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ABSTRACT

Redefining Place Through the Mazarinades: The Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale

Nathan Kent Jellen
Department of French and Italian, BYU
Master of Arts

In 1649, during the Fronde Parlementaire (1648-1650), Paris was teetering between opposing political camps that were trying to seize control of the city. The city’s bourgeois parliament, in open rebellion to the political policies of King Louis XIV’s Chief Minister, Cardinal Jules Mazarin, was raising an army and threatening to oust the Italian imposter. With the rise in violence within the city limits, Parisian printers and booksellers began circulating political propaganda in the form of booklets, mini-plays, brochures, and pamphlets that came to be known as mazarinades. Because these mazarinades—which took their name from the very man they were either attacking or defending—were often scathing in their criticism of the political forces at play within the city, they were rarely attributed to an identifiable author. But while the minds behind the matter were usually anonymous, the authors of the mazarinades made frequent reference to specific public places within Paris in an attempt to rally support to their cause. These public places, especially the Bourbon-constructed projects of the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale, were depicted in new ways to transform Parisian perceptions of the functionality of those places and to alter the relationship between the city’s inhabitants and their Bourbon royal family. This was done in an effort to manipulate public opinion and to redefine the urban culture of the city during the conflict.

This thesis demonstrates that the mazarinades were altering their Parisian readers’ perceptions of the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale as they tried to sway public opinion in favor of their authors’ partisan viewpoints of the citywide conflict. By appropriating these places and subsequently attributing specific political viewpoints and behaviors to their visitors, the authors of the mazarinades sought to change the way Parisians perceived those places and thus redirect the political atmosphere of the city. Public space became the critical intersection of the many political camps and emerged as a major thematic element in the many mazarinades circulating throughout Paris at that time.
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Introduction

“Not only is the city an object which is perceived (and perhaps enjoyed) by millions of people of widely diverse class and character, but it is the product of many builders who are constantly modifying the structure for reasons of their own.”

-Kevin Lynch, *The Image of the City*

In an unusual letter dated 1649, and distributed by a bookseller named Jean Paslé, the bronze statue of Henri IV located on the Pont-Neuf addresses the statue of his son, Louis XIII, in the Place Royale:

MON FILS, je n’ay peu encore satisfaire ma curiosité depuis le temps que j’ay remarqué avec de l’estonnement, beaucoup de trouble dans l’action de ceux qui passent pardessus ce Pont, & l’appareil extraordinaire où les Citoyens m’ont paru : je les ay veu marcher armez & animez, comme pour repousser genereusement l’ennemy qui les voudrait assieger, & plusieurs bruits de trompettes & de tambours de tous costez, m’ont fait connoistre que dans l’enceinte de cette grande Ville le calme auait fait place au desordre. (“Lettre dv roy Henri IV,” 3)

The astonishment described by this immobile *Roy de Bronze* at the sight of so much disorder around it reflected the greater response of the inhabitants of Paris in 1649 as their city was being torn between the opposing political camps of the Fronde Parlementaire (1648-1650) and the royalist forces under the direction of King Louis XIV’s Chief Minister, Cardinal Jules Mazarin. The city’s parliament stood in open rebellion to the policies of the royal administration and sought through military coercion to limit Mazarin’s power. With the rise in violence within the city limits, Parisian printers and booksellers began circulating political propaganda (like the
example above) in the form of booklets, mini-plays, brochures, and pamphlets that came to be commonly referred to as mazarinades. Because these mazarinades—which derived their name from the very man they were attacking or defending—were critical of the political forces at play within Paris, they were rarely attributed to an identifiable author. They did, however, make frequent mention of different places within the city as if to anchor their judgments in the urban culture of those particular city places. In this way, the mazarinades sought to participate in, or even change, the public’s ideas and views concerning these places, reshaping what scholars have called the urban imaginary.

Urban imaginaries are the behavioral notions city dwellers associate with specific urban places: “What we think about a city…informs the ways we act in it” (Huyssen 3). They dictate which social norms are acceptable within the limits of those places and project specific cultural, social, and especially political beliefs and practices onto the inhabitants and visitors of those places. Within the context of the Fronde Parlementaire, the mazarinades take a keen interest in claiming and redefining the imaginaries—or collective narratives—of the most influential public places in Paris. This present study considers two of the most commonly cited public places in the mazarinades: the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale. These two places were regarded as powerful voices in forging new imaginaries. This was on account of their history as the two most important building projects of the first Bourbon monarch, Henri IV, and because of their accessibility to all Parisians, no matter their social status or background. These two sites were often described by competing mazarinades as having specific purposes within the broader citywide conflict. Their appropriation in the mazarinades also contributed to the wider hostility exhibited by the city towards its royal administration and perhaps explains why Louis XIV eventually abandoned Paris for the royally regulated confines of Versailles. My specific aim in
this thesis is to analyze how the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale were being re-imagined and mobilized in the mazarinades of 1649, at the peak of their publication during the Fronde Parlementaire. Through this study, we can better understand the effort that was being made to propagate politically motivated narratives throughout the city at that time.

A Spatial Approach to the Mazarinades

From a literary perspective, the mazarinades have only been taken seriously if they met certain aesthetic criteria. As an example, Gabriel Naudé, in his Jugement de tout ce qui a esté imprimé contre le Cardinal Mazarin (1650), laid out several features that measured the overall quality of a mazarinade and could thus allow its readers to know whether or not the criticism ought to be taken seriously. Among Naudé’s criteria are, most notably, that a mazarinade “n’expose rien qui ne soit veritable,” that it be “fournie de bons memoires, & qu’elle descend dans le detail & le particulier de ce qu’elle traitte,” that it observe “vne moderation,” that it have “vn stile poly & agreable,” and that it be “également forte & remplie par tout de bon sens, & de iugement” (Naudé 199-200). With those criteria in mind, it should be noted that Gabriel Naudé was the personal librarian for Jules Mazarin, and that his Jugement is undeniably partial to his employer. Many of his criteria are based on mazarinades that defend the Cardinal. But even Celestin Moreau in his authoritative Bibliographie des Mazarinades of 1850 was fixed on including short assessments of the overall quality of the mazarinades he was cataloguing and largely based his judgments on the eloquence of each mazarinade’s language. As an example, in his notes on a mazarinade entitled Apologie de Monseigneur l’éminentissime cardinal Mazarin (1649), all Moreau had to say was “C’est ici une apologie véritable. La pièce est assez mauvaise pour être devenue quelque peu rare” (54). While in this instance admittedly comical, many
approaches to these documents for some reason resort to understanding them in terms of how “well-written” or how sophisticated the language of the text may seem to the reader. It is as though any given mazarinade should only be deemed credible if its arguments are sound, if its language demonstrates some level of sophistication, and, after reaching a suitable conclusion on these first two matters, if the reader determines that the intellect of its author is sufficiently developed. But this interest in aesthetics becomes rather mundane because of its basis in the relativity of preferences and ultimately distracts from the role these texts were playing in the wider conflict that was the Fronde Parlementaire.

To overcome this tendency to consider the mazarinades in terms of their aesthetic value, Christian Jouhaud, in his study *Mazarinades: la Fronde des mots*, writes: “A la limite, s’il fallait absolument trouver des critères de qualité, l’un des plus importants serait cette capacité à fonctionner dans l’instant, infiniment loin donc des positions de nos érudits qui attendent les recueils et vantent les textes qui ‘sont bons en tout temps’” (36). Jouhaud’s observation invites us to look beyond their aesthetic appeal by instead focusing on the mazarinades’ ability to function in the moment of their publication. As such, my focus here is to consider these arguments in light of how they set out to manipulate urban perceptions of place through the context of the political feud of the Fronde Parlementaire.

In this vein of thought, it is necessary to consider the place of these mazarinades in their political context. Jouhaud has argued: “Les mazarinades ne sont pas des témoignages sur les idées politiques d’un auteur ou d’une époque. Ou elles ne le sont que subsidiairement et d’une manière retorse. Elles ne sont pas le reflet d’une opinion publique et ne peuvent que très mal servir à l’écriture d’une histoire des idées politiques” (38). That the mazarinades are not a reflection of a public opinion is wholly consistent with my findings. If they had merely reflected
public opinion, they would not have set out to alter Parisian views of those public places. This would have been because their political ideas would have already conformed to urban imaginaries of the city of Paris. But because their political opinions did not encapsulate public opinion of the Fronde Parlementaire and because, as Alev Çinar and Thomas Bender have noted, “the ways in which a city is conceived, experienced, and represented are always conditioned by politics” (xvii), this study’s interest in how urban places can be manipulated in literature to impact public opinion is relevant to the more general question of why these mazarinades were circulating in Paris and why that is significant. To these questions, Jouhaud responds:

La ville, entité juridique et politique dans laquelle [les mazarinades] se diffusent, sépare constamment ce que mèle Naudé, les citadins et les campagnards, les artisans et les valets. Dans ses murs, dans son espace public, là où elles sont destinées à circuler – elles ont été écrites pour cela –, les mazarinades sont une littérature de partage social. Et aussi une littérature de factions, éphémère, bondissante. (35-36)

In this study, I consider the mazarinades with respect to the space (“la ville”) in which they were circulating to demonstrate the “partage social” they were creating in Paris. More specifically, I aim to focus my analysis on descriptions of specific public places within the city—the physical loci of “partage[s] socia[ux].” By this I mean that through their descriptions of physical places, the mazarinades set out to project new meaning onto those places in an effort to alter Parisian perceptions of their functionality.

