

*H-France Review* Vol. 11 (August 2011), No. 197

*Memoirs of Mademoiselle de Montpensier (La Grande Mademoiselle)*. Translated by P. J. Yarrow with the collaboration of William Brooks, MHRA New Translations, vol. I. London: MHRA, 2010. xxxiii + 246 pp. Pb. £9.99 / \$15.99 / €11.99. Kindle Ebook £4.99/ \$7.99. ISBN 978-1-907322-01-3.

Review by Jonathan Spangler, Manchester Metropolitan University.

This volume is the first in an exciting series of new editions of classic works translated into English published by the Modern Humanities Research Association in the United Kingdom.[1] Mademoiselle de Montpensier—Anne-Marie-Louise de Bourbon, often known as ‘La Grande Mademoiselle’ (1627-1693)—would be pleased to know that she was the first, not simply because she regarded herself among the first in the social hierarchy of seventeenth-century Europe (which she did), nor because she was aware that she was one of the first royal women to try her hand at writing and even publishing (which she was). Mademoiselle would be pleased because her story represents one of the first times in European history in which a woman, regnant queens aside, is known for herself, not as the daughter or wife or mother of someone else. Keeping her title of “Mademoiselle” all of her life was perhaps more significant than she knew, and in a small way paved the way for other women, elites at first, then women of other ranks as it became fiscally viable, to *choose* to remain single rather than marry or join a convent.

Whether Mademoiselle de Montpensier chose to remain a spinster or was a victim of circumstance is the topic for a much more narrowly focused study, following the threads laid down in the recent edition of Mademoiselle’s letters on the subject by Joan DeJean,[2] or the extremely thorough (and highly readable) biography by Vincent Pitts.[3] Here we are presented with Mademoiselle’s words alone, with little editorial or academic comment. We can decide for ourselves whether she was a brave pioneer or a naïve dupe.

The original Memoirs in full are quite long, and sometimes get mired in descriptive tedium and repetition, so it is natural for the editors to have shortened them for an English and student audience. This has been done effectively, first by translator P. J. Yarrow, Emeritus Professor of French at the University of Newcastle, then by editor and annotator William Brooks, Professor of French at the University of Bath. Both scholars are admirably chosen for this project, having published numerous books and articles on seventeenth-century France, specifically its theatre and its court women.[4] Their introduction is clear on what has been included here (just under a quarter of the text, p. xxviii), cuts are clearly indicated with ellipses, and summaries are provided of the omitted material in brackets between sections.

The basic material of the Memoirs is divided into two main sections. These are her involvement in the Fronde—including the famous turning of the cannons atop the Bastille in July 1652—and subsequent exile from the court; and her evolving relationship with the marquis de Lauzun in the 1670s, all entailing her interesting psychological shift from hopelessly school-girlish coquette and self-deceiver, to a more aware and cynical mature woman. These two topics cover the segments that are the most well known about La Grande Mademoiselle, so I will not comment on them here. Instead I would like to focus on some of the areas that are less well known, both as they are presented here, as well as some areas that are not to be found in this edition.

The translator and editor of this edition have been careful to leave much of Mademoiselle as they found her. Some of her mistakes remain (but are gently pointed out—such as calling someone Mlle who is a Mme, or giving a name as Grillon rather than Crillon); some of the contradictions remain (the visiting Charles II of Britain speaks French very well on p. 39, terribly at the top of p. 40, then beautifully again when speaking about love on the bottom of p. 40); and some of the dizzy meanderings remain (for example, on p. 149, when she struggles to explain why, although happy as a single woman, she thought she would like to be married). Several instances of old-fashioned expressions are used by the translator, for example, “pulling with all our might and main” (p. 158), or “it is meet” (p. 111), but the reader is never quite sure if the use of such language is intentionally quaint or not. Some of it reads like Enid Blyton: “The comtesse de Fiesque, who had gone to Paris the day before, had not returned, which was rather naughty of her” (p. 92). And there are some oddities of word choice: why use the quaintly (and distinctively English) “marchioness” in a French context (p. xii; though “marquise” is used throughout the actual text)? And why translate a compound surname such as ‘the house of Clermont *of* Amboise’ (p. 2), when Clermont d’Amboise would do? But in the main, this is a highly readable translation of an eminently readable memoir, in places deep and reflective, in others vain, silly and sarcastic.

