

**British Responses to Du Bartas' *Semaines*,
1584-1641**

A thesis submitted for the D.Phil. degree

Peter Auger
Merton College, University of Oxford

Abstract

'British Responses to Du Bartas' *Semaines*, 1584-1641'

Peter Auger (Merton)

D.Phil. English

Trinity Term 2012

The reception of the Huguenot poet Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas' *Semaines* (1578, 1584 *et seq.*) is an important episode in early modern literary history for understanding relations between Scottish, English and French literature, interactions between contemporary reading and writing practices, and developments in divine poetry. This thesis surveys translations (Part I), allusions and quotations in prose (Part II) and verse imitations (Part III) from the period when English translations of the *Semaines* were being printed in order to identify historical trends in how readers absorbed and adapted the poems. Early translations show that the *Semaines* quickly acquired political and diplomatic affiliations, particularly at the Jacobean Scottish Court, which persisted in subsequent decades (Chapter 1). William Scott's treatise *The Model of Poesy* (c. 1599) and translations indicate how attractive the *Semaines'* combination of humanist learning and sacred rhetoric was, but the poems' potential appeal was only realized once Josuah Sylvester's *Devine Weeks* (1605 *et seq.*) finally made the complete work available in English (Chapter 2). Different communities of readers developed in early modern England and Scotland once this edition became available (Chapter 3), and we can observe how individuals marked, copied out, quoted and appropriated passages from their copies of the poems in ways dependent on textual and authorial circumstances (Chapter 4). The *Semaines*, both in French and in Sylvester's translation, were used as a stylistic model in late-Elizabethan playtexts and Zachary Boyd's *Zions Flowers* (Chapter 5), and inspired Jacobean poems that help us to assess Du Bartas' influence on early modern poetry (Chapter 6). The great variety of responses to the *Semaines* demonstrates new ways that intertextuality was a constituent feature of vernacular religious literature that was being read and written in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Britain.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements and Textual Note	iv
Abbreviations.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Critical Survey	7
Outline	15
Part I: Translations.....	18
Chapter 1: Diplomacy in Sixteenth-Century Translations.....	24
i. Du Bartas at the Scottish Court.....	24
ii. <i>The First Day of the Worlds Creation</i> (1595).....	39
iii. William Lisle's English Alexandrines.....	47
Chapter 2: Versions of Heroical Poetry	59
Introduction.....	59
i. William Scott's <i>Model of Poesy</i> and Translations from <i>La Sepmaine</i>	64
ii. Seventeenth-Century Coalescence	73
iii. <i>Devine Weekes, and Workes</i>	85
Part II: Allusions and Quotations	107
Chapter 3: The <i>Semaines</i> and their Reading Communities	113
i. Before 1605	115
ii. Approaching the Accession	119
iii. Clerical Readers.....	126
Chapter 4: Approaches to a Christian Humanist Epic	135
i. Methods of Reading.....	137
ii. Case Studies, 1625-1641	147

Part III: Imitations in Verse	176
Chapter 5: A Paradigm for Divine Poetry, c. 1594 and 1640	181
i. Paraphrases in Late-Elizabethan Drama	182
ii. <i>Nebuchadnezzar's Fierie Furnace</i> : Zachary Boyd's Dependence on Sylvester	198
Chapter 6: 'Bartasian Poetics' in Jacobean England.....	219
i. Continuations	221
ii. The <i>Semaines</i> and English Literary Genres	244
Conclusion	255
Appendix: Synopsis of Du Bartas' <i>Semaines</i>	259
Addendum: Du Bartas' Visit to Scotland and England in 1587	261
Bibliography of Works Cited	264

Acknowledgements

I thank Colin Burrow for his expert supervision, in particular for helping me to situate the topic and my methodology within early modern literary studies. David Norbrook, Richard McCabe and Peter McCullough guided this project towards its final form at an early stage, and in doing so made this dissertation stronger; I am grateful for their attention and comments. The numerous academics, graduate students and friends who have taken an interest in my work provided encouragement and fresh ideas, and specific debts are noted in footnotes. I gratefully acknowledge that my graduate studies were funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, and that Merton College, Oxford, provided additional financial and day-to-day support.

Textual Note

Quotations from Du Bartas' and Sylvester's works are from the critical, modern-spelling editions of Holmes et al. and Snyder unless noted otherwise. The date given for all printed books is the year of publication; place of publication for pre-eighteenth century books is London unless stated. Short titles only are usually given in footnotes, with u/j and typographical modernization where appropriate. Once a source has been named in footnotes subsequent references to page, line or signature numbers within the same chapter appear in the body text. Translations of non-English sources appear in footnotes, and are my own if otherwise unattributed. All web links are accurate as of May 2012.

Original spellings and typography are retained in quotations, except that quotations wholly in italics are written in roman type, with previously non-italicized words italicized. Any accompanying marginalia are always placed on the right edge. Manuscript transcriptions follow semi-diplomatic principles: raised letters lowered, contractions expanded, and supplied letters italicized; fossil thorn replaced by 'th'; equals sign replaced by hyphen; italics and

stressed words indicated by ///text///; inserted letters and words by \text/; illegible text indicated with {...}.

Abbreviations

- ADB* *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*
- Arber *A Transcript of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.*, ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols. London, 1875-91
- BL British Library
- CL* *Comparative Literature*
- Crum Margaret Crum, *First-Line Index of English Poetry, 1500-1800, in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, Oxford* [accessed through Folger Union First Line Index of English Verse 13th-19th Century; <http://firstlines.folger.edu/>]
- EEBO Early English Books Online
- EHR* *English Historical Review*
- ELR* *English Literary Renaissance*
- EMLS* *Early Modern Literary Studies*; <http://purl.org/emls>
- ESTC* A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and English Books Printed Abroad 1473-1640*; <http://estc.bl.uk>
- Foster *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, ed. by Joseph Foster, 4 vols. Oxford and London, 1891-92
- Grosart Josuah Sylvester, *Complete Works*, ed. by Alexander B. Grosart, 2 vols. 1880; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969
- HLQ* *Huntington Library Quarterly*
- Holmes et al. *The Works of Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur Du Bartas: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and Variants*, ed. by Urban Tigner Holmes, John Coriden Lyons and Robert White Linker, 3 vols. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935-38; repr. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1977
- JHI* *Journal of the History of Ideas*

- MLN *Modern Language Notes*
- MLQ *Modern Language Quarterly*
- MLR *Modern Language Review*
- NQ *Notes and Queries*
- OC *Oeuvres et Critiques*
- ODNB *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan. 2008; <http://www.oxforddnb.com>
- OED *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edition; <http://www.oed.com>
- PMLA *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*
- PQ *Philological Quarterly*
- PRO Public Records Office
- RES *Review of English Studies*
- Riverside *Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. by G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd edition. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997
- RQ *Renaissance Quarterly*
- RS *Renaissance Studies*
- SC *The Seventeenth Century*
- SEL *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*
- Snyder *The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste, Sieur du Bartas*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester, ed. by Susan Snyder, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979 (volume 2 begins on p. 489)
- SP *Studies in Philology*
- Wing Donald Wing, *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*; <http://estc.bl.uk>

Introduction

An image of Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas (1544-90) appears on the painted frieze that ribbands the second floor of the Old Bodleian Library in Oxford.¹ Rediscovered in 1949 and newly visible in the renovated north-west corner, the portrait retains its original seventeenth-century inscription with an incorrect year of death: ‘Gul. Salustius Barthassius ob. An. D. 1570’.² The image, which is placed next to a hooked blade that may allude to Du Bartas’ martial service under Henri IV, keeps company with depictions of other notable early modern European intellectuals, such as Pico della Mirandola, Joseph Justus and Julius Caesar Scaliger and Sir Philip Sidney (shown next to a close helmet and gauntlets). Bodley’s first librarian, Thomas James, designed the frieze in 1619, selecting figures that reflected the collections in Duke Humfrey’s library, with theologians on the south range and secular men of letters on the north of the picture gallery (the modern-day Upper Reading Room).³ In J. N. L. Myers’ words, the frieze aimed to ‘portray the whole field of learning and literature as it presented itself to the eyes of Protestant English scholarship in the reign of James I: it is almost level with the carved image of James I (‘the most learned, munificent and best of Kings’, according to an inscription) on the Tower of the Five Orders outside, in which the monarch presents books to the University and Fame.’⁴

Du Bartas’ inclusion is not surprising given his great reputation as a Calvinist poet across early modern Europe.⁵ Guillaume Sallustre was born in Monfort, located within the

¹ Native French speakers inform me that ‘Du Bartas’ is pronounced without a terminal ‘s’ in modern French, but that the ‘s’ is pronounced in the poet’s own Gascon accent. The numerous occurrences of early modern English writers adopting the form ‘Bartus’ (distinct from those who Latinize the name) indicate that the terminal ‘s’ was probably sounded in seventeenth-century England too, e.g.: Edward Evans, *Verba dierum* (Oxford, 1615), K1v; Martin Fotherby, *Atheomastix: clearing Foure Truthes* (1622), Z3v. Accordingly, I pronounce the ‘s’ in ‘Du Bartas’, and mark this by not placing an additional ‘s’ after possessive apostrophes.

² The inscription is recorded in Thomas Hearne, *A Letter, containing an account of some antiquities between Windsor and Oxford* (Oxford, 1725), p. 4 (item 124).

³ Ian Philip, *The Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1983), p. 23.

⁴ ‘The Painted Frieze in the Picture Gallery’, *Bodleian Library Record* 3 (1950), 82-91 (84); Charles Edward Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford*, 3 vols (London, 1924), II, 227-28.

⁵ On Du Bartas’ French reputation, see Robert Garapon, ‘Sur la Renommée posthume de Ronsard et de Du Bartas de 1590 à 1640’, *OC* 6 (1981), 53-59; and Michel Magnien, ‘Du Bartas en France au XVII^e siècle’, in *Du Bartas: 1590-1990*, ed. by James Dauphiné (Mont-de-Marsan, 1992), pp. 45-80.

Gascony region in South-West France; his family name later became ‘Saluste’, implying a comparison with the Roman historian Sallust, and Guillaume gained the lordship of nearby Bartas on his father’s death in 1566.⁶ The young poet became doctor of law in 1566, married in 1570, and entered the service of Henri de Navarre in 1576, who became Henri IV of France in 1589. Encouraged by Jean d’Albret de Navarre around 1565, Du Bartas wrote an epic poem about the biblical heroine Judith which was published in *La Muse Chrestienne* (1574). This volume also contained ‘L’Uranie’, a poem in which the Christian muse urges poets to commit themselves to divine poetry, while *Judit* and ‘Le Triomphe de la Foi’, also printed in that book, exemplified the solemn, Scripture-based verse that Du Bartas advocated.

His next poem was *La Sepmaine ou creation du Monde*, which was extremely well-received on initial publication in Paris in 1578 and was followed by two *jours* of *La Seconde Semaine* in 1584 (see p. 259 for synopsis). Two further sections (‘Les Peres’ et ‘Jonas’ (later incorporated into ‘Le Schisme’)) were published in 1588, and the remainder of the two surviving days was published between 1591 and 1603. *La Sepmaine* retells the creation story of Genesis 1:1-2:3 through a descriptive narrative containing frequent moral reflection and details drawn from ancient authorities and contemporary writers. *La Seconde Semaine* was conceived, following the plan in Augustine’s *City of God*, as an account of the seven ages of human history, from Adam to the apocalypse.⁷ However, Du Bartas only completed four days: he died in 1590, shortly after composing verses to celebrate Henri’s victory at Ivry in March that year. Du Bartas’ works continued to be read and published in France and abroad in the decades following his death: Bellenger counts 194 French editions of Du Bartas’ works by 1616, 15 in Latin and 34 in English.⁸ Even in this broader context, however, Du Bartas’ reception in England and Scotland was exceptional. The *Semaines* were widely read and distributed, and these poems are

⁶ Biographical details are from Yvonne Bellenger, *Du Bartas et ses divines Semaines* (Paris, 1993), pp. 15-24, which is itself based on Georges Pelissier, *La vie et les oeuvres de Du Bartas* (Paris, 1882; repr. Geneva, 1969) and Holmes et al.

⁷ ‘Brief Advertissement’, in Holmes et al., I, 219; Saint Augustine, *City of God*, trans. by Henry Bettenson (London, 1972; re-issued, 2003), p. 1091 (Book 22, Chapter 30).

⁸ Bellenger, *Du Bartas et ses divines Semaines*, pp. 155-79 (p. 165).

the focus for this thesis, even though ‘the *Semaines*’ refers to two poems that were never published together in full during Du Bartas’ lifetime. The chapters that follow assess how British readers understood the relationship between individual sections and whole poems, and how this coloured their interpretation.

In addition to being situated metres away from where much of this thesis was researched, the Bodleian portrait is emblematic of its principal literary historical arguments. Like the frieze, this thesis presents Du Bartas as a leading seventeenth-century literary writer whose works merited comparison with other prominent intellectuals. We shall see in Chapter 1 that James VI and I was a crucial advocate for Du Bartas’ poetry, first in the Scottish Court during the 1580s and 1590s, and later as the dedicatee of Josuah Sylvester’s translation *Divine Weekes and Workes* (1605 *et seq.*), though he never patronized the translator; Du Bartas’ British reception, again like his appearance on the frieze, was assisted by the unique level of institutional authorization he received. Royal approval partly explains why early modern English readers in later decades were so open in their positive assessments of Du Bartas’ ambitious imaginative vision that drew together contemporary learning, ethics, exemplary biblical heroes, cosmology and respect for monarchical authority and conservative Calvinism. For example, Sir John Stradling summarizes some possible resonances and uses in his *Divine Poems* from 1625, which were addressed to King Charles:

He that by weekes and dayes his worke diuides, First on the worlds-creation poetizeth: Then forwards to succeeding Ages slides, The choisest matters in his Verse compriseth, Of elder Text: so sweetly beautify’de, As, with instruction, yeilds [<i>sic</i>] content beside. ⁹	<i>Du Bartas</i> his diuine Weeks.
--	---------------------------------------

The stanza offers several clues about how Stradling responded to the poems, in particular his perception that Du Bartas had judiciously selected material from the Bible (‘elder Text’ may

⁹ *Divine Poemes in Seven Severall Classes* (1625), G2v (stanza 195).

also denote classical sources), and had succeeded in combining *dulce* with *utile*, aesthetic pleasure with instruction. This Horatian division recurs in contemporary descriptions of the poems' importance.

This passage is a 'response' to the *Semaines* in that it implies direct engagement with the poems. In addition to asserting Du Bartas' literary historical importance, the other primary aim of this thesis is to catalogue the great variety of early modern responses to the *Semaines*, a range that may not be matched by any Elizabethan or Jacobean poetic work outside of the Bible. As well as critical comments such as Stradling's, the consciously generous definition of 'responses' offered here (see Part III, preface, in particular) incorporates many other reading activities for which textual evidence survives, from translating the poems in full or in parts, to making occasional annotations in a printed copy or recycling the text into new forms. Such responses give us access to the dynamic, context-sensitive intertextuality which exists between the *Semaines* and later works. This thesis is a study of the dialogue between these French poems and their British readers.

The responses included in this thesis all offer evidence of tangible interactions between writers and particular texts of the *Semaines*. This thesis does not address echoes, resonances or other types of kinship unsubstantiated by definite textual correlations. In stressing the importance of agency, this definition of 'responses' is similar to that which Gavin Alexander offers: "What "response" gives us is a concept that implies agency on both sides (action and reaction), that encourages us to imagine the connections between texts in terms of a dialogue, and that reminds us of the hermeneutic logic of question and answer".¹⁰ Alexander's preference for the singular form 'response', and reference to 'agency on both sides' is appropriate because his work on Sir Philip Sidney 'is not in the business of constructing and refining categories of imitation (however useful those such as [Thomas]

¹⁰ Alexander, *Writing After Sidney* (Oxford, 2006), p. xxxii.

Greene's are) or reception' (p. xxxvi).¹¹ The present thesis, by contrast, adopts the plural form 'responses' because it does seek to advance our understanding of different kinds of literary imitation and reception by examining contemporary practices. I use the textual legacy of the *Semaines* for assistance in 'reconstructing the diversity of older readings from their sparse and multiple traces', as Roger Chartier once wrote.¹² Such practices take place in varied situations, and cannot be easily extrapolated into a master narrative of either Du Bartas' reception or early modern reading experiences, though this thesis does argue that non-serial readings of *Semaines* were dominant.

Modern bibliographical and book-historical methodologies allow us to analyse this literary work more fully in its different material and textual forms. Paul Eggert has argued persuasively for understanding the concept of 'literary work' as 'what we remember of that particular reading *experience*, in relation to a material object' and that such aesthetic encounters can be described using bibliography and contextualized using book history: he advocates a framework for literary study that models

our understanding of works around their material forms, their chronologies of production and in terms of the agents who originally produced them, and in their successive versions and publication forms. Then the model must accommodate reception, and it is here, I think, that we can locate the aesthetic.¹³

While this thesis only makes a passing contribution to research on the early modern book trade, it fully exploits the *Semaines* in English as an ideal topic for testing the literary scholar's ability to re-capture emotional and intellectual responses that a work provoked by consulting available documentary evidence about its composition and reception. Recent developments in the history of reading have shown early modernists how to observe works being disseminated,

¹¹ Alexander refers to Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy* (New Haven and London; 1982).

¹² Roger Chartier, 'Texts, Printings, Readings', in *The New Cultural History*, ed. by Aletta Biersack and Lynn Hunt (Berkeley, 1989), pp. 154-75 (p. 157).

¹³ Paul Eggert, 'Brought to Book: Bibliography, Book History and the Study of Literature', *The Library* 13 (2012), 3-32 (31, 30).

transmitted and read, and how different texts and editions affected reader responses.¹⁴ Writers and printers produced texts that they believed would be bought and read; readers gave life to these texts as long as they fulfilled a need. This thesis calls on many late-Elizabethan and Stuart writers as witnesses to Du Bartas' multi-faceted contemporary appeal. By retracing earlier reading and writing activities, we can develop a critical imagination that can deliver a more empathic, more clearly historicized appreciation of these poems and their place in literary history.

Because my analysis focuses on responses as occurrences that take place across and through texts, this thesis is organized according to categories of textual evidence in order to group comparable types of writing together: translations (Part I), quotations and allusions in prose (Part II), and verse imitations (Part III). The thesis concentrates on the period in which printed translations from Du Bartas' poetry in English appeared, between Thomas Hudson's translation of *Judit* (1584) to the third edition of Josuah Sylvester's complete works (1641).¹⁵ The other restriction is that this thesis only considers 'British responses' to the *Semaines*; i.e. material in English, Scots and Latin that originates from the island of Great Britain.¹⁶ Within these parameters my corpus of responses (i.e. those listed under 'primary sources' in the bibliography) includes the widest possible range of contemporary evidence.

¹⁴ See Part II, preface, on how the history of reading informs this thesis; recent contributions (each providing a concise summary of earlier research) in the field include: Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading* (Cambridge, 2011); Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005); Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions* (New Haven and London, 2000); and *Reading, Society, and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. by Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker (Cambridge, 2003). On the diversity of early modern reading practices, see Eugene R. Kintgen, 'Reconstructing Elizabethan Reading', *SEL* 30 (1990), 1-18; Eve Rachele Sanders and Margaret W. Ferguson, 'Literacies in Early Modern England', *Critical Survey* 14 (2002), 1-8 and other articles in that issue.

¹⁵ *The Historie of Judith in Forme of a Poeme*, trans. by Thomas Hudson (Edinburgh, 1584); *Du Bartas his Divine Weekes, and Workes with all the other workes*, trans. by Joshua Sylvester (1641). Throughout this thesis I refer to Sylvester's translation as '*Devine Weekes*' (following the spelling in quarto editions, with 'u' modernized to 'v'), separate to Du Bartas' other 'Workes' (e.g. 'L'Uranie' and *Judit*): Sylvester's manuscript translation of 'The Colonies' (II.ii.3) presented to James is also entitled 'Devine Weekes, and Workes' (BL, Royal MS 17 A 41, fol. 1) indicating that it was his general title, and that the comma probably indicated that 'Devine Weekes' is a separate work containing his translation of both *Semaines* (see Chapter 2.iii).

¹⁶ The only Welsh response I have located is in Edmwnd Prys' work: in his poetic debate with Cynwal (1581-87, in Welsh), Prys advocates biblical and scientific poetry, and indicates that he may have known *La Sepmaine*; Gruffydd Aled Williams, 'The Poetic Debate of Edmwnd Prys and Wiliam Cynwal', *RS* 18 (2004), 33-54 (44-45) and 'Prys, Edmwnd (1542/3-1623)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22856>].

Critical Survey

This is the tenth doctoral (or B.Litt) thesis to analyze aspects of Du Bartas' British reception, and the first in almost thirty years.¹⁷ The majority of significant work on Du Bartas in English has arisen from postgraduate research, which reflects a continued perception—which this thesis challenges—that the topic remains relevant yet liminal to Renaissance and early modern studies. Philipp Weller's and Harry Ashton's dissertations in the early twentieth century defined the topic's scope.¹⁸ Ashton described the now-familiar arc in which Du Bartas' British reputation grew rapidly, reached an apex in about 1611 and declined precipitously in the second half of the seventeenth century, such that the French poet became largely unknown after 1700. Du Bartas has indeed remained relatively obscure ever since, aside from occasional favourable re-inspections (e.g. by Goethe).¹⁹ Ashton recognized that sensitive historicized readings were vital for comprehending Du Bartas' work, and that the poems had formerly appealed to readers with varied religious, social and national identities: 'Cette popularité n'était pas dûe aux seuls protestants, mais provenait du fait que son œuvre répondait aux besoins des lecteurs religieux de son époque'.²⁰

In some regards William Richardson Abbot's research is the closest precursor to this thesis: Abbot set the same chronological scope and also organized his material according to varieties of textual evidence.²¹ His thesis brought several new primary sources to light, such as John Swan's *Speculum Mundi* (1635) and Edward Browne's *Sacred Poems* (1641; see Chapter 4.ii

¹⁷ Yvonne Bellenger and Jean-Claude Ternaux, *Bibliographie des écrivains français: Du Bartas* (Paris, 1998), p. 163, a list which also includes theses on the French poems, and which I have supplemented with searches of online databases. Robert Cummings summarizes existing criticism on Du Bartas in English in 'Recent Studies in English Translation, c. 1590-c. 1660: Part 2: Translations from Vernacular Languages', *ELR* 39 (2009), 586-615 (591-92).

¹⁸ Philipp Weller, *Josuah Sylvesters Englische Übersetzungen der religiösen Epen des Du Bartas* (Tübingen, 1902); Harry Ashton, *Du Bartas en Angleterre* (Paris, 1908).

¹⁹ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, 'Rameaus Neffe' in *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 7, ed. by Norbert Miller and John Neubauer (Munich, 1991), pp. 663-64, and cf. poems 'Die Metamorphose der Pflanzen' ('Metamorphosis of Plants') and 'Metamorphose der Tiere' ('Metamorphosis of Animals') in *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 6.1, ed. by Victor Lange (Munich, 1986), pp. 14-19.

²⁰ 'This popularity was not due to Protestants alone, but came from the fact that his work met the needs of contemporary religious readers'; Ashton, *Du Bartas*, p. 339.

²¹ 'Studies in the Influence of Du Bartas in England, 1584-1641' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of North Carolina, 1931).

for both), and the present thesis offers several more. James Carscallen's B.Litt thesis, almost thirty years later, perceived among Elizabethan and Jacobean readers a shared 'response to his work as it is reflected in their translations, their expressed judgements, and their conceptions of poetry'.²² Carscallen uses the term 'response' to denote shared cultural reflections on poetry, whereas the 'responses' discussed in this thesis are particular acts that do not permit easy generalization. Only in Chapter 6 does this thesis seek to evaluate Du Bartas' place in the literary canon, and so work towards substantiating Carscallen's claim that 'we must expect to find that our rejection of Du Bartas - and Sylvester - is involved in a rejection of some of the most fundamental poetic beliefs of the Renaissance' (p. 132).

The immediate predecessor to this thesis is Anne Lake Prescott's valuable research in the 1960s and 1970s on French poets in the English Renaissance.²³ Chapter 3 is devoted to updating Prescott's work using critical tools and methodologies that were not available to her. This thesis seeks to complicate rather than correct Prescott's work, for she rightly depicted Du Bartas as a poet 'quintessentially of the Renaissance, from his mannered style and lexical innovations to his desire for religious poetry at once Christian and cosmological, scriptural and arranged along lines circling through number while soaring into space' (p. 233). This thesis replies directly to Prescott's own call in 2004, echoing a similar appeal made by C. S. Lewis fifty years earlier, for more research on Du Bartas in English, aware that 'to examine Du Bartas's reception need not mean only influence studies, <<sources>>, or using *Les Sepmaines* to explain obscurities in English poetry'.²⁴ The chapters that follow address numerous areas for further enquiry that Prescott identified, including: attitudes towards translation (Part I); the authorship of the 1595 translation *The First Day* (Chapter 1.ii);

²² James Carscallen, 'English Translators and Admirers of Du Bartas, 1578-1625' (unpublished B.Litt thesis, University of Oxford, 1958), p. ii.

²³ Throughout this thesis I refer to the chapter 'Du Bartas', in *French Poets and the English Renaissance* (New Haven and London, 1978), pp. 167-234 (Prescott, 'Du Bartas' in future references), rather than the earlier article 'The Reception of Du Bartas in England', *Studies in the Renaissance* 15 (1968), 144-73 or her doctoral dissertation (Columbia University, 1966).

²⁴ Prescott, 'Du Bartas and Renaissance Britain: An Update', *OC* 29 (2004), 27-38 (33). C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama* (Oxford, 1954), p. 544.

comparisons between translations (Chapters 1.iii and 2.ii); marginalia and other textual features in *Devine Weekes*, and their bearing on Sylvester's construction of authorship (Chapter 2.iii); and manuscript annotations in printed copies (Chapter 4.i).

The remaining five doctoral theses examined Du Bartas' poetic legacy in Britain. James Craigie's work led to his Scottish Text Society edition of Thomas Hudson's *Judith*, a work that regrettably falls outside this thesis's scope.²⁵ E. R. Gregory's research produced two articles that assess Du Bartas as a Christian poet: he writes of Spenser's and Sidney's 'sympathetic admiration of Du Bartas' direct approach to the creation of a Christian art'.²⁶ Three other theses written in the 1970s and early 1980s examined Sylvester's translations and poetry, and are introduced later when relevant to my argument.²⁷ Other scholars have worked on Du Bartas in English literature as well, but mostly in order to trace parallels between Sylvester's translations and canonical poetry.²⁸ They have not helped shake off the older perception, epitomized by Douglas Bush, that Sylvester's *Devine Weekes* is 'a kind of Albert Memorial of encyclopaedic fundamentalism': in 2006, Gordon Teskey still regarded *Paradise Lost* as a creation narrative 'cleansed of the quaint encyclopedism' found in Sylvester.²⁹ Du

²⁵ *Thomas Hudson's Historie of Judith*, ed. by James Craigie (Edinburgh and London, 1941), based on his University of Edinburgh thesis (1940).

²⁶ Gregory, 'Du Bartas, Sidney, and Spenser', *Comparative Literature Studies* 7 (1970), 437-49 (438); for a reply, see Alan Sinfield, 'Sidney and Du Bartas', *CL* 27 (1975), 8-20. See also Michael Mack, *Sidney's Poetics: Imagining Creation* (Washington, D.C., 2005), pp. 77-80. Gregory's doctoral thesis is called 'Du Bartas and the Modes of Christian Poetry in England' (University of Oregon, 1965).

²⁷ Eric Wimmers, 'The Style of Josuah Sylvester, Translator of Du Bartas' (University of Indiana, 1972), see Chapter 2.iii; Emily Schlesinger, 'Du Bartas and Sylvester in English Literature' (University of Maryland, 1975), see Part III, preface; John Louis Lepage, 'Joshua Sylvester's Translation of Du Bartas' *Les Semaines* and the Development of English Poetic Diction' (University of Glasgow, 1982), see Part II, preface.

²⁸ Peter Ure, 'Two Passages in Sylvester's Du Bartas and their Bearing on Shakespeare's *Richard II*', *NQ* 198 (1953), 374-77; Archie Burnett, 'Annotations to Milton', *NQ* 29 (1982), 28-32 and 'Sylvester's Du Bartas, Marvell and Pope', *NQ* 29 (1982), 418-19; John Louis Lepage, 'Eagles and Doves in Donne and Du Bartas: "The Canonization"', *NQ* 30 (1983), 427-28; Susan Snyder, 'Donne and Du Bartas: The Progresse of the Soule as Parody', *SP* 70 (1973), 392-407; Conrad Van Dijk, "'Those Proud Towers": Paradise Lost, V.907', *NQ* 51 (2004), 361-62. For Ian C. Parker's five articles on Marvell and Du Bartas, see Part III, preface. Robert Cummings offers a wider-angled reconsideration, emphasizing the poems' epigrammatic charm, in 'Reading Du Bartas', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. by Fred Schurink (Basingstoke, 2011), pp. 175-96; I thank Prof. Cummings for sharing with me the earlier conference paper on which the chapter is based.

²⁹ Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1962), p. 73; Teskey, *Delirious Milton* (Cambridge, MA, 2006), p. 25. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century critics, though noting Du Bartas' and Sylvester's supposed defects, were often more positive: George Edward B. Saintsbury, *A History of Elizabethan Literature* (London, 1887), pp. 289-92; Alfred Horatio Upham, *The French Influence in English Literature* (New York, 1908), pp. 145-218; Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in England* (Oxford, 1910), pp. 333-55.

Bartas' position in English literary history has too often been defined against John Milton's *Paradise Lost* or Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, while the intervening period investigated in this thesis has been neglected. Milton's invocation to Urania at the start of Book 7 occurs near the twilight of Du Bartas' fame, and is a poor guide to his popularity during the Stuart period.³⁰ Similarly, Edmund Spenser's interest in Du Bartas, particularly 'the fourth day of the first weeke' according to Gabriel Harvey, needs to be read alongside other Elizabethan responses: the allusion to Du Bartas as an exemplary divine poet at the end of Spenser's translation of Du Bellay's *Antiquitez de Rome* is significant—though also ambiguous—but his admiration for the Huguenot poet has important contemporary counterparts too.³¹ As Lily Bess Campbell showed, Du Bartas was an important divine poet (i.e. writing poems based on scripture) who inspired others to write vernacular biblical poems.³² Studies in Scottish literary culture, particularly those by Deirdre Serjeantson and Jane Rickard, are at the vanguard of showing that Du Bartas is not simply a make-weight between Spenser and Milton, but an important node in early modern English and Scottish literary culture.³³ Du Bartas needs to be understood as a canonical poet by placing him within his immediate historical and intellectual context: he offers more than 'an archaic and unsatisfactory precedent for the excellencies we now recognize in Elizabethan literature'.³⁴

³⁰ The major but now outdated study of Du Bartas and Milton is George Coffin Taylor, *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* (Cambridge, MA, 1934).

³¹ Susan Snyder is right to hesitate about specifying any close relation between Spenser and Du Bartas (they 'remain fairly far apart'), though Gabriel Harvey reported that Spenser enjoyed the Fourth Day; Snyder, 'Du Bartas', in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. by A. C. Hamilton (Toronto, 1990), p. 80; *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, ed. by Charles G. C. Moore-Smith (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913), p. 161 (ll. 8-10). John Henry Todd suggests that the section beginning at line 195 concerning Dido in 'November' of *The Shepbeardes Calendar* resembles Du Bartas' methods in 'Les Artifices'; see *Spenser Variorum: Minor Poems, vol. 1*, ed. by Charles Grosvenor Osgood and Henry Gibbons Lotspeich (Baltimore, 1943), I, 414. See also Chapter 3.i and 6, preface.

³² Campbell, *Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth-Century England* (Cambridge and Berkeley, 1959).

³³ Serjeantson, 'English Bards and Scotch Poetics: Scotland's Literary Influence and Sixteenth-Century English Religious Verse', in *Literature and the Scottish Reformation*, ed. by Crawford Gribben and David George Mullan (Farnham, 2009), pp. 161-89; Rickard, 'The Cultural Politics of Translation: King James VI and I, Du Bartas and Joshua Sylvester' in *New Developments in the Literary Culture of the Reign of James VI and I (1567-1625)*, ed. by David Parkinson (Leuven, forthcoming), pp. 99-117. I am grateful to Dr Rickard for showing me an advance copy of this piece.

³⁴ Hugh M. Richmond, *Puritans and Libertines* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1981), p. 4.

Numerous French critical works since the 1980s have decisively shown that the *Semaines* (with particular focus on *La Sepmaine*) are not antiquated encyclopedic works, but possess self-critical epistemological structures that were integral to its early appeal: following such reassessments, the newest edition of *The Cambridge History of French Literature* remarks on the ‘high quality’ of the *Semaines* as well as their success.³⁵ Du Bartas’ critical history in France can be divided into three stages either side of the two twentieth-century editions of his work. The first stage was prolonged neglect or scorn, typified by Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve’s impression that Du Bartas had succumbed to poor contemporary taste.³⁶ In the mid-1930s the Chapel Hill edition of Du Bartas’ works provided extensive bibliographic information, a detailed commentary and substantial introductions, and so helped foster new research: A. Emerson Creore worked on Du Bartas’ language; Michel Braspart examined Du Bartas as a Christian poet; Bruno Braunrot studied Du Bartas’ baroque sensibility; and Jean Dagens, anticipating later research, described the *Semaines* as an encyclopedia that we should read for its instruction: ‘nous lirons les deux *Semaines*, comme les contemporains le faisaient volontiers, pour nous instruire’.³⁷ Kurt Reichenberger enriched our understanding of textual variations and Du Bartas’ sources in his edition and commentary of *La Sepmaine*.³⁸ In this second stage, Du Bartas was most often interpreted as a poet of ideas, essentially of his time but unsurpassed in his ambition.

³⁵ Gary Ferguson, ‘Sixteenth-Century Religious Writing’, in *The Cambridge History of French Literature*, ed. by William Burgwinkle, Nicholas Hammond and Emma Wilson (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 188-95 (pp. 192-93). For earlier, less positive comments see Geoffrey Brereton, *An Introduction to the French Poets* (London, 1956), p. 39, and Louis François Cazamian, *A History of French Literature* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 109-10.

³⁶ ‘[il] a pu s’égarer et céder au mauvais goût de son temps dans le gros de ces oeuvres’ (‘he was led astray and gave into the poor taste of his times in most of his work’), Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, ‘Anciens Poètes Français: Du Bartas’, *Revue des deux mondes* 1 (1842), 256-75 (257).

³⁷ ‘we will read the two *Semaines*, as contemporaries freely did, for instruction’. Braspart, *Du Bartas: poète chrétien* (Neuchâtel, 1947); Creore, ‘The Language of Du Bartas’ (unpublished PhD thesis, Johns Hopkins University, 1940); Creore, ‘Du Bartas: A Reinterpretation’ *MLQ* 1 (1940), 503-26; Creore, ‘Ronsard, du Bartas, and the Homeric Comparison’, *CL* 3 (1951), 152-59; Creore, ‘Word-Formation in Du Bartas’, *Bibliothèque d’humanisme et Renaissance* 15 (1953), 192-208; Braunrot, *L’Imagination poétique chez Du Bartas* (Chapel Hill, 1973); Dagens, ‘Du Bartas, humaniste et encyclopédiste dévot’, *Cahiers de l’Association internationale des études françaises* 10 (1958), 9-24 (11).

³⁸ *Die Schöpfungswoche des Du Bartas*, ed. by Kurt Reichenberger, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1963); see also *Du Bartas und sein Schöpfungssepos* (Munich, 1962).

The current phase of Du Bartas criticism was accompanied, and perhaps in part instigated, by Yvonne Bellenger's editions of the *Semaines*.³⁹ Through her critical and editorial work, Bellenger has stimulated wider interest in Du Bartas' multi-faceted poetic achievement.⁴⁰ As shown in her critical survey of research on Du Bartas in the past forty years, scholars are now much more attuned to the bibliographical, scientific, generic, religious and other dimensions of his work.⁴¹ Du Bartas' other champion was James Dauphiné, whose doctoral thesis generated interest in the *Semaines*' scientific, cosmic and encyclopedic concerns in the early 1980s.⁴² Dauphiné recognized that an early modern literary encyclopedia involves a complex conjunction of ideas from different fields:

la pratique de Du Bartas n'en est pas moins exemplaire de ce désir légitime d'unir science, rhétorique, poésie et théologie au sein de l'édifice de cette 'bibliothèque idéale' que dévoilent l'architecture, l'économie, et l'esthétique de *La Sepmaine*.⁴³

Dauphiné edited or co-edited three collections of conference papers in the 1980s and 1990s that promoted work on how Du Bartas' aesthetics and learning are mutually constitutive, and so helped scholars to break away from the view that the *Semaines* are reliquaries of medieval aspirations to total intellectual coherence.⁴⁴

Two more recent monographs have shown how rhetoric, epistemology and aesthetics combine in *La Sepmaine*, and where the limits of this synthesis lie. The first is Jan Miernowski's study of how description and narrative in *La Sepmaine* correlate with Renaissance dialectic.⁴⁵

For Miernowski, description in *La Sepmaine* is circumscribed by the impossibility of

³⁹ Bellenger edited *La Sepmaine (texte de 1581)* (Paris, 1981); *La Seconde Semaine (1584)* (Paris, 1991); and *Les Suites de la Seconde Semaine* (Paris, 1994).

⁴⁰ *Du Bartas et ses divines Semaines; Le temps et les jours dans quelques recueils poétiques du XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 2002), pp. 201-09.

⁴¹ Bellenger, 'État present des études sur Du Bartas en France depuis 1970', *OC* 29 (2004), 9-26 (15).

⁴² *Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas: poète scientifique* (Paris, 1983).

⁴³ 'Du Bartas' practice is no less exemplary in its desire to unite science, rhetoric, poetry and theology in the heart of the edifice of this 'ideal library' that the architecture, economics and aesthetics of *La Sepmaine* reveal'. *La bibliothèque de Du Bartas* (Paris, 1994), p. 25.

⁴⁴ *Du Bartas, poète encyclopédique du XVI^e siècle*, ed. by Dauphiné (Lyon, 1988); *Du Bartas: 1590-1990; Du Bartas*, ed. by Dauphiné and Paul Mironneau (Pau, 1994); *Du Bartas et l'expérience de la beauté*, ed. by Dauphiné and Marie-Luce Demonet (Paris, 1993).

⁴⁵ *Dialectique et connaissance dans 'La Sepmaine' de Du Bartas* (Geneva, 1992).

completion: descriptive enumeration is almost infinite ('l'énumération descriptive est virtuellement infinie', p. 45). Such description, he shows, is hung upon a coextensive linear narrative (i.e. the seven days of creation) which is enmeshed with the digressive system of description weighing it down (pp. 59-60). This volatile structure requires flexible, alert readers who can repeatedly reconfigure their expectations of how textual space is being filled in the poem. Miernowski finds that Renaissance dialectic provided the expectations and intellectual rationalization behind this scheme: Du Bartas' wholly non-fictional poem logically describes the world through commonplaces, and his *topoi* generate fairly discrete lists which are treated like short autonomous poems or stylistically detachable pieces ('comme de courts poèmes autonomes, des pièces stylistiquement détachables', p. 227). *Narratio* (narration) and epic continuity are subordinated to this objective discourse; even *elocutio* (eloquence) conforms to a poetics of *varietas* (variety; 'l'élocution de *La Semaine* se conforme à l'esthétique de la *varietas*', p. 227). Du Bartas' natural theological investigations, in which the world is viewed as God's school, mirror, theatre, and book (I.i.135-54), are restrained by the Calvinist doctrine that human reason only ever achieves debased readings of nature: 'Le désir bartasien de lire la Création avec l'aide de la foi restera [...] inassouvi' (p. 286).⁴⁶ Du Bartas writes of the highest matters: 'Car aussi je ne veux que mon vers se propose | Pour sujet les discours d'une si haute chose' (I.ii.977-78).⁴⁷ Jean Lecointe later pursued these issues by examining how Du Bartas' authorial presence helped to marshal his potentially infinite material, specifically considering how Ciceronean and Ramist methods supported the poet's dynamic organizational force.⁴⁸

The second recent study of the *Semaines'* structures of knowledge is Violaine Giacomotto-Charra's *La forme des choses*, which interrogates *La Semaine's* genre and pursues

⁴⁶ 'The Bartasian desire to read Creation with the aid of faith will remain frustrated'.

⁴⁷ 'Nor shall my faint and humble Muse presume, | So high a Song and Subject to assume' (Sylvester, I.ii.1091-92).

⁴⁸ *L'idéal et la différence* (Geneva, 1993), pp. 566-72.

further the conclusion that *La Sepmaine* is a consciously incomplete work.⁴⁹ The poem's multiple genres disorientate the reader, but create new possibilities of expression too. The poem is not just scientific:

Celui-ci [*La Sepmaine*] est tour à tour ou conjointement qualifié de poésie philosophique, didascalique ou encyclopédique, cosmologique, poésie de la connaissance ou poésie de la nature, sans que les enjeux épistémologiques et poétiques exacts de ces variations taxinomiques ne fassent toujours l'objet d'un éclaircissement.⁵⁰

Du Bartas evaded tidy generic distinctions when claiming in the 'advertissement' to *La Seconde Semaine* that neither poem was 'un œuvre purement épique, ou héroïque, ains en partie héroïque, en partie panegyrique, en partie prophétique, en partie didascalique'.⁵¹ Giacomotto-Charra cautions that the poem is too evocative to be straight-forwardly didactic: 'L'encyclopédisme de Du Bartas [...] est plus évocateur que <<didascalique>>'.⁵² Like Miernowski, she finds that Du Bartas' theology stimulates a descriptive and scientific reading of the world, parallel to Calvinist biblical exegesis: 'Pour éviter toute lecture allégorique, *La Sepmaine* pratique une lecture descriptive et scientifique: elle choisit l'ordre de l'évocation du sensible, là où le commentaire de Calvin est lexical et théologique'.⁵³ She rehabilitates *La Sepmaine* by arguing that the poem is not a still-born reference work but is designed to evoke personal experiences and memories: 'Le rôle des épithètes n'est donc plus ici pédagogique ou explicatif, mais sensuel et esthétique'.⁵⁴ These questions about genre are pursued in Chapter 6 of this thesis, which asks how we might categorize the *Semaines* and its English analogues.

These French studies guide us to where an updated account of the *Semaines* in English could fruitfully begin, even though French criticism has concentrated heavily on *La Sepmaine*

⁴⁹ *La forme des choses: poésie et savoirs dans la Sepmaine de Du Bartas* (Toulouse, 2009).

⁵⁰ '*La Sepmaine* is by turns or simultaneously classed as philosophical, didactic, encyclopedic or cosmological poetry, poetry of knowledge or of nature, without the exact epistemological and poetic issues of these taxonomic variations always offering clarification' (p. 17).

⁵¹ 'a purely epic, or heroic work, but in part heroic, in part panegyric, in part prophetic, in part didactic', Holmes et al., I, 220.

⁵² 'Du Bartas' encyclopedism is more evocative than "didactic"', p. 123.

⁵³ 'To avoid all allegorical readings, *La Sepmaine* practices descriptive and scientific reading: the poem opts to evoke empirical objects where Calvin's commentary is lexical and theological', p. 84.

⁵⁴ 'the role of adjectives is not pedagogical or explanatory, but sensual and aesthetic', p. 284.

rather than its sequel. These reassessments not only show how English critics can move on from reading the *Semaines* as a naïve summation of Scripture and the works of various secular authorities, but also point to important aspects of the poems' early modern reception: we shall see how the poems integrated different types of knowledge in ways inspired by contemporary theological and intellectual developments, and how their earliest readers shaped the poems' meaning, and negotiated their intimations of infinity.

Outline

Beginning at these theoretical starting-points, this thesis recasts the *Semaines* as poems that won wide support for their imaginative vision and divine rhetoric. In order to comprehend why the poems were so popular, we need to examine which sections of the poems were being read, in which circumstances, and for what purpose. The chapters that follow show how readers consulted, browsed, studied, and otherwise used their copies of the *Semaines*, and in doing so reconstruct a historically-sensitive reading of the *Semaines* that can promote more sympathetic responses today. Du Bartas has often been mis-represented due to critical insensitivity as to how partial or focused many British responses to his *Semaines* were: all readings of Du Bartas' poems, whether aesthetic appreciations or more goal-orientated encounters, involved handling a document possessing particular textual and other physical features that mediated responses to the poems, and allowed readers to navigate to individual sections.

Devine Weekes centralized secular learning, divine poetry and spiritual wisdom into a single printed work dedicated to the King, and in this way the poems effectively became the poetic embodiment of the so-called 'Calvinist consensus'. The poems were taken up by those wanting to declare their allegiance to James, but were also appreciated by those wishing to add grandeur to divine poetry and for many other reasons. They did not press a fixed ideological viewpoint on English and Scottish readers, however; we see readers reinterpreting, modifying,

dismantling, adapting and finally rejecting the poems' world-view. Changing intellectual attitudes affected the poems' reception: the easy merger of science, politics and religion that they proposed became untenable in the Civil War period. But when the poems were popular, they were extremely popular.

This thesis considers in detail around twenty British readers of the *Semaines*, many of whom have received little critical attention, and endeavours to integrate these individual responses into the literary historical narrative of Du Bartas' reception. Each case study can be read independently, but is placed next to the sections and chapters most relevant to it. The first part considers translations, both as free-standing responses and as being instrumental for later readings. After examining Du Bartas' estimation in the Jacobean Scottish Court, particularly in James's translations, the first chapter goes on to look closely at the anonymous 1595 translation of the *First Day*, exploring Du Bartas' possible popularity at the Inns of Court, and introduces Simon Goulart's commentaries on the poems in a section on William Lisle's translations. Chapter 2 begins by considering historical associations of the different verse forms into which the *Semaines* were translated, then reads Scott's Du Bartas translations alongside his comments in *Model of Poesy*. I compare his work with Winter's and Barret's translations, and then introduce Sylvester's *Devine Weekes* in close detail.

Part II contains two chapters on how the poems, particularly in Sylvester's translations, were read and quoted, emphasizing Du Bartas' attractions for non-literary writers. Chapter 3 is a chronological survey of how the *Semaines* reached different communities of readers before 1641. It is paired with a longer chapter that investigates processes of quotation: this chapter begins with evidence from annotations and markings in printed books and the commonplace book *Englands Parnassus* (1600), and then pursues the rationale behind quotation practices in works by Thomas Nash, John Swan and Edward Browne. Part III considers responses by poets. Chapter 5 shows how Du Bartas provided a

model for divine poetry in two contrasting types of literary production: George Peele's drama *David and Bethsabe* and the anonymous *Taming of a Shrew*, and Zachary Boyd's *Zion's Flowers*. After these two chapters on processes of imitation, the final chapter evaluates Du Bartas' poetic legacy in general, initially through three further case studies and then in a more speculative section that seeks to adapt the findings of French criticism for English literary genres. This study of how a single early modern work in all its forms inspired new writing has broader implications, identified in the conclusion, for Du Bartas' later reception history, intertextuality in early modern religious literature, and continental influences on English poetry. And it is with continental European translations of the *Semaines* that we begin.

Part I: Translations

Preface

Richard Flecknoe commented in 1653 that Du Bartas' works, like Ovid's, were apt for translation because their appeal lay in their content rather than their style: 'the Translators of *Ovid*, and *du Bartas* for example (both more admir'd for their matter then Language) did make a more judicious choise (in my opinion) then should those who went about to translate *Virgil* or *Cicero*, whose chiefest excellency consists in the purity of their Language'.¹ Though Du Bartas' language certainly had been admired during the previous decades, the poems' 'matter' did make them a shrewd choice of text for translation by late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century translators across Europe.² In continental Europe the first translation in any language usually became definitive, and there was greater interest in *La Sepmaine* than its sequel. In these respects the Italian translation of *La Sepmaine* was typical: the poet, editor and translator Ferrante Guisone's well-received translation into hendecasyllabic *verso sciolto* was published as *La Divina Settimana* (Tours, 1592) and reprinted five times in Venice before 1613.³ Similarly, *La Divina Semana* (Barcelona, 1610), a translation of Du Bartas' first week by Joan Dessi into elaborate *ottava rima*, was the only version published in Spain, though Francisco (or Josepho) de Cáceres also produced a Spanish prose translation, *Los Siete Dias de la Semana* (Amsterdam, 1612) for his fellow exiled Jews living in Amsterdam that stressed their compliance with religious orthodoxy.⁴ A Danish translation of *La Sepmaine* alone was published in 1661, and a Swedish version in 1685. In Germany, Tobias Hübner translated both *Semaines* into elegant alexandrines: his translation of *Seconde Semaine* was published in 1622, and was followed in

¹ Richard Flecknoe, *Miscellania* (1653), G8v.

² For a list of printed European editions of Du Bartas' works, see Bellenger and Ternaux, *Du Bartas*, pp. 29-36.

³ R. Tamalio, 'Guisoni, Ferrante' in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* [[http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ferrante-guisoni_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ferrante-guisoni_(Dizionario-Biografico))]. The French poet Guillaume Du Peyrat composed a verse tribute to this translation in 1593.

⁴ Cristina Barbolani, 'Las Traducciones al Castellano de la *Première Sepmaine* de Du Bartas', in *Imágenes de Francia en las letras hispánicas*, ed. by Francisco Lafarga Maduell (Barcelona, 1989), pp. 209-16; Henry Mechoulan, 'La *Sepmaine* au secours de l'orthodoxie juive à Amsterdam au début du XVII^e siècle', in *Du Bartas: 1590-1990*, ed. by Dauphiné, pp. 427-45.

1631 by *La Sepmaine*.⁵ There was a range of Dutch translations: Zacharias Heyns produced *De Weke (La Sepmaine)* in 1616, which was followed by complete editions in 1621 and 1628; in addition, Theodorick van Liefvelt, Heer van Opdorp (1609) and Wessel van den Boetselaer, Heer van Asperen (1622) both translated *La Sepmaine*, and Joost van den Vondel translated ‘La Magnificence’ (II.iv.2) and ‘Les Peres’ (II.iii.2); an anonymous manuscript version of ‘Le Premier Jour’ also survives.⁶ Latin translators also favoured *La Sepmaine*: it was translated by Jean Édouard Du Monin (Paris, 1579), Gabriel de Lerm (Paris, 1583; later printed London, 1591) and Adriaan Damman (Edinburgh, 1600), but only Samuel Benoît (Lyon, 1609) translated the second poem.⁷

De Lerm’s and Damman’s translations are instructive points of contact between Du Bartas’ British reception and continental responses. All editions of De Lerm’s *Guilielmi Salustii Bartassii Hebdomas* were dedicated to Elizabeth, the Protestant Queen of England, Ireland and France (‘Angliæ, Franciæ, & Hybernæ Reginam’) whom the translator assumed to be amenable to poetry written by a Huguenot.⁸ Despite the dedication this edition was presumably reprinted in England for readers more confident with Latin than French.⁹ Damman’s *Bartasias; qui de Mundi Creatione Libri Septem* has Scottish connections: it was published in Edinburgh with James VI’s approval and contains dedicatory verses by humanist

⁵ Hübner’s translations were published as *Die Andere Woche* (‘The Second Week’; Köthen, 1622), *Erste Woche* (‘The First Week’; Leipzig, 1631), and *Die Erste und Andere Woche* (‘The First and Second Weeks’; Köthen, 1640). Siebigk, ‘Hübner, Tobias’, in *ADB*, vol. 13 (1881), pp. 272-73 [http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd120079291.html?anchor=adb]; Gilles Banderier, ‘Tobias Hübner, traducteur des *Pères* de Du Bartas’, *Germanistick* 13 (1998), 1-6.

⁶ A. Beekman, *Influence de Du Bartas sur la littérature néerlandaise* (Poitiers, 1912), pp. 70-195. E. Martin, ‘Vondel, Joost van den’, in *ADB*, vol. 40 (1896), pp. 290-95 [http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118627848.html?anchor=adb]; on Heyns’s *Wercken* and *De tweede weke vijfde dag*, see Anna E. C. Simoni, ‘John Wodroephe’s *Spared Houres*’, in *Studies in Seventeenth-Century English Literature, History and Bibliography*, ed. by G. A. M. Janssens and F. G. A. M. Aarts (Amsterdam, 1984), pp. 211-33 (p. 221, n. 25).

⁷ The polyglot Du Monin wrote a lengthy pastiche of the *Semaines* entitled *Uranologie ou le Ciel* (Paris, 1583); see *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises: Le XVI^e siècle*, ed. by Michel Simonin (Paris, 1951; repr. 2001), pp. 431-33; Michel Magnien, ‘Une lecture catholique de *La Première Sepmaine*: Du Monin, traducteur de du Bartas’, in *Du Bartas, poète encyclopédique*, ed. by Dauphiné, pp. 195-210. Robert Ashley wrote a Latin translation of ‘L’Uranie’ that was published in 1589 (see Chapter 3.i).

⁸ *Guilielmi Salustii Bartassii Hebdomas*, trans. by Gabriel de Lerm (1591), A2r and A3r-v; Olivier Millet, ‘*La Sepmaine* de du Bartas au miroir de la traduction latine de Gabriel de Lerm’, *OC* 29 (2004), 101-17.

⁹ A copy at the Beinecke Library (classmark: 2001 466) contains an annotation in Latin: ‘Descriptuus mundi’ (p. 7, alongside the line beginning ‘Liuentemque, teges’) and underlinings on pp. 44 and 45.

writers in Scotland, Holland and Switzerland (see Chapter 1.i). This book exemplified an interpretation of the *Semaines* focused on the scholarly arguments about the world's creation in *La Sepmaine*, and less concerned with esoteric detail or the historical narrative in *La Seconde Semaine*. Chapter 1 contrasts this translation with James's version of 'Les Furies', which appeared in *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres* (1591) and, like James's shortened versions of 'Le Second Jour' and 'Eden', found political significance in the *Semaines'* explanation of the heavens and earth's ordering. James is much more concerned with individual morality and good governance than more theosophical translations like Damman's were. References to Elizabeth, Nicholas Bacon and Philip Sidney in 'Babilon' show Du Bartas writing for an English and Scottish readership, and so helping to construct his own reputation, in part for diplomatic ends.

Through his translations James became a key figure in Du Bartas' reception, and the *Semaines* retained their royalist connotations in Stuart England. The publication of the first complete English translation, Josuah Sylvester's *Devine Weekes* (1605; entered into the Stationers' Register on 22 November 1604), may have been postponed until James's accession to the English throne (and delayed by the plague): the work contains extravagant dedicatory material addressed to the monarch, including a 'corona dedicatoria' in which each poem is shaped like a pillar, inscribed with names of the nine muses (including Urania).¹⁰ Also in the front-matter to *Devine Weekes* Sylvester pays tribute to 'England's Apelles (rather OUR APOLLO)' Philip Sidney (B2r), whose translation from Du Bartas, probably of *La Sepmaine*, is mentioned by Fulke Greville, Thomas Moffet, and was entered in the Stationers' Register as a 'translation of Salust de Bartas' on 23 August 1588 to William Ponsonby.¹¹ The translation has not been recovered, and may not have circulated widely; John Florio implies that Penelope

¹⁰ *Devine Weekes* (1605), A2r-8v. The second edition in 1608 (ESTC 21650) was the first to contain the entire *Semaines* in English. The two supplementary volumes of *Posthumus Bartas* had been entered on 13 November 1605 and 16 December 1606. Arber, III, 276, 304 and 335.

¹¹ The evidence for Sidney's translation is summarized in *The Poems of Philip Sidney*, ed. by William A. Ringler (Oxford, 1962), p. 339.

Rich and Elizabeth Sidney possessed the manuscript in 1603.¹² This translation, which Sidney would have composed at a similar time to his English psalter, may have positioned *La Sepmaine* as authentic divine poetry, and probably reciprocated Du Bartas' known interest in Sidney (see Chapter 1, conclusion).

James helped to stimulate English interest in Du Bartas during the 1590s and early 1600s (see Chapter 3.i), but Sidney's involvement—because his reputation matched Du Bartas' so well—inhibited the appearance of other complete English translations, and so indirectly encouraged other partial translations.¹³ Although there were no intellectual property laws to protect translation rights, printers and writers claimed different titles in the Stationers' Register and produced translations of different sections of the poems.¹⁴ Entries in the Register show that overlapping claims to publish translations existed. The first edition registered after Sidney's was 'Du Bartas *his weeke or Seven Dayes woork*', which was entered on 14 August 1591 to Gregory Seton (who was mostly publishing religious treatises and sermons), but appeared in shorter form as *The First Day of the Worlds Creation* four years later, with a dedicatory epistle aware that a 'kingly translator', such as James, 'divine Sidney' or 'stately Spencer', would potentially make this edition obsolete.¹⁵ 'Babylone' and 'Colonies' (the latter entered on 13 December 1597) from the *Seconde Semaine* were translated by William Lisle and printed alongside Simon Goulart's commentary.¹⁶ In the early 1600s there was confusion about who owned the printing rights, as multiple versions were put forward. Translations by Winter and Barret were entered within eight days of each other: Winter's *Second Day* was entered to the bookseller James Shaw on 18 November 1602 ('*the Second Daye of the first weeke*?), and Robert

¹² Michel de Montaigne, *The Essays*, trans. by John Florio (1603), R3r.

¹³ For a summary of English translations, see Snyder, pp. 70-71. John Eliot and Thomas Lodge composed short translations that are found in their prose works, and I consider them briefly below (see Chapters 1.i and 3.ii), but not Thomas Churchyard's paraphrase from the Fifth Day (his actual translation is assumed to be lost; see Chapter 3.i).

¹⁴ On translations and the print market, see Brenda M. Hostington, 'Commerce, Printing, and Patronage', in *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English: Volume 2*, ed. by Gordon Braden, Robert Cummings and Stuart Gillespie (Oxford, 2010), pp. 47-57.

¹⁵ Arber, II, 592. *The First Day of the Worldes Creation* (1595), A2r.

¹⁶ Arber, III, 98.

Barret's translation of '*The workes of (in parte)*' Du Bartas was entered for Adam Islip on the 26th, but was later struck out on 27 May 1605 with Islip's and Lownes's consent: it contained 'EURANIA the Triumph of fayth the firste weeke or Creation of the world in vij bookes *with* a large indexe or comment in order of Alphabett for the vnderstandinge of the hard wordes etc.'¹⁷ The transfers of rights here suggest that publishers and authors were unusually sensitive to which parts and how much of Du Bartas' works they were offering, and with which textual apparatus.

There was further confusion at Stationers' Hall about how each section of the *Semaines* should be understood relative to the whole poems, and who owned the relevant rights: when Thomas Winter's '*Third Dayes Creacon*' was entered to Thomas Clarke on 13 September 1604, the entry records that '[...] yf any other partie hathe Right therevnto or that *the firste and seconde bookes* of the said Lord BARTAS be not alreadie printed then this entrance to be void'; similarly, an occasional note made on 2 July 1603 records that Christopher Wilson also wanted to issue an edition: 'This is to be his copy yf no, other partie haue right vnto yt *viz* a booke called '*the Divine Workes of the worldes birthe*' of the right noble and Rare Learned Lord V.W. SALUSTIUS DU BARTAS'.¹⁸ Chapter 2 examines the cluster of translations that survive by Barret, Winter and Sylvester for traces of shared goals and mutual influence, and also considers the one translation that was apparently never intended for print: William Scott's recently recovered translations of the first two Days of *La Sepmaine*, also composed in the late 1590s. Once *Devine Weekes* was published, the *Semaines* were almost never translated into English again.¹⁹ The poems' reputation stabilized around this single translation, which released readers to begin thinking about and using the poems in new ways.

¹⁷ Arber, III, 221-22.

¹⁸ Arber, III, 271 and 37.

¹⁹ The exception is Josiah Burchett's *The Ark* (1714), a translation of 'L'Arche' (II.ii.1) in heroic couplets. Burchett's career in the admiralty doubtless influenced his choice of material: his original poem *Strife and Envy* (1716) is less 'a poor attempt to imitate "Paradise Lost" [...] mainly concerned with sea affairs' than a stylistic reworking of Du Bartas awash with nautical imagery (G. F. James, 'Josiah Burchett: A Newly Discovered Poem', *NQ* 171 (1936), 57).

Titlepages, dedicatory letters, prefatory verses, lineation, page layout, printed marginalia, and details of circulation provide valuable clues about how each printed translation responded to the *Semaines*. Translators concentrated on particular sections from the poems, worked from different French editions, disagreed about which English verse form was the best equivalent to the French alexandrine, and had their work printed in editions with different page layouts and apparatus. The *Semaines* provide a particularly valuable case study in sixteenth-century English translation practice because probably no other poems besides the Psalms were translated into so many different forms and metres within a decade. This section of the thesis takes the opportunity to explore historical associations of different verse forms in their material context, alert to how the translator's choice of metrical form projects authorial expectations which readers may or may not have shared.²⁰ Integral to this discussion is an understanding of how these translators influenced each other, especially how James's interest in Du Bartas stimulated new readings of the poems in London and elsewhere, as the Huguenot poet's early political favour resonated beyond the Scottish Court.

²⁰ On poetic form in its historical setting, see, for example, Gabriela Schmidt, 'Realigning English Vernacular Poetics Through Metrical Experiment: Sixteenth-Century Translation and the Elizabethan Quantitative Verse Movement', *Literature Compass* 7 (2010), 303-17; O. B. Hardison, *Prosody and Purpose in the English Renaissance* (Baltimore and London, 1989).

Chapter 1: Diplomacy in Sixteenth-Century Translations

i. Du Bartas at the Scottish Court

Du Bartas enjoyed James VI's hospitality during a visit to Scotland in the summer of 1587: having received a personal invitation, he was staying at the King's residence and hunting lodge at Falkland Palace, Fife, in mid-July, and was having velvet saddle pads worth a hundred crowns prepared for him in early September.¹ According to James Melville, Du Bartas knew that the King 'had him in great esteem, for his rare Poesie set out in the *French Tongue*', and, though denying having a 'secret Commission' from Henri de Navarre, he did act as an emissary and sought to negotiate a marriage between James and Henri's sister, Catherine de Bourbon.² Du Bartas evidently left a good impression: the French ambassador reports that on departure James presented Du Bartas with expensive gifts, knighted him, and 'accompanied him to the sea side, wher he made him promise to retourn againe'.³ As Melville hints, James's warm welcome was probably due more to Du Bartas' poetry than his diplomacy. Du Bartas was undoubtedly aware that James's *Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie* (1584) contained a translation of 'L'Uranie' with a flattering preface about his skill and learning, and that Thomas Hudson had translated his *Judith* (1584).⁴ James's *Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres* (1591) contains a full translation of 'The Furies' (II.i.3), with a prologue taken from the first forty-eight lines of 'Eden' (II.i.1) entitled 'The Exord, or Preface of the Second Week of

¹ James VI and I, *Lusus Regius, Being Poems and Other Pieces* (Westminster, 1901), pp. 58-61; Samuel F. Will, 'An Unpublished Letter of Du Bartas', *MLN* 49 (1934), 150-52. *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh A.D. 1573-1589* (Edinburgh, 1869), p. 500 (6 September 1587). See also Ashton, *Du Bartas*, pp. 23-30; and Pelissier, *Vie et les oeuvres de Du Bartas*, pp. 17-21. Amy L. Juhala found a reference in the Edinburgh Treasurers' Account (1581-96, fol. 449) to a payment made between Martinmas 1587 and 1588 of 'ye annuell of 900 merkis tayne upoun ye commoun guid quherof 400 merkis to ye kingis grace to gif Sengezeour Dubartas', which implies that Du Bartas remained in Scotland, or at least in Scottish minds, after November 1587. This entry is only slender evidence for a second visit in 1588, however, since Du Bartas was not necessarily in Scotland to receive the gift, and the entry may refer back to the gift offered before his departure. I thank Dr Juhala for her assistance; see 'An Advantageous Alliance: Edinburgh and the Court of James VI', in *Sixteenth-century Scotland*, ed. by Julian Goodare and A. A. MacDonald (Leiden, 2008), pp. 337-363 (p. 356). For an expanded account of Du Bartas' visit to England and Scotland, see Addendum below (p. 261).

² *The Memoires of Sir James Melvil of Hal-hill*, ed. by George Scott (1683), Z4v-2A1r.

³ *Extract from the Despatches of M. Courvelles* (Edinburgh, 1828), pp. 71-75, 79-80 (p. 80).

⁴ *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. by James Craigie, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1955), I, 16-37; II, 102-03. Future quotations from different manuscript versions of James's poetry are from this edition.

Du Bartas'. That publication also contained James's verse account of the Battle of Lepanto (1571) and Du Bartas' French translation of it, with a preface praising the vividness and sincerity of James's poetry: 'La graue douceur, la belle & artificieuse liaison, les viues & parlantes descriptions de sa L^epante m'ont tellement rauy, que j'ay esté contraint de fausser mon ferment' (M2r).⁵ James also composed a seventy-line translation from the 'Le Second Jour' but called 'A pairt of du Bartas first day' that survives in manuscript, as do his other translations.⁶ These literary and personal encounters between James and Du Bartas, which were nurtured by both sides, underwrote the poems' prominence and shaped the course of the *Semaines*' reception in England and Scotland.

Du Bartas was probably the most important single influence on James's poetry: according to Sarah Dunnigan, Du Bartas was 'aesthetically and ideologically a role-model for James' and 'emblematic of the direction, spiritually, philosophically and aesthetically, in which James sought to lead his imagined renaissance' at the Scottish Court.⁷ Dunnigan is right to present Du Bartas and his Christian muse, Urania, as figureheads for a larger literary enterprise in Scotland, though their importance was largely symbolic. J. Derrick McClure argues that '[c]ultural transference was the clearly-perceived aim of James and the Castalians: not on the individual scale, however, but on the collective', and that these poets wanted to create 'a new, Scottish, vision of their [i.e. French] entire poetic culture'.⁸ This vision called for religious verse that was learned, serious-minded but not austere: it had Urania as its patron muse, and Du Bartas as a leading practitioner. They demonstrated the Court's great receptivity to continental culture, and their significance preceded (and may even have precluded) close

⁵ 'The solemn gentleness, the beautiful and artful connections, the lively, speaking descriptions of *Lepanto* so enraptured me that I was obliged to break my oath [never to translate or paraphrase any work]'.

⁶ Parallel texts of 'The Exord' or 'The beginning of Eden' and 'The Furies' from *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises* and Bodley MS 165 are printed in Craigie (ed.), *Poems of James VI*, I, 106-95. Volume 2 contains the Add. MS 24195 text of 'The beginning of M^r du Bartas Eden' (pp. 156-58), and parallel texts from the Bodley and Add. manuscripts of the 'Second Day' translation (pp. 148-55).

⁷ Sarah Dunnigan, *Eros and Poetry at the Courts of Mary Queen of Scots and James VI* (Basingstoke, 2002), p. 5.

⁸ J. Derrick McClure, 'Translation and Transcreation in the Castalian Period', *Studies in Scottish Literature* 26 (1991), 185-98 (197). On problems associated with the term 'Castalian', see Priscilla Bawcutt, 'James VI's Castalian Band: A Modern Myth', *Scottish Historical Review* 80 (2001), 251-59.

engagement with the *Semaines* and other poems by Du Bartas. There is little evidence that other readers besides James studied Du Bartas closely: others allude to but do not imitate him, and it is striking that no vernacular translation of the whole poem was produced in Scotland. The French poet was a shared reference point for courtiers wishing to pledge their literary affiliation to James, but was not used as a stylistic model. Du Bartas' initial Scottish reception appears to have been centralized but casual; the *Semaines*' reputation was focused on James's response, but the poems were not necessarily being absorbed, studied or discussed thoroughly by others.

These courtiers did, however, use Du Bartas' name to align their literary priorities with the monarch's. The various other translations from European poems by Scottish courtiers need not be viewed as part of a coordinated project of literary translation: such poems as John Stewart of Baldynneis's *Roland Furious* were directed at James well after they had been begun.⁹ This section shows how the King's personal association with Du Bartas affected readers' expectations, both in the immediate court setting and more widely as Du Bartas maintained his position at the summit of a poetic, political, and spiritual hierarchy when James's translations were distributed in England. James's influence on the prosody, diction and rhetorical figures used in later translations in English may be negligible, but he established an important precedent for reading individual sections of the poems as didactic religious verse and played an crucial role in establishing Du Bartas' reputation as a French emissary who also communicated with the Muses.