Where I differ from Jouhaud, however, is in my approach to understanding how these political pamphlets were impacting perceptions of public places during the Fronde Parlementaire. Jouhaud is of the opinion that
Contrairement à d’autres corpus, tels les cahiers de doléances, les mazarinades ne se prêtent pas aux études sérielles. Il est impossible de les mettre bout à bout, en les considérant comme une collection d’énoncés homologues, c’est-à-dire, en dernière analyse, comme un vaste énoncé. Chacune est autonome, malgré les ressemblances…(38)

While I agree that each mazarinade is autonomous in its expression of political thought, from the perspective of urban imaginaries, there are recurrent themes threaded through multiple works that implicate the superimposition of a new narrative on designated public places. For this reason, my focus is on how specific sites—the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale—were mediating that political material to a Parisian audience in a way that was seeking to reconstruct popular notions of what the urban culture was and which parts of Paris could be associated with that political material. While each mazarinade is unique in its presentation of what the new urban imaginary should be, there are significant thematic similarities that bind many mazarinades together and that create solid projections of what the new imaginaries should be.

To further justify my use of the mazarinades as manipulators of the urban culture of Paris in 1649, one last observation is necessary. In his book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Benedict Anderson attributes the rise of imagined nationalism in Western Europe to “the novel and the newspaper” (25). Anderson argues that these two factors were critical in dispersing notions of identity and community. In strikingly similar fashion, the mazarinades were playing the same role in Paris in 1649. Denis Richet has certified the importance of printed material, particularly the thousands of mazarinades, during the Fronde:

“Alors l’écrit [pendant la Fronde] devint, en lui même, un acte, l’arme absolue en un moment où l’on ne pouvait résoudre autrement les problèmes. L’écrit cessa pour un temps d’être un segment
du réel historique pour en devenir le corps et le cœur” (7-8). We see in this observation that the mazarinades came to play a critical role in the political struggle that was tearing apart the city of Paris. As Richet has so astutely remarked, these political pamphlets came to embody the real historical forces at play. Literature and history, in his observation, welded together to identify and resolve the conflict. In essence, the mazarinades became the Fronde. No other record could better represent that widespread commotion in 1649, when the production of the mazarinades was at its height, and no other depiction of Paris’s major landmarks could better exemplify the turmoil that the city was experiencing. For this reason, my focus on how the mazarinades were presenting new narratives surrounding specific public places is relevant not only to the study of the Fronde and how it changed the urban atmosphere of mid-seventeenth century Paris, but also to the wider issue of how texts interface with and shape the urban culture that produces and consumes them.

Numerous studies have already examined Paris’ unique cityscape in light of urban theory, especially as that city is represented in different literary works. But few, if any, of these studies have considered Paris prior to its most obvious period of reconstruction under Haussmann in the nineteenth century. David Harvey’s *Paris, Capital of Modernity* and Walter Benjamin’s *Arcades Project* have been influential in determining how we consider Paris in the urban humanities today. But it is also clear that place was playing a critical role in determining the urban culture of Paris well before the nineteenth century. Mikhail Bakhtin has demonstrated in *Rabelais and His World* that the language and behaviors of the marketplace were impacting the inhabitants of Paris and other French cities as early as the Middle Ages, well before the seventeenth century and the Fronde. But for our purposes here, traces of the influence of urban places on their visitors can be found in the thousands of mazarinades that were circulating in Paris during the Fronde, so much
so that Celestin Moreau’s *Bibliographie des Mazarinades* frequently includes in its descriptions of over 4000 mazarinades references to specific features within the Parisian cityscape. As the Fronde was, during its initial stages from 1648-1650, essentially a city war, the influence of place in determining the new urban culture of Paris was quite substantial. The mazarinades played a unique role in mediating to Parisians how the collective narrative of the city was changing and how a new urban imaginary was superimposing itself on the royal capital of France.

**Urban Imaginaries**

So what exactly is an urban imaginary? Before we can answer this question, it is important to define the terms “place” and “space” to ensure the consistency of meaning throughout this analysis. Here I borrow Yi-Fu Tuan’s definitions of these terms. “Places” are tied to human experience; people relate personal and social meaning to them. “Spaces,” on the other hand, have no ascribed meaning; they exist as passageways and fill the distances between places. Tuan observes: “If we think of space as that which allows movement, then place is pause; each pause in movement makes it possible for location to be transformed into place” (6). “Places” then are specific points that draw people as destinations and “space” is the obstacle people must move through in order to reach those destinations. These distinctions are necessary in developing the notion of urban imaginaries.

To do so, we must draw from Andreas Huyssen’s observation that “no real city can ever be grasped in its present or past totality by any single person” (3). Cities, by their nature, are too vast for any single person to completely comprehend. Rather than frequenting all parts of the city in which they live, individual city dwellers interact with only certain monuments, buildings, public places and spaces, etc., on a daily basis. However, as Kevin Lynch has noted, “Nothing is
experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences” (1). As city dwellers interact daily with their city’s places and spaces, they will begin to associate them with certain people, buildings, memories, sights and sounds. These many different variables feed their understanding of their city by ascribing meaning to it in ways that give rise to a sense of urban culture. But cities are too large to completely comprehend. Any person’s experiences in a city are limited to what Kevin Lynch has described as a “cognitive map.” This cognitive map is a conception of the city based entirely on an individual’s own experience interacting with the parts of the city that he or she frequents on a regular basis. It is from this cognitive map that urban imaginaries—shared understandings of what the use of certain places is—are born. These imaginaries inform the behavior of urban dwellers within certain city places. They influence the way people see their city and dictate the manner in which they interact with other people in certain urban settings. Huyssten has noted:

An urban imaginary marks first and foremost the way city dwellers imagine their own city as the place of everyday life, the site of inspiring traditions and continuities as well as the scene of histories of destruction, crime, and conflicts of all kinds. Urban space is always and inevitably social space involving subjectivities and identities differentiated by class and race, gender and age, education and religion. An urban imaginary is the cognitive and somatic image which we carry within us of the places where we live, work, and play. It is an embodied material fact. Urban imaginaries are thus part of any city’s reality, rather than being only figments of the imagination. What we think about a city and how we perceive it informs the ways we act in it. (3)
In essence, urban imaginaries imbue any given cityscape with experience-based associations and meaning. They transform locations into places. They are what make cities unique on a cultural level as they suffuse behavioral patterns through perceptions of location-based social pressure and political norms. They are an important reason why we ascribe certain viewpoints to particular physical places and then expect people from those places to conform to those viewpoints. Lynch describes this phenomenon in the following manner:

There seems to be a public image of any given city which is the overlap of many individual images. Or perhaps there is a series of public images, each held by some significant number of citizens. Such group images are necessary if an individual is to operate successfully within his environment and to cooperate with his fellows. Each individual picture is unique, with some content that is rarely or never communicated, yet it approximates the public image, which, in different environments, is more or less compelling, more or less embracing. (46)

Lynch’s observations are particularly pertinent to my study of the mazarinades in 1649. While it is impossible for us today to fully conceptualize the urban environment of Paris during the Fronde Parlementaire, the mazarinades give us a unique understanding of how the different political camps in the Fronde were competing for dominion over the city. A perhaps startling pattern in these texts is their frequent reference to various public places within the city and their markedly inconsistent depictions of those places. With an understanding of urban imaginaries, however, we recognize that these references are actually masked attempts at superimposing new narratives upon the traditional urban conceptions of the use of those same city places.

My approach to understanding the urban imaginaries described in the mazarinades is largely derived from Kevin Lynch’s criteria on how to consider the “environmental image” of
various city places. Lynch breaks this “environmental image”—how a specific place in a city fits in with the rest of the city—into three critical parts: identity, structure, and meaning. In my study, I will begin by identifying my subjects, “which implies [their] distinction from other things, [their] recognition as [separable entities]” (Lynch 8). The subjects I have selected for study are the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale; their distinction from other Parisian places (“identification”) follows in the next section below.

It is also necessary to consider the structure of an image—the “spatial or pattern relation of the object to the observer and to other objects” (Lynch 8). This structure is presented to us in the form of the actual descriptions of the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale found in the mazarinades. It is through these descriptions that a relationship between these places and the readers of the implicated mazarinades is created and developed. The specific mazarinades become the media of these relationships as they create mental images of the new functionality of the places they describe.