This is not the heavily annotated tome of a nineteenth-century fanatical footnoter such as Adolphe Chéruel. The editors refer the reader back to that edition for these details, and rely on it for some of their footnotes.<sup>[5]</sup> There are some places where one would have liked them to look a bit closer at the details, but these are not many. For example, the list of the titles she inherited in 1627 (p. xii) is not entirely correct, as she was not Princess of Joinville until 1688 (and even then not fully, as the lawsuits over the Guise succession did not conclude until well after she had died).<sup>[6]</sup> The Duchy of Lorraine was not annexed by the Treaty of Montmartre in 1662 (p. xxvii), which failed spectacularly.<sup>[7]</sup> Some problems are merely details—there was no duchesse de Laval in the seventeenth century (p. 4, fn. 9; and p. 76, fn. 111; the daughter of Séguier was a marquise); Beringhen was not Master of the Horse but First Equerry (p. 42, fn. 67)—while others are more questionable historical interpretations, based perhaps on older readings of historical “givens” with an *étatiste* or franco-centric bias—for example, using an anachronistic phrase like Condé was acting “against his own country” (p. 74, n. 107); or correcting Mademoiselle’s statement that the court went to “Germany” (p. 207, n. 283), when in fact certainly Alsace, and arguably Lorraine *was* Germany in the 1670s. The king of France governed these territories (one *de jure*, one *de facto*), but they remained part of the Holy Roman Empire.

For advanced research on the French court in the seventeenth century, therefore, stick to the Chéruel edition in French. This version is for Anglophone students and provides a useful introduction to memoir writing, and in particular the reflections and writing style of a fascinating aristocratic woman. It provides a rich resource introducing a plethora of themes from court life to marriage, death, duties, and a healthy mixture of pathos, priggishness and humour. In fact, much of the work is doused with a subtle humor often overlooked when writing about Mademoiselle de Montpensier. She delivers a few good one-liners: “...if I want to quarrel with someone, I do it openly.” (p. 108); and provides a good chuckle in some of her understated deadpan reactions, for example to the one of the coquettish nuns in Perpignan who boasted of her lovers: “I did not know what to say to her.” (p. 141).

Yes she is very full of herself—“I owed it to my dignity” (p. 91; her dignity sometimes feels like it’s a separate character in her narrative)—but she can also be quite humble. The *Memoirs* give a good sense of what it was to be royal in the early modern world. Plenty of luxuries and honours came one’s way, but also significant inconveniences, bumping around from place to place on royal travels, sometimes with no place to stay and little to eat, being formally greeted wherever one went, “what pleasure was there in such journeys?” (p. 157). She struggles to be invisible when playing the unofficial tourist (“I am not I; I am incognita”, p. 134), trying to avoid being harangued by the city officials in Avignon, but thoroughly

enjoying the attention, and at times she conveniently “forgets” that she is trying to be incognita (referenced in the introduction, though not in the actual text, p. xviii). She even gets to play at being a real sovereign on one of these tours, with an intriguing section about her subjects and her councillors in her sovereign principality of Dombes (just north of Lyon): she dines in public, she pardons criminals, she receives oaths... (p. 126). But here is a good instance of the reader having to wonder how much of her memories are rose-tinted, for example in her description of the Dombes as a beautiful country, when it was really a fairly miserable swampland, badly affected by disease.

Despite the inconveniences of etiquette and travel, Mademoiselle always seemed to have her sense of humour with her; she was adept at describing mayhem, almost to the point of slapstick. This can be seen to great effect during the court’s travels to the frontier in 1670, amid flooded out roads, dead animals, and carts stuck in the mire; she herself falls into a hole and nearly pulls the Queen into the mud with her, then has to sleep in her carriage. This is followed a few days later by an even more hilarious account of the entire royal family being forced to camp out on mattresses in one room: King, Queen, Monsieur, Madame and two mistresses (La Vallière and Montespan), to the Queen’s great annoyance (alas, poor Marie-Thérèse comes across in these memoirs as a real sourpuss!) (pp. 157-158).

