

Frisquemore: A Northern Passage to Literary Creation

by
Andy Wallis

Charles Sorel's *Relation de ce qui s'est passé au Royaume de Frisquemore* constitutes one of the more obscure pieces of the Sorel anthology. Perhaps this is not surprising since it does not fall easily into any category of writing normally associated with him. Though it contains elements often linked with history, satire, pastiche or allegory, *Frisquemore's* connections to these genres are often fleeting and offer little reward to those who wish to understand its origins or its motivations at the generic level. It differs from *Description de l'isle de Portraicture* or the *Relation de ce qui s'est passé au Royaume de Sophie*, since it does not overtly take over—or take on—any one literary model.¹ Given this unspecific nature, and the fact that *Frisquemore* is little known today, the first part of this paper will briefly outline the work's narrative while weighing it against other comparable texts to account for the presence (or absence) of intertextual links or secondary codes that will aid in better defining what I believe is another one of Sorel's forays into nonconformist literary forms. The second part of this paper will discuss what this text may mean. Observing what is absent from the text, what it is “lacking,” seeing it “en creux” are operative terms because the map of Frisquemore is in many ways a map whose surface seems perfectly smooth at first glance and when viewed directly face-on. However, seen from a slight angle, indentations and bumps suddenly appear that bring the map and/or text literally *into* perspective. They move the two-dimensional cartographic world into the three-dimensional and serve as reminders of its representational status, and it does so much in the same way intertexts recall a written work's textual dependence, its layered origins. Understanding Frisquemore *en creux*, therefore, is not necessarily recognizing the precise generic parentage of the work, or knowing where exactly to trace the work's origins, it is understanding that the work must necessarily contain traces or umbilical scars of its creation, a photographic negative, that it is not a work *sui generis* or, as Sorel wrote, “une nouvelle découverte.”²

At the heart of the entire book (map, narration, prefacial material) that is Sorel's *Relation de ce qui s'est passé au Royaume de Frisquemore* (1662), lies the narration of the voyage to Frisquemore and the description of its lands. It tells the story of Lozières and Courtais, two captains trying to make their way from St.-Malo to the Indies by a northerly route. We get no information of their trip, nor of the exact course they take. And, as the title of the work suggests, the captains never make it to their intended destination, but they do discover the lush kingdom named Frisquemore. Not only is Frisquemore abundant in fruit, vegetables and all sorts of game, it is, as Lozières and Courtais find out, inhabited by a generous and gentle people. As if this were not fortuitous enough, Lozières and Courtais also happen upon an interpreter, a man forced to flee Moscow who, during his northerly flight, found and stayed in Frisquemore. Thanks to *truchement*, the captains and the reader learn a few facts, but not much more, about Frisquemore: it is Christian, has a king, a court and many of the same institutions found in France. These details are mostly mentioned matter-of-factly in the manner of a rather blasé report, and *Frisquemore* in that sense is very much a relation, a report or report-like structure that shies away from exaggeration and signals its aim to be taken seriously. Such even-handedness even shows through it the relation's moment of suspense. It comes towards the end of the narrative section when the king of Frisquemore announces he has a secret to communicate to the two captains. Sorel begins by building up the episode:

[Lozières et Courtais] remarquerent en passant par la Salle des Gardes & les Antichambres, ce qu'a de coûtume de produire à la Cour, l'ombre d'une faueur naissante, ayans pensé estre estouffez par les embrassemens & caresses des Courtisans, qu'ils eurent à leur rencontre ; desquels s'estans enfin démeslez avec assez de peine, il paruinrent jusqu'à la porte de la Chambre du Roy, dans lesquelles ils furent introduits par le premier Gentilhomme, & presentez à sa Majesté de nouveau, qui leur fit un accueil tout plein de bonté, & les fit passer avec lui

dans un Cabinet, où il ne voulut admettre avec eux que *Simeboisky, Nainroziens, & trois ou quatre plus considerables de la Cour, & où ils trouuernet* Le Chancelier & les quatre Secretaires d'Etat qui s'y estoient aussi rendus par ordre de sa Majesté. Le Roy ayant pris sa place, leur dit en peu de mots, que son Chancelier leur exposeroit de sa part le sujet pourquoy il les auoit ainsi mandez. (47-50)

