Garnier's Historical Sources in *Les Juifves*

DAMON DI MAURO

Summary: Robert Garnier's "*Les Juifves*" (1583) is generally considered to be the crown jewel of the French Renaissance stage. At the close of his prefatory "Argument" to the play, Garnier obligingly furnishes the historical sources from which he has taken the story of the sufferings of Zedekiah and his family. However, the bibliographic information which the tragedian supplies in his "Argument" contains at least one error with respect to the Bible, and a second error pertaining to Flavius Josephus's "*Jewish Antiquities*" is more than likely as well.

At the close of his prefatory *Argument* to *Les Juifves* (1583), Robert Garnier indicates the historical sources from which he has taken the story of the sufferings of Zedekiah and his family:

Ce sujet est pris des 24 et 25 chapitres du 4 livre des Roys, du 36 chapitre du 2 livre des Chroniques, et du 29 de Jeremie, et est plus amplement traité par Josephe au 9 et 10 chapitres du 10 des Antiquitez.¹

This article will attempt to show that the summary bibliography which the foremost tragedian of the French Renaissance stage supplies here in his *Argument* contains at least one error with respect to the Bible, and that a second error pertaining to Flavius Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* is more than likely as well.

The Bible

Indeed, the narrative found in 2 Kings 24: 17–20 and 25: 1–21² contains nearly all of the events which Robert Garnier retraces in his *Argument* to *Les Juifves*: Zedekiah's submission to Nebuchadnezzar and his rebellion against the same; the last agony of Jerusalem weakened by a siege without and ravaged by a famine within; the breach made in the city; the flight of Zedekiah and his entourage; the capture of the fugitives on the plains of Jericho; the judgment meted out to the perjured king at Riblah; and finally the deportation of the chosen race to Babylon. The reign of Zedekiah, the fall of Jerusalem,

and the captivity of the Jews are likewise dealt with, though in a more abbreviated manner, in 2 Chronicles 36: 11–21.³ However, the mention of Jeremiah 29 corresponds to none of the events described above and must be called into question.

In previous studies of Garnier's last and greatest tragedy, the historical biblical sources have not come under close scrutiny. All too often critics have accepted at face value the bibliographic notations which the humanist dramatist himself obligingly furnishes in his *Argument* and have contented themselves to merely repeat these scriptural references in their works.⁴ Only M.-M. Mouflard, in her erudite and nearly exhaustive study of the sources of Garnier's theatre, has noted that the third biblical narrative referred to in the *Argument* present some difficulty: "Mais la référence à Jérémie XXIX désigne un faux prophète et non le roi."⁵ Mouflard is quite right; for although Jeremiah does indeed mention a "Zedekiah" in the 29th chapter of the book which bears his name, and even foretells his death by the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, the prophet specifically identifies him as the "son of Maaseiah" and accuses him of false prophecy (Jer 29: 21–23). This "Zedekiah" has, of course, nothing to do with the last king of Judah, whose father was Josiah, the well-known religious reformer. Why then did Garnier cite Jeremiah 29? Mouflard is silent on that score. She only points out that this text is a problematical source for *Les Juifves* and pursues the matter no further.

Simply enough, it would appear that the wrong chapter of Jeremiah is cited at the conclusion of the *Argument* accompanying *Les Juifves*. There is good reason to believe that chapter 39 of this book, and not chapter 29, is the source which Garnier means to indicate. This is because the events described in the 39th chapter of Jeremiah are more in conformity with those which the tragedian details in his prefatory piece and which form the essence of his play. To demonstrate this, it would be well to quote from the brief summary which Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples places, in his famous translation of the Scriptures (1530), at the head of the chapter in question:

Comment la cite fut prinse / & Sedechias soy fuyant fut prins / & luy
furent les yeulx crevez...