The substance of my study focuses on the meaning aspect of these urban imaginaries. Lynch says: “this [urban space] must have some meaning for the observer, whether practical or emotional. Meaning is also a relation, but quite a different one from spatial or pattern relation” (8). Meaning relates to the cultural and political narrative a city dweller—or here, a reader of a mazarinade—associates with the identified urban place. As the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale are described in non-traditional ways in the mazarinades, the readers of these documents can begin to ascribe new meaning to those places and the dominant collective narrative can begin to be contested and transformed. By taking this methodical approach to understanding the proposed imaginaries for the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale in the mazarinades, this study is able to
extract the politically motivated initiatives that were trying to transform the Parisian narrative of the real function of these places during the Fronde Parlementaire.

Henri IV’s Pont-Neuf and Place Royale

There were certainly many important places in Paris during the Fronde Parlementaire, and while each place merits its own consideration with regards to the mazarinades, this study is primarily centered on the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale. As the two most important building projects of Henri IV in the early seventeenth century, these two sites were constructed to shape Paris into a modern commercial and political capital for France. In the words of Anthony Sutcliffe, “Henri IV (1589-1610) put Paris on the path of modernisation. Indeed, in a short reign he did more for the capital than any other French king, before or since” (19). In the twelve years following his own Edict of Nantes (1598), which marked the end of the lengthy, violent Wars of Religion, Henri IV took it upon himself to restore France’s confidence in the power of its monarch. A critical part of his plan was the reconstruction of his royal capital in Paris.

It is interesting that this particular king viewed the reconstruction of the city as a strategic method for projecting his power throughout the rest of the country. It is as though he saw that by creating a dominant urban culture centered on the beauty and sophistication of Paris, he could project a sense of security and peace through the magnificent landmarks he was constructing. Hilary Ballon observes:

As the seat of the centralizing monarch, [Paris] was compelled to assume a national role; it came to stand for the entire realm. We now take for granted the centrality of Paris to every aspect of French life, but Paris only acquired that role during the seventeenth century. The emerging conception of Paris as a national
capital shaped the physical character of the city. Henri IV understood that constructing a capital city was fundamental to achieving a centralized state. (4-5)

This consolidation and legitimization of his power was critical to the stability of the country, as many people questioned his claim to the throne. His controversial conversion to Catholicism and his very distant ancestral ties to Louis IX (1214-1270) were met with considerable skepticism as his Bourbon family opened its new dynastic rule of France (replacing the former Valois dynasty), even while a tense peace was secured under Henri IV’s reign. Ballon has argued: “There is a risk of overstating the extent to which [Henri IV’s] program succeeded, and it must be clear from the outset that neither Henri IV nor his successors on the throne achieved the creation of a fully centralized and absolutist state” (3). While a fully absolutist state was perhaps never completely achieved, in the sense that Ballon is using the term, the Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin were certainly intent on centralizing power around the crown, a political direction that by the mid-seventeenth century actually created significant tensions between the city of Paris and the government of Henri IV’s grandson, Louis XIV.

In a final stand to check the spread of royal power, the Parliament of Paris rebelled against Louis XIV’s Chief Minister, Jules Mazarin, in 1648. For this reason, I am primarily interested in how Henri IV’s building projects, specifically the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale, were being appropriated and redefined by the various political camps in the city at the height of the Fronde Parlementaire in 1649. Their efforts at reclaiming these specific, Bourbon-constructed places—at times even in the name of former Bourbon monarchs—demonstrates the conflicted nature of the relationship of Paris to its royal family in the seventeenth century and offers one of many potential explanations for Louis XIV’s eventual abandonment of Paris and the transfer of the centralized state to the palace of Versailles.
A second consideration for my interest in the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale is that they were both open to the public. Unlike the institutionalized places of the Bastille, Notre-Dame, and the Sorbonne, the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale, on account of their accessibility to the public, were plastic places. By this I mean that they were open to being redefined and reimagined by the variety of people entering and exiting their confines. Their “environmental image” (to borrow from Kevin Lynch) would have been subject to the political camps that were seizing control of their space in 1649. For these reasons, this study will concentrate on those mazarinades that consider new cultural and political narratives for the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale during the Fronde Parlementaire.

The Pont-Neuf

Perhaps the greatest building initiative under Henri IV was the completion of the Pont-Neuf bridge that still spans the Seine along the west side of the Île de la Cité. The bridge was originally designed under the Valois king, Henri III, in 1578, but due to lack of funds and the Wars of Religion, construction of the bridge was very slow and ultimately halted completely in 1588. The project resumed in 1598 under Henri IV as his first major building project in the city. The bridge would span the entirety of the Seine via the Île de la Cité, with five arches connecting the Left Bank to the island and seven additional arches connecting the island to the Right Bank.

Unlike all the other bridges in Paris at that time, the Pont-Neuf was designed to be free of houses and other buildings. An exception was made, however, for a small three-story pavilion located above the second arch near the Right Bank. This edifice, which came to be known as the Samaritaine (because of its Biblically-based sculptural relief of the good Samaritan), was built in 1604 to house an important pump that would provide water to the royal gardens of the Tuileries. Though this pump was not available for public use (Ballon 123), it nevertheless became an
important feature on the bridge through its association with the crown and subsequently made its way into many mazarinades during the Fronde.

Along with the Samaritaine, another important feature was the equestrian statue of Henri IV that stood in the middle of the bridge. Henri IV’s queen, Marie de Medici, originally commissioned this statue in 1603, though it was not completed until 1614 (four years after Henri IV’s death). As the statue dominated the open space provided by the Pont-Neuf, it, much like the Samaritaine, emerged as a symbolic entity in the mazarinades during the Fronde.

Because of the bridge’s centrality in the city, it became a critical juncture for the opposing political camps during the Fronde. In his brief description of a mazarinade from 1652 entitled *Les Dernières resvolutions faites en parlement, en presence de son Altesse Royale et de messieurs les princes, pour la protection de la ville de Paris, le 14 mai*, Celestin Moreau observes that the Pont-Neuf was a “sorte de Forum de la Fronde” (307). This reference is a clear allusion to the Roman Forum where judicial and commercial activities took place on a regular basis and in a similar manner paints the Pont-Neuf as an important part of Parisian civic life.

While this study is focused on the mazarinades of 1649, during the Fronde Parlementaire (1648-1650), this observation of Moreau’s is nevertheless beneficial to our understanding of the Pont-Neuf’s impact on the urban culture of Paris at the time. The bridge was indeed functioning as a political forum in 1649 as is made clear in the numerous mazarinades that specifically reference it while attributing politically motivated behaviors and beliefs to the bridge’s visitors. It is through these descriptions that new urban narratives begin to compete for dominance on the bridge.
But why did this interest in the Pont-Neuf, rather than in an individual person, as a political authority even matter? One answer is that the bridge was in the middle of the city and acted as a crossroads for Parisians from all walks of life.

With its central location near the Palais du Louvre and wide sidewalks leading to the Île de la Cité, the Pont-Neuf, or ‘New Bridge,’ had been a popular meeting place ever since King Henri IV finished it and opened it to the public in 1607. Until then, there was actually little space within the moats and walls surrounding Paris. The capital of France still looked like a dense city of the Middle Ages, a maze of narrow winding streets, some of them barely six feet wide, where about 250,000 inhabitants lived in a formidable concentration of humanity. Parisians eagerly went to the new bridge to take a breath of fresh air or learn the latest news. (Blanchard 9)

This description by Jean-Vincent Blanchard in Éminence: Cardinal Richelieu and the Rise of France reiterates the centrality of the bridge while highlighting its importance as an open space. As the primary access point to both banks of the Seine and to the Île de la Cité, the Pont-Neuf was a hub of commercial and social activity. It drew, without discrimination, inhabitants from all parts of the city. It is without a doubt because of the presence of all of these city dwellers, and their large variety of political opinions, that the bridge came to symbolize the different facets of the Fronde and that so many of the anonymous authors of the mazarinades chose it to stage their political claims. They recognized that if they could claim the political atmosphere of the bridge, they could gather support for their cause. This transformed the bridge into the verbal battleground of the Fronde.
In the paragraphs that follow, I will demonstrate how the authors of different mazarinades sought to create and impose new associations on the bridge’s functionality. We will find, woven throughout them, proposals for what the bridge’s new imaginary ought to be. Some mazarinades sought to strengthen its position as a hub for literary distribution within the city; others wished to transform it into purely anti-Mazarin territory; and still others believed it could stand as a unifying force for all Parisians in the conflict that was ripping the city apart.

A Site of Literary Distribution

In 1649, when publication of the mazarinades reached the first (and greater) of two peaks, we find ample evidence that there was an initiative being made by many of their anonymous authors to depict the bridge as a valuable center for literary distribution and circulation within Paris. This would have played into the forum-like atmosphere of the Pont-Neuf by encouraging Parisians to voice their concerns in all matters relating to the Fronde.