The scene is thus set for the revelation and voice is given to the King's chancellor:

...[L]e Chancelier reprit aussi-tost la parole pour leur faire entendre que sa Majesté les auoit fait venir en ce lieu pour leur faire part d'un secret qui luy tenoit au coeur depuis deaucoup d'années, & qu'il n'auoit point voulu, ny deub divulguer jusqu'à ce iour, pour ne auior pas eû lieu ny raison de le faire [...] *Que pour entrer donc en matiere, il esoit bon qu'ils sçeussent qu'il auoit depuis longtemps le dessein d'establir par la Nauigation le commerce des marchandises, & des les porter non seulement chez ses voisins, mais mesme dans les país les plus reculez de Frisquemore.* (50-51) [My emphasis.]

After the crowds, the aura of secrecy and a large dose of diplomatic turn of phrase, the great secret is revealed: establish, through navigation, the commerce of merchandise. Lozières and Courtais promise to guard this classified matter with their lives and agree to help bring this plan to fruition and the narrative comes to an end. It should be noted in this passage that the author uses a third-person voice that is more akin to fictional narrative than to this type of relation, which one would expect to be in the first person using either Lozières or Courtais as a diary writer.

The remaining 40 or so pages of this 118 page work is a minute description of the different regions of Frisquemore. No shipwrecks, political intrigue, detours, intercalated stories or other narrative devices to surprise the reader, just promises of trade and

commerce and a new opening on the world. What becomes striking, therefore, when wading through this last half in search of metaphors and meanings to give depth to this landscape, something to place these names in time and space—whether allegorical, utopian, realistic or other—is the very lack of a hook to latch onto. As an example of the description of Frisquemore shows, literal flatness (*Le pays est plat, excepté aux extremitez des Prouinces qui sont situées vers le Nord & la Mer glaciale*” [67]) is accompanied by figural counterparts such as the town by town description of the kingdom:

Hactéograde est une autre ville située sur une des emboucheures de Viuiersky, aussi fort peuplée & fort marchande: il s’y fait grand debit de sel, biere ceruoise, vinaigre, eau-de-vie, & de diverses autres denrées [...] Bertigorod situé sur la troisième emboucheure du Viuiersky, estant plus petite que les deux villes susnommées, ne leur cede pas en richesse... (91-92)

And so on and so forth. In spite of some phrases that might paint Frisquemore as some kind of utopia—debtors cannot be arrested in their houses there and convents do not exist, for example—the description of the kingdom goes little beyond the most banal facts. Reading *Frisquemore* as an allegory in the vein of Sorel’s *Sophie* or *Isle de la portraicture* becomes a search for occult meaning in face of the apparently void and superficial. But I would argue here that smoothness or banality can be tricky. Sorel appears to give his text too much luster, so to speak. The description of the kingdom, like the map, appears to exist almost exclusively on the superficial plane of the signifier. This becomes doubly true since motivation seems to flow not from “underneath” the text—whether underneath means allegorical or intertextual richness—but from linguistic similitude, phonemes that resonate, that evoke otherness like the suffixes “-eograde,” “-ersky,” or “-insky.” Such linguistic similarities suggest that the place names of Frisquemore are largely derivative based on maps of northern Europe and the discoveries of Willem Barents during the previous century.³ In order to add credence to these onomastic inventions, the author/mapmaker

enhances the text with Scricfinie, Finmarchie, Lapponie, Samoeides and Nova Zembla (all real places appearing in maps of the time).