⁹ See Katherine McClune, 'The poetry of John Stewart of Baldynneis (?1540-?1607)' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2006), pp. 114-25. For an overview of translation in 1590s Scotland, see R. D. S. Jack, 'Translating the Lost Scottish Renaissance', *Translation and Literature* 6 (1997), 66-80; 'Poetry under King James VI', in *The History of Scottish Literature, I*, ed. by Jack and Cairns Craig (Aberdeen, 1988), pp. 125-39; 'Music, Poetry, and Performance at the Court of James VI', *John Donne Journal* 25 (2006), 37-63; and I. A. N. Ross, 'Verse Translation at the Court of King James VI of Scotland', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 4 (1962), 252-67.

James only translated in full the most apocalyptic and moralizing section of the *Semaines*: ‘The Furies’ (II.i.3), which describes how God’s retribution is manifest in the beasts, diseases and calamities that beset humans. James chose this section for its relevance to contemporary moral issues: it was ‘a viue mirror of this last and most decreeped age’ (p. 98.3-4). The translator enrobes Du Bartas as a modern-day prophet who authorizes the monarch’s critique of a decaying society. Jane Rickard argues that James’s translation of the *Semaines* resembles his scriptural paraphrases in his appropriation of literary authority: ‘As James is borrowing subject and style from Du Bartas, so too he is borrowing literary authority. Indeed, his strategy of translating Du Bartas is comparable to his strategy of paraphrasing the Bible’.¹⁰ Du Bartas’ remarks about divine punishment across the poem become an opportunity for the King to meditate on royal prerogative.¹¹ In his *Reulis and Cautelis*, James proposed that translation was a literary mode suitable for political discussion. He compared translation to writing about political subjects (‘materis of *commoun* weill’), maintaining that neither form of writing should be inventive or idiosyncratic:

Especially, translating any thing out of vther language, quhilk doing, [...] ze are bound, as to a staik, to follow that buikis phrasis, quhilk ze translate.
Ze man also be war of wryting any thing of materis of *commoun* weill, or vther sic grave sene subiectis (except Metaphorically, of manifest treuth opinly knawin, zit nochtwithstanding vsing it very seindil) because nocht onely ze essay nocht zour awin *Inuentioun*, as I spak before, bot lykewayis they are to graue materis for a Poet to mell in.
(p.79.5-6, 8-15)

‘The Furies’ is preceded in *His Majesties Poeticall Exerises* by the beginning of ‘Eden’ (II.i.1), which provides an orientatation to the reader ‘that thereby thou may rightlie conceaue the comming in of this portion thereof’ (p. 98.14-15). Addresses to God (p. 106.1-2) and from the translator (p. 112.1-2) stress that James and Du Bartas both look towards the same godhead

¹⁰ Jane Rickard, *Authorship and Authority* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 47-52 (p. 49).

¹¹ On the Divine Right, see Glenn Burgess, ‘The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered’, *EHR* 107 (1992), 837-61.

and divine muse, and so establish James's solidarity with Du Bartas whilst indirectly commanding anyone else wishing to write about justice, punishment or other politically sensitive matters to seek authority through literary collaboration as well.

James's translation pares away the French text's poetic decoration in order to bring out the poem's moral didacticism.¹² The crucial decision here was to translate Du Bartas' alexandrines into fourteeners. The extra syllables make the *Semaines'* compressed lines more admonitory:

But man vnhappy can not find,
 Since this his sinne and fall,
 Plant, stone, or liuing creature,
 Yard, wood, nor flood at all,
 Plaine, Feild, Hill, Dale, Sea, Shore, or Hauen,
 Where he may draw his breath,
 That hath not written in the brow
 The hard doome of his death. (p. 124.213-220)

Mais depuis le peché l'homme triste ne treuve
 Plante, pierre, animal, jardin, bocage, fleuve,
 Campaigne, mont, valon, mer, rivage, ni port,
 Qui n'ait escrit au front un arrest de sa mort. (II.i.3.97-100)

In *Reulis and Cautelis* James stated that poets should 'eschew to insert in zour verse, a lang rable of mennis names, or names of tounis, or sik vther names. Because it is hard to mak many lang names all placit together, to flow weill' (p.75.8-11). In the quotation above, James mentions all twelve substantives that are listed in the French, but allows the lines and sense to 'flow weill' by dividing the fourteener line into eight and six syllables to match the strong caesura in the French alexandrine.¹³ In this example, as elsewhere in 'The 'Furies', catalogues lead toward a climax at the period's end: 'The hard doome of his death'. James arguably has the period's grim sentiment more in mind than the catalogue of different natural locations, even though McClure observes that James elsewhere supplies 'augmentations of Du Bartas's lists of

¹² Variations in the French text do not provide a conclusive answer about which edition of *La Seconde Semaine* James used. He may well have used a 1584 first edition, imported by the Vautroillers (see Chapter 3.i).

¹³ A method also described, for example, in William Webbe, *A Discourse of English Poetrie* (1586), F3r.

mutually attractive and mutually antipathetic beings with examples of his own: this piece of esoteric learning clearly aroused his interest'.¹⁴ As the preface states, James is not composing a poetic encyclopedia, but offering counsel on moral and political matters.

James's closest precedent for translating in fourteeners was probably not Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne's translation of the *Aeneid*, but William Fowler's translation of Petrarch's *Trionfi*.¹⁵ James wrote a dedicatory verse to this translation, the preface to which (addressed to Jane Fleming) is dated December 1587, just as Fowler would write one for *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises* (A4r).¹⁶ The *Trionfi* were among the most widely-known Italian texts in Scotland at the time, and appealed to Fowler for being filled with 'statelye verse with morall sentences, [and] godlye sayings' (p. 16).¹⁷ Fowler found in existing 'Frenche and English traductionis, this work not onelie traduced, bot evin as It war magled' (p. 16), probably referring to translations by Henry Morley and Georges de la Forge. By composing in fourteeners instead, Fowler could embellish and ornament Petrarch's lines and introduce emphatic moral comment:

O wandring myndis that hingis in doubt and hountrie ay in end!
 to what effect dois all your thoughts to trouble yow intend,
 When that a moment of ane houer sall shaddowles leawe voyd
 that vpon which so many yeares yow have your panis employid?
 ('The Saxt and Last Triumphe of Immortalitie', p. 129.83-86)¹⁸

As with James's Du Bartas, Fowler's invective gains vehemence by resituating the poem in a longer line. Fowler recognized Du Bartas' authority but eschewed serious formal or stylistic

¹⁴ J. Derrick McClure, "'O Phoenix Escossois': James VI as Poet", in *A Day Estivall*, ed. by Alisoun Gardner-Medwin and Janet Hadley Williams (Aberdeen, 1990), pp. 96-111 (p.103). For a parallel example, see the catalogue of frightened beasts in lines 121-36.

¹⁵ *The Whole .xii. Bookes of the Aeneidos of Virgill*, trans. by Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne (1573); *The Works of William Fowler*, ed. by H. W. Meikle, J. Craigie and J. Purves, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1914), I, 13-134. On Fowler, see Sebastiaan Verweij, 'The Manuscript of William Fowler: A Reevaluation of *The Tarantula of Love, A Sonnet Sequence and Of Death*', *Scottish Studies Review* 8 (2007), 9-23.

¹⁶ *Works of William Fowler*, I, 17-18.

¹⁷ See R. D. S. Jack, 'William Fowler and Italian Literature', *MLR* 65 (1970), 481-92 (especially 483).

¹⁸ Mike Hodder makes a similar assessment in an unpublished conference paper (kindly shared with me) in which he shows how these lines build on the Italian: 'O mente vaga, al fin sempre digiuna, | a che tanti pensieri? un'ora sgombra | quanto in molt'anni a pena si raguna.' See also Jack, 'William Fowler and Italian Literature', 484-85.

imitation in his poetry. His prefatory sonnet to Hudson's *Judith* confesses his failure to receive Uranian inspiration, as he characterizes Du Bartas as a poet for a cultural, and implicitly political, elite: 'The *Muses* nyne haue not reueald to me | What sacred seedes are in their gardens sowne, | Nor how their *Salust* gains the *Laurer* tre | Which throw thy toyle in *Brittain* ground is grown' (p. 4.1-4). A dedicatory sonnet before Fowler's translation of Petrarch's *Trionfi* written by 'E.D.' also suggests that Du Bartas was for discerning readers only: 'And France for RONSARD stands and settis him owt; | The better sort for BARTAS blawis the horne' ('E.D. in praise of Mr Wm Foular her friend', p. 19.6-7).¹⁹ All these allusions show Fowler's support for poetry that explores the boundary between divine providence and human affairs in stately moral verse. Du Bartas' works are symbolic of James's preferred mode of writing, and of its tone and moralizing edge, but are not directive of either a favoured verse form or narrowly defined subject-matter. In this way, Fowler's translation of the *Trionfi* was well in line with James's larger literary aspirations, for which Du Bartas' poetry provided a touchstone, if not a literary model.²⁰ The use of fourteeners in both works is not clear evidence for direct influence either way, but does attest to a shared sense of purpose. Fowler saw that Du Bartas' reputation is entangled with a hierarchy within which he is a reader subserviant to both poet and king.

John Stewart of Baldynneis also confessed that his relationship with Urania was all too distant. The prologue to his 'Ane Schersing out of Trew Felicitie' contains a dialogue with Urania that begins by disparaging his craft and vision as being unworthy of James:

fair vranie, the mychtie muse celest,
Me thocht appirit in my truiblit rest

¹⁹ According to Theo van Heijnsbergen, 'E.D' could be one of two Elizabeth Douglasses: the Earl of Errol's wife, or more likely the Douglas married to Samuel Cockburn to whom Fowler addressed a funeral sonnet. Alessandra Petrina suggests that 'E.D' could be Edward Dimocke, a friend of Fowler who wrote poetry; see *Machiavelli in the British Isles* (Farnham, 2009), p. 107. I thank Dr Heijnsbergen for sharing with me an unpublished conference paper on the topic.

²⁰ James was evidently more amenable to Petrarch than Tasso: in a letter from 1592, his Italian tutor Iacopo Castelvetro inserted a quotation from Du Bartas' 'Babylone' ('Dernier en age, premier en honneur') to encourage the king to read his poems; see Jason Lawrence, *Who the devil taught thee so much Italian?* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 7-8.

Maist discontent, And did me reprehend
 for pithles poems to my prence [James] so pend.
 “Thy rymys,” (Sayis scho), “ar resonles and ruid,
 Syn vith no constant sentence dois conclud.
 Quhow dar thow than sic dytment [writing] dull drect
 To my renownit scholer cheif elect?
 Belewis thow his godlie blissit braine
 Vill tak delyt of thy fantastick vaine [?]”²¹

Urania insists here on divinely-inspired poetry which is rational and sententious. Urania in James’s translation of ‘L’Uranie’ has a similar agenda.: ‘A lofty subiect of it selfe doeth bring | Graue words and weghtie, of it selfe diuine, | And makes the authors holy honour shine’.²² Likewise, there are affinities with James’s later pronouncement in *Basilikon Doron* that ‘the chiefe commendation of a poëme, is, that when the verse shall bee shaken sundrie in prose, it shalbe found so rich in quick inuentions & poëtick floures, as it shal reteine the lustre of a poëme although in prose’.²³ McClune insists that Stewart’s translation of Ariosto was not commanded by royal fiat, though, but shows an author reviving earlier work as he sought patronage (p. 123). She finds that Urania’s presence in ‘Ane Schersing’ is a conceit for arguing that Stewart’s poetry is worthy of royal attention: by validating the poet’s self-critique Urania’s criticism ‘disrupts the authorial control of Stewart’s narrator, but authorial control is more profoundly affected by her “removal” from the texts of James and Du Bartas’ (p. 258). Stewart’s multiple deference—to James, Du Bartas, and Urania—provides legitimacy to his didactic verse, and sets a standard to which his verse aspires. The narrator demonstrates that the relationship between divine muse and monarch demanded a broader congruence of religious and secular writing: the King’s ‘godlie blissit braine’ sought refined, intelligent and morally-uplifting poetry.

Stewart’s deference to Du Bartas and James resulted in continuity rather than imitation in ‘Ane Schersing’. The poem is an allegorical narrative in which the speaker

²¹ *Poems of John Stewart of Baldynneis*, ed. by Thomas Crockett, 2 vols (Edinburgh and London, 1913), II, 196.1-10.

²² *Poems of James VI*, I, 31.222-24.

²³ *The Basilikon Doron of King James VI*, ed. by James Craigie, 2 vols (Edinburgh and London, 1944), I, 186.14-17.

encounters personified virtues and vices. Donna Heddle contends that there are strong connections between Stewart's and Du Bartas' style and outlook: both are preoccupied with moral Protestant poetry, and reveal the same 'vigorous and majestic grasp of language'.²⁴ The closest Stewart comes to stylistic imitation of Du Bartas is in the digressive catalogue of biblical characters (stanzas 172-219); William Alexander's *Doomes-Day* (printed 1637), a poem more closely modelled on the *Semaines*, pursued this sub-category of divine poetry to an extreme.²⁵ Stewart's *Roland Furious*, a translation from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, was offered as a contribution to the same Jacobean literary enterprise. However, romance did not offer the same prestige as Du Bartas' religious verse did: Stewart, in a prose dedication to the King that alludes to *Reulis and Cautelis*, fears that he erred in 'electing of ane | So small and fectles subiect'.²⁶

Du Bartas' prestige may indeed explain why *La Sepmaine* was almost certainly not translated into Scots or English at the Jacobean Court, either by an individual or a group. James had received a quarto copy in 1583 from his nurse, Helen Little, but we have little evidence of his response, despite the original poem's particular popularity on the continent.²⁷ The King may have resisted offering this reputation-gilding commission to another aristocrat; alternatively, he could have known of, discussed, or even instigated, Sidney's work on *La Sepmaine*.²⁸ In the case of *Judith*, James had probably neutralized the potential political capital for the translator by entrusting it to a English court musician, rather than an aristocrat: Hudson claimed that he was commissioned to write it, and his apparent reward was mastership of the Chapel Royal two years later.²⁹ *Judith's* afterlife indicates that English and

²⁴ *Roland Furious*, ed. by Donna Heddle (Leiden and Boston, 2008), p. 18.

²⁵ Peter Auger, 'Recreation and William Alexander's *Doomes-day* (1637)', *Scottish Literary Review* 2.2 (2010), 1-21.

²⁶ *Poems of John Stewart*, II, 3.

²⁷ *The Library of James VI, 1575-1583*, ed. by George Frederic Warner (Edinburgh, 1893), p. xliii.

²⁸ On James's admiration for Sidney's writings, see *Poems of Alexander Montgomerie*, ed. by George Stevenson (Edinburgh and London, 1910), pp. lvii-lix.

²⁹ T. W. Bayne, 'Hudson, Thomas (d. in or before 1605)', rev. Willy Maley, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14040>]. Craigie (ed.), *Judith*, p. 4.

Scottish readers did find it laudable.³⁰ However, the *Semaines* show that James was not coordinating a literary project to make vernacular versions of major contemporary poems available in Scotland or England. Just as Du Bartas was primarily a hunting companion and literary confidant for James (despite his official duties as negotiator), so too James's translations were entertainments closely keyed to his personal and political interests.

Another possible reason for a full translation's absence is that James was simply not as drawn to other parts of the *Semaines*, especially *La Sepmaine*, or to the continental tradition that favoured interpretations focusing on their natural philosophy and jocund celebration of the created world. The one passage from *La Sepmaine* that James did translate, from 'Le Second Jour', holds a markedly political relevance: it describes how God directs human actions, and can be read as a complement to the meditation in 'The Furies' on sin, retribution, punishment and natural law. James foregrounds the argument that every element, like a king, affects the people's disposition:

I meane not that eache element / into his hands retaines
 The sceptre of one bodie aye, / his tyme about he raignes
 The subiect making for to stoupe / vnto his law and will,
 And als oft as his King is changed, / he changeth nature still:
 Euen as without respect of wealth, / of bloode or noble race,
 Eache worthie citizen commandes / a certaine tyme and space,
 In citties Democratick free, / that suddainlie appeare,
 Through changing of there magistrate / a changing face to beare.

(Add. MS 24195, ll. 35-42)³¹

Non que chasque element en main porte tout-jour
 D'un mesme corps le sceptre; ains regnant à son tour,
 Il fait que le sujet dessous sa loy se range:
 Et que changeant de roy, de naturel il change,
 Comme, sans respecter ni richesses ni sang,
 Chasque bon citoyen commande et sert de rang
 Dans la libre cité, qui semble, en peu d'espace
 Changeant de magistrat, changer aussi de face.

(I.ii.75-82)

³⁰ See Richard Brathwaite, *The English Gentleman* (1630), 2L2v; John Harington, *Orlando Furioso* (1591), 2C1v; and Robert Allott, *Englands Parnassus* (1600; see Chapter 4.i below).

³¹ *Poems of James VI*, II, 152.

There are few other passages in *La Sepmaine* that relate natural philosophical observations to political governance. By contrast, *Judith* can be read as a meditation on tyrannicide and heroism: Hudson found it ‘an agreeable Subject to your highnesse’.³² Yet *Judith* was not a piece of pro-monarchical propaganda either: Robert Cummings writes that ‘[t]he poem survives disengaged from any point that its subject or circumstances might seem to dictate’.³³ James’s selections from the *Semaines* suggest that he did value the poems as an arena for uncontroversial meditation on the nature of divine and temporal power. *La Seconde Semaine* was an obvious focus for James and the Scottish Court’s attention because it deals with incidents from biblical history exemplifying divine agency realized on earth. It was therefore natural that writers should treat the whole poem as an anthology of shorter narratives. When Fowler listed titles of great books in the preface to his lost work ‘The Pest’, for example, he could have named the ‘*Semaines*’ but instead singled out one section, ‘Babylone’ (II.ii.2), treating it as a discrete poem:

for Inscriptions and titillis of bookes ar occasioned veray oft through the materiall
 subject quhair of thay intreat, as VIRGILL his ænead, Ronsard his franciad, Bartas his
 Babilon, Aristotill his Ethykis, Plato his republict, Plutarch his Lyfes, Petrarch his
 Triumphs (I, p. 303)

Fowler follows James in isolating one section of the *Seconde Semaine*, and recognizing that parts of the poem could be instructively related to matters of providence, ethics and good governance—subjects tackled by writers like Virgil, Aristotle, Plato and Petrarch in his ‘Triumphs’—more easily than *La Sepmaine* could. Though James’s ‘Exord’ from ‘Eden’ was intended to give readers a better sense of the whole poem, James’s approach encouraged readers to concentrate on individual episodes like ‘The Furies’, and on the poetic manifesto in ‘L’Uranie’. Approaching the *Semaines* through French texts, Scottish readers gave little

³² Craigie (ed.), *Historie of Judith*, p. 4.

³³ Cummings, ‘The Aestheticization of Tyrannicide: Du Bartas’s *La Judith*’ in *The Sword of Judith*, ed. by Kevin R. Brine, Elena Ciletti and Henrike Lähnemann (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 201-12 (212).

attention to ‘the *Semaines*’ as a single poem and may not have felt any imperative to translate the whole work.

Finally, James may have avoided *La Sepmaine* because humanist scholars had already begun reading its natural philosophical sections in earnest. Damman’s *Bartasias*, a Latin translation of *La Sepmaine* printed in 1600 and dedicated to James, appears to invite the King into this community of learned readers. Damman was a Dutch humanist who taught at Leiden and Edinburgh Universities, and was probably a close associate of James: he wrote prefatory verses to *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises* and a celebratory verse (*Schediasmata*, 1590) on James’s marriage to Anne.³⁴ *Bartasias* was printed ‘cum privilegio regio’ by the royal printer Robert Waldegrave, and contains dedicatory verses by a host of esteemed European poets and scholars, including: Balduinus Berlicomius, author of *Hierostichon* (Heidelberg, 1598); John Johnston, a Scottish scholar who had studied at Helmstädt and Heidelberg; the Dutch physician Lazarus Marcquis; Thomas Jack, a schoolmaster and author of a classical dictionary; the Dutch translator of Hesiod and Sophocles, Georg Rataller; Robert Naunton, former university orator at Cambridge, and later James’s secretary of state; Gaspar Waserus, a Tigurine scholar praised for his erudition by Thomas Coryat; and Lucas Wyngarde.³⁵ In his preface Damman lauds James’s justice, piety and virtue, but his translation is less engaged with arguments for upholding the domestic polity than with comprehending God through the natural world. An epigraph from Romans 1:20 indicates that natural revelation is the concept that unites sacred and secular ideas in this translation: ‘invisibilia dei ex creatione mundi, in

³⁴ Katrien A. L. Daemen-De Gelder, ‘The Letters of Adriaan Damman († 1605), Dutch Ambassador at the Court of James VI and I’, *Lias* 31:2 (2004), 239–48; J. A. Van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons and Professors* (Leiden, 1962), pp. 79–80, n. 3; James K. Cameron, ‘Some Continental Visitors to Scotland in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries’, in *Scotland and Europe 1200–1850*, ed. by T. C. Smout (Edinburgh, 1986), p. 49.

³⁵ Petrus Hofman Peerlkamp, *Liber de vita doctrina et facultate Nederlandorum qui carmina Latina composuerunt* (Harlem, 1838); J. Derrick McClure, ‘Johnston, John (c.1565–1611)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14944>]; Ronald Bayne, ‘Jack, Thomas (d. 1598)’, rev. James Kirk, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14513>]; Daniel Jacoby, ‘Rataller, Georg’, in *ADB*, vol. 27 (1888), p. 339 [<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd135635349.html?anchor=adb>]; Roy E. Schreiber, ‘Naunton, Sir Robert (1563–1635)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19812>]; Thomas Coryate, *Coryats Crudities* (1611), 2F2v; Lucas Wyngarde may have been a magistrate in Bruges (*Précis analytique des documents que renferme le dépôt des archives de la Flandre-occidentale, à Bruges*, ed. by Joseph Octave Delepierre and Félix Priem, vol. 8, 11 (Vandecasteele-Werbrouck, 1851), p. 59).

operibus considerata, perspiciuntur, tam æterna eius potentia, quam divinitas' (C7v, decapitalized and spelling modernized).³⁶ This rationale pandered to James's wisdom and status while dealing much less directly with political theory.

The 'Ordo et Index Librorum' ('order and index of the book') reflects a reading of the *Semaines* focused on the world's composition and God's agency. The description of the first day begins: 'Canenda proponit, Mundum ex omni eternitate non exstitisse: factum esse; non fortuitò; non, vt semper duraret: DEVM, antequam Mundus esset, æuiternum; qui in tribus Personis, vnica est DIVINITATIS Essentia'.³⁷ The divergence from James's approach is illustrated by the summary of 'Liber Secundus', which makes no mention of its political implications: 'Simpliciáne, an composita; eorum harmonia in corporibus, coniunctio, dominatio, quid commodi ferant, aut in commodi [*sic*]'.³⁸ The translation relates Du Bartas' poem to early modern physics, theology, astronomy and cosmology; its intended readers are not courtiers, but the type of learned Latin reader whose commendations appear before the preface. James is being flattered by association, but does not exert control over how the poem is translated.

The presentation of Bartas in *Bartasias* as a Christian humanist is distinct from the Du Bartas who was domesticated in Scotland as a local prophet, but both depictions are compatible if *La Sepmaine* and *La Seconde Semaine* are treated as separate poems—as they should be in this earlier period. Damman's Latinized rendering is closely aligned to the depiction of 'Gul. Salustius Barthassius' as a European intellectual on the Bodleian frieze (see p. 1), whereas James's response had emphasized Du Bartas as a vernacular poet writing about providence in civic society. In different ways Damman's and James's translations both honour

³⁶ 'For the invisible things of him, that is, his eternal power and Godhead, are scene by the creation of the worlde, being considered in *his* workes, to the intent that they shulde be without excuse' (Geneva Bible).

³⁷ 'The things that must be sung he sets forth, that the world did not exist out of eternity; it was made, not by chance, not as if it had always existed: God existed before the world, in eternity; he who in three persons is a united divine essence', C4r.

³⁸ 'Simply, about the composition [of the elements], their harmony in bodies, their affinity, their sovereignty, what they might bring of use, or of no use', C3r-v.

Urania as a divine interlocutor on non-religious matters such as philosophy and politics: a key attribute of these early Scottish responses to Du Bartas is recognition of the poet's synthesis of religious and learned themes at a time when the two were often kept apart. Deirdre Serjeantson identifies Du Bartas as an important figure in a movement stimulated by 'intellectual nature of Castalian poetry, the French influence at the court, [and] James's admiration for Du Bartas' towards syncretic poetry that married sacred and secular themes and poetic forms.³⁹ Noticing that Henry Lok, who wrote a prefatory verse to *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises*, does not mention Du Bartas in his works, Serjeantson writes:

It seems more likely that he [Lok] was affected by familiarity with a poetic milieu in which Du Bartas's syncretism was general; and the Scottish court, where he was writing his laudatory sonnet to James even as the Latin *Sepmaine* [i.e. de Lerm's] was published in London, was just such a place. (p. 175)

She names Barnabe Barnes as another English poet who followed Du Bartas's example (p. 175). Barnes' allusion in his *Centurie of Divine Sonnets* does indeed belong within a wider network of criticism generated by Gabriel Harvey's reaction to James's translation (see Chapter 3.i); however, his poetic influence is more visible in long poems that versify factual information rather than sonnets or other lyrics. It is difficult to trace precise routes through which Du Bartas acted as a conduit in Anglo-Scottish literary relations.⁴⁰ The early Scottish vernacular response foregrounded the *Semaines* as political commentary more than any later translation would, and accordingly neglected its encyclopedic learning and poetic qualities. It established Du Bartas' reputation and brought readers like Barnes to the *Semaines* more quickly.

James fostered Du Bartas' reputation as a major 'divine' poet by allowing Scottish courtiers to make connections between the poet's access to the king and to divine inspiration,

³⁹ Serjeantson, 'English Bards and Scotch Poetics', pp. 179-80.

⁴⁰ On the English reception of Scottish poetry, see Priscilla Bawcutt, 'Crossing the Border: Scottish Poetry and English Readers in the Sixteenth Century', in *The Rose and the Thistle*, ed. by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (East Linton, 1998), pp. 59-76.

a connection confirmed by the visit in 1587 and the mutual translations of each other's works. Into the seventeenth century, James's admiration for Du Bartas was known in both England and France; Jacques Du Pin addressed the first edition of the *Seconde Suite de la Seconde Semaine* to James as King of Scotland and England.⁴¹ James' association with the poems survived throughout the seventeenth century. Sylvester's translation renewed James's reputation both as patron and translator of Du Bartas, which the King promoted in *Basilikon Doron* (see Chapter 3.ii). In encouraging the *Semaines* to be received as divine poetry, James stimulated many later responses to the poems and inspired the politically and ecclesiastically conservative tendencies in later responses, like the clergymen citing Du Bartas in sermons (Chapter 3.iii) and Edward Browne's appropriations (Chapter 4.v). Although James did not affect the form of later translations, he was probably responsible for ensuring that the *Semaines* were regarded as major religious poems written in a contemporary high style. The Scottish beginnings of Du Bartas' British reception provide a centripetal force to later responses, and most likely led later writers to exaggerate their deference to his poems. Meanwhile, the Scottish response to the *Semaines* lost its distinctive character after James became King of England, though William Drummond of Hawthornden, William Alexander and the Glaswegian preacher Zachary Boyd (see Chapter 5.ii) were still reading Sylvester's poems in the seventeenth century, and his translations were still remembered in 1685 (by another William Alexander) as one of the 'excellent Poems he writ'.⁴²

Early translators of the *Semaines* in England, less bound by James's response, introduced a range of alternative approaches. John Eliot, for example, translated verse paragraphs from the *Seconde Semaine* for use in *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593), but his intention was to write 'in a merrie phantasticall vaine', to which end he included stories such as that 'of the

⁴¹ Holmes et al., I, 228.

⁴² Alexander, *Medulla historiae Scoticae* (1685), I9r. Drummond's 'Shadow of the Judgement' contains a passage on the three Furies that L. E. Kastner believes are 'obviously modelled on the corresponding lines' of Du Bartas' 'Furies'; see *Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden*, ed. by Kastner (Edinburgh, 1913), II, 56-57 and 342.

Larke and her note of *Tee-ree-lee-ree* (B1v).⁴³ The story is from ‘Le Cinquiesme Jour’, which begins with the following blithe couplet: ‘The pretie Larke mans angrie mood doth charme with melodie, | Her Tee-ree-lee-ree Tee-ree-lee-ree chipping [*sic*] in the skie’ (T2r).⁴⁴ Yet other English translators were certainly aware of James’ translations and deliberately chose to translate different sections from him. They also recognized Du Bartas’ position in the political establishment, and were alert to Du Bartas’ separate diplomatic connections with the English, but produced contrasting translations. Indeed, this merry, song-like translation, which was printed in 1595 and is discussed in the next section, may have been a reaction against the autocratic voice of James’s version.

ii. *The First Day of the Worlds Creation* (1595)

A dedicatory letter to Anthony Bacon precedes the translation of the First Day published in London in 1595. Bacon was an appropriate choice of dedicatee because he had spent time at Henri de Navarre’s Court and knew Du Bartas personally.⁴⁵ In a letter of September 1584, Du Bartas speaks of Bacon having passed on his recent letters to the Queen, and updates Bacon on the publication of the *Seconde Semaine*, which he has entrusted to a mutual friend: the allusions to Anthony’s father, Nicholas Bacon, and Elizabeth in ‘Babilon’ evidently reflected Du Bartas’ pre-existing connections.⁴⁶ As in Scotland, Du Bartas did not just assume a diplomatic role in England because his poetry had attracted attention; his poetry attracted attention because he had assumed a diplomatic role. As a result even this ultimately

⁴³ His first translation, thirty-six lines of a eulogy to France from ‘The Colonies’ (II.ii.3), was first printed in *The Survey or Topographical Description of France* (1592, A3r-4v), where it is followed immediately by the corresponding translation from Simon Goulart’s commentary. It was reprinted a year later in *Ortho-epia Gallica* (J3v-4r), which also contains two other short translations in fourteeners: twenty-eight lines from ‘Babylone’ (II.ii.2, on L1r-2v) and five lines from ‘Le Cinquiesme Jour’ (the Fifth Day, T2r). See D. H. Thomas, ‘John Eliot’s Borrowings from Du Bartas in his Minor Works’, *Revue de littérature comparée* 43 (1969), 262-76, which also points to Eliot’s use of Du Bartas in prefatory sonnets to Robert Greene’s *Perymedes the Blacksmith* (1588) and Maurice Kyffin’s *Blessednes of Brytaine* (1588).

⁴⁴ ‘La gentile alouette avec son tire-lire | Tire l’ire à l’iré, et tire-lirant tire | Vers la voute du ciel’ (I.v.615-17). Sylvester later writes: ‘The prettie *Larke*, climbing the Welkin cleere, | Chaunts with a cleere, heere peere-I neere my Deere’ (I.v.661-62). English readers were probably aware that Du Bartas was adapting an earlier reference in Ronsard’s *L’Alouette* (Lee, *French Renaissance in England*, p. 245).

⁴⁵ Alan Stewart, ‘Bacon, Anthony (1558–1601)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/988>].

⁴⁶ BL, Cotton MS Nero B VI, fol. 288 (text printed in Holmes et al., I, 201).

inconsequential stanzaic translation fed off Du Bartas' role in cross-channel relations. The translator recognized the *Semaines* as a prestigious work, and knew of James's *Poeticall Exercises*:

[t]his most Christian Poet, and noble *Frenchman Lord of Bartas*, might haue been naturalized amongst vs, either by a generall act of a Poeticall Parliament: or haue obtained a kingly translator for his weeke (as he did for his Furies:) [marginal note: "The king of Scots translated his Furies."] or rather a diuine *Sidney*, a stately *Spencer*, or a sweet *Daniell* for an interpreter thereof [...] if any of the forenamed Heroicall Spirits haue vndertaken the performance of that act, I would not haue my seele daies worke to preiudice their Weeke.⁴⁷

The translator describes his effort as one 'daies worke' within a whole 'Weeke', distinguishing the whole *Sepmaine* from the solitary day that he has translated. The letter also indicates that a longer translation existed—the one entered in the Stationers' Register in 1591 (see preface above, footnote 15)—but that the translator 'suffered onely the first daies worke to passe abroad' and had held back from publishing more material until he knew whether 'any of those sweete recording Swans', presumably Sidney in particular, had a translation in print (A2v). Having prepared this rhyme royal translation by 1591, the translator perhaps became aware that it was too 'homely' (A2v) given James's and Sidney's interest. *The First Day* was the first translation from *La Sepmaine* printed in London, though Sylvester's partial translations from 'Les Peres' (II.iii.2) and 'Le Schisme' (II.iv.3) had already been printed in 1592 alongside 'The Triumph of Faith'. The translation is nonetheless announced as belated on its titlepage with the Latin phrase 'Etsi serò seriò' ('though late, in earnest') to accentuate its sincerity, perhaps ironically.

The First Day's self-professed obsolescence may be linked to its unusually lively tone. The translation neither relates the poem to contemporary moral and political themes nor unpicks the poem's claims about Creation. The Argument to *The First Day* does, however, contain some vivid imagery: 'This whole frame and organ of the world tuned by the finger of

⁴⁷ *The First Day of the Worldes Creation*, A2r-v. Future references given in the body text as signature numbers, except when quoting from the translation, when I use the form 'page.stanza.line'.

God and breathed into by his spirit, serveth as vocall musicke to conueigh the significant dittie of his power and glorie into euerie sence' (A3r). The rhyme royal verse form leads the translator to embellish Du Bartas' text, and accordingly depart from the original poem's phrasing, rhythms and factual content. This is apparent from the very beginning:

THou, that the course of glittering heauen dost guide
 And checkest trucebound *Neptunes* surlie waues,
 Shaking the steedie earth both far and wide:
 Whose word can tame th'Æolian broad that raues,
 Or cause them bussell from their vented caues;
 Discharge my mind of cloudie cares and thought:
 And to thy selfe, hale vp my sprights aloft. (1.1.1-7)

Toy qui guides le cours du ciel porte-flambeaux,
 Qui, vray Neptune, tiens le moite frein des eaux,
 Qui fais trembler la terre, et de qui la parole
 Serre et lasche la bride aux postillons d'Æole,
 Esleve à toy mon ame, espure mes esprits,
 Et d'un docte artifice enrichy mes escrits. (1.i.1-6)

The stanza imitates the shape of Du Bartas' period but supplies several new words and phrases ('trucebound', 'steedie', 'bussell' ('bustle'), 'far and wide'), and does not force a full rhyme in the final couplet. The translation usually preserves Christian vocabulary (e.g. a marginal note on B3r glosses the 'Trinitie' as 'Three persons, one God made the world'), but also supplies additional classical references and softens some theological allusions:

That Father solitarie could not be,
 Which had begot before all worlds begun
 An ofspring motherles, for companie:
 His word, his wisdom, and his onelie Son (5.2.1-4)

Il n'estoit solitaire, avecques luy vivoyent
 Son Fils et son Esprit, qui par tout le suivoyent. (1.i.65-66)

The translator does not reproduce arguments about cosmology with studied accuracy; the omission of words like 'chaos' at important moments may be unintentional (especially as it later appears in lines 16.3.7 and 25.4.3), though Richard Hillman argues that the translator

sought to sidestep possible controversy.⁴⁸ The translation scrutinizes the didactic content less rigorously than James's or Damman's versions do, but is consequently more sensitive to rhetoric and form.

The translator's identity is unknown. Ernest Strathmann showed over sixty years ago that Josuah Sylvester did not write it, despite earlier claims to the contrary.⁴⁹ The key piece of evidence against this attribution is the dedication to Sylvester's 1598 translation, which is also addressed to Bacon and goes out of its way to indicate that the author has never presented anything to him previously: 'I haue not seldome wished by some acceptable endeour to approue my selfe vnto you [...] But hitherto (according to the frowardness of mine vsuall fortunes) I haue bin frustrate of this desire also.'⁵⁰ Snyder tentatively suggested that Thomas Winter may be the author; however, he was surely too young to have written it, for he matriculated at Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1595 aged seventeen, so was just thirteen when the Stationers' Register entry was made.⁵¹ The author's references to his work being 'infantlike' and 'vndertaken in the nonage of my studies, before I was professed' suggest a birth-year closer to 1570.

Two prefatory verses, also in rhyme royal, offer the best clues for a positive attribution. 'The Translator to the Author' offers conventional praise for Du Bartas: 'Thus, thus Lord Bartas hast thou done, and wonn | Arts garland, and truthes heauenly blessing' (A1r). The second poem is untitled, and indicates that the translator had been exposed to classical works, for he borrows an anecdote from Plutarch's *Life of Alexander* in comparing Achilles' harp with Du Bartas' poetry. Crucially, this poem has the initials 'Io. Ho.' printed

⁴⁸ Richard Hillman, 'La création du monde et *The Taming of the Shrew*: Du Bartas comme intertexte', *Renaissance and Reformation* 27 (1991), 249-58 (252).

⁴⁹ Ernest A. Strathmann, 'The 1595 Translation of Du Bartas' "First Day"', *HLQ* 8 (1945), 185-91. His article contains a bibliographical note that identifies all early twentieth-century secondary sources that attribute the translation to Sylvester. Prescott also names the translation as anonymous ('Du Bartas', p. 181). The *ESTC* names Sylvester as author for the 1596 re-issue (*ESTC* 21658.5; identical except for the changed date on the titlepage), but not for the original 1595 edition (*ESTC* 21658).

⁵⁰ *The Second Weeke or Childhood of the World*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester (1598; *ESTC* 21661.5), E2r.

⁵¹ See Snyder, pp. 63 and 71.

immediately beneath it, which Strathmann suggested may have been inserted to indicate the poem's author's, and probably also the translator's, identity.⁵² Among individuals entered in the *ODNB* only one person with these initials was flourishing at this time and had known literary interests: the poet and lawyer John Hoskins (1566-1638).⁵³ Hoskins received a BA degree in 1588, an MA in 1592 and was called to the bar in 1600. His connections to the Middle Temple make him a plausible candidate for authorship of this dedicatory verse, and potentially the translation too; Robert Ashley's Latin version of 'L'Uranie' was produced while he was there, and Philip J. Finkelpearl notes that in general 'men at the Inns were the prime consumers of serious literature'.⁵⁴ There are no comparable examples to *The First Day* in Hoskins's surviving poetic output, but he was comfortable working with foreign languages and would not have balked at producing a full translation of *La Sepmaine*; in this period he compiled the first half of a Greek lexicon. Given his later reputation as a parliamentarian, a connection with Hoskins alerts us to a potential irony in his prefatory remarks. The preface's plea for a translation to be composed by 'a generall act of a Poeticall Parliament' may hint at the politics of his translation: the contrast with James's more moralizing, didactic reading of the poems may be sardonically pointed.

Even if Hoskins did not write the translation himself, the initials 'Io. Ho.' offer a potential setting for its composition. After being admitted to the Middle Temple in March 1593, Hoskins was bound with the poet Sir John Davies, whom he knew previously from New College, Oxford. Alternative candidates for the translation's authorship are the poets Hugh Holland and Benjamin Rudyerd, to whom Hoskins was also close.⁵⁵ One other poet who definitely knew Hoskins, though not necessarily in the 1590s, was John Davies of

⁵² Strathmann (190-91) guesses that 'Io. Ho.' was the translator, but does not name any possible candidates.

⁵³ Wilfrid Prest, 'Hoskins, John (1566–1638)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13838>].

⁵⁴ John Ferris, 'Ashley, Robert (1565–1641)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/763>]; Philip J. Finkelpearl, *John Marston of the Middle Temple* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), p. 26.

⁵⁵ Baird W. Whitlock, *John Hoskyns, Serjeant-at-Law* (Washington, D.C., 1982), pp. 46-47; Colin Burrow, 'Holland, Hugh (1563–1633)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13527>]; David L. Smith, 'Rudyerd, Sir Benjamin (1572–1658)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24256>].

Hereford, who wrote an epigram about him in *Scourge of Folly* (1611) and certainly admired the *Semaines* (see chapter 6).⁵⁶ It is difficult to pursue this attribution further: a comparative stylometric analysis would be inconclusive, given the difficulty of pinpointing common stylistic features between a poet's original works and a translation; but it would be worth examining manuscript verse collections containing Hoskins's verse thoroughly for traces of a *Semaines* translation.⁵⁷ These other names do, however, provide a potential literary context for *The First Day* worth exploring slightly further here.

Sir John Davies's poetry offers a particularly constructive point of comparison, as Prescott noted.⁵⁸ His lifetime was probably exactly contemporary with the translator's: he was baptised in 1569 and called to the bar in 1595.⁵⁹ In 1596, when *The First Day* was re-issued, he published his first original poem, *Orchestra: or a Poeme of Dauncing*. Both poems, though printed at different presses, contain similar type ornaments on their titlepages that supply a Latin motto but not the author's name. Both are anonymous, though *Orchestra* contains a dedicatory verse attributed to Richard Martin. The poems are of similar length as well: the 1596 *Orchestra*, also written in rhyme royal, contains 131 stanzas, and *The First Day* 161. In style and content, *Orchestra* is the closest match with *The First Day* among Elizabethan poems in rhyme royal with cosmological interests, other examples of which are Edmund Spenser's *Ruines of Time* (1591) and *Fowre Hymnes* (1596), and John Norden's *Vicissitudo Rerum* (1600). Davies, and those in a similar milieu, borrowed freely from classical and modern French authors, and could well have known about James's 'Furies'.⁶⁰ If the translation was not intentionally mocking James's

⁵⁶ *Complete Works of John Davies of Hereford*, ed. by Alexander Grosart, 2 vols (Hildesheim, 1878; repr. 1986), II, 59 ('To Worthy Persons').

⁵⁷ See David Colclough, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 238-48.

⁵⁸ Prescott, 'Du Bartas and Renaissance Britain', 34.

⁵⁹ Sean Kelsey, 'Davies, Sir John (bap. 1569, d. 1626)', in ODNB [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7245>].

⁶⁰ *Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. by Robert Krueger (Oxford, 1975), pp. 326 and 360-61.

approach, then the *First Day* may have sought to gain political capital, just as Davies later wrote a poem on *The Kinges Welcome* and his *Nosce Teipsum* was said to be known to James.⁶¹

Whatever its political undertow *The First Day* has a good counterpart in voice and style in Davies's poetry. Ruby Nesmer argues that *Orchestra*, which may have been performed at an Inns of Court revels, possesses a metrical form that matches its theme and 'essential levity': 'the suitability of the theme to his natural style makes the poem the only example in the canon [i.e. Davies's] of perfect consonance between inclination and necessity'.⁶² A similarly felicitous harmony can be heard in the sonorous and urbane tone of *The First Day*. The translation and *Orchestra* both contain a playful quality characteristic of early modern discourses on natural philosophy.⁶³ They are witty exercises in rhetorical invention that are curious about the universe's formation, and the analogies and conceits that describe it. The poems' thematic common-ground is strongest when describing the universe's creation from a shapeless chaos (e.g. *Orchestra*, stanza 19 and *First Day*, 14.1). Moreover, both poems (like the *Semaines*) are striking examples of rhetorical amplification: Hoskins's *Directions for Speech and Style* (c. 1599) mentions that 'this only tricke made vpp J: Ds poeme of dauncing, All daunceth, y^e heavens, y^e elem^{ts}., mens myndes, commonwealths, & soe by pts all daunceth'.⁶⁴ Although Du Bartas is not mentioned in *Directions*, earlier in the same paragraph the manuscript copy reads 'Bacon in his first colonie'; assuming this line does not refer to Bacon's role in establishing North American colonies, the copyist may be confusing 'Bacon' with 'Bartas' and perhaps had Lisle's translation of 1598 in mind.⁶⁵ Finally, the annotated copy of *The First Day* held in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (4° W 26(1) Th.) is witness to the translation being read for its technical accomplishment and metrical properties. The late-Elizabethan or Stuart hand, which does not

⁶¹ Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. by Philip Bliss, 4 vols (London, 1813-20), II, 400. Krueger and Nesmer (eds), *Poems of John Davies*, I, 228-30 and 417.

⁶² *Poems of John Davies*, pp. lxiv-lxv, and see Finkelppearl, *John Marston*, p.76.

⁶³ On playfulness in natural philosophy, Paula Findlen, 'Jokes of Nature and Jokes of Knowledge: The Playfulness of Scientific Discourse in Early Modern Europe', *RQ* 43 (1990), 292-331.

⁶⁴ *The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638*, ed. by Louise Brown Osborn (New Haven, 1937), p. 136.

⁶⁵ John Hoskins, *Directions for Speech and Style*, ed. by Hoyt H. Hudson (Princeton, 1935), p. 76.

match Hoskins's, shows a reader evaluating the translation with a critical eye for the quality of the imitation, as is indicated by a quotation from Pliny above the titlepage border: 'Cum est arduum similitudinem effingere ex vero, tum longe difficillima est imitationis imitatio. Plin. Epist. li.q. ep. 28'.⁶⁶ Except for some additional references to the Calvinist preacher Girolamo Zanchi (see Chapter 2.i) and others which are supplied in a printed marginal annotation on E2r, all the manuscript notes are minor corrections to the poem, often picking up on errata, removing catalectic lines or improving scansion.⁶⁷

The First Day's rhetorical experimentation is one reason that it lost relevance, and so why no further references to it survive. When the dedicatory letter mentions those 'forenamed Heroicall Spirits', it may well recognize that the present translation will be superseded by a rendering in 'heroical' verse more fitting for the *Semaines'* grand style. Like William Scott (see Chapter 2.i), the translator may have started translating from the poem's beginning with the intention to investigate how the *Semaines* would read in a different verse form. It was unsuitable as a canonical translation because it is too playful: its recognition of the poems' links with Anthony Bacon and James did not produce a suitably stately translation. The Middle Temple setting provides a solid hypothesis for the environment in which such a translation would be produced: William Scott's probable residence at the Inner Temple and knowledge of Hoskins's *Directions* makes the connection more tempting still.⁶⁸ Although it cannot be attributed to a single writer, John Hoskins is the likeliest candidate from the information available: 'anonymous (John Hoskins?)' is my suggested attribution.

The First Day is an experiment in describing metaphysical and theological topics in verse, which makes no attempt to replicate the grand epic style encouraged by a Protestant-humanist reading of *La Sepmaine* as a divine poem. Although the translation is playful in some

⁶⁶ 'Though it is hard to create a likeness from real-life, it is much more difficult to make an imitation of an imitation'. For Hoskins's hand, see Osborn (ed.), *John Hoskyns*, p.71.

⁶⁷ See A1v, A3v, B1v, E3r, F1v and F2v.

⁶⁸ Information from paper delivered by Gavin Alexander at the Renaissance Society of America's annual meeting, 24 March 2012.

regards, its author was nonetheless aware of James' approval for Du Bartas, and Du Bartas' connections with Bacon. The final translator considered in this chapter was also alert to these connections and to the particular importance of Simon Goulart's commentaries to the *Semaines*. William Lisle, equally aware of the poems' symbolic place in Elizabethan diplomacy, offered a translation that sought to assimilate French and English poetic structures while exploiting the poems' learning.

iii. William Lisle's English Alexandrines

Most printed editions of the *Semaines* in French contained systematic, directive printed marginalia and commentaries. The Huguenot scholar Simon Goulart composed the apparatus found in most French editions; Pantaleon Thevenin also produced a commentary of *La Sepmaine* in 1584, and Claude Duret wrote one for *La Seconde Semaine*, but neither was as widely used as Goulart's edition was in France and across Europe.⁶⁹ Goulart was a reformed minister and protégé of Theodore Beza in Geneva, and a prolific writer described as a 'polyhistor' in one contemporary portrait.⁷⁰ Goulart's literary endeavours were largely directed towards translating and otherwise popularizing theological and other humanist writings, and he also wrote religious poetry (e.g. *Vœu pour les martyrs* (1570; 'Vow for the Martyrs')), sharing Du Bartas' view that contemporary literature required urgent regeneration from its perceived state of moral corruption. Goulart was best known for his commentaries on the *Semaines*, which appeared in editions of *La Sepmaine* from 1581, and editions of *La Seconde Semaine* from 1589; thirty-one French editions of the poem were printed between 1589 and 1632, and most of them (except for pocket-sized editions) contained textual apparatus. As Du Bartas' work was

⁶⁹ *La Seconde Sepmaine (1584)*, ed. by Yvonne Bellenger, 2 vols (Paris, 1991), I, xv, xvi and xlvii. *La Sepmaine: Texte du 1581*, ed. by Bellenger (Paris, 1981), pp. lx and lxii-lxiii.

⁷⁰ T. de Morembert, 'Simon Goulart', in *Dictionnaire de biographie française*, vol. 16 (1985), pp. 737-38; Leonard Chester Jones, *Simon Goulart 1543-1628* (Geneva and Paris, 1917), p. 285 (see pp. 285-320 for an overview of Goulart's career).

disseminated across Europe, twenty-eight editions of Goulart's commentary followed in various languages.⁷¹

The commentary accordingly played an important role in Du Bartas' reception. In a period when it was more common to produce annotated editions of classical verse and philosophical or theological prose, Goulart's commentary on these contemporary poems brought them prestige, indicating his high regard for their aesthetic and moral value, based on their non-fictional content.⁷² Du Bartas knew of Goulart's work, and may have authorized it: in a letter from 1584 Goulart asks Joseph Justus Scaliger to pass on his wishes to Du Bartas, and speaks of his personal obligation to see this great project through to completion.⁷³ The commentary is digressive but thorough, often remarking on several words in the same line.⁷⁴ Goulart highlights the *Semaines'* contemporaneity by drawing on other sixteenth-century historians and natural philosophers, and giving attention both to Du Bartas' description of natural phenomena and his accounts of recent historical events: in his preface, Goulart specifically praises Du Bartas' 'fitting and vnaffected stile' in his 'infinite and excellent tracts of all the parts of Philosophy, either rationall, naturall, or supernaturall, Physike, Law, Politike, Military and Oeconomike Science, as well in Cities as in Fields'.⁷⁵

The commentary was being read in England throughout the period covered by this thesis, and shows that the information-driven responses to Du Bartas' works prevalent on the continent did have counterparts in England. John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593) is the earliest known English printed book containing material from Goulart.⁷⁶ Thomas Lodge's translation of the entire commentary, which was printed in 1621, 1637 and 1638, showed the sustained

⁷¹ Jones, *Simon Goulart*, pp. 576-82 (for a list of French editions, see Holmes et al., I, 70-79, 84-92).

⁷² Cécile Huchard, *D'encre et de sang* (Paris, 2007), p. 106.

⁷³ Jones, *Simon Goulart*, p. 373.

⁷⁴ Jean Ceard, 'Les Transformations du Genre du Commentaire', in *L'Automne de la Renaissance 1580-1630*, ed. by Jean Lafond and André Stegman (Paris, 1981), pp. 101-115 (p. 112).

⁷⁵ *A Learned Summary upon the Famous Poeme (the first and second Weeke) of William of Saluste lord of Bartas*, trans. by Thomas Lodge (1621), A1r.

⁷⁶ Chandler B. Beall, 'John Eliot's "Ortho-epia Gallica" and du Bartas-Goulart', *SP* 43 (1946), 164-75; David H. Thomas credits Eliot with greater imaginative transformation of Goulart's commentary than Beall does; see 'John Eliot's Borrowings from Du Bartas', 267-69.

appeal of Goulart's scholarship. Goulart praises the *Semaines* as a great marriage of Horatian *dulce* and *utile* ('delightfull and profitable instruction', *4v) and exhorts readers to meditate on the poem, rather than simply extract attractive phrases:

For they who onely ouer-read *Bartas* for their delight [*sic*] sake, or to cull out some Words and Elegancies which please them most, resemble him who would plow vp and manure a rich plat of ground, to the end only he might gather flowers to be garlands, & Nosegayes of little countenance, respectless of such wholesome and necessary fruits, as are more commodious for mans life, and whereof he might better make very good prouision. (*4r)

Goulart insists that readers should stay alert to the poems' pedagogical and moral sustenance, even though by the 1620s cursory 'over-readings' of the *Semaines* were probably routine. For his English translation, Lodge regrets that the poem (which is 'in severall mens hands' (*2r), probably referring to its wide circulation) is not printed alongside the commentary, but suggests that the *Semaines* are most profitable when used with this guide to its 'Metaphysicall, Physicall, Morall, and Historicall knowledge' (titlepage). Lodge wishes readers 'to reade and digest, to ruminare and vnderstand, before they reprove and condemne' (*2v) the poem, and his commentary serves as a companion to such further study. He argues that the Goulart commentary helps readers to navigate, scrutinize and digest the whole text.

Such reflective, considered readings of the *Semaines* are indirectly advocated in William Lisle's translations from *La Seconde Semaine* from the mid-1590s, which are the only English translations printed with Goulart's commentary. William Lisle (or 'L'Isle') was a scholar at King's College, Cambridge, best remembered today for his early editions of Old English texts.⁷⁷ He translated several sections from *La Seconde Semaine: Babilon* (II.ii.2; printed 1595) and *Colonies* (II.ii.3; 1598) in the 1590s, revised versions of which were reprinted in 1625 and 1637 alongside new translations of the conclusion to 'Les Artifices' (II.i.4), with 'L'Arche' (II.ii.1)

⁷⁷ On Lisle's Old English scholarship see Philip Pulsiano, 'William L'Isle and the Editing of Old English', in *The Recovery of Old English*, ed. by Timothy Graham (Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000), pp. 173-206; Timothy Graham, 'Early Modern Uses of Claudius B.IV', in *The Old English Hexateuch*, ed. by Rebecca Barnhouse and Benjamin C. Withers (Kalamazoo, Mich., 2000), pp. 287-313.

and ‘Les Columnes’ (II.ii.4). In these publications the Goulart commentary encourages closer engagement with the poems, while again stressing the poem’s commitment to profit and pleasure: the titlepage to *Babilon* contains an epigraph from Horace’s *De Arte Poetica*, ‘Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci’.⁷⁸ That titlepage also advertizes that it contains ‘the Commentarie, and marginall | Notes of S.G.S.’; similarly, the three other publications all contain the same initials ‘S.G.S.’ (Simon Goulart de Senlis) on the titlepage, which would have emphasized Du Bartas’ learning, and may have marked out the publication for an intelligent, Calvinist readership; the initials ‘S.G.S.’ had appeared once before in an English printed book, after the preface to a tract by the reformed theologian Zacharias Ursinus in 1585, and later appeared on the titlepages to two of Thomas North’s translations in 1602 which used Goulart’s work on the Roman biographer Aemilius Probus.⁷⁹

Lisle’s translations were also literary tributes to the diplomatic correspondence between England and France in the 1590s and 1620s. Lisle was careful, he informed King Charles in the preface to the 1625 edition, to avoid translating those sections which James had ‘in his youth so incomparably made English’.⁸⁰ Instead he chose two sections on contemporary European literary culture and political geography that were appropriate for his dedicatee, the High Admiral Charles Howard.⁸¹ Alert to the praise of Elizabeth (II.ii.2.631-54) in *Babilon*, Lisle informs Howard in the dedicatory letter that Du Bartas is ‘in my simple iudgment the properest, and best learned of them all, I am sure the best affected to England, and the gracious Emperesse thereof’ (A2r) and mentions that he ‘setteth out in such maner

⁷⁸ ‘He has won every vote who has blended profit and pleasure’ (l. 343). References to and translations from Horace are from *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, trans. by H. Ruston Fairclough, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA, 1926; repr. 1970). The titlepage to *Colonies* contains a Latin translation of the second line of Homer’s *Odyssey*, also from *De Arte Poetica*, that affirms that the poem’s subject has a classical precedent: ‘Mores hominum multorum narrat et urbes’ (l. 142, ‘he relates the customs and cities of many men’ (emphasis retained: Horace has ‘vidit’ (‘saw’) instead of ‘narrat’)). On the Horatian imperative to literary profit and pleasure in early modern literature, see Robert Matz, *Defending Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2000).

⁷⁹ Zacharias Ursinus, *Doctrinae Christianae Compendium* (Cambridge, 1585), preface; Cornelius Nepos, *The Lives of Epaminondas, of Philip of Macedon, [...]* (1602); Plutarch, *The Lives of the noble Grecians and Romaines* (1603).

⁸⁰ *Part of Du Bartas* (1625), ¶¶3v.

⁸¹ Howard also received dedications in two contemporary works of colonialist propaganda: Walter Raleigh’s *The Discoverie of the Large, Rich, and Bewtiful Empire of Guiana* (1596) and Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation made by Sea or Over-Land [...]* (1599-1600).

the Queenes princely maiestie, hir learning, wisdom, eloquence, and other excellent vertues' (A3v).⁸² Furthermore, Lisle addresses a nautical metaphor to the High Admiral which represents his translation as part of an embassy. Possibly alluding to Du Bartas' actual mission to England and Scotland in the 1580s and James's translation, Lisle informs Lord Howard that Du Bartas has been 'newly transported out of Fraunce' (A1r):

[...] at length I landed my stranger in England. Where since his arriuell he hath gladly encountred diuers of his elder brethren, that were come ouer before, some in a princely Scottish attire, others in faire English habits; and to th'entent he might the better enioy their companie, who by this time had almost forgotten their French, he was desirous to learne English of me: therefore I kept him a while about me, was his teacher at home, and enterpreter abroad; [...] and now that he can (so as he can) speake for himselfe, may it please your good L. to talke with him at your leisure. (A3r)

Lisle pledges to let his visitor 'speake for himselfe', which gestures to a translation strategy that resists naturalizing Du Bartas into English. The conversation that Lisle imagines may recollect that Howard was indeed a former emissary to France, and acknowledges that Howard spoke fluent French: he directs Howard to hear Du Bartas speak about such political matters as 'the godly gouernment of good princes, & the wicked practises of Tyrants' (A3r), and also commends the translation to the admiral's sons, who shall find there 'profit so blended with pleasure, learning with delight' (A4r).⁸³ Du Bartas' role as a trustworthy interlocutor in a bilingual colloquium on political theory is almost identical to that set out by James. Goulart's commentary, though not mentioned in the epistle, was an aide to Du Bartas' cultural mission, in that it provided further context to the original French publications. It also distinguished Lisle's translation from others by activating its pedagogical uses. This letter and its associations apparently galvanized Lisle's reputation, for a variant issue of his *Faire Ethiopian* (1631) contains a newly type-set version of the 'Epistle to the Lord Admirall. 1596'

⁸² *Babilon* (1595; ESTC 21662); a second imprint (ESTC 21662a) is dated 1596 on the titlepage.

⁸³ James McDermott, 'Howard, Charles, second Baron Howard of Effingham and first earl of Nottingham (1536–1624)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13885>].

from *Babilon*, which along with brief verses to the King and Queen, may remind readers of Lisle's earlier work; the same letter appears in *Foure Bookes of Du Bartas* (1637).⁸⁴

Lisle's insistence on preserving Du Bartas' distinctive French voice indicates a translation strategy compatible with his Anglo-Saxon scholarship. His *Saxon Treatise concerning the Old and New Testament* (1623) contains parallel Old and early modern English versions of texts by Ælfric, edited from manuscripts in Robert Cotton's possession. Lisle criticized Saxon Bible translations that introduced neologisms and other taints to the natural lucidity of the English language: '[the Saxon Bibles] will in many places conuince of affected obscuritie some late translators; who [...] are faine to stuffe the text with such fustian, such inkehorne termes, as may seem to fauour their parts' (e3r). Lisle defends the use of words with etymological connections to Greek and Latin: 'some will say, they are too too old words, and far out of knowledge, and differing much from our speech now currant. What then? Shall we therfore vtterly neglect them?' (e4v). Lisle sought to nourish the English language by reintroducing older and dialect terms because an invigorated vocabulary would facilitate more precise, more accurate communication:

what tongue is able more shortly and with lesse doubtfulnessse, to giue vtterance and make way for the cumbersome conceits of our minde, than ours? What more plentifull, than ours might be, if we did vse well but our owne garbes, and the words and speeches of our sundry shires and countries in this Iland? (e3v)

Lisle's philology retraced different languages and dialect forms that shared a common linguistic source in order to increase the expressive range of English.

In support of this argument he quotes the French 'Babylone' and then four lines from his translation, with slight variation, in which the poet praises Clément Marot's sensitivity to classical and biblical literature (f1r):

⁸⁴ *The Faire Æthiopian* (ESTC 13047.5), A4r-v; *Foure Bookes of Du Bartas* (ESTC 21663a.5), 2M2r-v.

Thus englished in his [i.e. Du Bartas'] owne kinde of verse; which is to be read as diuided in the middle:

Thee (*Marot*) I esteeme, euen as an old Colosse,
 All soiled, all to broke, all ouergrowne with mosse;
 Worne picture, tombe defac'd; not for fine worke I see,
 But in deuout regard of their antiquitee.

The additional spaces between the sixth and seventh syllables indicate that Lisle indeed followed Du Bartas' 'owne kinde of verse', the alexandrine, which is the metre that he (and only he among English translators) uses in all his translations. International relations were a factor in this decision too, as seen when Lisle defended his versification in *Part of Du Bartas English and French* (1625), a publication which, as the dedicatory epistle to Charles confirms, was designed to celebrate the King's imminent 'happie match' with Henrietta-Maria (2¶3v). Lisle refigured his translations in this later volume as upholding Anglo-French unity, symbolized by having the French and English texts printed together; he hopes 'to helpe an Englishman vnderstand the whole French of *Bartas*, or a Frenchman the whole English of *Siluester*' (2¶4r). This later publication displays self-consciousness that it is just a 'part' of the *Semaines*, whereas prior to Sylvester's translation single books had routinely been published alone. Although Lisle envisages a great parallel-text edition (and hints that he wanted to translate other sections), he still finds it acceptable to gain a sense of a whole poem through extracts only: 'I may say of this Author, as of *Homer*, know foure of his bookes, and know them all' (2¶3v-4r).

Lisle's strategy for demonstrating the equivalence between the languages and cultures grows from his choice of alexandrine in the earlier editions: in *Part of Du Bartas* vertical bars appear which mark the medial caesuras in the first opening of the parallel texts (A1v-2r). To justify his English alexandrine, Lisle needs say 'no more, but that it is the same which the Author kept in the originall: and he doubtlesse, for the more graue, made choice thereof with great reason, according to the counsell of *Horace*, who aduiseth all writers, *Descriptas seruare*

vices, operumque colores.⁸⁵ Again invoking *De Arte Poetica* for his creed, Lisle justifies his use of the stately hexameter ‘kept in the originall’ and swipes at pentameter (the metre used in his verse translation of *Æthiopia*), and implicitly at Sylvester’s translation too (which he refers to on the same page): ‘what is our English Pentameter but the same kind of verse which is vsed in our Comedies?’ (2¶4r). Lisle’s ‘desire to trie how French and English would go hand in hand’ (2¶4r) has a visual counterpart on A1r, which depicts a French Fleur de Lys and English rose shaking hands. The titlepage publicizes this marriage between the languages, announcing it as being ‘in his [Du Bartas] owne kinde of | Verse, so neare the French Englished, as | may teach an English-man French, or | a *French-man English*’. Indeed, once the translation’s political purpose had expired, the re-issue in 1637 contains a new titlepage that reverts to promoting the pedagogical merits of the poems’ factual content and their use as a text for learning French: it is suitable ‘for the instruction and pleasure of such as delight in both languages’. Goulart’s commentary, which is printed in both later editions, still had a part to play in promoting the cross-cultural relations first described in the dedication to Charles Howard. Lisle’s Du Bartas, helped by Goulart, is a literary ambassador who also merits close private study.

Lisle’s commitment to retaining the alexandrine in English does not produce a translation unusually sensitive to the qualities of French. Instead it preserves a monotonous rhythm that often misses rhetorical ornamentation and lexical subtleties in the French. For example, Lisle converts the beginning of this longer anaphoric verse paragraph into a sequence of monosyllabic hemistiches:

The Northen [*sic*] man is faire, the Southern fauor’d hard;
 One strong, another weake; one white, another sward;
 This hath haire fine & smooth, that other grosse and twinde;
 He loues the bodies paine, and he the toile of minde;
 Some men are hot and moist, some other hot and drie;
 Some merry, and other sad; one thunders out on hie,

⁸⁵*Part of Du Bartas*, 2¶4r. Latin quotation from *Ars Poetica*, l. 86 (‘to follow these well-marked shifts and shades of poetic forms’).

Another speaketh low; (‘Colonies’ (1625), 2A4r)

L’homme du Nort est beau, celui du Midi laid:
 L’vn blanc, l’autre tannè [sîc]: l’vn fort, l’autre foiblet:
 L’vn a le poil menu, l’autre gros, frizé, rude:
 L’vn aime le labeur, l’autre cherit l’estude.
 L’vn est chaut & humide, & l’autre sec & chaut:
 L’vn gay, l’autre chagrin. L’un entonne bien haut,
 L’autre a gresle la voix. (2A3v)

Lisle places a punctuated break after the sixth syllable here, but does not retain the pronouns that structure the antithetical pairings amplifying the topic ‘homme du Nort’ or ‘Northen man’. The argument in English nonetheless proceeds exactly in tandem with the French, in a sense making his version entirely synchronous with the French and allowing Du Bartas to ‘speake for himself’. This versification would also have assisted readers in navigating the poems for factual information. For the commentary to remain functional, Lisle’s translation had to preserve accurately the wording, as well as the content, of the French. ‘The Northen Man’, for example, is referred to directly in Goulart’s notes: ‘59 *The Northen man*. He [Du Bartas] entreth consideration of many points, wherein the North and Southerne people differ’ (2C1v). The reference numbers and printed marginalia divide up the text to make individual topics easier to locate, and thematic divisions within the text are introduced by proper nouns at the start of verse paragraphs; for example, commentary entries usually begin with such terms as ‘40 *But all this other world*’ (Y4v) and ‘12 *The Hebrew tongue*’ (N1v). Such methods allow the translator to compress the poems’ knowledge, for Du Bartas’ concision was important to his appeal: ‘For here in lesse roome then might be thought able to containe so great and sundrie matters, are plainlie set downe, and euen tabled-out unto us, the seuerall partes, peoples and policies of the whole earth’.⁸⁶ Lisle’s alexandrine ensured that the poem’s factual content remained intact, but with hindsight the translation was more successful for what it represented than as a literary achievement. The only known contemporary readers of Lisle’s

⁸⁶ *The Colonies*, A4v.

translation are George Hakewill (see Chapter 3.iii), who quoted the original 1595 text to cite Du Bartas on Clément Marot (see passage quoted above), Robert Allott (see Chapter 4.i below) and Robert Burton, who owned a copy of *Colonies*.⁸⁷

Lisle's translation was a breakthrough among early attempts at translating the *Semaines* in that it self-consciously sought to achieve an English voice fitting for a French poet-statesman who had composed a learned poem with a distinctive epic grandeur. Lisle's translation was the first to seek to rival the linguistic and informational compression of Du Bartas' alexandrine. John Henry Todd, a nineteenth-century editor of John Milton's works, was especially struck by Lisle's use of compounds towards this end: 'Lisle's compound epithets, in his translation, are numerous, and sometimes very beautiful.'⁸⁸ These formations are often required by the alexandrine half-line, and follow an equivalent term in the French, whereas Sylvester's are more often straightforward contractions to fit the pentameter line:

The man whose fore-head shines, as doth a blazing starre,
Skie-gracing, frighting-men, who for his scepter barre
A seare, yet budding rod (Part of Du Bartas, P1r)

[...] that Prince whose browes appeare
Like daunt-earth comet's heaven-adorning brand (Sylvester, II.ii.2.554-55)

Celuy de qui le front flambe comme un comete
Orne-ciel, donne-peur, qui porte une baguete (II.ii.2.553-54)

Lisle's translation favours sense over sonority, but is more conscious of the interrelation between structure and content than the other translations considered in this chapter are.

Lisle was the first translator to deliberate about which English poetic form was most suitable for replicating the learned gravity of *Semaines*, respecting them as French poems with

⁸⁷ Burton also owned a copy of Sylvester's *Lachrimae Lachrimarum*; see *The Library of Robert Burton*, ed. by Nicolas K. Kiessling (Oxford, 1988), pp. 267 and 295.

⁸⁸ *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, ed. by Henry John Todd, 6 vols (London, 1826), I, lxiii. Todd does not expand on the 'preceding poets' he hears in *Devine Weekes'* epithets.

useful political and pedagogical applications in English. Like James and the translator of *The First Day*, Lisle read individual parts and days from the *Semaines* as separate poems, though by 1625 he perceived them as belonging to a corporate whole. The next chapter will show how approaches began to coalesce in the late 1590s and early 1600s as translators sought to combine the ‘encyclopedic’, aesthetic and moral appeal of the *Semaines* introduced in this chapter to create a complete translation of the poems in English that also did justice to their celebrity within the higher circles of the aristocracy. These translators are not as consciously Horatian as Lisle, but do unite *utile* and *dulce* more successfully than either the sprightly *First Day* in 1595 or James’s stern reading of ‘Les Furies’. Goulart’s commentary helped Lisle to explore these issues, but his English alexandrine only possessed grandeur by association, not in the poetic cadences it produced.