In the mazarinade entitled Second dialogve, entre le Roy de Bronze & la Samaritaine. Sur les affaires du temps present, we find a fictitious conversation occurring between the statue of Henri IV (le Roy de Bronze) and the water pump known as the Samaritaine. The Samaritaine opens the forum by informing the Roy de Bronze of its important position on the Pont-Neuf amidst the political turmoil that Paris is experiencing. It then indicates that it has sent an anonymous servant to “aller acheter cinq ou six de ces libelles, que la moitié de ceux qui passent par icy vend à l’autre” (3). The “libelles” in question are the general corpus of mazarinades circulating on the bridge in 1649; the Samaritaine’s interest in them suggests their widespread availability and their value in communicating the present state of affairs. This is intriguing because the dialogue between the Samaritaine and the Roy de Bronze is being delivered via the same medium (a mazarinade) that the water pump is so eager to possess. The text thus builds its
own awareness of its nature as a political tool and, by incorporating this *mise en abyme*, the mazarinade projects itself into the nature of the Samaritaine, ultimately redefining the character of the water pump. In essence, the pump comes to represent a forum of different voices through the literature it is interacting with and extends its own meaning beyond its originally intended purpose. The Samaritaine and, by extension, the Pont-Neuf become a place for Parisians with opinions and especially for those Parisians seeking to share or sell those opinions through literary means.

This idea of the Pont-Neuf as a place for the indiscriminate circulation of literature is strengthened in *Plaisant entretien dv Sievr Rodrigves Covrtisan dv Pont Nevf: Avec Ivles Mazarin, Qui ayant ruiné la France, est resolu de s’en aller, disant son peccavi*. In this mazarinade, a fictional Mazarin says that “il n’y a pas iusques aux petits enfans qui n’ayent entendu parler de moy, & principalement en ce lieu de vostre promenade ordinaire [Pont-Neuf], où ie ne doute point que le Sauoyard & les autres illustres Orphées du Pont neuf, ne me mettent dans leurs papiers” (4). Here, we observe the extent to which the Pont-Neuf became a locus for literary distribution in the city of Paris during the Fronde. It was an accessible space for all Parisians, no matter their rank or even their age. This particular mazarinade makes the claim that even the smallest of Parisian children would have heard of Mazarin and his connection to the citywide conflict because of the “papiers” being circulated on the bridge. This claim, regardless of how truthful it really would have been, nevertheless builds an idea of the bridge as a place for everyone implicated by the Fronde. It communicates the nature of the bridge as a crucial intersection of Paris’s many different types of inhabitants and as a center for gaining access to Fronde literature in 1649.
Further claims of the bridge’s importance as a literary hub are found in *La Requête des Avthevrs présentée au parlement, A l’encontre de Mazarin*. Here, references to the Pont-Neuf as a place associated with the scribes of Paris and of a particular literary style designate the bridge as more than a simple passageway. “C’est pourquoi nous avons député des plus habiles de nos Scribes Parisiens, tant du stile du Palais, que de celuy du pont-neuf, & de la Samaritaine…” (Hénault 4). This mazarinade goes so far as to compare the quality of the literature circulating on the Pont-Neuf and around the Samaritaine with the “stile du Palais.” While this statement certainly invites a study of literary style and aesthetics—a subject we do not wish to treat here—it also paints the bridge as a center for creative thinking and expression. Perhaps in juxtaposing the literary style of the Palais de Justice—which represented the judges, lawyers, and educated bourgeoisie of the city, while also implicating the aristocracy—and that of the Pont-Neuf—the throughway for the other classes of Paris—the mazarinade wished to emphasize another facet of literary culture within the city that was prone to being overlooked by the city’s elite. If so, the mazarinade became the medium of literary expression that represented the popular classes of Paris during the Fronde.

This emphasis on literary style continues in another mazarinade *Le Bvrlesqve remerciement des imprimevrs et colportevrs aux autheurs de ce temps*. In the format of an extended poem, the mazarinade depicts the Pont-Neuf as a site for reciting written works.

Contentez-vous d’un Imprimeur

Qui ne fut jamais grand Rimeur,

Qui ne sçait regle, ny methode,

Mais qui fait des vers à sa mode
Emphasis is of course centered on the Pont-Neuf as a place where written verse is sung, but this extends to creative expression in general. The bridge in these mazarinades takes on an importance and an influence that extend well beyond its functionality as a physical passageway between the two banks of the Seine and comes to exemplify, in its own way, the creativity of the popular classes of Paris. We see how new urban imaginaries are being created in these texts as the bridge is described as a place where Parisians express themselves literarily and where they possess a unique style that distinguishes the bridge from other literary centers in the city. The bridge emerges as a place of accessibility, creativity, and literary expression.

In a different light, *Le Predicateur degvisé* takes a unique stance by criticizing the Pont-Neuf as a site of literary distribution. The author of this particular mazarinade attempts to take a position of neutrality in the citywide conflict arguing that “n’est-il pas vray de mesme que c’est de frane cœur s’exposer au peril, & rechercher les moyens de se perdre, ou de deuenir méchant que de lire tous ces petits Liures qui se debitent sur le Pont-neuf, sçachant qu’ils ne sont remplis que d’inuectiues, & que les meilleurs ne publient que de mauuaises maximes” (6). This mazarinade is strongly critical of the literature produced on the Pont-Neuf. It reduces the mazarinade form to the equivalent of literary rubbish: it is full of insults and false maxims. While an outside opinion might be tempted to agree, it should be noted that this particular text is also a mazarinade and therefore participates in the very activities it criticizes. Nevertheless, the viewpoint expressed here rubs off on the image of the Pont-Neuf itself: the poor quality of the literature being circulated there is a reflection of the quality of the arguments and the greater conflict that otherwise seem to be emanating from its premises. The bridge seems to play more
of the kitschy role of *agent provocateur* and, as such, is better being dismissed by the public than being taken seriously by it. Of course, this is just another point of view expressed in another of a thousand mazarinades—but as one that is reactionary, and seemingly a minority among its peers, is it safe to assume that the urban culture surrounding the Pont-Neuf was evolving through the Fronde and that, perhaps, the mazarinades were being taken seriously on some—perhaps even many—accounts? The *Troisieme dialogve, entre le Roy de Bronze, & la Samaritaine sur les affaires du temps present* sheds some light on this concern. This mazarinade is motivated by a clear initiative to reconstruct the collective narrative of the city of Paris. In it, the Samaritaine again gains its own voice as it openly criticizes its servant as she runs around Paris gathering information about the current state of affairs. The Samaritaine announces to the *Roy de Bronze* that

> Comme elle croit tout, elle pretend aussi m’obliger à tout croire, comme texte d’Evangile : & si peu qu’il m’eschappe de rire de ses impertinences, mon incredulité l’offense & la scandalise, comme vne nouuelle heresie. Enfin, on dit cecy, on dit cela : & au bout du conte, ce Maistre On est le seul garand de ses contes à dormir debout. (4-5)

While never overtly mentioning the Pont-Neuf, this comical account nevertheless implicates the bridge through the locality of the Samaritaine. Because the Samaritaine is bombarded by contradictory information, the bridge becomes a scene of chaos. It adopts the chaotic nature of the Fronde as its own and becomes the intersection for the many political camps that are struggling for power over the city. The literature being circulated on the bridge is at the forefront of the pandemonium and, by association, extends itself into the competing urban imaginaries of the bridge. But it also feeds the agora-like image of the bridge. We find the Pont-Neuf opening
itself up to the many narratives that are attempting to superimpose themselves on its physical presence within the city in the struggle for power within the Fronde Parlementaire.

An Anti-Mazarin Enclave

It should not be surprising that, with its literary style that was so distinct from that of the royal court and its appeal to the popular classes as a public place, the Pont-Neuf was associated by many mazarinades with the anti-Mazarin camps within the city. Perhaps it was because of its forum-like quality that those opposed to Mazarin felt so strongly that they could express their open criticism of his involvement in the government of France. In the following paragraphs, we will draw upon multiple mazarinades that have a clear initiative to depict the Pont-Neuf as an enclave for the anti-Mazarin factions in Paris.