Another incident reveals Mademoiselle’s sense of humour, but also the deviousness required at times to avoid complications of etiquette. During the visit of Queen Christina of Sweden in 1658, Mademoiselle goes to see her, and is clearly mixed in her views of awe and pity, subtly jesting about her appearance, then clearly indicating that the Queen has overstayed her welcome and become a tedious houseguest. The members of the court (Mademoiselle included) find they have to lie to Christina, pretending that the masked balls are tedious rather than fun, so she that she will not attend them, though etiquette would demand it (pp. 114-115). Elsewhere in this section she provides intricate details about court protocol—who pours what for whom—and the difficulties etiquette can sometimes cause when it goes against natural political feelings, as, for example, when members of the court have to hide from the English ambassador to avoid wearing mourning for Cromwell (p. 123). Images such as these undermine, in a playful way, the more stereotypical views we often have of the French court as stately and rigidly correct, much like the images presented in St-Simon’s memoirs of hunchbacked dwarf princesses (Condés and Contis) limping along the corridors of Versailles, which of course smelled of urine since courtiers did not dare leave the presence of the King long enough to find a proper toilet!

In the later years of the 1650s, Mademoiselle began to emerge as an arbiter of etiquette, a role she forged in tandem with the King’s brother, Monsieur, and for which the King was happy to delegate authority.[8] But she also commented on the growing ridiculousness of Monsieur’s behaviour. At times, for example, he courted her as a potential bride—and she gently mocked him, saying in one place that he came to see her off one morning at seven, despite the fact that he never gets up before eleven! (p. 107). A few pages later, she described one of the classic moments in the Monsieur story, when they appeared together at a ball dressed as gypsy girls (p. 116), though her humour turned sharply to concern or criticism when she saw how willing her young cousin was to be sexually humiliated in public by one of his many male favourites. The Memoirs contain many more references to this interaction between Mademoiselle and Monsieur and their shared interests in court protocol and fashion. It is Monsieur who arbitrates a potential precedence dispute between Henrietta Anne of England and Mademoiselle, by suggesting they enter any room hand-in-hand (p. 113); it is also Monsieur who suggests to Louis that asking for Mademoiselle’s hand in marriage the day after the death of his first wife is a breach in etiquette (p. 169). In fuller versions of the Memoirs, Mademoiselle goes to great lengths to describe the frequently matching gowns she and Monsieur wore to court balls. For example, in the winter of 1659, they wore silver cloth with silver lace, pink piping, pearls and diamonds, and pink and white feathers, topped off by their hair coiffed like shepherdesses from Bresse (Chéruel, III, pp. 355-356). Mademoiselle never seems uncomfortable with young Philippe’s sexuality, rather his dignity as a prince, but she was certainly wary of the attentions of his favourites on her

fortune, notably during the second possible engagement between the two cousins in 1670 (pp. 170-171).<sup>[9]</sup>

Another area that is cut down, which actually has more impact on our understanding of Mademoiselle's relationships with members of her extended family, is the material dealing with her grandmother, the Duchess of Guise, and her aunt, Mlle de Guise, who took over control of the family after the Duchess's death in 1656.

The Duchess is presented from the very start as one of several lamented absentee parents, as Mademoiselle's mother died early on, her paternal grandmother Marie de' Medicis was exiled, and her father ignored her. Her desire for paternal love and the growing impatience and even embarrassment of her relationship with Gaston are persistent themes throughout the *Memoirs* (dealt with at length, pp. 130-131; 137-38). But, after brushing aside Mademoiselle's early comment about her maternal grandmother, the Duchess of Guise, as "only remotely my grandmother; she is no queen"—which, in my opinion, is not a slam against her second husband, the Duke of Guise, as indicated in a footnote, but rather against the Duchess herself, as a member of the House of Joyeuse, which rose from relatively provincial obscurity to the top of the court hierarchy in one generation thanks to the good looks of her uncle, one of the mignons of Henri III—her relations with the Guise are mostly cut from this edition. Her Guise grandmother, for instance, can be partly excused for ignoring the young Mademoiselle (if in fact she did) since she was busy raising seven children of her own, and was herself exiled from France for nine years, from 1634 to 1643.<sup>[10]</sup>

What is missing from this edition is *not* Mademoiselle's disdain for her Guisard and Lorraine relations (including her step-mother, Marguerite de Lorraine and half sisters, one of whom becomes Duchess of Guise)—there is plenty of that here—but rather the shift in her emotions, due in large part to legal entanglements after her grandmother's acts as "mediator" between herself and her father, and her grandmother's subsequent death in 1656, when Mademoiselle discovered she had been almost entirely cut out of the will. This shift complements nicely the other changes in her emotional state in dealing with topics like love and matrimony. Prior to the 1650s, she regarded her Guisard relations warmly: she was very glad to see the Duchess and her children when they returned from Florence in 1643, and went to see them at the Hôtel de Guise almost every day (Chéruel, I, 70-71); she was even pleased to see her step-mother give birth to a son ("ce qui me donna une joie infinite et la plus grande que j'aie sentie de ma vie."), and commissioned fireworks, since she knew how important it was to her father to have a male heir for the House of Orléans (Chéruel, I, 255). It was in fact her Guise grandmother who looked after her finances in the earliest years of her life, since her father Gaston was still legally a minor until she was about seven.<sup>[11]</sup>