International relations are being managed and manipulated in all three early translations studied in this chapter. Though it was advantageous for each translator to relate their edition to current affairs, the persistent associations inform us about an essential aspect of Du Bartas’ contemporary reputation in Britain, one which was cultivated by the poet as well as his readers. Warren Boutcher cites a document prepared for Robert Naunton before his first official visit to Paris which mentions that Du Bartas had learnt English to read Sidney’s *Arcadia*, and suggests that for Elizabethan poets and diplomats, especially those around the Earl of Essex, Du Bartas’ verse was an instrument for nurturing relations with France: ‘the Protestant diplomatic culture of the 1570s and 1580s provides Essex with paradigms which associate particular diplomatic friendships with particular texts and the acquisition of particular modern languages’.⁸⁹ Du Bartas encouraged such uses by expressing admiration for Elizabeth and James through his verse, and English writers eagerly responded by translating and otherwise admiring the *Semaines*. Sidney, who may have met Du Bartas

⁸⁹ “‘A French Dexterity, & An Italian Confidence’: New Documents on John Florio, Learned Strangers and Protestant Humanist Study of Modern Languages in Renaissance England from c.1547 to c.1625”, *Reformation* 2 (1997), 39-109 (96).

during his European tour of 1573-5, was an obvious choice of translator for Du Bartas, and the Stationers' Register entry leads us to think that he was among Du Bartas' first English translators: comments by later translators (e.g. in *The First Day*) suggest that it never was printed, but Sidney's *Sepmaine* could well have been shown to James, Du Bartas and members of the Sidney circle in manuscript.⁹⁰ In the 1590s anticipation grew for a printed translation which would do justice to Du Bartas' status and poetry. Because neither James's nor Sidney's translations had fulfilled that need, it was left to other translators to explore further approaches to the *Semaines* that could realize them in English as divine poetry, remarkable for their style, breadth of learning, potential applications as a reference source and valorization by the political establishment. The *Semaines'* association with the King did not weaken in subsequent decades as the poem's readership spread well beyond a diplomatic cadre.

⁹⁰ On the likelihood of Sidney having met Du Bartas, see Albert W. Osborn, *Sir Philip Sidney en France* (1932; repr. Geneva, 1974), pp. 35-36.

Chapter 2: Versions of Heroical Poetry

Introduction

The *Semaines*' generic diversity raised important questions about literary decorum for the four English translators of the *Semaines* working at the start of the seventeenth century. *The Model of Poesy* (c. 1599) by William Scott, an exceptional new primary source for understanding Du Bartas' early reception in Britain, contains more than ten references to the French poet, which together offer an unparalleled framework for understanding issues confronted by its later translators.¹ The manuscript treatise is followed by a translation of the first two Days of *La Sepmaine*, which allows us to witness Scott's poetic theory and practice together: indeed, Scott may have consciously been developing both Sidney's *Defence of Poetry* and translation from Du Bartas. Scott shows how the *Semaines* might be read and translated as 'heroical' poetry that consolidated natural philosophy in verse, and in doing so guides us towards a better understanding of how later translations constructed the poems' reputation. Though great variation between translation strategies remained, Scott and other translators held increasingly similar conceptions of the poems' worth, and of what a translation of them ought to achieve. They were more aware now of the *Semaines* as a single work, and translated sections from the whole poem conscious that other English versions existed. 'Heroical', an archaic form of 'heroic' ('relating to or describing the deeds of heroes; of a poem or poetry = epic' *OED* 3a), is the historical term, used by Scott and other translators, that best epitomizes this common ground among late-Elizabethan responses to the poems: the *Semaines* were epic poems about natural philosophy and history which required translation into a high style.²

¹ *The Model of Poesy*, BL, Add. MS 81083. See Stanley Wells, 'A New Early Reader of Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare's Book*, ed. by Richard Meek, Jane Rickard and Richard Wilson (Manchester, 2008), pp. 233-40; Gavin Alexander, 'William Scott and the Dating of George Wyatt's Sonnets', *NQ* 59 (2012), 58-60; and Hannah Leah Crummé, 'William Scott's Copy of Sidney', *NQ* 56 (2009), 553-54.

² Though the concepts of 'epic' and 'heroic' are closely related, the critical discourse on Renaissance epic offers little on scientific or philosophical verse, and so is not surveyed here. See Alastair Fowler, 'Didactic Kinds' in *Oxford History of Literary Translation*, ed. by Braden et al., pp. 194-200. On the 'heroic' in general, see, for example, Kenneth Borris, *Allegory and Epic in English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2000); on the history of 'heroic' as a

The titlepage of Thomas Winter's translation, *The Second Day of the First Weeke* (1603) states that it was '[d]one out of French into English Heroi- | call verse by Thomas Winter, Maister of Artes' (typography standardized). 'Heroical' may denote a grand literary style, perhaps specifically in pentameter verse form, suitable for conveying the poems' philosophical arguments, which are the focus of his attention in this publication and the equally sober *Third Dayes Creation* (1604). Robert Barret also used the term 'heroical': his translations from *La Seconde Semaine* are written in a double *abab*-quatrain pentameter stanza that he described in his verse chronicle *The Sacred Warr* (see Chapter 6.i) as being apt for singing of 'acts-heroical' in 'verse-heroical'.³ His version of heroical poetry also emphasized Du Bartas' learning, and Barret included interpolations that turned to new topics and rhetorical figures. Though Sylvester had begun his translation before these writers and does not use the term, his translation is also broadly 'heroical'. The best marker of *Devine Weekes*' success, perhaps, was the sheer breadth of later responses that it facilitated. Sylvester and his printer sought to produce a definitive translation of the *Semaines*, and did so by uniting the political affiliations, conservative moral readings, encyclopedic uses and divine rhetoric associated with poem into a single publication.

Before turning to the *Model of Poesy* and these translations, it is worth briefly unpacking contemporary perceptions and definitions of 'heroical' in order to foreground the rhetorical and poetic framework within which writers confronted issues about the *Semaines*' value at the turn of the seventeenth century. There was no settled definition of 'heroical' among Elizabethan writers but the term is consistently used to refer to prosodic, generic and functional features of poetry, and provides a good historical formalist lens through which to

prosodic term, see Peter L. Groves, *Strange Music* (Victoria, B.C., 1998) and William Bowman Piper, *The Heroic Couplet* (Cleveland, 1969); and on classical precedents, Derek Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables* (London, 1974).

³ Robert Barret, *The Sacred Warr*, Bodleian, Add. MS C.281, pp. xi and 1. Translations from *La Seconde Semaine*, Folger, MS V.b.224.

view the various problems that these writers negotiated.⁴ Scott's description of the *Semaines* is novel for contending that Du Bartas' works show that natural philosophy, science and sacred subjects are suitable topics for post-classical heroic poetry. In the *Defence*, Sidney identifies three kinds of poetry: divine (i.e. scriptural); philosophical, incorporating moral, astronomical and historical subjects (e.g. Lucretius', Manilius' and Lucan's works, and Virgil's *Georgics*); and verse written by true poets who 'most properly do imitate to teach and delight'.⁵ Each of these kinds involves a different source of invention: divine poetry is mapped onto the Bible, and philosophical poetry onto the 'proposed subject' (80.26), but the third kind only allows scope for the poet to pursue his own wit, paint the subject in the most attractive way, and include conjectural, imaginative and moralizing material. Heroical verse fits into this third category: it is 'the best and most accomplished kind of poetry', a category which includes Homer's *Iliad*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, and Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, all poems brilliant in their truth, virtue and magnanimity (97.34-98.12). Sidney's classical definition of 'heroical poetry' denotes authentic and prestigious writing about great individuals, and is distinct from divine poetry.

George Puttenham offered a more literal definition when describing 'heroick' poets as those who write 'long histories of the noble gests of kings & great Princes entemedling the dealings of the gods, halfe gods or *Heroes* of the gentiles', but he also used the term to describe 'historicall Poesie'; i.e. epic narratives written in hexameter verse.⁶ Importantly, he included popular philosophical verse of the kind that Sidney excluded:

The profitable sciences were no lesse meete to be imported to the greater number of ciuill men for instruction of the people and increase of knowledge [...] such doctrines and arts as the common wealth fared the better by, were esteemed and allowed. And the same were treated by Poets in verse *Exiameter* fauouring the *Heroicall*, and for the grautie

⁴ An instructive defence of historical formalism is given by Stephen Cohen in 'Between Form and Culture: New Historicism and the Promise of a Historical Formalism', in *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements*, ed. by Mark David Rasmussen (New York and Basingstoke, 2002), pp. 17-41 (esp. pp. 32-33).

⁵ *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. by Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan Van Dorsten (Oxford, 1973), pp. 80-81 (p. 81.3-4). On genre formation, see Alastair Fowler, 'The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After', *New Literary History* 34 (2003), 185-200.

⁶ *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589), E2r, F4r-G2v and G1r; see also S2r.

and comelinesse of the meetre most vsed with the Greekes and Latines to sad purposes.
(G2r)

He names two poets mentioned in Sidney's description of philosophical verse, Lucretius and Manilius, and adds Nicander, whose surviving poems contain medical, zoological, botanical and mineralogical descriptions in hexameter verse, and Oppian of Apamea, who wrote poems about hunting and fishing.⁷ Puttenham stretches Sidney's definition by including 'didactic' verse (a later term used here to refer to works with pedagogical value) that covers philosophy, astronomy and history, but also the many 'honest and profitable Artes and Sciences' (G2r).

There is a prosodic component too: classical heroical poetry was written in dactylic hexameter, and English heroical (i.e. epic) metre should closely resemble the 'grauitie and comeliness' of the classical 'exameter'. Roger Ascham had raised the difficulty of translating epic metre directly into English twenty years earlier, and for Puttenham pentameter was the most suitable English equivalent: 'The meeeter [*sic*] of ten sillables is very stately and Heroicall, and must haue his *Cesure* fall vpon the fourth sillable, and leave six behinde him' (K4v).⁸

Other treatises repeat Puttenham's claim that iambic pentameter is particularly suited for English heroical verse, not that 'blank verse' was yet established as the closest English equivalent to classical hexameter.⁹ Thomas Campion associates 'Heroical verse' with dactylic forms which 'hath bene oftentimes attempted in our English toong, but with passing pitifull successe: and no wonder, seeing it is an attempt altogether against the nature of our language', and goes on to identify the iamb as the most natural English foot, while Samuel Daniel, responding to Campion's work in *The Defence of Ryme* (1603) stressed the ancestry of iambic verse.¹⁰ There was also divergence about the historical associations and best use of

⁷ See Nicander, *The Poems and Poetical Fragments*, ed. by A. S. Gow and A. F. Scholfield (London, 1997), pp. 18-25; *Oppian's Halieuticks*, trans. by William Diaper and John Jones (Oxford, 1722).

⁸ Roger Ascham, *The Schoolemaster* (1570), R4r.

⁹ Martin J. Duffell, *A New History of English Metre* (London, 2008), p. 124.

¹⁰ Thomas Campion, *Observations in the Art of English Poesie* (1602), A8v and B3r; *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. by G. Gregory Smith, 2 vols (Oxford, 1904; repr. 1950), II, 356. Campion may also have written the following

pentameter, as with 'heroical'. George Gascoigne, in 'Certayne notes of Instruction', named iambic pentameter 'ryding rime' and observes that it 'serveth most aptly to wryte a merie tale' in *The Canterbury Tales* and 'divers other delectable and light enterprises'.¹¹ Edmund Spenser and William Warner were described as 'heroical' poets, while several poems were described as 'heroical' on their titlepages, including Richard Carew's and Edward Fairfax's translations of Torquato Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*; and Michael Drayton's *England's Heroical Epistles* (1598), which specifically recalls George Turberville's translation of Ovid's *Heroides*.¹² All three works are composed in pentameter, as is John Harington's *Orlando Furioso in English Heroical Verse* (1591), in which the 'Apologie of Poetrie' emphasizes heroical poetry's potential for self-improvement: 'all other sortes of Poetrie [besides comedy] may bring their profit as they do bring delight, and if all, then much more the chiefe of all, which by all mens consent is the Heroicall' (¶6r).

It is within this theoretical context that later translators sought to mediate the *Semaines* for English readers: the poems were heroical verse that incorporated divine and philosophical elements. Jonson was one of very few writers to question whether Du Bartas should be praised as a poet, asserting that his creation epic was not itself a creative work befitting the poet as maker: according to William Drummond, Jonson 'thought not Bartas a Poet but a Verser, because he wrote not Fiction'.¹³ Otherwise, English translators picked on such features as form, metre, diction, imagery and textual apparatus to recreate Du Bartas' grand synthesis of religious and philosophical content in English. These were urgent questions for translators who shared the sense of the poems' prestige described in the first chapter but approached the *Semaines* as continuous epic poems.

comment in the address to the reader before Philip Rosseter's *Booke of Ayres* (1601): 'as in Poesie we giue the preheminance to the Heroicall Poeme; so in Musicke, we yeeld the chiefe place to the graue and well inuented motet'.

¹¹ *Complete Works of George Gascoigne*, ed. by John W. Cunliffe, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1907-1910), I, 472-73.

¹² Francis Meres' *Comparison of English Poets* (1598), in Smith (ed.), II, 319.12-14. Torquato Tasso, *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The Recoverie of Hierusalem*, trans. by Edward Carew (1594); *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The Recoverie of Jerusalem*, trans. by Edward Fairfax (1600); Ovid, *Heroicall Epistles*, trans. by George Turberville (1567).

¹³ *Ben Jonson: Works*, ed. by C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52), I, 133.

i. William Scott's *Model of Poesy* and Translations from *La Sepmaine*

Scott writes in a prefatory letter to Henry Lee (who, incidentally, Sylvester praises at I.iv.599-606) that he hoped that *The Model of Poesy* was sufficiently original that ‘euen for the rarenes of these presented fruites (beeinge well neere without any precedent) they may be worth acceptance’ (2v). His choice of title may have reinforced the claim to originality: in full it reads, ‘The [MODELL] OF POESYE | Or | The Arte of Poesye drawn into a sho[r]t | or summary Discourse’ (1r). ‘Modell’ is illegible on the titlepage, but Scott restates the main title in the preface: ‘I offer your Honour this MODELL of POESY (indeede but modellinge my dutifull Affection)’ (2v). The noun ‘modell’ was a relatively new word in 1600: its general meaning here is ‘representation of structure’ (*OED*, ‘model’ *n.* I), with the specific sense of ‘a summary, epitome, abstract’ (1c); in the phrase ‘[M]odelling my dutifull affection’, Scott puns on an alternative meaning of ‘modell’: ‘something which accurately resembles or represents something else, esp. on a small scale; a person or thing that is the likeness of another’ (2a). Scott’s self-deprecating remarks about lack of time and experience do not suggest that *The Model* intends to be particularly prescriptive or systematic (i.e. ‘an object of imitation’ (II) or ‘a type or design’ (III)): the treatise is a summary description of poetry, similar in scope to Sidney’s *Defence* but less argumentative and slightly broader in range. As well as building on Sidney’s mock-oration in his treatise, Scott’s decision to translate from *La Sepmaine* may have consciously followed on from Sidney’s lead.

The treatise may be ‘without any precedent’, but Scott willingly admits his indebtedness to familiar humanist sources, including Horace, Aristotle, Julius Caesar Scaliger and Sidney. Scott mentions many contemporary poets, including Petrarch, Torquato Tasso, Geoffrey Chaucer, Thomas Wyatt, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey—and Du Bartas or Sylvester on twelve occasions. The treatise explains what poetry is, what the different kinds of poetry are, and what makes a good poem. Scott defines poetry as the shaping of creative

inspiration using reason, judgement and art: ‘The matter or substance must be admitted, mixed with, and molded by our Nature and Reason; borne & disposed by the assistance of Arte and Judgement’ (4r). The poet must be endowed with a suitable disposition: he should possess strong intuitions of virtue, piety and eternity, and be capable of love arising from ‘sensitue, reasonable or intellectuall apprehension of good’ (8r). As for kinds of poetry, Scott begins with varieties of ‘Heroicall or Epick’ verse (10r), and it is here that the first of his references to Du Bartas is found.

Scott defines ‘heroical’ poetry as narrative verse that deals with important subjects offering moral edification: ‘a Poeme or Imitation simply Narratyue, of greate and weightye thinges, in weighty and \high/ style, to rayse the mynde by admiration to some glorious good’ (10r). He subdivides heroic poems according to subject-matter. The first type is poetry based on the actions of heroic individuals; Homer, Virgil, Tasso and Ariosto all wrote such poetry, and ‘Bartas his Judith is a worthy patterne of a religiously trayned and vertuously luyinge woman’ (10v). Poems that describe individual people’s downfalls (e.g. *Mirror for Magistrates*, *Rape of Lucrece*) and other narratives that address ‘small seeminge matters, in highe and stately manner’ (11r; e.g. Spenser’s ‘Virgil’s Gnat’ and ‘Muiopotmos’) are also acceptable. *Judith* illustrated a divine aspect in some heroic poetry, while the *Semaines* confirms for Scott that divine and heroic poetry can also be philosophical. Scott refers to *La Sepmaine* when claiming that natural philosophical poetry is a separate tradition within heroic verse:

[t]his heroicall kynde handles sometymes Naturall knowledge, and Philosophy, by waye of discourse or Narration, as of old Empedocles, later Palingenius. Hitherto must be reduced [recalled] Ovids Metamorphosis, in Narration clowdinge much Naturall and Morall knowledge. In this kynde last in tyme, but first in worthynes, is our incomparable Bartas, who hath opened as much Naturall Science in one weeke, conteyninge the storye of the Creation, as all the rable of Schoole-men and Philosophers haue done since Plato and Aristotle; indeede, methinckes, what Jerome Zancheus, that sounde deepe diuine and refiner of true Naturall knowledge, (drawinge all to the touch-stone of truth) in his most diuynely philosophical writings, hath discussed & concluded, Bartas hath minced and sugred for the weakest and tendrest stomak, yet throughly to satisfie the strongest judgements; these deliueringe the knowledge of Nature in soe infinite varietye, and the Infinitenes of euery particuler, as it is to our concepite. (11r)

The phrase ‘storye of the Creation’ indicates that *La Sepmaine* is uppermost in Scott’s mind as a poem filled with ‘Naturall Science’ or ‘Naturall knowledge’; i.e. such fields as cosmology, astronomy, zoology and botany.¹⁴ Scott’s understanding of these terms can be understood through the comparisons he makes with other poets. Naming Empedocles illustrates where Scott departs from Sidney’s classification, and from Aristotelian descriptions in general: Sidney brackets him as one of several pre-Socratic philosophers who ‘under the masks of poets [...] sang their natural philosophy in verses’ (75. 3-4); Aristotle calls him a physicist, not a poet (φυσιολόγον μᾶλλον ἢ ποιητήν, *Poetics* 1447b.19-20).¹⁵ Scott places two Latin texts that were commonly used in sixteenth-century schools in the same category: Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus’s twelve-book *Zodiacus Vitae*, written in hexameter verse and translated into English by Barnabe Googe, and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.¹⁶ Scott connects the philosophical and moral value of Du Bartas’ verse to his religious outlook when he compares the Huguenot Du Bartas to the Italian Calvinist theologian Girolamo Zanchi, notable for his views on predestination, and respected by the Elizabethan religious establishment.¹⁷ Du Bartas’ Protestant poetry evaded the possible tension, identified by Linda Gregerson, that ‘the epic genre was also

¹⁴ Scott’s phrasing ‘in one weeke’ recalls the compliment that Ronsard paid to Du Bartas, which was recorded by Simon Goulart and is repeated by other English writers: see Kastner (ed.), *Poetical Works of William Drummond*, 1, xxi; William Bloys, *Meditations upon the XLII Psalme* (1632), O7v; and John Eliot in *Ortho-Epica Gallica* (see Chapters 1.i and 3.ii). For definitions and the range of Renaissance natural philosophy, see Ann Blair, ‘Natural Philosophy’, in *The Cambridge History of Science, vol. 3: Early Modern Science*, ed. by Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 365-406; in the same volume, see Mary Baine Campbell, ‘Literature’, pp. 756-72.

¹⁵ *Poetics*, ed. by D. W. Lucas (Oxford, 1968; repr. 1990). William Webbe reiterated Aristotle’s attitude towards Empedocles: ‘as Aristotle sayth of *Empedocles*, that in hys iudgment he was onely a naturall Philosopher, no Poet at all, nor that he was like unto *Homer* in any thing but hys meeter or number of feete, that is, that hee wrote in verse.’ *Discourse of English Poetry*, B4v-C1r. See Sacvan Bercovitch, ‘Empedocles in the English Renaissance’, *SP* 65 (1968), 67-80.

¹⁶ Palingenius and Du Bartas are compared in Luzius Keller, *Palingène, Ronsard, Du Bartas* (Bern, 1974); and see Foster Watson, *The Zodiacus Vitae of Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus* (London, 1908).

¹⁷ William Barrett was forced to retract criticisms which he made about Zanchi, Theodore Beza and other theologians in a sermon preached in Cambridge on 29 April 1595: see Girolamo Zanchi, *The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination Stated and Asserted* (Perth, 1793), pp. 24-26 and Elizabeth Allen, ‘Barrett, William (b. c.1561, d. in or after 1630)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1521>]. See also John Swan’s pairing of Zanchi and Du Bartas (Chapter 4.ii). Palingenius had gained favour in Elizabethan England for his satirical tone towards the Roman church, though he never stepped ‘a foote from the true Catholicke faith’ (*The Zodiacke of Life*, trans. by Barnabe Googe (1576), ¶4r).

preeminently equated with Virgil, which is to say, with Rome', offering instead a form of heroic poetry both divine and philosophical.¹⁸

Elsewhere in the treatise, Scott admires the synthesis of sacred and secular material encouraged in 'L'Uranie', and commends Du Bartas for his high-minded rejection of profane literature: 'Truely I see not that Bartas wanteth any grace may be looked for in a Poet, though worthely he contemne these heathnish Raggés, garnishing his Poeme with most proper and sweete allusions storyes and graces, arising from honest truth and vnsuperstitious conceipts, as you may especially note in his Judith' (24v; see also 24r). Scott repeats this claim later with a quotation from *La Sepmaine*: 'as Bartas sayth waste not your precious tyme and giftes in wanton argument [...] Lett euery one resolute as diuine Bartas doth, after a worthye reproofe of heathnish conceipted & loose Poetts. || Or tout tel que ie suis \J'ay/ du tout destiné [...]' (42r; quoting I.ii.26-30 in French and English). He adds that this is a 'resolution becominge a modest vertuous mynde'. The scriptural foundations of the *Semaines* lent moral authority to their presentation of natural philosophy.

These theoretical considerations were paired with an admiration for Du Bartas' style. Scott's comments and quotations are focused on *La Sepmaine*, but he had also encountered *La Seconde Semaine* (alluding to Du Bartas' praise for Julius Scaliger in 'Babylone' (18v)). French quotations from *La Sepmaine* in *The Model* indicate that Scott was most likely using a 1588 Chouët/Durant edition of the poems, but may have seen a 1593 Chouët edition.¹⁹ Both editions contain Simon Goulart's commentary and annotations, which marked up the informative aspects of the poems that Scott foregrounds in *The Model*; the marginalia in Scott's translation often paraphrase Goulart's annotations, and his interpolations are usually inserted

¹⁸ Linda Gregerson, *The Reformation of the Subject* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 4.

¹⁹ On fol. 32v Scott quotes a line that only appears in Chouët editions: 'La nuict peut temperer, du iour la secheresse' (I.i.499; Holmes et al., I, 212). Scott's insertion to the line 'Or tout tel que je suis, \J'ay/ du tout destiné' (42r, I.ii.27) may indicate that he worked from the 1588 edition, in which this line has no 'J'ay' (copy consulted at All Souls College, Oxford (classmark: hh. 13.12)), but later saw a 1593 edition which does (and which exists in two versions with different titlepages for Durant and Chouët; copy consulted at Jesus College, Oxford (classmark: I.7.29)); alternatively Scott could have added the word himself, having noted that the line was hypometrical.

where the Chouët text is broken up to supply Goulart's commentary. Scott also knew Josuah Sylvester's 'well-labour'd & commendable translation of the second weeke of Bartas' (42v), *The Second Weeke* (1598), and criticizes the length of Sylvester's forty-line interpolation at the beginning of 'Eden' (42v; see Sylvester, A6v-7r), which distorts the original; Scott's own invocations are just four lines long each (see 53r and 66v (twice)).²⁰ Scott viewed the simpler structure in the French as a specific stylistic merit, noting that 'some [poets] ioyne the Proposition & Invocation together; as Homer and Bartas' (42v; see 44r on *Judith*). Indeed, Scott found that Du Bartas' poetry possesses the four desirable qualities for poetry: proportion (20r, 33v), variety (20r, 34r), sweetness (21v, 34v) and *energia* ('forceableness', 25r, 38r). He gives examples in two direct quotations, the first of which is a description of the night found in a passage about poetic sweetness. Scott praises Du Bartas' plain, direct and rousing verse as he asks: 'Can any thinge be more cleere, pure, full, fluent, softe & sweete? Lykewise all style is of a sharpe quicknes or stirringe, that procedes from the inwarde warmenes of the affection' (33r; 32v-33r quoting I.i.499-507). The parallel constructions in that passage make the structure transparent ('cleere, pure, full'), and cadences are well-balanced in the French, though less so in Scott's accompanying English. The other quotation, by contrast, occurs in the discussion of *energia* and highlights asyndeton and evocative diction that Scott does imitate:

Bartas speaking of Thunder sayth: Sans cesse il tourbillonne
 Il bourdonne, il fremit, il muge, il bruit, il tonne
 This ambitiously translated
 And without rest he tumbleth, rolles rounde ouer vnder
 Doth pantinge, frett, groane, chafe, rage, fume, storme, bellowe, thunder
 (39r, quoting I.ii.661-62)

²⁰ Other writers avoid Sylvester's interpolations when quoting the poems too, implicitly marking them as subsidiary to Du Bartas' arguments: for example, George Hakewill (see Chapter 3.ii) omits six lines of Sylvester's poetry italicized and in parentheses in *Devine Weekes* (I.iii.867-72) when quoting lines I.iii.865-884 in an *Apologie* (1627), S3r.

Scott contemplates the metrics of heroic verse near the treatise's conclusion. He discusses English versification in some detail, comparing it with classical prosody and observing that the prevalence of monosyllables in English poses a problem when writing quantitative metre 'bycause euery such worde will haue a full or longe tyme, and soe our feete [...] are distinguished by the accent or moderation of the sounde' (35v). After various Aristotelian comments on the heroic, such as '[t]he ende of the Heroick is to lift vp the mynde, by some worthy & manly affection, to some more then ordinary pitch of vertue' (41r), Scott decides that hexameter is equally suitable when writing heroic verse:

for your style it must be riche & highe, and then your verse must be Hexameter (called Heroicall as most proper to this kinde) [...] when you come to more busye & troobled matter this verse is more Capable of forceablenes & vehemencie; and this statelynes and grauety is as well seene in our vulgare kynde of Hexameter, as in the ancient (44r-v)

Scott concedes that others may prefer heptameter or pentameter (44v) but selects hexameter not just for its historical associations, but for the force, strength and grandeur he heard in it. Scott's appreciation for Du Bartas' importance grew alongside the translations he was preparing, in which the poetic outcomes of these ideas are explored.

The manuscript in which the translation survives has suffered damage in its final leaves such that some passages are illegible and subsequent leaves have been lost. We cannot know whether Scott only translated the first two days, but even if so he is unusual in beginning from the start of the *Semaines* and working through in order. Though the anonymous 1595 translator had probably begun with 'Le Premier Jour' too, he recognized that it made his translation vulnerable to obsolescence, and by the late 1590s translators were choosing sections they found immediately relevant and which had not appeared in print. Scott's choice is evidence that he never intended the translation primarily for the eyes of its dedicatee, his uncle George Wyatt (grandson of Sir Thomas). Though a manuscript work, it is unsurprising

that Scott highlights the *Semaines*' divine and natural knowledge by including marginalia, some of which are adapted from Goulart's annotations. Their primary purpose is to divide the text into its different topics, e.g.: 'God eternall and describ'd' (53v) and 'The wordle [*sic*] a glasse to see God in' (55r). The translator is particularly attentive to the structure ('proportion' is closer to Scott's terminology) of Du Bartas' argument, and numbers individual reasons within an argument. These divisions follow the syntax of Du Bartas' periods, such as those containing series of appositive clauses marked off by the phrases 'veu que' or 'soit que' ('seeing that' or 'or that'). On 60v, for example, the numbers one to five in the margin mark various 'opinions' about how light was made, presented as a series of 'soit que' clauses in French. This structure is only apparent from the marginalia, since it is unclear where the first reason starts, while the remaining four use different phrases to introduce the parallel clauses. The frequent use of the word 'reason' may correspond to Scott's understanding of how Renaissance dialectic informed poetic analysis.²¹

Though he clearly registers *La Sepmaine* as a single poem, Scott arguably lacks a sense of the cosmic vision that animates its structure. He principally imitates Du Bartas' grand style by translating into rhymed hexameter lines, hemistich by hemistich. His line length and medial caesurae take coherence away from his translation, particularly in contrast to Sylvester's shorter lines. Nor does Scott have Sylvester's capacity or inclination to blend original imagery into the English, as we see in the following example where Sylvester transports Du Bartas' scene to May Day celebrations:

As the jocant Ringe
 Of milk-maydes, trampelinge on the carpets of thee springe,
 Marringe their measur'd trippings with the Tabers stroake
 Dauncinge all in a round, vnder an Elme or Oake
 Doe couple hande in hande, soe as the first is fast
 By them that come betwene, lincked vnto the last. (71r)

²¹ I owe this point to Michael Hetherington, who delivered a paper on Scott's 'logical poetics' at the Renaissance Society of America's annual meeting, 24 March 2012.

comme les pastourelles

Qui, d'un pied trepignant, foulent les fleurs nouvelles
 Et mariant leurs bons au son du chalumeau,
 Gayes, balent en rond sous les bras d'un ormeau,
 Se tiennent main à main, si bien que la premiere
 Par celles du milieu se joint à la derniere. (I.ii.309-14)

As Country Maydens in the Month of *May*
 Merrily sporting on a Holy-day,
 And lustie dauncing of a lively Round,
 About the May-pole, by the Bag-pipes sound;
 Hold hand in hand, so that the first is fast,
 By meanes of those betweene, unto the last. (Sylvester, I.ii.327-32)

In Scott's version the movement from line to line is rougher, the phrasing is less tight, and the bucolic image lacks focus. Likewise, Scott produces a less memorable and technically accomplished reading of these well-known lines:

This wordle is Gods great booke, wherein he doth imparte
 In capitall great letters, his admired Arte,
 Where each worke is a page, and each effect of his
 Is as one Character, whose fayre draught perfect is. (Scott, 55v)

Le monde est un grand livre, où du souverain maistre
 L'admirable artifice on list en grosse lettre.
 Chasque œuvre est une page, et chasque sien effect
 Est un beau caractere en tous ses traits parfaict. (I.i.151-54)

The World's a Booke in *Folio*, printed all
 With God's great Workes in Letters Capitall:
 Each Creature, is a Page, and each effect,
 A faire Character, void of all defect. (Sylvester; I.i.173-76)

Various features attenuate Scott's heroic line: monosyllables, such as the epanalectic repetition of 'is', and its rhyme with 'of his'; multiple subclauses ('wherein [...]', 'Where [...]', 'whose [...]'); and tautological adjectives ('capitall great letters', 'fayre draught perfect is'); unconvincing repetition of words and sounds ('great', 'admired Arte', 'Where each worke' or 'each [...] each effect'). Scott's obedience to his self-imposed metrical demands hinders his translation in these and other ways, just as Lisle's medial caesura weakened his translation (see Chapter 1.iii). Scott allows the metre to affect his diction, for example, as he translates

‘puissance’ as ‘Puissance’ (53r), ‘powerfulnesse’ (53v) and ‘Might’ (e.g. 54r and 55v) whenever it fits best within the metre. ‘Puissance’ is one of several examples of the author’s apparently more adventurous word choices being anglicized forms of Du Bartas’ French: others include ‘malapart’ (53v), ‘Soureigne’ (54r), ‘palpable’ (57v), ‘bronde’ (60v, French ‘brandon’) and ‘gulph’ (61r). Similarly, an idiosyncratic metaphor added in the opening lines of the First Day has the primary benefit of creating a rhyme with ‘maye’: ‘Graunt me *thou* mightye God, that in my verse I maye | The diuerse and choise wares of this wordles shopp display’ (‘O grand Dieu, donne-moy que j’estale en mes vers | Les plus rares beautez de ce grand univers’, l.i.9-10; 53r). This close attention to prosody weakens the translation’s musical and visual appeal.

Having observed in the treatise that monosyllables are particularly prevalent in English (35v), single-syllable words dominate his translation. Moreover, numerous small discrepancies between the translated extracts in *The Model* and Scott’s translation, which are surely authorial given that it is unlikely that the manuscript circulated while he was writing, suggest insensitivity to fine distinctions of meaning: in the Night description from the ‘First Day’ (60r-61v), for example, ‘should’ appears for ‘doth’, ‘setts our myndes at ease’ for ‘giues our mynde free peace’, ‘worlde’ for ‘Earth’, and ‘softely [...] calme’ replaces ‘calmely [...] softe’. Such changes suggest a translator inattentive to subtle differences between auxiliary verbs, or whether ‘monde’ is more accurately translated as ‘world’ or ‘Earth’.

Scott’s translation, plausibly intended for scribal circulation alone and dedicated to his uncle, struggles to imitate Du Bartas’ bold, public poetry in its private context. The translation is overstretched by its adherence to the principles of form and content outlined in *The Model*. Scott reads the *Semaines* as heroic poetry but cannot raise his translation to the same pitch. He is significant for Du Bartas’ reception, however, in reflecting on the *Semaines* as a single work and understanding their achievement within contemporary poetry as no other writer had done previously. Scott thinks seriously about where the *Semaines* belong in the English poetic

canon. The two translators to whom I now turn, Robert Barret and Thomas Winter, wrote versions that similarly aspired to capture the learning and eloquence of the *Semaines*. Their translations, like Scott's, offer a viewpoint on the *Semaines*' significance *in toto* and how they should be represented in English.

ii. Seventeenth-Century Coalescence

Thomas Winter

The preface to Prince Henry before Thomas Winter's *Third Daye* (1604; A2r-v) shows how previously fragmented aspects of Du Bartas' works and reception—James's admiration, philosophical argumentation, Horatian poetics, printed marginalia, heroic verse—were coalescing into a shared interpretation of the *Semaines* as the poems' reputation stabilized to a degree in the seventeenth century.²² Winter alludes to James's translations in his *Poetical Exercises* (1591; see Chapter 1.i) and the King's admiring reference in *Basilikon Doron* (1599; repr. 1603; see Chapter 3.ii), but also esteems Du Bartas as a teacher of 'Divinity and Philosophy' for his 'insensible [imperceptible] mixture of profit and pleasure', and for his 'sweete measure and delicate cadencie of a maiestical verse'. Winter writes of the *Semaines* as a theosophical synthesis in which Du Bartas has 'artificially compounded' serious matter and pleasing poetry into a work suitable for 'any Prince, or other good Christian'. 'Maiestical' picks up on both the *Semaines*' epic grandeur and their regal qualities, as does his use of the word 'heroical' in his closing pledge to pray 'for your Graces happie growth in all Princely and heroicall vertues'.

The epistle to Walter Raleigh in his translation of the Second Day makes similar claims when it states that Du Bartas 'was so noble for his birth, so famous for his learning, and so admirable for his inuention' (A2v). Where Scott argued for the *Semaines*' epic qualities

²² When quoting signature numbers from Winter's translations, I refer to *The Second Day of the First Weeke* as '1603' and *The Third Dayes Creation* as '1604'.

from their form, Winter argues from their political associations. Though his translation is described as ‘heroical verse’ on the titlepage, Winter alludes to the possible unsuitability of his metre in the preface: ‘[I] haue done him [Du Bartas] iniury, to cloath him with a sute so ill fitting to his proportion’ (A2v).²³ ‘Proportion’ may refer to the translation’s style or metre (II.8a), or perhaps to its brevity (i.e. proportion meaning ‘size, magnitude’ (*OED* I. 3a)) in only offering one Day; either way, the translator offers his translation as ill-becoming Du Bartas’ reputation.

The titlepages to both translations inform us that Winter had taken a Master of Arts degree, though neither adds that it was taken at Magdalen College, Oxford.²⁴ Like Damman, Winter’s translations from *La Sepmaine* are at the interface between natural philosophy, theology and poetry, and present textual apparatus suitable for a scholarly readership. Winter includes prose arguments (1603, B1r-v; 1604, B1r-2r) which give some context for the Day’s place within Du Bartas’ Week, and set out the topics covered. In his ‘philosophicall narration of the thunder and lightning’ Du Bartas ‘shewes himself a Philosopher in producing these naturall reasons, yet he would haue euery man to shew himselfe a Christian, in not wholly resting satisfied with these second causes’ (1603, B1v). Also like Damman, Winter packs the preliminaries to his translation with dedicatory verses from university men, including several who were linked to Magdalen (A3r-A4v in both): John Davies of Hereford, who praises the ‘heate’ of Winter’s work despite his frosty-sounding name; the grammarian John Sanford, author of the French textbook *Le Guichet François* (1604; Du Bartas is mentioned on E3r); the physician Edward Lapworth, who also wrote verses for *Devine Weekes*; plus Henry Atwood, Nathaniel Tomkins, Thomas Mason, John Dunster and Douglas Castillion.²⁵ As James

²³ Sylvester used the same metaphor in *The Triumph of Faith* (1592): ‘I maie seeme to haue spoiled these books (his louely babes) of their rich & sumptuous French garments, to cloath them in so poore & base English weeds as my course wardrobe affoorded’ (A3r).

²⁴ Foster, p. 1662.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 43 (Atwood), p. 249 (Castillion), p. 434 (Dunster), p. 984 (Mason), p. 1493 (Tomkins). Charlotte Fell-Smith, ‘Sandford, John (c.1565–1629)’, rev. Elizabeth Haresnape, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24639>]; C. L. Kingsford, ‘Lapworth, Edward (1574–1636)’, rev. Sarah

Doelman has observed, some of these names re-appear in two works published in the same year: the volume of panegyric poetry, *Academiae Oxoniensis Pietas*, which also contains references to Du Bartas (see Chapter 3.ii); and the prefatory verses to Davies of Hereford's *Microcosmos* (see Chapter 6.ii).²⁶ The connection with *Microcosmos* is useful because Davies of Hereford, like Winter, does not separate the *Semaines'* rhetorical innovations from their subject-matter. Winter produced his translation in an environment shared with scholars who were interested in languages, natural philosophy and James's accession.

This intellectual background guided Winter's decision to translate sections with more natural-philosophical interest, but his choices were also influenced by his awareness of other translations that were then available. He and his booksellers James Shaw (who was an apprentice to William Ponsonby, to whom Sidney's translation was entered) and Thomas Clarke knew that his publications were entering a congested market, even though they were the first English translations to appear in print for these sections, and apparently no complete translation had been printed.²⁷ *The First Day* of 1595 (Chapter 1.ii) may have prevented Winter's translation of that section from coming to print, but also may have established a precedent for publishing individual Days, even though a full translation of *La Sepmaine* (which would contain the Third Day) was surely imminent. It was probably not distributed widely: no contemporary references have come to light, and few copies survive today.

The printed marginalia in English and Latin provide an insight into what Winter's translations sought to achieve. Winter probably wrote them without assistance from Goulart, and in one instance an annotation defends the decision to translate 'aubades' (I.iii.890) as 'sportfulness' (1604, E4v): 'The word *Aubades* signifies such squealing musique, as fiddling

Bakewell, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16066>]; Davies of Hereford may never have been officially attached to Oxford or Magdalen, but did write two sonnets in praise of the college (*Microcosmos* (1603), 2N4r).

²⁶ James Doelman, 'The Accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', *SEL* 34 (1994), 19-40 (39, 56n and 57n). *Microcosmos*, A4v (Sanford), B2v (Castillion), B4v (Tomkins); *Academiae Oxoniensis Pietas* (1603), F7r (Castillion), H10v (Tomkins).

²⁷ H. G. Aldis et al., *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640* (London, 1910) [accessed through <http://www.bbti.bham.ac.uk/>]. See Part I, preface.

minstrels play at mens windowes'. These marginalia give distinctively specific summaries of the argument, such as '[t]he foure chief winds resembled to the foure seasons of the yeare, the foure humors of a mans bodie, the foure elements, and the foure ages' (1603, D3r).

Explanatory notes are tied to specific phrases using asterisks, like 'Iosephus in the warres of the Iewes' for 'temple' (1603, E3r). In *The Third Dayes Creation* other annotations corroborate factual information with sources, and are linked to the text using lower-case letters. In a catalogue of plants on sigs D4v and E1r, the margins are filled with references in Latin and English of this type: 'The Italians (saith Matthiolus) call this herbe *Sferra-cauallo*, that is, Vnshoe horse. Florio seemes to make it all one with the herbe *Æthiopis* mentioned by Plinie lib. 26. cap. 4.' (D4r). These marginalia assert the translator's breadth of learning: Winter refers here to Pierre Ercoli Matthioli's commentary on Dioscorides (Venice, 1548) as well as Pliny. They also encourage an exegetical process that corroborates Du Bartas' statements about the natural world while isolating memorable comparisons (similes are often marked in the margins). The translation is readable, undramatic and sensitive to individual word-choices as well as larger structures of meaning: these accurate though prosy translations fit the scholarly environment in which they were produced by staying close to Du Bartas' arguments, though without imaginative flair. The following excerpt, marked 'Howe the springs are engendred', is typical:

For the drie earth this falling water straines
 Through the thin boulder of her hollow veines,
 Then makes it[s] way, and from the rockie mountaines,
 Makes bubble daily millions of fountaines;
 Of these the litle gurgling brookes do grow,
 Which ioyn'd do make the wasting torrents flow,
 The wasting torrents do proud riuers forme,
 Of which the sailing floud is eftsoones borne. (1604, C1r)

Car la terre alteree ayant passé ces eaux
 Par le rare tamis de ses cavez boyaux,
 Luy fait voye à la fin, et des roches hautaines
 Fait sourdre jour et nuict mille vives fontaines:
 Des fontaines se font les ruisseaux murmurans,
 Des murmurans ruisseaux les ravageux torrens,

Des torrens ravageux les superbes rivieres,
Des rivieres se font les ondes marinieres. (I.iii.127-134)

Winter replaces the tumbling anaphora and repetition with relative pronouns that regulate the sense, and the solitary repeated phrase ‘wasting torrents’. More pronouns reduce the number of syllables and decongest syntax and imagery; however, the lines do not scan well despite chevilles like the auxiliary verb ‘do’. Winter curbs Du Bartas’ rhetoric where Sylvester indulges it, by stripping the poem of some of its linguistic decoration in order to concentrate on the sense.

This emphasis on presenting Du Bartas’ arguments while being accurate in his prosody leads Winter to employ a formal, polysyllabic vocabulary, including terms directly loaned or translated from the French. Words that Winter uses, but neither Scott nor Sylvester (in the whole *Devine Weekes*) does, include: anneareth (1603, B3r and E3v), antipathie (1603, C1v; contre-carré, I.ii.235), discolours (1603, C1r; changent, 210), ravishment (1603, C3r; la ravissant, 331), impediment (1603, C3v; empeschement, 351), waggish (1603, D2r; 479), and valorous (1604, C3v; valeureux, 312). Moreover, Winter uses at least twenty words that have no earlier recorded use in the *OED*. Nine of them are the *OED*’s first cited use for their particular sense: Magnesian (1604, E3v; adj.¹), moist sugar (1604, D3r; adj.), nombril (1604, D1v; n.2), pother (1603, F4r), queendom (1603, D4v), redly (1604, D4r; adv.²), rendezvous (1604, C1r; *OED* n.3b), rumblement (1604, D1v), and retrogression (1604, B3v). A further eleven words antedate the *OED*’s first cited use (while ‘croysure’ (1604, B4r), meaning ‘cruciform’, has no entry): annihilation (1603, B4r), antiperistasis (1603, D1r), journement (1604, C2r; jour apres jour, 211), manat (1603, F3v), redescent (1603, F1r), stickerly (1604, C4r), sunderment (1603, F2r), symbolize (1603, C1v), and transparently (1604, C4r). Though many words sound French (especially where the suffix ‘-ment’ is used) relatively few are directly imported. Most describe abstract ideas, rather than adding descriptive colour. Many of

these words are placed at line-endings, and are made to rhyme possession/ retrogression (1604, B3v), element/ sunderment (1603, F2r), drie/ stickerly (1604, C4r). Such double rhymes and diction lend his translation the cadences of prose: 'For one halfe houre you may passe ouer drie, | The other halfe it runnes so stickerly, | As none can passe' (1604, C4r).

Winter translates the poem into 'heroical verse', but does not attempt to create his own English version of Du Bartas' style. Snyder describes his efforts as 'decent but rather colourless translations in workmanlike verse' and finds that he tends to translate 'piecemeal while missing the drift of the whole' (p. 63), while for Prescott, Winter's verse 'is not daring or intense, but fairly pretty, despite some lax or stiff rhythms' (p. 185). Winter's translation strategy is congruous with its presentation in both publications that emphasizes its scholarly qualities. Such a translation led to linguistic innovation, and promoted Du Bartas' Christian philosophy to Winter's associates and dedicatees. Though it responded directly to James's approval for the *Semaines*, Winter did not realize the *Semaines'* potential as a popular, public work of poetry that could be read outside learned circles.

Robert Barret

Snyder characterized Barret as being 'the opposite of Winter, lacking not imagination but control', and his translations from the *Seconde Semaine* as a 'tumbling, energetic affair' in which 'Barret rejoices in, even adds to, the poem's store of conceits and stylistic decorations' (p. 64). Prescott writes that the translations have 'an angular and eccentric charm, and Barret is seldom as dull as Lisle, Hudson, and James', but later offered a harder judgement: 'Convolutéd, almost insanely asyndetic, his disheveled verse deserves its outcast state'.²⁸ Schlesinger found a more meticulous and empirical strain in his work: commenting on Barret's interpolations, she observes a contrast between Barret's 'matter-of-fact, detailed, pedagogical thinking' and Du Bartas' 'sensory-emotional, creative, excursive habit of

²⁸ Prescott, 'An Unknown Translation of Du Bartas', *Renaissance News* 19 (1966), 12-13 (13); 'Du Bartas', p. 189.

thought'.²⁹ Indeed, Barret's supposed wildness only distracts us from appreciating where this translation belongs alongside his other works, and why it almost became the main English translation in print, had Islip not transferred rights to Lownes. Moreover, Barret's fascination with Du Bartas' intertextuality, non-fictional information, technical vocabulary and his desire to supplement the originals is representative of broader trends that would emerge in the *Semaines'* English reception.

The translation entered into the Stationers' Register in 1602 mentions virtually all of Du Bartas' poems absent from the Folger manuscript (see Part I, preface). Perhaps the manuscript destined for Islip's print-shop was separated from the translated poems that do survive, namely all of *La Seconde Semaine* that had been printed before 1603 (II.i, II.ii, II.iii.2 and 3, II.iv.1 and 2, and 'Jonah' but not 'Le Schisme' (1603; II.iv.3)), as well as 'Lepanto', 'Canticle of Ivory' and 'Judith'.³⁰ The manuscript's later ownership by the eighteenth-century watchmaker David Jones may reflect Barret's Welsh ancestry, but provides no clues about the remainder of Barret's translations.³¹ Barret spent a sustained period translating Du Bartas, and developed a verse style that resembles the French poet's more than any other translator considered so far: as Snyder observed, '[i]t is surely more than coincidence that the two translators who were most capable of transmitting Du Bartas' manner as well as his matter were also the two who persevered longest in their work' (p. 65). Barret's translations may well have been intended for printing, and obstructed only by the Lownes-Sylvester translation.

Barret and Sylvester are also the only translators to include interpolations imitating Du Bartas' style. Supplementary passages in Barret's work, far from being uncontrolled, were researched and then inserted within the text under new headings, and correspond to the

²⁹ Schlesinger, 'Du Bartas and Sylvester', pp. 120-26.

³⁰ It is not clear exactly which pre-1603 edition Barret was using: he follows earlier variants in 'The Furies' at lines 26 ('embrassant' for 'cherissant') and 111 ('le soleil' instead of 'le frere'), but seems to use a later edition in 'Babylon' (ll. 524-39, p. 104).

³¹ Jones wrote his name and several notes on the manuscript, including a order dated to 'May the 26th 1793' (p. 207; see also, e.g., 263 and 331), that identify him with the watchmaker whose biography appeared in the *Merthyr Telegraph* in 1861; see transcribed, 'David Jones, Senior, Watchmaker, of Merthyr Tydfil, 1861', *Merthyr Historian* 10 (1999), 265-67.

interests evident from his other surviving works. Barret's prose treatise *The Theorike and Practike of Modern Warre* (1598), a work that grew out of his military career (which may explain where Barret acquired his knowledge of French) contains descriptions of weaponry, of tactics, of military hierarchies, and arithmetical tables showing possible divisions of troops.³² These topics reappear in *The Sacred Warr*, a verse chronicle in thirty-two books about the crusades based on William, Archbishop of Tyre's twelfth-century *Historia Hierosolymitana*, but also containing sections on contemporary conflicts between Christians and Muslims. As Chapter 6 examines in detail, his translations from Du Bartas are a stylistic and structural inspiration for *The Sacred Warr*. Although the digressions in his translations do concern martial affairs, they also correspond to Barret's fondness for arithmetical and technical information. Barret justifies the additions in the argument to 'The Pillars':

I haue; in this my traduction, added somewhat, of Arythmetick, Geometrie, and Musike, yt hathe been principally doon for myne owne exercise: And not, as thincking those learned paynes of the Inimitable Du Bartas to be in any sorte defective therein; and so I desyre my paynes and meaning to be construed. (p. 130)³³

These additions amount to three and a half stanzas on arithmetic (p. 132, after line 58 in the French), eight stanzas introducing Euclidean geometry (p. 138, after line 194) and a coda with fourteen and a half stanzas about music theory (pp. 151-54).³⁴ This final addition comes after the final line of 'The Pillars' and is entitled 'Barrets Corolarium'; in the previous book, an eight-stanza addition appearing at the end of 'The Colonies' in praise of Elizabeth (pp. 127-28) is also entitled a 'Corolarium'. These 'Corolaria' or corollaries may have been 'exercises' in self-improvement but also update these twenty-year-old poems with new information.

³² See Nick de Somogyi, 'Barret, Robert (fl. 1586?–1607)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1519>] and occasional references in his *Shakespeare's Theatre of War* (Aldershot, 1998).

³³ The scenario of 'The Pillars' is taken from Josephus's *Antiquities of the Jews*, which records that Seth (third son of Adam and Eve) and his descendents built two pillars inscribed with mathematical and scientific discoveries.

³⁴ Schlesinger, 'Du Bartas and Sylvester', pp. 123-24; Prescott, 'Unknown Translation', 12-13.

Barret picks up and integrates specialized language into his translation in order to supplement Du Bartas' surveys of these topics. One of his sources was Leonard Digges' *A Geometrical Practise named Pantometria* (1571; repr. 1591). Barret may well have been drawn to this work as a 'Geometricall Practise' that did not just expound Euclidean principles (although that is what he borrows in this coda) but taught through applied examples: a grounding in geometry was necessary 'to attayne exacte knowledge in *Astronomie, Musicke, Perspective, Cosmographie* and *Nauigation*, with many other Sciences and faculties' (A2r).³⁵ Barret's three 'exercises' for 'The Pillars' are filled with lists of basic geometrical vocabulary from Digges:

Quadrangled figures foure sorts wee fynde behoulde
 The square, and long foote Parallelogramme;
 The poincted Rhombus; and Rhomboides frame;
 Then bee Trapezia-sundry; next enroullde,
 The Pentagon, the hexagon, the heptagon,
 The Octagon, the Ennagon, and Decagon;
 With many-many Poligonas moe,
 Lo, in her tablet how they stande aroe. (p. 138)

The reference to 'tablet' and the amendment to 'behoulde' in this quotation direct the reader to the geometrical figures, also from Digges, that Barret has drawn in the margins on either page as a visual companion to the text. An auto-didactic motivation may also have led Barret to take time over these painstaking compositions: having prepared the page with ruled lines and compass-drawn curves using a sharp point (just as guide-lines are marked where the text is written) Barret inked the corners and then drew the full shape (see pp. 138-39); pieces cut out from pages 98 and 135 may show where errors were made in other drawings. Barret's *Theorike and Practike* explored military applications of geometry, and he may have known Digges' treatise through his work on ballistics. Barret understood mensuration as a practical skill with multiple applications, including those mentioned in 'The Pillars' (such as astronomy), and the translation gives equal weight to the information and technical

³⁵ Katie Taylor, 'Vernacular Geometry: Between the Senses and Reason', *BSHM Bulletin* 26 (2011), 147-59.

understanding needed. He supplements the practical knowledge in the *Semaines* using another treatise to renew the poems' dynamic synthesis of applied learning; his engagement is more active than simply versifying factual information for mnemonic purposes.³⁶ The pentameter line '1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, zero' (p. 133) epitomizes Barret's desire to summarize elementary knowledge by expanding Du Bartas' survey of arithmetic. In 'Barrets Corolarium' to the *Pillars*, he employs musicological terminology loaned from Thomas Morley, *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke* (1597), another 'practicall' handbook to a discipline, vocabulary which is recycled in a sequence in *The Sacred Warr*. His coinage 'corolarium' for describing this insertion implies that Barret is being self-consciously innovative in fusing different components from several sources.

The textual apparatus in the manuscripts provides further insights into Barret's view on the poems. Barret, like Winter, composes prose arguments for each section. The argument for 'The Furies', for example, serves a similar function to Winter's, but is more attentive to the contours of Du Bartas' argument: 'for more to exaggerate the miseries of man, hee proueth the advantage that other creatures haue about hym' (p. 38). Barret's marginalia are more comprehensive: they serve to gloss proper nouns (e.g. 'Ophtalmia, a hot imposition in the eies' (p. 46)) and track the argument (e.g. 'Since Mans transgression the secret hatreds of sundry creatures' (p. 40)). Brief notes for unfamiliar or obscure terms are also provided; in the catalogue of diseases in 'The Furies', Barret supplies a series of glosses, such as 'the Amerik, is the poxe'; 'Crauros, the kings Euill' and 'Epilepsia, falling sicknes' (p. 51). Around half of Barret's marginalia label rhetorical terms. These are more varied and specific than those in other translations, and are good evidence that his stylistic enthusiasm was more principled and controlled than has previously been allowed. Two rarer rhetorical terms used frequently by Barret in 'The Furies' are defined together in Henry Peacham's *Garden of Eloquence* (1593):

³⁶ Though for an analysis of mnemotechnics in the *Semaines*, see Gilles Banderier, 'Du Bartas et l'ars memorativa', *Tangence* 87 (2008), 31-45.

‘Scesis onomaton’, meaning ‘when a sentence or saying doe consist altogether of nownes’ (G4v); and ‘hyrmos’, which occurs ‘when an vnfashioned order of speech is long continued’ (H1r; though Barret, like Puttenham, spells the term ‘Irmus’ (p. 54) without a rough breathing).³⁷ Barret distinguishes between three specialized types of zeugma, also described by Peacham (K2v-3r): ‘prozeugma’ (p. 48), ‘metozeugma’ (p. 54) and ‘hypozeugma’ (p. 39). Other terms used in ‘The Furies’ are ‘apharesis’ (p. 45; C2r), ‘apocope; syncope’ (p. 43; C2r), ‘ecphonesis’ (p. 43; K4r) and ‘homœosis’ (p. 44; not in Peacham). Though Snyder does not take Barret’s marginalia as evidence of methodical translation, she is right to comment that he adds to Du Bartas’ ‘store of conceits and stylistic decorations’ (p. 64), as we see in the following passage:

Her greedy gorge dyshe after dyshe devowres	Anaphora	
Her staunchles Maw, meat after meat recalls;		
Her gourmande paunche still eating still out powres;		
Her owne babes fleshe not fylls her greed [<i>sz</i>] galls:		(p. 45)

Son gosier va cherchant la viande ès viandes;	
L’un mets l’autre semond; ses entrailles gourmandes	
Se vuydent en mangeant. De ses enfans la chair	
Son enragé desir ne peut mesme estancher.	(II.i.3.253-57)

The marginal notes alongside insertions like these suggest that Barret’s additions are a controlled and deliberate expansion of his translation’s rhetorical range: the translator is self-consciously fashioning his poetic style. In the following example, Barret introduces anadiplosis (on ‘sweet’), marked in the margin, but also adds a triple-barrelled compound (‘Oulde-cumbred-Chaos’) and epizeuxis on ‘Enyon’:

That frights fell <i>Enyon</i> ; <i>Enyon</i> that applies	Enyon the Goddess,	
Oulde-cumbred-Chaos gayne to set on feet	or furie of warre	
Th’aye-smyling heaven, which eye[s] his Mystris sweet	Anadiplosis	
Sweet <i>Mell</i> , and <i>Manna</i> in her bosome powred.		(p. 40)
Qu’Ennyon s’en estonne, Ennyon qui, cruelle,		
Les antiques debats du Chaos renouvelle.		

³⁷ Puttenham, *Arte of English Poesie* (1593), V3v.

Le ciel, qui tousjours-beau sa maistresse œilladoit,
 Qui rien que manne et miel dans son sein n'espandoit. (II.i.3.45-48)

Sylvester and other translators avoid erasing paragraph divisions as Barret does here.

Deletions in the manuscript on this page suggest Barret was struggling to make the words fit the lines. Though Snyder (p.64) may be right that Barret's eight-line stanza is a poor match for Du Bartas' hexameter as topics and sentences are broken up between stanzas, Barret's versification should be not dismissed outright for it is consistent with his tendency to insert new figures. His method is intrusive, but that puts the translator in command to reinvent Du Bartas' style in ways that earlier translators had largely avoided.

In other regards Barret's translation, written in a stanza form he later described as heroic, makes a concerted effort to make his work a receptacle for practical knowledge. Barret treats the poems as a resource that is assembled from different sources and can be supplemented later. Like Scott, Barret reads the *Semaines* as a compilation of contemporary knowledge but actively supplements the poems and re-uses them in new contexts. The manuscript suggests a writer who sought to acquire the ability to write like Du Bartas, employing new rhetorical figures and secondary sources to create an original voice in English. His handling of the text also shows his awareness that the *Semaines* are not a closed encyclopedic work, but contain an open-ended structure for knowledge ready to receive later insights and discoveries. The translation's imagination and idiosyncrasy made it, in one sense, an 'exercise' in replicating Du Bartas' style in English that supplied additional ornamentation and information and was a precursor to Barret's *The Sacred Warr*, yet never emerged as a translation for a wider reading public.

The translation was more ambitious than either Winter's or Scott's in seeking to make Du Bartas' learning accessible, and to develop an English voice for the French poet. Barret may well have been the first man to write a complete translation, and his willingness to add

further material probably grew from his conception of what the entire *Semaines* represented, and rhetorical, informational and intertextual possibilities for their use. He confronts both the poems' uses and their limitations, presenting the *Semaines* as grand, dynamic summations of contemporary learning that provided a valuable model for further divine poetry in English. Barret's translations began to realize the potential wider appeal of the *Semaines* in English as heroic poetry, but it is Sylvester's translation that would finally make the poem's natural philosophy and history available in a way that could be consulted and imitated extensively.

Barret's stanzaic form and additions may have reduced its chances of becoming the standard English translation, particularly as the alternative that Sylvester offered was already known: heroic couplets are easier to extract for separate quotation, whereas topics often end mid-stanza in Barret's version. Snyder argues that Barret even knew Sylvester's translations (p. 65) based on occasional parallels in phrasing, though the apparent debts could just be coincidences. It is striking that when *Devine Weekes* is published in 1605, it contains precisely the apparatus and other poems mentioned in the Stationers' Register entry for Barret's translation in 1602. Barret explored the *Semaines'* possibilities as a template for further divine poetry through his translation and subsequent poems, and it holds an important place among poetic responses to the *Semaines* for that reason, even if it only influences Du Bartas' reception history in providing a foil to Sylvester's *Devine Weekes*, which was quickly confirmed as the standard English translation upon publication.

iii. *Devine Weekes, and Workes*

Josuah Sylvester (1562/3-1618) and his printer Humfrey Lownes organized the learning, sacred rhetoric and perceived stateliness of Du Bartas' poetry, the particular strengths of earlier editions, and all the individual Days into a single whole volume potentially worthy of James's commendation, first printed in 1605 as *Devine Weekes, and Workes*. Five aspects of *Devine Weekes* and its initial reception will demonstrate how printer and translator combined to

produce this definitive English translation of the *Semaines*: how Sylvester's translations in the 1590s and the manuscript presented to James in 1603 were preparations for this edition, rhetorical strategies used in the edition's front matter, how Sylvester modified his earlier translations, how his translation's style captured the qualities of the French more effectively than previous versions did, and contemporary comments lauding Sylvester's work as translator. *Devine Weekes* marked the meridian point in Du Bartas' British reception, arriving after so many earlier translations and now placing the *Semaines* securely in the seventeenth-century literary firmament from where new types of reader could encounter the poems' brilliance.

Sylvester learnt French at Southampton Grammar School under the Belgian Huguenot Hadrianus Saravia, and subsequently spent years abroad working with the Merchant Adventurers.³⁸ His first published work, with a dedicatory verse to two fellow 'creditors' or merchants that compares his poetry to 'bad marchant-guise', was a translation from Du Bartas' commemoration of Henri IV's victory over Catholic forces at Ivry on 14 March 1590.³⁹ Even in this early work, Sylvester was as sensitive as Du Bartas was to the timeliness of such poetry, for the English translation was also printed in 1590. Likewise, Sylvester's translations of 'Les Peres' (II.iii.2) and 'Jonah' (ultimately part of II.iv.3) were published within a year of the French poems' initial printing in 1591: they are found in the volume *Triumph of Faith* (1592) alongside a translation of Du Bartas' 'La Triomphe du Foi' and *Canticle of the Victorie*.⁴⁰ This volume concludes with verses promising further translations from *La Seconde Semaine*, which is additional evidence that Sylvester had not composed the anonymous 1591/1595 translation from *La Sepmaine* (C3v, see Chapter 1.ii).

³⁸ Snyder, pp. 8-9. Details about Sylvester's life are taken from Snyder's edition and biography 'Sylvester, Josuah [Joshua] (1562/3–1618), poet and translator', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26873>].

³⁹ *A Canticle of the Victorie obtained by the French King, Henrie the fourth, at Yvry* (1590), A1v.

⁴⁰ See Holmes et al, I, 83 (item 7b).

Though Sylvester did later cultivate a close association between his and Du Bartas' literary personas, particularly through *Devine Weekes*, he always had broader interests in French religious poetry. In the 1590s, for example, Sylvester translated Odet de la Noue's *Paradoxe* (1588), printed in English as *Profit of Imprisonment* (1594). This poem, dedicated to his patron Robert Nicholson, is a Christian meditation on liberty and discipline that was also linked to contemporary politics: de la Noue's father, François, was a renowned military captain and author of the treatise *Discours politiques et militaires*, printed in English as *The Politicke and Militarie Discourses of the Lord de La Nouue* (*sic*; 1588), while his son's poem, as Sylvester's title acknowledges, was written while Odet was held captive during the Wars of Religion.⁴¹

Sylvester later translated the *Quatrains* (first published in 1564) of Guy de Faur, Sieur de Pibrac, a Catholic apologist for the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre. His choice of material, evidently not inspired by partisan instincts, must have been made with its dedicatee in mind: Prince Henry, who subsequently promised his mother that he would try to memorize all the French poems, and translated twenty-five of them into Latin prose.⁴² Francis Davison and Joseph Hall also refer to psalm translations by Sylvester that do not appear in his surviving printed books.⁴³ Though further research is needed on all these translations and their place in Anglo-French literary relations (e.g. to place Sylvester's translations alongside Esther Inglis's transcriptions of Pibrac's *Quatrains*), these early translations show Sylvester's long-standing care for framing these translations of French poems for his immediate cultural environment and potential patronage.⁴⁴

Sylvester's *Second Weeke* was the first printed English translation to describe the poems as Weeks rather than individual Days. It was thus a conceptual precursor to *Devine Weekes*, and

⁴¹ Odet de la Noue, *poète et soldat huguenot* (Paris, 1919), pp. 6 and 39.

⁴² Snyder, p. 21. The volume is held at Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R. 7. 23. vii.

⁴³ Lara Crowley, 'Donne, not Davison: Reconsidering the Authorship of "Psalm 137,"' *Modern Philology* 105 (2008), 603-36 (613; with thanks to Joel Swann for alerting me to the reference); Joseph Hall, *Epistles the first volume: Containing II. decads* (1608), L3r.

⁴⁴ Sarah Gwyneth Ross, 'Esther Inglis: Linguist, Calligrapher, Miniaturist, and Christian Humanist', in *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*, ed. by Julie D. Campbell and Anne R. Larsen (Farnham, 2009), pp. 159-181 (pp. 176-80).

may have helped Sylvester secure the authority to have his later translations published ahead of Barret's. *The Second Weeke* contained translations of 'Eden' (II.i.1), 'L'Imposture' (II.i.2) and 'Babylone' (II.ii.2), and was reprinted in the same year with translations of the three intervening sections (II.i.3- II.ii.1). The volume was dedicated to Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, and Anthony Bacon, who had almost certainly both known Du Bartas when he was alive, but apparently brought no financial reward; Sylvester instead became tutor to William Essex, a country squire, while continuing to work on the *Semaines* (Snyder, pp. 15-18). Sylvester was aware of other translations as he created his *Week*: he had surely avoided *La Sepmaine* because of Sidney, and in the final section used the incongruous title and running header 'The Seconde Day of the Second Week', probably to avoid using the title 'Babilon' found in Lisle's recent translation. Sylvester showed an emergent concern for authorial self-presentation in *The Second Weeke* by including commendatory poems from George Burgh (possibly the George Burghe who graduated BA from Peterhouse, Cambridge in 1581-82), the revenue collector George Gaywood, 'R. Hyther' and the twenty-seven-year old German John Mauldeaus, who was associated with Cologne and had matriculated at Christ Church in 1588.⁴⁵ These poems look to promote Sylvester's reputation as a 'true interpreter' (Gaywood) of Du Bartas, who together were 'the glorious lights of England and of France' (Hyther).⁴⁶ Through such strategies Sylvester tentatively sought to establish his personal reputation as the major translator of the *Semaines*.

Having presumably translated the remaining sections of the *Semaines* between 1598 and 1603, Sylvester announced his intention to publish *Devine Weekes* in the manuscript copy of 'The Colonies' presented to James in 1603.⁴⁷ This was an exclusive preview of a print publication that had been delayed by the plague (referred to as 'the grievous visitacion of Gods heavie hand', 5r). Sylvester staked his claim to be Du Bartas' main translator by

⁴⁵ Snyder, p. 933. *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, ed. by John Venn, 10 vols (Cambridge, 1922-54), I, 257; Foster, p. 990.

⁴⁶ A4v and B1r in the re-issued version (ESTC 21661.5).

⁴⁷ BL, Royal MS 17 A 41.

referring in his title to the entire ‘Devine WEEKES, and workes, | of | The noble, learned, and religious, | Lord of **BARTAS**’, and choosing to present the first section after those which appeared in *The Second Weeke* (which James therefore may have already seen) and the only other section that Lisle had translated (which Sylvester may have seen). In his letter to James, Sylvester emphasizes that the translation should be read as a synecdoche for a greater whole, and *a fortiori* the greater honour reserved to James: ‘I was faine, thus soudainlie to scribble over this small Parte: That (in the mean time) by a Part, I might (as it wear) giue your Highnes Possession of the Whole’ (5r). This statement marks a key shift in Du Bartas’ early British reception, for the earlier approach to the poems as discrete units decisively gives way here to an assurance that each part belongs to a whole, and that this whole belongs to James: as Du Bartas’ personal associations with James receded from the public consciousness, the *Semaines*’ reputation as panegyric intensified, and they came to represent the monarch’s symbolic position at the centre of a heavenly scheme of scriptural and natural philosophical truth.