In the mazarinade called *Dialogve entre le Roy de Bronze, et la Samaritaine. Sur les affaires du temps present*, we once more see an interesting exchange between the statue of Henri IV and the Samaritaine. The Samaritaine’s insights are a conspicuous replication of this author’s political interests; but by directing them through the Samaritaine, it is clear that the mind behind the matter sought to impose his idealized view of a new “Paris-sans-Mazarin” on the dominant urban culture of the city in 1649. It is for this reason that the Samaritaine anchors its criticism of Mazarin in the “discours de tous ceux qui passent par icy: car enfin on ne parle plus si bas comme l’on faisoit, & ie m’estonne fort que vous [statue of Henri IV] n’en ayez appris quelque chose de tant d’honnestes gens qui vous enuironnment” (“Dialogve entre le Roy de Bronze et la Samaritaine” 7). This appeal to the authority of the many people who pass by the Samaritaine is a clear manipulation of the urban environment of Paris and most especially of the bridge. The anonymous author saw that, by basing his arguments on the rationale that the regular visitors swarming by the Samaritaine all shared his criticism of Mazarin, his political schemes could
more easily infiltrate public opinion by depicting a collective, albeit completely imaginary, cognitive map of the political landscape of the city—and in this instance, particularly the Pont-Neuf. In so doing, he would have impressed upon his readers that their discontent with the current state of political affairs was widespread. In addition to this, the Samaritaine’s observation that “on ne parle plus si bas comme l’on faisoit” (7) is an obvious invitation to open verbal rebellion. By saying that the Samaritaine had noticed that people were speaking more openly and more loudly about their criticism of the government, there is an obvious attempt at provocation of the masses. We see that place is acting as a prodding tool in this city war.

The Samaritaine is also astonished that the Roy de Bronze has yet to observe the same criticism being spoken aloud by the crowds surrounding it. We learn in the final comments of the Dialogye that the reason for the statue’s inability to understand its visitors is a common head cold that it has contracted. The Roy de Bronze states, “Car à present pour auoir esté, comme ie suis, tousjours nuë teste au froid qu’il fait, i’ay de la peine à t’ouyr, & plus encore à te respondre, tellement ie suis enrhumé” (8). It becomes obvious that the old statue-king cannot fully engage in the present state of public tumult on account of its inability to hear well. As the statue represents the Bourbon monarchy, its deafness certainly extends to Louis XIV’s administration, which the author suggests has refused to consider the plight of the city of Paris. Dually, this same deafness is projected upon the inhabitants of the city who, like the statue of the old king, may not be up-to-date on the current state of affairs. It is as if the author, through the statue, is inviting his fellow Parisians to open their ears—to clear their heads—and adopt his view that the Pont-Neuf, and the rest of Paris, is not a place for Mazarin.

This unwelcoming atmosphere for Mazarin extends into other mazarinades as well. In Plaisant entretien dv Sievr Rodrigves Covrtisan dv Pont Nevf, we see harsh criticism of Mazarin
originating specifically from the premises of the bridge. Rodrigues, a fictional courtier of the *Roy de Bronze*, upon discovering the true identity of the fictional Mazarin, cries out: “Et vertubleu comment osez-vous paraistre en ce lieu; vous avez sagement fait de vous deguiser de la sorte, & de ne venir icy qu’entre chien & loup: car si le moindre vous aperceuoit, il vous tomberoit incontinent vne gresle de coups de baston sur les espaules qui vous mettroient menu comme chair à pastez, ho, ho ?” (4). Through Rodrigues’s words, the Pont-Neuf suddenly becomes a public place that is really only accessible to those Parisians who oppose Mazarin. Mazarin himself is not welcome there and so Rodrigues is quite surprised when the Cardinal ventures onto the bridge. The implication is clear: the Pont-Neuf is the domain of those who stand against the intrusive rule of this Italian interloper in the French royal court. In a very real sense, we see a part of Paris—in this case, the Pont-Neuf—being closed off to Mazarin, even revolting against him. The bridge is a place for those who would do him harm. Rodrigues continues: “Vous ne trouuerez point icy d’Aduocat qui se veille charger de vostre mauuaise cause & vous avez raison de dire vostre Peccaui” (5). Here, Rodrigues makes it clear that the Pont-Neuf is completely hostile to Mazarin. He will find no advocates, no friends on the bridge. It is the haven for the anti-mazarinistes—those who have no reservations opposing him. This mood is a clear indication of an intruding urban imaginary that is trying to subdue other conceptions of the bridge. The initiative to transform the environment of the bridge to one of hostility where the typical frequenters of the bridge would readily agree that Mazarin has a lot to redress turns the bridge into a sort of confessional for Mazarin and his supporters.

This is consistent with attitudes in other mazarinades as well. In *La Sottise des deuX partis. Dialogue dv Parisien et dv Mazariniste*, an anonymous “Parisien” transforms the Pont-Neuf into a very hostile environment for Mazarin where the only way for him to make restitution
for what he has done to Paris and to France is to die. “Il n’est pas que vous n’ayez ouy dire qu’on n’a chanté sur le Pont Neuf, si iamais dans Paris tu rentre on te fera comme au Marquis d’Ancre” (4). In referencing the “Marquis d’Ancre”—Concino Concini—an unpopular Italian minister of Marie de Medici whose corpse was mutilated on the Pont-Neuf after he was executed in 1617, the bridge takes on a vicious nature as a place where hated Italian ministers are killed in order to appease justice. That people sing about a similar fate for Mazarin as that of Concini only adds to the threatening imaginary that is trying to take over the bridge.

Continuing in this vein of thought, in Le Movchard, ov espion de Mazarin, a fictitious spy working for Mazarin delivers a report to the Cardinal that “ie ne negligeray pas de vous dire, que iamais personne n’a esté mocqué & vilipendé comme vous estes dans la bouche des grands & des petits, & que les chanteurs du Pont-neuf, les Gazetiers & vn nombre infini de Colporteurs vous donnent mille noms de mespris” (8). Once more, we see the Pont-Neuf becoming a center for those who wish to openly mock and vilify the man they so strongly hate. But we also find in this passage an invitation to those who find themselves in the anti-Mazarin camp to come to the Pont-Neuf and to share in a culture of mass hatred for the man who rules France.

The Unifier of Paris

In other mazarinades, a common image associated with the Pont-Neuf is as a unifying point for the city of Paris during the Fronde. Threads of this theme can already be seen in the mazarinades I have cited above, especially where the mazarinades consolidate hatred for the Cardinal. But as I will demonstrate in the paragraphs that follow, other mazarinades incorporate narratives of the bridge that directly tie it to the broader city of Paris and give us the impression that the bridge is the driving force behind the citywide feud.
This can be seen in *Plaisant entretien dv Sievr Rodrigyes Covrtisan dv Pont Nevf*. In this clearly anti-Mazarin pamphlet, we find a fictional Jules Mazarin coming to Rodrigues, a courtier of the statue of Henri IV on the bridge, and asking him “[vous] qui depuis vn si long-temps courtisez les bonnes graces de la Samaritaine, que vous semble de l’estat present de la France [?]” (3). In this question, Mazarin seeks Rodrigues’s opinion of the conflict because of his time-honored association with the personified water pump. When we consider how this phenomenon reflects on an urban imaginary of Paris, we see the Samaritaine, and the broader Pont-Neuf, emerging as a prominent public place for considering and developing a reasonable outlook of the conflict. The Samaritaine and the Pont-Neuf, as they are considered through Rodrigues’s opinion, become harshly critical of Mazarin because of his conspired designs to rule Paris. Mazarin reveals his plot: “Je me promettois faire plier tout Paris & en suitte toutes les villes de France, afin de rendre plus redoubtable & ne plus trouuer d’obstacles à mon ambition, on me faisoit croire que Paris estant bloqué ne subsisteroit iamais trois iours de marché sans sedition ou division” (5). A strong notion of Parisian unity vis-à-vis the tyranny of Mazarin emerges in this lamentation as an image is depicted of the city outlasting the Cardinal’s attempts to subject it to his will. This idealized sense of a community narrative draws on Benedict Anderson’s observation: “Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined” (6). In this mazarinade, Paris distinguishes itself because of its unified resistance to Mazarin. Its ability to outlast the tyrannous Cardinal exemplifies the author of this mazarinade’s outlook that the inhabitants of the city are unified against imposters in the government of France.

But this specific criticism of Mazarin is downplayed when the discussion between the two characters turns generally critical of anyone who promotes continued violence. This
becomes clear when Rodrigues and Mazarin agree that “le plus jeune [des deux Princes contre Mazarin] est si violent, si fougueux & si haut à la main qu’on ne luy oseroit rien dire de peur de le mettre encore dauantage en fureur” (6). This criticism of one who shares the political motives of the mazarinade, but who obviously takes them to an extreme, reveals the objective of the text. More than trying to simply oust Mazarin, it seeks to establish a unified Paris that rejects all tyrants via the image of Rodrigues on the bridge. The Pont-Neuf becomes a unifying force against such despots, regardless of who they are or what ideology they profess to adhere to, and it is able to do so because it represents all inhabitants of the city.

This unifying theme is developed further in *A monsievr de Brovssel, conseiller dv Roy av parlement de Paris*, which designates the Pont-Neuf as the gathering site where the Frondeurs learned of the release of Pierre de Broussel, a major parliamentary figure who opposed taxation proposals by Mazarin in 1648.