It is obvious now that I do not believe Frisquemore to be a real place or another typical allegorical satire from Sorel. In fact, the longitudes and latitudes on the map place this region nearer to the Urals than to the northern tip of Norway and next to Nova Zembla. All the evidence therefore points to a fabricated land for which Scricfinie, Finmarchie, Mer Blanche and Nova Zembla serve as buttresses,⁴ as “effets de reel” that sustain an illusion. Like all effects, they distort; here, they are pull at the edges of the map, framing, distorting, and ultimately tearing at its center, revealing imperfections that belie the text’s lustre. Looking at what lies beneath the tear, the outline of a process appears, the layers of which may help explain Frisquemore’s existence, its generation if not its genre.

Subtexts

In the layers that work to both underpin and undermine the text lies the pressure exerted by the “real”—i.e., the rich literary and cartographic knowledge available to the writer of *Frisquemore*, *La Science universelle* and *Discours sur la jonction des mers*. Of course, what specific knowledge the author had about the region is impossible to discern, but almost certainly Sorel would have heard of the Willem Barents voyage, which was one of the earliest adventure stories about survival in the frozen wilderness. Possible also is the influence of the equally adventurous—but fictional—*De I Commentarii del Viaggio* (1558), which tells of an island named Frisland. Unfortunately for those looking to decode Sorel using Frisland as a guide, the two works are totally different.⁵ The true story of the Barents trips (by Gerrit de Veer) was translated into French from the Latin and published by Cornille Nicolas in 1609. It is a detailed and adventurous account (compared to *Frisquemore*) of travel to the *Septentrion* as its complete title shows:

Vraye description de trois voyages de mer tres admirables fait en trois ans, a chacun an un, par les

navires d'Hollande et Zélande, au nord par derrière Norwege, Moscovie, et Tartarie, vers les royaumes de China & Catay, ensemble les découverts du Waygat, Nova Sembla, & du pays situé sous la hauteur de 80 degrez, lequel on presume estre Groenlande, où oncques personne n'a esté, plus des ours cruels & ravissans, & autres monstres marins, & la froidure insupportable, d'avantage comment a la dernière fois la navire fut arrestee par la glace, & les matelots ont basti une maison sur le pays de Nova Sembla, situé sous la hauteur de 76 degrez, où ils ont demeuré l'espace de dix mois, & comment ils ont en petites barques passé la mer, bien 350 lieues d'eauë, non sans peril, a grand travail, & difficultez incroyables.

A look at the many images from de Veer's work reveals its spectacular content: Men fight for survival against a polar bear, a ship trapped in ice and "monstres marins" (called, incidentally, "walrusces"), and pictures of indigenous peoples wearing exotic outfits fill the pages along side scientific observations of latitude, longitude, water depth and coastline conditions. So how did Sorel go from a true and great adventure yarn upon which he might have based his very own map and story to this mechanical non-adventure? Is the author indeed trying to hide its "imperfections" rather than exploit them in narrative word games *à la Francion* or the *Berger extravagant*? Uncharacteristically, Sorel seems to be "smoothing over" this work's literary heritage, eschewing his usual anti-novel or satirical stance. Such smoothing over invariably reveals the very ruptures it seeks to hide, a fact with which the author proved himself familiar in his anti-novels and in his dedication/preface to *Frisquemore*.

Origins: Paratext/*Père-à-texte*

When the author dedicates his work to the "TRES-HAUT ET TRES-UISSANT SEIGNEUR, MESSIRE GASTON GOTH, duc d'Espéron, Pair de France, Sire de Lesparre, Marquis de Rouillac, etc.", he inserts reality into a fictional world to create an ambi-

guous mélange. Like Scricfinie or Nova Zembla for the map, a relation to the real exists in the dedication carries over to the entire text, upholding it while revealing its weaknesses. This merits an explanation of course. The Duc d'Épernon, also known as Jean-Baptiste Gaston de Goth, was, in fact, a real person. His father, Jacques de Goth, marquis de Rouillac, died in 1662, the same year as the publication of *Frisquemore*. The circumstances of the manuscripts history are quite explicit, as the author explains as he writes to Gaston de Goth:

Monseigneur, Je viens vous restituer un meuble de la succession de feu Monsieur vostre Pere, qu'on n'a pas compris dans son Inuentaire, & qui pourtant ne vous appartient pas pas que ceux que vous possédez aujourd'hui si legitimememnt. La bonté qu'il auoit pour moy me fit prendre auant sa mort la liberté de luy faire voir des Memoires qu'un Gentilhomme de mes Amis m'auoit enuoyez sur la nouvelle découuerte du Royaume de Frisquemore; & il y auoit trouué quelque chose de si conforme aux lumieres qu'on luy en auoit autrefois données, que nonobstant toute la resistance qu'il rencontra dans mon esprit, il m'auoit incessamment porté par ses persuasions à les mettre en ordre pour leur faire voir le iour sous son illustre nom. (i-iii)

Thus, under the “douce loy” (iii) of the duc’s father, the author begins rewriting the text, working to “oster par mon industrie ce qu'ils auoient de plus rude & de plus sauvage...pour les rendre en estat de parestre avec assurance dans le monde” (iii). At this point, however, fate intervenes: “... [L]a mort l'ayant enléué aux hommes, au moment de l'exécution [du projet], me causa de sa perte un douleur si sensible qu'elle alloit faire enseuelir dans son monument le projet & l'ouvrage, si ie n'eusse en mesme temps, MONSEIGNEUR, ietté les yeux sur vous” (iv). How providential is it that the author sees Gaston? Very much so, since inheriting this manuscript is a heavy responsibility, as the author notes after laying eyes on the young heir, “celuy qui deuoit suruiure à ses dessins aussi bien qu'à sa gloire” (iv). What is most interesting at

this point in the text is that Sorel positions the work within the almost dithyrambic encomium of the younger Duke's father and he stresses simultaneously the circular nature of life and death processes, and the linearity of genealogy: "Vous n'estiez pas moins l'heritier de ses vertus que de ses grandes Terres, & qu'on pouoit encore adiouster, sans pourtant faire tort à sa mémoire & violer le droit du Tombeau; que vous possediez une qualité sur-eminente, qui vous est propre, & et que vous tenez purement que de Dieu..." (iv). And moreover:

[C']est cette liberalité qui sied si bien aux grandes ames, ce rayon de la Diuinité, qui seule les distingue du commun des homes; c'est aussi, MONSIEGNEUR, le partage de la haute naissance, telle qu'est la vostre, qui est aussi ancienne que la Monarchie, & si auguste qu'on n'en peut faire la Genealogie sans découvrir dans sa source des Princes et des Souverains. I'en dirois dauantage, si la crainte de blesser votre modestie ne me retenoit & ne m'obligeoit à finir, pour vous supplier tres-humblement, MONSEIGNEUR, de permettre à cette petite narration de courre sous vostre protection (iv-v).

Sorel's motivations are clear here since such flattery could only entice Gaston to fulfill his filial duties by bringing this work to publication. Not to do so would not only offend his father but a whole line of ancestors as old as the French monarchy, not to mention God who gave him his unique "rayon de Diuinité." Publication, it is implied, will allow the son to honor his father with a monument to his life while taking full possession of his glory. What is less clear here is whether the author is simply following decorum in honoring the Gaston's father, or whether he is purely and simply sarcastic. Reading Tallémant de Réaux's *Histoires* about the Goth family open the door to irony, for the Marquis de Rouillac, was well a known excentric, an "extravagant," according to Réaux (141). De Réaux, perhaps

coincidentally, also speaks to Gaston de Goth's lineage, if in decidedly sarcastic terms:

Le Marquis de Rouillac est de la maison de Got, bonne maison de Gascogne; son père avoit épousé la soeur de feu Mr . D'Epernon avant que Mr. D'Epernon fût en faveur. Mais il pretend un bien plus illustre d'origine, car il veut être de Foix et d'Albret tout ensemble..Un jour qu[e le Marquis] rompoit la tête au prince de Gueménée...et qu'il lui disoit bien sérieusement : 'Canelle de Foix épousa.....—Oui' dit M. de Gueménée, en l'interrompant, Canelle 'de Foix épousa Girofle d'Albret' (141).