The manuscript also contains the dedicatory corona that later appears in *Devine Weekes*: the sequence contains present-tense references to the succession that are carefully transferred to perfect tense in 1605: ‘our SVNNE is sett, and yet noe night ensues’ (2r), for example, becomes ‘our Svnne did Set, and yet no NIGHT ensew’d’ (A3v). Sylvester clearly had a good sense of James’s admiration for Du Bartas, probably even before *Basilikon Doron* was published in England (see Chapter 3.i), for the corona insinuates the translator into the nexus of associations previously established in Scotland between James, his ‘Mynion’ (3r) Du Bartas, royal authority, secular wisdom and sacred art: ‘To whom should sacred Arte, and learned Piety | In highest notes of Heaunly Musike sing | The Royal Deedes of the redoubted Diety, | But to a learned and Religious *King?*’ (3v). This manuscript was the final stage in the progressive development of Sylvester’s authorial person as the English Du Bartas and his concomitant attempt to publish the whole *Semaines* in English.

Lownes only ended the confusion at Stationers' Hall over Du Bartas by securing the rights to publish the *Semaines* in 1604; Snyder conjectures that Lownes's marriage to the widow of Peter Short, who had printed Sylvester's *Second Weeke* (1598), allowed Lownes to claim them.⁴⁸ The very first poem in *Devine Weekes* (1605; ESTC 21649) is a sonnet addressed to James VI and I in which the translator now makes a direct plea for recognition as Du Bartas' *alter ego*: the phrase 'VOY SIRE SALUSTE' appears at the beginning of the octet and sestet, and provides resolution to the verse as the translator signs off with the phrase 'Anagrammatisme | de | IOSVA SYLVESTRE: | de vostre Maiestè, | Tres humble Subiect | & | *Serviteur*' (A2r). The dedicatory corona contains a new innovation to capture the King's attention: it is presented as a set of concrete poems, among the earliest in English, with pillar motifs for each of the muses.⁴⁹ There are further imaginative touches in the paratextual materials' layout: a full-page pillar with Sylvester's and James's names appearing on the lower and upper capitals in A8v, Sidney's emblem of the porcupine on B5v (which is used again in Sylvester's *Lachrymæ Lachrymarum* (1613, H1r)), a woodcut arch framing the titlepage and paired poems on A2v-3r, and ornate woodcut brace brackets on the page stating the 'order of bookes or tracts' on B1r. The 'index of the hardest words' (2X2r-2X*3r), printed marginalia largely translated from Goulart, and translations of 'Uranie' and 'Triomphe de la Foi', along with Sylvester's translations from Pibrac, de la Noue, and Jean du Nesme (and, from 1608 onwards, Thomas Hudson's 'Judith' translation for good measure) ensured that this publication of both Du Bartas' Weeks and his other works contained almost everything offered by earlier translations, including the publication that Islip described.⁵⁰

Devine Weekes was re-issued (ESTC 21649a) with a copper-plate engraving on its titlepage by Christopher Switzer depicting a monumental arch from which the royal arms

⁴⁸ Snyder, pp. 19-20, and see Part I, preface.

⁴⁹ James L. Potter, 'Sylvester's Shaped Sonnets', *NQ* 202 (1957), 405-6.

⁵⁰ Sylvester's translation of *Judit, Bethuliens Rescue*, first appeared in *The Parliament of Vertues Royal* (1614), and was published in the 1621 and later folio editions.

hang, with a cartouche below containing a moon reflecting the sun's rays; this personal emblem was appropriate for Sylvester as a translator, and Margery Corbett and Ronald Lightbown note that 'perhaps it is not too much to assume that it was he who got together the design for the whole title-page'.⁵¹ Later re-issues and editions swiftly covered any remaining gaps in the translation's coverage. *Devine Weekes* was published with *I Posthumus Bartas* in 1606 (ESTC 21649a.5), which contained the untranslated sections from the Third and Fourth Days of *La Seconde Semaine*. *II Posthumus Bartas* (1607; ESTC 21665) provided the remaining untranslated material from the Fourth Day, all of which was incorporated into the first complete edition of the *Semaines* in English, still entitled *Devine Weekes, and Workes*, in 1608 (ESTC 21650), which in turn was followed by further editions in 1611 (ESTC 21651) and 1613 (ESTC 21652). There is little textual variation between editions from 1608 onwards. Lownes printed a folio edition of Sylvester's complete works in 1621 (ESTC 21653), which was printed again in 1633 (ESTC 21654) and 1641 (Wing D2405). These publications established the *Semaines*' existence in English as a single poetic work, and sealed James's and Sylvester's association with the poems throughout the seventeenth century.

The commendatory and dedicatory poems in *Devine Weekes*, which were supplemented between the 1605 and 1608 editions, sought to ingratiate Sylvester within a community of aristocratic patrons and respected literary figures. The earlier poems from 1598 were combined with a set of carefully programmed verses. Snyder (pp. 878-82) analyses in detail how Sylvester reworked earlier dedicatory poems into the ambitious scheme summarized in a poem to Prince Henry in the 1608 edition (2N8v; see Snyder pp. 904 and 933) in which the First Week is dedicated to James, the Second Week to members of the nobility (Lord Mountjoy, Thomas Egerton, and the Earls of Salisbury, Dorset and Pembroke) and the Fourth Day to Henry, since it provided profitable examples of monarchical conduct. The pre-1608 editions, it is worth noting, did not contain this additional sequence of dedicatory

⁵¹ *The Comely Frontispiece* (London, Henley and Boston, 1979), pp. 98-104 (p. 104).

sonnets between the First and Second Weeks; instead, we find a series of Latin and Greek verses commending Du Bartas taken from earlier French and Latin editions, which is good evidence about which editions were available to Sylvester.⁵² Meanwhile, prefatory commendatory verses by Samuel Daniel, Ben Jonson and Joseph Hall welcomed Sylvester as their peer; Charles Fitzgeffrey, who wrote epigrams on other well-known poets, also contributed a Latin verse. The poems suggest links with the milieu of Winter's translations too: John Davies of Hereford wrote several poems (see Chapter 6, ii) and Snyder (p. 935) is surely right to name 'E.L. Oxon' as Edward Lapworth. 'R.R.' is likely to be Robert Roche, author of a divine epyllion on Susanna called *Eustathia* (1599), in which the 'To the Reader' and prologue are written in the same *ababcc* stanza as the verse 'in commendation of this worthie Worke'; in addition, the poet takes Spenser and Daniel as his literary paragons in both.⁵³ A possible candidate for author of a six-line Latin epigram attributed to 'Jo: Bo. Miles' is Josias Bodley, brother of the scholar Thomas, who had been knighted in 1604.⁵⁴ The total effect of these poems is to see an entire community of writers and noblemen being called on to celebrate this major literary event, and thus approve the translation's implicit claim to be the ultimate English edition of Du Bartas.

Sylvester worked up the text of his earlier translations to make *Devine Weekes* more accurate and authoritative. While the six parts (II.i.1-4 and II.ii.1-2) that were subsequently published as *The Second Weeke* in 1598 survive largely intact, Sylvester's translations in *The*

⁵² From Gabriel de Lerm's Latin translation are found a poem about bees (K4r-v; 1605, S7v-8r) and verses by Jan de Serres (A5r; 1605, S5r; also in the 1588 Chouët/ Durant edition of *Sepmaine*) and Theodore Beza (A5r; 1605, S5v; also in 1588 *Sepmaine*). A poem by 'Annas Rulmanus' is found in the 1593 Chouët edition (**1v), with the attribution and title used in the 1605 edition; poems by 'Federicus Morellus' and Jean Dorat (1605, S7r) appear in editions of *La Seconde Semaine* (see Holmes et al., I, 191 and 193), and poems on S8v and T1r in the 1605 edition (the latter a possible inspiration for Sylvester's concrete poems) appear in *Suite des Oeuvres de G. de Saluste Sieur Du Bartas* (Paris, 1603), 2G2r-v (placed immediately after the titlepage in the Bodleian copy). A poem by 'L. Constans' may be written by the Huguenot minister Léonard Constant (see Eugénie Droz, *Jacques de Constans: l'ami d'Agrippa d'Aubigné; contribution à l'étude de la poésie protestante* (Geneva, 1962), pp. 113-14). These findings support Snyder's contention (pp. 68-69) that Sylvester must have used the 1589 Chouët or later edition, such as the 1591 Haultin edition, both of which contained Goulart's marginalia.

⁵³ *Eustathia* (1599), A3r-v; *Devine Weekes*, A9v. Prescott compares Roche's use of compounds to Sylvester's in 'Du Bartas and Renaissance Britain', 34-35.

⁵⁴ J. J. N. McGurk, 'Bodley, Sir Josias (c.1550-1617)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2757>].

Triumph of Faith (1592) were thoroughly revised for *Devine Weekes*, and provide insights into how Sylvester's translation strategy had changed. Snyder (pp. 44-48) argues that a major motivation in Sylvester's revisions was 'to increase accuracy and eliminate non-Bartasian ideas'. Although Sylvester had already, in the preface to the 1592 translation, remarked that he hoped that 'thou shalt find that I have not omitted manie of mine authors words, neither anie of his meaning' (A4r), his revisions for the 1605 edition do indeed show the translator refining his text by bringing it closer to the French. The following examples are all from 'The Fathers' (II.iii.2): 'eternelle' (l. 131) is translated as 'immortall' in 1592 (A3v), and 'eternal' in 1605 (2L2v); 'contre-soufflé' (l. 209) as 'counter-pufs' in 1605 (2L4r) rather than 'boisterous blasts' (A4v); and an omitted phrase like 'detestable autheur d'un exemple si rare' (ll. 123-24) is supplied for the 1605 edition ('odious Author of a Precedent | So rarely-ruthles' (2L2r; cf. A2r)). In order to make the translation complete, he restores sixty lines cut from the 1592 translation (ll. 239-99, between 'astraic' and 'O father' on B1v) in which Isaac poignantly asks where the sacrifice is, and then seeks an explanation when Abraham weeps in response. Sylvester's emendations also take the English further away from French vocabulary on occasion, often to tighten his verse's metrical composition and make imagery more vivid (examples from 'The Fathers' unless stated): 'valeur' (60) is translated as 'fortitude' (2L1r) in 1605 and 'valure' (A2r) in 1592; lines 188-90 ('C'est vous qui vous paisez d'holocaustes funestes, | Qui rodez à l'entour de l'encensé bucher') are given a more visceral rendering in 1605, 'As streaming Riuers of our luke-warme blood' (2L3v; cf. 'With streames of bloud that from our veines distill' (1592, A4v)); and 'La vapeur de l'encens, de l'amome et du nard' ('Histoire de Jonas', 136) is expanded to 'Nard, Incense, Mummie, and all rich Perfumes' (1608, 3G7v; cf. 'The smoke of incense, Nard and sweet Amome' (1592, C3r)). Sylvester also introduces syntactical variation for effect: 'Canst thou, mine Arme? O canst thou, cruell Arme' (2L2r) replacing 'Mine arme canst thou? canst thou my cruel arme?' (A3r; 'Mon bras, pourras-

tu bien, pourras-tu, cruel bras' (114)). In such instances, we see the translator's concern to make his imitation of Du Bartas' voice more arresting as well as more accurate.

In all his translations Sylvester was largely successful in retaining core elements of Du Bartas' style. Harry Ashton presented many examples of how Sylvester usually closely matches, sometimes expands upon, but rarely modifies compound phrases, onomatopoeia and word-plays in the French, though he does often avoid Du Bartas' characteristic duplicated syllables.⁵⁵ Ashton finds that Sylvester tends to exaggerate habits such as alliteration (pp. 220-22) when anglicizing Du Bartas' distinctive voice. Eric Wimmers inclined to agree: he finds that 'Sylvester is no slavish copier. Rather, he throws himself into his work with a truly Elizabethan resourcefulness [...] he rarely was at a loss for an English equivalent to a particular Bartasian extravagance'.⁵⁶ Ashton observed that, although some of Sylvester's additions were excessive, the translator sought to be intelligible and lively: 'Ce que le traducteur a ajouté, il l'a fait dans le but de rendre son livre plus intelligible. Quand il retranche, c'est encore par considération pour le lecteur dont il veut ménager l'intérêt ou les sentiments' (p. 226).⁵⁷ When Sylvester includes interpolations (listed in Ashton, pp. 176-77, and separate to the type of smaller expansions mentioned above) they often localize his translation to a British setting, and when he simplifies the text—for example, by substituting plain English terms for classical references (e.g. 'Nightingale' for 'Phillomele'; see pp. 182-84)—he does so to make the translation more accessible. Vagn Lungaard Simonsen recognizes that Sylvester's translation follows these 'practical and external principles', but he also detects a consistent desire to prioritize exposition of factual detail over rhetorical effect: Sylvester 'makes his descriptions broader, more concrete and less complicated in style and in

⁵⁵ Ashton, *Du Bartas*, pp. 195-208.

⁵⁶ Wimmers, 'Style of Sylvester', p. 78.

⁵⁷ 'What the translator has added, he has written to make the work more intelligible. When material is lost, it is still done from consideration for the reader, to manage the reader's interest or feelings.'

syntax'.⁵⁸ Wimmers counted the occasions that Sylvester follows or departs from Du Bartas' rhetoric to prove the translator's stylistic fidelity, and his rough figures bear out Ashton's observations: Sylvester adds a mythological name in thirty-six places, but uses a literal equivalent seventy-two times; he adds detail in thirty-six places, and removes it in twenty-four places; he eliminates periphrasis on two hundred and eleven occasions, but introduces the device thirty-two times; Sylvester avoids Bartasian *traductio*, *agnominatio*, *antanaclasis* and *paranomasia* thirty-one times; and half of Sylvester's twenty-four interpolations are specific to Britain (pp. 103-4, 106, 115, 122 and 130). Likewise, Snyder also found a desire for simplicity in Sylvester's work: she compared him to translators of the Bible who saw 'the text as a divinely inspired work of edification to be made accessible to the common reader; and consequently his aim, like theirs, was to be at once fully accurate and fully intelligible' (p. 45). Sylvester's stylistic imitation was guided by a desire to simplify and explain the text to readers: it was a committed stylistic imitation, and yet Simonsen can still remark with justification that 'Sylvester's rhetoric aims at the facts while Du Bartas' aims at a purely stylistic effect' (275).

Perhaps the key translation decision that helped Sylvester produce a close imitation of Du Bartas' rhetoric that was comprehensible and unabridged was his choice of metre. Sylvester used iambic pentameter from his earliest translations in 1592 onwards, and it distinguished his work from others at an early stage. The metre made it more successful as 'heroical poetry', certainly when compared to Scott's hexameter, but also encouraged the translation's more egregious idiosyncracies. The line length forced the translator to compress phrases and continually reduce the number of syntactic particles. A direct consequence of this prosodic pressure—and characteristic of Sylvester's energetic reinvention of Du Bartas' verse in general—are the many new words which reinforce both the originality and metrical security of his translation. Throughout Sylvester's translations and other pentameter verse are found

⁵⁸ Joshua Sylvester's English Translation of Du Bartas' "La Premiere Sepmaine", *Orbis Litterarum* 8 (1950), 259-85 (260, 267).

many words that have no previous recorded use in the *OED*, and are not taken from the French either. According to the *OED*, Sylvester's oeuvre includes over fifty new words each with the prefixes 'un-' and 're-', and suffix '-less', and many new words containing the particles 'be-', 'dis-' and '-ful', such as unold (II.iv.100), rebloom (II.iii.96), modestless (I.i.15), befoam (II.i.372), disceptre (I.vi.604) and starful (II.iii.30). In context it is apparent that these linguistic innovations arise from the relative rigidity of his iambic beat and relative malleability of early modern English. 'Floodless', 'sighful', 're-repeat' and 'modelet' are new words in the following quotations: 'A Fruit-les, Flood-les, yea a Land-les Land' (II.iii.3.1186; 'Terre sans fruits, sans eau, voire, terre sans terre' (1082)); 'hee roareth out | A sigh-full song, so dole-fully devout' (II.iv.1.1273-74; 'Anime une chanson si tristement devotte' (1078)); But soft my Muse, what? wilt thou re-repeat | The Little-Worlds admired Modelet? (I.vii.735-36; 'Quoy, Muses, voulez-vous redire l'artifice | Qui brille haut et bas dans l'humain edifice?' (709-10)). Each of the English quotations has a strong iambic pulse sustained by the insertion of new words with weakly stressed prefixes and suffixes. Even an awkward coinage like 'un-self-delicious' (five syllables) is called into being by metrical and rhythmic exigencies: 'Such were not yerst, *Cincinnatus Fabricius*, | *Serranus, Curius*, who un-selfe-delicious' (I.iii.1045-46). New words like these condense the French alexandrine into English pentameter, while maintaining an iambic beat and cutting down on superfluous monosyllables. The result, as the examples above show, is a distinctive, ornate, compressed but still fairly lucid poetic voice—all valuable qualities in a translation of Du Bartas. The coinages gain legitimacy by mimicking Du Bartas' linguistic innovations: in the final example above, 're-repeat' copies Du Bartas' distinctive habit of reduplicating syllables, and 'Modelet' is a French diminutive as if found in Du Bartas' French (which it is not). His neologisms reconcile two tendencies in his translation that might seem incompatible: reproducing Du Bartas' elaborate, compacted style whilst aiming towards relative clarity in voice and syntax. Sylvester's translation is mannered and ornate, but these properties made it successful as an English imitation of Du Bartas' style.

In imitating Du Bartas' elaborations Sylvester retained the French poet's epistemological outlook, as well as his rhetoric *per se*: by developing Du Bartas' ideas Sylvester pushed at the conceptual envelope of the *Semaines*, refining distinctions and applying them to new contexts. Sylvester's translation was as ambitious as Barret's in providing new material whilst creating a version that could stand alone as an English *Semaines*. The following description from the Fifth Day, for example, shows Sylvester active in corroborating and developing Du Bartas' catalogue with further observations. He adds a further eleven examples to Du Bartas' twelve:

You devine wits of elder Dayes, from whom
 The deepe invention of rare Works hath come,
 Tooke you not patterne of your chiefest Tooles
 Out of the Lap of *Thetis*, *Lakes*, and *Pooles*?
 Which partly in the Waves, part on the edges
 Of craggie Rocks, among the ragged sedges,
 Bring forth abundance of Pinnes, Pincers, Spoakes,
 Pikes, Piercers, Needles, Mallets, Pipes, and Yoakes,
 Oares, sayles, and swords, sawes, wedges, Razors, rammers,
 Plumes, Cornets, Knives, Wheelles, Vices, Hornes, and Hammers. (I.v.48-58)

Esprits vrayment divins à qui les premiers aages
 Doivent l'invention des plus subtils ouvrages,
 N'a-vous pris le patron de voz meilleurs outils
 Dans le flottant giron de la perse *Thetis*?
 Qui tantost dans les flots, ore contre les roches,
 Produit fecondement des aiguilles, des broches,
 Des pennaches, des coins, des pinceaux, des marteaux,
 Des tuyaux, des cornets, des raseoirs, des couteaux,
 Des scies, et des jous; (I.v.47-55)

Such additions demonstrate the translator's intellectual and poetic accomplishment in developing the knowledge contained in these poems, which as Miernowski and Giacomotto-Charra have shown were self-consciously limited. Sylvester's translation probably was considered true to the spirit of Du Bartas in its capacity to reinvigorate the poem for an English readership whilst achieving a coherence and completeness that no other translation had managed.

Most of all, Sylvester finally united the previously disparate parts of the poems into a single work, and so activated for English readers the poetic structures of knowledge in the French that facilitated its practical uses as a reference source. Specifically, the poem became that much more suited to dialectical analysis that isolated the poems' topics, as Miernowski has described. When combined with textual apparatus, the translation enabled a host of new ways to read Du Bartas in English with particular literary and non-literary applications in mind. Sylvester's heroic couplets played an important role in structuring Du Bartas' arguments so that writers could locate and quote specific sections. For example, here are six lines from the Second Day of the First Week:

Or like a *Lais*, whose inconstant Love
 Doth every day a thousand times remove;
 Who's scarce unfolded from one Youthes embraces
 Yer in her thought another she embraces;
 And the new pleasure of her wanton Fire
 Stirres in her still, another new desire (I.ii.227-32)

Telle qu'une Laïs, dont le volage amour
 Voudroit changer d'ami cent mille fois le jour,
 Et qui n'estant à peine encore deslacee
 Des bras d'un jouvenceau, embrasse en sa pensee
 L'embrassement d'un autre, et son nouveau plaisir
 D'un plaisir plus nouveau luy cause le desir. (I.ii.215-220)

Helkiah Crooke quotes this passage in *Mikrocosmographia* (1615) as a useful analogy for the inconstancy of forms. Sylvester's translation is focused on the comparison through its simple, direct and concrete vocabulary and syntax. The first couplet, which comes within a larger verse paragraph, copies the French by making the topic (i.e. inconstancy) explicit in the first couplet, and then developing the image in the two couplets that follow. By contrast, Winter's version of the same passage (C1r-v) is less straightforward, both in its diction ('cogitation', 'yonkers', 'unlaced') and its syntactical units spanning several lines; whereas Sylvester, for example, inserts 'she' in line 230 to make the second couplet more grammatically coherent. Printed marginalia in Sylvester's edition would have helped readers like Crooke extract the

phrase desired: at the beginning of this verse paragraph, *Devine Weekes* offers the simple annotation ‘Sundry Similes to that purpose’ (E4r) where Winter’s translation has two Latin notes placed together: ‘Materia Prima Gallo’ and immediately below, ‘similis’. Meanwhile, Scott puts moral uprightness first in producing an otherwise unmemorable and imprecise reading:

Like to the brothell filth, whoe in her flittinge loue,
 A thousand tymes a daye, affection can remoue,
 Whoe while to one her loue, with her clothes she vnlaceth,
 In her vnsatiablenesse, she embraceth,
 An others lew’d embracements, thus her newe delight,
 Her fancye to a newer pleasure doth incite; (69v)

The publication of *Devine Weekes* was pragmatic both in its aspirations for royal patronage and its clear presentation of the poems’ content through the translation’s diction, syntax and verse form. The textual apparatus—the order of contents, printed marginalia, argument stanzas and index of difficult words—made the poem easier to navigate so that readers could locate desired sections like consulting a reference work. There is more work to be done on how these textual features reflected authorial expectations and affected contemporary reading experiences of the *Semaines*, but subsequent chapters of this thesis will nonetheless begin to illustrate at length the difference made by bringing together much more of the text within a single quarto volume.

Sylvester did not simply aspire to prepare a pristine, transparent translation of the *Semaines*, though we have witnessed his efforts to improve its accuracy, but made himself the vessel through which Du Bartas could be heard in English. Sylvester’s poetic voice developed over thirteen years into a closer imitation of Du Bartas’ to the point where his public persona and original verse were indistinguishable from his role as translator of the *Semaines*. Sylvester’s achievement as a translator rests in laying bare the entire work’s informational content while creating a convincing stylistic imitation, a balance that no other translator came close to

achieving.⁵⁹ He avoided the lighter tone of voice in the anonymous 1595 translation but retained a sense of wonder and ease; he did not adopt the stanzaic forms used by Barret, but did share that translator's interest in practical knowledge; he did not pursue the English alexandrine of Lisle's version, but was committed to absorbing the distinctive features of the French and used Goulart's work; he was not bound to the scholarly emphasis of Winter's version, but did present the cosmological views offered by the whole poem; and he did not copy the tone of James's translations, but did recognize the King as a key advocate for Du Bartas.

Certainly his self-promotion as an English Du Bartas led his translation to follow, and often exaggerate, stylistic traits in the French, but Sylvester also localized the poem to a British readership more thoroughly than either Barret or Lisle did: his translation is 'more vigorous and less grand [...] more personal, more denunciatory, more specific' (Snyder, p. 59). These localizations were not merely incidental to the translation's appeal: John Egerton, Viscount Brackley, specifically marked up his copy of *Devine Weekes* (1621) with phrases like 'applied to England' in places where Sylvester introduced new allusions.⁶⁰ Sylvester's approach is a stylistic synthesis of both Barret's and Winter's translations: Sylvester, like Barret, employs verbal innovations and frequent interpolations to make the poem more specific to Britain, but is also sensitive to the poem's arguments and James's succession, and coins new words for metrical convenience. Sylvester was consciously intrusive in emulating Du Bartas' rhetorical style. His approach echoes the concern of the other translators discussed in this chapter to convey the natural philosophy and other factual content in an accessible way, and establish the *Semaines* as 'divine' poetry in English. *Devine Weekes* grew directly from the Elizabethan and Jacobean cultural response to the *Semaines* in the preceding two decades.

⁵⁹ On a possible tension between Sylvester's authorial investment in his translation and quasi-antiquarian concern to preserve Du Bartas' epideictic verse through unobtrusive supplementation, see Andrew Zurcher, 'Deficiency and Supplement: Perfecting the Prosthetic Text', *SEL* 51 (2012) 143-64 (160).

⁶⁰ Copy held at Folger Shakespeare Library (STC 21653, copy 3): see D6r-v, H5r, I4v K1r and M2r.

Sylvester was, as several contemporary and later writers have observed, truer to Du Bartas' spirit than to his actual words. Seventeenth-century readers agreed that Sylvester's translation was a convincing impersonation of Du Bartas, and the two poets were often spoken of together: Thomas Powell wrote of 'the excellent *du-Bartas*, and his no less excellent interpreter *Sylvester*'; Margaret Cavendish found Sylvester's pairing with Du Bartas highly felicitous; Philip King wrote that '*Silvester* had all from *Dubartas*', just as Virgil relied on Homer; and George Wither wrote of 'Matchlesse *Silvester*, glory of these yeeres. | I hither to haue onely heard your fames | And know you yet but by your workes and names'.⁶¹ John Taylor summarized the prevailing opinion: 'And in the English tongue tis fitly stated, | By siluer-tongued *Silvester* translated. | So well, so wisely, and so rarely done, | That he by it immortall fame hath wonne.'⁶² It quickly became established opinion that Du Bartas had found a worthy translator in Sylvester; Stephen Jerome, for example, praised Sylvester's translations as 'the best minde musick of numerous versifying' that grew from 'positiue, reall (or else only fictious or imaginarie) grounds'.⁶³ Just as contemporaries recognized his success in domesticating the French poet, the twentieth-century critic John Arthos, who believed that Sylvester's style influenced natural description in post-Restoration poetry, wrote that '[h]is translation is not literal, but one might say that his imagination was [...] His exuberance gave his poetry a quality Du Bartas's lacked, even while it doubled the excesses of the original', while more recently, Alastair Fowler made the wry remark (which Wimmers' figures support) that Sylvester succeeds in 'matching the qualities of his original, if not always in corresponding places'.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Thomas Powell, *Humane Industry* (1661), M3r; Margaret Cavendish, *The Worlds Olio* (1655), C2v, and *The Philosophical and Physical Opinions* (London, 1655), A2v; Philip King, *The surfeit to A B C* (1656), C10r; George Wither, *Abuses Stript, and Whipt* (1613), R2r. King claims that Du Bartas relied on an unidentified (but presumably patristic) Latin poem, 'an old Latine Copy which I have seen, composed, as thought, by some religious man in a riming hexameter'.

⁶² *The Nipping and Snipping of Abuses* (1614), B3r.

⁶³ *Origens Repentance* (1619), B2r.

⁶⁴ John Arthos, *The Language of Natural Description in Eighteenth-Century Poetry* (Ann Arbor, 1949), p.80. Fowler, 'Didactic Kinds', p. 196.

Sylvester was well-known among contemporary writers in London, but never managed to establish a reputation independent from his work on Du Bartas. A late-seventeenth century source records some ribaldry that passed between Sylvester and Jonson when drinking at the Devil Tavern with Michael Drayton and Samuel Daniel present.⁶⁵ Jonson, though reported as having criticized Sylvester's translation, wrote an epigram praising *Devine Weekes*, and Sylvester composed commendatory verses for the writers Clement Edmonds and John Vicars.⁶⁶ Lines from the *Semaines* about the lark (also quoted by John Eliot; see Chapter 1.i) were set to music.⁶⁷ Yet almost every contemporary comment on Sylvester's own verse portrays it as blighting his reputation as translator:

'T Were no absurdity to question it,
 Whether the great *Du-Bartas* better writ,
 Or *Silvester* translated, quaintly rare
 Is his conversion, had he rested there
 His Fame had been advanced to the skies,
 Now groveling, clog'd wih his own Fripperies.⁶⁸

Michael Drayton came to a similar judgement, and decades later Edward Phillips and William Winstanley observed that his original poetry had never been well received.⁶⁹ Comparison with his great contemporaries did not help either: a post-Restoration reader, 'J. L.', places quotations from Milton's and Shakespeare's poetry alongside comparable passages from *Devine Weekes*, and subsequently records negative judgments about several of Sylvester's

⁶⁵ Humphrey Crouch, *England's Jestes Refin'd and Improv'd* (1693), D11r-12r. Drayton, Daniel and Sylvester are mentioned together as 'worthie poets' in Robert Fletcher, *The Nine English Worthies* (1606), K2v.

⁶⁶ Drummond reports Jonson's opinion 'that Silvesters translation of Du Bartas was not well done, and that he wrote his Verses befor it err he understood to conferr'. Herford and Simpson (eds), *Ben Jonson*, I, 133. Epigram CXXXII in *The Workes of Benjamin Jonson* (1616), 3Y5r; the epigram was first published in a re-issue of the 1605 *Devine Weekes* (ESTC 21649a), A6r. Clement Edmonds, *Observations upon Casars Comentaries* (1609), A4r; Richard Herring, *Pietas Pontificia*, trans. by John Vicars (1617), A2r.

⁶⁷ John Hilton, *Catch that Catch Can*, ed. by John Playford (1652), C4r.

⁶⁸ 'Epig. 8. *Silvesters* Translation of *Du-Bartas*, | His *Divine Weeks*, and *Works*'; Samuel Sheppard, *Epigrams Theological, Philosophical, and Romantick* (1651), L8r.

⁶⁹ Michael Drayton, *The Battaille of Agincourt* (1631), V1v; John Phillips, *Sportive Wit* (London, 1656), 2E4r; William Winstanley, *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (1687), H7r (see A7v and G3 for quotations from Sylvester's translations). See also Edward Phillips, *Theatrum Poetarum* (1675), 2E11v; and Snyder, p. 22. For a unique perjorative criticism of Sylvester as translator, see Emma Cole, 'Note on Anonymous Criticism of Sandys and Sylvester as Translators', *NQ* 58 (2011), 380-81.

original poems.⁷⁰ This neglect has continued: there has been almost no critical comment on Sylvester's non-Bartasian verse since the seventeenth century.⁷¹ Sylvester received a pension from Prince Henry, not James, and after Henry's death returned to penury; he later died in 1618 on the continent, having travelled abroad again as secretary to the Merchant Adventurers.⁷²

Sylvester's critical fate has always been pegged to Du Bartas', in part because Sylvester sought to profit from his reputation in later years. His later volumes of poetry, *The Parliament of Vertues Royal* (1614) and *The Second Session of the Parliament of Vertues Reall* (1615), similarly matched contemporary French poetry to potential patrons: Jean Bertaut's *Pannarette*, a poem written for the birth of Louis, Henri IV's son, was dedicated to the teenage Prince Charles; Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas' *Judith* was offered to Anne and other aristocratic ladies; and his *Memorials of Mortalitie*, translated from Pierre Matthieu, was dedicated to Shakespeare's patron, Henry Wriothesley.⁷³ His translation of Pierre Duval's *Psalme de la Puissance* (probably based on the text in Étienne de Maisonfleur's *Cantiques* published in Paris in 1586 and reprinted in Rouen in 1613 which also contains Pibrac's *Quatrains*) is helpful for understanding Sylvester's later attitude towards the *Semaines*, for his translation is entitled *Little Bartas* and was dedicated to Elizabeth Stuart as a Protestant rewriting of the Catholic Duval's meditation on mankind's place in the Ptolemaic cosmos.⁷⁴ The translation reveals Sylvester's perception of Du Bartas' literary antecedents and how the Huguenot poet surpassed Catholic predecessors.

⁷⁰ Folger, STC 21653, copy 2, 2F2r-v ('Milton' and 'Macbeth', with *Macbeth*, II.ii.34-36 quoted) and 2F3r ('Shakespeare', *Macbeth*, II.ii.50-51 quoted), 4X1v (*Hamlet*, III.i.55 and *Macbeth*, V.v.24). 'Mottoes' (5I6v) and 'Epithalamion' (5L6v) are 'bad', and 'Holy Preparation' (5M1v) is 'very bad'. All line references from the *Riverside Shakespeare*.

⁷¹ The one study is Franklin B. Williams, 'The Bear Facts about Joshua Sylvester, The Woodman', *English Language Notes* 9 (1971), 90-98.

⁷² Sylvester was in Middelburg with copies of his poetry in 1617: a volume containing Sylvester's three publications between 1613 and 1615 (the two parts of *Parliament of Vertues Royal* and *Tobacco Battered*) in the Houghton Library, Harvard (HOLLIS number: 009643546) contains the following autograph inscription: '1617. in Middleburgh 19 September | To my worthy Friend | Mr George Morgan, | Merchant Adventurer | Accept with this poore Mite, a minde | That honours Worth, in euerie kind.'

⁷³ Georges Grente, *Jean Bertaut, abbé d'Aunay, premier aumônier de la reine, évêque de Séez (1552-1611)* (Paris, 1903), pp. 179-87.

⁷⁴ Hugues Vaganay, 'L'oeuvre d'un évêque français traduite par Josuah Sylvester', *Revue de littérature comparée* 15 (1935), 109-10.

The image of limning contained in the title ‘Little Bartas’ also suggests that the original Bartas presented a more generous vision of creation with greater stylistic accomplishment: his translation was ‘[t]hat Great *Vniversal* Table, | Made in Six Dayes, with Art so admirable; | And, by My BARTAS, in His *Weekes* divine, | So large and liuely draw’n in every line’.⁷⁵ Sylvester’s Bartas was the greatest success of his career, but the translator lacked the vision or variety to escape from the reputation and poetic voice he had so carefully cultivated in *Divine Weekes, and Workes*.

Sylvester’s translations helped Du Bartas to maintain his status as an unofficial laureate poet possessing unusual spiritual understanding, a profound poetic vision, and a distinguished verse style. In the late-Elizabethan period when Sidney’s translation—apparently not widely available even at the time—created a space for other attempts, we see an anonymous translator adopting a more lighthearted approach to ‘Le Premier Jour’, and William Lisle seeking to transfer Du Bartas’ French and Goulart’s commentary into English alexandrines. As the absence of an authoritative translation became ever more conspicuous in the early 1600s, numerous printers and translators sought to capitalize on the commercial opportunity presented by the poems, and the *Semaines* were increasingly treated as long epics rather than a disaggregated series of verses. Scott’s consciousness of the *Semaines*’ importance as philosophical verse is visible in Winter’s interpretation of *La Sepmaine*’s cosmology and astrology, and in Barret’s enthusiasm for technical vocabulary. Sylvester’s translation developed during this period, probably shaped and refined to an extent by the competition, into the definitive translation finally printed in 1605, which decisively shaped the later course of Du Bartas’ reception history.

⁷⁵ *Parliament of Vertues Royal* (1614), Q4v.

Though *Devine Weekes* contained translations from various French poets, Sylvester earned his place in contemporary networks of poetry and patronage solely as Du Bartas' translator. We shall see that *Devine Weekes* was read well beyond the closed circles of readers at the Scottish Court, Magdalen College, Oxford, and probably the Middle Temple too that we have observed in this first part of the thesis. Sylvester's translation succeeded in releasing the poems to many different types of response: dialectical analysis of their topics, rhetorical study and imitation of their figures, casual browsing for quotations that could be re-used, and consultation for Du Bartas' opinion on particular natural philosophical and historical matters. *Devine Weekes* contains didactic sections about England's moral condition, follows closely the natural knowledge and history of the poems, offers marginalia from Goulart's translation, and captures the baroque style of the original. It was the ultimate 'heroical' translation of the *Semaines* because it consolidated the various qualities associated with that concept, above all the poems' stylistic and intellectual gravity, into one translation of the whole poems. Readers could focus on particular sections, skim or leaf through whole Days, locate Du Bartas' opinions about a particular topic, or contemplate the greater structural significance of the poems.

The narrative of this first part has shown how earlier translations and approaches coalesced into a single complete translation closely associated with the monarch. James VI and I was among Du Bartas' earliest British admirers in the 1580s, and his support resonated among later translators (though none imitate James), guaranteeing the *Semaines'* relevance to English and Scottish literary culture for the sixty years that followed. But *Devine Weekes* by no means dictated an ideological agenda about how the poems should be read, though such agendas did surface as Civil War approached. The poems' reception becomes ever more diverse and context-dependent, and we primarily find that Miernowski and Giacomotto-Charra are right to emphasize that the poems were not rigid containers for encyclopedic learning, but were analyzed and read in the digressive fragments from which they were

composed. The success of Sylvester's translation was to create an idea of 'the *Semaines*' as a total work that could be read selectively according to the reader's particular purpose.

English texts of the *Semaines* were open to just as many different readings as the French texts were. Most Stuart readers come to the *Semaines* through *Devine Weekes*, and French editions and other translations appear to have been used less often. *Devine Weekes* was a print phenomenon that embedded the *Semaines* more deeply in contemporary English literary culture, increasing their stature and visibility, and facilitating extraction and quotation when writing new texts. Far from restraining heterogenous readings, Sylvester's translation created the conditions for the many reworkings and re-dispersals of Du Bartas' works within English-language texts.

Part II: Allusions and Quotations

Preface

In her 'Book of Remembrance' (c. 1639), Elizabeth Isham reports being distressed by

the reading of Dubertus in a place reasoning with an Athest as I take it for I doe not well remember the words, it was now the second time \it was/ I read the booke I liked it so well. neither was I troubled with reading the place afore. which doth \[ever]/ make me take the fault or weaknes to be of my selfe /rather\ then any hurt of the Booke (which since I have found some places to maintaine the truth of the diety).¹

Isham, a diarist from Northamptonshire, could probably read French and may not have used Sylvester's translations, but in other regards seems a fairly typical seventeenth-century reader of the *Semaines*: she approached the book with a pious spirit for private instruction and meditation, read the poems more than once, and sincerely admired them.

Yet Isham must serve to represent a large and anonymous constituency of contemporary readers, because the surviving textual evidence contains an intrinsic bias away from what Brian Stock has called 'aesthetic readers' who read for pleasure or without a pre-determined purpose, and leans towards 'ascetic readers' who read for specific reasons or to help with their writing.² Most surviving evidence of reading practices is from printed books that show how writers looked for new ideas, elegant phrases, or corroboration of existing opinions in the *Semaines*. Manuscript annotations and quotations in printed books are valuable for helping us to recover traces of reading practices, but this evidence only tells us about those who held a pen in their hand while reading. Consequently, thoughtful readers like Isham who were not consulting the *Semaines* with an intention to write or publish works in print or

¹ *Book of Remembrance*, 31r [<http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/ren/projects/isham>]. She may be referring to a section in either the First Day (1605, C2r) or 'The Arke' (2D4r) which have printed marginalia noting that Du Bartas is 'confuting' atheists.

² Brian Stock, *Ethics through Literature* (Hanover, 2007).

manuscript are liable to be under-represented.³ This limitation, however, encourages us to concentrate on observing active reading practices, where a close relationship exists between reading and writing.⁴ Though Isham shows that directive reading was not the rule—readers surely often allowed themselves to be surprised while leafing through the *Semaines*—it makes sense to concentrate on writers who find ethical, political, religious or epistemological significance in the work because this carefully controlled type of response is more easily recovered, and reveals more about the processes and purposes of early modern intertextuality.

As poems which were read unusually widely and for varied reasons, the *Semaines*' English reception is highly relevant to recent research into the history of reading. Numerous copies of *Devine Weekes* (e.g. those described in Chapter 4.i) can be added to the growing body of evidence of how early modern readers used and marked their books.⁵ The material context of translations, such as page layout, printed marginalia and paratexts, guided reader responses.⁶ In attempting to reconstruct reading experiences, however, an analysis should also heed Jennifer Richards and Fred Schurink's recommendation to bear textuality in mind as well as materiality; i.e. how the *Semaines* were being read as poems.⁷ As foregrounded in earlier chapters, it remains important to determine how writers perceive the relationship between individual sections of the poems and the total structure, and to discern the interpretative implications of this preference. Specifically, it is necessary to determine whether the *Semaines*

³ On early modern literacy, see David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order* (Cambridge, 1980); Kenneth Charlton, *Women, Religion and Education in Early Modern England* (London, 1999); Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* (Cambridge, 1981; repr. 1989); and Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge, 1991).

⁴ Aside from studies already cited see, among others, Ann Blair, 'Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550-1700', *JHI* 64 (2003), 11-28 (13-14, 17-19) and Peter Mack, 'Renaissance Habits of Reading', in *Renaissance Essays for Kitty Scoular Datta*, ed. by Sukanta Chaudhuri (Calcutta, 1995), pp. 1-25.

⁵ See William H. Sherman, *Used Books* (Philadelphia, 2008); Sasha Roberts, *Reading Shakespeare's Poems in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2003). On studying manuscript annotations, see, for example, Fred Schurink, "'Like a Hand in the Margine of a Booke': William Blount's Marginalia and the Politics of Sidney's *Aradia*", *RES* 59 (2008), 1-24.

⁶ Studies that make this point include: *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge, 2011); William W. E. Slights, *Managing Readers* (Ann Arbor, 2001); Evelyn B. Tribble, *Margins and Marginality* (Charlottesville and London, 1993); and *The Future of the Page*, ed. by Peter Stoicheff and Andrew Taylor (Toronto and London, 2004).

⁷ Jennifer Richards and Fred Schurink, 'Introduction: The Textuality and Materiality of Reading in Early Modern England', *HLQ* 73 (2010), 345-61.

contain allegorical structures that pre-dispose readers to look for higher meaning, and, if not, to propose models of interpretation that reckon with either the work's totality, or with the poems as genuinely isolable pieces that can be read non-serially. Miernowski's and Giacomotto-Charra's criticism refuted suggestions that the poems were written as allegories and that they are self-contained, all-encompassing encyclopedic poems. Their research encourages us to look more closely at how non-lyric printed verse suited discontinuous reading.⁸ It also directs us to scrutinize what it meant to label the *Semaines* as divine literature, investigate how their reputation affected interpretation and quotation practices, and also seek parallels with contemporary liturgical practices where possible: Peter Stallybrass finds that textual apparatus in early English-language Bibles helps to indicate 'the centrality of indexical reading to nearly all Christians in early modern England'.⁹ In order to start examining how the *Semaines*' different forms and editions effect meaning, this part of the thesis uncovers a set of older reading practices that can help us develop a historized appreciation of how the poems were admired, and in doing so re-evaluate the poems' achievement.¹⁰

John Louis Lepage's doctoral thesis provides a good point of contrast with the types of reading practice proposed in the following chapter, not least because his argument made an initial attempt to use bibliographical evidence to reconstruct earlier interpretations of the *Semaines*.¹¹ Lepage argued persuasively that the *Semaines* do not possess the fixed architectonic and allegorical structures of Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (1590, 1596), but that they do

⁸ Two studies that emphasize discontinuous early modern poetic reading in English are Alastair Fowler, *Renaissance Realism* (Oxford, 2003), and Gerard Kilroy, 'Advertising the Reader: Sir John Harrington's "Directions in the Margent" [with illustrations]', *ELR* 41 (2010), 64-110.

⁹ 'Books and Scrolls: Navigating the Bible', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. by Jennifer Lotte Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, 2002), pp. 42-79 (p. 51). Relatively little work has been done on earlier ways of reading the Bible and other divine literature; see Kevin Killeen, 'Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in Early Modern England', *HLQ* 73 (2010), 491-506.

¹⁰ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 13. For an introduction to related issues of readership and authorship, see Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books*, trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1994), e.g. p. 90.

¹¹ Lepage, 'Joshua Sylvester's Translation of Du Bartas' *Les Semaines*'. William Newton Short, Jr. takes a different approach to some similar questions when discussing ontology and aesthetic experience in the *Semaines* through an analysis of Martin Heidegger's philosophy and Du Bartas' poetry: see 'The Phenomenology of Du Bartas' "Les Sepmaines"' (unpublished PhD thesis, Rice University, 1979).

have symbolic elements that grow from linguistic, rhetorical and imagistic structures, rather than the poems' massive seven-Day design: for Lepage, the *Semaines* and Sylvester's translation are 'rhetorically bound to a greater, natural scheme of things' (p. 46), since both are constructed from images and conceits that expand into larger linguistic units through rhetorical figures of repetition, accumulation and above all antithesis. This observation leads Lepage to argue, taking Sylvester's use of enjambment as evidence, that '*Divine Weeks* is not a sentence or paragraph oriented work, however, but a phrasal one' (p. 51). His argument's kernel is that each phrase contains 'hieroglyphic' markers that point from microcosm to macrocosm. However, as the next two chapters demonstrate, readers did divide Sylvester's translation into discrete sentence- and paragraph-units, using printed marginalia to find factual information. Lepage supports an emphasis on phrasal structures by viewing italicized words as interpretative cues:

the hieroglyphic language of science that I have discussed in *Divine Weeks* consists of most of the words that Sylvester and his publishers have taken care to italicise in the text. [...] It is difficult for me to imagine sensitive readers of Sylvester's time insensible to the allegorical language of his italicised text. (p. 183)

The case for intentionality here is greatly weakened by the many minor differences in italicization between seventeenth-century editions of Sylvester's translation. Moreover, there are simpler explanations for the presence of italicized words: they are used for proper nouns (which often appear in the glossary of difficult words, and very seldom suggest personification), quoted or sententious phrases, loan words and the translator's interpolations (which is how italics are used in the Authorized Version).¹² In short, the material evidence does not support a case that '*Divine Weekes* is a model for metaphorical correspondences' (p. 188), in which each part is directed towards a single whole. Lepage's claim that the *Semaines* have a generic epic narrative is also disputable: his thesis argues that 'Du Bartas' epic forces

¹² On italics in the Authorized Version, see Kent P. Jackson, Frank F. Judd Jr and David R. Seely, 'Chapters, Verses, Punctuation, Spelling, and Italics in the King James Version', *The Religious Educator* 7 (2006), 40-64 (56-60).

upon him an almost Virgilian concern with narrative line' (p. 92), a line which is studded with symbolic keywords. Although Lepage's conclusions may be flawed, his approach has great potential, and the following chapters pursue his attempt to recover earlier interpretations of the *Semaines* using material evidence. A particular concern is to describe further approaches to *Divine Weekes* that do not grow out of allegory, since we have seen that the poems were not associated with this kind of writing or reading at the time: as A. C. Hamilton once wrote, Du Bartas was 'the great divine poet' but 'first enemy' to allegory and fictive verse.¹³ Recent work on alliances between natural philosophy and biblical exegesis, which were both turning away from symbolic interpretation towards active, empirical investigation, suggests that such readings may fit well with broader intellectual developments of the time.¹⁴ The *Semaines* served as ethical, spiritual, rhetorical and quasi-encyclopedic companions to poets, and these different aspects often blended together, without necessarily offering any fixed paradigm for how the poems were being read. This part introduces the *Semaines*' unique identity as non-lyric divine poems with a strong foundation in epideictic rhetoric which were read selectively for instruction, as well as for private meditation and inspiration.

Given this emphasis on purposive readings, it makes sense to group together similar kinds of response, beginning by separating evidence in prose from poetry. Prose writers tend to extract specific quotations, and include references to Du Bartas by name, often specifying the section of the *Semaines* they are citing. They demonstrate readings that are often congruent, consciously so, with James's deference for the poems as morally enriching didactic works, and with the continental esteem for the *Semaines* as an authoritative non-fictional work. Poetic responses, by contrast, are seldom announced in the text, and are usually stitched more tightly together in style, theme and tone to a larger composition, at times becoming

¹³ A. C. Hamilton, *The Structure of Allegory in the Faerie Queene* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 124-25, 223. For similar reasons, it seems unlikely that Du Bartas' or Sylvester's poetry possesses numerological structures; cf. Noel Heather, *Du Bartas, French Huguenot Poet, and his Humorous Ambivalence* (Lewiston, N.Y., and Lampeter, 1998).

¹⁴ Peter Harrison, 'Reinterpreting Nature in Early Modern Europe: Natural Philosophy, Biblical Exegesis and the Contemplative Life', in *The Word and the World*, ed. by Kevin Killeen and Peter J. Forshaw (Basingstoke, 2007), pp. 25-44.

indistinguishable from a poet's own writing. Such examples provoke a different set of questions and methodological concerns, about distinguishing actual responses from general affinities or resonances (see Part III, preface), processes of imitation and how poets borrowed and reshaped individual phrases in their own poems (Chapter 5), and what Du Bartas' wider influence on English poetry might be (Chapter 6).

Because there are more quotations in prose than poetry, and they are more susceptible to being mediated by the particular editions being used to locate information, I will consider these first in two chapters that look at where, when and why the *Semaines* were disseminated in different translations and editions (Chapter 3), and then examine exactly how writers took quotations from the poems and redeployed them in new contexts (Chapter 4). Chapter 3 summarizes how translations, particularly Sylvester's, were distributed across England and Scotland. It begins by reviewing how French and English copies circulated, and then offers a concise summary of some different communities of readers through a survey of references to 'Du Bartas' and 'Sylvester' in printed books. Chapter 4 investigates the processes of reading behind these responses in closer detail. Since most examples are prose references to individual passages from the *Semaines*, I begin by showing how readers facilitated such extraction by annotating their copies and writing quotations in commonplace books. A series of case studies follows that show prose writers reading Du Bartas, in particular conservatives who admired the *Semaines'* compatibility with the synchronous astronomical and liturgical cycles. These two chapters elaborate in turn on the calculus and mechanics of Du Bartas' reception: how his readership and reputation changed over time, and how readers used the poems.

Chapter 3: The *Semaines* and their Reading Communities

This chapter traces how the *Semaines*' readership expanded and diversified between Hudson's and James VI and I's first translations published in 1584, and the final re-issue of Sylvester's translation in 1641.¹ Within this period the poems were read, praised and quoted in French and English by a wide range of poets, playwrights, scholars, courtiers, clergymen and other writers. As more printed editions became available the number of references to Du Bartas increased, and different communities of readers emerged. In the late sixteenth century Du Bartas was chiefly mentioned in print by writers in London who were well-informed about contemporary poetry; after—and partly because of—James's accession to the English throne, the *Semaines* reached a wider educated readership which admired the poems as an authoritative repository of knowledge. This chapter provides a survey of the whole period covered by the thesis, as we focus now on how writers cited or invoked the *Semaines* when composing original works.

'Divine' is probably the most common epithet used by early modern English-speaking writers to describe Du Bartas and his poetry, and this term is best understood in relation to 'L'Uranie' (1574), which was also being read at this time (James having made the first English translation in 1584): Urania had appealed for serious, religiously committed verse based on Scripture.² As Scott describes, the *Semaines* were also philosophical poems with close links to other branches of learning: they intertwined poetry, classical learning, natural philosophy and world history. This ambitious combination was both attractive and useful in the seventeenth century: Du Bartas, unlike post-classical poets like Petrarch, Ludovico Ariosto and Torquato Tasso, was cited in many English-language treatises, sermons and other prose works. Two reasons for the poet's distinctive reputation were James's admiration for Du Bartas and the multiple editions of *Divine Weekes*.

¹ I thank two reviewers for *Renaissance Studies* for their valuable comments on a version of this chapter.

² See Campbell, *Divine Poetry and Drama*, pp. 4-5.

This chapter examines the *Semaines*' dissemination using the more than 150 English printed books in the period 1584-1641 that refer to Du Bartas, many of which Prescott mentions in her book-chapter.³ In addition to incorporating numerous references that have not been discussed previously, this chapter builds on Prescott's work by placing a methodological emphasis on how individual readers responded to the text of the *Semaines*. 'Du Bartas' did not have the same meaning to people writing sixty years apart, even though most early modern writers do refer to him by that name. 'Du Bartas' often acts as a proper noun for a French poet, but is also used, sometimes simultaneously, as a metonym for his works. As far as possible, the present analysis is sensitive to the different editions being read and quoted from, how texts are circulating, which readers are being addressed, and whether a reference belongs within a cluster of contemporaneous material. This chapter focuses on the changing social and intellectual contexts of references to 'Du Bartas', looking for consensus where it exists and drawing connections between sources where possible.

A more closely contextualised account of Du Bartas' British reception can show how, why, where and when the poem's perceived value developed. It is difficult to identify exactly when the *Semaines*' popularity peaked, but 1615 is a rough median date of publication for printed references until 1641. The three sections that follow concentrate on different groups of readers. The first looks at references before *Devine Weekes*, beginning with Gabriel Harvey's *Pierces Supererogation* and the other Elizabethan texts and individuals associated with this work. The second section looks at a contrasting range of responses to the *Semaines* before and after James's accession, and the third discusses the *Semaines*' clerical readership.

³ References were collated from data gathered by Abbot and Prescott, and supplemented with other work relating to Du Bartas' British reception, and keyword searches on EEBO-Text Creation Partnership (TCP) and other databases for 'Bartas', 'Sylvester' and variants. This catalogue does not necessarily offer a complete picture of Du Bartas' reception: in particular, Scottish responses after 1603 are not represented well in print. For the strengths and limitations of EEBO as a research tool, see Anders Ingram, 'Readers and Responses to George Sandys' *A Relation of a Journey begun An: Dom: 1610* (1615): Early English Books Online (EEBO) and the History of Reading', *European Review of History—Revue européenne d'histoire* 7 (2010), 287-301.

i. Before 1605

Gabriel Harvey's praise for the *Semaines* is among the earliest tributes to Du Bartas' poetry, and has been quoted often by later critics. His marginalia contain around ten references, while *Pierces Supererogation* (1593) dilates at length on the French poet's merits: he is 'the Treasurer of Humanity and Jeweller of Diuinity' and 'a right inspired, and enravished Poet'.⁴ The standard interpretation of this passage is that it shows that Du Bartas' popularity was founded on an excessively high estimation of the French poet that was corrected shortly after the Restoration. While Harvey's comments are indeed broadly representative, they are also specific to the particular texts he was reading in the 1590s. Harvey's adulatory epithets are found in a passage that begins by praising James VI's translations: '[James] hath not onely translated the two diuine Poems of Salustius du Bartas, his heauenly Vraney, and his hellish Furies: but hath readd a most valorous Martial Lecture vnto himselfe in his owne victorious Lepanto' (G4r). Harvey mentions here James's translations of 'L'Uranie' in *Essayes of a Prentise* and 'The Furies' (II.i.2) in *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises* (in the section of this passage not quoted, Harvey alludes to the full title of the 1591 collection in mentioning kings who 'render an accompt of their vacant howers'). Eleanor Relle has shown that the volume which was 'in the front of Harvey's mind, and almost certainly on the table, as he wrote' these words contains those two books and the editions of Sylvester's translations from 1592, all three of which were bound together in or around 1592 into a book that Harvey annotated.⁵ Harvey's notes to James's 'L'Uranie' translation are a source for the passage quoted above, with one sentence appearing almost verbatim: 'In a manner the only Poet of Diuines: and worthy to be alledgid of them, as Homer is quoted of Philosophers.'⁶ So Harvey's public, printed utterance about Du Bartas arose from his private reading of James VI's poetry, some of it from a book

⁴ Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation* (1593), G4r-v; Moore Smith (ed.), *Harvey's Marginalia*.

⁵ Eleanor Relle, 'Some New Marginalia and Poems of Gabriel Harvey', *RES* 23 (1972), 401-16 (409). On Harvey's reading of James's *Essayes*, see Jennifer Richards, 'Gabriel Harvey, James VI, and the Politics of Reading Early Modern Poetry', *HLQ* 71 (2008), 303-21.

⁶ Relle, 'Some New Marginalia', 403.

that Harvey had obtained within a year of its publication. Indeed, James VI's printer and his wife, the French Huguenots Thomas and Jacqueline Vautrollier, may have supplied Harvey with the Scottish books: they were one of the first book businesses to operate simultaneously in Edinburgh and London.⁷ Although conscious that Du Bartas was favoured by James, Harvey's positive evaluation suggests a reading style more relaxed than the ruthlessly pragmatic strategies said to characterize his reading of other writers such as Livy.⁸

French editions must have been circulating in the 1590s when no other English translations were available. References in Latin hint at Du Bartas' early prestige, and again connect the poet with his esteemed English translator: the earliest extant printed reference to Du Bartas in an English book is found in an Oxford anthology of Latin poems and epigrams in memory of Sidney (*Exequiae Illustrissimi Equitis, D. Philippi Sidnaei, Gratissimae Memoriae ac Nomini Impensae* (1587), D3r, E2v and K1r). Harvey doubtless knew the French as well, for in *A New Letter of Notable Contents* (1593) he laments the absence of Du Bartas translations (A4r). Abraham Fraunce's *Lanyers Logicke* (1588) names 'Bartas' (B3r) as a great European poet; published in the same year, Fraunce's *Arcadian Rhetoricke* advertizes on its titlepage that it contains French quotations from 'Salust his Iudith, and both his Semaines'.

Those around Harvey knew, or were expected to know, Du Bartas' poetry too. Barnabe Barnes must have read James VI's translation before he wrote the prefatory letter and sonnet to Harvey in *Pierces Supererogation*:

I right hartely take my leau with a Sonnet of that Muse, that honoreth the Vraney of du Bartas, and yourselfe: of du Bartas elsewhere; here of him, whose excellent Pages of the French King, the Scottish King, the braue Monsieur de la Nöe, the aforesayd Lord du Bartas, Sir Philip Sidney, and sundry other worthy personages, deserue immortall commendation. (3*2v)

⁷ Alastair J. Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade, 1500-1720* (East Linton, 2000), pp. 14 and 137; John Corbett, 'The Prentise and the Printer: James VI and Thomas Vautrollier', in *The Apparelling of Truth*, ed. by Kevin J. McGinley and Nicola Royan (Newcastle, 2010), pp. 80-93. Vautrollier's heirs complained in 1589/90 about the burgh taxes levied on Scottish books sold in England.

⁸ See Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, "'Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past and Present* 129 (1990), 30-78.

Barnes also names Du Bartas as the archetypal divine poet in the preface to his *Divine Centurie of Spiritual Sonnets* (1595, A3r), though in context the quotation does not indicate that Barnes took Du Bartas as a poetic model. Barnes is an addressee of the prefatory letter in *Pierces Supererogation* along with two others who are likely to have known Du Bartas' poetry: John Thorius and Antony Chute ('Chewt'). Thorius clearly read continental literature: he translated numerous works from Dutch and Spanish (including works by Bartolome Felippe, Antonio de Corro and Francisco de Valdes), though his printed works nowhere mention Du Bartas.⁹ Chute was close to Harvey by 1592, and his printer for *Beawtie Dishonoured* (1593) was John Wolfe, who printed Ashley's Latin translation and Harvey's *New Letter* (he is the addressee) and shared a residence with Barnes (which is how Barnes knew Harvey).¹⁰ Chute is among the first writers to praise Du Bartas' endurance when referring to 'the weeke labours of her [France's] toyling-mused Bartas' in the opening lines of the dedicatory letter to Sir Edward Winckfield in *Beawtie Dishonoured* (A2r). In *Pierces Supererogation* these writers are lined up with Harvey against Thomas Nashe: Harvey's praise implicitly chides his opponent for not appreciating contemporary poetry. Nashe responded in *Have with you to Saffron-Walden* (1596): 'I neuer so much as in thought detracted from *Du Bartas*, *Buchanan*, or anie generall allowed moderne Writer, howere *Gnimelfe Hengiest* [Gabriel Harvey] here giues out'.¹¹

This cluster of references centred on Harvey shows that Du Bartas was a 'generall allowed moderne Writer' whose poetry was known among a small group of highly literate writers between 1593 and 1595. His works were known to other well-read Londoners too. As examined above (Chapter 1.ii) John Hoskins may have been linked with the 1595 translation of 'Le Premier Jour', and other Middle Templars were probably aware of it too. Thomas Churchyard probably translated part of 'Le Cinquiesme Jour', though only a paraphrase

⁹ Howard Jones, 'Thorius, John (b. 1568)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27335>].

¹⁰ Sidney Lee, 'Chute, Anthony (d. 1594/5)', rev. Matthew Steggle, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5411>].

¹¹ *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. by R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols (London, 1910), III, 130. The Buchanan slight was made in Harvey's *Foure Letters, and certaine Sonnets* (1592; repr. Plaistow, 1922), pp. 67-68.

survives.¹² Several years later the *Semaines* featured in another literary quarrel, that between Joseph Hall and John Marston. The fourth of Marston's *Certayne Satires* (1598) accuses Grillus (Hall) of criticizing Du Bartas, the Hopkins and Sternhold's psalter and, apparently by implication, James:

At *Bartas* sweet *Semaines*, raile impudent
At *Hopkins*, *Sternbold*, and the *Scottish King*,
At all Translators that doe striue to bring
That stranger language to our vulgar tongue,
Spett in thy poyson theyr faire acts among.¹³

In *The Kings Prophecie: or Weeping Ioy* (1603), which was composed for James I's coronation, Hall asserted a desire to emulate Du Bartas:

So may thy [James's] worth my lowly Muse vpraise,
So may mine hie-vp-raised thoughts aspire
That not thy *Bartas* selfe, whose sacred layes
The yeelding world doth with thy selfe admire,
Shal passe my song, which nought can reare so hye,
Sauce the sweete influence of thy gracious eye

(ll. 115-20)

Hall's reference to Du Bartas' 'sacred layes' helps form a favourable impression of his literary tastes. Hall's (and the 'yeelding world's') esteem for Du Bartas is linked with James VI and I, and plays well with a readership that presumably included James and Marston.¹⁴

Marston's and Hall's references to the *Semaines* imply that the poems were known to a slightly wider public by the late 1590s. As Chapter 5 explores in detail, Du Bartas was known and read among late-Elizabethan dramatists too, including Christopher Marlowe, George Peele and the author of *Taming of a Shrew*. He is also mentioned in final *Parnassus* play performed at St. John's College, Cambridge, which contains a request for a copy of Du Bartas:

¹² Thomas Churchyard, *Churchyards Challenge* (1593), A5r-v and X1v-2v; see also *A Musicall Consort of Heavenly Harmonie [...] called Churchyards Charitie* (1595), E4v and G4r.

¹³ *The Poems of John Marston*, ed. by Arnold Davenport (Liverpool, 1961), p. 82. See Hall's *Virgidemiarum* (1597), Satire 1.IV, ll. 21-6.

¹⁴ Hall's dedicatory verse to Sylvester, which first appeared in the 1608 *Devine Weekes*, was written when both writers were in Prince Henry's service; they would not have known each other in 1605 when the first edition was printed. *The Poems of Joseph Hall*, ed. by Arnold Davenport (Liverpool, 1969), pp. 144 and 273.

‘Sirrha boy remember me when I come in[to] Paules Churchyard to buy a *Ronzard & Dubartas* in French’.¹⁵ The *Parnassus* plays offer a satirical but realistic portrait of contemporary London society; St Paul’s Churchyard was known for its language schools aimed at the middle classes.¹⁶ This detail is good evidence that Du Bartas’ works—and printed books—were being distributed there at that time.¹⁷

ii. Approaching the Accession

The printed references mentioned so far do not indicate much close engagement with either Du Bartas’ works generally or the *Semaines* in particular. However, the few pre-Jacobean references not yet discussed show that the *Semaines* were also being consulted for specific information and examples in the 1590s. As writers were drawn to the *Semaines’ dulce and utile*, commended by both William Lisle (Chapter 1.iii) and William Scott (Chapter 2.i), the *Semaines’* practical value came to play an increasingly important part in the poems’ reception history.

John Eliot’s *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593) is contemporary with Harvey’s writings on Du Bartas, but offers a very different approach to the *Semaines*. The book was intended for French learners, and Eliot is quick to mention contemporary poets to show that he is attuned to French culture: he focuses on authors ‘one should read for stylistic development more than for grammatical study’.¹⁸ Eliot readily admits in his preface that he has taken ‘a score or two of verses out of *Bartasius’* (B3r). He includes over sixty lines of original translations from the *Semaines*: forty lines from ‘Les Colonies’ (II.ii.3) in praise of France (J3v-4r; this translation is reproduced from his *Suruay or Topographical Description of France*, A3r-4v); three extracts from ‘Babylone’ (II.ii.2) on Elizabeth (L1r-2v), Joseph Justus Scaliger (F1r-v) and Cicero (G2r); and the five-line quotation about the lark (T2r; see Chapter 1.i). Other references focus on Du

¹⁵ *The Three Parnassus Plays* (1598-1601; repr. London, 1949), p. 301 (Second Part of the Return from Parnassus, III.iii, ll. 1267-70).

¹⁶ Paula Glatzer, *The Complaint of the Poet* (Salzburg, 1977), p. 200; Douglas A. Kibbee, *For to Speke Frenche Trewey* (Amsterdam, 1991), pp. 110 and 196.

¹⁷ For other plays that cite Du Bartas, see M. P. Tilley, ‘Charles Lamb, Marston, and Du Bartas’, *MLN* 53 (1938), 494-98 and ‘The Comedy *Lingua* and Du Bartas’ *La Sepmaine*’, *MLN* 42 (1927), 293-99.

¹⁸ Kibbee, *For to Speke*, p. 121.

Bartas' poetic talents: the preface notes that 'the sweetest that are to be read are in French, pend by *Bartas, Marot, Ronsard, Belleau, de Portes*, and diuers other wits inimitable in Poësie' (B1r); the speaker in one practice dialogue asks to '[l]et me see the first and second weeke of Bartas in French' (i2r); while a third, adapting a comment attributed to Ronsard (and recycled by other writers too), mistakenly mentions 'the Christian Poet *William Sallustius*, Lord of Bartas, who hath written more in *Three-Weekes*, then all other French Poets, or all other Poets either Pagan or Christian haue done in all their life' (H1r). Importantly, Eliot is elsewhere indebted to Goulart's commentary on 'Babylone' for information about European languages and literatures.¹⁹ Although a reference to the 'Three-Weekes' of the *Semaines* is hardly evidence of close reading, *Ortho-epia Gallica* is an early attempt at extracting useful non-fictional content from the *Semaines* and Goulart's commentary.

Gabriel Harvey's annotated copy of *Ortho-epia Gallica* allows us to distinguish sharply between Eliot's and Harvey's approaches to Du Bartas.²⁰ Harvey marks numerous Du Bartas allusions and translations throughout the work, but his annotations are concentrated in the opening dialogue, which contains an extended treatment of individual poets. Harvey writes 'braue Homer', 'braue Virgil', 'braue Ariosto' and 'braue Tasso' at the top of sigs G1r, G3r, G3v and G4r, with the following (now badly cropped) phrase at the bottom of G3v: '*Ariosto, & Tasso*, two heroically, & diuine Wittes: most braue, & souerain Poets next Homer, & Virgil; still my two singular Types, [—] Bartas also an inspired & diuine spirit'. On H1r, Harvey writes 'braue Du Bartas' and the following sentence: '*Bartas*, for ye maiesty of his heauenly matter, & diuine forme, a most-excellent, & singular Poet: the only Christian Homer to this day'. Each note indicates that Harvey was interested more in the poet's prestige than in either Eliot's translations or Goulart's commentary.

¹⁹ See Frances Yates, 'The Importance of John Eliot's *Ortho-Epia Gallica*', *RES* 7 (1931), 419-30.

²⁰ Caroline Brown Bourland, 'Gabriel Harvey and the Modern Languages', *HLQ* 4 (1940), 85-106 (99-102). Quotations from Harvey's copy, which is held by the Huntington Library and is viewable on EEBO, are from this article.

Eliot is almost alone in using the *Semaines* as a reference source at this time. His practice is undoubtedly connected to the printed context of these references: the extracts work well as French-English parallel texts, and Eliot was using an annotated French edition of the *Semaines*. Lisle's translations were an early indicator that the *Semaines*' factual content was being appreciated, but apart from Fraunce in *The Arvadian Rhetoricke*, Thomas Lodge is the only other writer in the 1590s to cite the *Semaines* for non-fictional information. In *A Fig for Momus* (1595) Lodge quotes a reference to the numbers three and nine in 'Les Colomnes' (II.ii.4), and in *Wits Miseries* (1596) offers a fourteen-line original translation from 'Les Furies' (II.i.3) in English introduced by three lines from the French.²¹ Lodge's and Eliot's facility in French gave these writers access to a complete *Semaines* text with apparatus that allowed them to select material with care.

Prior to *Devine Weekes*' publication, it is impossible to generalize about the language or editions preferred by British readers. Sylvester's early translations, however, evidently expanded the *Semaines*' potential for quotation: they are cited often in the commonplace books *Englands Parnassus* and *Bodenham's Belvédère* (both 1600; see Chapter 4.i). Other writers, however, still based their knowledge of Du Bartas on the French. Alexander Hume's praise for Du Bartas' 'extolling of liberall sciences' in a work published in Edinburgh in 1599 suggests that he had read a Goulart-annotated French edition: 'I contemne not the moderate and trew commendation of the vertuous, & noble actes of good men: nor yet the extolling of liberall sciences: But thou hast notable examples in the French toong set foorth by *Salust* of *Bartas*.'²² Francis Thynne praises Du Bartas' contribution to French literature in a prefatory verse to a 1602 edition of Chaucer's works. He alludes to the 'seven daies', which did not become available in English for another three years: 'What fame *Bartas* vnto proud France

²¹ Lodge, *A Fig for Momus* (1595), H3v; *Wits Miserie* (1596), K3v.