But in her post-1650s writings, Mademoiselle is probably justified in her annoyance at being "betrayed" by her grandmother's arbitration, which not only failed to award her large sums of money owed to her by her father, but in fact ordered that she was responsible to cover his significant debts!<sup>[12]</sup> On the other hand, her reaction to her exclusion from the Duchess's succession reveals one of the most petty sides to Mademoiselle's character, when possibly the richest woman in France complained about money being divided evenly between herself and her poorer cousins. The Duchess, in her testament of 25 November 1655, quite rationally asks Mademoiselle: "to accept this [donation of a pension and a large diamond] and to consider the great wealth which she has ... which was notably augmented during the time we had administration of it, and to accept that all [the amounts] she could claim on the rest of my succession would not be very considerable for her, as they are greatly so for the rest of my children, to whom I have been obliged to provide the means of sustaining the dignity of their birth."<sup>[13]</sup> Mademoiselle's response: "Je me trouvai déshéritée; ce qui me surprit fort. Je ne croyois pas qu'après m'avoir tant ôté de choses dans mes affaires avec Son Altesse royal [her father], elle fût encore d'humeur à faire des libéralités à mes dépens à ses autres enfants."<sup>[14]</sup> She then battled her aunt, Mlle de Guise, for this succession for the rest of her life. Another interesting detail which alludes to this emotional shift is in her passing

references to the composer and ballet master, Lully, whom she was excited to take into her service as an Italian instructor as a “gift” from her cousin Roger, chevalier de Guise, sent to her from Florence in 1646. [15] Her later references noted “Jean-Baptiste” only in passing as the King’s ballet master (Chéruel, III, 347-348), with no hint of her earlier relationship with him (nor is this noted in the footnotes by the editors). She has surgically removed certain memories and former associations.

I am certainly biased due to my specific entwinement with the Guise and the House of Lorraine, but these omissions potentially reflect an outmoded mentality of conceptualising historically significant individuals in the early modern world from a solely patrilineal approach, when it is increasingly apparent that members of this society were always aware of both lineages in the “kinship clusters” that were central in the construction of individual identities. I have no doubt that this opinion is shared by Yarrow and Brooks, but this translation’s cuts do result in a (minor) imbalance of Mademoiselle’s relationship with her relatives, in favour of her father.

Above all, this new translation provides access to some quite stirring passages of expression and contemplation. From the very start we are given an exposition on “why I write,” which is worth quoting at length: “I used to have great difficulty in imagining how the mind of someone accustomed to the court, and born to live at it with the rank that my birth confers on me, could occupy itself when that person found himself condemned to live in the country; ... since I have been secluded on my estates, I have had the pleasant experience of finding that remembering everything that has happened during one’s lifetime is a sufficiently enjoyable occupation. ... my natural curiosity had led me to discover some [of the things that I have learned in my life] are sufficiently curious to make me think that they will not bore the reader.” The translation by Yarrow captures the flavour of this opening paragraph nicely—though I rather like the original word “reduced” instead of “condemned” to show a real courtier’s bias against country living!

She establishes that she enjoys writing, but she does not dwell on this much here. We do not get many references to her participation in the salon culture of the 1650s, or her own contributions, in the literary portraits of her friends, or her contribution to the evolution of the novel as a genre, such as the *Histoire de Jeanne Lambert d’Herbigny, marquise de Fouquerolle* (1653). The editors mention this in their introduction (pp. xxiii-xxiv), but here is potentially an area where students and general readers would benefit from a little more scholarly apparatus—though this is briefly touched on in the “further reading” section at the rear—especially since this is a subject these two scholars of French literature know a great deal about. [16]

The editors help us to understand Mademoiselle the human being, with contradictions and emotions. In their introduction, she is described by them as naïve, but there is genuine wisdom here as well, for example, in her moderate and carefully considered views on Jansenism (pp. 95-98). She understands that disputes are not all black and white, that, for example, not all Jesuits are black-hearted. In one particularly revealing section, Mademoiselle attempts in her own manner to analyse herself and her contradictions: “In what I am saying about myself, there is much nobility of feeling, but there are also defects in my temperament. I do not, therefore, need to be afraid of praising myself too much, because, at the same moment, I admit the faults in what might appear a praiseworthy act on my part” (p. 142). She writes this in admission of her jealousy at seeing her half-sisters enjoy the honour of living in close proximity to the Queen, something which is denied to Mademoiselle due to her “opulence,” i.e., she could afford a house of her own.