Such stories throw serious doubt on Sorel's statements that Gaston de Goth's family is "aussi ancienne que la Monarchie" and full of "Princes" and "Souverains." Yet, if the *Historiettes* are definitely sarcastic, this does not necessarily mean Sorel's work is, only that it may be. In this context, the manuscript for Frisquemore has equivocal roots tied to the Duke's father, on the one hand, but with the father's family, taste and discretion seeming rather dubious on the other.

Over three hundred years later, it is difficult if not impossible to balance Sorel's sarcasm and/or his sincerity. What Sorel stresses—sarcastically or genuinely—is the importance of lineage, of origins, and this would seem necessary. Indeed, according to Conley, cartographic writing almost always "...seeks to account for origins, to chart out the past, and to legitimate the present state of things..." (16). If this is true, the author/mapmaker would clearly need to articulate his role as articulator, to imbue his narration with the trappings of authority. Unlike the son who inherits "vast lands" and "gloire" from the father, the author inherits a "rude" and "sauvage" text he must transform. Here genesis and genealogy rise to the surface of the text to inform and justify the signifiers. The narrator states that the Kingdom of Frisquemore got its name from "...un mot Hebreu corrompu, qui signifie froid, & d'*Amorrhæus* fils de Chanaan qui donna le nom aux *Amorrhéens*" (61). Etymol-

ogy and genealogy thus run parallel courses for Frisquemore: words and families are tracable, understandable, motivated through time. Indeed, Sorel does not dwell on the nature of the Amorites, but on their traceability to ancient times (i.e., the fact that the name “Frisquemore” could be derived from Hebrew). That the word has been “corrupted” over time evokes less the idea of “corruption” than the notion of natural linguistic evolution, of the accretion/transformation of meaning over time. It serves to remind the reader of birth and origins, to give the text historical depth. The author further seeks to explain Frisquemore’s origin by noting that, pushed by Saxons, Moscovites and Prussians, a detached (and forgotten) branch of Charlemagne’s army wandered for several centuries before joining the Frisquemoreans and bringing the Christian ways and gentle mores one finds there. This also justifies their king (monarchy being the natural tendency of the Gauls, of course). All in all, Sorel wants to paint Frisquemore with a certain intrinsic history, give it an essence in much the same way he lauds the Duke d’Epernon’s family. Lineage means reinstating links between close and not-so-close generations in order to establish history in recognition of the formal power of historical tropes within his “petite narration.” Father figures, like the Marquis, Charlemagne or the Amoreans stand in homage to the historical trope, to family narratice (*Genesis*); they are, in other words, the *père-à-textes* who exert power in the text.

Nova S/Zembla

Sorel’s etymology of corrupted Hebrew (cold + Amorean) runs parallel to real-world names of lands along the northern borders of Finland, Norway and Russia. “Frisquet,” in French, means of course “cold,” while “more” is Russian for “sea.” The homonymic resemblance of “more” and “mort” further etches out the parallel workings of Sorel’s project. Indeed, though in description Frisquemore’s lands abound in fruit, vegetable, animal and mineral (in spite of harsh winters), the kingdom is surrounded by ominous signs: desert, glacial sea, and the ambivalent tone of “mort.” The two main rivers of Frisquemore, the “Viuiersky” and the “Morinsky,” are at the very heart of the map. Heavy with the psychological symbolism that reflects not only the quandaries