Au milieu du Pont-neuf se fit cette entreueuë,

Qui surprit nos esprits d’vne ioye impreueuë

De te voir de retour mon Heros glorieux… (4)

This inclusion of the Pont-Neuf as the place where the city of Paris learned of the release of De Broussel is indicative of its importance as a unifying symbol for the city around a common cause—in this case again, indirectly, to oppose Mazarin, but most especially to celebrate a “Heros glorieux” who overcame, to the apparent great joy of those on the bridge, the tyrannous rule of the Italian imposter. Whether the events that this mazarinade describes truly happened or not becomes irrelevant next to the imaginary Pont-Neuf it is describing to its readers. The initiative to transform the bridge into a celebratory, unifying public place not only dominates the description but also imposes itself on the reader’s typical associations of the bridge. Thus it takes
on a new narrative where champions of Parisians’ rights are freed and are allowed to express themselves.

The Pont-Neuf is also depicted as the epicenter of the Fronde and is the pivot point around which the whole conflict seems to break out. Le memoire des plvs remarqvables pieces faites depuis le 26. Aoust iusques à present describes a scene on the bridge in August 1648 that led to the entire city of Paris barricading itself against the King’s Swiss troops.

Cependant vne fille ou femme reuestuë d’vn cotillon rouge, monte à l’orloge de la Pompe du Pont-Neuf, & sonna le tocsain, le peuple se meut entendant le tocsain, & voyant cette cõpagnie de Suisse qui venoit pour s’emparer dudit Pont Neuf, sortirent de leur maisons armés, & commencèrent a se barricader d’vne telle sorte, qu’en moins de deux heures la ville de Paris fut barricadée. (5)

As it is depicted in this mazarinade, the bridge becomes the center of the Fronde; it is the place where it all began. As the focal point, it is also the unifying force for all of Paris. The fact that the passage neglects mentioning any opposition to the barricading of the city (besides the obvious opposition that would have come from the royal guard) is indicative of the open bias of the mazarinade’s position in the conflict. But even beyond this, after reading this passage, the reader is under the impression that the whole city, at the sounding of the Samaritaine’s bell, responded by barricading the streets. It is as if the Pont-Neuf dominates the social scene of Paris and that all Parisians are implicated in the events that occur there. In a way, the bridge becomes the mirror of the city; it is at the heart of what happens in Paris and it brings its inhabitants together in the midst of any crisis that finds its origin there.
The Pont-Neuf in the Mazarinades

These many different references to the Pont-Neuf indicate a clear interest, on a cultural and political level, to redefine its unique public place during the Fronde Parlementaire. While the bridge existed as a forum prior to the conflict—it certainly was a place where Parisians could gather and share news—these mazarinades indicate that different political forces in the city were trying to seize control of popular perceptions of the bridge and impose their own urban imaginaries onto that place. It is interesting that, in all of the cases cited above, there is a strong bias toward a general anti-Mazarin camp, even if each case adopts a unique perspective of the bridge’s place in the debate. Their general distrust of the Cardinal indicates a strong cultural understanding that the Pont-Neuf stood as a gathering place where the non-aristocratic population of the city could express itself liberally, if anonymously. It is significant that, as the project of the founder of the Bourbon dynasty, the bridge and the bronze statue of its builder were being claimed in the name of the different political agendas that were seizing Paris. By creating notions of the bridge as a place where controversial information was being widely circulated, as an enclave for anti-mazarinistes, and even as a focal point around which all Parisians could stand in unity against tyranny, the mazarinades sought to manipulate the urban culture of the city during the Fronde Parlementaire.

The Place Royale

Another important feature of the Parisian cityscape in 1649 was the Place Royale. This large piazza in the Marais district— it measures 143 meters square and today is called the Place des Vosges—was another of the major building projects under Henri IV. Starting with its groundbreaking in 1605, it was initially intended as a commercial center for the state-subsidized
silk trade. Henri IV hoped the square would become “the centerpiece of a royal campaign to stimulate French manufacturing” (Ballon 58-59). But by 1607, those plans had changed and the silk works that had lined the northern side of the square were transformed into brick-and-stone residences for the aristocracy. Today, those same residences still exist and at the square’s southern and northern entrances stand, respectively, the towering King’s Pavilion and Queen’s Pavilion. These emblematic towers dominate the square and ever would have reminded its seventeenth-century residents of the power of their royal family.

Because of these many changes and additions to the functionality of the Place Royale, it was not inaugurated until 1612, two years after the assassination of Henri IV. While the former monarch could not be present for the celebration, his son, Louis XIII, oversaw the festivities that lasted three full days. According to reports from the time, a total of 60,000 people turned out for the celebration, though Ballon quickly notes that that figure is a gross exaggeration (111). In any case, from the time between its inauguration and the events of the Fronde, the square served as a favorable venue for jousting tournaments and citywide celebrations (Ballon 111). In 1639, Cardinal Richelieu commissioned a large equestrian statue of Louis XIII—not unlike the statue of the king’s father, Henri IV, on the Pont-Neuf—to adorn the center of the square.

Thus, before the events of the Fronde, the Place Royale was an important place for the nobility within the city of Paris. Jean Nagle indicates that “cette Place, ce Théâtre de Noblesse, a été voulue comme cœur de ce quartier” (116). The Place Royale certainly became the celebrated heart of the Marais. In fact, it was so in vogue among the nobility that Pierre Corneille wrote a play (perhaps in keeping with the notion of “Théâtre de Noblesse”) that transpired in the Place Royale in 1634. The play, entitled La Place Royale, ou l’amoureux extravagant, admittedly does not often speak directly of the Place, but it communicates the clear association of the Place
Royale with the nobility—a notion that still existed when the Fronde Parlementaire erupted in 1648.

It should not strike us as surprising that when the mazarinades were circulating in 1649, at the height of their publication during the Fronde Parlementaire, the Place Royale became contested territory within the city, both because of the vastness of the open space it offered and, most particularly, because of its connection to the aristocracy. Additionally, the history of the premises—the Hôtel de Tournelles occupied the same site before the construction of the Place-Royale and was the place where the Valois king, Henri II, was killed during a jousting tournament in 1559 (Ballon 66)—lent Place-Royale further meaning as a place where French monarchs became acquainted with their own mortality. Louis XIV’s reign was certainly contested there as the most prominent portrayal of the square in the mazarinades depicts it as a military training ground where the troops of the Frondeurs gather and prepare for battle in open rebellion against the royal administration. However, other themes emerge that instead critique the Frondeurs, depicting the Place Royale as a conflicted place, or even as a place of celebration. It is through these contradictory depictions that we see the politically motivated attempts by the authors of the mazarinades to recreate the collective narrative of the Place Royale.

_A Military Training Ground_

Taking the format of a response from the statue of Louis XIII in the Place Royale to the Roy de Bronze statue on the Pont-Neuf, the *Response du Roy Louis XIII en Bronze, de la Place Royale, a Son Pere Henry IV de dessus le Pont neuf* begins with a description of the noise that is stirring in the Place Royale. “Je n’ay pas esté moins surpris que vous, alors qu’un bruit de trompettes & de tambours qui monstrént ne respirer que la guerre, est venu interrompre mon repos, & le calme du sejouer magnifique où ie regne si superbement” (3). This description
connects the tumult and conflict of the Fronde with the Place Royale, which, as an aristocratic neighborhood, strongly contradicts the clear assumption that the piazza had previously existed as a calm, quiet area. Of course, this description is the obvious product of a biased political pamphlet that has, as its central motive, a desire to stir up opinions against Mazarin, so we cannot necessarily take this as a historically accurate account of the true nature of the Place Royale prior to the Fronde. At the same time, the statue of Louis XIII could also be referring not to the particular level of noise in the piazza so much as the discord associated with the events of the Fronde. This latter observation reveals that the motive of this mazarinade is to demonstrate that the Fronde is a conflict that is touching all Parisians, regardless of their particular social class, while also striving to impose an urban imaginary of the Place Royale as a potential center for political expression among the elite classes. The critical tone of this mazarinade towards Mazarin, but its very carefully placed praise of King Louis XIV, indicates an initiative to demonstrate that an inhabitant of the Place Royale can wish for the end of Mazarin while still supporting the rule of the king. This creates an account that supports the king’s rule while contesting the authority of his foreign minister.

Further descriptions of the Place Royale support this observation.

Cette Place pompeuse, honorée continuellement de ma présence, & qui comme un Temple sacré ne devoit estre destinée qu’à des spectacles de resjoüissance, est à présent troublée par un tumulte importun de chevaux & d’hommes, qui ont plus la contenance de faire des desseins pour la guerre, que des parties de galanterie pour passer le temps. (3)

The Place Royale is a place that is being disrupted by the political feud in the rest of the city. In an appeal to build more support among the Parisians who live there, it is elevated to the status of
a sacred temple whose purpose in existing is more to be a place of celebration than a place of war. However, with Mazarin at the head of France’s affairs, the mazarinade emphasizes the new position of the Place Royale as a place of war. The implied message becomes one of cause-and-effect. If Mazarin stays, the Place will continue to be a place of war. But if he goes, it will be restored to its former state.