As we read along, we see Mademoiselle mature and grow (recalling that the memoirs were written in several quite distinct periods of her life, from 1659 to the late 1670s and 80s). This seems to culminate in a cry out against God himself, a momentary going off the hinges for a normally quite pious woman (p. 193). Throughout the Memoirs, she has blamed her misfortunes on those surrounding her (this commences on page 1); here, on discovering that



her planned marriage to Lauzun has been scuppered, she places the blame higher: “Throughout all this, God alone could have given me comfort; but as He wanted suffering to make me His, He was not willing to give me any.” This moment of drama is corroborated by the memoirs of the Abbé de Choisy, who describes her “like a fury, dishevelled, her arms raised in threats to heaven and earth”, and by Mme de Sévigné, who calls it a “perfect piece of theatre”.<sup>[17]</sup> Here is a great example of a primary source selection to help students see the drama of life and emotions in the early modern world, which can in many sources appear quite dry and soulless.

At a higher level, what more theoretical ideas or seminar discussion points can be gained through this translation of the memoirs? As mentioned in the forward by Jean Garapon, Mademoiselle exhibited a spirit of non-conformism, unusual for its day, and foreshadowed liberty of conscience, even feminism. But there is more here, especially from a political angle. She revealed her adherence to an older code of monarchy, a “corporate” enterprise, in which all members of the family took part in the governance of the Kingdom. This was one of the key concepts being dismantled by the cardinal-ministers, with the support notably of Queen Anne, and which continuously rankled those excluded from the centralisation of power: Marie de’ Medici, Gaston d’Orléans, the prince de Condé, and Mademoiselle de Montpensier herself. We can see this in part in her references to her father’s apanage, including its chief city of Orléans, which in her words, he “owns” (pp. 54, 59). But we can also see some of her concessions towards a more centralised absolutism, almost word for word Hobbesian, in a quote included from the Chéruel edition in the introduction: “it seems to me that the authority of one man partakes so much of divinity that one should submit joyfully and respectfully to it of one’s own free will, even if God had not willed us to be born under it.” (p. xvi, citing Chéruel, I, 191).

On a more social level, the memoirs provide interesting, if often contradictory, views on why a woman of Mademoiselle’s rank might choose to be single. In the 1650s, she was convinced that “her dignity” restricted her from making free choices, and that only suitors of appropriate (read: royal or imperial) rank should apply. This shifted in the 1660s when she realised that companionship of whatever sort could make a person happy, so it might as well be Lauzun (with another great opening line for this chapter: “As man cannot leave well alone and has a fickle mind, I began to be weary of my condition, though a happy one, and to wish to be married,” p. 148). But when these plans were dashed, and Lauzun was revealed to be the cad that he was (despite her self-deprecating arguments to the contrary: “he did not mean what he was saying,” p. 165; though was she really so self-deceiving? “through it all I could see what I wanted to see.” p. 176), she explained why women of her rank, if not called to be married to foreign sovereigns, should remain in the world and not join convents. Their role was to build and support schools, hospitals, orphanages, seminaries, and so on (p. 200). In this Mademoiselle began, unwittingly or not, to provide a role model for other women of her rank. A quick look through prosopographical resources from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries reveals a growing number of women at the court who had the financial means and the social acceptance to remain single, rather than being forced into marriage or life in a convent. In my own work on the Guise, I found convincing stories of women in this situation, Mlle de Guise, Mlle d’Elbeuf, Mlle de Lillebonne and Mlle d’Armagnac, the last of whom even rejected a clear offer by Louis XIV to become the next Grand Duchess of Tuscany, as she preferred to stay at Versailles where she could play cards and receive her friends informally as she pleased.<sup>[18]</sup> It would be a leap to assert that La Grande Mademoiselle was the model for “That Girl,” but it is a starting point for a discussion of the levels of choice or victimhood for aristocratic women of this period.