linked to inheriting a name, glory and lands, but also the compulsions that push us to fulfill the unsaid contracts of family, these two rivers reflect the oscillating movements of the text: father to son, readership to authorship, old to new. They constitute evidence of how the modern consciousness blurs the lines of disposition and elocution: how one places/sees oneself and others physically in the world (cartographically) and how the writer relates it. This also affects invention: the mythological and allegorical frameworks are replaced with History (or the modern myth of historical truth); values are no longer a transparent code, but must be established through traceability. The progressive replacement of the figural by an abstract language of visual signs becomes obvious—influenced of course by the geometrical world of maps. Likewise, the map exemplifies graphically of the transformation of psycho-linguistic space during the seventeenth century, of the circularity of the voyage from self to other, and back to self—a reminder of one's own genetic, social or psychological space within a frame of otherness. As Conley puts it: “The development of atlas-structures and of two-dimensional views confirms the rapid attenuation of the mixture of scientific and mystical dimensions in the history of cartographic literature from the age of the incunabulum to the triumph of the Cartesian method” (13).⁶ The unknown (i.e., unknown lands, death, the unthinkable), as sign, unifies and regulates the *terrae incognitae* as part of a repeating equation; the multiple unknowns of the past come to be singular otherness (Conley 13). Louis Marin is pertinent here as well. “La topographie,” writes Marin, “devient topique” (152). And so is it true of Frisquemore: life, death and restitution become rivers, hills and valley. The rituals of life and death, once expressed through the “external” system of allegory, now pass through an internal symbolic matrix.⁷ Nova Zembla, that “real” island, is case in point. As latitude and longitude attest, this map does not exactly *refer* to Nova Zembla (or any real or fictional place near there) in the strictest sense of referral, of denoting the “real” object. Rather, while acknowledging the representative action of words, the text privileges an accretion of multiple meanings that are built up from the inside of the text. Where the allegorical text/society accepts for example that a nude female figure represents Truth and depends on a pre-established and well-developed

order of meaning-making,⁸ this is less true for symbolic literature whose goal is to constitute an autonomous literary object in which the value of symbols depends on interdependence structured *within* the text—"Zem" becomes "sème," or "sym." Likewise, the translator ("le truchement") in the text is named *Simeboisky*. Without anachronistically stating that *Frisquemore* is symbolist literature, it nonetheless prefigures such a literary concept. While retaining the hallmarks of a text that promotes transparent circulation of words as images and without denying external reference, Sorel's texts accumulates meaning for and by itself. In *Frisquemore* the literature and language of symbol triumphs over traditional allegory and marks the passage of one system of representation to another becoming a cornerstone of a unique creative enterprise. *Frisquemore*, eschewing dependence on the same linguistic pacts one finds in the usual allegorical literature of the times, creates its own in a unique combination with genres familiar to the author: history, pastiche, allegory, realism. By integrating familial and textual ontology into the topographic fabric, Sorel succeeds in creating a literal voyage of sublimation in which the self is always present and elsewhere, and whose verbal and visual expression reveal the strengths and the straining points of the map/text.

Sorel's propensity for creating books in which image plays a central role stresses the importance he must have placed on the graphic conceptualization here. Space no longer reiterates the physical, but the psychological. Discourse, being and space bind to form an inextricable knot that is quite different from Lysis' (*Berger Extravagant*) confusion of St-Cloud and Forez, or Scudéry's map of sensibility. The complexes of inheritance and parentage are mapped out to guide the reader through the work that follows, to explain and colonize new and old territories. This colonizing tendency is taken even farther by Sorel since his desire to frame and control the work leads him to the paradox of reproduction: he needs Gaston de Goth to bring the work to light, but he refuses to let the Marquis de Rouillac's importance overshadow his own by embedding the work in ambiguous flattery. Again, Sorel has found a way to reinvent and recombine genres and codes in novel ways. Regardless of whether a "clef" can be found for each

and every name on the map of Frisquemore, another key, which is that of literary creation and recreation exists to enrich this work.

Whittier College

NOTES

¹ Emile Roy lists *Frisquemore* in his bibliography of “œuvres galantes ou précieuses” (410), but does not discuss it in his critique. Without any discussion of the work, one can only guess that Roy categorized *Frisquemore* there because of its title, which is similar to that of Sorel’s allegorical satires. Gabrielle Verdier does not list the work, however. Paul Zumthor mentions the existence of 5 allegorical utopias written by Sorel, but again, does not really discuss *Frisquemore*. In his long analysis of allegory in Sorel (19-46), Wim de Vos also eschews *Frisquemore*. Sorel himself does not mention it as an allegory in *La bibliothèque française* (166-74).