²² Hume, *Hymnes* (Edinburgh, 1599), A4v.

hath gained, | By seuen daies world Poetically strained.²³ Francis Beaumont refers to Goulart's commentary in the same volume: 'not onely all Greeke and Latine Poets haue had their interpretours, and the most of them translated into our tongue, but the French also and Italian, as *Guillaume de Salust*, that most diuine French Poet' (A5r). As noted in Chapter 2.ii, Goulart's marginalia, printed in full for the 1605 *Devine Weekes*, made the poem's organization more transparent and enabled writers to extract quotations more quickly (e.g. by sparing the reader from scanning through the Fifth Day to locate a particular fish or bird).

The *Semaines*' status as major Jacobean poems is confirmed by the five further editions of Sylvester's translation that appeared after 1608, each of which contained the same extravagant paratextual material associating James with Du Bartas. As Chapter 1 showed, James VI was among the first British admirers of Du Bartas' poetry, and was closely involved in the earliest translations (and indirectly in their distribution, through the Vautrolliers). James made his support for Du Bartas clear for the English in *Basilikon Doron*, copies of which were reportedly being printed within hours of Elizabeth's death, and were made available just four days later, on 28 March 1603.²⁴ *Basilikon Doron*'s 'To the Reader' remarks that the work 'must be taken of all men, for the true image of my very minde, and forme of the rule, whiche I have praescriued to my selfe and minde'.²⁵ James Craigie observes that 'Du Bartas is the only modern poet ever cited' in James's prose works, though James certainly knew the critical writings of Pierre de Ronsard and Joachim Du Bellay, and shows further knowledge of French writers in his poetry.²⁶ The key reference in *Basilikon Doron* comes from a section that James revised: after a quotation in the 1599 edition discouraging the noble from manual labour, '*Leur esprit s'en fuit au bout des doigts*', the 1603 version contains the following line: '[...] saith *Du Bartas*: whose workes, as they are all most worthie to be red by any Prince, or other

²³ *The Workes of our Ancient and Lerned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer* (1602), B1r.

²⁴ James Doelman, "'A King of Thine Own Heart': The English Reception of King James VI and I's *Basilikon Doron*", *SC* 9 (1994), 1-9 (1).

²⁵ Craigie (ed.), *Basilikon Doron*, I, 22.19-21.

²⁶ Craigie (ed.), *Poems of James VI*, I, xxiii.

good Christian; so would I especially wish you to bee well versed in them'.²⁷ James's request for good English Protestants 'to bee well versed' in Du Bartas' works posited them, and the *Semaines* in particular, as significant cultural objects with which readers ought to be familiar; his words, as Jane Rickard suggests, echoed the appeal made in *Essayes of a Prentise* (1584) for Du Bartas' works being published 'to this yle of *Brittain*' (C3r).²⁸ The recommendation encouraged more English translations: Thomas Winter quoted the phrase in the preface to *The Third Dayes Creation* (1604; see Chapter 2.ii).

After 1603 more writers made use of the *Semaines*' illustrations of non-fictional content, as well as exploiting, initially at least, their connection with the King. Numerous panegyric verses referred to the association with James: Joseph Hall's *The King's Prophecie* (1603) has already been mentioned, while three university anthologies published in 1603 confirm that Du Bartas' name was known in Oxford and Cambridge at the time of the accession. An Oxford anthology of poems composed for Elizabeth's death contains a verse in French by Edward Evans which begins by asking his Muse to greet Du Bartas.²⁹ *Academiae Oxoniensis Pietas* contains a Latin verse with an anagram equating the French poet with the Scottish King: 'Iacobvs Stevartvs | Vivè Scotus Bartas', and Thomas Goad, in Cambridge's *Threno-thriambenticon*, is still more direct in praising Du Bartas.³⁰ British readers may never have been truly 'well versed' in the *Semaines*, but the association with James remained close, and it became a work to know and to quote from. For rhetorical purposes, the *Semaines* could be taken as an index to the King's tastes: the preface to James in an English translation of Philippe Du Plessis Mornay's *Traicté de L'Église* (London, 1606) includes a French quotation from 'Babylone' that helps the translator John Molle argue for his work's legitimacy:

²⁷ I, 199.15-18. The French phrase means 'their spirit flies out of their fingertips'. James also cites Du Bartas in *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies* (Edinburgh, 1598), D6v.

²⁸ Rickard, 'Cultural Politics of Translation'.

²⁹ *Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium* (Oxford, 1603), H4v.

³⁰ *Academiae Oxoniensis Pietas*, D1v (quotation decapitalized); *Threno-thriambenticon* (Cambridge, 1603), I2r.

The worthines of the Author, who being highly esteemed of all true professors, as a notable Champion of Gods Truth, (for so the great *Du Bartas* setteth him out in these words; || ———*qui combat l'Atheisme, | Le Paganisme Vain, l'obstine Iudaisme, | avec son propre glaiue.* || may giue me iust occasion to presume of your Maiesties gracious acceptance in this behalfe. (A2r)³¹

Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* (1605) contains a reference to Du Bartas that also recalls a specific quotation from the *Semaines*.³² The association was manipulated to flatter James too: as late as 1624, Caleb Dalechamp invokes the 'Gallic nightingale' as evidence for James's poetic talents.³³ Dozens of Stuart writers similarly emphasize their work's continuity with the *Semaines*, and in doing so demonstrate that their writing is religiously and politically acceptable; as I discuss below, if the *Semaines* were affiliated to any ecclesiastical cause in England, it was conformity rather than further reform. The Crown's support underwrote the *Semaines*' authority and facilitated the work's dispersal across Britain, such that the type of citation first found in Eliot's and Lodge's work becomes more prevalent. The publication of *Devine Weekes* in 1605 made the *Semaines* more accessible to educated readers, and subsequent editions continued to satisfy demand.

References to 'Du Bartas' in seventeenth-century English printed books are almost always taken from Sylvester's translation, and, according to the *ESTC*, over one hundred copies of Sylvester's translations survive in British and American libraries today.³⁴ Copies were held in many private libraries, including those of: Francis Bacon; Ann Bowyer; Robert Greville Brooke, who also owned a 1593 edition of the *Seconde Semaine*, another edition published in Geneva in 1589, and a copy of Du Bartas' works printed in Paris in 1598; Samuel Brooke, whose two copies of the 1633 edition are listed under 'Divinity in English folio';

³¹ II.ii.2.673-75 ('And this *du Plessis* beating *Atheisme, | Vaine Paganisme*, and stubborne *Judaisme, | With their owne armes*'; Sylvester, II.ii.2.641-43).

³² *The Two Bookes of Francis Bacon* (1605), E1v (referring to I.iii.3-6).

³³ *Artis poeticae et versificatoriae encomium* (1624), in *Latin Treatises on Poetry from Renaissance England*, ed. and trans. by J. W. Binns (Signal Mountain, TN, 1999), pp. 156-57.

³⁴ However, *ESTC* records do not all correspond to surviving editions: St Peter's and Oriel Colleges, Oxford, do not have editions (with thanks to the librarians at these colleges for fielding enquiries), while a copy of the 1605 edition held at All Souls College (pp.5.6) in fact refers to four uncut waste sheets from that edition that appear on the front and back boards of another book (sheets containing N4/N5 and N3/N6 are used on both boards).

Thomas Manton, whose 1641 edition is listed under ‘Philology in English’; Sir Thomas Bludder, a cavalier; Thomas Plume (1641 edition); and the Deputy Chamberlain Scipio le Squyer.³⁵ From Cambridge inventories, we know that Richard Fletcher owned two volumes of Sylvester’s works (possibly the *Parliament of Vertues Royal*) in 1617; the linguist Abraham Tillman owned ‘Bartas gallice’ in 1589/90; William Ball, chaplain at Trinity College, possessed works by Du Bartas; and a student who specialized in grammar owned a copy of de Lerm’s translation in 1621.³⁶ Gabriel Naudé writes that it would be a ‘fault unpardonable’ to build a library that did not have a copy of Du Bartas’ works (among others of ‘the Modern most famous and renowned Authours’).³⁷ Seventeenth-century individuals who wrote their names in copies include Thomas Wilbraham, probably of Queen’s College, Oxford, in a 1611 French edition (Bodleian, Douce S subt. 2); and Thomas Lukin, in a 1633 English edition (Bodleian, Caps. 11.1).³⁸ A copy of the 1608 edition (Bodleian, Buxton 106) was owned by Elizabeth Balfour in March 1650 and later by John Adam (see A2r) and then Margary Muray, whose name appears on a blank leaf before ‘The Trophies’; Muray copied out the first line of the Argument on the leaf opposite to the printed text (‘Saul’s fall from favour into gods disgrace’). As *Devine Weekes* came into the possession of these and many other readers, James’s

³⁵ Francis Bacon, *Bibliotheca Baconia* (1686), p. 2, item 37; Victoria E. Burke, ‘Ann Bowyer’s Commonplace Book (Bodleian Library Ashmole MS 51): Reading and Writing Among the “Middling Sort”’, *EMLS* 6.3 (2001), 1.1-28 (26); Robert Greville, Baron Brooke, *Catalogus librorum ex bibliotheca nobilis cujusdam Angli [i.e. Baron Brooke]*, ed. by Gabriel Sangar and Nathaniel Ranew (1678), R1r, item 34, V1r, item 32, V1v-2r, items 14 and 45; Samuel Brooke, *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae reverend. et eruditi viri D. Samuelis Brooke* (1681), D1r, items 9 and 10; *Catalogus variorum et insignium librorum [...] Viri Thomae Manton, S.T.D.*, ed. by William Cooper (1678), K1v, item 1; John Lievsay and Richard Davis, ‘A Cavalier Library—1643’, *Studies in Bibliography* 6 (1954), 141-60; *Catalogue of the Plume Library at Maldon, Essex*, ed. by S. G. Deed, Jane Francis and Frank Chalton (Maldon, 1959) [<http://library.thomasplumeslibrary.co.uk/HeritageScripts/Hapi.dll/search1>]; F. Taylor, ‘The Books of Manuscripts of Scipio le Squyer, Deputy Chamberlain of the Exchequer (1620-59)’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 25 (1941), 137-64 (156). The Lumley Library catalogue mentions ‘Sir William Harbertes translation of the Urania or Coelest Muse of Salust de Bartas, out of French into English, dedicated to my lorde Lumley. manuscript’, about which no more is known (see Prescott, ‘Du Bartas’, p. 179). Du Bartas is named in twenty-three French book inventories: six from 1601-41 and seventeen from 1642-70 (*Livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVIIe siècle, 1598-1701*, ed. by Henri-Jean Martin and Roger Chartier, 2 vols, 3rd edition (Geneva, 1999), I, 514).

³⁶ E. S. Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories* (Cambridge, 1986), I, 572; II, 287.

³⁷ *Instructions concerning erecting of a library presented to my lord, the President De Mesme*, trans. by John Evelyn (1661), D5v.

³⁸ Foster, p. 1629. See Chapter 4.i for further examples.

association with the *Semaines* was reinforced and the poems were seen to defend both the existing political and ecclesiastical establishment, as the next section shows.

iii. Clerical Readers

The *Semaines* were widely seen as Du Bartas' 'no lesse learned then Christian weeke'.³⁹ The lawyer Richard Zouch noted that the *Semaines* are more contemplative than didactic: '*Spencer*, hauing as well deliuered Morall, and Heroicall matter for vse and action, as *Du Bartas* (now ours) Naturall and Diuine, for study and meditation.'⁴⁰ William Vaughan quoted a Bartasian nautical metaphor concerning spiritual guidance: 'following *Du Bartas* his aduise, hauing Faith for my sailes, the *holy Ghost* for my Pilot, and the Bible for my starre'.⁴¹ Though Du Bartas was a Huguenot and several notable puritan figures consulted the *Semaines*, it seems unlikely that the poetry was associated with a reformist agenda. Du Bartas may be the first author of 'moderne Distiques' that the godly William Prynne names as he commends divine poetry that is 'lawfull, yea usefull and commendable among Christians', but there is at least one recusant writer, Richard Rowlands, who cites the *Semaines* too.⁴² The poems probably represented conformity, both to a Jacobean ecclesiastical consensus and to contemporary humanistic learning; Prescott argues that Du Bartas' works slaked 'the increased thirst for explicitly religious or unfeigned moral verse' (p. 203). The *Semaines* were a good fit for preachers wishing to show moderation without stooping to rely on heathen sources: 'The occasional rhetorical flourish could also serve as a defence against establishment charges of "ignorance", and as a point of distinction from the truly radical enthusiasts who demanded the sole conjunction of the Scripture and inner light in pulpit explanations.'⁴³

³⁹ Pierre de La Primaudaye, *The French Academie*, trans. by Thomas Bowes, Richard Dolman and William Phelp (1618), 3R4r.

⁴⁰ *The Dove* (1613), E6v.

⁴¹ *The Arraignement of Slander Perjury Blasphemy* (1630), 2I3r.

⁴² Prynne, *Histrio-mastix* (1633), 5O1v; Rowlands (Verstegan), *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (Antwerp, 1605), G2r.

⁴³ John Morgan, *Godly Learning* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 121-41 (p. 122).

At least eighteen prose texts written by clergymen and published between 1608 and 1635 refer to Du Bartas. These sources refer to the *Semaines* for information about the natural world and history. Du Bartas' name is mentioned in published sermons by Thomas Adams, Paul Baynes, Edward Evans, Thomas Foster, Samuel Hinde, John Jackson, Matthew Stoneham, Henry Valentine and Samuel Ward.⁴⁴ Similar kinds of citation are found in works by Robert Bolton, John Crompe, Nicolas Hunt, James Martin, Samuel Purchas, Nehemiah Rogers, Archibald Simson, John Boys (who became Dean of Canterbury), and, perhaps unsurprisingly, James VI and I's royal chaplain, Martin Fotherby.⁴⁵ All these references are further evidence that James's presence helped to establish the poems' suitability in religious discourse at this time: George Abbot, for example, owned a copy of Sylvester's works (1621 edition) when he was Archbishop of Canterbury.⁴⁶ These references draw widely from the *Semaines*, but most are brief marginal citations and need not be quoted in full here. The following two brief examples are typically esoteric: James Martin, as he praises Moses' deeds, directs the reader to 'See M. *Sylvest.* Diuine Weekes'. Paul Baynes quotes the *Semaines* reference to the Greek island of Melos in the following marginal note: 'The French Comment on Bartas, in the third day of his first week, out of Mela'.

Du Bartas was closely associated with the world-book motif too; Prescott observes that 'several who described this volume [the world-book] call Du Bartas as witness' (p. 221).

⁴⁴ Adams, *The Happines of the Church* (1619), 2M7r; Baynes, *An Epitomie of Mans Misery and Deliuerie* (London, 1619), A3r; Evans, *Verba Dierum*, A1v, I2v and K1v; Foster, *Plouto-Mastix* (1631), D4r; Hinde, *A Free-will Offering* (1634), F4v-F5r; Jackson, *Ecclesiastes, The Worthy Church-man* (1628), B1v; Stoneham, *Two Sermons of Direction for Judges and Magistrates* (1608), B1v; Valentine, *Foure Sea-Sermons* (1635), C4v and E1r; and Ward, *A Coal from the Altar, to Kindle the Holy Fire of Zeale* (1615), F3v.

⁴⁵ Bolton, *Some Generall Directions for a Comfortable Walking with God* (1626), A3r; Crompe, *Collections out of S. Augustine and some few other Latine writers upon the first part of the Apostles Creed* (1638), D2v; Hunt, *The New-Borne Christian* (London, 1631), T3v; Martin, *Via Regia* (1615), C7v; Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimage* (1613), e.g. A6v; Rogers, *A Strange Vineyard in Palaestina* (1623), G4r; Simson, *Heptameron, the Seven Dayes* (Saint Andrews, 1621), A5r; Boys, *An Exposition of the Proper Psalms used in our Liturgie* (1616), B1r; Fotherby, *Atheomastix*, Z3v, 2C5r, 2E4r and 2E5r.

⁴⁶ Copy held by Lambeth Palace Library ((ZZ)1621.43). Richard Bancroft, Abbot's predecessor, owned a copy of James VI's *Poeticall Exercises* ((ZZ)1585.16.02) with several manuscript corrections that also appear in Bodleian copies (BB 19(1) Art. Seld. and Vet. A1 e.26 (except E2v)), such as 'Ars\e/nicke' (C1v), '\w/rinckles' (F2r). The Art. Seld. copy contains manuscript caesuras written against hypermetrical lines (e.g. C2v, E3r).

There are four priests who do so: Samuel Hinde, John Boys, Edward Evans and Nehemiah Rogers. For instance, Hinde's citation reads:

This world is a booke in Folio wherein are written the workes and wonders of Gods omnipotent hand, the acts and monuments of our maker and preserver in his owne proper characters; [marginal note: Dubartas i. day. The world's a booke in Folio written all with Gods great works in letters capitall.] *(A Free-will Offering, F4v)*

Hinde's note provides the same couplet from Sylvester's translation that the other writers have in mind. Rogers appears to have borrowed his reference from Boys, and none of these writers demonstrates close reading of Du Bartas, or even acquaintance with the poem beyond the First Day. Each author does, however, make a meaningful gesture to the *Semaines*' organizing conceit, localized to the same couplet. In the above cases, each writer recalls just one quotation, probably from memory, and does not, with the exception of Evans, provide the information necessary for a reader to locate it. Yet it was useful, especially for puritan-minded preachers, to adopt vivid metaphors while presenting them as products of individual, fallible human minds.⁴⁷ Furthermore, these writers show that the *Semaines* were now available nationwide. Although almost all the religious works mentioned were published in London, the printed copies associate the sermons with preachers and congregations across the country, from Dalkeith, Midlothian (Simson) to Norwich (Stoneham) and Devon (Foster). Even if the marginal references to Du Bartas were supplied by London printers, they still highlight unmistakable allusions to Du Bartas in the body of the text: it was reasonable to think that priests and congregations across England and Scotland, and readers of these books, would all be familiar with the *Semaines*. The *Semaines* were no longer the preserve of cultured Londoners: they were known to educated readers across the country.

The religious writer who quotes Du Bartas most often, and is worth pursuing in closer detail here in preparation for the analysis of reading practices in the next chapter, is another

⁴⁷ Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 139.

royal chaplain, George Hakewill. In *An Apologie of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World* (Oxford, 1627; second edition, 1635) Hakewill is alert to the *Semaines'* scriptural and theological frameworks, and the conservative ecclesiological viewpoint that accompanies them. *An Apologie* is a vindication of divine providence, modern intellectual endeavour and the reformed church that argues for natural cycles of renewal and perpetual theological, cosmological and epistemological unity that existed before the foundation of the Catholic Church.⁴⁸ *Apologie* was a response to Godfrey Goodman's *Fall of Man* (1616), which upheld a traditional view of moral, natural and intellectual decline in the world; the much expanded 1635 edition contained two further books addressing objections, with the fifth taking the form of a dialogue between 'G. G.' (Goodman) and 'G. H.'⁴⁹ Hakewill robustly defends contemporary ecclesiastical and intellectual activities:

the *Arts* being thus refined, & Religion restored to its primitiue brightnes, [...] If then we come short of our *Auncestors* in *knowledge*, let vs not cast it vpon the deficiencie of our wits in regard of the *Worlds decay*, but vpon our own *sloth*.⁵⁰

He draws on 'subsidiary aydes, from *Philosophers, Historiographers, Mathematitians, Grammarians, Logicians, Poets, Oratours, Souldiers, Travellers, Lawyers, Physitians*' (c2v) to make his argument, among which Du Bartas was one of his most useful guides.

In ways similar to the Oxford scholar Thomas Winter (see Chapter 2.ii), Hakewill is drawn to Du Bartas' arguments about natural processes. Hakewill quotes from *Devine Weekes* nineteen times in the 1627 edition, using a copy published in 1611 or later, and almost always quotes in English only, except for his first quotation in the preface, which has an

⁴⁸ For academic and political contexts, see William Poole, 'The Evolution of George Hakewill's *Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God*, 1627-1637: Academic Contexts, and Some New Angles from Manuscripts', *Electronic British Library Journal* (2010), 1-32; Reid Barbour, *Literature and Religious Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 218-32. On the relation of Hakewill's style to his argument, see Ronald W. Hepburn, 'George Hakewill: The Virility of Nature', *JHI* 16 (1955), 135-50. For Hakewill's place in intellectual history, see Richard Foster Jones, *Ancients and Moderns* (New York, 1982), pp. 29-37 and Victor Harris, *All Coherence Gone* (Chicago, 1949), pp. 47-85.

⁴⁹ See Poole, 'Evolution of George Hakewill's *Apologie*', 4-7, 10-11; Ronald W. Hepburn, 'Godfrey Goodman: Nature Vilified', *Cambridge Journal* 7 (1953), 424-34.

⁵⁰ b3v. All quotations from 1627 edition unless stated.

accompanying French couplet with the marginal note ‘Sept. iour 1’ (C3r, I.i.35-36).⁵¹ These quotations, which mostly come from *La Sepmaine*, are focused on the discussion of the heavens’ constitution (eleven quotations appear between L4r and S3r), and a section on poetry and human innovation in Book Three (there are five quotations between 2G2v and 2L1v). Hakewill uses Sylvester’s printed marginalia to identify relevant sections of the argument: he usually quotes from the start of verse paragraphs, and edits quotations to fit their new context. Hakewill quotes, for example, lines marked in *Devine Weekes* (1611 edition) with a marginal annotation, ‘The I. creature extracted from the *Chaos*, was Light’ (C7v, I.i.479-82), that almost paraphrases his argument: ‘From whence should the voice of *God* in *holy Scripture* begin, but from the *light*?’ (L4r).⁵² Furthermore, he rearranges quotations to merge them into their new context: a passage originally marked with the side-note mentioning ‘the disposing & combining of the Elements’ contains a sub-section on water that Hakewill places first when quoting from it in order to create a bridge between an observation about water to general comments about the elements (O1v; I.ii.323-32, 319-22). A more complicated assemblage of quotations on the elements is found on the next opening. Its basis is a verse paragraph marked in *Devine Weekes* as being ‘Of the Situation of the Elements, and of the effects thereof, compared to the Notes of Musick, and to the letters of the Alphabet’ (D8r), and follows on from a musical analogy in Hakewill’s prose. Hakewill makes changes to ensure continuity with that analogy, and with a comparable image from Ovid about printing from a wax stamp that immediately follows (O2v; I.ii.257-72, 197-200 and 153-64).⁵³ He makes minor amendments to Sylvester’s lines in order to make the transitions between different sections smoother:

⁵¹ Hakewill uses variations adopted in the 1611 and later editions on three occasions: N1v (‘these’ instead of ‘their’), N4v (‘(sometime) hath’ rather than ‘hath sometimes’) and 2I4r (‘weary’ instead of ‘warie’).

⁵² For further examples of Hakewill employing Sylvester’s marginalia, see Book Three, e.g.: I.vi.885-96, 897-906 (quoted on 2I4r). Nathaniel Wanley appears to recycle Hakewill’s transcription of this passage in *The Wonders of the Little World* (1673), 2D2v-3r (where he follows Hakewill (2I4r-v) in quoting I.vi.943-58 as well). Wanley also quotes I.iii.973-86 (see Hakewill, 2L1v) on 2D2r.

⁵³ Incidental notes in a Bodleian copy of *Devine Weekes* (1605; Douce S. 558) also show a reader cross-referring to the first book of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* on C5v.

‘changing’ substitutes for ‘this *Too-too-much*’ in Sylvester to create a link with ‘incessent changes’ at the end of the previous quotation.

Hakewill’s quotations from the *Semaines*, which are carefully integrated into his text, validate his defence of modern minds: the expanded edition contains a table of authors (5N1r-3r) with around 770 entries, in which ‘Du Bartas’ (5N1r) is placed under ‘B’ as a modern authority amidst many classical authors. Hakewill reads the *Semaines* as a treatise containing a rational, empirical justification of universal coherence that offers eloquent guidance on such topics as the relation between heaven and earth, light’s emergence from chaos and recent inventions; in no sense does he approach the poems as allegories. *An Apologie* suggests practical and intellectual reasons that may have drawn other clerical readers to the *Semaines* who were curious about their philosophical significance. Hakewill’s example also shows the tendency for Du Bartas to be interpreted as a modern intellectual who defended the integrity of modern learning as well as established church practices—a tendency that becomes more pronounced in the later 1630s, as the next chapter shows. Although Hakewill does read Du Bartas for specific arguments, he clearly approaches the *Semaines* as one work composed of many details; by the 1610s and 1620s readers approached the poems as great epic poems, as Du Bartas’ Divine Weeks.

Du Bartas’ conceptual ambition and endurance were particularly admired by those who praised him as a ‘divine’ poet. Thomas Gokin, in the preface to *Meditations upon the Lords Prayer* (1624, A4r), writes that: ‘I doe much maruell that this taske hath not beene vndertaken in this kinde by some *Du Bartas*, who might erect an heauen on earth vpon this *Basis*.’ Other writers pun on ‘days’ or ‘weeks’ to emphasize how well spent Du Bartas’ time was. Edward Evans, for example, praises Du Bartas for not consuming his days in vain pursuits, but

producing a great Day.⁵⁴ The physician and poet Edmond Graile describes Du Bartas' 'Poetrie divine' in his prefatory verse to *Little Timothe his Lesson* (1611):

I Leauē perfection of a Poets skill,
 (which doth with siluer raies poor rusticks daunt)
 To *Siluesters*, and to *Du Bartas* quill,
 and such as harbour, where the *Muses* haunt,
 Bathing in crystall streames of rare conceits,
 conceiting what they list, of any subiect,
 Subiecting whatsoeuer them delights,
 vnto their witte and art, their natures obiect.
 To such leauē I, the maiestie,
 of Poetrie diuine:
 more rife is their dexteritie,
 their wittes more ripe then mine. (A8v)⁵⁵

In their passionate declaration of the *Semaines'* merits, Graile's lines recall the sentiments expressed by Harvey: 'maiestie, | of Poetrie diuine' is not far from the marginal reference in *Ortho-epia Gallica* on the 'maiesty of his heauenly matter, & diuine forme'. But there are important differences too. Harvey may have lauded Du Bartas as a 'French Salomon', but there is no evidence that he ever put Du Bartas' wisdom to practical use. The above passage from Graile, however, is the beginning of a verse from 'the author to a curious reader' which defends Graile's poetic creation. Graile was a physician at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in Gloucester, and refers to the now widely-available *Devine Weekes*. His comments are focused on the *Semaines'* poetic qualities and their astonishing range, 'conceiting what they list, of any subiect, | Subiecting whatsoeuer them delights'. Graile provides another indication that the strong clerical response to the *Semaines* is symptomatic of the wide literate readership of Du Bartas' works during James's reign, one that led to poetic imitation as well as translation. This overview has sought to show that James's interest in Du Bartas' poetry and the accessibility of

⁵⁴ Evans, *Verba Dierum*, K1v.

⁵⁵ For another invocation of Du Bartas' talents, see Abraham Darcie's dedicatory verse to the Countesses of Derby, Montgomery and Barkshire [*sic*] in *The Honour of the Ladies* (1622), A3r (C2v-3r quotes l.vi.1025-42): 'Had I *Du Bartas* spirit, and *Hanibals* powers, | The extracted quintessence were onely yours.'

Devine Weekes facilitated these divergent responses. Du Bartas' name was not just used to refer to a famous poet, but to cite from poems that were useful in a variety of contexts.

There are many other Jacobean references to Du Bartas—too many to list here—without a religious agenda. Most of them mine the *Semaines* for specific pieces of information, e.g.: John Selden quotes Du Bartas on dubious lineages; James Hart cites him on the 'Oysan du Bas' goose in a dietary treatise; Patrick Gordon follows him in giving Christian names to non-Christian characters; Robert Monro draws on the Sixth Day's reference to Androcles and the Lion; and Robert Harcourt cites 'Eden' as proof for the existence of trees that shrink from human touch.⁵⁶ André Favyn called Du Bartas 'the French Lucretius' when borrowing passages for factual information.⁵⁷ Du Bartas' name appears in Jacobean textbooks too: John Sanford's *Le Guichet François* (1604), a Latin primer produced in Oxford (Sanford also wrote commendatory verses in Winter's translations); John Clark's popular treatise on versification, *Formulae Oratiorum* (1637); and books for studying French aimed at a wider readership, like Pierre Erondelle's *The French Garden* (1621). Thomas Gainsford is a rare Jacobean prose writer who remarks on how Du Bartas has 'so advanced Poetry by his grave, majesticall, and pleasing verse'.⁵⁸ Du Bartas' poetic merits, though sometimes mentioned in passing by prose writers, mostly become the primary concern of other Jacobean poets only (see Chapter 6).

Integral to the poems' value in all these regards was that they could be navigated and adapted easily into new contexts. The availability of Sylvester's translation and James's enthusiasm for Du Bartas were major causes of the poems' new status as a standard literary

⁵⁶ Selden, *Tithes of Honour* (1614), D1r; Hart, *Klinike, or The Diet of the Diseased* (1633), L4r; Gordon, *The Famous Historie of the Renowned and Valiant Prince Robert surnamed the Bruce King of Scotland etc.* (Dort, 1615), *3r; Monro, *Monro his Expedition with the Worthy Scots Regiment (called Mac-Keyes Regiment) levied in August 1626* (1637), K2r; Harcourt, *A Relation of a Voyage to Guiana* (1613), I1v.

⁵⁷ Favyn, *The Theater of Honour and Knight-hood* (1623), trans. by Anthony Munday (?), P4r, 2M5v, 2N1r and 2Q6r (see also A3r, T1r, Z4v and 3A6v). Favyn probably composed the Latin commendatory verse which appears on S5r in *Devine Weekes* (1605).

⁵⁸ *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain* (1610), A2v.

point of reference, as readers shared in the poems' grand cosmological and theological vision but also read particular, pre-selected sections. In other words, the diversity of approaches witnessed among translators did not recede after *Devine Weekes'* publication, but continued to flourish. The history of the *Semaines'* reception is complicated and refined by understanding the processes by which the poems were read, mostly in translation. This chapter has charted the literary historical narrative of Du Bartas' early reception in detail, and shown that responses to the *Semaines* should not just be understood as bilateral encounters between text and reader, but within textual networks within which readers were influenced by local contexts and imperatives. Having traced the *Semaines'* ascent in detail, this thesis now concentrates on creating a taxonomy of responses that can describe the breadth and reach of Du Bartas' appeal. I turn first to manuscript materials in order to witness up close how the *Semaines* were being read and transcribed, and then investigate further how the theological and political issues described in this chapter affected how writers read and picked out material.

Chapter 4: Approaches to a Christian Humanist Epic

The previous chapter showed how the *Semaines* reached different cultural milieux in Britain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, the historical sweep of Du Bartas' reception history needs to be set against the particular textual circumstances that conditioned responses: the texts being used, readers being addressed and views being defended. This chapter examines how readers annotated and divided the *Semaines* into its component parts for potential and actual re-use. It needs emphasizing, for example, that Du Bartas was almost always being read in printed editions, and that I have found no instances of transmission between scribal copies.¹ Because printed editions of the *Semaines*, particularly *Devine Weekes*, were distributed so widely and many copies survive, a valuable body of evidence survives that offers insights into methods of reading the poems to extract information. This chapter begins by identifying techniques used by readers to gather material, especially processes of discontinuous reading involving cutting or selection—practices associated etymologically in the Latin verb *lego*, 'to gather, collect, read'.²

Even when looking for fragments to extract, readers of the *Semaines* usually had some sense of the poem's logical framework: manuscript annotations and notes in printed copies show how readers added glosses, summaries, underlinings and indexes to make the text and its structure clearer. Similarly, passages with particular non-fictional importance were targeted, to make cross-references with other modern and classical sources, to analyze Du Bartas' discussion of particular topics or to mark sections with didactic or political meanings. Robert

¹ Extracts from Sylvester's original verse, but not his translations, appear to circulate in verse miscellanies; see footnote 13 below. The song 'Beware Fayre Maydes' appears in the folio edition of Sylvester's works (1633 and 1641, 3K5r-v), was printed in William Corkine's *Second Booke of Ayres* (1612), and circulated widely in seventeenth-century verse miscellanies. BL, Add. MS 25707, fol. 58r; Egerton 923, fol. 16r; Stowe 962, fol. 64r and 229v. Bodleian, Eng. poet. f.9, fol. 25 and Eng. poet. f. 25, p. 25; Rawl. poet. 117, fol. 28v; Tanner 169, fol. 199v. Folger, V.a.339, p. 188; V.a.245, fol. 10v; V.a.345, p. 292. Houghton, Eng 966.7, fol. 18r. 'The Argument, in an Epitaph' to *Lachrymae Lachryarum* (first published 1613, A2r) is copied out in Folger, V.b.303, p. 258 and W.b.455, p. 69.

² On the etymology of 'selection' and theoretical implications, see Juliet Fleming, 'Afterword', *HLQ* 73 (2010), 543-52. See also Adam Smyth, 'Rend and Teare in Peeces: Textual Fragmentation in Seventeenth-Century England', *SC* 19 (2004), 36-52.

Allott's *Englands Parnassus* (1600) shows the strong links between such practices, humanist commonplacing, and basic dialectical analysis focused on paragraph divisions, keywords and proper nouns; while humanist training encouraged readers to decompose the text into fragments, it also encouraged structural exegesis that allowed readers to perceive the persuasiveness and moral cogency of texts as wholes.³

As Miernowski showed at length (see introduction) and Hakewill's example illustrated, Renaissance dialectic provided an intellectual framework that helped readers to apprehend the expansive vision of a Christian world-order that the *Semaines* projected, albeit imperfectly. The hermeneutic circles created as readers understood the parts of the *Semaines* from the whole, and the whole from its parts (circles determined in the first instance by how much of the poems readers accessed) roughly correspond to a gap between Renaissance humanist method and the poem's explicitly Christian vision: readers searched for commonplaces in the poems, but also apprehended their Scripture-based structure. Du Bartas' Christian humanist epic, however incomplete, helped to bridge that gap.

Three case studies will help us to situate such practices in their direct intellectual and material context. First is Thomas Nash, who cites Du Bartas in both English and Latin to provide intellectual support for the arguments in his dialogue *Quaternio*. Two other writers are more conservative and aware of the poems' overarching hexaemeral structure as they elide their authorial personas with Sylvester's: John Swan, in *Speculum Mundi*, quotes systematically from *Devine Weekes* and includes several original pentameter verses in Sylvester's style, while Edward Browne's *Sacred Poems* contains long mosaic-like quotations that rearrange passages from the First Week. *Sacred Poems* shows vividly how selective reading could grow from a sense of the whole poems' structure, and Browne's account of his work's hostile reception vividly illustrates the political connotations and stylistic expectations that the poems, when

³ See Peter Mack, 'Rhetoric, Ethics and Reading in the Renaissance', *RS* 19 (2005), 1-21 (3-4).

treated as a whole, had acquired by 1640. By investigating how the methods described in the first section operated in individual printed works, we can gain a better understanding of the practical, intellectual and stylistic appeal of *Devine Weekes*, and the local circumstances that had an important bearing on individual responses.

i. Methods of Reading

Manuscript Notes

Manuscript evidence provides an important guide to how readers are likely to have prepared their texts for future quotation. Readers' annotations to their copies of the *Semaines* tend to fulfil one of five purposes: underlining or otherwise highlighting striking passages, particularly *sententiae*; glossing difficult words or phrases; summarizing the topic of a verse paragraph, period or phrase; marking rhetorical features, especially similes and epithets; and drawing cross-references with other works. A good example of glossing is found in a copy of the 1605 edition (Bodleian, Vet. A2 e.336) which explains occasional classical references without marking larger structural units or arguments as, for example the '*Pryenian Princely Sage*' is named as 'Bias' (C2v; referring to the sixth-century Greek sage) and 'Gonorrhoe' is defined as 'The flux of naturall seed in man[y] woman unwittinglie, commonly called the running of the reine[s]' (Z8r; see also T8v). The other four purposes are each illustrated in Thomas Edwards' copy of *Devine Weekes* (1608), held by All Souls College, Oxford (classmark: rr.2.20), which contains a detailed scholarly exegesis of the *Semaines*, presumably completed shortly after he acquired the book in June 1610 (as a note on the titlepage indicates). Edwards entered that college in 1581, aged 27, and was later prebendary at St Paul's Cathedral and Chancellor to the Bishop of London; he is said to have bequeathed many books to the Bodleian and Christ Church, Oxford.⁴ Many of his notes make cross-references to secondary material: he refers to Augustine's exposition of the Psalms and Pliny's *Natural History* (C2r), Du Plessis Mornay's

⁴ Foster, p. 450.

'booke of the veri[e] Christian Religion' (C4r), Aquinas (D7v), Dioscorides (H1r), Cardano, Scaliger (C7v), Seneca's *Hippolitus* (also known as *Phaedra*) and Virgil's *Georgics* (H6r). There are biblical cross-references, for example, to Genesis (e.g. 2F6r), the Book of Joshua (2G3r), the First Letter of Paul to the Corinthians (2G1v) and his Letter to the Hebrews (2F8v). Edwards (and a later reader) underlined words and phrases (e.g. C5v, P2r, 3A5r), marked passages in the margin (e.g. P5r), summarized the poet's arguments and made occasional additions to the index (e.g. 2G6v, 3O2r), and marked numerous similes in the margins (e.g. 3A5v, 3A6r-v, 3E4v, 3S2v and N1r ('comparison')).

Edwards' annotations integrate the *Semaines* within contemporary biblical, theological and philosophical writing, and offer a basic form of logical analysis in which the reader of Du Bartas did not just admire and extract memorable phrases but divided the text into its constituent topics. The printed marginalia in Sylvester's edition facilitated such readings, and readers supplemented this text's annotations with their own: the availability of the entire work probably encouraged readers to perform such analysis on sections of the poems. A good example is the copy of the 1608 edition held at Queen's College, Oxford (classmark: UUub.4502), inscribed with the name 'Lawrence Omer', which contains, on the reverse of the titlepage, notes that highlight important topics: there are underlinings and several single-word summaries such as 'Creation' (C5r), 'World' (C6r), 'Doomsday' (C6v), 'Light' and 'Night' (C8v) and 'Auarice', 'Pride' and 'Deuils baites' (D2r).⁵ A more systematic examination of the poems' structures is found in James Bisse's copy of *La Seconde Semaine* (1584) and its revised edition, later bound in a single book.⁶ Bisse (1552-1609) was probably a fellow at Magdalen College, Oxford, for a decade from 1574 (too early to have been associated with the group around Winter, but the right time to have known Ashley, translator of 'L'Uranie'; see Chapter 2.ii) and

⁵ Similarly, the cardinal numbers are underlined on B2r of the Bodleian copy of Robert Ashley's translation of 'L'Uranie' (classmark: 4° L 80 (12) Art.).

⁶ BL classmark: 839.h.27. See Carscallen, 'English Translators and Admirers', pp. 213-17.

became rector of Mells in Somerset shortly afterwards.⁷ The book contains two versions of a manuscript index in the same hand, found after each of the two editions of *La Seconde Semaine*, which are almost certainly by Bisse (who inscribed his name on the titlepage to the first edition). Bisse appears to have read and annotated the later version first, before checking it against the earlier text and making emendations (A3r-4r) that revert to the first edition: in particular, a line new to the revised edition is marked ‘expungite’ (A3r). Likewise, the index found after the revised edition may be the original because page references in both indexes refer to the newer text. The index to the revised edition contains the same entries as those on 2C2v and the third additional leaf found in the first edition (with entries from letters C to V): it is possible that Bisse copied out his original index from the revised edition, which is now found alongside further index references (also to the revised text) which appear on the first additional leaf and, almost identically, on the second. Entries indicate a broad range of interests: place-names (e.g. Calais, Tyre, Asia Minor), rhetorical figures (allegoria, hyperbola, five examples of periphrasis) and themes (bellum, otium), with an emphasis on moral and devotional passages (cupiditas, visio trinitatis, deus secunda poetas, paradisus (five entries)). In the first edition Bisse transcribes several quotations from Sylvester’s 1598 ‘Furies’ translation, including the glosses ‘Pearl-fish’ and ‘mastic’ for the French terms ‘Pinne’ and ‘Espion’ (G2r and G2v), while the revised text (which he presumably owned before 1598) offers occasional glosses for French words (e.g. B3r, though these may have been composed by another writer, since Randle Cotgrave’s *Dictionary of French and English Tongues* (1611) appears to have been used) and contains more marginal annotations.⁸ These notes are densest in two sections over which British readers often lingered: ‘Furies’ (H2v-4r), and the catalogue of literary figures in ‘Babylone’ (T3r-T4v). On Z4v-2A1r numerals are written under ‘arithmetique’ in the margin during a passage in ‘Les Colomnes’. Such annotations show how Bisse customized his copy to

⁷ Foster, p. 131, and ‘Will of James Bisse, Doctor of Divinity, Canon Residentary of the Cathedral Church of Wells, Somerset’, PRO, PROB 11/112 (Image 320/ 826).

⁸ On Cotgrave’s dictionary, see Vera Ethel Smalley, *The Sources of ‘A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues’, by Randle Cotgrave (London 1611)* (Baltimore, 1948).

make it easier to locate different topics, without being directed by a coordinating thematic interest, and continued to value his annotated copy after obtaining an earlier edition. The book shows how a reader's interest in local detail and rhetoric was consistent with a progressive elucidation of the poems' total structure.

For evidence of less knowledge-centred and more politically-directed reading, we can turn to a copy of the 1611 edition with notes in a Stuart hand showing how a reader's preoccupations changed with the section being read.⁹ The densest notes appear on the reverse of the leaf containing the colophon (3R4v), and suggest a conservative reading of the 'Captaines' (II.iii.4) that dwelt on around ten passages between 2L5v-8r that made pro-monarchical arguments: the reader marks a passage on 'a kinges prerogatiue', another 'Agaynst factious teachers and sedicious preachers' and a third offering 'a godly perswation to dew obedience'. The phrases used to summarize page 509 (2L7r) are taken directly from successive line endings on that page. Elsewhere the copy contains infrequent notes in the same hand that also indicate a conservative didactic interpretation. In *Judith* (3O5r) another moral lesson is epitomized in the margins: 'secret mariag | seldome good | parents ought t[o] | confirme | the[ir] childrens mariag'. The annotator paid heed to Sylvester's moralizing interpolations too: alongside a long italicized section on E8v and F1r (in the Second Day) is written: '[a] warning for [E]ngland to repent' and 'Englands seuerall sinns particularized'. Elsewhere, the reader responds to arguments about the physical universe in *La Sepmaine*. Two sections on the location of heaven and hell are picked out from the First Day: 'where is Hell' and 'who can tell how far heaven is from hell' (D1r). The reader picks out details on the topic of 'night' by underlining ten phrases containing 'night' (only one is missed) and writing the word in the margin on C8v. Similarly, in the Second Day the reader consistently underlines names of

⁹ This copy is held at Cadbury Research Library, University of Birmingham (classmark: R16. D801). It was obtained by Hugh Greene on 14 November 1666, and was passed onto one John Frost three years' later, on 20 August 1669. All Souls College, Oxford, also holds a copy of this edition (pp.9.9), owned by Nathaniel Palmer (1625), Benjamin Tomkins, and later Ralph Freeman (c.1772); the back leaves contain short rhymes about the first owner, but the text is unannotated.

biblical characters who are introduced in the First Day, as if to flag up different sections in the text (D2v, D3r). Nearby glosses indicate a reader less confident in other languages and with classical allusions: ‘Amalthean Horn’ is glossed ‘plenty of all things’, ‘Rendez-vous’ as ‘appointed place of meeting’ and ‘chaos’ as ‘a confused heape’ on the same page, with a summary ‘the matter of the world before it receued forme’ (D5r). Taken whole, these notes show a reader sensitive to the multiple demands and insights offered by the text: the reader records political sentiments in ‘Captaines’, observes how night is described in the First Day, glosses tricky terms in the section on chaos, and underlines individual names during a longer section on the Bible. The reader analyzed the text dialectically, taking a whole passage and dividing it into constituent parts by paying close attention to paragraph beginnings and endings, and the distribution of keywords and proper nouns.

Despite these readers’ varied levels of education, we see that none purely admires the beauty and form of Du Bartas’ rhetoric or merely marks passages for re-use, but uses annotations to elucidate the text’s larger arrangement, and to analyze the poems’ scope. Before 1640 readers seldom extract passages purely for stylistic interest, though readers always valued well-expressed *sententiae*. The only extracts from the *Semaines* in a manuscript commonplace book known to me date from the later seventeenth century: belonging to William Smith and dated 5 August 1663, it contains multiple extracts from Sylvester on herbs alongside other religious verse and prose, mostly in Latin.¹⁰ An important source for the *Semaines*’ continued appeal in the second half of the century is a manuscript verse miscellany with nine passages from *Devine Weekes* and other extracts from Sylvester.¹¹ The miscellany’s compiler, possibly Henry Gould (see item 109) from Derbyshire, takes selections directly from the 1633 or 1641 folio of Sylvester’s work, including the entire *Quadrains of Pibrac* (fol.

¹⁰ Beinecke, Osborn MS b284, pp. 52-54. The list of ‘books to be bought’ on the reverse of the flyleaf provides a valuable insight into Smith’s other reading, such as Edmund Calamy’s *Godly Mans Ark* (1657).

¹¹ Leeds, MS Lt 91. I rely heavily here on Sebastiaan Verweij’s descriptions, available with digital images of the manuscript on the Scriptorium archive [http://scriptorium.english.cam.ac.uk/manuscripts/images/index.php?ms=Leeds_Lt_91&page=1]. References to item numbers follow these descriptions, and I thank Dr Verweij for drawing my attention to the manuscript.

13r-21v; item 53) and the autobiographical poem ‘Woodman’s Bear’ (fol. 39v-49v, item 94).¹² The *Semaines* are treated here as one item within Sylvester’s collected works. The miscellany contains several extracts (none from the *Semaines*) that are found in other verse miscellanies, which implies that its compiler was not wholly separated from networks of scribal distribution.¹³ However, there is no evidence that the *Semaines* circulated in manuscript earlier in the century.

Englands Parnassus (1600)

Robert Allott also employed rapid structural analysis to locate textual fragments in Sylvester’s translations when compiling his printed commonplace book *Englands Parnassus*.¹⁴ The commonplace books *Bel-vedère* and *Englands Parnassus* were both printed by the Bodenham circle (which included John Bodenham, Robert Allott, Anthony Munday and Nicholas Ling) in 1600, and both use excerpts from Sylvester’s poetry and Thomas Hudson’s *Judith*.¹⁵ In *Bel-vedère* Charles Crawford found 36 lines (largely in couplets) from Sylvester’s works: 22 from

¹² Several sonnets are transcribed that first appear in the 1633 folio: fol. 4r-v, items 23-26; fol. 7v, item 33.

¹³ Items 28 and 29 are from *Astrea*, cf. Crum T2173 and S3; Bodleian, Rawl. poet. 160, fol. 100r-102v and Rawl. poet. 142, fol. 24r-25v (item 29 only). These miscellanies have been dated to 1640 and 1630-50 respectively (the latter was probably owned by William Bloys, cf. Chapter 2, footnote 14), but variations between transcriptions (like ‘fairest Leda’ (stanza 5), ‘purred’ (11) retained, and stanza 12 omitted in Leeds MS), and the number of other transcriptions from Sylvester’s works indicate a provenance independent of these manuscripts. Item 59 is ‘An Epitaph on Q Elizabeth’, cf. Crum S1076, and Bodleian, Eng. poet. e. 40, fol. 124r (from a mid-eighteenth century miscellany that describes the piece as ‘an old couplet’, fol. 167v) and Rawl. poet. 153, fol. 8v (items 58 and 60 transcribe adjacent sections in the printed folio, suggesting it was not transcribed from the Bodleian manuscripts). Item 63 is ‘A Caution for Co’tly damsels’, Crum B357, though the eight manuscripts containing these passages contain a variation not found in the Brotherton miscellany (see also note 1 above). Elizabeth Lyttelton quoted from Sylvester’s lament of Sidney in ‘Babilon’ (II.ii.2.653-6) in her late seventeenth-/ early eighteenth-century miscellany (Cambridge, Add. MS 8460, fol. 68v).

¹⁴ Significant studies of early modern commonplace books which provide a fuller account of a commonplacing mentality include: Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford, 1996); Peter Beal, ‘Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-century Commonplace Book’, in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts*, ed. by W. Speed Hill (Binghamton, 1993), pp. 131-47; Edgar Mertner, ‘Topos und Commonplace’, in *Toposforschung: eine Dokumentation*, ed. by Peter Jehn (Frankfurt, c. 1972), pp. 20-68; Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority* (Princeton, 1993); Ann Blair, ‘Humanist Methods in Natural Philosophy: The Commonplace Book’, *JHI* 53 (1992), 541-51; and Elizabeth W. Pomeroy, *The Elizabethan Miscellanies, their Development and Conventions* (Berkeley, 1973).

¹⁵ Arthur F. Marotti, ‘Bodenham, John (c.1559–1610)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2754>] and ‘Allott, Robert (fl. 1599–1600)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/413>]; Franklin B. Williams, Jr., ‘John Bodenham, “Art’s Lover, Learning’s Friend”’, *SP* 31 (1934), 198-214; Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass, ‘The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays’, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59 (2008), 371-420 (383-87), and Stallybrass and Roger Chartier, ‘Reading and Authorship: The Circulation of Shakespeare 1590-1619’, in *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text*, ed. by Andrew Murphy (Chichester, 2010), pp. 35-56.

Jean Du Nesme's *The Miracle of the Peace in Fraunce* (1599; the titlepage attributes the poem to Du Bartas), and fourteen from the translation of 'Les Peres' (II.iii.2) published in *The Triumph of Faith* (1592; A1r-C1r).¹⁶ Since Bodenham only takes quotations that are couplet-length or shorter, it is more difficult to reconstruct his practice than Robert Allott's in *Englands Parnassus*, which contains a much greater number of verses from Sylvester's translations.

Englands Parnassus contains 2350 quotations taken from 'the choysiest Flowers of our Moderne Poets', including 123 quotations from Sylvester.¹⁷ The anthology arranges its quotations under headings that largely cover moral virtues, vices and courtly attributes, but also deals with the natural descriptions announced on the titlepage ('descriptions of Bewties, Personages, Castles, Pallaces, Mountaines, Groues, Seas, Springs, Riuers, &c'). Crawford speculates that the compiler may have first copied down passages and then 'cut up his sheets into slips, each containing one or more extracts, and pasted these on to other sheets which had prepared headings'.¹⁸ Allott's process certainly led to mistakes, for Crawford counts 130 misattributed quotations and finds frequent transcription errors; however, Allott presumably did record which sections he quoted because he only duplicates a passage once.¹⁹ Through an analysis of quotations from Sylvester in *Englands Parnassus*, we can reconstruct aspects of Allott's reading for selection.

Allott's quotations from Sylvester's translations from the *Semaines* are self-contained couplets detached from their original context, just as he takes full stanzas from Spenser's

¹⁶ John Bodenham, *Bodenham's Belvedere or The Garden of the Muses* (1600), A5v. Charles Crawford, 'Belvedere, Or the Garden of the Muses', *Englische Studien* 43 (1911), 198-228 (204 and 207). Crawford identified 2830 of the 4482 lines in *Belvedere* (201). See also Crawford's 'J. Bodenham's Belvedere', in *The Shakespeare Allusion-Book*, ed. by C. M. Ingleby et al., 2 vols (London, 1932), II, 489-518.

¹⁷ Robert Allott, *Englands Parnassus* (1600), titlepage. All information about the work's composition derives from Charles Crawford's Clarendon Press edition (Oxford, 1913). See also Franklin B. Williams, 'Notes on Englands Parnassus', *MLN* 52 (1937), 402-5; and H. M. Klein, 'Florilegium Florilegii: An Example of the Influence of "Englands Parnassus"', *NQ* 20 (1973), 378-79.

¹⁸ Crawford (ed.), p. xxvi.

¹⁹ A quotation about 'drowsie Sloath' that appears under 'Feare' (G6r, #482) is also quoted under 'Idlenesse' (L1v, #800). When citing *Englands Parnassus*, I supply Crawford's quotation numbers (marked with a '#' for clarity), and cite from Grosart's edition of Sylvester to facilitate cross-referencing with Crawford. Because the typography and lineation of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts are relevant here, I also quote signature numbers from original editions of Sylvester's translations and *Englands Parnassus*.

Faerie Queene (1590, 1596), John Harington's *Orlando Furioso* translation (1591) and William Warner's *Albions England* (1596). When quoting from Sylvester's 'The Triumph of Faith' (1592), by contrast, Allott will use an unrhymed couplet (R7r) and a three-line quotation (P8v); elsewhere, an eleven-line quotation under the heading 'Discriptions of Beautie & personage' (2D5r-v) contains the first eleven lines of a sonnet found in the poetic sequence *Astrea*, from *The Miracle of Peace* (1599, D7r). The sequence's main title, 'The Love and Beautie of Astrea' (D2v and D3r) possibly guided the compiler to this passage through the keyword 'Beautie'. At some level, a generic distinction is being made between the schematic copia of the *Semaines* and the more lyrical *Astrea*: the *Semaines* were not the place to find idealizing verse portraits, but were valuable for their brief, well-expressed encapsulations of contemporary wisdom.

Allott takes extracts from Sylvester's translations from 'The Fathers' and 'The Schism' (II.iv.3) in *The Triumph of Faith*, and from *The Second Weeke* (1598). Two unattributed couplets taken from 'The Colonies' (II.ii.3) show that he also had access to Lisle's translation and that Allott regularized his hexameter lines to pentameter.²⁰ It is striking how often Allott's headings anticipate marginalia that are absent from the edition he was using (and he does not do this so consistently as to suggest that he had access to a French edition). A passage quoted under 'Of the Hebrew tongue', for example, gains the marginal annotation 'Praise of the Hebrew Tongue' in *Devine Weekes* (1605). Other examples include: 'Of the Rainebow'; 'Of a drunken man'; 'Of Eden'; and 'Of Scaliger'.²¹ These coincidences result from the compiler's tendency to select quotations that contain the topic word in the first line of a verse paragraph,

²⁰ Cummings, 'Tudor Translation', pp. 191 and 196. #1071 ('The Dutch in loue is proude, Italians enuious, | The French man full of mirth, the Spanyard furious') and #1735 ('Allusion of words is no sure ground, | For one thereon a steddie worke to found'); and Lisle, 1598 'Th'Allusion of words is not a suer ground | For any man thereon a stedly worke to found' (D2v) and 'The Dutch in Loue is proud, th'Italian enuious, | The Frenchman full of mirth, the Spaniard furious' (K1v). Cf. Sylvester, 1605 '*Dutch Louers* proud; th'*Italian* enuious, | Frolicke the *French*, the *Spaniard* furious' (2H4r) and 'Some words allusion is no certaine ground | Whereon a lasting Monument to Found' (2G3r)

²¹ 2I8v, #2297, cf. F2r-v (1598) and 2F2r (1605); 2A1r, #1938, cf. K5v (1598) and 2D7r (1605); Z8v, #1934, cf. K6v (1598) and 2D8r (1605); Z8r, #1932, cf. A1r (1598) and T5r (1605); 2I8r, #2295, cf. F1v (1598) and 2E8v (1605).

as with : ‘*Nepenthe*, enemy to sadnes’ (B1v (1598); ‘Nepenthe’, 2K4r, #2317) and ‘Th’ayres daughter Eccho’ (A7r (1598); ‘Of Eccho’, 2K4r, #2318). The parallels indicate that the printed marginalia corresponded to pre-existing structures in the text.

Lacking a fully annotated edition, however, the compiler largely uses a small number of passages intensively: he exploits those sections of the *Semaines* that most closely resemble a commonplace book in being arranged in well-defined topics, just as manuscript annotators marked discrete sections of the text. This is probably why his favoured sections from *The Second weeke* are ‘The Furies’ (II.i.3) and ‘Eden’ (II.i.1), both of which possess obvious thematic coherence. ‘The Furies’, which Allott quotes twenty-five times, is about the descent of pestilence, war and dearth to the earth, and over half of its 800 lines are catalogues of different physical and spiritual diseases. ‘Eden’, quoted twenty-two times, focuses on natural description (rivers, trees, plants, herbs) and moral topics like sin, knowledge and labour. Allott targets moments where these themes are most prominent, such as a passage in ‘The Furies’ (E7v-E8v, ll. 284-331) which divides easily into three sections, ‘Dearth’, ‘Warre’ and ‘Furie’, marked by capitalization in the 1598 text, and printed marginalia from 1605 editions onwards.²² The capitalized words are emphatic, but do not direct Allott to an allegorical reading, as Lepage’s interpretation implies: they simply indicate where each topic in this eighty-line passage begins. A list of personified mental afflictions (F6v-F7v, ll. 660-731) is another source: the keywords ‘Sorrow’, ‘excessive Ioy’, ‘Pride’, ‘Feare’, ‘Desire’, ‘Auarice’ and ‘Wrath’ correspond closely to headings in *Englands Parnassus*, and are later marked in *Devine Weekes* marginalia as ‘Diseases of the Soule’ (F6v).²³

These examples cover twelve of Allott’s twenty-five quotations from ‘The Furies’, and several more come from nearby sections which show that the compiler also read through

²² E7v-8r, ll. 284-303, cf. *EP*, Z5v, #1922; E8r, ll. 304-19, cf. *EP*, V5v, #1672; E8v, ll. 320-31, cf. *EP*, H6r, #571 (and also under ‘Furie’ see F1r; ll. 350-56).

²³ ll. 660-77, #1548; ll. 678-81, #835; ll. 684-85, #1374; ll. 688-95, #482; ll. 696-707, #326; ll. 708-17, #54; and ll. 718-731, #1792.

parts of the text continuously, including a section listing sixteen plants for ‘Hearbes’, four lines ‘Of the infernall floud’ and two couplets on ‘Counsaile’.²⁴ Allott also contracts quotations (2K3v-4r, #2315; E7r, ll. 237-41) and groups three extracts from E3v to E4v (ll. 66-113) in the miscellaneous category ‘Preparations for defence’ (2K2v, #2306; 2K3r, #2310; 2K3v, #2311). The compiler seems more concerned about the layout of quotations on the printed page than about retaining their original sequence.²⁵ Similar strategies are used when transposing other paragraphs from Sylvester’s translation under *Englands Parnassus*’ headings. The poems’ organization assisted Allott in locating fragments in ways that foreshadow *Devine Weekes*’ apparatus, especially its printed marginalia, and possible uses. A reader like Allott could use his understanding of the poems’ themes and structures to locate material, even when using these earlier translations from the *Semaines*. *Englands Parnassus* established Sylvester as an important literary personality by 1600, but had little influence on the circulation of his translations; there is only one possible instance known to me in which another writer may extract a quotation from Sylvester via *Englands Parnassus*.²⁶

In this section we have seen readers of the *Semaines* who were not just drawn to fragments at random, but probably did not read continuously through the poems either; instead, they balanced an awareness of the poems’ overarching structure with an interest in certain topics. This double perspective on the poems made it easier to locate material, while refining their understanding of the poems’ total argument. This basic hermeneutic outlook on the poems implies readers who appreciated that Du Bartas’ description of the Christian cosmos was constructed using humanist methods of compilation and synthesis. Rather than generalize further about such practices, however, we will turn now to see how three writers approached the *Semaines* as Christian humanist poems that encouraged both holistic and atomistic responses.

²⁴ EP 2I6r, #2276; Syl. E5v-6r, ll. 170-81; 2I7v, #229; E7r, ll. 246-49; and C8r, #170, E8v-F1r, ll. 346-49.

²⁵ Crawford (ed.), p. xxvi.

²⁶ *Haec-vir* (1620), B3v, uses a passage from the 1592 ‘Sacrifice of Isaac’, found as quotation #262 in Allott.

ii. Case Studies, 1625-1641

The methods of reading observed above informed and were informed by the reader's appreciation of the relationship between the *Semaines'* parts and whole. Thomas Nash, John Swan and Edward Browne each possessed a stable impression of the *Semaines'* whole significance that allowed the poems to accrue additional political, religious and intellectual connotations, and in turn changed how these writers navigated and manipulated the poems. Each writer's mode of interpretation engaged with contemporary considerations as well as the practical matter of using one text to assist with the composition of another.

Thomas Nash

Thomas Nash (1587/8–1648), no relation to his Elizabethan namesake, was an Inner Temple lawyer and author of two printed works: the pleasantly moralizing dialogue *Quaternio: or, a Fourfold Way to a Happy Life* (1633) and *Gymnasiarchon: or, the School of Potentates* (1648), which translates a Latin work by the German historian Georgius Acacius Ennenckel (1573-1620). Prescott comments briefly on his interest in Du Bartas' poetry: 'Nash could have found in its arguments both the variety he liked and ample support for his belief in law, structure, and pattern.'²⁷ A 'belief in law, structure, and pattern' is indeed a unifying theme in Nash's *Quaternio*, just as it was in Hakewill's *Apologie*, albeit with a more conspicuous political and ecclesiological edge. *Quaternio* is argumentative, various and humorous, but also anxious to demonstrate the author's good sense and learning—which is why over twenty-five quotations from Du Bartas are placed in the margins.

Quaternio is a dialogue between a countryman, citizen, divine and lawyer on the relative merits of city and country. Though over two-thirds of the colloquy are taken up with the speech of the lawyer, the work's front- and back-matter indicate that the author sought to

²⁷ 'Thomas Nash (1588-1648) and Thomas More', *Moreana* 59-60 (1978), 35-41 (38); Sidney Lee, rev. Anne Lake Prescott, 'Nash, Thomas (1587/8-1648)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19792>]; *Imagining Rabelais in Renaissance England* (New Haven and London, 1998); Prescott, 'Du Bartas', pp. 224-25.

placate readers suspicious that Nash was unqualified to write about four different life-styles: 'I heare some whispering that it is not proper to a professor of the Law to personate a Countryman, Citizen, or Divine, or to talke of dogs and hawkes, things out of the lifts and limits of his profession' (2N3v). Nash deprecates his work as a 'toy and trifle' (2N3v and)(1v) and calls the work 'these my *Miscellanea*' (A4v), an epithet which became the work's title in the work's third edition (*Miscelanea [sic]: or A Fourefold Way to a Happie Life*, 1639). Though the author is also self-conscious about borrowing and imitating the authority of other writers, he adopts a more confident tone when discussing how conscientious authors are guided by their predecessors:

Who cannot goe in a Common rode without a guide, and who cannot write an *Encomium* of the foure Cardinall vertues, when as every Booke will yeeld vnto him a helping hand? But with that honorable Knight [Thomas More] to write an *Vtopia*, or with *Erasmus* to write a *Panegyre of follie*, or with *Synesius* in prayse of *baldnes*, or with *Glanco* in prayse of *injustice*; to extract vertue out of a red Herring, or to make a Cat speak, *hic labor, hoc opus est.* (2N3v)²⁸

His defence of literary vade-mecums is continued on the final leaf, which lists 140 writers that 'the Author hath made vse of in this Booke'. A quotation from Pliny's *Epigrammata* piously stresses the need for integrity: 'Benignum est & plenum ingenii [*sic*] pudoris, fateri per quos profeceris, reprehensione autem dignum, Maiorum tacere nomina, & eorum sibi appropriare ingenia'.²⁹ The eclectic list constructs an industrious authorial persona who ranged widely for supporting references, but is also self-conscious about such borrowings. 'Bartas', with the 'Du' perhaps removed to classicize the name, is eleventh on the list, following ten ancient

²⁸ 'this is the task, this is the work' (Virgil, *Aeneid*, 6.129). Nash recalls Erasmus's prefatory epistle to Thomas More in *Encomium Moriae (Praise of Folly)*, which refers to Glauco (a speaker in Plato's *Republic*) on injustice, and the fifth-century bishop Synesius's *Calviti Encomium (Praise of Baldness)*. See Betty Radice (trans.), 'Praise of Folly', in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 27 and 28, ed. by A. H. T. Levi (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1986), pp. 83 and 466-67. As this epistle was not published in editions of Thomas Chaloner's sixteenth-century English translation, it looks likely that Nash read a continental Latin edition. Nash also alludes to the other Thomas Nashe's *Nasbes Lenten Stuffe* (1599), which contains a piece on 'the praise of the red herring'.

²⁹ 'it is good and very modest to make acknowledgements when you have finished, but reprehensible to keep quiet about the names of great ones and appropriate their qualities'.

writers; ‘Petrarch’ and ‘Chawcer’ are named slightly further down, but few other contemporary writers are ‘helping hands’.

The colloquy itself is accompanied by quotations in small type that fill the thick fore-edge margins and occasionally run into the tail margin. These notes are keyed to the body text using superscript letters and brackets: on O4r, for example, the margins contain quotations from Cicero, Bede, Suetonius and Virgil, and a reference to Paul’s second letter to Timothy. All of these quotations, and many more in *Quaternio*, are reproduced in Latin, apparently raising the intellectual authority of Nash’s cross-references.³⁰ No other poet is quoted as often as Du Bartas is in *Quaternio*: almost every English verse quotation longer than a couplet is taken from Sylvester.³¹ The margins contain thirty-two quotations from Sylvester’s translation of the *Semaines*: Nash quotes most often from the First, Third, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Days of the First Week (twenty quotations in total), and once or twice from each book of the first two Days of the Second Week (twelve in total).³² His quotations span the entire work: after a single quotation in the preface, there are eight quotations in the rustic’s speech, four in the next two, and fifteen during the lawyer’s address. Nash probably used a 1605 edition of *Devine Weekes* which contains all the parts he quotes from; textual variations between editions of *Devine Weekes* also suggest that this edition was used.³³

Nash, remarkably, also quotes from Du Bartas in Latin. Each quotation from Sylvester’s First Week is paired with the equivalent lines from Gabriel de Lerm’s Latin translation of *La Sepmaine* (see Part I, preface), while quotations from the Second Week are

³⁰ On the status of Latin and vernacular English in the seventeenth century, see John Hale, *Milton’s Languages* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 1-16.

³¹ The exception is a quotation of eight consecutive lines (on 2M2r) from Fragment A of the *Romaunt of the Rose* (ll. 239-46 in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition (Oxford, 1988)), attributed to Chaucer in *Quaternio*. Unattributed English verse quotations are all by Sylvester (see next note).

³² This total includes several quotations that are not attributed to ‘Bartas’: four lines from ‘The Furies’, cited at the top of N2v, immediately following two attributed quotations at the bottom of the previous page; and the second quotation on C2r, which follows a quotation attributed to ‘Bart.’; K1r from ‘Babylon’; also K3v (II.i.3.145-47, 149-50), L1r (II.i.3.199-202) and 2E3r (I.vii.591-96).

³³ Nash adopts pre-1611 readings three times: ‘faynting’ instead of ‘fainted’ (N1r), ‘an’ for ‘and’ (N2r) and ‘seeketh’ instead of ‘strives’ (2M3v; 1605-only reading); on C3v, however, ‘poysoned’ (found in the 1611 edition onwards) is used instead of the earlier ‘prison’d’.

given in English only. The Latin quotations do not always correspond exactly to the English.

Here, for example, Nash quotes lines I.iii.1043-44:

Haud Moses, haud ipse Noemus et Abram,
 Has curas humilésq[ue]; boum sprevere labores:
 Sed studium colere arva fuit, vel pascere pingues,
 Balantum per rura greges & buccera secla.
 Great *Kings* and *Consuls* haue oft for blades,
 And glittering Scepters, handled bookes and spades. Bartas (B2v)

The matching Latin quotation actually comes from two lines later in Lerm's translation: 'regia dextera falcem | Saepe armata tulit, regnique insigne bidentem.'³⁴ Nash makes a similar error slightly further along in the countryman's speech: he quotes four lines from Sylvester (I.iii.1107-10), but the accompanying Latin quatrain begins at the line before this quotation, and so misses off the last line. These slips probably arise because Nash takes both his Latin and English quotations from the start of verse paragraphs marked in the original editions, whereas the matching Latin quotation actually begins in the second line.³⁵ These moments look consistent with Nash's decision to use the Latin, rather than Du Bartas' French, in the first place: duplicated quotations bulk out the text's bilingual marginalia, but do not suggest close textual engagement. The Latinate 'Bartas' presents the French poet as a transnational intellectual authority.