A close inspection of the text itself of Jeremiah 39 will confirm nearly all the information relevant to the Zedekiah story. The only pertinent facts that it does not mention are Zedekiah's initial appointment to the throne and his subsequent revolt against his overlord.⁶

Further weight can be added to the identification of Jeremiah 39 as the more appropriate reading at the close of the *Argument* by the marginal notes in sixteenth-century editions of the Bible. These draw a close parallel between Jeremiah 39 and another biblical passage which Garnier correctly cites in the *Argument* as a source for his work: 2 Kings 25. The phenomenon can be observed in Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples's edition of the Bible: at the beginning of Jeremiah 39, he cross-references the first part of 2 Kings 25 ("4 des roi.25.a."), while at the beginning of 2 Kings 25, he indicates that the first few verses of Jeremiah 39 ("iere. 39.a.") constitute a parallel passage. The same is true of Pierre-Robert Olivétan's equally well-known Protestant version of the Scriptures (1535): a marginalium at the head of Jeremiah 39 first summarizes the contents of that portion of Scripture ("La prise de Jerusalem soubz Zedekiah") and then draws the reader's attention to 2 Kings 25 ("2 Roys 25.a."), while a cross-reference to the first part of 2 Kings 25 repays the favor by sending the reader back to Jeremiah 39 ("Jere. 39.a."). In short, since it is clear that 2 Kings 25 is indeed a legitimate source for Garnier's sacred drama, it follows that he must have also had Jeremiah 39 in mind in citing his biblical sources at the end of the *Argument*.⁷

But did Robert Garnier actually make use of Jeremiah 39 in composing his religious tragedy? The case can be made that he did. It so happens that this particular portion of Scripture contains one very important detail that 2 Kings 24–25 and 2 Chronicles 36 do not. Only Jeremiah 39 reveals that Nebuchadnezzar was not content to merely butcher Zedekiah's sons before their father's eyes, but, at the same time, "le roy de Babilone occist tous les nobles de Juda" (Lefèvre's Bible). This would explain Garnier's reference in the *Argument* to "les principaux seigneurs de Jerusalem" who were also executed by Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah and would justify the corresponding scene in the tragedy itself (see lines 1902–1908, 1967–1982). It should be remarked that Flavius Josephus says it quite differently: [Nebuchadnezzar] "ordonna, que ses enfans et ses amis plus familiers [emphasis added] fussent occis en sa presence."⁸ There is some distance from the nobles of Judah, of which the Bible speaks, to Zedekiah's most intimate friends, as the Jewish historian would have it. Thus, the indication that the Assyrian king also put the noblemen of Jerusalem to the sword at Riblah could only have been culled from Jeremiah 39.

Now that it is clear that Jeremiah 39 is the true source for Garnier's play, it might well be asked to what the ill-assorted reference to Jeremiah 29 in the *Argument* is due. A typographical error is not implausible. It is quite conceivable that a "2" was printed instead of a "3," hence the chapter "29 de Jeremie"

and not the chapter “39.” However, one might wonder why Garnier did not seek to rectify this error when he undertook the *ne varietur* edition of his tragedies in 1585. This would suggest that he did not realize that the reference was inaccurate. Moreover, M.-M. Mouflard has brought to light some of the playwright’s other mistakes in citing his historical sources, from the *Arguments* of earlier works, and she notes: “L’attitude de Garnier envers ses sources historiques se caractérise d’abord par sa désinvolture; il se croit obligé de citer les textes historiques, alors qu’il ne mentionne pas alors ses sources littéraires, mais ses références sont souvent fausses.”⁹ Because this would not be the first time that Garnier had inaccurately cited a passage as a source for his work, it is less likely that a misprint occurred here in the *Argument* to *Les Juifves*. Rather, the tragic author himself should be blamed. Even so, his substitution of Jeremiah 39 would be easy enough to understand. It would be due to a mental lapse on his part and would merely betray a faulty memory.

Flavius Josephus’s *Jewish Antiquities*

It seems that Robert Garnier is once again mistaken when he states in his *Argument* to *Les Juifves* that the story of Zedekiah is treated by Flavius Josephus “au 9 et 10 chapitres du 10 des Antiquitez.” More precisely, the story of the last king of Judah is found in chapters 10 and 11 of the same book of the *Jewish Antiquities*. To show this, it will perhaps suffice here to list the chapter headings for the three texts at issue as they appear in the famous French edition of the histories of Flavius Josephus which Gilbert Génébrard published in 1578:¹⁰

IX. Comment Nabuchodonosor Roy de Babylon, changeant d’avis, assiegea Joacin, qui se rendit de son bon gré, et fut emmené captif en Babylon.

X. Comment Sedecias fut constitué Roy en Hierusalem par le Roy de Babylon.

XI. Comment Nabuchodonosor donna l’assaut aux Juifs, les bastant incessamment par l’espace de dixhuit jours: et à la parfin print Hierusalem par force, et transporta le peuple en Babylon.