This new translation of Mademoiselle de Montpensier’s Memoirs provides an efficient, clean, easy to read and well-presented edition that will be quite useful for undergraduate teaching. From the very start, it effectively highlights the paradox of Mademoiselle de Montpensier having everything and nothing at once—rank and wealth, but little happiness in marriage or politics: “Born with all possible greatness and the advantages God has given me, I have been so unhappy all my life” (p. xii). As catharsis, she turns to writing, to share

her feelings and to provide some self-justification for her actions. At once an insistence of her right to freedom of action, her memoirs are also a record of her perceived condemnation to spinsterhood and solitude.

## NOTES

[1] The series, New Translations, complements the older series of Tudor and Stuart Translations, and another new series, European Translations. See [www.translations.mhra.org.uk](http://www.translations.mhra.org.uk). It is hoped more like this will soon follow, for example the memoirs of Primi Visconti or Baron Spanheim.

[2] Joan DeJean, ed., *Against Marriage: The Correspondence of la Grande Mademoiselle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

[3] Vincent Pitts, *La Grande Mademoiselle at the Court of France (1627-1693)* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000). See specifically chapter eight, "The Muse's Lament."

[4] Yarrow and Brooks collaborated previously on a study bringing together the worlds of the theatre and the court: *The Dramatic Criticism of Elizabeth Charlotte, duchesse d'Orléans, with an annotated chronology of performances of the popular and court theatre in France (1671-1722), reconstructed from her letters* (Lewiston, N.Y., Queenston, Ont, and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996).

[5] Adolphe Chéruel, *Mémoires de Mlle de Montpensier, petite-fille de Henri IV*, 4 vols. (Paris: Charpentier, 1858-1859).

[6] The main settlement for the Guise succession was in 1698, though parallel lawsuits continued for another decade. I have written briefly about this elsewhere, in "Benefit or Burden? Elite Widows in Seventeenth-Century France," *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* 31 (2003): 78, fn. 25.

[7] As it happens, I have also written elsewhere on this topic: "A Lesson in Diplomacy for Louis XIV: The Treaty of Montmartre, 1662, and the Princes of the House of Lorraine," *French History* 17 (2003): 225-250.

[8] As indicated by the authors in the introduction (p. xvi).

[9] Discussions of Monsieur's sexuality, often with reference to comments from Mademoiselle's memoirs, are provided in Nancy Nichols Barker, *Brother to the Sun King. Philippe, Duke of Orléans* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), chapters three and five; and Dirk Van der Cruysse, *Madame Palatine, princesse européenne* (Paris: Fayard, 1988), chapter five.

[10] This is covered well by Pitts, p. 8.

[11] The letters giving Gaston the guardianship of his daughter, 27 July 1627, name Guise as "tuteur subrogé," but Parlement refused to register these, as Gaston himself was a minor. It was not until 1635 that Gaston received full authority over his daughter. Bibliothèque Nationale, Joly de Fleury 120, fols. 246, 273.

[12] See Pitts, pp. 114-120; and Mademoiselle's words in Chéruel, vol. II, pp. 296-97; 327-33; and 341ff.

[13] Archives Nationales, K 540, no. 32.

[14] Chéruef, vol. II, pp. 368, 381-382.

[15] Patricia Ranum, *Portraits Around Marc-Antoine Charpentier* (Baltimore, 2004), p. 548; for more details on the relationship between Mademoiselle, the Guise and Lully, see Jérôme de La Gorce, *Jean-Baptiste Lully* (Paris: Fayard, 2002), pp. 22-56; or more specifically, Catherine Massip, "Le mécénat musical de Mademoiselle," *Papers on French Seventeenth-Century Literature* 22, no. 42, (1995): 79-90.

[16] The favoured specialist in the writings of La Grande Mademoiselle given in the "further reading" section is Jean Garapon, notably his *La Culture d'une princesse: écriture et autoportrait chez Mlle de Montpensier* (Paris: Champion, 2003).

[17] Both Choisy and Sévigné are cited and translated in Pitts, p. 204.

[18] As related by Saint-Simon (Louis de Rouvroy, duc de), *Mémoires*, ed. A. de Boislisle (Paris, 1879-1928), vol. XIII, p. 354. This is backed up in part by some of the papers of the succession of Mlle d'Armagnac (Charlotte de Lorraine) in AN, T 1503<sup>1</sup> and T 491<sup>6</sup>, revealing quite a significant fortune.

Jonathan Spangler  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
[j.spangler@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:j.spangler@mmu.ac.uk)

Copyright © 2011 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/ republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172