Bilingual quotations do not in themselves add further credibility to Nash's arguments, but do provide a short-cut to generating extensive marginalia. Ease of locating appropriate quotations may have induced Nash to use the *Semaines* so often; as with Allott, he often locates passages containing multiple potential quotations. Nash quotes from a hundred-line section marked 'Commendations of the Country Life' (I7r) in the 1605 *Devine Weekes* eight times during the countryman's encomium (B2r-D3v). Nash edits quotations, quite possibly to

³⁴ *Hebdomas*, E1r. The quatrain from Sylvester's translation that corresponds to Nash's actual Latin quotation is: 'Noah the just, meeke Moses, Abraham | (Who Father of the Faithfull Race became) | Were Shepherds all, or Husbandmen (at least) | And in the Fields passed their Dayes the best' (1037-40).

³⁵ Sylvester's line 'Still keepe him sound, and still new stomack gives' (1110) matches 'Et membris aluere suos, stomachoque vigores' (E2r), which Nash does not quote.

accommodate them better on the page: two quotations on C2r are abridged from mismatched Latin and English passages (I.iii.1087-89, F2v; I.iii.1131-32, 37-38; also C1v (I.iii.1127-30)).

Nash presumably took care in gathering and stitching quotations together, for there is little semantic disruption and no unintended anacoluthon. Appositive structures in Sylvester's verse paragraphs made it easier to rearrange passages into new forms, and Nash fuses fragments together (‘text’ indicates continuous sections in Sylvester's translation):

‘The *cheerefull birds*, chirping vs sweet good morrowes,
With natures musicke doe beguile our sorrowes.’
‘The prettie *Larke* clyming the welking [withering] tree,
Chaunts with a cheere, here peere I neare my deare.’ (D3v; I.iii.1077-78 and v.661-62)³⁶

‘O fowle defect, O short, O dangerous madnesse,’
‘That makes the vaunter insolent,’ the cruell violent,’
‘The fornicator wax adulterous,
The Adulterer become incestuous.’
(Y1r; II.ii.1.596, 599-602; 599-600 are merged into the second line)

There are no obvious breaks in sense here or in other examples; however, these textual mosaics in *Quaternio* required sophisticated engagement both in choosing fragments relevant to the dialogue, and in fitting the quotations together.³⁷

Nash presents Du Bartas as a trusted intellectual authority with a reputation and status comparable to other scholars and classical poets. *Quaternio* does not associate the *Semaines* with any one political or religious cause, however, nor does it offer any opinion about the poems taken as a whole, except to promote their epistemological uses. On one occasion, two couplets by Sylvester are rendered into prose (2M3v; cf. I.vii.729-34). This mutation, which is not forced to save space, shows the author using ‘Bartas’ purely for factual content and associated imagery, with little or no regard for his poetic qualities. Nash does not express any

³⁶ See Chapter 1, note 44.

³⁷ See K3v, II.i.3.145-47 and 149-50 (second ‘greedy’ is ‘grieved’ in Sylvester); L1r, I.iii.209-10 and 221-22; L4v, I.iii.911-12 and 17-18; N2r, II.i.1.285-86 and 281-84 (immediately preceded by quotation from I.vi.989-90); N2v, II.i.3.43-44 and 68-69; X3r, II.ii.4.759 and 745-50; 2H3v; I.iii.509-10 and 525-28 (‘Lo’ in Sylvester is amended to ‘Let’ in the third line; Latin quotations from D6r given).

appreciation for the *Semaines* as poems, but approaches them more like a humanist treatise. Peter Heylyn's *Microcosmos* (Oxford, 1625) offers a comparable example of a writer turning to the *Semaines* for eloquently-written factual information, in this case on the Lombards, whilst revering Du Bartas as a French thinker named alongside Ramus, Calvin and Beza.³⁸ Heylyn's and Nash's discontinuous, pragmatic reading is a better-worked version of techniques used by Allott, but still focused on individual sections only; John Swan and Edward Browne engage more closely with the *Semaines*' hexaemeral system of ideas.

John Swan

John Swan spent his life in Cambridgeshire: he was educated at Trinity College, and became an Anglican priest at Duxford and Sawston; according to Bernard Capp he was a 'pugnacious Laudian'.³⁹ A report following a visitation from the Bishop of Ely, Matthew Wren, in 1638 suggests that Swan's parish was indeed High Church, for Wren only had to request that the reading desk be turned East-West and that the church be paved.⁴⁰ If Wren had looked through Swan's recently published *Speculum Mundi* (1635) during the visit, he would probably not have been displeased at the many references to Du Bartas it contained: Wren's copy of Thomas Browne's *Pseudodoxia epidemica* (1646) contains an annotation praising Du Bartas and Sylvester's translation.⁴¹ Iain MacKenzie provides a useful explanation of why a Calvinist writer like Du Bartas might be acceptable to Laudians who resisted predestination, emphasizing that for Calvin predestination was 'supplementary to, and not determinative of,

³⁸ On E8r, Heylyn quotes 'The Colonies' (II.ii.3) on the Alains, Goths and Vandals (2X7r-v, quoting II.ii.3.155-60), ancient Britons (F7r, II.ii.3.145-48) and Lombards (Z4r, II.ii.3.183-88). For the latter topic, *Devine Weekes* contains two relevant annotations (2A2r-v) and Heylen quotes both sections as a single passage, placing the second extract earlier because 'Lombard' is in the first line (Z4r, II.i.3.183-88, 149-52, 191-92 and 153-54).

³⁹ Bernard Capp, 'Swan, John (*bap.* 1605, *d.* 1671)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38039>]. On Swan's body of work, see Iain MacKenzie, 'Note on John Swan: The Authorship of *Speculum Mundi* and other Works Attributed to Him', *NQ* 41 (1994), 161-65.

⁴⁰ Traviss Frederick Teversham, *A History of the Village of Sawston*, 2 vols (Sawston, 1942-47), II, 111.

⁴¹ Alongside a reference to Basil and Ambrose's *Hexaemeron* Wren writes (brackets original): 'instead whereof, wee haue [Du Bartas] an elegant, & Modest writer: Justly honored by (2) Excellent Poets, his Translators: Hieronymus Vida, of Cremona a second Virgil, who turnd Him into Latin vse, most smoothlye. | And our Silvester, a second Spencer, Who hath soe finely fitted him, with an English Garbe, that itt seemes to become him as handsomlye, as his owne Natiue French' (Bodleian, O 2.26.Art. Seld, E1r). See C. S. L. Davies, 'The Youth and Education of Christopher Wren', *EHR* 123 (2008), 300-27 (303). No other source has corroborated Wren's allusion to a Vida translation.

the doctrine of grace', and that both Laud and Andrewes read Calvin sympathetically whilst rejecting the later concept of double predestination (i.e. maintaining both divine election and reprobation).⁴² In this light, Swan's reading of an orthodox Calvinist like Du Bartas is not inconsistent with High Church values, since ecclesiastical conservatives could admire Du Bartas' description of how grace upholds the world order.

Speculum Mundi is a prose work in nine chapters: two concern the circumstances in which the world was created, and seven are about the days of the first week that provoke the reader to a better understanding of the natural world around us. The titlepage describes these seven chapters as 'an Hexameron, or a serious discourse of the causes, continuance, and qualities of things in Nature; occasioned as matter pertinent to the work done in the six dayes of the Worlds creation'; in the second edition of 1643 only, a separate titlepage before Chapter 3 makes the 'hexaameron' a separate section (C3r). All seventeenth-century editions contain a detailed table of contents that allows the book to be used efficiently to locate specific information. The 1665 and later editions contain slightly more specific marginal annotations that give the Day and the Week being quoted from, like '*Du Bart.* 2. day of the 1. week' (H2r (1665), cf. L3r (1635), which has no note), but do not include the thematic index found in the 1635 and 1643 editions. This index contains 'the principall and most remarkable matters contained in this book' (3S1r). Du Bartas and Girolamo Zanchi (see Chapter 2.i) are the only modern writers named, with the 'Bartas' entry (3S1v-2r) directing readers to sections on 'a divine Poet 4. [1635, A2v]', 'His opinion of the worlds end 9. [B1r]', 'His description of the worlds ages 17. [C1r]', 'His opinion of the worlds beginning 4. [A2v]' and seven other opinions. The phrasing here often echoes the equivalent marginalia in *Devine Weekes*. Swan's references are associated with particular passages in the poems: a quotation from the *Semaines* is found on each of these pages in *Speculum Mundi* and Du Bartas is named in the body of the text. When taken together, these quotations identify Du Bartas as a contemporary thinker

⁴² MacKenzie, *God's Order and Natural Law* (Aldershot, 2002), p. 5.

with whom the author is keen to be associated. Almost uniquely among responses to Du Bartas in Stuart England, Swan concentrates on *La Sepmaine*, and almost never quotes from the *Seconde Semaine*. Accordingly, his reading prioritizes the *Semaines* as a ‘hexaameron’ and argues for unified governance in the heavens and on earth, but contains no direct political comment.

Swan may be drawn to Du Bartas’ ‘opinions’ and *La Sepmaine*’s structures, but he also attends closely to factual description. The index records fewer than half of the quotations from Du Bartas in *Speculum Mundi*: there are many more that are accompanied by marginal references only, or, in several cases, are unattributed (see table 1 below). Swan consulted the *Semaines* alongside several other specialist reference works, including Edward Topsell’s *Historie of Four-footed Beastes* (1607); John Harington’s *The Englishmans Doctor* (1607), a translation of Joannes de Mediolano’s *Schola Salerni*; John Gerard’s *Herball* (1597); and William Fulke’s *A Goodlye Gallerye* (1563). Swan also makes three direct references to Lodge’s translation of Goulart’s commentary, *A Learned Summarie*: he instructs the reader to ‘See *Du Bart. Summarie*’ (2L4v), names the summary alongside Ovid (3B1v) and once refers to ‘my *authour’ with a marginal reference to the 1621 edition of the commentary, ‘* See Purch[as]. and Du Bart. Summary, pag. 240’ (3G2r).⁴³ *Speculum Mundi* is a model example of how Goulart’s commentary supported English readers in using them as philosophical poems, decades after continental Europeans had first read the poems in this way. This trend correlates with Swan’s greater interest in the poems’ hexaemeral structure, which provided an organizing structure for the poems’ information.

⁴³ Abbot (‘Influence of Du Bartas in England’, p. 118) lists eighteen places where he believes Swan consulted Lodge’s commentary when writing.

<i>Devine Weekes</i> , First Day (I.i; <i>Speculum Mundi</i> , Chapters 1-3)	27-30, 35-36 (A2v); 405-16 (B1r-v); II.i.iv.649-72 (C1r-v); 425-30, 435-36 (D2r); 95-96 (F3v); 217-18 (F4r); 285-90 (G1r); 529-30 (H1r); 541-42 (H1v).
Second Day (I.ii; Chapters 4-5)	1143-48 (H4r); 1157-62 (H4v); 427-34 (L3r); 503-504 (L4v); 773-80 (R3r); 747-52 (R3v); 819-22 (T2r).
Third Day (I.iii; Chapter 6)	255-60 (2E3r); 251-54 (2E4r); 245-46 (2E4v); 261-66 (2F1v); 267-72 (2F2r); 467-68 (2F3r); 477-80, 525-28 (493-94) (2G4r); 785-90 (2I2r); 761-66 (2I4r); 755-60 (2K1r); 708-10 (2K3r); 695-96 (2K3v); 673-76, 683-88 (2L2r); 717-18 (2L3r); 741-42 (2L3v); 903-08, 919-22, 929-32 (2N4r).
Fourth Day (I.iv; Chapter 7)	103-08, 121-26 (2S1v); 445-50 (2V1v); 661-68 (2Y2r); 671-74 (2Y2v); 681-84 (2Y3r); 703-04 (2Y3v).
Fifth Day (I.v; Chapter 8)	345-50 (3A1r); 509-12 (3B2r); 293-94 (3C1r); 669-70 (3E1v); 667-68 (3E1v); 653-54, 657-60 (3E4v); 885-88 (3F2v); 775-78, 781-82 (3G1r).

Table 1 Quotations from the *Semaines* in John Swan's *Speculum Mundi* (Cambridge, 1635)⁴⁴

William Richardson Abbot was right, however, to distinguish between references to Du Bartas as an authority on Creation (i.e. as represented in the index) and as a poet. Abbot (pp. 87-101, 103) cites several places where Swan's prose blends in phrases from Sylvester's poetry, usually near a direct quotation from *Devine Weekes*. For instance, the couplet 'The Night, to temper Dayes exceeding drought, | Moistens our Aire, and makes our Earth to sprout' (I.i.543-44) is moulded into the following sentence: 'The night serveth to temper the dayes exceeding drought, and to cool its heat; for by moistening the aire it makes the earth to fructifie' (H1v). Elsewhere, Swan adapts Sylvester's epithet 'Periwig of Snow' (2Y3r, I.iv.693) as 'periwigd with snow'.⁴⁵ For example, Abbot noticed the parallels between Sylvester's and Swan's description of the sea-bream:

Th'adulterous *Sargus* doth not only change
Wives every day, in the deepe streames; but (strange)
As if the honey of Sea-loves delights
Could not suffice his ranging appetites,
Courting the Shee-Goats on the grassie shoare,

⁴⁴ In the 1665, 1670 and 1698 editions, two sections from the first chapter with Du Bartas quotations (on B1r-v and D2r in the 1635 edition), are placed at the very end of the work (3R2r).

⁴⁵ John Dryden later recalled the couplet containing this phrase as an example of Sylvester's 'abominable fustian' (see Conclusion below).

Would horne their Husbands that had hornes before. (l.v.195-200)

But the *Sargon* is contrarie [to the Mullet]; for this is an adulterous fish, daily changing mates; and not so content, useth to go on the grassie shore, horning the he-goats who had horns before. (3B3r)

The nearby descriptions of the cantharus and mullet in both texts also contain marked similarities, as do descriptions of other fish and birds. These examples suggest that Swan may well have had *Devine Weekes* open on the table, though it is difficult to identify exactly where Sylvester's diction is definitely present in Swan's prose. His announced quotations from Du Bartas are visible threads within a larger tapestry that seeks congruity with the cultural imaginary of Du Bartas' poetry in a more comprehensive and self-denying way than we have so far witnessed: Swan wanted *Speculum Mundi* to be a mirror of the world as Du Bartas depicted it. Swan's response to Du Bartas is unmistakably both explicit and implicit: the French poet is treated as a named authority, but is silently assimilated into his writing too. Swan names Du Bartas as a Protestant writer in the main text and index, but also weaves Sylvester's translation into the texture of *Speculum Mundi*, blurring the distinction between original and borrowed material. The first technique draws attention to the theological importance of Du Bartas' voice, the second to the knowledge gathered from his poem.

Swan abridges and reorders sequences from *Devine Weekes*, and at times creatively collaborates with his source. For example, he makes specific corrections to Sylvester's verse when replacing the rhymed words 'forms/forms' with 'makes/shapes' (R3r), and 'Duell/cruell' with 'strife/life' (2I2v). This artistic collusion is taken further within a quotation with an annotation indirectly acknowledging that the text has been modified:

The mealie mountains which were late unseen,
Change now their coats, all into lustie green.
The gardens prank them with their flowrie buds;
The meads with grasse, with leaves the naked woods.
Sweet Zephyrus begins to busse his Flora,
Swift-winged fingers to salute Aurora;
And wanton Cupid, through this universe,

Partly out of
Du Bart.

With pleasing wounds, each creatures heart 'gins pierce.
 ,, Yea Titans presence doth again revive
 ,, As well things sensible as vegetive. (2Y2r-v)

The first eight lines are from *Devine Weekes*, I.iv.661-68. However, the final couplet encapsulating the argument is not borrowed or adapted from *Devine Weekes*; as the marginal annotation hints, it may well be Swan's own verse. Sylvester and Swan apparently combine again on the same opening:

Th'earth by degrees her lovely beautie bates,
 Fills others full with her deare delicates:
 The apron and the osier-basket (both)
 Catch dainty fruits to please each daintie tooth:
 Untill at last trees, gardens, meads and all,
 Are naked stript and robbed quite of all. (2Y3r)

The first four lines are Sylvester's I.iv.681-84. The penultimate line recalls line 664 ('The Meads with grasse, with leaves the naked Woods', the fourth line of the previous quotation), but is probably Swan's invention, although it appears inconsistent for the author to edit out one single-word rhyme (on R3r, see above) only to insert another here. Again the new couplet provides a succinct summary of Sylvester's point. His stylistic imitation is rooted in his understanding of the poem's argument, as well as the rhythms of Sylvester's verse. These additions merge Sylvester's and Swan's literary personas. Other unattributed quotations in *Speculum Mundi* suggest further authorial insertions. The more idiosyncratic additions are covertly announced in the prose as discrete textual elements. Other quotations that seem to be Swan's original compositions are a couplet on 2S3v ('O never let these works forgotten be: | Their art is more then humane eyes can see'), a couplet and six lines added to a Sylvester quotation on 2G4r-v, a six-line verse summary of Ælian's anecdote about the dolphin of

Iassos (3B2v) and twenty-six lines on 2H1r-v.⁴⁶ Swan was certainly capable of composing such verse: the preface contains sixteen lines of heroic verse in which ‘J. S.’—a possible pun on John Swan’s and Josuah Sylvester’s initials—introduces *Speculum Mundi* while imitating Sylvester (¶¶1v): ‘When fresh Aurora first puts forth her head, | And calls bright Sol from out his Eastern bed, | She modestly doth blush; her crimson die | Makes red the verges of the dawning skie’.

These original poems reveal the author’s interest in mortality, sympathy and good morals. They also show an author imitating Sylvester by writing verse in short paragraphs (of around three couplets’ length) on topics closely integrated with the words around them. Swan selected material in discrete, non-consecutive verse paragraphs, whilst synchronizing his loans to the poems’ hexaemeral macrostructures. Swan also adopted Sylvester’s voice on several occasions, showing how stylistic imitation could accompany the desire for intellectual affinity with the *Semaines*. It was worthwhile both to mention Du Bartas in the index, and to seed the work with quotations that confirmed how little Swan departed from the hexaemeral narrative of the *Semaines*. Metrical and phrasal repetitions asserted the depth of this continuity.

Swan’s practice is potentially shaped by current affairs in the 1630s in several ways. His conservative imitation practice may be intentionally consistent with an Anglo-Catholic vision of a global harmony between Church and the world, and the liturgical repetition of set texts that denies personal inspiration or revelation; Edward Browne’s imitation, discussed in the next section, provides strong evidence that such connections were being made at this time. Swan is writing when the *Semaines*’ reputation as authoritative philosophical poetry was secure, and Sylvester’s poetry had consolidated its place in the modern English canon (as Chapter 3 showed). In this later period of Du Bartas’ reception, by which point Sylvester and James were both dead, writers were apparently emboldened to imitate Sylvester’s voice—the

⁴⁶ Unattributed quotations on 2O4v and 2P2r are taken from John Donne’s ‘The First Anniversary’ (ll. 343–44), and a Friar Lawrence speech in *Romeo and Juliet* (II.iii). See *Shakespeare Allusion-Book*, I, 399. Epigram 6 from Henry Parrot’s *Mous-trap* (1606) is quoted in full on 3E3v.

most striking examples introduced in this and the following chapter were written after 1630—and perceive more generous conceptual frameworks in the poems. Accordingly, Caroline writers less often concentrate on individual sections of the poems but are induced to absorb the poems' spirit and projection of celestial harmony whole.

Swan's interest in the seven-day division had a precedent in Du Bartas' regular appearance in astrological almanacs in the early seventeenth century: according to Bernard Capp, '[t]he most widely quoted literary source [in almanacs] was the poetry of the French Protestant, Du Bartas, in the immensely popular English translation by Silvester. The moral tone and astrological themes fitted ideally the almanac's purpose'.⁴⁷ Capp particularly has in mind John Evans' *Evance. 1613. A new almanacke and prognostication* (1613) which principally consists of 'A Briefe Discorse of the Natures, and Qualities of the tweule Signes' in verse (B3r-C3r; typography standardized) that contains a bricolage of extracts from Sylvester's translation (probably the 1605 edition) and from Nathaniel Baxter's *Oourania* (1606).⁴⁸ The sources are unacknowledged in the printed text, but a contemporary reader of the Bodleian's copy, possibly the Cambridge-educated puritan minister Matthew Page, inserted the following note at the poem's start: 'Out of Siluesters Dū Bartās. 4 day first weeke page 96 verbatim &c'.⁴⁹ The quotations are indeed 'verbatim', starting with an unbroken quotation of I.iv.181-294 (B3r-4v, excluding 203-04), then from II.ii.4.363-564, both of which describe the zodiac signs in turn.⁵⁰ At a new paragraph on B7v, beginning 'This wondrous frame of heauen and earth wee see', Evans begins quoting passages on celestial bodies from *Oourania* (ll. 384-413, 420-21, 428-31, 446-51 and 454-59). After these lines follows a bridging couplet that is Evans' only original contribution to his collage-work ('*Sol, Venus, Mercurie, and the Moone, | Now have*

⁴⁷ Bernard Capp, *English Almanacs, 1500-1800* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1979), p. 227, and see p. 483 n. 83.

⁴⁸ Evans' use of 'speckled' (B3r, l.iv.197), 'Heaven' (B3v, l.iv.218), 'Summers' (B4r, l.iv.239) and 'in milde proude manner' (B4r, l.iv.249) indicates use of 1605 quarto.

⁴⁹ The page reference is to the 1611 edition. On Matthew Page, see Adam Smyth, 'A New Record of the 1613 Globe Fire During a Performance of Shakespeare's King Henry VIII', *NQ* 52 (2005), 214-16.

⁵⁰ On one occasion, Evans deliberately amends 'Lemuel' to 'James': 'The next, that Beame, which in King *Iames's* hand, | So iustly waighes the Iustice of our Land' (B7r).

I told their names right-soone', B8v), and then further material from the Fourth Day about Saturn, Jupiter, Mars and the seasons (ll. 367-94, 657-704, 395-424, 431-68, 475-78 and 501-526).

By quoting so much material without modification Evans adopted an extreme form of imitation, perhaps better described as appropriation. Evans' contemporaries may also have perceived these reduplications as being illicit, which would explain why they are absent from later almanacs, and would be consistent with William Lilly's assessment of Evans as an unscrupulous rogue.⁵¹ Another astrologer also read Du Bartas sympathetically: Henry Coley, who copied down Du Bartas' praise of 'Artists in Astrology' in his notebook several decades later.⁵² Evans' practice has a close counterpart in Edward Browne's borrowings, for in both cases writers quoted much longer continuous extracts. Sylvester's translation provided material that could easily be taken out and reapplied in new contexts, in ways similar to the examples of commonplacing and annotation seen at the beginning of this chapter, but now much less restrained.

Edward Browne

Edward Browne was secretary to the merchant and civic politician Sir James Cambell (c. 1570-1642) from about 1626 to 1642.⁵³ Cambell was an alderman from 1620, Lord Mayor of London in 1629, and governed the French Company and Company of Merchants of the Staple.⁵⁴ Browne informs us that Cambell had Calvinist sympathies: his master enjoyed reading the works of the sixteenth-century godly clergymen William Perkins and Richard Greenham, the 'latchet of whose shoes' Browne felt unfit to loosen, and engaged in 'earnest

⁵¹ Bernard Capp, 'Evans, John (b. 1594/5?, d. in or after 1659)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53669>].

⁵² Bodleian, Add. MS B. 8, fol. 38 (quoting II.ii.4.667-691 from a 1633 or 1641 folio). Capp, 'Coley, Henry (1633-1704)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5899>].

⁵³ Sidney Lee, rev. Trevor Dickie, 'Cambell, Sir James (c.1570-1642)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4429>]; Edward Browne, *A Rare Paterne of Iustice and Mercy [...] Whereunto is Annexed A Meteor, and A Starre* (1642), F8r.

⁵⁴ Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution* (London and New York, 2003), pp. 89-90. See also Valerie Pearl, *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution* (London, 1961), pp. 394-95.

zealous prayer with his family all the dayes in the weeke'.⁵⁵ Robert Brenner (p. 296) detects that 'Cambell's Puritanism did not, however, prevent him from remaining closely in touch with the increasingly Laudian establishment': his will bequeathed money for both Laud's restoration of St Paul's Cathedral, and reformed Dutch and French congregations in London. The will was also generous in supporting London's poor, but only provided twenty pounds for Browne.⁵⁶ In a pamphlet published in 1642 Browne gave a specific reason for the size of this legacy: 'I believe if I had surceased from printing Bookes my Master would have bequeathed me 200.l'.⁵⁷ In numerous other pamphlets Browne defends himself against the charge that he disrespected his master by publishing two works in 1641 and 1642.⁵⁸ By his own account, Browne's response to Sylvester's *Devine Weekes* is closely bound up with these accusations.

Although these pamphlets also demonstrate that Browne was a moderate royalist who defended established liturgical practices and rituals, his most controversial book was neither political nor polemical. *Description of an Annuall World and Sacred Poems* (1641) is a seemingly innocuous four-hundred page prose treatise about cosmological order and the liturgical year, which Browne notes was influenced by the Book of Common Prayer, and a series of verses about daily tasks and days of the week.⁵⁹ *A Rare Paterne of Justice and Mercy* and *A Meteor, and a Starre* (1642), which must have been published after Cambell's death in January 1642, looks

⁵⁵ *A Rare Paterne*, F8v and C8v.

⁵⁶ PRO, PROB 11/188, fol. 11.

⁵⁷ *Sir James Cambells Clarks Disaster, by making books, shewing that lying and scandalous pamphlets against the King and Parliament are in great estimation, but bookes of learning and religion little regarded* (1642), A2r.

⁵⁸ Edward Browne, *A Paradox Usefull for the Times* (1642); *A Potent Vindication for Book-Making, or, An Embleme of these Distracted Times* (1642); *A Compendious and Patheticall Retractation for Book-Making Very Usefull for these Distracted Times* (1643).

⁵⁹ *Annuall World and Sacred Poems* can be treated as a single work. Copies of the first edition of *Annuall World* (Wing B5102), printed by 'E[dward] G[riffin]', contain a verse by John Booker on A6v and another named 'Liber ad Lectorem' (A7r). It was re-issued in the same year (B5102A) with these two verses omitted and a truncated titlepage inscription, 'London, Printed by E.G.'. Wing lists *Sacred Poems*, which has a separate titlepage and a new signature register, as a different publication (B5106), but, while it is possible that *Sacred Poems* was initially published alone, Browne's preface to *Annuall World* (quoted below) indicates that the two works were conceived as a single book. The two parts were sometimes bound separately, e.g.: the Scottish hymn-writer Henry Francis Lyte owned a copy (Bodleian, Mason AA 269) of the *Sacred Poems* that included the prefatory material from *Annuall World* (B5102, A2r-8v) between the titlepage and A2r, and his hand-written contents page to both works. See also Grolier Club, *Catalogue of Original and Early Editions of some of the Poetical and Prose Works of English Writers from Wither to Prior*, 3 vols (New York, 1905), I, 96-97.

equally inoffensive: the titlepage announces that it eulogizes the deceased Cambell's 'many notable and charitable Legacies', and is paired with another set of 'Briefe and pleasant Meditations', offering a prose description of providence (*Meteor*), and verse and prose on love (*A Starre*). Browne used astronomical metaphors for his works in various places, using them on one occasion to describe his use of Du Bartas in *Sacred Poems*:

I compared [*Sacred Poems*] to the *Moone*, because it is most part borrowed from that glorious *Sun* divine *Du Bartas*. And the last [*Description*] to the *Sunne*, because it treats of divine Meditations throughout the year. (*Rare Paterne*, G2v)

Browne is not exaggerating: *Sacred Poems* contains more than 1200 lines—roughly half the total work—copied out, almost verbatim, from Sylvester's *Devine Weekes*. Cambell and others seem to have been especially hostile towards these centos; Browne's later prose publications are effectively a response to this initial criticism. Very little has been written about Browne's verse to explain why he quotes so heavily from Sylvester's translation, or how the contexts of the book's reception inform an understanding of this idiosyncratic text.⁶⁰ Browne's quotations from *Devine Weekes* are a key to understanding these works and their unfavourable reception: by the 1640s it could be contentious to quote Du Bartas' poetry, especially when imitated as overtly as Browne does, because the poet's name held royalist connotations. Browne's distinctive methods of close reading provoked political, ecclesiological and literary contention because of the interpretation of *Devine Weekes* that it projected.

Browne's prefaces to *Annall World* and *Sacred Poems* tell us that his meditation on and imitation of Du Bartas provided a necessary stimulus for his writing. Browne was surely confident that Cambell, as a Calvinist who traded with the French, would approve of Du Bartas' poetry. *Sacred Poems* contains a dedicatory verse to Cambell that evokes deference and

⁶⁰ See Abbot, 'Influence of Du Bartas in England', pp. 120-75. John Steadman refers to Browne in 'Tantalus and the Dead Sea Apples (*Paradise Lost*, X, 547-73)', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 45 (1965), 35-40; and 'Milton, Fulgentius, and Edward Browne: A Note on the Tantalus Myth', *NQ* 13 (1966), 391-92. Nigel Smith refers to Browne, in passing, as a writer 'attempting to boil down the teachings of puritan classics (Perkins, Greenham, du Bartas) for a popular audience, in a longer and older tradition of spiritually edifying literature' (*Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven and London, 1994), p. 30).

humility, and also the poet's intimacy with his master: 'Also [I] have observ'd, you doe of late, | Delight to read, more then in former state. | This did induce me to become so bold, | My Talent in your lap thus to unfold' (*Sacred Poems*, A2v). Two versions of Browne's preface to *Annually World* survive: one is addressed to Cambell, is dated 29 October 1640 and appears as the preface to *Meteor* in *A Rare Paterne* (F8r-G3v); the other is addressed to the then-Lord Mayor Edmund Wright, his aldermen and his sheriffs, is dated 3 June 1641, and was published as the preface to *Annually World*. Both prefaces give the same account of the work's genesis, but the original preface (assuming it was not written retrospectively, or the date was altered) reveals far more about Cambell's response to the work. It may have been published as the preface to a later work simply to demonstrate to his detractors that Browne had made every effort to make *Annually World* and *Sacred Poems* pleasing to Cambell. Browne writes at the beginning of the earlier, 1640 preface that he has 'patched the fine-spun cloth of the Prince of Poets *Du Bartas*' (F8v), but hopes that 'these unlearned workes of mine, being nothing else but an expression of my affection, will bee more acceptable now in your old age then a present of greater cost and worth' (G1v). Presumably referring to events in 1640 (again, unless the preface was amended), Browne tells Cambell that 'after some labour and travell in English Authors', and having revised his work after it was 'greatly disliked contrary to my expectation', he

finished my *Annually World* to the second story, and therefore would not leave off in the midst of my worke, contrary to your Worships direction, who advised me to surcease and leave, lest I might come to be as some have been, and receive such punishment as *Phaeton* brought upon himselfe, by being too busie in things above my learning and strength. (G1r-v)

Browne did not follow his master's recommendation to 'surcease and leave' the work: the preface goes on to relate that Browne, although 'afraid that my *Annually World* would have proved displeasing to your taste', intended to dedicate the finished version of *Sacred Poems* and *Annually World* 'not onely to your selfe, but to all the Senators of this famous City' (G1v).

Browne did exactly that in the later publication. Extensive verbal parallels show how lightly the text of the first preface was revised for its new addressees:

Worthy Senators; I (though far unworthy) having patched and peeced the *Fine-spun-cloath* of the Prince of Poets, Divine *Du-Bartas* smooth eloquence, with my *home-spunne ragges* and course materials, and framed thereof a peece of rough Poetry, for my retired thoughts to repose in; presented the same in private to my judicious loving Master, the right Worshipfull *S^r. James Cambell* the *senior* Alderman of this famous City; which I had no sooner brought forth, but this *Annually World* so closely followed those Poeticall Meditations, that I could not rest satisfied in my mind, till I likewise produced it: and so after some pleasing labour and travell in divers Authours, brought it to this maturity, and because they are as *Twins*, joyned them both together, and placed the yonger before the elder. (A2r-3r)

The content of these prefatory materials leaves us in no doubt that *Annually World* and *Sacred Poems* were conceived as a single book, despite the separate titlepages, dedications and signature numbers; as Browne tells it, the work began with his meditations on Du Bartas but grew to include a prose treatise. By including the earlier preface the 1642 publication was already an implicit defence of Browne's first book. We can infer from these prefaces that Cambell felt that Browne was unable to reach the poetic pitch needed to engage seriously with a poet like Du Bartas, and that it required more work to be worth distributing to others. *Annually World* was probably composed to make the publication more respectable, but Cambell lost patience with the project. Browne nevertheless published the work, leaving himself open to the charge of having dishonoured his master.

A strong suspicion arises from this reading of the preface that Cambell's disdain for *Sacred Poems*, which Browne tried to compensate for in his later writing, is connected to its most unorthodox feature: Browne's many extended quotations from *Devine Weekes*. Though he does not annotate his poems, Browne did not conceal his appropriations either: he marks borrowed lines with quotation marks, which is a relatively novel practice in a period when

such marks often indicated important lines that are worth quoting by others.⁶¹ There is little doubt that Cambell or any other contemporary reader would not have known (after encountering so many examples) that the marks indicate loans from Sylvester. The problem was not that Browne was dishonest, but that his meditations on Du Bartas' poetry are recklessly derivative. The first half of *Sacred Poems* contains unexceptional verses on everyday tasks:

When I array my selfe, then doe I muse,
 How in a spirituall habit, I should use
 To deck and cloth my selfe, so, every day
 That I might never feare the fatall fray

('Of putting on Apparell', A6v)

The long poem 'Of the Night' (B1r-5v) contains a sixteen-line collage of quotations (B3r) from a passage in 'The Furies' (II.i.3.225-26, 223-24, 245-50, 263-68 and 253-54), and concludes with forty lines (B5r-v) that duplicate two complete verse paragraphs from the First Day (I.i.542-82) with only minor emendations (the largest is that 'kill' replaces 'thrill' in line 554). The first quotation is unique in that it is the only occasion that Browne quotes from the Second Week or reworks a single passage so intricately. Shortly afterwards, a poem 'Of the Weeke' (B7v) introduces a series of poems on the seven days, at which point Browne's longer quotations from Sylvester dominate the collection (see Table 2). 'Quotation' is still the accurate modern term for Browne's practice, since he not only acknowledges his borrowing (and names Du Bartas on D8r), but very seldom revises lines from Sylvester and does not provide much evidence that he imitated anything other than Sylvester's form in his original verse. There is an act of creative authorship involved in choosing to present these lines on the page and offer them to Cambell as cento-meditations.

⁶¹ See Margreta de Grazia, 'Shakespeare in Quotation Marks', in *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, ed. by Jean I. Marsden (New York and London, 1991), pp. 57-71 (esp. 58-60) and G. K. Hunter, 'The Marking of Sententiae in Elizabethan Printed Plays, Poems, and Romances', *The Library* 3-4 (1951), 171-88.

‘Sunday’ (B8v-C2v) 34 lines quoted	I.i: (248-49), 250-54, 269-72, 285-86, 521-42, 835-36
‘Monday’ (C2v-C4v) 36 lines	I.ii: 47-56 289-94, 299-308 1087-90 1143-46 1293-94
‘Tuesday’ (C4v-D1r) 282 lines	I.iii: 27-30, 39-42, 53-62, 81-86, 91-102, 393-414, 425-26 (478-80), 481-86, 493-96, 525-28, 439-440, 443-61, 529-38, 543-76, 799-812, 599-606, 663-66, 691-92, 701-14, 795-98, 865-66, 873-902, 933-52, 997-1000, 1005-28, 1173-74 919-32, 907-917, I.iv.379-88
‘Wednesday’ (D1r-D4r) 181 lines	I.iv: 61-68, 201-320, 327-48, 359-66 (527) 559-60, 565-72, 561-64
‘Thursday’ (D4r-D7r) 152 lines	I.v: 25-48, 63-80 (98) (84) 85-86, 131-32 246, 253-58, 353-68 591-602, 641-44, 649-56, 661-70, 799-826, 699-704, 707-18
‘Friday’ (D7r-E3r) 298 lines	I.vi.13-16, 25-32, 93-100, 105-08, 123-50, 157-82, 289-310, 327-32, 419-26 467-78, 481-84 501-16, 739-46, 763-80, 963-1002, 1007- 1018, 1025-90, 1121-22 I.iv.395-402
‘Saturday’ (E3r-E8v) 244 lines	I.vii.1-116, 123-98, 369-80, 387-436, 447-48, 453-58, I.i.157-58, 173- 76, I.vii.461-466 I.iv.367-72 I.vii.449-52

Table 2 Quotations from the First Week in *Sacred Poems*. Commas mark consecutive quotations, vertical bars indicate that quotations are separated by original poetry, and parentheses denote that the quoted lines have been modified.

For Abbot (p. 150) ‘caprice’ was the only coordinating principle of Browne’s ‘baffling’ practice. The examples witnessed earlier in this chapter and contemporary theories of imitation provide little precedent for Browne’s practice and authorial self-presentation. However, patterns do emerge when recovering aspects of how Browne made his collages. Most obvious is that Browne closely parallels his seven Days with Du Bartas’ Week, breaking this rule on very few occasions. He re-uses a version of the final couplet in each Day of Sylvester’s translation five times: ‘so morne and evening the [First] day conclude, | And God perceiv’d that all his works were good’ (C1r, C8r, D3v and E2v, with quotation marks, and C4r without). In the five poems in which this couplet appears, the lines conclude the description of the day’s creation, and then further material about each day follows, often with classical references and with far fewer quotations from *Devine Weekes*. As well as organizing his material within his poems, Browne is selective about which passages he quotes from. He consistently avoids quoting invocations, Sylvester’s interpolations and lengthy similes, and stays close to the narrative sequence of the poem without rigidly adhering to the original line

order, for example in ‘Tuesday’ he quotes from I.iii.481-86, 493-96, 525-28, 439-440, 443-61 and 529-38 in succession. None of the long catalogues in the earlier Days are used, though Browne does resort to those on animals in the Sixth Day.

Browne seems to have consulted at least two editions of *Devine Weekes*, since in at least two cases a passage contains variations from both pre- and post-1611 editions.⁶² A possible explanation is that he literally cut out passages from two copies of *Devine Weekes*, and rearranged slips of paper to create his poems (as Crawford proposed for Allott’s practice). Such a method would be consistent with Browne’s heavy use of quotations with almost no adaptation (though there are many minor changes to typography and punctuation), and the fact that Browne never quotes the same passage twice. Like most writers considered in this chapter, Browne seems sensitive to printed marginalia in *Devine Weekes*. In ‘Sunday’ Browne reads off sections corresponding to marginal references to ‘Genes. 1.2’ (I.i.269, C5v (*Devine Weekes*, 1605)) and ‘Gen. 1.3’ (I.i.521; D2r), and in ‘Monday’ to ‘the 1. Cha. of Gen. ver. 6,7,8’ (I.ii.58; E1r) and ‘Gen. 1.7’ (I.ii.1148; G3v). As he read through each chapter of Genesis, Browne’s method is familiar from earlier examples: he usually quotes from the start of verse paragraphs, and leaves out the most digressive sections.

Although Browne’s practice is similar in several ways to examples discussed earlier in this chapter, the length of quotations that he culled from the poems was unique, and looked eccentric even to *Sacred Poems*’ first readers. Prefatory verses to *Annually World* and *Sacred Poems* make repeated self-conscious, amused even, defences of Browne’s imitation. Their cheery acceptance that Browne has stolen material may show that Cambell had already criticized strongly the quotations in the final forty pages of this five-hundred page work. This would

⁶² On D2r, ‘Mild-proudly marching’ is the reading in 1611 editions and later (I.iv.249) but ‘And by returning’ is from 1605 and 1608 only (I.iv.276); on E3v, ‘Brings softly home’ is a pre-1611 reading (I.vii.38), but ‘there ascends a mountaine’ is post-1611 (I.iv.42). In both cases, the two quotations are located on different pages in *Devine Weekes* (K6r-v and S8v-R1r in the 1605 edition).

explain why the prefatory poems debating Browne's practices appear before *Annually World*, as well as *Sacred Poems*, and also why imitation practices were being debated at such length in the 1640s, when the topic was discussed in print less often than it had been fifty years ago. The sequence of prefatory verses by notable contemporary poets before *Annually World* provides a robust defence of Browne's practices. These include poems attributed to Francis Quarles (A5r-v), John Vicars (A6r), and the parliamentarian astrologer John Booker (A6v; removed in the re-issued version), while Browne writes elsewhere that George Wither, Henry Peacham and John Taylor also approved of his work (which makes them candidates for authorship of the anonymous verses).⁶³ The prefatory verses begin with two poems that accuse the reader of handling stolen goods. One is entitled 'An Epigramme | *To his Criticke*':

Didst not thou buy this Book? The Merchant gave it
 Into thy hand: Did not thy hand receive it?
 Thou callst the Authour Thiefe? 'Tis true: However,
 The Thiefe is not so bad as the Receiver. (A5r)

The apologetics in the verses immediately preceding *Sacred Poems* adopt a more pious tone (A2v-A4r): 'But Divine Bartas helped me in part: [...] I borrowed his, to make this presentation, | A perfect, and compleat Gratification' (A4r).

Once *Annually World* and *Sacred Poems* were published, Browne was attacked more widely for his supposedly disreputable conduct towards Cambell in bringing out these works. The changes made for the work's re-issue (see footnote 59 above), and the original preface reprinted before *Meteor* may testify to the work's stormy reaction. In *A Rare Paterne*, Browne emphasizes that he read Du Bartas in order to learn from him ('A Starre', K6r). Elsewhere he argues that he felt Cambell would 'affect me the better for expending my spare time in such divine meditations, and did say that God had put into his heart to doe me good' (*Rare Paterne*, D4r). Browne is justifying not only his imitation practice here, but also his decision to publish

⁶³ *A Potent Vindication*, A1v.

the work despite Cambell's request that he should not. He goes on to state that the small legacy he received showed his master's concern for Browne's spiritual well-being, an argument that deflects the accusation that Browne had published the poems to gain a larger bequest; in the 1640 preface, Browne reassured Cambell that he did not seek 'any of your earthly substance from you, neither doe I hereby cog, flatter, or sooth you, or any other, in hope to get some great preferment thereby' (G2v). Browne portrays himself as a humble poet who read Du Bartas sincerely in his spare time for personal instruction.

Contemporary developments in print culture meant that more pamphlets were being printed between 1641 and 1644, and we consequently have numerous documents that record Browne's defence of his works.⁶⁴ The five pamphlets that followed trace how the debate quickly escalated and became politicized. In *A Paradox Usefull for these Distracted Times* (1642), written for 'vindication of my reputation' (A1v, cf. A3v), Browne argues that it is better to imitate established truth-bearing expressions than create original falsehoods. In doing so he defends the Book of Common Prayer, which he claims influenced *Annually World* (a connection also made in *A Potent Vindication*, A1v), and proposes *Devine Weekes* as another work to read closely and imitate:

though I doe borrow a better forme of prayer then I am able of my selfe to compose according to my matter, though it be out of our Church Liturgy, which some call the English Masse-booke, I esteeme of my Booke [*Annually World*] never the worse, for I had rather speak 4. or 5. words with understanding, then a great deale of non-sense to no purpose. In my sacred *Poems* I have used the assistance of learned *Du Bartas*, and other Poets elegant expressions on the day in generall, and all the dayes in the weeke, for which I, and so I hope all understanding people will love my Apothecaries Shop the better for such variety of expressions, though some say this dead flie hath made all my Bookes of oyntment unsavoury. (A4r)

Browne uses an image of the fly in ointment taken from Ecclesiastes 10.1; he seems aware, like Quarles in his prefatory verse to *Sacred Poems*, of the same biblical book's argument that

⁶⁴ Joad Raymond, 'The Development of the Book Trade in Britain', in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture: Volume One*, ed. by Raymond (Oxford, 2011), pp. 59-75 (pp. 62-63).

‘there is nothing new under the sun’ as a defence of established practices.⁶⁵ Browne has already rebuked non-conformists who ‘give God thanks that they have forgotten the *Lords Prayer*’ and the preacher who ‘railes non-sense against the Book of Common-Prayer for its well composed repetitions, and never considers his own vain babling’ (A2v).

Sacred Poems takes Du Bartas as a text for private meditation, but consciously avoids creative imitation and charismatic reinvention: it is important that Browne should *not* say anything new. Harold Love has suggested that the Anglican insistence on ritual repetition may have nurtured greater tolerance for literary appropriation, and that, similarly, puritan devotion may have been one origin for ideas about literary originality that later generations inherited.⁶⁶ The ecclesiastical parallels are pronounced in Browne’s pamphlets, even if we can only speculate whether Cambell criticized Browne’s poetry because his clerk had read Du Bartas with insufficient devotional passion and enthusiasm, or simply because found it poetically uninspired. The recurrent planetary metaphor which Browne uses to describe his works, in which *Sacred Poems* is the moon, serves double duty elsewhere in this treatise to underscore both the coherence and heavenly reach of his total oeuvre, as well as his conservative defence of an established natural order (A3r-v).

Browne provides a more explicit account of *Sacred Poems*’ composition in *A Potent Vindication*:

I having received into my soule divers good motions from the holy Spirit of God, intimated by the God of dreames, wandred in the Forrest of my owne imagination and by my owne capacity thought to imitate the golden straines of *Sylvesters* heavenly harmony, on *Du Bartas* weekly dayes. And having extracted from thence many heavenly lessons, I inserted them into my fantasticke notions. (*A Potent Vindication*, A1r-v)

⁶⁵ Cf. Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Ann Arbor, 1950), p. 224, F400 (‘Dead Flies corrupt the most precious ointments’).

⁶⁶ Harold Love, ‘Originality and the Puritan Sermon’, in *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (Basingstoke, 2003), pp. 149-65.

The theme of heavenly inspiration is placed alongside references to Browne's own creative powers as enhanced by Sylvester and Du Bartas. In this pamphlet Browne is more direct in identifying non-conformist hostility towards his work: 'neither Anabaptist, Brownist, nor any of your new inspired Doctors, durst lift pen on paper against my *Annuall* world, or Sacred Poems' (A1v). The final section of the pamphlet is a defence of the established church which foregrounds the ecclesiological stance behind his writings: 'I may not unfitly compare my Bookes to the true *Protestant* Religion, and my selfe to the Imperious Clergy' (A4r). This pamphlet also shows that the issue had become a matter of Browne's personal reputation, for it also contains a declaration, dated 15 August 1642 and subscribed by some dignitaries addressed in the revised preface to *Annuall World* (including Edmund Wright), which states that Browne 'did not [print] these Bookes with any intent to dishonour his said Master, but onely to obtain his Masters favour upon his honest endeavours' (A2r-v). This pamphlet shows that the publication had created a personal crisis for Browne in which his conduct and beliefs came under attack, as well as his publications.

Two further pamphlets are variations on the same themes. *Sir James Cambels Clarke's Disaster* is more contrite in acknowledging that expressions in *Sacred Poems* 'are borrowed from the radiant *Sun* of divine *Du Bartas* his Weekly Dayes' (*Compendious and Patheticall Retraction*, A2v), but is nonetheless vituperative in relating *Sacred Poems*' rejection to larger outrages against the established church order, and repeats the lunar comparison and fly-in-ointment image (A3r-v). In the confessional final pamphlet, *Compendious and Patheticall Retraction* (1643), Browne reiterates his belief that the 'folly' of publishing these works cost him an inheritance ('I have lost two or three hundred pounds, besides other worldly goods' (A2v)), and later adds that political radicals created this trouble for him, an unlearned but devoted soul, specifically those 'malignant parties [which] at this time do abundantly multiply, and oppose themselves against all good order in Church and Commonwealth' (A2v). The phrase 'malignant parties' was used in the 1641 Grand Remonstrance, and a year later by Charles in ironic reference to

parliamentarians (*OED* A.1.b and c), which is how Browne uses it here. Finally, a printed fragment also survives apparently containing Browne's correspondence appealing for further support: the most remarkable is the reply from Richard Holdsworth, then Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, which refuses Browne's request to present his verses to Charles: 'my iudgement is, that to preferre it to the King you shall doe great wrong both to your Master, and the Executors, and your selfe'.⁶⁷

Browne's imitation practice had explicitly become embroiled in contemporary Church politics. His modesty as poet and pamphleteer is that of a conservative unwilling to press for change, and his comments again equate Browne's close quotations from Du Bartas with set prayers repeated by the faithful. The final lines of *Sacred Poems* (E8v) suggest that a political undercurrent was already present before these wider liturgical disputes, for Browne finishes with a quatrain from the Seventh Day, withheld from being used earlier in 'Saturday', that is one of very few passages in *Devine Weekes* with pointed political relevance to contemporary debates. It takes the monarch's side in speaking of a Church united around its martyrs, apostles and elect worshippers:

Where with the Prophets, and Apostles zealous,
The Constant Martyrs, and our Christian fellowes,
Gods faithfull servants, and his chosen sheepe,
In Heav'n I hope (within short time) to keepe.⁶⁸

Responses to Du Bartas were not necessarily dividing along confessional lines by 1641: the book was defended by both conformists like Browne and Quarles, the parliamentarian Booker and Vicars (a Calvinist and friend of Sylvester).⁶⁹ Despite such sentiments, the argument over Browne's poetry began with the suspicion that his imitation was, to use the modern term,

⁶⁷ *Time Well Spent* (1643), A3v.

⁶⁸ 'C'est le grand jubilé, c'est la feste des festes, | Le Sabat des Sabats qu'avecques les prophetes, | Les apostres zelez, et les martirs constans, | Heureux, nous esperons chommer dans peu de temps' (I.vii.431-34).

⁶⁹ At least two literary works by staunch non-conformists in the mid-seventeenth century show traces of Du Bartas' wide readership: the Quaker John Perrot's *A Sea of the Seas Sufferings* (1661) and John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667). See Nigel Smith, 'Exporting Enthusiasm: John Perrot and the Quaker Epic', in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 248-64 (p. 259).

plagiarism. Browne failed to transform the material he was using to create any distance between his writing and source material. The original accusation against Browne's verse is likely to have been the same that modern readers would bring: that *Sacred Poems* reprinted large sections of *Devine Weekes* without adding any value. In the charged atmosphere of the 1640s this complaint took on the broader implication that Browne's verse meditations were a mindless, serial repetition of a monarchically-approved text that was better described as theft than devotion. As such, Browne's quotations from Du Bartas are a defiant final avowal of the practices of selective reading and quotation from the *Semaines* witnessed earlier in this chapter. The conservative associations of the *Semaines* persisted, but became pernicious to the degree that a dispute about a secretary publishing hastily-written verses to win his dying master's favour took on intellectual, social, political and ecclesiological dimensions. The political establishment's support for the *Semaines* had begun to injure the poems' reputation.

Conclusion

As a counterweight to the many example of quotations from and into printed works presented in this chapter, it is worth pointing briefly to two instances where quotations from the *Semaines* appear in a manuscript work but are removed from its equivalent edition in print. The antiquary Tristan Risdon (c.1580-1640) wrote a survey of Devon that circulated in manuscript in the seventeenth century before print publication in 1714 and 1811.⁷⁰ The British Library manuscript (Add. 36748) containing his 'Peritinerary of Devon', which is dated 1633, contains quotations from 'The Trophies' on folio 45.⁷¹ Risdon, discussing the Carys of Cockington, describes how Robert Cary regained his father's estates and compares his candour to Nathan's using four lines from Sylvester's translation (II.iv.1.1171-74). Risdon may have come to this section after recalling an earlier passage about cocks and cockpits (II.iv.1.311-20) which he punningly adapts when describing Robert's later duel with an

⁷⁰ Mary Wolffe, 'Risdon, Tristram (c.1580-1640)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23668>].

⁷¹ The catalogue also mentions a quotation on fol. 56, but this couplet (beginning 'Thy rest gives me a restless life') is unlikely to be Sylvester's: it also appears in John Stow's *Survey of London* (1618; *ESTC* 23344), 2A1r.

Aragonese knight. Neither quotation survives in printed editions, though nearby lines from Horace, Virgil and Drayton do.⁷² Risdon may well have known personally the young Cary (who later wrote an antiquarian work himself), and these quotations may be a gesture of friendship or at least a reference specific to the Cockingtons that had lost its currency once the work was printed.⁷³ The other example, too rich to analyze properly here, is Edward Sparke's *Learned and Pious Poems*, a manuscript containing versions of the poems featured in his *Thysiaſtērbion: vel, Scintilla altaris* (1660), an Anglican clergyman's description of liturgical feasts interspersed with original verses.⁷⁴ Sparke's confessional stance resembles Browne's, as does his taste in poetry: the second half of the manuscript contains long poetic extracts, including a verse that alternates stanzas from George Herbert's 'Church-Porch' and Sylvester's *Quatrains of Pibrac* (fol. 76-84), and then pages of extracts from Sylvester's and Quarles' works—the same pairing admired by another clergyman, Zachary Boyd, who is introduced in the next chapter. Again, these quotations do not appear in the printed editions, perhaps because they served as poetic models for Sparke's original compositions.

We have seen that some readers marked their copies of the *Semaines* and prepared them for use. The poems were read non-serially for rhetoric and erudition which could be reapplied easily to other settings, but such reading did not exclude appreciations of the poems as a meditation on the Christian universe. With their well-organized poetic structures and additional finding aids in print editions, the *Semaines* provided a ready resource for Allott in compiling his printed commonplace book, and for Nash reinforcing the arguments in *Quaternio* by quoting Du Bartas in Latin and English. In two examples post-1630 we witnessed writers who showed their deference to the *Semaines*' vision of creation by adapting the poems' structure and Sylvester's voice.

⁷² See *Chorographical Description or Survey of the County of Devon* (1714, 1811), 2C4r.

⁷³ Mary Wolffe, 'Cary, Robert (*bap.* 1615, *d.* 1688)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4843>].

⁷⁴ Beinecke, Osborn b137.

This part of the thesis has traced the historical development of the *Semaines*' reputation in England and Scotland while illustrating multiple ways of personalizing and transforming the poems' texts. James VI and I's favour for Du Bartas and Sylvester's *Devine Weekes* were crucial for the *Semaines*' continued success in Britain, though the monarch's affiliation with the poems may eventually have poisoned the poems' reputation among non-conformists. The *Semaines* were an essential Christian humanist work equally valuable in secular and sacred contexts: a virtual commonplace book in verse packed with information that presented a pious vision of the Christian macrocosm. For the readers discussed in this chapter the poem did not offer symbolic or fictive meanings, as Lepage proposed, but were a literal interpretation of the Genesis narrative expanded using modern sources. We have also seen how the *Semaines*' reputation developed over time as writers became bolder in manipulating the texts. Allusions and quotations to the *Semaines* are so frequent because the poems were comprehensive but accessible. Though we cannot know how readers with a similar background to Elizabeth Isham found the poems, it is likely that they were often read for pious Christian instruction of various kinds.

Edward Browne's *Sacred Poems*, though a verse composition, provided the ultimate example of how individual quotations from the *Semaines* were selected with a steady conception of the poems' total ambition. As a case study, his work demonstrated the political commitments potentially involved in adapting the *Semaines*, but does not do justice to the new creative possibilities that the *Semaines* offered. The final part of this thesis explores how the *Semaines* influenced poets, first examining how borrowings and paraphrases were integrated into vernacular verse (Chapter 5) and then considering whether a 'Bartasian poetics' ever developed in Jacobean England as poets composed works with similar structures and content to the *Semaines* (Chapter 6). It is necessary to consider these further areas of enquiry before assessing what overall impact the *Semaines* might have had on English and Scottish literary history.

Part III: Imitations in Verse

Preface

We have seen that the *Semaines* were regularly approached as divine historical and philosophical verse but not as an allegorical vision of Creation. As a Christian humanist epic the *Semaines* grew out of and were embedded in contemporary literary culture; they did not offer a self-contained encyclopedic *summa* of world knowledge. Du Bartas' Calvinist poetics recognized that the presentation of the world's origins through Scripture was compromised by the poet's debased rational and imaginative capacities, and in this way religion could be seen as one factor in David Quint's claim that '[t]he Renaissance author emerged as original at the moment when a traditional and authoritative canon was historicized and relativized'.¹ The *Semaines* were a landmark work in re-defining how erudite individuals might interpret Scripture in verse using modern sources and idioms, and as such the poems became conceptual and stylistic models for later writers. This part examines more closely how poets discovered their own persona when imitating the poems in French or English.

There is a broad lexicon in English for describing literary imitation, one which includes such terms as: adaptation, borrowing, copying, duplication, appropriation, plagiarism, revision, reworking, recasting, parodying, paraphrase, simulation, excerption, absorption, resemblance, emulation and inspiration.² Traces of historical practices that match the concepts behind these terms are found in texts that shape the *Semaines* into new forms, as the *Semaines* simultaneously shapes how those texts are written. These are active processes whose unifying feature is evidence of authorial agency. With a work as long as the *Semaines* and so familiar to a doctoral student specializing on the text, however, there is a real risk of recognizing

¹ David Quint, *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature* (New Haven and London, 1983), p. 220.

² Some standard accounts of Renaissance imitation are: Harold O. White, *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance* (Cambridge, MA, 1935); G. W. Pigman III, 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance' *RQ* 33 (1980), 1-32; M. L. McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance* (Oxford, 1995); and Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests*, trans. by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln, Nebraska, and London, 1997).

correlations between texts that did not originate in a specific encounter between an author and text, and do not show poets actively negotiating problems of originality, individuality and authorship. Such resonances are catalogued in Emily Kemp Schlesinger's exhaustive study of more than forty sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers and their relation to Du Bartas and Sylvester: for her, literary influence is an ethereal process involving 'sympathetic vibrations of later minds in response to notes which Du Bartas transmitted'.³ Consequently her work does not examine the co-dependence of reading and writing in the early modern period, processes which, as Terence Cave has shown, were 'virtually identified' with each other.⁴ The responses considered so far have always unambiguously involved a reader who has consulted a particular edition or translation of the *Semaines*, and has been stimulated to write in a certain way because of it. In order to reconstruct reading and compositional strategies, we have considered which texts were used, and how paratexts, apparatus and other material features affected reading experiences; we have sought to identify traces of agency by observing clustered borrowings from individual sections, selective quotation (e.g. of similes), refusal to quote whole lines, generic affinities (e.g. a divine drama quoting a divine poem), and similar trends. Such indicators of agency allow us to separate responses from resonances. This clarification is necessary before dealing with original verse, where the relationship with the *Semaines* is often unannounced, because it allows us to sift out dubious examples and place responses on a spectrum between direct imitation and less textually-rooted kinds of inspiration.

The *Semaines'* rhetoric was, as we have already seen, easily transferable to other texts. For this thesis, then, responses need to indicate consistent practices of reading and writing from parallel passages with linguistic or thematic continuity: it is insufficient to compile lists of correspondences and argue for direct influence from the total number of references. The

³ Schlesinger, 'Du Bartas and Sylvester in English Literature', p. 798.

⁴ *The Cornucopian Text* (Oxford, 1979), p. 35.

dangers of this earlier approach are epitomized in George Coffin Taylor's *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* (1934), a work whose ambitious claims are no longer widely accepted, despite Taylor having accumulated ideational similarities between the *Semaines* and each book of *Paradise Lost*. A more materially-conscious methodology can, for example, help us process the 'Marvellian echoes' and resemblances to Du Bartas.⁵ In five articles published in *Notes and Queries* between 2005 and 2009, Ian C. Parker argued that Marvell borrowed words, images and themes from *Devine Weekes* in five poems written over a twenty-year period. This is not inherently unlikely, for Marvell may have become well-acquainted with *Devine Weekes* when serving as tutor in the Fairfax household.⁶ Although Parker argues for intentionality, his articles do not give proof of a literary 'response' as defined above. This is not to say that his conclusions are necessarily incorrect, but that they cannot inform us about how Marvell may have read the poems. Parker rarely insists that any specific line or phrase was definitely taken from Sylvester, but argues that a series of weak affinities amounts to substantial evidence for influence. In the earliest example, he found three sections of Sylvester's 'The Decay' (II.iv.4) comparable to Marvell's tigress simile in 'The Last Instructions to a Painter' (1667), including the shared phrase 'Tygress fell'.⁷ 'The Character of Holland' (1653), 'The Loyall Scot' (c. 1667-73) and 'The Mower against Gardens' (c. 1650-52) also have parallels with 'The Decay'.⁸ Traces of 'The Furies' (II.i.3) are detected in 'The Dialogue between the Soul and Body' (1552 or later), including the verbal coincidence that a section on diseases in Sylvester's translation contains nineteen words (such as 'love', 'heat', 'melancholy', 'disease', 'ulcer' and 'cramp') that are found in lines 31 to 40 in Marvell's poem.⁹ The most recent article suggests that *Devine Weekes* may be a source for the poet's use of the word 'crystal' in 'A Dialogue, between the Resolved

⁵ See James Loxley, 'Echoes as Evidence in the Poetry of Andrew Marvell', *SEL* 52 (2012), 165-85.

⁶ *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith (London, 2003), p. 214. Dates for Marvell's poems are taken from this edition.

⁷ Ian C. Parker, 'Marvell and the "Tygress fell"', *NQ* 52 (2005), 318-24; and 'Marvell and the "Tygress fell": A Supplementary Note', *NQ* 55 (2008), 299-300.

⁸ Parker, 'Marvell's Use of Sylvester's Du Bartas, II.iv.4.', *NQ* 53 (2006), 172-78 (178).

⁹ Parker, 'Marvell's "A Dialogue between the Soul and Body": Probable Sources and Implications', *NQ* 55 (2008), 291-99 (295).

Soul, and Created Pleasure' (?after August 1667), though by this point Parker assumes Du Bartas to be 'an extremely important source for Marvell'.¹⁰

These articles use parallels as a basis for further speculation about Marvell's writing process, whereas this thesis always considers textual evidence and likely authorial practices together. With the tigress simile, Parker finds that Marvell was influenced simultaneously by *Devine Weekes* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: '[the simile] appears to draw on at least ten distinct passages in his two main probable proximate sources' (2008, 300). Marvell appropriates from 'diverse sources with potentially divergent associations [...] to produce a particular composite effect' (2008, 300). Parker detects borrowed words and phrases, 'verbal and thematic resonances' and 'broader associations' with Du Bartas (2008, 296). Yet Marvell's practice is also presented as highly deliberate: the tigress simile is imagined as a calculated collation of different sources, and Marvell's supposed preference for 'The Decay' would have required him to pass over many other sections of the *Semaines* on purpose; Parker argues that 'The Decay' was an 'attractive storehouse of images for Marvell' (2006, 177) and that it may have resonated with Marvell as 'a study of moral and political decay, decline, and dissolution' (178).

Marvell may indeed have worked with the *Semaines* in complex, multifarious ways that cannot be disentangled into easily designated practices. He may have read *Devine Weekes* for its striking imagery, phrases and words and its political and thematic significance; used particular sections (such as 'The Decay') repeatedly when writing unrelated poems in different genres over a twenty-year period; knew certain parts of the poems so well that they casually influenced different aspects of his work, and combined multiple sources when writing, with two or more books open before him. Yet this model does not present a coherent image of how Marvell may have used a copy of the poems. Parker's argument is weakened by the questionable verbal parallels drawn, but it may nonetheless be true that Marvell was

¹⁰ Parker, 'Marvell's "Crystal" Mirror', *NQ* 56 (2009), 219-26 (223). Future references to Parker's five articles are given in the body text in the form (year, page number).

influenced by *Devine Weekes*, and that his methods are too subtle and involved to be fully recovered today.

In any case the two dramas and dramatic poems considered in Chapter 5 are placed together because they offer high chances of identifying specific historical methods of composition. These case studies are not the canonical poems discussed by Schlesinger, but relatively unknown works in manuscript and print where debts to Sylvester and Du Bartas are most extensive and transparent. This close examination of forms of imitation leaves us better placed to observe less direct types of resemblance and contact in the final chapter. This part of the thesis makes contributions, as Chapter 4 did, to writing the history of reading but touches now more closely on aesthetics: as well as examining how physical texts were used, my examples now show how and why readers appreciated the poems. We can witness the *Semaines* being read for enjoyment, for moral and factual instruction, for their rhetoric, and for their distinctive literary style.

Chapter 5: A Paradigm for Divine Poetry, c. 1594 and 1640

This chapter considers how authors at either end of the chronological period dealt with in this thesis adopt the *Semaines* as a stylistic paradigm for early modern divine poetry. First I consider two dramas that are among the earliest works to imitate the *Semaines* in English: George Peele's *The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe* (printed 1599) and the anonymous play *The Taming of a Shrew* (1594). Both dramatists paraphrase individual passages from the French text to amplify the rhetorical register of speeches at important points in the action; specifically, both use Du Bartas to fashion a more overtly Christian version of Christopher Marlowe's pioneering blank verse.¹ The second section introduces a previously undiscussed source for Du Bartas' reception history that was probably written fifty years later, but follows the *Semaines* even more closely as an exemplar for divine poetry, albeit using very different methods. The work is Zachary Boyd's *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace* (?c. 1640), one of nineteen dramatic poems in his collection *Zion's Flowers*, which borrows from Sylvester's works throughout. Together with Boyd's other papers and what appears to be his annotated copy of Sylvester's works, this case study offers a significant new example of contemporary reading practices, remarkable for both the quality and quantity of evidence available. Like the two Elizabethan dramatists, Boyd reads the *Semaines* as a path-breaking model for popular religious verse. In all three works we see *Devine Weekes* presented almost as secular Scripture, written in heroic couplets that befitted the Bible's grandeur. However, there are great differences in the ways that writers consulted Du Bartas' works in the 1580s and 1640s, due in part to editions that were available and the changed political circumstances in which the poems were read. These works illustrate numerous ways that Du Bartas' work contributed to the development of early modern English religious verse, and as such prepare for the wider survey of how the *Semaines* inspired new religious poetry offered in the final chapter.

¹ I use 'paraphrase' to describe rewordings that appear to make no claim to be replicating a text in the same or another language: I agree with Matthew Reynolds that the term 'paraphrase' tends to emphasize difference from a source text, whereas 'translation' also offers the (illusory) possibility of identity, such that a translation can be quoted and read as if it were the source. See *The Poetry of Translation* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 16-25 (p. 24).

i. Paraphrases in Late-Elizabethan Drama

A character called Bartus appears in Christopher Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* (printed c. 1592-94), a play which was probably first performed at the Rose Theatre on 30 January 1593.² The play stages the circumstances surrounding the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572, but it was not strictly accurate to portray Du Bartas and Philippe de Mornay ('Pleshé') as the King of Navarre's closest attendants: the former was an advisor to and secret negotiator for the future Henri IV, but not a close confidant.³ 'Bartus' was probably intended as a topical reference to a poet known, especially for his political connections, among English writers in the early 1590s, though few contemporary playgoers would have read his works yet (as Chapter 3 showed). The *Semaines* were coming into vogue in 1590s London: de Lerm's Latin translation, dedicated to Elizabeth, had affirmed Du Bartas' credentials as a Protestant poet (see Chapter 1), while Henri IV's coronation in February 1594 may have rekindled interest in the Huguenot poet, who had died in 1590.

Du Bartas was being read by the set of university-educated dramatists, known as the 'University Wits', who were educated in foreign languages, attracted to ennobling rhetoric in verse, and were producing commercial dramas in London at this time.⁴ Thomas Nashe and Thomas Lodge knew Du Bartas' *Semaines* (see Chapter 3), as did George Peele: the first and final scenes in the printed text of *The Love of David and Faire Bethsabe, with the Tragedie of Absolon* (1599) contain debts to *La Seconde Semaine* (1584).⁵ First performed around 1592 and entered

² *The Massacre at Paris*, ed. by Edward J. Esche, in *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe, Volume V* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 295, 315-16. The text of *Tamburlaine the Great*, ed. by David Fuller in the same volume is cited in this chapter for references and quotations to this play.

³ Paul H. Kocher, 'Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*. Part Two', *MLQ* 8 (1947), 309-18 (316).

⁴ G. K. Hunter, *English Drama 1586-1642* (Oxford, 1997), p. 22.