While this message of cause-and-effect is not reiterated quite as strongly in other mazarinades, the notion that the Place Royale has been converted into a military training ground continues to emerge as a critical theme. Rarely do these other mazarinades take the time to explore how this new Place Royale came into being. Instead, they resort to giving descriptions of the square as the place where the Frondeurs are preparing for war. In *Conseil necessaire donné avx bovrgeois de Paris pour la conservation de la Ville. contre les desseins de Mazarin, & les libelles qu’il a fait semer* we read the explicit details: “sur tout faictes souvent l’Exercice militaire, soit à la place Royalle ou ailleurs, en presence de personnes qui scauent le mestier de la guerre, afin que vos armes & vos forces legitimes s’opposent à la tyrannie que l’on veut establir par tout le Royaume” (7). This open call to perform military exercises in the Place Royale exemplifies the transformation of the square into the training ground of the Fronde. The clear implication is that by performing these exercises in such an open, public space, the residents of Paris will understand that the city is ready to oppose Mazarin’s forces. The inclusion of “en presence de personnes qui scauent le mestier de la guerre” is meant to encourage a sense that the training exercises at the Place Royale are being carried out by professionals and that the Parisian military force is qualified and is capable of fighting off the Cardinal. The fight against “la tyrannie” further justifies the cause of the Fronde Parlementaire. It stresses that the feud that is transpiring in the city is just and necessary for the preservation of France. These observations
paint the Place Royale in a new light—one that differs greatly from its former association as a fashionable quarter for the nobility—and clearly designate a motivation by the Frondeurs to claim it in the citywide feud.

The propaganda-like aspect of these mazarinades continues to reveal itself in *Diverses pieces de ce qvi s’est passé a S. Germain En Laye, Le vingt-troisiéme Ianvier 1649. & siiuans.* The mazarinade indicates that “nous dépensons cinquante mil francs par jour, croyans d’avoir prés de cinq mil chevaux & douze mil hommes de pied : on trouve bien ce nombre, ou à peu pres, dans les reveuës de la Place Royale” (16). The message here is that the Place Royale is full of soldiers preparing for war and that the city possesses the means of sustaining those military forces. With 12,000 infantry “ou à peu pres,” the square becomes associated with the opposition to Mazarin and with the brute force of the Fronde Parlementaire. The Place Royale’s location near the Bastille would have strengthened its symbolic role as a training ground for the city’s military forces.

The extent to which these military forces are prepared for war is developed further in *Le mercvre parisien, contenant tovt ce qvi s’est passé de plus particulier, tant dans Paris qu’au dehors, depuis la nuict du iour & Feste des Roys iusques à present. Et qui n’ont esté remarquées aux Imprimez cy-deuant publiez.* The author notes that “sur les cinq heures du matin du Lundy 8. Fevrier, autre-commandement fut fait aux Bourgeois de sortir promptement avec les armes & se rendre sous leurs Capitaines à peine de la vie, ce qu’ils firent & tous allerent dans la Place Royale où la montre & la reeuë fut faite” (6). Here, the readiness of the city’s forces is emphasized by their early awakening in the morning and their prompt response to the orders they were being given “à peine de la vie.” We also learn of the involvement of the bourgeois class within the ranks of the city’s military forces. This new association with the Place Royale is
significant, in that the square takes on a new image as one being occupied by the instigating class of the Fronde Parlementaire. It is as though the square becomes the newly acquired property of the bourgeois, and especially the city parliament that represents their interests. Until the bourgeois class’s grievances are resolved, we are under the impression that the Place Royale—perhaps symbolically representing the aristocracy and the royalty of France—will remain under the occupation of that inferior class. The mazarinade’s ambiguous use of “Bourgeois” also implicates all the residents of the city: thus this expression of military force concerns all of the city’s population. Furthermore, a clear initiative to tout the strength of these forces in the Place Royale is another effort at changing Parisians’ perceptions of their involvement in the Fronde. That the city’s forces are getting stronger also becomes more evident. In the format of rhyming couplets, Svitte du iournal poetiqve de la gverre parisienne. Dedié aux conservateurs du Roy, des loix, & de la patrie makes the claim that “l’on fit reueuë de quelque Infanterie / Dans la Place Royalle ; ie dis sans flatterie” (29). This push to impress upon Parisians the strength of the city’s forces is a clear attempt at swaying public opinion, and by placing those forces in the neighborhood associated with aristocratic finesse and power, the manipulative nature of this proposed urban imaginary undeniably manifests itself to the reader.

At least four other mazarinades make a case for the Place Royale as a new center for military training. Each of the four was written under the oversight of the same editor, Rolin de la Haye. Each of the four recounts how different aristocrats, pledging themselves to the Frondeurs in Paris, presented their regiments before different parliamentary and aristocratic authorities in the Place Royale. The motive in these mazarinades again is to strengthen the image of the Place Royale as a public place occupied by the authorities of the city and as a site for military training and inspection. In Svitte et troisieme arrivée, we read “le Regiment de Cauallerie de
Monseigneur le Duc d’Elbœuf fit monstre & serment en la place Royalle” (5). Svitte et quatrième arrivée also recounts “Les Regimens d’Infanterie de Conty, Cugnac, Villebois & autres, firent reseauë en la Place Royalle” (5). In Svitte et cinquiesme arrivée, we read “Monsieur le Duc de Beaufort faisoit reeuë de son Regiment de Caualerie dans la Place Royale” (7). And in Svitte et septiesme arrivée, we learn that “vne partie du Regiment de Paris fit monstre à la Place Royale” (7). In each of these cases, the mazarinade highlights the visual aspect of the regiments in the Place Royale. Because of its open space, it would have been the optimal place within the city walls to conduct such trainings and, as a public place, would have appealed to authorities for its high visibility among the inhabitants of the city. These descriptions further emphasize the involvement of certain aristocrats as they pledge their support to the parliamentary cause in the feud. This appeal to authority creates a notion that the noble inhabitants of the Place Royale can share in the city’s dispute with Mazarin’s administrative role in the government and can likewise pledge their own support to the cause without fear of being alone among their peers in the cause. A strategy emerges through this new urban imaginary to create a sense of strength and a sense of security via the space provided by the Place Royale as its place embraces Parisians from all socioeconomic classes.

A Conflicted Place

While most of the mazarinades that treat the subject of the Place Royale associate it with military trainings and preparations for war, the author of one mazarinade considers the square in a slightly different light: the Place Royale as a place that is conflicted with its former uses. The lyrical poem Air de Cour nouveau, sur la plainte de l’Amour, contre la Guerre Parisienne: sur le chant, De la Courante de la Reyne, &c. contained in the Recueil general, de toutes les chansons mazarinistes. Et avec plvsieurs qvi n’ont point estées chantées demonstrates the rupture that is
tearing the square’s image apart. It adopts a tone that is very critical of the “Fascheux Parlement” that has instigated the present “Guerre Parisienne” because the bourgeoisie “[Croit] auoir droit de reformer les Loix” (8). The unknown author laments a Place Royale that was once a place for lovers but that has become a place of war.

Place Royalle autant d’Amants,
Monstroient leurs tourments
Où leurs destins,
Estoit toujours flatté par Constantin
On n’entend plus au lieu de tant d’Aubaudes :
Que mousquetades,
Et les Amours,
Pour toujours n’ont plus que son des Tambours. (8)

The author paints an image of a conflicted place that is being torn between its former imaginary as a place for lovers and its present use as a military training ground. A certain regret du passé clings to the square yearning for what it once was while remaining undeniably insecure about its present situation within the conflict. The reference here to aubades—a “concert qu’on donne dès le matin à la porte ou sous les fenestres de quelqu’un pour l’honorer, ou pour le rejouïr” (Furetière)—ties the Place Royale to an artistic tradition lost to the events of the Fronde Parlementaire. The implication is that the piazza’s place within Paris is in conflict; it no longer is recognizable in the same way it was prior to the citywide political struggle.

This accentuates a new, conflicted imaginary that was being imposed on the square. The way that it was being described is motivated by an effort to use it as a microcosm for the wider ramifications of the Fronde Parlementaire on the whole (and thus necessarily biased) urban
culture of Paris. It is as though the square is a little slice of the city that exemplifies what the mazarinades were claiming was happening in the wider conflict. With these viewpoints in mind, the next consideration of how the Place Royale was being depicted becomes all the more intriguing within the cultural context of the urban environment of the city.