The material of the last two chapters seems to square better with the events outlined in the *Argument* and most clearly falls within the province of the play’s action. As one can plainly see, chapter 10 deals with the circumstances surrounding Zedekiah’s establishment as king. The 11th chapter, besides its

general description of Jerusalem besieged and taken by storm, naturally recounts the tragic fate of Garnier's hero as well.

This time, however, critics have been attentive to the imperfect correspondence between the chapter numbers to which Garnier refers in his *Argument* and those which one finds in Gnbrard's edition of the *Antiquities*. M.-M. Mouflard attributes this discrepancy to Garnier's usual nonchalance in citing his historical sources.¹¹ According to her, though, the playwright would have actually drawn on chapters 5 to 11 of book 10 of the *Jewish Antiquities*, this is to say from Josiah's ascension to the throne to the deportation of the Jewish people.¹² The implication is that Garnier should have cited all of these texts in his *Argument*. While it is quite true that the characters of *Les Juifves* discuss some of those events which directly precede the collapse of Jerusalem and which thus bear upon the current plight of the Hebrew nation, namely the death of Josiah and the misfortune of the last king of Judah (lines 397–444; cf. lines 1110–1178), none of these events are recorded in the *Argument*. Instead, Garnier's prefatory piece is solely devoted to the tragic destiny of Zedekiah. So there is no reason to believe that he meant to cite any other portion of book 10 of the *Jewish Antiquities* besides those chapters 10 and 11 which deal explicitly with the story of the fallen king.

Another student of Garnier's sources, D. Seidmann, of course recognizing that at least the 11th chapter of book 10 of the *Jewish Antiquities* is absolutely essential to the Zedekiah story, postulates "une faute d'impression qu'ont reproduite toutes les ditions des *Juifves*."¹³ What this critic does not seem to know, though, is that Garnier himself had been mistaken before, and that he also was so in the very same sentence of the *Argument* to *Les Juifves* where he apparently commits a mental error in substituting Jeremiah 29 for 39. Because Seidmann does not consider the possibility that the tragic author himself could err, he is forced to conclude that a publishing error occurred. But the theory itself is seriously flawed, as D. Stone has pointed out:

Are we to assume that 10 was printed instead of 11? If so, a text that read "9 & 11" would be incorrect. The mistake would have to have been either the omission of "& 11" after "9 & 10" or the omission of the number 10 before the ampersand and the printing of 10 for 11 after the ampersand — nothing so simple as a "faute d'impression."¹⁴

For his part, Stone goes on to prove the existence of sixteenth-century editions of Flavius Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* which produce different chapter divisions than those which one finds in Gilbert Gnbrard's version. What is most significant about this discovery is that the chapters 9 and 10 of book 10

of the said editions would furnish the essence of Garnier's *Les Juifves*, as the chapter headings in an early French translations of the *Jewish Antiquities* by Guillaume Michel will sufficiently show:¹⁵

IX. De la captivite du roy Joachim en Babilone et obstination de Sedechias contre le prophete Hieremie.

X. De la destruction de Hierusalem par les Chaldees.

Stone therefore believes that the bibliographic information which Garnier provides at the end of his *Argument* is entirely accurate and that Gnbrard must not be the right source for his borrowings from the *Antiquities*.

Nevertheless, Stone's contention that the *Argument* is error free is not as air-tight as it would at first seem. By his own admission the alternative textual tradition which he unearths had been "relegated to a secondary position"¹⁶ by the time of the publication of *Les Juifves*. Indeed, by the middle of the sixteenth century this system of chapter division for Flavius Josephus's histories, which is based on Tyrannius Rufinus's ancient Latin translation and which Guillaume Michel reproduces in his French version, had well-nigh been abandoned. A new generation of translations of the *Jewish Antiquities*, undoubtedly patterned on the original Greek text recently published at Basel (1544),¹⁷ follow the chapter divisions which are also found in Gnbrard. While it is well-worth noting that the succeeding editions of the *Antiquities* often preserve the older textual tradition by placing in the margins a series of Roman numerals to signal the alternative chapter divisions, the numeral "X" happens to be wanting in the margin of Gnbrard's text, thus making it highly improbable that this important and influential edition — which Garnier is commonly purported to have used — would have drawn his attention to them.¹⁸ This would mean that if the Renaissance tragedian truly did find the story of Zedekiah treated in chapters 9 and 10 of book 10 of the *Jewish Antiquities*, it could only have been in an all but antiquated version.