⁵ Elmer Blistein provides the clearest account of Peele's reading of Du Bartas in the introduction to the Yale edition (all references to the play are to this edition): *The Dramatic Works of George Peele*, ed. by R. Mark Benbow et al. (New Haven and London, 1970), III, 148-51. The relation was first described in P. H. Cheffaud's *George Peele (1558-1596?)* (Paris, 1913), pp. 137-41, 176-85, and later by H. Dugdale Sykes in 'Peele's Borrowings from Du Bartas', *NQ* 147 (1924), 349-51 and 368-69. Sykes acknowledges Alexander Dyce's similar observations in his 1861 edition of Peele's works, but had not apparently read Cheffaud. An allusion to 'Eden' in Peele's verse

in the Stationers' Register in 1594, the play is roughly contemporary with *Massacre at Paris*, and also with *The Taming of a Shrew* (1594), a play best known in connection to Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* but which subsumes other works, including a section of 'Le Premier Jour' of *La Sepmaine*.⁶ The paraphrases in both plays are strikingly similar in method and purpose, and can be understood within larger patterns of imitation and innovation in dramatic technique among London playwrights in the 1590s which coalesced around Marlowe's example, and provide valuable insights into Du Bartas' literary appeal within the context of Elizabethan dramatic literature.⁷

David and Bethsabe and *A Shrew* assimilate both Du Bartas' and Marlowe's rhetoric into their work; indeed, it may be Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* that spurred these poets to use the *Semaines*. The plays are so-called 'sons of *Tamburlaine*' which uphold Peter Berek's claim that in the early 1590s 'the best way to capitalize on the success of *Tamburlaine* was by mediating between that play and their audience's perhaps uneasy, but fundamentally conservative tastes'.⁸ Adapting Du Bartas' words helped these dramatists achieve such mediation: the *Semaines* were a valuable counterpart to *Tamburlaine* in that they possessed comparable rhetorical amplitude and sidereal grandeur but projected a more overtly traditional stance on divine authority and providence. Both dramatists use the *Semaines* to create theologically conservative but passionate speeches at crucial points in the action; in addition, Peele uses Du Bartas' example to exploit new possibilities for biblical drama created by Marlowe's blank verse. The borrowings from the *Semaines* were not necessarily spoken on stage, though: the dramatists may have resorted to these well-regarded religious poems to

'Honour of the Garter' (1590) is suggested by G. Lambin, 'Du Bartas et le Style de Peele', *Revue Anglo-américaine* 3 (1925-26), 54-56 (56).

⁶ *The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto*, ed. by Stephen Roy Miller (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 147-52. The association was first observed in H.W. Crundell, 'Notes on *The Taming of a Shrew*', *NQ* 163 (1932), 309-10, and George C. Taylor, 'The Strange Case of Du Bartas in *The Taming of A Shrew*', *PQ* 20 (1941), 373-76.

⁷ On the relations between commonplacing, dramatic composition and early modern audiences, see Charles Witney, 'Ante-aesthetics: Towards a Theory of Early Modern Audience Response', in *Shakespeare and Modernity*, ed. by Hugh Grady (London, 2000), pp. 40-60.

⁸ "'Tamburlaine's' Weak Sons: Imitation as Interpretation Before 1593', *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982), 55-82 (82).

cultivate their play-scripts into a more ‘literary’ printed text.⁹ George Chapman, another poet in the same cultural sphere, was also paraphrasing Du Bartas in poetry at this time: his ‘Hymnus in Noctem’ in *Shadow of the Night* (1594) contains six anaphoric lines taken from ‘Le Premier Jour’:

When earth, the ayre, and sea, in fire remaind,
 When fire, the sea, and earth, the ayre containd,
 When ayre, the earth, and fire, the sea enclosde,
 When sea, fire, ayre, in earth were indisposde,
 Nothing, as now, remainde so out of kinde,
 All things in grosse, were finer than refinde (A3v)¹⁰

La terre, l’air, le feu se tenoient dans la mer;
 La mer, le feu, la terre estoient logez dans l’air;
 L’air, la mer, et le feu dans la terre; et la terre
 Chez l’air, le feu, la mer. (I.i.233-36)

Chapman produces an English approximation of a conceptually ambitious passage without wholly translating its words or sense. His unacknowledged stylistic borrowing is qualitatively different from the many other points of intertextuality noted in the glosses after his poem, to Hesiod, Homer, Virgil and Natalis Comes among others (C1v-2r); indeed, this commentary plausibly takes after Goulart’s work on Du Bartas just as the verse incorporates the poet’s diction. The French poet’s influence is activated by a creative translation, just as Chapman similarly adapted Gilles Durant’s poetry in his *Banquet of Sense*.¹¹ Peele and the *Shrew*-author’s paraphrases have similar qualities: all three writers provide free renderings of the French that retain rhetorical figures, images and ideas without offering an exact translation of the sense or words, or acknowledging Du Bartas by name. The *Semaines* are being used as a writing resource, not a reference work: they are being read to compose original religious verse that

⁹ For an overview of recent research on literary authorship and print publication, see articles in Susan Zimmermann and Garrett Sullivan (eds), ‘Forum: The Return of the Author’, *Shakespeare Studies* 36 (2008), 19-131. See also Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 251-52.

¹⁰ Phyllis Brooks Bartlett contends that ‘[i]t is obvious that Chapman had Sylvester’s book open before him’ (see *Poems of George Chapman* (New York and London, 1941) p. 423); however, Chapman was more likely imitating the French directly, since Sylvester’s translation of this section was not published until 1605. I thank Lavinia Silvaes for a fruitful discussion of the glosses in Chapman’s *Shadow*.

¹¹ Lee, *French Renaissance in England*, pp. 465-77.

infuses Marlovian cadences with Du Bartas' cosmological imaginary and verbal patterning. In all three cases, their aesthetic response has a practical literary outcome.

The passage adapted in *Hymnus in Noctem* comes just a few lines after the section featured at the beginning of Kate's speech in *The Taming of a Shrew*. The play's connection to Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, as printed in the 1623 folio, is of course strong: *A Shrew* shares in common not just its title and scenario but also many similar words and phrases, sometimes re-arranged or partially reiterated.¹² Recent editors have emphasized its creative distance from the Shakespeare play: Ann Thompson, for example, finds that *A Shrew* is 'a derivative text dependent on *The Shrew*, but the original has been handled more freely and rewritten more extensively (especially in the sub-plot) than is usually the case with memorially reconstructed texts'.¹³ *A Shrew* holds intertextual relations with numerous other sources. The plot and subplot are indebted, perhaps through the Shakespeare text, to a scenario in George Gascoigne's play *Supposes* (itself translated from Ariosto).¹⁴ *A Shrew* also has fluid associations with other highly imitative works: Valeria's opening words in scene four (4.1-6) have linguistic resonances with *Orpheus: his Journey to Hell* (1595, B1v), thought to be written by Richard Barnfield; and phrases from the play reappear in *A Knack to Know a Knave*.¹⁵

Furthermore, *A Shrew* is arguably as Marlovian as it is Shakespearean. Echoes from across Marlowe's dramatic oeuvre are found in *A Shrew*'s blank verse: for Berek, the play employs 'Tamburlaine-like rhetoric indiscriminately'.¹⁶ The correlations with Marlowe's plays

¹² For a scene-by-scene comparison of textual parallels, see Miller (ed.), pp. 127-43.

¹³ *The Taming of the Shrew*, ed. by Ann Thompson, updated edition (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 172-82 (p. 182).

¹⁴ Miller (ed.), p. 4.

¹⁵ Ann Thompson, 'Dating Evidence for *The Taming of the Shrew*', *NQ* 29 (1982), 108-9. The parallel with *Orpheus* has not been noticed before, but for the poem see A. Leigh DeNeef, 'The Poetics of Orpheus: The Text and a Study of "Orpheus His Journey to Hell" (1595)', *SP* 89 (1992), 20-70.

¹⁶ Berek, "'Tamburlaine's" Weak Sons', 59. Miller (following 'The Taming of a Shrew': *Being the Original of Shakespeare's 'Taming of the Shrew'*, ed. by Frederick S. Boas (London, 1908), pp. 91-98) records the following parallels in *A Shrew: Tamburlaine* at 2.38-40, 3.22-24; 3.62-64, 3.81-85, (4.56-60), 4.67-69, 4.131-32, 4.148-49, 4.156-59, 7.43-45, 11.1, 11.63 and 13.73-74; *Doctor Faustus* at 1.8 and 5.2-5; *Edward II* at 3.13-15 and *Dido, Queen of Carthage* at 11.12. There are also verbal parallels with Peele's *Edward I*: see 11.7-11 and 2.13-15; also Crundell, 'Notes', 309.

are often ironic when heard: for Leah Marcus, ‘*A Shrew* does not so much plagiarize Marlowe as borrow Marlovian language to undercut the heroic pretensions of the speakers’.¹⁷ This judgement is apt for Ferando’s hyperbolic encomium to Kate (7.148-62), but other incongruities are less focused in their bathos, such as when the Boy, dressed in women’s attire, enters quoting Callapine’s plea for release (2.38-40; *2Tam* 1.2.9-11). Elsewhere, a snatch of inconsequential dialogue in the subplot between Polidor’s boy and Sander strongly recalls both the A- and B-texts of *Doctor Faustus* (5.2-5); since *Faustus* was not printed until 1604 and probably not performed before 1594, the *Shrew*-author must have accessed the dialogue either through memorial recollection or notes on a performance.¹⁸ These unsystematic loans do not possess any coordinating purpose other than to introduce Marlowe’s diction into the drama: both protagonist and clowns speak like the equivalent Marlovian characters do. *A Shrew*’s eclectic borrowings suggest that the play possesses an aspiration to emulate Marlowe’s verse style, without consciously parodying him (as Shakespeare would several years later).¹⁹

Into this bricolage are incorporated two passages from ‘Le Premier Jour’ that are uniquely fitted to their new context. The author manipulates Du Bartas differently from other sources, perhaps because the *Semaines* are the only religious work, the only poems and above all the only non-English source used. Rather than appropriate material seemingly at random, the author produces a close paraphrase from one continuous section only, and deploys it exactly where a higher rhetorical register is needed. The paraphrase is placed towards the start of Kate’s crucial speech in which she invokes God’s authority before declaring a wife’s obligations to her husband:

¹⁷ Leah S. Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance* (London and New York, 1996), pp. 101-31 (p. 121).

¹⁸ The first recorded performance of *Faustus* was on 30 September 1594, and the play was probably not performed until after Marlowe’s death in May 1593; see *Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe, Volume II: Doctor Faustus*, ed. by Roma Gill (Oxford, 1990), p. xv. See also Raymond A. Houk, ‘*Doctor Faustus* and *A Shrew*’, *PMLA* 62 (1947), 950-57.

¹⁹ e.g. the First Player’s pastiche of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* in *Hamlet*, II.ii.445-518 (performed c. 1600); Phoebe’s quotation from *Hero and Leander* in *As You Like It*, III.v.81 (c. 1599; *Riverside*); Pistol in *Henry V* (IV.i.44-48)

Theternall power that with his only breath,
 Shall cause this end and this beginning frame,
 Not in time, nor before time, but with time, confusd,
 For all the course of yeaes, of ages, moneths,
 Of seasons temperate, of days and houres,
 Are tund and stopt, by measure of his hand,
 The first world was, a forme, without a forme,
 A heape confusd a mixture all deformd,
 A gulfe of gulfes, a body bodiles,
 Where all the elements were orderles,
 Before the great commander of the world,
 The King of Kings the glorious God of heauen,
 Who in six daies did frame his heauenly worke,
 And made all things to stand in perfit course.

(*Taming of a Shrew*, G1r-v)

L'immuable decret de la bouche divine,
 Qui causera sa fin, causa son origine.
 Non en temps, avant temps, ains mesme avec le temps,
 J'entens un temps confus, car les courses des ans,
 Des siecles, des saisons, des moys, et des journees,
 Par le bal mesuré des astres sont bornees.

(I.i.19-24)

Ce premier monde estoit une forme sans forme,
 Une pile confuse, un meslange difforme,
 D'abismes un abisme, un corps mal compassé,
 Un Chaos de Chaos, un tas mal entassé
 Où tous les elemens se logeoient pesle-mesle,
 Où le liquide avoit avec le sec querelle

(I.i.223-27)

'Le Premier Jour' lends the speech, in Coffin Taylor's words, a 'strangely inartistic, didactic, definitely theological' tone that is absent from the folio text.²⁰ Kate is more dignified in this Bartasian version, though her indulgent piety may approach farce. Ferando immediately acknowledges how convincing the speech is: 'Enough sweet, the wager thou hast won, | And they I am sure cannot deny the same' (14.143-44). Only lines 110 to 113 ('The first world [...] orderles') are a direct translation written in heroic couplets, with the line 'Un Chaos de Chaos, un tas mal entassé' (226) omitted.²¹ The paraphrase introduces grammatical confusion: the subject changes from 'Theternall power' to 'seasons', and the clause beginning 'before' (l. 126)

²⁰ Taylor, 'Strange Case', 374.

²¹ Richard Hillman may attribute too much theological subtlety to the writing when he argues that this omission demonstrates a writer with sensitivity to the religious controversy about the pagan concept of 'Chaos', a word also used in both Scott's and Sylvester's translations ('*La création du monde* et *The Taming of the Shrew*', see Chapter 1 above).

lacks a main verb. These alterations are consistent with the *Shrew*-author having worked directly from the French text, which is likely for several reasons: no English translation that survives today was available in print yet; Peele, as we shall see, most likely read the original too; and any lapses are attributable to the English version being a paraphrase produced in a specific context, rather than a close translation.²² It seems unnecessary to speculate, as Miller does, that the ‘bungled’ translation of certain phrases ‘suggests that the author of *A Shrew* encountered the passage in English’ (p. 150), possibly in a manuscript translation, commonplace book, or another playtext. On this unique occasion in *A Shrew* the writer probably went to a specific text in a foreign language to exploit a single passage for clear dramaturgical reasons: at the moment where an original expression of conventional moral sentiments was most required, the dramatist turned to Du Bartas, not Marlowe or Shakespeare. The author may have taken a cue from Marlowe’s reference in *Massacre*, and may have known that Peele and Chapman were also incorporating lines into their works; it is superfluous, however, to postulate an intermediary English text used by the *Shrew*-author.

In contrast to the debts to other playwrights dispersed across the text, the *Shrew*-author quotes a single passage from the *Semaines* that is transformed for particular effect when placed in its new context. The author’s practice and principles may have differed when using a French text: trans-linguistic imitation made it more difficult to navigate the whole text for short quotations, and it may have been acceptable to quote a single section intensively as it would not be for another English-language text (a similar distinction pertains in Ben Jonson’s drama).²³ While so much of the literary cross-pollination that took place in and through *A Shrew* remains obscure, the imitation from the *Semaines* is uniquely isolable and purposeful. The paraphrase may have been incorporated into stage performances in the 1590s, or may

²² Since Sylvester’s translation of *La Sepmaine* was not printed until 1605, and in 1592 Sylvester declared his intention to translate the *Second Weeke*, it is probable that he did not translate *La Sepmaine* until 1598 or later (see *The Triumph of Faith* (1592), C4v).

²³ On Jonson’s imitations, see Ian Donaldson, “‘The Fripperie of Wit’: Jonson and Plagiarism”, in Kewes (ed.), *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*, pp. 119-33.

have supplemented the printed text only alongside many other textual fragments. Either way, the use of Du Bartas made sense within the theatrical context of the 1590s, one in which Marlowe's ambitious rhetoric encouraged further experimentation with contemporary writers. Readers of the later 1607 edition of *A Shrew* may have recognized the source material since Sylvester's translation was available by then, but had the quotation survived into the 1623 folio it would have been anomalous because by this time Du Bartas was being quoted in earnest by prose writers: George Hakewill uses the same passage in his *Apologie* from 1627 (C3v, see Chapter 3.iii). In the 1590s the paraphrase in *A Shrew* was entirely appropriate within a text whose author was sensitive to contemporary literary trends, and where it addressed a specific dramaturgical need for eloquently sincere religious feeling in its final scene.

George Peele's imitations from the *Semaines* are similarly attentive to local dramatic exigencies, and to the *Semaines* as outstanding examples of divine poetry: in *David and Bethsabe* he draws on the *Semaines* to mimic Marlovian blank verse to write biblical drama. Peele draws parallels between the two shepherd-kings David and Tamburlaine throughout the play.²⁴ In the opening scene, for example, David speaks words taken from 'Eden' (II.i.1) when describing his rapture at sighting Bethsabe in a situation that parallels Tamburlaine's pursuit of Zenocrate:

That precious fount, beare sand of purest gold;
 And, for the Peble, let the silver streames
 That pierce earths bowels to mainteine the sorce,
 Play upon Rubies, Saphires, Chrisolites,
 The brims let be imbrac'd with golden curles
 Of mosse that sleeps with sound the waters make (ll. 60-65)

Au long d'un clair ruisseau dont la brillante arene
 Est de fin or d'Ophir, les caillous de rubis,
 L'onde de pur argent, le rivage de lis:

²⁴ Annaliese Connolly, 'Peele's *David and Bethsabe*: Reconsidering Biblical Drama of the Long 1590s', *EMLS* Special Issue 16 (2007), 9.1-20 (1).

Et qui des plis glissans de sa source sacree,
Gazouillard, labyrinthe une flairante pree. (II.i.1.474-78)

Peele has modified the biblical account (2 Samuel 11:2) by removing the scene from ‘the Kings palace’ to a typical *locus amoenus*. Inga-Stina Ewbank spotted a close connection between this idealized garden and the situation, language and themes of Elizabethan readings of Ovid, such as that in Chapman’s poem *Ovids Banquet of Sence* (1595).²⁵ Ewbank also notes that ‘Peele has indeed borrowed the rhetorical scheme (‘climax’ the Elizabethans would have called it), and, as it were, the verbal skeleton of the passage, from Du Bartas’ (61). As in *A Shrew* the dramatist transfers a sequence of images and rhetorical figures into a Marlovian form: the audience or reader is challenged to empathize with David in a speech containing prosodic structures with comparable rhythmic impetus to Marlowe’s verse. The imitations are incorporated without losing their associations with Paradise. Occasional allusions to Eden (e.g. ‘[f]aire Eva plac’d in perfect happinesse’ (l. 53)) confer a sense of grace that counterbalances David’s predatory thoughts: as A. R. Braunmuller notes, ‘the play’s opening establishes two patterns, one vertical (the ascent to heaven, the descent to earth; the relation of God and man) and the other horizontal, a pattern of penetration and resistance appropriate to the sensual and earthly seduction about to occur’.²⁶ The speech contains two more images borrowed from ‘Eden’:

Lending her [Bethsabe’s] praise-notes to the liberall heavens,
Strooke with the accents of Arch-angels tunes (ll. 54-55)

Et marians leurs tons aux doux accents des Anges,
Chantoient et l’heur d’Adam et de Dieu les louanges. (II.i.1.85-86)

Let all the grass that beautifies her bower,
Beare Manna every morne in steed of dew (ll. 67-68)

²⁵ Inga-Stina Ekeblad (later Ewbank), ‘*The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe: A Note on George Peele’s Biblical Drama*’, *English Studies* 39 (1958), 57-62 (57). See also R. J. Frontain, ‘The “Curious Frame” of Chapman’s *Ovids Banquet of Sence: 2 Samuel 11*’, *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 31 (1987), 37-43.

²⁶ *George Peele* (Boston, 1983), p. 109.

Si je dy qu'au matin des champs la face verte
 Estoit non de rosee, ains de manne couverte (II.i.1.73-74)

Ewbank finds this speech particularly innovative: 'It is not only that a playwright like Peele could both compose the delicate lyric which opens *David and Bethsabe* and devise a dumb-show which needed "3. violls of blood and a sheeps gather", but that he and his contemporaries were always trying out new ways of combining word and spectacle.'²⁷ The bold synthesis of the Bible, Du Bartas and Marlowe is a powerful constitutive feature of this speech that epitomizes the play's amalgamated secular and sacred inspirations.

David and Bethsabe has specific linguistic correspondences with the *Semaines*, but no larger resemblance in plot or theme. P. H. Cheffaud argued that 'Les Trophées' (II.iv.1) influenced the 'general conception' ('La conception générale', p. 137) of *David and Bethsabe*, but there is no textual evidence to support his claim: Peele certainly used an edition of *La Seconde Semaine* containing the first two days ('Adam' and 'Noah'), perhaps a 1593 Chouët edition, but there are no grounds for believing that he also obtained the volume containing 'Les Trophées' that was first published by Hierosome Haultin in 1591.²⁸ That edition included 'La Magnificence', which describes the same encounter between David and Solomon in the play's final scene, but which Peele did not use. Aside from a raven simile spoken by the chorus from 'L'Arche' (II.ii.1.521-26, 555-61), only 'Eden' (II.i.1) and 'Les Artifices' (II.i.3) are used, in the first and final scenes respectively. Again it is possible that the paraphrases were never performed on the Elizabethan stage, and were expressly inserted at either end of the play-text for print publication. Arthur Sampley has argued that the playtext was expanded for printing, drawing attention to Solomon's sudden appearance in the closing scene, which is heavily

²⁷ Inga-Stina Ewbank, "What words, what looks, what wonders?": Language and Spectacle in the Theatre of George Peele', in *The Elizabethan Theatre: V*, ed. by G. R. Hibbard (London, 1975), pp. 124-54 (p. 127).

²⁸ Holmes et al., I, 85 (item 7c). See note 33 below.

indebted to 'Les Artifices', as seeming 'tacked on or added as an afterthought'.²⁹ The scene could alternatively be understood as providing dramatic resolution by foreseeing a positive future for David's line; equally, it is plausible that the outer scenes only contain debts to the *Semaines* because these were revised later, perhaps in 1593 or 1594.

Peele wrote the play for the Admiral's Men, and it was probably first performed at the Rose with David played by Edward Alleyn, who had created the role of Tamburlaine.³⁰ An early audience would have more readily recognized parallels with *Tamburlaine* than with Du Bartas, for the *Semaines* are silently used to fashion Marlovian scenes within a biblical context. Peele's play was one of at least ten other biblical dramas performed between 1593 and 1602, and to judge from titles and implied subject-matter alone (such as *Nebuchadnezzar* and *Tragedy of Job*) these plays probably adopted a similar dramatic idiom to Peele's, which was more progressive than Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge's earlier *A Looking Glass for London and England* (c. 1590) with its residual elements of medieval morality plays.³¹ Peele was aware of contemporary dramatic trends as well as other divine literature: Lily Campbell writes that 'Peele seems to me to stand as the lone poet of the age to undertake a divine play conscious of its place in divine literature and aware of traditions and practices of the poets who were writing divine poems'.³² Whereas *A Shrew* draws on Du Bartas for one set-piece speech, Peele makes a greater attempt to work the French text thoroughly into the scene's fabric, which we can witness in more detail by briefly considering each scene in turn.

In the opening scene the natural imagery in the twenty-four-line encomium of Bethsabe takes on darker connotations as David plots to entrap her. The details from 'Eden'

²⁹ 'The Text of Peele's David and Bethsabe', *PMLA* 46 (1931), 659-71 (669). On textual issues, see also T. W. Craik, 'Some Notes on the Text of Peele's "David and Bethsabe"', *NQ* 23 (1976), 208-10.

³⁰ Connolly, 'Peele's *David and Bethsabe*', 8; A. D. Wraight, *Christopher Marlowe and Edward Alleyn* (Chichester, 1993), Chapter 1.

³¹ Connolly, 'Peele's *David and Bethsabe*', 2.

³² Campbell, *Divine Poetry and Drama*, pp. 252-60 (p. 260).

establish a rhetorical motif that returns when David voices a desire to lure Bethsabe to an artificial grove:

Bright Bethsabe shall wash in Davids bower,
 In water mix'd with purest Almond flower,
 And bath her beautie in the milke of kids.
 Bright Bethsabe gives earth to my desires,
 Verdure to earth, and to that verdure flowers,
 To flowers, sweet Odors, and to Odors wings,
 That carrie pleasures to the hearts of Kings. (ll. 86-93)

David's voice resembles Tamburlaine's in its tone, imagery and syntax: compare this quotation with, for example, 'And in my helme a triple plume shal spring, | Spangled with Diamonds dancing in the aire, | To note me Emperour of the three fold world: | Like to an almond tree ymounted high, | Upon the lofty and celestiall mount' (*2Tam* 4.3.116-20). With the intricate anadiploses in the final four lines Peele has probably followed the French: 'à la terre verdeur, | A la verdure fleurs, aux fleurs une alme odeur' (II.i.1.107-08). Moments later more Bartasian images develop David's vision of the bower:

To joy her love Ile build a kingly bower
 Seated in hearing of a hundred streames,
 That for their homage to her soveraine joies,
 Shall as the serpents fold into their nest (ll. 117-20)

The middle two lines here are taken from the French: 'Du bruit de cent ruisseaux semond le doux sommeil' (43). The 'hundred streames' become hyperbolic, while the new serpent simile to describe the streams' 'oblique turnings' (121) adds a suspicion of temptation: the comparison with Adam having been established, Peele now shows David succumbing to sin. 'Eden' thickens the active associations in the play's opening scene while raising the verses' pitch. Blistein (pp. 257 and 259) also observes a parallel with Song of Songs 2:9 ('My welbeloued is like a roe, or a young heart' in the 1560 Geneva Bible) in the couplet 'Now comes my lover tripping like the Roe, | And brings my longings tangled in her haire' (ll. 115-

16), and with Psalm 133:2-3 at the end of David's earlier speech (ll. 69-71). It may not be coincidental that all these examples are found in David's speeches: this pattern may signal that these lines were intended for Alleyn, but as Peele gives lines from 'Les Artifices' to other characters in the final scene (though David's final speech is particularly parallel-laden), it may indicate a later attempt to amplify the scene's rhetoric while introducing psychological depth.

The final scene (ll. 1641-1920) largely consists of a dialogue based on 1 Kings 2:1-9 in which David gives advice to the young Solomon. Peele exploits the David-Adam analogy again by relating the scene to the exchange in 'Les Artifices' where Adam counsels Seth. The parallels are much more extensive here; the scene develops in tandem with the French. Solomon's questions to David about the heavens and future of humankind (ll. 1711-25), and subsequent responses (ll. 1726-71) are inspired by Seth's questions to Adam (II.i.3.503-653). The exchange is interrupted by the announcement of Absalom's death (ll. 1794-1897), after which 'Les Artifices' is drawn on throughout David's final speech. Two quotations from the same section are used before the dialogue begins. On the first occasion Peele locates four lines on Jubal's lute (marked 'Louange du Luth' ('praise of the Lute') in the French (F6r (1584 edition))), and works them into Bethsabe's speech to David:

Take but your Lute, and make the mountaines dance,
 Retrieve the sunnes sphere, and restraine the clouds,
 Give eares to trees, make savage Lyons tame,
 Impose still silence to the loudest winds,
 And fill the fairest day with foulest stormes (ll. 1648-52)

Et [Jubal] fait sur ce modele un luth harmonieux,
 Qui meine au bal les monts, retrograde les cieux,
 Oreille les forests, les lions dessauvage,
 Impose aux vents silence, et sereine l'orage. (II.i.3.503-07)

Peele re-uses each of Du Bartas' images in order, whilst transposing the verbs into the imperative. David's description of Bethsabe, which draws on Du Bartas' invocation to Peace, again sounds like a Christian reimagining of Marlowe's Zenocrate or Hero:

But, Bethsabe, the daughter of the highest,
 Whose beautie builds the towers of Israel,
 Shee that in chaines of pearle and unicorne,
 Leads at her traine the ancient golden world,
 The world that Adam held in Paradise,
 Whose breath refineth all infectious aires,
 And makes the meddowes smile at her repaire.
 Shee, Shee, my dearest Bethsabe,
 Faire peace, the goddesse of our graces here,
 Is fled the streets of faire Jerusalem (ll. 1660-69)

Sainte fille du Ciel, deesse qui ramenes
 L'antique siecle d'or, qui, belle, r'asserenes
 L'air trouble de François: qui fais rire nos chams:
 Unique espoir des bons, juste effroy des meschans:
 Vierge depuis vingt ans aux Gaulois incogne,
 O Paix, heureuse Paix, tu sois le bienvenue. (II.i.3.1-6)

The French lines are uneasily integrated into the pentameter line here: Peele switches into the French with the phrase 'daughter of the highest', which initially seems to be in apposition with 'Bethsabe' until the 'Shee' two lines later (Bethsabe has already been addressed as 'Thou') clarifies that there is another subject, one which is not announced as Peace until the next sentence.

Sustained parallels with the Adam-Seth dialogue begin when Nathan uses Bartasian epithets for Seth to aggrandize Solomon: 'Let Salomon be made thy staffe of age, | Faire Israels rest, and honour of thy race' (ll. 1695-96; 'Et sur tous Seth, qui tient du saint Abel la place, | Baston de sa vieillesse, et gloire de sa race', II.i.3.517-18). The eighty lines that follow are closely modelled on the French, as David responds to Solomon's request for knowledge of the heavens and earth. The dialogue enters a more sublime, philosophical register as David and Solomon share a joint vision of humankind's destiny: 'A secret fury ravisheth my soule, | Lifting my mind above her humane bounds' (ll. 1757-58, 'Il est soudain poussé d'une fureur secrete', II.i.3.573). Solomon describes a sensation of transcendence using another phrase taken from Du Bartas: 'So Salomon mounted on the burning wings | Of zeal devine, lets fall his mortall food' (ll. 1766-67, 'Le prophete guindé sur les ardentés ailes | Du seraphique

amour, perd les choses mortelles' II.i.3.585-86).³³ Nathan marvels at one of David's heavily imitative speeches: 'See David how his haughtie spirit mounts | Even now of height to wield a diademe' (ll. 1772-73). This speech has a didactic tone similar to Kate's final speech in *A Shrew*; likewise, Peele saves the most extensive borrowing for David's climactic final lines. The conclusion to this speech shows Peele's imitation of Du Bartas aspiring to create a fresh idiom for religious verse:

Thy day of rest, thy holy Sabbath day
 Shall be eternall, and the curtaine drawne,
 Thou shalt behold thy soveraigne face to face,
 With wonder knit in triple unitie,
 Unitie infinite and innumerable. (ll. 1912-16)

Ton Sabat est sans fin. La courtine tiree,
 Tu vois Dieu front à front; et saintement uni
 Au Bien triplement-un, tu vis en l'infini. (II.i.3.674-76)

Just as Ferando recognized the superior quality of Kate's words, so *David and Bethsabe* concludes as Joab recognizes the noble strength in this heavily imitative speech: 'Bravely resolvd and spoken like a King, | Now may old Israel, and his daughters sing' (ll. 1919-20).

The two scenes that imitate Du Bartas were probably written together: the dramatist may even have planned a narrative arc in which David begins as an onlooker in the Garden of Eden, but becomes Adam's true heir at the play's end. By discussing each scene separately we have seen how Peele's imitation is more creative than the single imitative speech in *A Shrew* is: images are removed and re-inserted within speeches, parallels are drawn implicitly to add rhetorical weight to speeches, and creative rewritings soar free of Du Bartas' verse. If the diction and tone of Peele's imitations stand out from the surrounding dialogue, then this provides evidence that, as in *A Shrew*, Du Bartas is being used to amplify the rhetoric of certain speeches. The Du Bartas imitations may be later additions to the play, which would be

³³ The first line of this quotation appears for the first time in the Chouët text of 1593, making this year a *terminus a quo* for the insertion.

consistent with Peele obtaining his copy of Du Bartas in about 1593 and using a divine poet to produce a work intended to be read, not performed. The same may apply to *A Shrew*, which similarly valorizes the *Semaines* as divine poetry composed in a language and style comparable to Marlowe's. We learn from these examples that the *Semaines* made a useful counterpart to the Bible as a literary source in the 1590s, while Peele's imitation practice is an early exploration of the creative possibilities of imitating Du Bartas. Although paraphrases are unacknowledged in both cases, it seems unlikely that early modern audience members, if they had picked up on them, would have found these practices illicit 'plagiarism' (Sykes).³⁴ There was apparently a qualitative difference between intra-linguistic borrowings and transference from French into English that sought to use extant poetry to assist dramatists in achieving an imaginative and prosodic strength akin to Marlowe's. These paraphrases are carefully adapted to the particular dramatic context for which they were intended, on the printed page if not necessarily on stage.

These paired responses to the *Semaines* show how two English readers recognized the vigour of Du Bartas' French poetry, and imitated it to reinforce religious elements in their own vernacular dramas. Efforts to remodel Du Bartas in English continued in the 1590s and early 1600s as multiple translations were produced, culminating in Sylvester's *Devine Weekes*. By the 1640s the idiom created by Sylvester's translation was established as exemplary divine poetry. There was still interest in transferring Du Bartas' and Sylvester's style into new works, but there was no longer need for such ingenuity as witnessed among these late-Elizabethan dramatists. With Zachary Boyd we will see a Scottish writer plundering Sylvester's *Semaines* and other works for material with little concern for original context or how he might creatively incorporate excerpts to fashion an individual voice. Once *Devine Weekes* became canonical divine poetry, there was less urgency to translate, modify or otherwise integrate his

³⁴ Sykes, 'Peele's Borrowings', 349. For discussion of the early modern conception of plagiarism, see essays in Kewes (ed.), *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*.

quotations. Boyd's approach may initially seem artless, but it provides a uniquely lucid example of a later reader who, like Peele, wants to discover a voice for writing popular divine verse. The discovery of Boyd's considerable debts to Sylvester not only offers a new vista on his poetic works, but offers a valuable new case study in early modern reading and imitation practices, for we can partially reconstruct how Boyd's eye travelled across the page as he selected material for re-use. Before reconstructing his practice, however, it is necessary to prove that Boyd did consult and extract material so voraciously, while explaining why his approach has previously gone unrecorded.

ii. *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace: Zachary Boyd's Dependence on Sylvester*

Margarete Rösler edited *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace: nach dem ms. Harl. 7578* for the series 'Materials for the Study of Old English Drama' in 1936, and attributed the work to Josuah Sylvester because it shares so many lines in common with *Devine Weekes*.³⁵ She transcribed the fourth item in British Library, Harleian MS 7578: a mid- to late-seventeenth century manuscript written in a fairly rapid but consistent secretary hand. The text is arranged on quarto sheets numbered consecutively from 321 to 368, with running heads and catchwords. *Fierie Furnace* is a verse adaptation of Daniel 3 that relates how Nebuchadnezzar set up a golden image and demanded that all should fall and worship it when summoned by music, or else be thrown into the eponymous furnace. Daniel's three companions Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego are threatened with burning when they refuse to pay homage. The manuscript breaks off at this point after 1459 lines, but the catchword 'Mens' on the final leaf indicates that the work did go on to relate the trio's miraculous escape from the fire. The text begins with a list of speakers, contains speech headings throughout, and has a single stage direction, 'The Kings Herald conveneth the princes etc.' (ll. 76-77). Observing that the text is 'set out

³⁵ *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace*, ed. by Margarete Rösler (Louvain, 1936), pp. xii-xiv. All quotations from the section of *Fierie Furnace* edited by Rösler (i.e. the first 1459 lines) are taken from this edition and are given with page and line references; when quoting from unprinted later sections, folio numbers from various manuscript sources are given. I thank Theo van Heijnsbergen for his comments on this section.

as nothing less than a drama' ('nichts weniger als dramatisch aufgebaut', p. viii), Rösler speculated that *Fierie Furnace* was a play performed in the 1600s or 1610s before James VI and I, whom she supposed was represented by Nebuchadnezzar. She believed Sylvester to be its author, based on the many close verbal similarities she discovered between *Fierie Furnace* and *Devine Weekes*.

Susan Snyder disputed this attribution, contending that it 'appears to be the work not of Sylvester himself but of one of his fervent admirers, who borrowed his vocabulary and (rather mechanically) some of his phrases and conceits, but not other aspects of his style or his ideas' (p. 41). Although Sylvester did indeed pursue royal patronage and wrote original divine poetry, Snyder correctly pointed out that the poem's style makes him an unlikely candidate for its authorship: the writer of *Fierie Furnace* wrenches the literal meaning of images in *Devine Weekes* to give them new figurative connotations; does not share 'Sylvester's taste for couplets shaped by antithesis, alliteration, and line-balance' (p. 40); and in sum 'the pattern of these [borrowings] suggests not so much a writer to whom Sylvestrian phrasing comes naturally as one leafing through the *Weekes* as he writes' (p. 41). Snyder also debunked the idea that *Fierie Furnace* was ever presented before James, remarking that the association between James and Nebuchadnezzar would be a 'strange kind of compliment' (p. 41). Nonetheless, she maintained that *Fierie Furnace* was an 'unfinished play' (p. 39). Her brief analysis leaves several basic questions about the manuscript unanswered: Who wrote it? When was it written? How much text is missing? Was it part of a collection of works? What was it written for? Why does the author imitate Sylvester so closely? And if it is a play, when and where was it performed?

Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace is in fact a dramatic poem written by the Scottish preacher and poet Zachary Boyd (1585–1653), who borrowed many epithets and similes from across Sylvester's oeuvre when writing his versifications from Scripture, collected as *Zion's Flowers*. This discovery does not just correct Rösler's and Snyder's earlier work, but encourages

us to look closely at Boyd's use of Sylvester when composing other dramatic poems. After confirming Boyd as *Fierie Furnace's* author by retracing the provenance of the Harleian MS 7578 text, this section considers Boyd's reading of Sylvester's *Devine Weekes* (in the 1633 edition), with particular attention given to the copy that Boyd probably used and annotated. It is possible to reconstruct with unusual precision how Boyd relied on specific passages from Sylvester throughout his verse writing. A close reading of *Fierie Furnace*, as a representative example of Boyd's poetic technique, shows these habits in action and demonstrates the continuity with the methodical interpretation of Daniel 3 in Boyd's sermons. This analysis concentrates on *Fierie Furnace*, but the other eighteen poems in *Zion's Flowers* each deserve scrutiny for their insights into Boyd's stylistic traits, methods of imitation and didactic biblical exegesis. Boyd's poetry can contribute to our understanding of seventeenth-century preaching and poetry, concepts and practices of imitation and intertextuality, and popular Scripture-based poetry more broadly.

When read from start to finish, there are clear grounds to doubt that *Fierie Furnace* is a playtext that would have been suitable for early modern stage or closet performance. The text is a highly derivative and repetitive retelling of the Authorized Version's text of Daniel with almost no dramatic momentum. Fundamental to *Fierie Furnace's* composition and structure are the replication of pleonastic repetitions in Scripture, such as the six-item list of instruments calling people to devotion (Daniel 3:5, 7, 10 and 15; cf. lines 448-9, 520-1, 728-9, 760-1 and 924-5). The names of Nebuchadnezzar's various attendants—the princes, governors, captains, judges, treasurers, counsellors, sheriffs and rulers of the provinces (Daniel 3:2, 3 and 27)—are the nucleus of the work's entire structure: the attendants are included in the list of 'speakers' at the work's beginning, and much of the text is taken up by sequences of bombastic speeches from each set of attendants that advocate intolerance towards dissenters. The Harleian MS

7578 text contains six cycles of speeches (beginning at lines 93, 266, 464, 705, 990 and 1184), with numerous refrains voiced by the attendants that reiterate the same harsh stance towards non-observance: 'If any will your image not adore | The *fierie Furnace* him shall soone devore' (ll. 591-2, 610-11, 651-2 and 703-4).³⁶ The debts to Sylvester make it almost impossible on chronological grounds that the work is related to the now-lost Elizabethan biblical drama *Nebuchadnezzar* (1596), which was performed eight times at the Rose theatre; moreover, *Fierie Furnace* does not contain features we would expect to find in a successful stage adaptation, such as Nebuchadnezzar vividly depicted as a proud warrior king.³⁷ By contrast, *Fierie Furnace*'s protagonist never wavers from the monotonous fustian of his opening lines (which contain phrases taken from *Devine Weekes*, II.i.4.713, I.i.64 and 176, and II.i.4.717-8):

Wee gods on earth should climb supernall stories
 Wee should atchieve great things to grace our glories;
 Behind us we should leave some cleare character
 That wee have lived on this earths theater,
 That afterdeath our names in all mens eyes
 May be like starres that brandish in the skyes. (ll. 20-5)

A closer inspection of the manuscript's provenance uncovers an alternative explanation for why *Fierie Furnace* was transcribed with speech headings. The other texts bound in Harleian MS 7578 offer no clues (these include a copy of Lydgate's Proverbs and verses by Humfrey Wanley), nor have the remaining sections of this transcription (i.e. pages 1-320 and 369-end) been traced. The crucial piece of evidence is British Library, Harleian MS 7518, which has a clear genetic relationship with Harleian MS 7578 that has not been observed previously. This second Harleian manuscript is a fair copy of five poems from Boyd's *Zion's Flowers: Pharaoh's Tyrannie and Death* (fol. 1r-42r), *The History of Jephthe* (fol. 42v-59v), *History of Samson* (fol. 60r-100r), an incomplete *David and Goliath* (fol. 100r-104v) and an incomplete *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace* (fol. 105r-128v). The connection with Harleian MS

³⁶ Other refrains appear at lines 193-6, 220-3, 233-6 and 262-5; 510-11, 529-30 and 564-5; 1048-9, 1066-7, 1085-6, 1106-7 and 1127-8; 1252 and 1301; and 1361-2 and 1378-9.

³⁷ Connolly, 'Peele's *David and Bethsabe*', 17.

7578 is assured by the textual apparatus: the running heads, catchwords, page numbers and list of speakers in both texts are identical, and both texts end abruptly on a page numbered 368 with the catchword 'Mens'. The orthography in both texts is very similar.³⁸ It is highly likely that Harleian MS 7578 is a transcription of Harleian MS 7518 that followed the page lay-out of the fair copy. In addition, *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace* in both the Harleian MS 7578 and 7518 texts corresponds closely to the holograph copy of *Fierie Furnace* held at Glasgow University Library.³⁹ Since the holograph copy was removed to London until being repatriated in the mid-eighteenth century, Harleian MS 7518 may well have been copied directly from Boyd's text, and Harleian MS 7578 from that transcription.⁴⁰ Four other partial transcriptions of Boyd's poetry survive, one of which contains a full-length copy of *Fierie Furnace* as found in the holograph.⁴¹ It is not necessary to collate these texts in full to establish beyond doubt that Zachary Boyd wrote *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace*.

Fierie Furnace, a poem containing almost 3000 lines in total, is the longest of the nineteen dramatic poems in the collection named *Christian Poems for Spiritual Edification* in Boyd's holograph version, and subsequently better known as *Zion's Flowers*. This discovery provides new information about the genre, dating, and purpose of the text in Harleian MS

³⁸ e.g. spellings such as 'atchieve' (line 21) and 'powr/ towr' (ll. 105-06) appear in both. Rösler's emendations of transcription errors (e.g. lines 637 and 1323, which are found in the Harleian MS 7518 text as well) match Boyd's holograph copy, though in line 384 the deleted 'fry', replaced by 'try' (also found in Harleian MS 7518), is authorial. Without having collated the Harleian MS 7518 and 7578 manuscripts in full, it is difficult to determine whether minor discrepancies and scribal errors (such as 'wretched ~~cold~~ clod', Harleian MS 7578, 34v) were introduced when transcribing from one to the other, or transcribing from the original holograph.

³⁹ Gen MS 394, fol. 139r-180v. All Gen MS manuscripts referred to are held by Glasgow University Library, and I thank the librarians there for their assistance.

⁴⁰ University records (Glasgow, Clerk's Press MS, 30, referred to in a note inside Gen MS 394) report that in January 1760 the manuscripts 'belong[ed] to the public library, but had been taken out of it and lost before the Revolution, [and] were now in the possession of Mr Bernard Baine Apothecary in London'. These include 'three MS books', namely Gen MSS 393, 394 and 401: the two halves of *Zions Flowers* and the *English Academie*.

⁴¹ BL, Add. MS 34781 contains later seventeenth-century transcriptions in a cursive, mixed hand of the same poems found in Harleian MS 7518 without omissions. A late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century transcription of the same sections once in Bristol, but now held at Glasgow University Library (Gen MS 151) may have originated from the same source. A mid- to late-seventeenth century transcription in BL, Add. MS 10310 (entitled 'Christian Poems for Spirituall Ædificatione') contains ten poems from *Zion's Flowers* not found in Harleian MS 7518. An eighteenth-century transcription of eight poems from the holograph now held by the Mitchell Library (numbered series, MS 33) contains lengthy descriptions of its previous owners: it is attributed to the Scottish physician William Hunter, who presented it to John Pringle (president of the Royal Society in 1772); it later came into a Mr Nasmyth's possession in the mid-1870s, who restored the text using Harleian MS 7518.

7578, and leads us to the original insight that Boyd drew extensively on Sylvester when writing his poetry. Indeed, once Sylvester's influence is acknowledged, we can observe direct borrowings across Boyd's poetic works: there are substantial debts to Sylvester in most of the other dramatic poems from his *Zion's Flowers*, and in other poems besides. This chapter makes no attempt to catalogue all of Boyd's references to Sylvester, but concentrates on *Fierie Furnace* as a good example of his compositional practice. Before exploring the poem in detail, though, we must situate Boyd's poetry within its immediate social, theological and literary milieu.

Zachary Boyd was a Church of Scotland minister closely associated with the University of Glasgow, and is celebrated today as a key figure in the institution's development: he became Vice-Chancellor in 1644, and bequeathed a substantial legacy to the college.⁴² He was a committed Calvinist and a moderate royalist initially reluctant to accept the Scottish Covenant, though he later did.⁴³ Any resentment he expresses towards the English is reserved for pernicious Catholic and Arminian elements he perceived being harboured south of the border: Boyd's sermons on Daniel 3, which I examine below, suggest that *Fierie Furnace* is an attack on idolatrous behaviour condoned by the monarch and promoted by those around him. All Boyd's writing, including his poetry, is inspired by a kerygmatic vocation to demonstrate the strength and immediacy of spiritual concerns in politics and society. David W. Atkinson has argued that Boyd's literary aspirations have detracted from his posthumous reputation as a preacher, but his poetry and prose are perhaps better understood as different aspects of the same evangelizing mission.⁴⁴ To an extent Boyd switches genres to propagate the same doctrinal truth for different settings and readers: he composed a long prose treatise, *Last Battell of the Soule in Death* (1628) that provides succour and moral instruction on

⁴² [<http://www.universitystory.gla.ac.uk/biography/?id=WH0006&type=P>]

⁴³ David W. Atkinson, 'Boyd, Zachary (1585–1653)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3119>].

⁴⁴ *Selected Sermons of Zachary Boyd*, ed. by David W. Atkinson (Glasgow and Aberdeen, 1989).

confronting death in the *ars moriendi* tradition, but also published a catechism for children designed for use each Sunday.⁴⁵

His poetry was also written to proselytize. In *Garden of Zion* (Glasgow, 1644), an entirely separate work from *Zion's Flowers* despite its similar title, Boyd commends the good counsel embedded in his scriptural adaptations to Charles I and appeals for God to 'teach me to compile | An usefull work; with grace now steel my stile | That whosoever reads this book he may | Reape profite, I comfort, thou praise for ay' (A7v; see also A2r-v). Boyd also composed English versions of the Old and New Testament songs, including a metrical psalter that was passed over by the General Assembly for use in church.⁴⁶ *Zion's Flowers* is also a didactic work, which is signalled by its epigraph taken from Psalms 119:54 (all references to the Authorized Version): 'Thy stactutes have beene my songs | in the house of my pilgrimage.' A deleted beginning to *Fierie Furnace* similarly contains an epigraph, directed at those in authority: '[Be wise O] yee kings; be instructed, yee Judges of the [Earth kiss] the son least he be angrie' (Psalms 2:10, 12).⁴⁷ *Zion's Flowers* has been called 'Boyd's Bible', even though there are many books and chapters that he never versified, and several poems expand considerably on the Authorized Version, in contrast to the much closer versification of the Gospels in the manuscript poem *Foure Evangelis*.⁴⁸ The epithet 'Boyd's Bible' is fitting in so far as it encapsulates his poetry's devotional purpose, despite the term's derogatory undertone. *Zion's Flowers* has seldom been praised: the nineteenth-century critic John Cousin remarked on Boyd's 'uncouth verse', while John Lang found that Boyd 'was not a poet, yet he was something more than a mere doggerel rhymmer [...] the commendable features are often

⁴⁵ Boyd, *Cleare Forme of Catechising, before the giving of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (Glasgow, 1639); *The Last Battell of the Soule in Death* (Edinburgh, 1628); D. W. Atkinson, 'Zachary Boyd and the Ars Moriendi Tradition', *Scottish Literary Journal* 4.1 (1977), 5-16.

⁴⁶ *The Songs of the Old and New Testament in Meeter* (Glasgow, 1648); Atkinson, 'Boyd'.

⁴⁷ Gen MS 394, fol. 208v.

⁴⁸ Boyd, *Four Poems from "Zion's Flowers"*, ed. by Gabriel Neil (Glasgow, 1855), p. 7. *The Foure Evangelis*, Gen MS 400.

marred not merely by rugged verse, but also by hard and unsympathetic thought'.⁴⁹ Other writers could hear the textual instability created by Boyd's imitations from Sylvester without diagnosing the cause: Thomas Pennant complained about Boyd's incongruent phrases and images; John Jamieson, who argued that Boyd's faults had been 'grossly exaggerated', is reported to be among those believing 'that the ludicrous passages commonly printed as Boyd's are not really his', while a nineteenth-century writer held that Boyd 'did not entirely escape from the conceits and the affectation of quaint illustrations so prevalent in that age'.⁵⁰ More recently, Atkinson made a partial defence of Boyd's verse when he wrote that it 'is not as uniformly wretched as it has been made out to be, nor is it without examples of artistically accomplished verse'.⁵¹ Both the merits and flaws of Boyd's poetry are contingent on his use of Sylvester.

One reason the poems have not been read more widely, and the close connection with Sylvester's poetry not noticed, is that they largely survive in manuscript form only. Despite a request in Boyd's Deed of Mortification that the college should print his works, the four poems in Gabriel Neil's 1855 edition are the only sections of *Zion's Flowers* (discounting Rösler's *Fierie Furnace*) to have been published.⁵² In that edition Neil observes similarities between Boyd's and Sylvester's styles: 'In general merit, our Author's Pieces and translations will stand a fair comparison with those of Sylvester [...] The similarity of Sylvester's works and talents to his own, had attracted the attention and won the esteem of our Author' (p. xiii). This comment is inspired by Boyd's one direct reference to Sylvester in print, when he quotes almost two hundred consecutive lines from 'The Vocation' (II.iii.1.667-862) in *The Garden of*

⁴⁹ John W. Cousin, *A Short Bibliographical Dictionary of English Literature* (London, 1910), p. 44; John Marshall Lang, *Glasgow and the Barony thereof* (Glasgow, 1895), pp. 48-49.

⁵⁰ John Slezer, *Theatrum Scotiae*, ed. by John Jamieson (Edinburgh and London, 1874); Thomas Pennant, 'Pennant's Second Tour in Scotland', in *A General Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in all Parts of the World*, ed. by John Pinkerton (London, 1809), pp. 171-569 (p. 240); anon., 'Some Account of the Life and Writings of Zachary Boyd', in John MacUre, *The History of Glasgow* (1736; repr. Glasgow, 1830), pp. 355-63 (p. 359).

⁵¹ David W. Atkinson, 'Zachary Boyd: A Reassessment', in *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature*, ed. by Roderick J. Lyall and Felicity Riddy (Stirling and Glasgow, 1981), pp. 438-456 (p. 438).

⁵² Neil (ed.), *Four Poems*, pp. 22-23.

Zion and explains that ‘this paraphrase was made in verse by the Prince of English Poets, JOSHUA SYLVESTER’.⁵³ Neil judiciously linked this phrase with the opening lines to Boyd’s earlier verse account of the Covenanters’ victory at Newburn, written in heroic couplets that are highly consonant with Sylvester’s and owe specific debts to the beginning of Sylvester’s First Week: ‘O Prince of Poets, make my braine to boile, | With *grace* and *verse*, that I may now extoll | Gods praises high’.⁵⁴ Neil did not apparently suspect that poetic fragments from Sylvester inhabited Boyd’s works here or elsewhere. The only other comment that may reveal awareness of Boyd’s alliance with Sylvester and Du Bartas is the following jibe from the seventeenth-century writer Samuel Colvil, son of Elizabeth Melville (who was among the most important Calvinist religious poets in Renaissance Scotland): ‘Where one laughs at the Poems of *Virgil, Homer, Ariosto, Du Bartas, &c.* twenty will laugh at those of *John Cockburn, or Mr. Zacharie Boyd*’.⁵⁵

Once the affiliation is recognized it quickly becomes apparent that Sylvester is a pervasive and constitutive influence on Boyd’s verse. *Fierie Furnace* contains a high frequency of borrowings, even when compared to other poems in *Zion’s Flowers*: in the text edited by Rösler, almost one in every five lines has a direct verbal parallel with *Devine Weekes*.⁵⁶ There are

⁵³ Boyd, *The Garden of Zion*, B7r-C4v (B7r).

⁵⁴ Boyd, *Battle of Newburne* (Glasgow, 1643), p. 4. I am grateful to the Mitchell Library, Glasgow for granting me access to their copy. Sample imitations: ‘With hideous roaring and with sulphy flash [...] The hills about did greatly grone and grumble’ (p. 5; cf. I.ii.701-04); ‘Terroures from heaven made all the footmen flee | By a backside with blushing infamie’ (p. 7; cf. I.ii.716); ‘Poyson’d the air with their blasphemous Braves’ (p. 9; I.i.779).

⁵⁵ Samuel Colvil, *Mock Poem, or, Whiggs Supplication* (1681), A7r. Cockburn was also a late seventeenth-century Scottish minister (Tristram Clarke, ‘Cockburn, John (1652–1729)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5774>]).

⁵⁶ Approximately 270 lines out of 1460. Parallels not noted by Rösler (excluding those already mentioned above) are in lines 9-11 (II.i.iv.701-02); 29 (II.i.iv.556); 32-33 (II.ii.1.231-2); 90 (I.iv.785); 338-39 (II.iii.1.777-8); 361 (I.v.25); 451 (II.iii.2.64); 455 (II.iii.2.284); 472 (I.vii.28); 540-41 (II.i.2.289-90); 556-57 (II.i.2.541-2); 562-63 (II.i.3.449-50); 631-32 (II.ii.3.847-8); 641-42 (II.iii.3.85-6); 644 (II.iii.3.962); 654-55 (II.iii.3.1481-2); 669 (II.iii.4.264); 670-71 (II.iii.4.765-6); 676-77 (II.iii.4.665-6); 683-84 (II.iv.1.691-2); 693-94 (II.iv.1.901-2); 697-98 (I.v.871-82); 719 (II.iv.2.327); 750-51 (II.iv.2.687-8); 814-15 (II.i.2.289-90); 824-25 (II.i.3.93-4); 826-27 (II.i.3.329); 873 (II.iv.1.585); 888-89 (II.iii.4.909-10); 917-18 (II.iii.4.1211-12); 920 (II.iii.4.1085); 939 (II.iii.4.1216); 970 (II.iii.1.789); 1003-4 (II.iv.4.1055-6); 1071 (II.iv.4.1080); 1080-81 (II.iv.4.585-6); 1109-10 (II.iv.3.907); 1160-61 (II.iv.2.262); 1168 (II.iv.2.1143); 1191 (II.iv.2.208); 1213-14 (II.iv.1.1049-50); 1223 (I.vii.285); 1229-30 (I.vii.265-6); 1231-32 (I.vii.143-4); 1233 (I.vii.221); 1280-81 (II.i.3.154-6); 1291-92 (II.i.3.149-50); and 1333-34 (II.iv.1.117-18).

further references throughout the second half.⁵⁷ Of the nineteen poems in *Zion's Flowers*, all but one (*The Historie of Jonah*) contain specific linguistic affinities with Sylvester, as do most sections in another poem, the *English Academie*. Given how massive Boyd's and Sylvester's poetic corpuses are, it is not difficult to locate coincidental resonances between both works, but these are distinct from the substantial direct loans in Boyd's poetry. The first poem in *Zion's Flowers*, 'The Fall of Adam', can be read as a prelude that announces Boyd's intention to utilize Sylvester's works, first through lines with immediately recognizable similarities to the *First Day* (including such lines as 'Immutable, immortal, mine alone, | and all sufficient, who have need of none | Incomprehensible, omnipotent | Invisible, in working excellent'), and then through brief summaries of each day of creation with allusions to Sylvester's argument stanzas.⁵⁸ In the poems that follow, Boyd continued to consult Sylvester's work as he wrote, Boyd, borrowing many phrases and rhetorical figures from passages to expedite the rapid composition of his scriptural verse.

These features of Boyd's practice can be retrieved more easily after considering which edition of Sylvester he used. In addition to many citations from *Devine Weekes*, *Zion's Flowers* contains links with several other poems that were printed together for the first time in Sylvester's 1621 folio. In *Fierie Furnace*, for example, it is possible to see how Boyd referred to several page openings in *Job Triumphant* and *Quadrains of Pibrac*.⁵⁹ He used several other poems from that folio too, such as *Maiden's Blush: or Joseph*, which supplies Boyd's *Joseph Tempted to Adultery* with factual details; *Memorials of Mortalitie*, used in the thirteen and fourteenth day's exercises in *English Academie*; and even a dedicatory verse to Robert Nicholson before *The*

⁵⁷ e.g. 'Let there owne sputtle on their face be driv'n | Such in a fierie furnace cast anowe | That all may learne to stoup before your throne' (Add. MS 34781, 107v; cf. II.iv.iii.606); 'and all our confidence | Like naughty spiders brittle residence, 109v; cf. JT 548); 'Soon let the furnace with its whiffing fire | Burn up these rebels flesh and bones intire' (112r; II.iv.3.609).

⁵⁸ Add. MS 10310, 2v (cf. I.i.45-48), and 3r: 'The fifth day shall the fishes of the sea | mind to make with foules in air to flee. | In the sixth day have it in my mind | The creeping things and Cattell of each kinde' (cf. Arguments to Fifth and Sixth Days in Snyder, pp. 231 and 262).

⁵⁹ For parallels with *Job Triumphant* (references to Literature Online text) see: *Fierie Furnace* lines 137-38 (JT 801-02), 139-42 (685-88), 144 (733), 145 (739-40), 148 (668), 156 (622), 225 (911-12), 228 (866), 229 (863). For *Quadrains of Pibrac* (also Literature Online text) see: *Fierie Furnace* lines 1402 (QP 425), 1404 (423), 1405 (360), 1410 (50), 1415 (81), 1416 (83).

Profit of Imprisonment.⁶⁰ There is therefore little doubt that Boyd used the folio edition, which was printed in 1621, 1633 and 1641. Because he seldom refers to the same passage twice, we might expect that Boyd marked his copy to show which lines he had used.⁶¹ A copy of the 1633 folio inscribed with Glasgow College's name has annotations that serve just this purpose: it contains an extensive series of careful markings, roughly one every four lines on average, alongside the margins on both columns of each page against individual lines.⁶² There are marks throughout *Devine Weekes* and in all the works just mentioned, as well as in other poems, the dedicatory Corona (A2r-v), John Vicars's epitaph to Sylvester (A6r) and even 'The Printer to the Reader' (B1r).⁶³ In the same ink are written three verbal annotations in a seventeenth-century hand that resembles Boyd's.⁶⁴ In addition, there are similes marked with crosses and double-crosses throughout the book, particularly in the translations from the *Semaines*. The majority of lines that Boyd imitates are marked in the copy, while the frequency of single lines, incomplete grammatical units, and lines unremarkable except for the single phrase that Boyd uses all indicate that he probably marked lines that he had just imitated in this copy; for example, a double mark against one line (F2r, line beginning 'In vain') may correspond to Boyd quoting twice from that line in succession in *Fierie Furnace* (ll. 361-63). All these marks would need to be cross-checked systematically against the entire *Zion's Flowers* before stating outright that Boyd used this copy, a project that would require a separate study; nonetheless, the Glasgow copy can be provisionally treated as important evidence for reconstructing the author's processes of imitation.

⁶⁰ For *Joseph Tempted* see, for example, Neil (ed.), pp. 51 (MB 580) and 93 (MB 999). The poem also contains details from *Triumph of Faith*, p. 91 (canto 3, st. 33 and canto 2, st 29). For *English Academie* see Gen MS 401, 165r, 13.29 'Like unto trees wee bloome & bud | wee ripen, at last wee rot, | And after that lye downe in mud, | thus to the grave we trot' (cf. *MM* st. 11, 2Y6r) and 183r, 14.44 'Trust not in great prosperity, | For all such earthly things | Are ushers of adversity | and take them to there wings' (cf. *MM* st. 89, Z4v). For the Nicholson poem (2D3r), cf. *Jacob and Esau Reconciled*, Gen MS 393, 184r: 'Links of my kindnesse I doe never breake, | Those that me serve I never will forsake: | Where I doe love, sincere is my affection, | All such I will take vnder my protection' and 'As brookes that downe high horned cliffs doe rush'.

⁶¹ In *Fierie Furnace*, for example, II.iv.4.1028 is used at line 1456, and 1032 in the next line, 1030 has been used four hundred lines earlier, at line 1071, and 1055-56 was used at lines 1003-4.

⁶² Glasgow University Library, shelfmark Sp Coll Bm3-c.6.

⁶³ All signature numbers from *Devine Weekes and Workes* are from the 1633 folio edition (ESTC 21654).

⁶⁴ 'a gun' on G6r, 'servile' on 2I2v and 'arbiter' on 2R5v.

Boyd's likely use of a 1633 edition is important new evidence for dating *Zion's Flowers*. Boyd's manuscript offers few clues otherwise: there are no dates, and the presence of *Popish Powder Plot* (based on the 1605 Gunpowder Plot) and *World's Vanities* (appended to Boyd's *Last Battell* in 1629) is not reliable evidence for composition of the rest of the manuscript.⁶⁵ Gabriel Neil supposed that the poems were composed when Boyd was in France between 1607 and 1623 because they contain allusions specific to French culture. Although Neil does not cite specific examples, it is now obvious that such allusions may well have another source: Du Bartas' and other French poets' work in the Sylvester folio, as quoted by Boyd. There are other reasons to suppose that the date of composition was definitely after 1621, and probably closer to 1640. A date after 1633 is attractive because, in addition to the printing of the second edition of Sylvester's folio, the Authorized Version was published in Edinburgh for the first time to mark Charles' formal coronation in Scotland. In addition, Boyd's sermons on 'Nebuchadnezzar's Fierie Furnace' which survive in manuscript reveal an interpretation of the Authorized Version text of Daniel sensitive to the theological and political context of the pre-Civil War years, which is carried through into *Fierie Furnace* as well: these eight sermons are undated but are bound in a miscellaneous collection of sermons that includes two that were preached in 1643.⁶⁶ *The Battell of Newburne* and *Garden of Zion* show that Sylvester's poetry and Charles' policies were both in Boyd's mind in the early 1640s, as was the idea of a verse Bible. Both the sermons and dramatic poems may be responses to the same political conditions around the period 1638-1643. Regardless of the poem's exact date of composition, *Fierie Furnace* is analogous in important ways to the 'Fierie Furnace' sermons, and it is worth developing this exegetical context for Boyd's poetic compositions, because Boyd's reading of

⁶⁵ Cf. Neil (ed.), p. 10. For evidence that Boyd transcribed *Zion's Flowers* from an earlier copy, see Gen MS 394, fol. 143r, where appears the phrase 'At all your wordes which godly are indeede' struck out after the line ending 'browe' and before the one ending 'see', and inserted after 'heade' and before the line concluding 'allowe' in order to complete the rhyme.

⁶⁶ 'The Fierie Furnace of King Nebuchadnezzar | preached in eight sermons', Gen MS 386, item 1. Item 12 was preached on 26 February 1643, and item 13 in March 1643.

the Authorized Version precedes his reading of Du Bartas and so helps us to reconstruct his motivations for appropriating material from *Devine Weekes*.

Atkinson finds that Boyd's methods of scriptural interpretation closely follow the scheme described in the puritan preacher William Perkins' *Arte of Propheying* (published in Latin, 1592; in English, 1607).⁶⁷ Perkins writes that preparation of a text involves interpretation and 'diuision or cutting': interpretation is 'the *Opening* [επίλυσις] of the words and sentences of the Scripture, that one entire and naturall sense may appear' (C4v), and 'diuision or cutting' meant 'resolution' of a text into an edifying form, either through direct 'notation' of the biblical verse if it expressed doctrine, or else through 'collection' to extract meaning through one of nine arguments ('causes, effects, subiects, adiuncts, dissentenies, names, distribution, and definition', G3v). The eight 'Fierie Furnace' sermons are a verse-by-verse exposition of Daniel 3 that interpret, divide and resolve each line of Scripture and foreground the 'Use' of each section in ways comparable to structures in *Fierie Furnace*. Writing in a plain style, Boyd explicates narrative and textual details from Daniel in both works.

The first sermon, which interprets the first seven verses, establishes a process used in the other sermons and with strong thematic analogies to *Fierie Furnace*. Boyd first supplies the Authorized Version text (4r-v), and then explains the 'division of the chapter' as a whole into six parts, and the 'division of the text' into four parts which he treats in turn. The six parts of the chapter's division correspond to the episodic structure of *Fierie Furnace*, as reinforced by the attendants' cycles of speeches: the speakers obsessively repeat the central idea of the first part, 'how Nebuchadnezzar did dedicate an exceeding great image of gold in the field of Dura for to be worshipped by all his subiects', and of the second, 'Shadrach Meshach and Abednego are accused for not worshipping that image' (4r). In the four sections that discuss

⁶⁷ Atkinson, *Selected Sermons*, p. xxxi.

parts of the scriptural text, Boyd pays close heed to specific phrasing and figures: for example, he ‘collects’ the significance of Dura (mentioned in Daniel 3:1) by turning to Ptolomy’s *Geography*. The same attention to detail appears in *Fierie Furnace*: ‘Dura’ recurs in the locutions ‘Duras field’ rhymed with ‘yeeld’ (ll. 701-02, 730-31, 762-63, 786-77), or ‘Duras plaine’ rhymed with ‘ordaine’ or ‘disdaine’ (ll. 50-51, 80-81, 115-16, 441-42 (647-48, ‘remaine’), 895-96, 909-10). Perkins also writes about sacred rhetoric, concluding that: ‘All tropes are emphaticall, & besides delight and ornament they doe also afford matter for the nourishment of faith’ (E8v). Boyd is especially sensitive to emphatic pleonasm: for example, he informs the reader of his sermon (the work is introduced with a preface ‘To the Reader’) that ‘the image is called his not once, as if the preacher were afraide to speake it, but four times it is called the image which Nebuchadnezzar the king has set up’ (7r, underlining retained), and then repeatedly uses the same verb ‘set up’ (found in the Authorized Version) in the poem.

The sermons elucidate further Boyd’s obsessive repetition of the names of the King’s attendants in the poems: Boyd is cautioning both monarchs and the wider populace that ‘great men if they be not good men are the fittest men to bring in idolatrie’ (10r). He advocates suspicion concerning ‘outward appearance in matters of religion’, declaring that ‘wee must not say, the King the Princes, the treasurers and sheriffs are of such a religion, and therefore I will follow them, I will be ruled by authoritie’ (11r). He reinforces this point using the same pleonasm later in the sermon: ‘learne heere not to trust in men of whatsoever degree whether princes governours captaines treasurers counsellors or people, trust only in God’ (17r). The omission of the king from this list is surely deliberate: Boyd’s agenda is not republican, but Presbyterian. His ‘To the Reader’ outlines an intention only to admonish: ‘Kings and princes and all that are in authoritie may learne what not to command, and also where subiects may learne in what not to obeye’ (2r). If Nebuchadnezzar is keyed to any historical figure, it is the Pope: ‘Let all men iudge if Papists have reason thus to rage to banish, burne, herd and hang Gods [‘Dan 3.’ in margin] shadrachs who are willing to yield there bodies that they may not

serve nor worship any God except their owne god, to whom be glory for ever' (3r). These sentiments are brought to the surface in the *Battel of Newburne*, which celebrates the Scottish victory, not over the King but Arminians, Catholics, and episcopalian 'Canturburians'. This current of ideas confirms the real polemical drift behind the extraordinary structure of *Fierie Furnace*, which has no equivalent elsewhere in *Zion's Flowers*: the cycles of speeches are a denunciation of unscrupulous officials who lead the king astray. The 'Use' at the conclusion of *Fierie Furnace* asserts the same moral: 'Let all heere learn, who would have rest or ease | To study still the living Lord to please | More then all Men that are of high Degree | Though Kings be high, the Lord is the most Hie | Of Shadrac, Meshach and Abednego.'⁶⁸

Sylvester's poetry does not impinge on *Fierie Furnace's* biblical inspiration or structuration, but it does make the poem's rhetoric, superficially at least, more compelling. Nowhere in *Zion's Flowers* does Boyd allow Du Bartas' or any other poet's words to direct the content, narrative or moral message of his dramatic poem, even in *The Towre of Babylon*, which draws on Sylvester's 'Babylon' alongside Genesis 11, and *David and Goliath*, which is influenced by Sylvester's account in 'Trophies' as well as 1 Samuel. However, this does not diminish Boyd's reliance on Sylvester for assisting him in composing divine poetry, in even more direct and appropriative ways than seen in *David and Bethsabe* and *A Shrew*. The 'Use' passage from *Fierie Furnace* just quoted offers a good example: embedded in Boyd's didactic verse is an extended simile that compares God's agency to a stone that creates ripples when thrown into a pond. The simile and much of the phrasing, but not the application, is taken from 'The Colonies':

Ev'n as a stone \that/ æmis'd a pond ye fling
 About his fall first forms a little ring
 Wherein new Circles, one in other growing
 (Through the smooth waters ever gently flowing)
 Still one the others more and more compell
 From the ponds centre, where the stone first fell

⁶⁸ Add. MS 34781, 116r.