A Place of Celebration

A final consideration for the Place Royale in the mazarinades of 1649 is as a place of celebration. These mazarinades are particularly interesting as they were both written after the Paix de Rueil and the Paix de Saint Germain in March of 1649. Both take strikingly different approaches to the square, while admitting it as a pro-royalist place within the city. Curiously, neither one takes any interest in the Place Royale as a formerly conflicted place in the feud. This obvious denial, particularly in respect to the two thematic imaginaries described in the sections above, reiterates the contradictory narratives of the piazza during the Fronde Parlementaire. Two mazarinades in particular insist on the celebratory atmosphere of the square. The first, entitled *Le couvrs de la Reyne : ov, le Grand Promenoir des Parisiens*, is a satirical piece that is written in rhyming couplets and that emphasizes during its first 15 of 16 pages the excesses of the royal court. The author, clearly a moralist who is critical of the extravagance of France’s aristocracy, focuses his criticism on the court, but then, in the very last lines of the poem, turns his satire on the Place Royale.

Il faudra que ie te regale

Au frais dans la Place Royale,

De vingt-&-quatre Violons,

Tous François, mais vrays Apollons,

Qui te feront dire sans peine
Que leur adresse est plus qu’humaine ;
Que la France est vn beau séjour,
Qu’il n’est rien comme nostre Cour ;
Et que Paris où tout abonde,
Vaut plus luy seul que tout le Monde. (16)

While the essence of the satire is difficult to grasp in this short selection, the message is that the Place Royale, much like the Royal Court, is a place of over-indulgence and extreme tastes and that it misleads Parisians into believing that they live in the greatest city in the world. This is an interesting viewpoint within the context of this study: the mazarinade takes no interest in the political forces that were trying to seize control of the square just a few months earlier, and by so doing, suggests a depiction of the square in its pre-Fronde state. It exhibits a level of denial that the place had been appropriated for other purposes prior to the peace accords, and suggests a present collective narrative of a depoliticized place that is more wicked on account of its extravagance than its involvement in the Fronde Parlementaire.

This sense of denial in the political turmoil of the conflict is reemphasized in *Relation cvrievse et remarqvable de la pompe royale dv iovr de la Saint Lovis. Ensemble des Harangues & Ceremonies faites à nostre Dame: Et de tout ce qui s’est passé depuis l’heureuse arriuée du Roy iusques à present*. This mazarinade, which celebrates the “bonté du Roy,” differs from the one prior to it in that it bears no moralizing critique of the present state of affairs in the city. Rather, as it was written after the August 1649 return of the royal court to the city, it depicts a Place Royale that is wholly elated by the presence of the royal family and Mazarin within the city.
La Reyne arriua aussi tost, le Roy la prist par la main, & entrerent ensembles dans cette Eglise, où leurs Majestez entendirent le Sermon & les Vespres. Au partir de ce lieu le Roy s’en retournia au Palais Cardinal, on auoit tapissé la place Royalle de pareile tautres qu’au saint Sacrement, y auoit des chandeliers & plaques sur les fenestres, tous entourez de perles & diamans, qui faiisoient admirer leurs richesses par leurs brillants, croyant que sa Majesté y passeroit. (12)

This mazarinade depicts the Place Royale as a pro-royalist place of extravagant celebration, even while the royal family neglects it after their religious worship at Notre-Dame. The whole square is transformed into a welcoming ground and a center of support for the king. This is indeed at odds with the descriptions in the other mazarinades that mention the piazza and clearly reiterates some level of denial of the greater conflict that had seized the city earlier that year. This creates a notion that the status quo within the Place Royale has not been greatly influenced by the citywide feud and that there has been a complete return to normalcy. The political implications are clear: the Fronde Parlementaire was nothing but a minor setback in the magnificent reign of such an inspiring monarch. Nothing has changed.

*The Place Royale in the Mazarinades*

While these various accounts differ in their themes and in their depictions of the Place Royale, all of them attest to the existence of an urban imaginary surrounding the square as they, in their own ways, attempt to manipulate their readers’ associations with the square. What is perhaps most intriguing in these particular instances is the obvious political divide in claiming the piazza’s space. In essence, we find the mazarinades remapping the cityscape of Paris for their own political purposes. In the case of the Place Royale, there is a clear interest by many of the mazarinades—even if they are only fictional accounts—to transmit a narrative of the square as a
military training ground and as a place occupied by the Parliamentary forces that had seized control of the city. To another extent, we find other mazarinades that highlight the conflict that has engulfed the square and has transformed it into a place that is at odds with its own role within the context of the wider city feud. This notion is certainly reflected in the mazarinades that altogether deny that the Place Royale’s place within Paris was changing. These last mazarinades manifest a greater interest in portraying a square that was immune to the wider Fronde and that resisted the change that was impacting the rest of the city’s public places. Irrespective of the true historical facts of 1649, these mazarinades present their own history of the Place Royale in a clear attempt to draw their readers to their own political interest in the Fronde Parlementaire. The aristocratic connections to the square were certainly driving this wide difference of political motivation as the various sides in the Fronde Parlementaire were trying to rally support to their individual causes as they sought to take control of the war-torn city.

Conclusions

The mazarinades present a lively reinterpretation of public places for their readers. Where they are clearly motivated by their own political interests, their depictions of Paris and its places cannot be considered accurate accounts of the urban cityscape. However, when regarded in terms of urban imaginaries, the mazarinades contribute unique insights into the political forces that were at play during the conflict. Their purpose in attacking or defending Jules Mazarin served to connect individual Parisians with one another on a political and ideological scale. As certain public places became increasingly associated with a certain camp in the Fronde Parlementaire, new perceptions of what Paris was and of what it meant to its inhabitants began to compete with traditional views of the city. Thus we find within the mazarinades frequent proposals to shift the
collective narrative of the cityscape. Their authors sought to superimpose new urban imaginaries on the existing perceptions of the city and its public places.

This is a significant finding, particularly where other studies of the mazarinades, including Christian Jouhaud’s, have concluded that the mazarinades should not be considered side by side, in one “etude sérielle” (Jouhaud 38). Contrary to these conclusions, my study demonstrates that spatial representation is a common element throughout much of the corpus. Many mazarinades share similar politically motivated initiatives that inform their descriptions of the functionality of specific public places like the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale. This focused study of these two examples demonstrates how the mazarinades were impacting the urban setting during the Fronde.

As the reconstruction of public place is a recurrent theme in many mazarinades, my findings invite continued analysis of the many other different places in Paris during the Fronde. Further spatial consideration of these texts would provide greater insight into the urban culture of Paris at the time and could explain the hostility Louis XIV associated with the city throughout the rest of his reign as King of France. As they stand, my findings contribute to more detailed explanations for his choice in moving the royal court to Versailles in 1682.

Additionally, this study indicates that place—and most particularly public place—was playing a pivotal role in the developing citywide conflict. By pursuing further analysis of how institutionalized places were being depicted and manipulated in the mazarinade corpus, more conclusions could be drawn about the relationship between those places and the public, while giving us a wider notion of how Paris was changing in the mid-seventeenth century.

As public places, the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale were certainly impacting the manner in which the inhabitants of Paris viewed their city in 1649. They were influencing
Parisian behaviors; especially where the authors of the mazarinades were prescribing new urban imaginaries for their functionality in the feud. By depicting these places in new ways, the authors of these texts attempted to disseminate their political ideologies by attributing certain behaviors and beliefs to the visitors of the Pont-Neuf and the Place Royale. By doing this, they sought to manipulate the political atmosphere of the city and tilt public opinion in their favor. The extent to which they succeeded can be viewed in the events that followed the Fronde Parlementaire: the rebellion of the nobility during the Fronde des Princes (1651-1653) and the eventual abandonment of the city by Louis XIV and his court for the royally-regulated atmosphere of Versailles. Place was an undeniably powerful mechanism for maintaining and projecting political influence across a broad plane. Fully conscious of that power, the authors of the mazarinades went to great lengths to manipulate Parisian places in order to propagate their own partisan interests across the city with the hope that they could win the majority of Paris to their cause and realize their desired outcome.
Works Cited


Works Consulted


Corpus

Many of these sources were obtained from the L. Tom Perry Special Collections at the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University in Provo, UT. Others were acquired via mail from the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C. and those listed as web references were taken from the Mazarinades.org database published by the University of Tokyo.


Diverses pieces de ce qvi s’est passé a S. Germain En Laye, Le vingt-troisiéme Ianvier 1649. & suiuans. 1649. Web.


- - -. *Svitte et troisième arrivée dv covrier françois, apporant tovtes les nouuelles de ce qui s’est passé depuis sa seconde arriviée iusques à present.* Paris: 1649. Web.

- - -. *Svitte et septiesme arrivée dv covrier françois, apporant tovtes les nouuelles de ce qui s’est passé depuis sa sixiesme arriviée iusques à present.* Paris: 1649. Web.

- - -. *Svitte et quatrieme arrivée dv covrier françois, apporant tovtes les nouuelles de ce qui s’est passé depuis sa troisiéme arriviée iusques à present.* Paris: 1649. Web.


---


---


---


---

*Recit veritable de ce qvi s’est passé avx barricades de lannee mil cinq cens quatre vingts huict, depuis le septiesme May, iusques au dernier Iuin ensuiuant. Descrites en vers burlesqve*. 1649. Web.

---


---