But the most serious drawback to Stone's hypothesis is that it is not corroborated by a linguistic comparison of the texts themselves, for he does not examine any of Robert Garnier's specific borrowings from Flavius Josephus in light of the different sixteenth-century editions of the *Jewish Antiquities* in order to determine in precisely which two chapters of book 10, 9 and 10 or 10 and 11, the dramatist approached the story of Zedekiah. To be sure, the mass of Garnier's borrowings from the *Antiquities* are generally unremarkable and do not permit one to identify the exact edition he used. Yet

certain lexicological similarities between *Les Juifves* and Gnbrard's version of the *Antiquities* have been established by previous critics.¹⁹

The most notable of these concerns Zedekiah's dramatic appearance before Nebuchadnezzar. When the king of Babylon at last sights his wayward vassal, one reads in Gnbrard that he specifically upbraids him for his "wickedness" and "disloyalty":

Nabuchodonosor l'ayant devant soy commena l'appeler *meschant et desloyal* [emphasis added], qui avait rompu sa foy, et mis en oubly ses promesses: car il avoit promis de garder ce pais souz le Roy de Babylon.²⁰ (Livre X, Chapitre XI)

Garnier reproduces the same terms in the corresponding scene of his tragedy:

Toy, *mechant desloyal* [emphasis added], le pire de la terre,

Tu as induit ton peuple me faire la guerre. (lines 1375–1376).

It should be noticed that the epithets found in Guillaume Michel's version of this explosive encounter are sufficiently different:

Et quant Nabuchodonosor le veit / il l'appella *malheureux et mauvais* [emphasis added] et non remembrable de son jurement quil avoit faict de luy conserver la province.²¹ (Livre X, Chapitre X)

Another indication that Garnier consulted Gnbrard's edition of the *Jewish Antiquities* also deserves mention. When Zedekiah and his fellow fugitives are overtaken by the Chaldean men of war on the plains of Jericho, one reads in this translation:

Ses amis et les princes qui s'en estoient fuys avec luy, voyans les ennemis pres d'eux, l'abandonnerent et *chacun s'esquarta a et l, o l'esperance de se pouvoir sauver le pousoit. Il demeura presque seul...* [emphasis added] (Livre X, Chapitre XI)

Michel's text laconically states:

[Zedekiah] fut suivy par lesditz princes des Babiloniens / et prins aupres de Hiericho: car ses amys et princes senfuyrent. Et fut mene au roy de Babilone... (Livre X, Chapitre X)

But if one examines *Les Juifves*, one finds that Garnier's debt to Gnbrard's version involves more than just vague reminiscence, for there are specific textual imitations of such expressions as "s'carter" (line 789) and "demeurer seul" (line 790):

Alors nous commençons à nous batter et destordre,
 Deçà delà courir en un confus desordre,
Les hommes s'escarter où les chassoit la peur:
Le roi seul demeura [emphasis added] trop attendry de coeur.
 (lines 787–790).

It is, of course, impossible to prove that the influence of Gnébrard's version upon Garnier was exclusive. Still, while it cannot be ruled out that the dramatist consulted more than one edition of the *Jewish Antiquities* in composing his religious tragedy, and even an edition in which the story of Zedekiah appears in chapters 9 and 10 of book 10, one can be certain that he used the version found in Gnébrard, where it is related in chapters 10 and 11. At the same time, there is a definite pattern of oversight and error which emerges from the abbreviated bibliographies which Garnier customarily furnishes at the close of the *Arguments* accompanying his tragedies. The *Argument* to *Les Juifves* already contains one mistake with respect to the biblical source. It therefore stands to reason that Flavius Josephus is imperfectly cited as well.