² I am indebted to Tom Conley’s work *The Self-Made Map* for his explanation of the umbilical in Guy Rosolato’s *La relation d’inconnu*. The layers of Sorel’s text in this case are, in the words of Tom Conley and Guy Rosolato, like the navel, “a site where the unknown has its first physical trace” (Conley 9). Such traces refute the work’s self-sufficient pretenses by recalling binary poles of life/death, conscious/unconscious. Conley speaks of Freud’s notion that consciousness can be depicted as a small circle within the much larger circle of the unconscious (11). This is not unlike *Frisquemore*: the narration, seemingly “smooth” and “un-corrupted” like Freud’s center circle, consciousness finds itself subject to unknown surrounding forces such as its paratexts, the map of *Frisquemore* and the *Dédicace*. As this paper later explains, at work in the creation of *Frisquemore* are, literally and figureatively, the forces of life and death.

³ Barents discovered Novaya Zemlya in 1594 during his search for a northern passage to the Pacific. The first map of the region was in the diary of Gerrit de Veer (1598).

⁴ The author is precise but gives impossible latitudes and longitudes: “Le païs de Frisquemore est situé entre le cinquante-sept & le soixante-unième degré, quarante huit minutes de latitude, & confine du costé de l’Est & Nordest, à la *Lapponie* ou *Lappie*...” (66).

⁵ *De I Commentarii del Viaggio*, reports the fictional travels of Nicolo and Antonio Zeno in the Northern Atlantic. They were supposed to have

sailed extensively in these relatively unknown waters, including to the new lands of Frisland, Icaria, Estotiland, and Drogio. A descendant of the Zeno brothers, supposedly found the manuscript along with a map, which he published in Venice in 1558. Though this volume was completely fictional, it was widely accepted as true when first issued. Gerard Mercator, in his seminal world map of 1569 included the Zeno geography, and this depiction was followed closely by Abraham Ortelius in his influential map of the Northern Atlantic in 1573. Frisland is located nearer to Greenland and Nova Scotia on Ortelius' map, a fact which further distances it from *Frisquemore*.

⁶ I am again employing terms of Conley here, in particular chapter 8. Conley notes "The expanding number of toponyms in the drawn and printed between the time of Bougereau and the end of Henry's reign show that a *consciousness of a collective population of subjects* was materializing in graphic and strategic ways" (301 [my italics]). Naming, being and spacing for a grid of subjectivity.

⁷ Though perhaps anachronistic, the 19th century definitions of symbol vs. allegory seem pertinent here.

⁸ This is exactly the opposite case of Sorel's *Sophie*, in which the transparent language of traditional allegory is primordial and necessary for its irony.

WORKS CITED OR CONSULTED

Conley, Tom. *The Self-Made Map*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

De Vos, Wim. *Le Singe au miroir*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1994

Marin, Louis. *Utopiques*. Paris: Minuit, 1973.

Roy, Emile. *La vie et les oeuvres de Charles Sorel*. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.

Sorel, Charles. *Le Berger extravagant : où parmi des fantaisies amoureuses on void les impertinences des romans & de poésie*. Paris: Toussaint de Bray, 1627

_____. *La Bibliothèque française*. (1667). Genève: Slatkine, 1970.

_____. *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans la nouvelle découverte du royaume de Frisquemore*. Paris: Thomas Jolly, 1662.

Tallemant des Réaux, Gédéon, *Les historiettes de Tallemant des Réaux Tome cinquième: mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du XVIIe siècle*. Paris: A. Levavasseur, 1834

Veer, Gerrit de. *Vraye description de trois voyages de mer tres admirables fait en trois ans...* Amsterdam: Cornille Nicolas, 1609.

Verdier, Gabrielle. *Charles Sorel*. Boston: Twayne, 1984.

Zumthor, Paul. "La Carte de Tendre et les Précieux," *Trivium* 6 (1948): 263-73.