaires de Rouen et du Havre, 2008, 326.
65. *Ibid.*, 325.
66. The term 'talking portrait' as a translation for 'portraits parlants' is used by Jean-Philippe Beaulieu in his article '« La gloire de nostre sexe » : savantes et lectrices dans Les dames illustres (1665) de Jacquette Guillaume' (*Études françaises*, 47, 3, 2011, 127–142). François Dinot, *Le Théâtre françois des seigneurs et dames illustres*, 1664, chapter XII, 54–59, quoted in Colette H. Winn, *Protestations et revendications féminines – Textes oubliés et inédits sur l'éducation féminine (XVIe–XVIIes)*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2002, 21.
67. Jean-Philippe Beaulieu, "La Gloire de nostre sexe": savantes et lectrices dans Les Dames illustres (1665) de Jacquette Guillaume', in *Études françaises*, 2011, 47(3), 130.
68. 'Marie Stuard Reyne d'Escosse, laissa [sa tête] sur un échaffaut, pour avoir été soupçonnée d'intelligence avec l'Espagnol. La plupart des hommes ne remplissent leur cerveau que de soupçons, de niaiseries, & de sottises, ce qui rend presque toutes les femmes mal-heureuses' (Guillaume, *Les Dames illustres*, 439).
69. Beaulieu, 'Jacquette Guillaume et Marguerite Buffet', 330.
70. Timmermans, *L'Accès des femmes à la culture*, 71.
71. *Ibid.*
72. 'L'art de cacher une partie des trésors qu'elle possède à des gens qui ne la connaissent pas' ('Lettre à Mlle Chalais, Décembre, 13 1640', in Edmé Rathery and Madeleine Boutron, *Mademoiselle de Scudéry, Sa vie et sa correspondance*, Paris, Léon Techener, 1873, 168).
73. 'La règle de la véritable science' (Guillaume, *Les Dames Illustres*, 221).
74. Knox and Dickinson (ed.), *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, vol. 2.
75. Meskill (ed. and trans.), *Praises of Illustrious Learned Women*, 27.
76. *Ibid.*
77. 'Puisque les hommes sont nés pour la société, et que cette société ne se peut entretenir que par les Langues, il ne faut point s'étonner si les plus grands esprits non seulement de nôtre siècle, mais mesme de tous les siècles passés ont toujours este les panégégistes de ceux qui se sont attachez à les apprendre dans leur pureté' (Buffet and Meskill (trans.), *Éloges des illustres sçavantes*, 1–2).
78. Isabelle Ducharme, 'Marguerite Buffet lectrice de la querelle des femmes', in Isabelle Brouard-Arends (ed.), *Lectrices d'Ancien Régime*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003, 260.
79. 'Le véritable secret de bien parler, & bien escrire estoit celuy de sçavoir faire entendre beaucoup en peu de mots' (Buffet and Meskill (trans.), *Éloges des Illustres Sçavantes*, 91).
80. Madame de Chaune, Julienne Moelle, Marguerite Morus, Marguerite of France, Claude Catherine de Clermon, Cassandra, Bestizia Gosadina.
81. 'Cette illustre & vertueuse princesse, parmy la foule de ses malheurs, n'eut jamais d'emportement ny aucune, absence d'esprit, sa raison demeura toujours égale, sans estre altérée par la furie de ses ennemis' (Buffet and Meskill (trans.), *Éloges des illustres sçavantes*, 335–336).
82. 'Cet esprit invincible après un long-temps de prison, sur le temps de mourir, sa constance & sa vertu ravissait ceux qui vouloient l'en consoler, & leur donnoit envie de mourir avec elle, pour aller trouver une beatitude & une vie plus heureuse que celle qu'ils possédoient icy bas' (*ibid.*, 336).
83. 'Les Ecossais révèrent toujours sa mémoire: elle ne mourra jamais parmi ces peuples qui l'ont toujours aimée' (*ibid.*).

84. 'Si les têtes couronnées & les mains qui ont porté le sceptre ne peuvent se defendre de la persecution de leurs ennemis, c'est sans doute où il paroist très injustement en la personne de Marie Stuart qui fut reine de trois royaumes' (ibid., 335).
85. 'Son bel esprit s'appliquoit aux bonnes lettres, elle sçavoit fort bien parler diverses langues' (ibid., 336).
86. 'Les adversaires disent que les ventricules, les sutures des testes, & cerveaux féminins sont plus petits, & plus serez que ceux des mâles' (ibid., 227).
87. 'Les philosophes remarquent en divers animaux & principalement aux asnes & aux buffles, & aux bœufs, lesquels pour avoir de grosses testes, n'en ont pas plus de cervelle ny plus d'esprit' (ibid., 228).
88. 'Que les hommes se vantent donc tant qu'ils voudront, & qu'ils fassent gloire de la grandeur de leurs corps & de la grosseur de leurs testes, cela leur est commun avec de très stupides animaux, & de très grosses et lourdes bestes' (ibid.).
89. Édouard, 'Un Exercice'; Pollnitz, *Princely Education*, 199–219.
90. Gina Luria Walker, 'The Invention of Female Biography', in *Enlightenment and Dissent*, 2014, 29, 79.