In conclusion, Robert Garnier commits at least one error, and very likely two, in citing his historical sources in the *Argument* to *Les Juifves*. He evidently is guilty of a mental error in stating that the subject of this biblical tragedy is found in Jeremiah chapter 29, instead of chapter 39, where it is actually discussed. In all likelihood, Garnier is once more mistaken in specifying chapters 9 and 10 of book 10 of the *Jewish Antiquities* as the other source of his work, for the Zedekiah story is treated more exactly in chapters 10 and 11 of the same book 10 in Gilbert Gnébrard's edition — which the dramatist is known to have used. But lest Garnier be taxed with indifference towards his historical sources, it is worth considering what his practice and manner of citation might reveal about his own learning and that of his time. Apparently, Garnier did not feel the need to have the original documents at hand at the time of writing, but relied on his memory to quote them. He was not, however, always able to recall specific details with precision. Nevertheless, the willingness and ease with which he cites the texts he consulted implies a certain confidence in his erudition and a measure of familiarity with the source material. Indeed, inaccurate or imperfect citation on the part of Renaissance authors such as Robert Garnier could indicate, quite paradoxically, that the sources had truly been assimilated.

Notes

1. The edition referred to in this article is that of R. Lebègue, *Oeuvres complètes de Robert Garnier*, vol. 1: *Les Juifves, Bradamante, Poésies diverses* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949).
2. It should be noticed that Garnier's own nomenclature here ("4 livre des Roys") would confirm what critics have usually assumed, and not a few times explicitly stated, that he read Holy Writ either in the Vulgate or in a Catholic vernacular version. The French Protestant Bibles, it will be remembered, had adopted the Hebrew designation as early as Pierre-Robert Olivétan's first edition: "Le Second livre des Roys / qui est le quatriesme / Selon les Latins," *La Bible qui est toute la Sainte escriture. En laquelle sont contenus le Vieil Testament et le Nouveau, translatez en François...* (Neuchâtel: Pierre de Wingle, 1535).
3. One might wonder why the Catholic playwright did not adopt the Vulgate's nomenclature for this book as well, for the title "Paralipomenon," taken over by the Latins from the Greeks, had also been brought into currency in Renaissance France. Nevertheless, the title "Chroniques" which Robert Garnier employs here in his *Argument* can in no ways be construed to be any less "Catholic," for it had the very sanction of Saint Jerome himself, who, in commenting on the original Hebrew denomination, remarked that the book might be more appropriately styled "Chronicles": "DABRE AJAMIN, id est, verba dierum, quod significantius *Chronikon* totius divanae historiae possumus appellare": *Prologus Galeatus*, PL, XXVIII, 554. In fact, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, having retained the traditional transcription "Paralipomenon" in his first vernacular edition of the Scriptures, hastens to cite the opinion of this eminent church doctor: "Saint Hierome lapelle la Cronique / ou le recueil de toutes les divines Histoires": *La Sainte Bible en Francoys, translatee selon la pure et entiere traduction de saint Hierome...* (Anvers: Martin Lempereur, 1530). Even the Protestants, in this case, do not remount to the *veritas hebraica*, but consider Jerome's title more representative of the book and make it their own. In general, then, one can say that in the sixteenth century the work was known by two titles, "Paralipomenon" and "Chroniques," although the former begins to yield ground to the latter, and that not only in Protestant circles but in Catholic circles too.
4. This is regrettably the case even with the most scrupulous studies of the influence of Scripture upon *Les Juifves*: see R. Lebègue, *Les Juives de Robert Garnier*, 3rd ed. (Paris: Centre de documentation universitaire "Les cours de la Sorbonne," 1979), p. 35; and D. Seidmann, *La Bible dans les tragédies religieuses de Garnier et de Montchrestien* (Paris: Nizet, 1971), pp. 21–22.
5. M.- M. Mouflard, *Robert Garnier 1545–1590*, vol. III, *Les Sources* (La Roche-sur-Yon: Imprimerie Centrale de l'Ouest, 1964), p. 184.
6. These facts are found in 2 Kings 24 and 2 Chronicles 36, both of which are quoted by Garnier in the *Argument* as sources for his work, and rightly so.
7. The point which needs to be made here, though, is that not only in Renaissance editions of Holy Writ, but in modern versions of the Scriptures and in biblical commentaries of every age as well, the marginalia and cross-references inextricably link the three narrative passages which Garnier apparently means to indicate in his prefatory piece:

2 Kings 24–25, 2 Chronicles 36 and Jeremiah 39. These texts can even be said to form a unity. While it is true that Jeremiah 52 also treats the Zedekiah story, it is thought that this chapter – a sort of historical appendix – was added to the book of Jeremiah to show how the prophet’s message of doom was fulfilled. In fact, both Lefèvre in his Bible and Olivétan in his, refer to Jeremiah 52 as a “Repetition” of previous texts. One can safely assume, then, that because Jeremiah 52 does not add any new information to the story of Zedekiah, Garnier did not deem it necessary to cite this text as well in his *Argument*.

8. *Histoire de Flave Josephe Sacrificateur Hebrieu mise en François*, Gilbert Génébrard (Paris: Michel Sonnius, 1578), Livre X, Chapitre XI.
9. *Op. cit.*, p. 191. For instance, Mouflard finds that Garnier’s references to his historical sources in the *Arguments* accompanying *Porcie* and *Cornélie* are particularly careless and fraught with error: see pp. 160, 166.
10. *Op. cit.*
11. *Op. cit.*, p. 184.
12. Although Mouflard in fact says that “ce sont les chapitres 5–10) (et non 9–10) qui ont surtout inspiré Garnier,” she most certainly means to include the 11th chapter of book 10 as well, for many of the passages from the *Antiquities* which she cites in her detailed comparison of Josephus and Garnier are taken from this last chapter: *Ibid.* 184–190.
13. *Op.cit.*, p. 21.
14. D. Stone, Jr., “Robert Garnier and Josephus Flavius,” *Harvard Library Bulletin*, XX (1972), p. 185.
15. *Joseph Juif et Hebrieu, Hystoriographe Grec, de Lantiquite Judaïque, Nouvellement translaté de Latin en Vulgaire Francoys* (Paris: Estienne Caveiller, 1539).
16. *Art.cit.*, p. 186.
17. Flavii Iosephi, *Opera* (Basileae: Froben, 1554). The rise and fall of Zedekiah are discussed in chapters 10 and 11 of book 10 of this edition.
18. It is important to note that Gilbert Génébrard’s version is not his own. In reality, Génébrard’s translations is that of François Bourgoing, who is responsible for at least three vernacular editions of Flavius Josephus’s *Jewish Antiquities*, in 1558, 1562, and 1569 respectively. In his preface to the reader, Génébrard is perfectly clear about why he has found it necessary to republish his predecessor’s text:

Ne t’esmerveille pas, amy lecteur, si apres un certain Heretique nommé Bourgoing, j’ay voulu revoir et renouveler en François l’Historiographe Josephe, d’autant que, outre une infinité de bestises et asneries procedees de celui, qui ne sçavoit ny Grec ny Hebrieu, et bien peu entendoit le Latin de Sigismond Gelenius, lequel seul il s’estoit proposé de suivre, il y a meslé de la poison, à la maniere des autres heretiques.

In all events, the chapter divisions of book 10 of the *Jewish Antiquities* as well as their contents correspond absolutely in both Bourgoing and Génébrard. This means that Garnier could very well have used Bourgoing’s edition in preparing his tragedy. One

reason for preferring Gnbrard's version is that it is closer in date to *Les Juifves*. Another is that Gnbrard would have been well known to Garnier as a prominent figure in the Counter-Reformation movement. Moreover, it is not impossible that Garnier and Gnbrard frequented the same literary circles and knew one another on a more personal basis, for they both sent commendatory sonnets to Andr Thevet for his famous work, *Les vrais pourtraits et vies des hommes illustres* (Paris: Veuve J. Kervert et G. Chaudire, 1584).

19. See R. Lebgue, *op.cit.*, pp. 35, 92, 102 and 134, as well as his critical edition of the play, p. 276; M.- M. Mouflard, *op.cit.*, pp. 188–189; and D. Seidmann, *op.cit.*, p. 22.
20. If Gnbrard's edition is actually that of Franois Bourgoing, it should also be stated that Bourgoing's edition is itself derivative, having been translated from Sigismundus Gelenius's Latin text: "Quem postquam in conspectu habuit Nabuchodonosor, impium et foedifragum vocare coepit..." Flavii Josephi, *Opera* (Basileae: Frobren, 1554).
21. Guillaume Michel's version is based on the latin of Tyrannius Rufinus: "Venientem quoque ad se regem: Nabuchodonosor impium et infoelicem vocare coepit..." Flavii Josephi, *Opera* (Venetiis: Bernardinus Vercellenses, 1502).