Till at the last the largest of the rounds
 From side to side 'gainst ev'ry bank or bounds;
 So at the first God unto wrath is slow
 His plagues are little but they overflow
 The Bank, at last, not bounded with a border
 Their widest circle brings all in disorder. (Boyd, Add. MS 34781, fol. 116r)

For, as a stone that midst a Pond yee fling,
 About his fall first formes a little ring,
 Wherein, new Circles one in other growing
 (Through the smooth Waters gentle-gentle flowing)
 Still one the other more and more compell
 From the Ponds Center, where the stone first fell;
 Till at the last the largest of the Rounds
 From side to side gainst every banke rebounds:
 So, from th'Earths Center (where I heere suppose
 About the Place where God did Tongues transpose)
 Man (day by day his wit repolishing)
 Makes all the Arts through all the Earth to spring (Sylvester, II.ii.3.297-308)

Boyd's reduplication here is unusual in quoting almost verbatim from Sylvester, since he much more often stops short of quoting entire lines, sometimes changing a single noun or word-form only: 'The lime it crumbles from the yawning chinks' (l. 318, cf. 'The mortar crumbles from the yawning chinkes', II.iii.4.208); 'My feet are feathr'd with the wings of Hope' (l. 979, cf. 'Their feet are feathered with the wings of hope', II.iii.4.344).⁶⁹ On the other hand, this example is absolutely typical of Boyd's practice in that he manipulates a rhetorical decoration and applies it to a totally different referent: in Sylvester, the simile describes humankind's dispersal across the earth; in Boyd, it describes the unfolding of God's providential wrath. Another characteristic feature of Boyd's imitations is that multiple quotations from a section of *Devine Weekes* appear together, which provides corroboration that Boyd consciously borrowed material from the poems. In this case, just over ten lines before using this simile, Boyd has taken several phrases from a couplet found almost twenty lines earlier in Sylvester, at the bottom of the previous leaf ('th'Earths thick shade | Ecliptst the

⁶⁹ Two other exceptions, also from 'The Colonies', are found in *Dinah Ravished by Shechem*: one is the same stone-in-water analogy just quoted (Neil (ed.), p. 149; cf. II.ii.3.297-304), and the other also draws on natural imagery 'birds which downie feather'd, young, | Still feare to flie before their quilts be strong' (p. 150: cf. II.ii.3.31-32).

silver browes of *Cynthia* bright, | And her browne shadow quencht her brothers light,
 II.ii.3.278-80; N5r in 1633 folio): ‘The moon we see with silver brows most bright | Ecclipt
 anone and als her brothers light | With dark browne shawdow colour’d like a sack’ (Add. MS
 34781, fol. 116r). Such an insertion is ornamentation for nearby proclamations like: ‘It’s not
 fir Kings, to make their will a Law | To great and small; but they should stand in aw | And
 not ordaine; but what God doth command | Who only Lord is both of sea and land.’

Boyd’s recourse to different openings in Sylvester’s folio to supplement the rhetorical interest of his didactic poetry is just as evident throughout *Fierie Furnace*. Boyd’s habit of taking two or more quotations from the same section at once makes it possible to trace his eye moving over the page: for example, within fifty lines Boyd takes at least six phrases from three leaves at the conclusion to ‘The Captaines’ (II.iii.4, S3v-5r): ‘thunder throwing hand’ and ‘command’ (ll. 888-89; 909-10, S3v); ‘belch or bark’ and ‘dark’ (ll. 913-14; cf. 1203-04, S5r); ‘They not reforme, but should deforme my state’ and ‘debate’ (ll. 917-18; cf. 1211-12, S5r); ‘sacred helme exclude’ (l. 920; cf. 1085, S4v); ‘in gentle sort’ (l. 939; cf. 1216, S5r); ‘leach’ (l. 941; cf. 1215, S5r). Such borrowings are insensitive to context, and at times perfunctory: Boyd loans rhyming pairs from Sylvester on about sixty occasions (i.e. most couplets listed in Rösler and in footnote 56). He continually resorts to Sylvester’s works to provide local colour and vivid examples without detracting from the biblical exegesis. Such tissues of quotations barely amount to stylistic imitation of Sylvester, especially when Boyd’s original couplets fall so far short of emulating Sylvester’s. Boyd does not conceal his appropriations either: early readers could well have recognized the provenance of such phrases as ‘perill proof’ (l. 451; II.iii.2.63-64), ‘too too malapert’ (l. 771; II.iv.3.83) and ‘porke porking cry’ (l. 1002; II.iv.3.274). Throughout *Zion’s Flowers* and *English Academie* loans from Sylvester are sometimes underlined, both in the holograph and later transcriptions, which prevents them blending into the poetic texture. On other occasions, Boyd appears to recollect individual phrases and lines from memory: the distinctive phrase ‘dizzie darnell seed’ (II.iv.4.411-12) appears in *Fierie Furnace* (l.

1097) as well as in *Joseph Sold by his Brethren* (Gen MS 393, 211r) and *Fall of Adam* (17v). When one of the best-known passages in *Devine Weekes* is used in the second half of *Fierie Furnace* (marked in the Glasgow folio), Boyd may not have needed to consult the printed text: ‘Of them I shall a Booke in Folio make | That by them others may Example take’ (Add. MS 34781, 113v; see Chapter 3.iii). There are moments of creative imitation as well, though. In several places Boyd includes related catalogues of trees, animals and other natural phenomena that are compiled by Boyd, but are nonetheless highly reminiscent of *Devine Weekes*:

The wel wood pecker and the draick and ducke
 The Kestrell, rough the rear, raven, Gull, the Jay
 The Jackdaw and the Griffon strange for pray
 The Pelican, the phenix, and the brush
 The facone ferice which down with force doth rush.⁷⁰

The brief survey offered here has sketched out how Boyd utilized Sylvester’s poetry to reinforce the rhetoric and tone of voice in *Fierie Furnace*. Although Boyd wrote that Sylvester was the ‘Prince of Poets’ and clearly admired his poetry, the appeal of Sylvester’s work was surely as a leading precedent for writing vernacular divine poetry. Moreover, Boyd also quotes from Sylvester’s interpolations (which other writers often avoid) and paratextual works, and also imitates Francis Quarles’s *Divine Poems* in several places.⁷¹ Such connections suggest that Boyd wrote these poems as popular redactions of biblical narrative, presented to reach the same readers who had enjoyed Sylvester’s and Quarles’s poetry. Boyd was not attempting to emulate Sylvester, but to rework aspects of his poetry as a vehicle for composing works for a similar readership with a Presbyterian slant. Boyd posits Sylvester as a great writer of

⁷⁰ *Fall of Adam*, Add. MS 10310, 7v; cf. *Flood of Noah*, 94r-v; and *English Academie* (see Gabriel Neil, *Biographical Sketch of the Rev. Zachary Boyd* (Glasgow, 1832), pp. xxxviii-ix).

⁷¹ For interpolations (see Chapter 2, note 20) quoted by Boyd, see e.g. *Abraham Commanded to Sacrifice Isaac*, ‘Hee doth not lye on pillowes of securitie | Or beastlie snorts on downe beds of impuritie; | As those whose senses overgrowne with fat, | No doore have left for grace to enter at’ (l.ii.917-20). For Quarles quotations, see, for example, *Historie of Samson* and *Historie of Jephtha*, which borrow from the *Historie of Queene Ester*, and the nineteenth to twenty-first day’s exercises in *The English Academie* (Gen MS 400, 247r-273r) borrows from the introduction and author’s apology to *A Feast for Worms* and *Ester. Quarles’ Emblemes* were known in Scotland, and provided imagery for various seventeenth-century tombstones: see Michael Bath and Betty Willsher, ‘Emblems from Quarles on Scottish Gravestones’, in *Emblems and Art History*, ed. by Alison Adams (Glasgow, 1996), pp. 169–201.

contemporary divine poetry: the strength of Du Bartas' earlier reputation in Jacobean Scotland may linger in Boyd's poetry, but *Zion's Flowers* also shows that Sylvester's poetry had become a ready precedent for writing religious verse. Further corroboration for this point is found in Edward Browne's poems (discussed in Chapter 4.ii), which contain substantial uninterrupted quotations from *Devine Weekes*. The *Semaines* are no longer being moulded with care when paraphrased for larger compositions, as with the Elizabethan dramatists: they are long poems, easily accessible in English, that provide assistance for writing derivative religious verse. Boyd shows the *Semaines'* Jacobean Protestantism being reworked into a new form for Presbyterians that retains the poems' metaphors and rhetorical devices while scrambling their meaning.

Boyd's dependence on Sylvester is an important discovery for scholars of earlier reading and imitation practices, as well as seventeenth-century Scottish literature. The above analysis has only hinted at the detailed insights that these various documents could yield about Boyd's working methods. A complete digital or printed edition of Boyd's poetry is a prerequisite for an extensive analysis of the poems, as is collating the manuscripts in Glasgow and London to determine their precise relationship. After this initial editorial work, there are five areas in particular that would benefit from further research. Most urgently, *Zion's Flowers* needs to be systematically cross-checked against Sylvester's works, the Authorized Version and Quarles' poems, and the exact connection to the annotated Glasgow folio discerned. Secondly, Boyd's other poems, especially *English Academie* and *Battel of Newburne*, require similar close analysis to investigate what role Sylvester's works played in their composition. Thirdly, Boyd's use of his source texts for each of the nineteen poems in *Zions Flowers* needs to be compared in order to witness how widely his practice diverged between sections, and how far this corresponds to the demands of the particular section he was writing. Fourthly, Boyd's reading practice across all his poems needs to be consolidated into a single comparative analysis of how he navigated the *Semaines* to pick out epithets and similes, which

will reveal the strategies and habits he developed while writing. And finally, these discoveries need to be situated within Boyd's wider professional background, and larger currents of theological and political thought in mid-seventeenth century Scotland. These different strands would most naturally be brought together in an annotated scholarly edition with textual notes, commentary and introduction to Boyd's literary career and habits of reading and imitation.

Boyd's *Fierie Furnace* is a pragmatic attempt to distil sermonizing content into more accessible, entertaining forms, towards which aim Boyd's imitations from Sylvester are a subsidiary aid. The *Semaines* were an important resource for stylistic imitation, but were assimilated by Boyd with Sylvester's other writing to create an adhesive texture concocted from disunited fragments. There is nothing of the precision or careful integration of quotations from the French text that we saw in *A Shrew* and especially in *David and Bethsabe*, even though all three works use Du Bartas for the comparable purpose of writing religious verse. Boyd reveals no musical sensitivity to cadences in the *Semaines* or *Devine Weekes* when lifting out quotations; indeed, his practice bears more resemblance to the scattered and decontextualized Marlovian imitations in *A Shrew*. Sylvester's translations, in a sense, cast a shadow on Boyd's creative writing that was more inhibiting than Marlowe's presence was on the Elizabethan dramatists. One reason is that the *Semaines* probably only acquired such great status as divine poetry once printed in Sylvester's translation: Peele and the *Shrew*-author adopt the French poems as a paradigm in specific situations where ennobling divine poetry is required; for Boyd, the *Semaines* are a convenient store-house of rhetoric in English that required little continuous reading of the poems. As other sections of this thesis have shown, the *Semaines* in the 1590s were valued as contemporary poetry that could raise the quality of vernacular religious verse. By the 1640s the poems were a fixed feature in the intellectual landscape, but would lose their place once their reputation became detached from the aesthetic appreciation they had initially inspired. We have seen that the *Semaines* could be used as a stylistic paradigm for divine poetry; other poets, however, found inspiration in the

Semaines to write new religious poems that drew on contemporary learning, and it is only after evaluating their responses that we can make any concluding judgement about the *Semaines'* place in British literary history.

Chapter 6: 'Bartasian Poetics' in Jacobean England

Du Bartas' importance for English poets was first registered in Spenser's *Ruines of Rome*: the final poem celebrates how Du Bartas began 'hie to rayse | His heavnely Muse, th'Almightie to adore'. For Richard Danson Brown, '[t]he sonnet's comparison of Du Bellay with Du Bartas as terrestrial and devotional poets bears witness to the Spenserian view that Uranian, or divine, poetry is the apogee of poetic kinds'.¹ Though Spenser's adulation of Uranian poetry may not be quite as unequivocal as Brown implies, certainly Spenser is one of the first poets who positions Du Bartas as setting a new standard in divine poetry through his 'Uranie', *Judit* and *Semaines*. Poetic responses to the *Semaines* as divine poetry are to a degree inseparable from admiration for Du Bartas' Uranian manifesto and for particular translators. Previous chapters have mentioned numerous well-known poets who praised the *Semaines*—including William Fowler, John Stewart of Baldynneis, William Drummond, William Alexander, Barnabe Barnes, Michael Drayton, John Taylor, Samuel Daniel and Ben Jonson—as well as several minor writers who made highly derivative use of them, but I shall focus now on poets who imitate the poems' structures, content, interpretative expectations and stylistic technique. After five chapters which observed conscious translation, quotation and imitation that allowed us to associate particular ideological convictions with deliberate references to the *Semaines*, this final chapter will look at less empirical and individually isolable forms of response in poets who absorbed Du Bartas' precedent and follow the structures, rhythms, themes and voice of his poetry. Such poems allow us to work towards defining a 'Bartasian poetics' in Christian humanist vernacular poetry which consolidated Scriptural detail, Calvinist theology, empirical observation and historical narrative into a fragmentary whole.

This chapter begins with three examples from the early Jacobean period, when consciousness of the importance of the whole *Semaines* increased (as Part I showed) and the

¹ Richard Danson Brown, *The New Poet: Novelty and Tradition in Spenser's 'Complaints'* (Liverpool, 1999), pp. 157-58; see also pp. 79-83.

King's support gave poets a particular motivation to emulate Du Bartas. The *Semaines* provides particular assistance in understanding each poem, and the poems in turn shed light on alternative paths to continuing the *Semaines*' project. Robert Barret adopts Du Bartas as the 'sweet patterne' for his verse chronicle *The Sacred Warr*; John Davies of Hereford, who composed sympathetic verses before Sylvester's *Devine Weekes* and Thomas Winter's *Second Day*, followed these translators in using a French source as an authority for his natural philosophical verse. Thirdly, Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island* can be read, directly or indirectly, as a continuation of the Sixth Day of the First Week, and in that way it perpetuated Du Bartas' didacticism. Though critics have tended to split the poem into pieces, when read alongside Fletcher's professed admiration for Du Bartas the whole work reads like another attempt to consolidate new empirical and ethical knowledge.

These poems develop a distinctively Calvinist hermeneutics that encouraged natural theological observations whilst being aware of their limits: though encouraged to read the world as living Scripture, the poet cannot write a complete book of nature. In order to see how these poets place signs of God's eternal presence within finite poems better described as epideictic or didactic than allegorical, I shall look specifically at how these poets reconcile moral insight with factual information in their works, how they manage the sacred and secular concerns of their poetry, how they establish an interpretative framework and present navigational devices to connect individual sections with the poem's totality, and how far they imitate Du Bartas' rhetoric and style in aspiring to these goals.

Before drawing final conclusions about British responses to Du Bartas, it is important to assess the *Semaines*' wider poetic legacy beyond their Jacobean vogue. Two larger questions arise immediately: Was there a shared perception of the poems' cultural significance within or throughout the period under discussion? And what was the literary historical impact of the widespread enthusiasm for the *Semaines*? The final section of this chapter pulls back from

closely historicized case studies to view British responses to the *Semaines* in panorama. It tries to determine whether the *Semaines* gave rise to new forms and genres of English poetry, and whether the *Semaines* represented a genuine innovation in English and Scottish divine poetry. To do so, I look back to the poems' ultimate source, Genesis 1, in order to draw broad contrasts with *Paradise Lost*. This comparison disrupts the traditional genealogy that holds the *Semaines* to be a weaker ancestor of *Paradise Lost* to focus attention instead on the poems' generic distinctiveness which is difficult to categorize using modern terminology like 'hexaemeral', 'encyclopedic' and 'didactic'.

i. Continuations

Robert Barret's *Sacred Warr*

The English poem most explicitly modelled on the *Semaines* is a long manuscript poem known to few critics that was written by that dedicated translator of Du Bartas, Robert Barret (see Chapter 2.ii), who learnt the poetic techniques to compose his 60,000-line verse chronicle *The Sacred Warr* from the *Semaines*.² This huge poem contains specific verbal and structural features evolved from Barret's translation that possess a close affinity with Du Bartas' vision without specifically imitating the poems' phrasing or content. The *Semaines* were an empowering precedent for Barret in composing poetry that retold and expanded upon historical source material. Barret tells the reader as much in a preface which explains how Du Bartas strained his poetic spirit 'so farre as my Capacitie coulde search':

Let it not seeme strange that I haue so rudely embouldened my selfe to inter-mixe so true and graue an history with Poetical fictions, phrases, narrations, digressions, Reprizes, Ligations, descriptions, Representations, Similes, and poetical figures, with Epithetes, Motti, and names agreeable, so farre as my Capacitie coulde search; sith my sweet patterne the perennall-famous Salustius, Sieur du Bartas, and sundry his Long-long fore-runners, in their eternal-during fabriques, haue doon the like: Hee, in his sainted Iudith, and Great-worlds byrth and Childhood; they, in their Troian and Latine warrs. (‘To the Christian Reader’, p. xvii)

² Bodleian, Add. MS C.281. For an account of the manuscript see Thomas Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-poetica* 52 (1860), 193-99.

Barret names the biblical epic *Judith* here, not the *Semaines*, as he places Du Bartas alongside Virgil and Homer. Yet Barret's translation, when read alongside *The Sacred Warr*, is the key precedent for integrating the various poetic features mentioned into his history. When Barret uses this taxonomy in the preface and marginalia to his poem, he is to an extent manufacturing first principles that justify an already-written work, but the terms nonetheless present an original classification of Du Bartas' poetic structures that exerted a powerful influence on Barret's aesthetic.

The Sacred Warr is a thirty-two book epic poem that surveys Muslim-Christian relations from the sixth to sixteenth centuries. The titlepage describes the work as 'An History' that is '[g]athered out of the Chronikes of William | Archbishoppe of Tyrus, the Protoscribe of Palestine, of Basilius Ithohannes Heraldus, and sundry others' and which has been '[r]educed [i.e. brought together] into a Poem Epike'. The first twenty-three books are a free translation of William of Tyre's twelfth-century chronicle *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*.³ Barret probably used the text found in Johann Heroldt's continuation, published as *De bello sacro continuata historia libri vi. commentarijs rerum Syriacarum Guilbelmi Tyrensis archiepiscopi additi* (Basel, 1560), which is the main source for Books Twenty-Four to Twenty-Nine, named 'The Sacred Warrs Continuation'. The poem, which fills over 1200 folio pages in manuscript, was probably composed rapidly and consecutively. Although Barret sought to publish his translations from *La Seconde Semaine*, *The Sacred Warr*'s length makes it unlikely that this long verse chronicle was ever intended for print publication.⁴

Barret did not begin writing *The Sacred Warr* knowing how it would conclude: the manuscript suggests that he revised the ending at least twice. Books Twenty-Four to Twenty-

³ Text available in The Latin Library [<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/williamtyre.html>], and in English translation as *A History of Deeds Done beyond the Sea*, trans. by Emily Atwater Babcock and August C. Krey, 2 vols (New York, 1943). References to the work take the form 'Book.Section'.

⁴ Cf. Corser, p. 199. There is no reference to the *Sacred Warr* in the Stationers' Register between 1606 and 1611, which is when it would presumably have arrived at the press.

Eight render the first five books of Heroldt's continuation (page 733 names Heroldt 'and sundry others' again as source material), but not the sixth book narrating the rise of Islam in Turkey. Instead, Books Twenty-Nine and Thirty recount the spread of Islam in Africa and Spain, and conclude with an Epilogue and Latin motto; ink marks and dirt on page 1060 indicate it was once an outer page. Barret rearranged the poem from Book Twenty-Eight onwards, renumbering this book Thirty-One and modifying the folio numbers of this and Book Twenty-Nine to follow on from Book Thirty, only to rewrite the original folio and Book numbers later. He had written new versions of Books Twenty-Nine and Thirty, and initially numbered them in continuous register from Book Twenty-Eight, but later assigned them after the Book Thirty epilogue. His final decision was to supply a new introductory verse that led into Book Thirty-One, originally the replacement Twenty-Nine ('The Consorts sweet, Clio, Melpomene, | Assist me in my Later-byrrthing Muse', p. 1063), and renumber both new books—though Book Thirty-One still ends with the phrase 'Libri 29. finis' (p. 1073).

Although the manuscript may not have been bound in Barret's lifetime, all the numerical corrections that are followed in the final ordering look authorial, and these revisions are a larger symptom of Barret's habit of interweaving original material throughout the Latin and introducing digressions into his history. Three further sections that follow the end of Book Thirty-Two emphasize three key characteristics of the poems: 'An Exhortacion Elegiacall, to All European Christians, against the Turks' (pp. 1111-16) reinforces the anti-Islamic Christianity of the poem; a prose description of 'The Military Offices of the Turkish Empery' (pp. 1117-26) resembles the tone of Barret's martial treatise *The Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres* (1598), a work that reflects on Barret's imagination in *Sacred Warr*; and two 'Alphabetical Tables' (pp. 1133-98, numbered as pages 1-64, and pp. 1199-1212, unnumbered) make the poem easy to navigate (the translation mentioned in the Stationers' Register also mentions an index, see Part I, preface). Strident moral applications, absorption

with the practical business of warfare, and ease of targeted, discontinuous reading: these are cornerstones of Barret's work, each of which is consistent with Du Bartas' stylistic influence.

The points of contact between the translation and *The Sacred Warr* are so strong because the poems are roughly contemporaneous: *Sacred Warr* was probably composed immediately after, or even during, the writing of Barret's translation around 1600. Book Thirty-Two ends with the phrase 'these trienniume historical-Martial toyles | finished the 26. of March | Anno 1606' (p. 1110), though this year-date was altered to 1610, perhaps by a later writer; likewise, the date 'Anno. 1610' (p. xi) on the titlepage was changed from 1606. An internal reference to his wife Maria's decease indicates that *The Sacred Warr* was written over at least four years, between 1602 and 1606.⁵ As well as being chronologically related, verbal consistencies between translation and poems suggest that Barret's translation did indeed consciously inspire aspects of his historical poem. In his 'corolaria' to the translations from *La Seconde Semaine* Barret merged material from two practical treatises on geometry and music into his creative translation, and in doing so imitated the digressiveness of Du Bartas' verse. The terminology used in *The Sacred Warr* may not be better defined than 'corolarium' was, but such specialized terms help to rationalize Barret's tendency to introduce new information using rhetorical figures of digression, amplification, copia and improvisation.⁶

Barret makes a qualitative distinction between discursive modes when he invokes the muses, particularly Clio (the Muse of History) and Melpomene (Tragedy); Urania is called on twice (pp. 3 and 233). These references gesture to the larger difference expressed in the 'Preface' between 'history', when Barret is adapting the Heroldt text, and 'Poetical fictions' where Barret follows Du Bartas' 'pattern'. The following digression and description, for example, which begin by distancing themselves from historical writing, recall Barret's

⁵ An annotation with manicule added to the Argument to Book Eleven reports the death of his wife: 'Maria, wife to Robert Barret, deceased the 8. of August Anno. 1602' (p. 306).

⁶ On origins and significance of narrative digressions in seventeenth-century verse, see Anne Cotterill, *Digressive Voices in Early Modern English Literature* (Oxford, 2004).

translation of ‘Furies’ in its subject-matter. The marginal annotations correspond to a distinctly Bartasian catalogue of snake species:

<p>Sweet Clio stay thyne historizing stepps, Stande, to remarke this all-dumbe-ouglie show, In Gretians Pallace; wheare, with serpent-leaps, Slie, silent, and with all pestiferous brow, In-creepes that ougly hagg, that springs from feare, And poizons froath; Pyning at others weale, Myrthing at others woes: whose ougly haire Be odious snakes; Amphibine, head, and tayle; Her toung an Aspike; Cacoblepas eies, A dragons throat; and slie Cerastias front; Vipers her teeth; voice, change-shape Hyens cries.</p>	<p>Digressio</p> <p>Description of Envie Poetically.</p> <p>Read Solinus and Plinius touching the nature of these venomous Animals (p. 286)</p>
--	---

Barret employs technical, Latinate vocabulary and catalogues to aggrandize his epic poetry, here citing two ancient herpetological authorities to sharpen his depiction of envy. This whole fifty-line sequence grows from the single word ‘invidens’ in the first sentence of *Historia rerum*, 10.13, and Barret is evidently self-conscious about the departure from ‘historizing stepps’ as he describes Envy ‘poetically’ to bring home its moral theme.⁷

‘Description’, which is indexed on page 1155, often corresponds to passages on other personifications (such as Discord and Fame), but also earthly and celestial phenomena which are largely additions to the narrative. Most of the ‘descriptions’ listed in the index take moral subjects familiar from Du Bartas, such as fame, joy, discord, ambition and avarice, while one factual topic, ‘Discription of the heauens, the starrs and their sundry motions’, is also included. ‘Digression’ is unindexed but also marked in the margins, often against moral reflections. Several other terms in Barret’s lexicon reappear in the marginalia too as defences of the poem’s structural coherence; equally, the pseudo-technical term ‘ligation’ does not appear elsewhere, which supports the case that the terms are partly used to make his methods seem more systematic than they actually were. ‘Annotacion’ (meaning ‘comment’) is marked

⁷ The whole sentence reads: ‘At vero idem imperator, vetusto Graecorum more, nostrorum successibus invidens, quamvis eos, ut praediximus, apud se satis benigne habuisset’ (‘But in truth the Emperor [Alexius], as we have said, following the old Greek habit, envied the Christian’s success, although he treated them well enough when they were with him’).

around thirty times (e.g. pp. 246, 575 and 812), most often placed alongside apostrophes directed at kings and princes; meanwhile, an ‘*annotacion elegiacall*’ ends with this despairing couplet: ‘Ah, Canckred Age, that thus the selfe will smother | And quell the flame that shoulde thee light the way’ (p. 394). ‘*Observations*’ and ‘*Exordiums*’ perform comparable purposes.⁸ Such moments permit the authorial voice to step aside from Heroldt and William of Tyre: the poet follows the chronology of William’s account precisely, and supplies references to make the poem’s message more immediate and less anachronistic for the early seventeenth-century reader.

Another term from his lexicon, ‘*reprise*’, is particularly useful for isolating the architecture of Barret’s poem. Barret uses the word to mean ‘re-capture’ on the titlepage (‘*Iherusalems Lamentable Reprizee*’), but the passages marked as ‘*Reprizees*’ are all ‘resumptions’ (*OED* 7c, first cited use 1607), often accompanied by a fresh appeal to Clio. The term effectively marks the transition between Barret’s self-announced historical and poetical modes of writing. The first specialized use of ‘*reprise*’ is on page 6, following an annotation and digression on the previous page which describes lessons to be drawn from the Saracen cooperation with Heraclite. The ‘*reprise*’ is marked alongside the narrative’s continuation (‘*Faynting Heraclite, leaving Holy Land*’), and is preceded by four lines in which the poet redirects his attention back to the history: ‘Stay, wandring Muse, thou stragglest ouer-bould, [...] Returne thee to thyn hystories endolde’ (p. 6). Barret twice invokes Clio when making similar transitions. After a long, four-page sequence about orders of knights, Barret returns to William’s history (12.7) with a ‘*Reprizee*’ that begins: ‘Clio, recurbe thy course this byazzing, | Returne thou to thy historizing track’ (p. 397; see also p. 291b). When Clio is also invoked after ‘*Barrets Complaynt*’ about the contemporary church, Barret uses ‘re-’ prefixes to stress the need for resumption: ‘Wherefore, sweet Clio, Rebethinke thy selfe, | And rebetake

⁸ e.g., ‘*Barrets Exordium*’ at the beginning of book twenty-four (p. 731). There are more than thirty ‘*observations*’: see, for example, pp. 33, 279, 556 and 757.

thy selfe agayne to kings' (p. 482; for other examples, see pp. 3, 622 and 1063). This passage is an extreme example of Barret's desire to incorporate factual information, for it follows three pages (pp. 479-81) in which Barret simply lists prelates in the Asian Christian church, without even arranging them in verse. He is apparently unconcerned about the work's total length, but does distinguish his Bartasian digressions from the versified relation of past events based closely on a specified source.

Interpolated passages contain a far higher frequency of Bartasian devices, namely the 'phrases', 'similies' and 'poetical figures' mentioned in the preface: Barret's style becomes more elaborate when digressing from Heroldt and William of Tyre. Anaphora and apposition sometimes drive Barret's poetic sequences and suggest his saturation in Du Bartas' verse:

There swaggaring, Mufflike, in all villanies;	A Narration, similizing
There swearing, Wallounes, in all, blasphemies;	our Westerne abuse
There raving, Itals, in all raging cries;	
There brauing, Ibers, in all Tyrannies;	
There ryding, Ruyters, in all Leacheries;	(p. 219)

To the infernal Hall, hall ougly darck,	Descriptio Interorum poeticë
Vast, Oceanlike, deuouring, neuer full,	
Large entrances, vnknown, full of carck,	
Wherein, like Atomies, roll wonderfull,	
Crime-spotted spirits, leaving late their spoyles,	(p. 451)

Barret also develops existing similes and descriptions in the source material. The following simile originates in a passing comparison with a lioness ('more leonum, quibus raptis catulis est ira propensior', *Historia rerum*, 13.22; 'like a lion, whose wrath is aroused by her cubs being captured'):

As wholpling-Louer, littered Lioness,	A simile
Whose whelps the Sybian hunters prized hath,	
Furious, encountring whome, In moodynes,	
Them chargeth with fyer-metamorphoz'd breath;	
This, tearing, with her bryar-teened pat,	
That, murdering with her yvory-armed Iawes,	
An other egorging, with Tisyphon hate;	
In fine, All flatting with wraths stormy flawes:	(p. 304)

This quotation is a good example of Barret taking the opportunity to make incidental additions to the history. Apostrophe, schesis onomaton and figures of repetition are other devices familiar from Barret's translations that recur in his poem. His attraction to specialized vocabulary is carried over from his translation in several places, with glosses provided for terms like 'Parallelogram: a long square', which is marked alongside a description of a city with the phrase '[f]abriked in forme parallelogram, | With one side somewhat longer then the other' (p. 209); and 'Geometriked, land-measured or enlarged the kingdoms bounds' (p. 394), which accompanies the use of the unusual words 'geometriked' and 'enzeized' (took possession of). Such terms again expose Barret's impulse to modernize using neologisms and supplementation; the method is very similar to his translation practice. Diction re-used from Barret's translation provides unequivocal evidence of direct intertextuality between the poem and translation. For example, the following interjection clearly reworks the same musicological terms from Morley's *Plaine and Easie Introduction* found in a corolarium to Barret's *Semaines* translation:

And in this traunce to measure full the traunce,	
The Peoples outrage, and his Peoples cries,	
Bumbasted, beat, with bastonnado-daunce,	
To triple Monarks; maz'd Diaphonies:	
The vulgars Dyapâson; treason, treason,	Diapason, Proportio duplex.2.
Diapented is with, sould, sould, sould, are wee;	Diapente, sesquialla. v2.3. and [.]
Then sesquiterced with Diatessaron,	Diatessaron, sesquinterine.4.ad.[.]
To Greekes w'are sould to Greekes villaniously.	
Then tripled with Diapase-Diapente cries,	Diapason-diapente. triplex.3 a[.]
Kill-kill-kill, our traytor enimies;	
Last, Disdiapasoned with horrors Noise,	Disdiapason, quadruplex. 4 ad
Kill-kill, kill-kill, these Graijans Iustles Ioyes	(p. 507)

These loaned phrases are reapplied in a figurative context: the musical intervals specified here do not make the historical recreation of the scene any more accurate, but they are consciously 'poetic' in that they dramatize the scene's horror and state its moral purpose.

Book Eleven, which is the longest in *The Sacred Warr*, gives a good sense of how such strategies affect the poem's overall balance. This book picks up from *Historia rerum* 10.23, and relates the remainder of this and the following book over seventy-six pages (pp. 307-83). *Historia rerum* 11 begins by narrating Bohemond's journey from Apulia (or Puglia) northwards through Italy to the Alps.⁹ The journey begins in Barret's history with the marginal note 'Bohamond arrives in Apulia' (p. 315), at which point Barret commences a long 'Narration' (marginal note on p. 315) that introduces various Italian cities, from South to North. When Barret's Bohemond finally reaches Paris nine pages later, he meets Philip's daughter Costancia, who is mentioned in the next sentence of 11.1. Barret digresses again to describe Bohemond's courtship (pp. 324-25) before introducing a 'repreize' (p. 326) addressed to his 'wandering Muse': it includes a self-conscious passage about 'Varietie' using the same musicological terms mentioned above ('Dyapase, Dyapente, Dyatessron') before returning to 'the History' (p. 326); further on there is a six-page catalogue of the winds (pp. 332-34) and descriptions of Northern Europe (pp. 352-54) that are introduced in the argument as 'an terrible tempest discribed poetically at large' and 'their long nauigation discribed at larg' (p. 306). Barret may well be drawing on personal experience as a soldier, especially in a long marginal note on page 353 that contains a technical calculation for navigating to Jerusalem, accompanied by a description of the astrolabe and cross-staff. Despite these regular digressions, which prove just how little pressure Barret felt to restrain his narrative, it is relatively easy to know when Barret is using *Historia rerum* due to the dates included in the margin; like the *Semaines*, *The Sacred Warr* uses time-divisions (years, rather than days) to organize its expansions.

⁹ 'Qui, postquam in Apuliam pervenit, modico tempore in sua regione moram faciens, assumpto de suis fidelibus honesto comitatu, Alpes transiens, ad dominum Philippum illustrem Francorum regem pervenit' ('who, after he came into Apulia, making a stop in the region for a short time, having gathered an escort of his honest trusted men, crossing the Alps, came to the ruler Phillip, famous king of the Franks').

Du Bartas provided Barret with a valuable model of how to combine historical sources with further non-fictional material and moralizing zeal to write long poetry that domesticated unfamiliar material for Christian readers. *The Sacred Warr's* multi-faceted texture sustains the dogmatic confidence of this nationalist epic. We have no evidence about how seventeenth-century readers may have used the poem, but one nineteenth-century owner of the manuscript shows its possible appeal. Robert Southey, who was later to praise Sylvester's works in *The Doctor* (c. 1834-38), gained possession of the manuscript containing *The Sacred Warr* shortly after becoming Poet Laureate in 1813 (his dated autograph appears on the titlepage), and is reported by the book collector James Crossley to have admired the work as 'the great poetical manuscript treasure of his library'.¹⁰ Southey marked several sections with hooked crosses in pencil (pp. 13, 15 and 954), others with a single hook (pp. 19-21) and drew a question mark alongside the word 'Boota-silla' (p. 23, the term apparently means a Spanish trumpet call for cavalry to mount). Southey used these passages when composing his own nationalist epic, *Roderick, King of the Goths*, which looked to satisfy the increased public interest in Spanish history during the Peninsular War (1808-14). Southey consulted Barret's second Alphabetical Table for 'Roderick' and found a passage from Book Twenty-Nine (the first section not based on the 1560 volume), which is one of the sections marked with a hooked cross (p. 954). The other two passages are 'A Complaint against the Iniquitie of that age' (p. 13) and a sequence about Christian armies (p. 15). In the notes to the first edition (1814) of *Roderick* Southey quotes the first two of these passages and two others.¹¹ Reviewers at the time were critical of these notes: the *Christian Observer* found 'something hard, something sarcastic, something scoffing' in them, while the *British Review* declaimed them as an excuse to inflate the

¹⁰ See flyleaf, p. x. Crossley writes that 'there is no unprinted Poem of the same period in English in existence that I know which is philologically of such value. It was intended by the author to rival Tasso's Jerusalem'. Southey's autograph matches that in Ray Rawlins, *Four Hundred Years of British Autographs* (London, 1970), p. 118. *The Doctor*, ed. by Maurice H. Fitzgerald (London, 1930), pp. 34, 35, 38-39 (quoting l.iii.1057-1012) and 238 (quoting from 'Tobacco Battered').

¹¹ p. 954 on pp. lxvi-lxvii; p. 13 on pp. xiv-xvi; pp. lii-liii and pp. civ-cv and cviii contain quotations from *Sacred Warr* that I have not located. Southey comments on the poem on pp. xiv and cviii: Barret is 'an old soldier, whose language is a compound of Josuah Sylvester and King Cambyses, with a strong relish of Ancient Pistol' (p. xiv; referring to *1 Henry IV*, II.4.387 (*Riverside*)).

book's price.¹² Diego Saglia, however, argues that Southey's notes 'circumscribe that wealth of literary, legendary, historical, and traditional precedents that define the nation as a cultural continuum and give it material presence'.¹³ Indeed, Southey probably drew on *The Sacred Warr* to see how a seventeenth-century writer had responded to the same Roderick material.

Barret and Southey both seized on Roderick, and the Crusades more generally, as subject matter for historical poetry about national origins. Du Bartas' precedent showed Barret how to perform this act of cultural renewal by blending different discourses through digression and description. The result, as Southey recognized, was an idiosyncratic rewriting of the original material. Barret's translation of the *Semaines* provided a stylistic and interpretative example for an ideologically conservative, rhetorically elaborate work. *Historia rerum* already contained non-narrative sections (e.g. the description of Jerusalem in 8.1), but Barret's style becomes more overtly Bartasian in sections that are not based on the Latin original. He does not just inherit isolated poetic features from Du Bartas, but begins to formulate methods of composition that draw distinctions between different kinds of discursive modes. This allows him to pursue a mode of writing with a strong moral purpose, updated for the early 1600s.

Barret's translation was a guide, and almost a template, for composing *The Sacred Warr*. Barret's admiration is grounded on his rhetorical analysis of the *Semaines*, but his stylistic and structural imitations also correspond to *The Sacred Warr*'s design as described in his preface. It is not yet obvious, however, whether the digressive 'Bartasian poetics' that Barret develops was a singular manuscript exercise that does not reflect wider trends, or whether Du Bartas did provide a stylistic paradigm for other English poets who wished to versify non-fictional resources. As such, *Sacred Warr* is a valuable case study in illustrating how writers digested the

¹² Robert Southey: *The Critical Heritage*, ed. by Lionel Madden (London, 1972; repr. 1995), pp. 189 and 193.

¹³ Diego Saglia, 'Nationalist Texts and Counter-Texts: Southey's *Roderick* and the Dissensions of the Annotated Romance', *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 53 (1999), 421-51 (427). See also Shari Benstock, 'At the Margin of Discourse: Footnotes in the Fictional Text', *PMLA* 98 (1983), 204-25.

Semaines and sought inspiration from them, but barely takes us closer to making judgements about Du Bartas' wider poetic influence. The printed poems of two other early seventeenth-century writers do not absorb Du Bartas' style as thoroughly as Barret, perhaps because they had not read the *Semaines* as closely, but do provide a better basis for considering the extent of Du Bartas' influence on English poets. Both John Davies of Hereford's and Phineas Fletcher's responses suggest that the poems had become conceptual and stylistic models for philosophical divine poetry.

John Davies of Hereford and Panegyric

John Davies of Hereford praised the *Semaines* more expansively than any other contemporary poet did. He composed three poems on the *Semaines* and their translators: two in editions of Sylvester's translations, and one before Thomas Winter's *Second Day* (see Chapter 2.ii). The poems are too conventional and laudatory to be taken seriously as analyses of the *Semaines*, but it is still significant that Davies of Hereford celebrates them as models of religious poetry which are generous in scope, deeply-rooted in faith, and have been attentively translated into English. Unique to the early 1600s, he understands the poems as being co-authored by Du Bartas and his translators. A sonnet 'In praise of the Translator' that appears in all editions of *Devine Weekes* (1605, B6r) emphasizes the breadth of Du Bartas' and Sylvester's vision: Sylvester's '*Lines* are made to BARTAS Bent, | | Whose *Compassse* circumscribes (in spacious Words) | 'The *Vniuersall* in particulars'. A longer poem 'Of the Work, Author, and Translator', first printed in the 1608 edition (2N5v-7r) and later expanded (1611 and 1613, 3H3r-5r), praises *Devine Weekes* as a collaborative enterprise founded upon solid moral and epistemological principles: 'The BASE that bears it, is the WORD that stands | True GROVND of highest *glory, truth, and grace*. | 'The BVILDING rear'd by two rare *Heads and Hands* | (Diuinely holp) to glorifie that BASE' (1611, 3H3r). Davies of Hereford associates Sylvester's translation with virtue (e.g. ll. 42, 97-98, 104) and with learning (ll. 74, 104, 127). His sonnet before

Winter's translation (1603, A4v) is an extended pun on Winter's name, but also asserts the place of Du Bartas, 'the bosome of whose blessed *Muse* | With *Homers* sacred fire (refin'd) did burne', in the literary canon.

Davies of Hereford's religious poetry was produced in very similar circumstances to these prefatory verses and by extension to Sylvester's and particularly Winter's translations, though he does not imitate either outright. His long poem on the intellectual and spiritual capacities of humans, *Microcosmos* (1603), contains commendatory verses by several men who also wrote poems before Winter's *Second Day*: John Sanford, Douglas Castillion and Edmund Lapworth (see Chapter 2.ii).¹⁴ These men, like Winter, were all associated with Magdalen College, Oxford, and though Davies was never formally attached to either the college or university he did compose two sonnets before *Microcosmos* that describes his bond 'forc'd by force of mutuall loue' (2N4r) with the college.¹⁵ Davies probably sought to emphasize his poem's learnedness by association, which may be one reason why the poem was printed in Oxford by Joseph Barnes. A marginal note on 'Apollo' in the very first stanza announces an aspiration to synthesize Christianity with secular intellectual learning: 'Christ the true God of Wisedome, & the onelie Sunne inlightning our Intelligence' (G4r). Davies of Hereford, like Sylvester in his manuscript translation of the same year (see Chapter 3.iii), may have wished to stress the poem's intellectual appeal to impress its dedicatee, James VI and I. Du Bartas' learned piety gave Davies of Hereford a strong precedent for his own poem, which was surely published to coincide with the accession: Nicholas Deeble's prefatory verse exhorts Davies's book to '[g]o, pay thy vowes; await his dread command | To whom in prostrate duety thou art sent' (B4r).¹⁶ Davies of Hereford's prefatory verses recognize in *Devine Weekes* a 'vertuous Muse' that can hope for patronage from the state: 'Then may thy HOPES (wing'd by thy virtuous Muse, | Dear *Sylvester*) expect some cherishment, | In this blest *State*' (1611, 3H5r).

¹⁴ John Davies of Hereford, *Microcosmos* (1603), A4v, B2v and 2P2r.

¹⁵ P. J. Finkelpearl, 'Davies, John (1564/5–1618)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7244>].

¹⁶ Doelman, 'Accession of King James I', 27-28.

Davies of Hereford sets his work before the King in long panegyrics to James (C1r-F2v) and Prince Henry (F3r-G3v) preceding *Microcosmos*. His familiarity with these translations of Du Bartas almost certainly informed his own attempt at learned panegyric.

These contextual associations probably also explain why Davies of Hereford only attempted an indirect imitation of the *Semaines. Microcosmos*' primary source is another well-regarded French work that was also available in English translation, Pierre de La Primaudaye's *L'Academie Françoise* (1586 *et seq.*).¹⁷ The complete work contains four books which cover human conduct, the body's material and spiritual constitution, the natural world, and 'Christian Philosophy'. *Microcosmos* is not an alternative translation, versification or stylistic imitation of La Primaudaye, but does defer continually to the authority of its French source for factual reference and corroboration. Davies of Hereford's methods are comparable to those used in the commonplace books *Witts Theater of the Little World* (1599), *Witts Commonwealth* (1598), and *Belvédère, or, the Garden of the Muses* (1600), which all borrow precise details from La Primaudaye, but no larger framework for organizing knowledge.¹⁸ *Microcosmos* contains 678 Spenserian stanzas (with terminal pentameter lines) in fourteen unnumbered and untitled sections that describe reason (section 1), physiology (2), the faculties of the soul (3-4), government and English monarchical history (5-8), and the soul and emotions (9-14), for which the second and third books of the *French Academie* are most used.¹⁹ The central sections on political matters, incongruous with those surrounding it, show Davies of Hereford, like Sylvester in his interpolations, localizing his poems to their intended readership: he concludes with an optimistic vision of James's coronation and the perpetuation of the Stuart line (Y2v).

¹⁷ La Primaudaye, *French Academie*, 2V5r. Ruth L. Anderson, 'A French Source for John Davies of Hereford's System of Psychology', *PQ* 6 (1927), 57-66. Murphy's doctoral thesis, 'John Davies of Hereford' (unpublished PhD thesis, Cornell, 1940), is the major work on Davies of Hereford's sources, and his findings are discussed in Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare, A Lover's Complaint, and John Davies of Hereford* (Cambridge, 2007).

¹⁸ D. T. Starnes, 'The French Academie and Witts Commonwealth', *PQ* 13 (1934), 211-14; 'Some Sources of Witts Theater of the Little World (1599) and Bodenham's Belvedere (1600)', *PQ* 30 (1951), 411-18.

¹⁹ On different conventions for dividing poems into named or unnamed sections, see Kenneth Borris and Clark Meredith Donaldson, 'Hymnic Epic and *The Faerie Queene*'s Original Printed Format: Canto-Canticles and Psalmic Arguments', *RQ* 64 (2011), 1148-93 (1168). The article describes the *Semaines* as 'indirectly hymnic' (1181).

There are some echoes of Du Bartas' style in *Microcosmos*, though under La Primaudaye's influence Davies of Hereford's arguments contain more abstract nouns. For example, after five stanzas that follow a passage in La Primaudaye on jealousy, Davies of Hereford composes an original stanza using Bartasian congeries for amplification:

<p>The fell disturber of <i>Loves</i> sweete repose, <i>Copesmate</i> of <i>Care</i>, tormenter of the <i>Minde</i>, The <i>Canker</i> of faire <i>Venus</i> sweetest <i>Rose</i>, The <i>Racke</i> that over racks the over-kinde, The over-watchful Eye of <i>Loue</i> stil blinde: The <i>Hart</i> of <i>Caution</i> wherein ay are bredd The vital <i>Sp'rites</i> of <i>Arte</i> to <i>State</i> assign'd; <i>Soule</i> of <i>Regard</i>, alive when it seemes deade, All this is <i>Iealousie</i> that holds the <i>Heade</i>.</p>	<p>Iealousy, what</p>	<p>(2D4r)</p>
--	-----------------------	---------------

His verse is not saturated in Du Bartas' rhetoric, however, as Barret's was: a better point of comparison would be the Scottish courtiers (see Chapter 1.i) who also respected the French poet as a model for poetry directed at James without necessarily having read the poems closely. In the year before *Microcosmos* was printed, Davies of Hereford had already published a structurally and thematically similar poem, *Mirum in Modum* (1602), which described the soul's capacities using material from the second book of La Primaudaye. The third poem in this loose trilogy is *Summa Totalis* (1607), called 'an addition to *Mirum in Modum*' on its titlepage, which loans arguments and phrases from another Huguenot treatise available in English: Philip Sidney and Arthur Golding's translation of Du Plessis Mornay's *Vérité de la Religion Chrestienne*.²⁰

These poems display Sylvester's example most forcefully by tightening their poetic structures over time to secure an interpretative relationship between borrowed grains of information, and the poem's global structure. *Mirum in Modum* (1602) is the least organized of the three poems: it has no larger framework, nor does the printed book contain any finding devices (marginalia or indexes) to locate material. The title (meaning 'in a miraculous way'),

²⁰ Charles Driscoll Murphy, 'John Davies's Versification of Sidney's Prose', *PQ* 21 (1942), 410-14.

subtitle ('[a] Glimpse of Gods Glorie and the Soules Shape') and epigraph ('Eyes must be bright, or else no eyes at all | Can see this sight, much more than mysticall') each exhort the reader to read *Mirum in Modum* as devotional poetry, though the poem does not guide readers towards super-mystical perception of the divine microcosmic and macrocosmic planes.

Microcosmos, however, offers more than a glimpse: its subtitle (decapitalized) promises 'the discovery of the little World, with the government thereof'. It contains more guidance for the reader with marginalia and section breaks, and announced pauses: the narrator rests so that his 'travell'd *Muse* might breath somtimes, | And, that the *Reader* too might doe as much' (N2v).

Summa Totalis (1607), described as an 'addition' to *Mirum in Modum*, is more ambitious still: its alternative title is 'All in All, and the same for ever'. The locution 'all in all' may well be from Sylvester: 'Before all Time, all Matter, Form and Place, | God all in all, and all in God it was' (l.i.54-55). Davies of Hereford may well have internalized *Devine Weekes* by now, for he structures his *Summa* around a seven-day week and type ornaments now demarcate sections. Six times the sun sets and the speaker resumes by addressing his *Muse*: 'Arise dead *Muse*, resume thy wonted *Spright*, | And once againe, with *Him*, thy Iourny take | Through Heau'n, to find him out, that *All* did make' (H4r). As a result of this innovation, *Summa Totalis* best matches what Marshall Grossman described as 'an apparent alliance between the emergence of narrative as the paradigmatic form for the understanding of events and the rhetoric of accumulation'.²¹ The fictional seven days in *Summa Totalis* embolden the narrator to organize information into a scheme harmonious with the calendar, and so encourage comparison with the *Semaines*. Marginalia provide assistance in navigating the poem's argument and in clarifying references. Unlike the abrupt conclusions to the earlier poems, *Summa Totalis* ends with a reflection on intertextuality in religious discourse, and how this new poem will itself be reviewed and revised:

²¹ Marshall Grossman, 'Literary Forms and Historical Consciousness in Renaissance Poetry', *Exemplaria* 1 (1989), 247-64 (252).

And, though we must confesse all *Helps* we tooke
 That *God*, and Men affoorded vs herein,
 Out of Mens VVritings, and *Gods* blessed *Booke*
 Yet to our *Muse*, it hath so waighty bin
 That now she (fainting) sincks, for feare to sinne:
 Then, here an *End*, before an endlesse *End*,
 Sith we may lose, if more we seeke to win:
 And what is done, we meekely do commend
 To mortall **Saints*; to use, refuse, or mend.

*The church militant.
 (K1v)

In asserting that the books of God and men provide the material for all later religious writing, the narrator acknowledges a poetics of humanist collaboration and synthesis shared by the *Semaines* while also registering his specific debts to poems such as Du Bartas'. The poet aspires to join a congregation of Christians led by James. Aside from this rhetorical appeal, Davies of Hereford's appreciation for the *Semaines* is inseparable from the guidance they offered for writing panegyric. In addition to those who made specific references to the *Semaines* directed at James (described in Chapter 3), the poems were a stimulus for other eulogizing poems that loosely adapted Du Bartas' compositional methods. Nicholas Breton, a poet keenly alert to contemporary trends, appears to glance at the *Semaines* in his panegyric *The Soules Immortale Crowne Consisting of Seaven Glorious Graces* (1605), albeit probably only to improve the page layout of his publication. *Soules Immortale Crowne* is described on its titlepage, alongside a dedication to James, as being 'devided into seaven dayes Workes', but the poem makes no other reference to the week-division except for the running headers on each page. The only apparent purpose of the reference is to make the page layout distinct from Simion Grahame's *Passionate Sparke of a Relenting Minde* (1604), which was published in the previous year with the same unusually extravagant titlepage borders first used in Thomas Bentley's *Monument of Matrones* (1582). Other panegyrics are potential analogues to the *Semaines* too, such as William Leighton's *Virtue Triumphant* (1603). However, if these works indicate any shared vision of the poems at all, then it is a very abstract association centred on James's personal wisdom.

Davies of Hereford was almost certainly encouraged and perhaps guided by Sylvester's and Winter's publications when writing his own work of learned piety for James VI and I. He appears particularly sensitive to how the poems combine fragmentary knowledge into one politically acceptable whole, though his response is arguably too focused on James's reaction to inform wider discussion of whether Du Bartas' poems gained wider acceptance as a literary model. Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island* shows how the *Semaines* may have inspired later poets indirectly, though the direct evidence of intertextuality is correspondingly slim. Fletcher is a good test-case for assessing how far Du Bartas' poetry continued to resonate among English poets without a particular connection to any translation, especially among those who also admired Spenser.

Phineas Fletcher as 'Spenserian' and 'Bartasian' Poet

The Purple Island (Cambridge, 1633) was probably composed in the early 1610s. Du Bartas, along with Jacobo Sannazaro and Edmund Spenser, is mentioned by name in glosses alongside the opening stanzas:

And that * <i>French</i> Muses eagle eye and wing	* <i>Bartas</i>
Hath soar'd to heav'n, and there hath learn'd the art	
To frame Angelick strains, and canzons sing	
Too high and deep for every shallow heart.	(1.14.1-4) ²²

Phineas's brother Giles, in the preface to his poem *Christs Victorie in Heaven*, also expressed his amazement at Du Bartas' devout concentration: 'thrice-honour'd *Bartas*, & our (I know no other name more glorious than his own) M^r. *Edmund Spenser* (two blessed Soules) not thinking ten years inough, layeing out their whole lives upon this one studie' ('To the Reader'; I, p. 11). Of the two poems, Phineas's *The Purple Island* is ostensibly more 'Bartasian' in its concern with anatomical knowledge, though this needs to be set against its 'Spenserian' elements: the Castle

²² Line and page references from Giles and Phineas Fletcher, *Poetical Works*, ed. by Frederick Boas, 2 vols (London and Cambridge, 1908-09). On dating the poem, see footnote 29 below.

of Alma, alluded to at 6.51.6, was an inspiration for Fletcher, while the pastoral frame locates the poems around other ‘Spenserians’ like William Browne and George Wither.²³ Nonetheless, *The Purple Island* may be a conscious expansion upon the Sixth Day which did not offer completion but invited another poet-physician to take up the task:

But, now me list no neerer view to take
 Of th’Inward Parts, which God did secret make;
 Nor pull in peeces all the Humane Frame:
 That worke, wear fitter for those men of Fame,
 Those skillfull sonnes of *Æsculapius*:
Hipocrates; or deepe *Herophilus*:
 Or th’eloquent and artificiall Writt
 Of *Galen*, that renowned *Pergamite*. (I.vi.725-32)

Fletcher may not have had precisely these classical authorities to hand when composing *The Purple Island*, but he certainly had access to medical treatises, possibly John Banister’s *Historie of Man* (1578) or Andreas Vesalius’s *Fabrica* (1543).²⁴ In showing how closely Fletcher’s poem follows on from Du Bartas, we can see whether it represents a broader renewal of the *Semaines*, and accordingly in what ways appreciating these Bartasian elements adjusts our interpretation of the poem.

The Purple Island is an allegorical description of the human body narrated by the shepherd Thirsil. Within a pastoral setting the poem is related over the course of seven days, which may be another reference to the *Semaines*. The poem is divided into twelve cantos that cover various scientific and psychological aspects of humankind. The second to fifth cantos describe features of the island which correspond precisely to the human body in ways made explicit by accompanying marginalia. For example, alongside the lines ‘At that caves mouth
 ‘twice sixteen Porters stand, | Receivers of that customarie rent’ is found the note ‘e In either chap are sixteen teeth; foure cutters, two dog-teeth, or breakers, ten grinders’ (2.30.1-2). The

²³ P. G. Stanwood, ‘Fletcher, Phineas (1582–1650)’, in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9738>]; Joan Grundy, *The Spenserian Poets* (London, 1969), p. 2.

²⁴ Peter Mitchell, *The Purple Island and Anatomy in Early Seventeenth-Century Literature, Philosophy, and Theology* (Madison, N.J., 2006), Chapter 7 (pp. 299-300).

marginalia create a distinctive *mise-en-page* in these four cantos which comprise 183 (out of 696) stanzas in the poem. The annotations prioritize the poems' factual information and discourage allegorical reading: the cave does not symbolize the mouth – it *is* the mouth. Since Abram Barnett Langdale's study *Phineas Fletcher, Man of Letters, Science, and Divinity* (1937), most criticism on *The Purple Island* has focused on these cantos alone and sought to relate them to contemporary anatomy.²⁵ The remaining seven cantos shift from describing the topography (i.e. anatomy) of the island to its population (psychology). Although the Fletchers' editor, F. S. Boas, believed these cantos to be superior ('I am one of those who find the chief merits of Fletcher's allegorical poem in the later cantos, where he deserts physiology for psychology'), the latter cantos have received little attention.²⁶ Viewed alongside the *Semaines*, however, it is unsurprising that Fletcher should have examined both the body's physical constitution and passions, and so demonstrate how moral actions have material origins. The poem's governing image of the island-body draws different types of knowledge together, just as the *Semaines* did. In looking to identify how *The Purple Island* is a continuation of the *Semaines*, it would be worth looking not just at each individual section but how the poem coalesces into a whole. G. R. Baldwin's view (refuting Langdale) that Fletcher's science is unoriginal, and that *The Purple Island* is a 'valuable source of Renaissance ideas in their clearest, most settled, simplest form' may, in fact, identify Fletcher's achievement: that he crystallized new learning and made its ethical importance clear.²⁷ Fletcher confirms that poetry was still an appropriate medium for attempting such a synthesis, as Thomas Healy observes: 'Fletcher is offering a more-up-to-date scientific structure, and replacing cosmology with anatomy, so that poetry once more

²⁵ Abram Barnett Langdale, *Phineas Fletcher, Man of Letters, Science, and Divinity* (New York, 1937); the anatomical cantos had previously been praised in two medical journals: anon., 'Nova et Vetera', *British Medical Journal*, 1: 9 May, no. 3358 (1925), 890; and A. J. Pohlman, 'The Purple Island by Phineas Fletcher', *Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin* 18 (1907), 317-21. Aside from Mitchell's book, other critical references to *The Purple Island* since then include: Marjorie Hope Nicolson, *The Breaking of the Circle* (Evanston, 1950), esp. p. 29; R. G. Baldwin, 'Dubious Claims for the Anatomy in "The Purple Island"', *NQ* 9 (1962), 377-78 and and Eric F. Langley, 'Anatomizing the Early Modern Eye: A Literary Case-Study', *RS* 20 (2006), 340-55.

²⁶ F. S. Boas, '[Review of] Langdale, A. B.: *Phineas Fletcher*', *MLR* 33 (1938), 430-31 (431). Edmund Gosse, *The Jacobean Poets* (London, 1894), p.148.

²⁷ R. G. Baldwin, 'Phineas Fletcher: His Modern Readers and His Renaissance Ideas', *PQ* 40 (1961), 462-75 (475).

apparently agrees with empirical exploration.²⁸ In short, Fletcher's twelve-canto exposition of anatomical and psychological knowledge adopts a Bartasian poetics that pulls fragmentary knowledge together into a single narrative.

The *Semaines*, one of Fletcher's immediate precedents for writing 'scientific poetry', showed that such explorations gained moral value when they could be integrated into existing theological and scriptural frameworks. The poem participates in a larger project for theological instruction through discovery about the self and world. Daniel Featley observed in a preface to the poem that self-knowledge was preliminary to understanding the divine: 'He that would learn *Theologie*, must first studie *Autologie*. The way to God is by our selves' (¶4r). 'Autology' is a new word here, presumably created in contrast to 'theology', and intended as an incitement to greater self-knowledge. Featley encourages close reading in order to reveal the poem's depths: 'Peruse it as thou shouldst thy self, from thy first sheet to thy last. The first view, perchance, may runne thy judgement in debt; the second will promise payment; and the third will perform promise' (¶4r). As devotional literature, Featley writes, the poem deserves scrutiny from its first page to its last.

Fletcher's poem provides a renewed level of empirical detail to his autological poetry, but still does not pretend that it is complete: 'this Isle is a short summarie | Of all that in this All is wide dispred' (5.8.1-2). If Thirsil could look hard at the 'Sunne',

Then should thy shepherd (poorest shepherd) sing
 A thousand Canto's in thy heav'nly praise,
 And rouze his flagging Muse, and flutt'ring wing,
 To chant thy wonders in immortal laies. (6.76.1-4)

In his dedicatory poem Francis Quarles admired this aspiration to limitless copia, while acknowledging that the poem could never rein in all anatomical knowledge within one work.

²⁸ Thomas Healy, 'Sound Physic: Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island* and the Poetry of Purgation', *RS* 5 (1991), 341-52 (344).

Quarles observes in his commendatory verse (II, p. 8, ll. 9-14) that the marginalia fail to offer as much detail as the poem:

If (my ingenious Rivall) these dull times
Should want the present strength to prize thy rhymes,
The time-instructed children of the next
Shall fill thy margent, and admire the text;
Whose well read lines will teach them how to be
The happie knowers of themselves and thee.

Quarles hopes that future generations shall ‘fill thy margent’ by annotating the text with new discoveries, much as the distinctive printed marginalia did in the 1633 publication. The marginalia may, however, be a later addition to the poem composed in the 1610s: Edward Benlowes, who was instrumental in the publication of Fletcher’s works, was fascinated by the possibilities for printing *The Purple Island*, and would surely have approved of, and may even have instigated, their inclusion.²⁹ Harold Jenkins writes that Benlowes ‘was anxious to try his hand at book-production’, that ‘Fletcher’s poem provided an excellent opportunity’, and that he ‘was so much responsible for the design of the book, at any rate in the presentation copies, that the whole was almost a joint production’.³⁰ The marginalia provide far more detail than those in *Devine Weekes* do, and deliberately introduce a new level of detail, perhaps taking the Book of Ecclesiastes as model (the marginalia are comparable in layout and content to those accompanying Ecclesiastes 12 in the Geneva Bible). They bear closer resemblance to those in George Sandys’ 1632 translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (earlier editions in 1621 and 1626 had no marginalia), and Jenkins observes that Sandys (as well as Sylvester) were major influences on Benlowes’ own poem *Theophila* (1652; p. 114). Far from encouraging us to split the poem into two discrete sections, the marginalia suggest that *The Purple Island* is a single, united poem that had dynamically reworked its poetic predecessors and which would continue to evolve through further study, contemplation and empirical reading. James Joyce recognized

²⁹ Based on internal evidence, *The Purple Island* is generally agreed to have been written between the *Piscatorie Eclogues* and Fletcher’s later *Locustae*. See Langdale, *Phineas Fletcher*, pp. 51-52.

³⁰ Harold Jenkins, *Edward Benlowes, 1602-1676* (London, 1952), pp. 71-74 (pp. 71, 74).

the poem's unity when writing that the poem was the only 'epic of the human body' before *Ulysses*.³¹

This interpretation does not prove that Fletcher used the *Semaines* as a model to write the poems, but has shown that the structural relationship between highly detailed individual sections and a larger epistemological design is a crucial issue for understanding *The Purple Island*, and that the *Semaines* were a major precedent for writing religious poems of this type. In stressing that *The Purple Island*, like the *Semaines*, is a well-organized poem consisting of smaller units, this reading counters the view that Fletcher is a 'Spenserian' poet who, in Joan Grundy's study, is presented as one writer within a group of pre-romantic poets who all delighted in spontaneity. Writing of Fletcher's pastoral setting, she argues that the Spenserians 'sought to be at once the amateurs and professionals of poetry, amateurs in their rejection of discipline, their insistent self-pleasing; professionals in their emphasis on the distinction of the poet's office' (p. 8). Grundy recognized Du Bartas' 'general effect upon taste' (p. 43-44), and finds that '[i]n the Spenserians this discipline [of convention] is breaking down – again partly through Du Bartas's influence and example' (p. 44). In the long poems of William Browne, George Wither and Giles Fletcher, Grundy finds that Du Bartas is a 'very potent influence in the development of the Spenserians' rhapsodic attitudes to poetry, as well as on their handling of narrative' (p. 65). Recent work has tightened the definition of 'Spenserian' around a textual community of pastoral poets, such that the term is more closely tied to professed allegiance rather than forms of writing.³² However, this has not clarified Spenser's position as a stylistic model: as Robert Cummings puts it, 'Spenser's imitators parade debts that are only superficially owed'.³³

³¹ Frank Budgen, *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses'* (London, 1972), p. 21.

³² Michelle O'Callaghan, *The 'Shepherd's Nation'* (Oxford, 2000); David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, revised edn (Oxford, 2002), p. 179.

³³ *Edmund Spenser: The Critical Heritage*, ed. by R. M. Cummings (London and New York, 1971), p. 12. See also Bush, *The Early Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660*, p. 81.

If Fletcher was indeed inspired by the Sixth Day as well as the Castle of Alma, then he responded keenly both to Du Bartas' description of the human body and the possibilities for including natural philosophy in religious poetry. The stylistic debt may be no greater than Spenser's, but the poem emerges as being a truly unified 'autological' study that participated in the continuing renewal of poems like the Sixth Day. In this way *The Purple Island* may epitomize the wider trajectory of Du Bartas' influence into the 1630s, when scientific discovery, theology and poetry were mutually sustaining. It may well be that Du Bartas' influence had a particularly strong hold among those poets who also admired Spenser. However, such speculation neglects that the *Semaines'* poetic reception was probably strongest within divine poetry. In order to press further the claim that the *Semaines* were innovative religious poems that were a model to English poets, the final section begins by seeking to define what it was about the *Semaines'* poetics that was so iterable, and then examines where they belong alongside other contemporary Jacobean religious poems that drew on non-fictional secular sources.

ii. The *Semaines* and English Literary Genres

An article based on this section was printed in
Peer English 8 (2013). Available at:
[http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/english-association/
publications/peer-english/8/1%20Peter%20Auger
%20-%20Contemporary%20Analogues.pdf](http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/english-association/publications/peer-english/8/1%20Peter%20Auger%20-%20Contemporary%20Analogues.pdf)

In the broadest terms, Barret, Davies of Hereford and Fletcher shared Du Bartas' holistic vision in which poetic composition could unite Scriptural and intellectual truth. However, their poems are so dissimilar that we can only tentatively point to general shared features as long digressive poems that versify contemporary knowledge. Even if direct connections and broader analogies with the *Semaines* are insecure, such comparisons are still worthwhile for presenting new perspectives on these poems, and our understanding of other English verse could similarly benefit by acknowledging the *Semaines* as a parallel. We could seek evidence of 'Bartasian poetics' in poems like William Browne's *Britannias Pastorals* (1613) or Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1612).³⁴ Such poems are not necessarily responses to the *Semaines*, but

³⁴ See Ashton, *Du Bartas*, pp. 328-31.

may simply share religious, scientific and literary assumptions. In order to comment at all on these global affinities, we would need to establish which features of the *Semaines*, as a large multi-generic work, may have had particular historical resonance. Without attempting to draw together the readings witnessed across this thesis into a single historical master narrative, these broader considerations can help us to work towards positioning the *Semaines* within English and Scottish literary history.

In theme and structure the *Semaines* are fundamentally 'hexaemeral' poems based on the historical narrative in Genesis. Both poems, and particularly *La Sepmaine*, can be viewed as Augustinian interpretations of Scripture that supplemented a literal retelling of the Book of Genesis with material taken from such authors as Pliny and Aristotle to update biblical narratives with modern learning.³⁵ As well as French poetic responses in Christofle de Gamon's *Semaine* (Lyon, 1609) and Pierre Magnan's *Journee du Voyage du Monde faite sous la conduite de l'Uranie* (Montpellier, 1621), other European poems followed on from *La Sepmaine* closely: Torquato Tasso's *Le Sette Giornate del Mondo Creato* ('The Seven Days of the World's Creation'; Viterbo, 1607), Alonso de Acevedo's *Creacion del Mundo* ('Creation of the World'; Rome, 1615), Gaspare Murtola's *Della Creazione del Mondo* ('Of the World's Creation'; Venice, 1608) and Don Felice Passero's *L'Essamerone* ('The Hexaameron', Venice, 1609).³⁶ There are, however, no equivalent hexaemeral poems in English that versify Genesis. The only contemporary writer, aside from John Swan (whose *Speculum Mundi* was discussed in Chapter 4.ii) and Zachary Boyd (Chapter 5.ii), that I have located who attempted an original description of the seven days of creation in English is the preacher Henoah Clapham, though his *Elohim or Ælohim-triune* (1601) describes the first day of Creation only in thirteen sections; the poem is marked on the titlepage as the 'First Part', but Clapham does not appear to have

³⁵ See Kenneth J. Howell, 'Textual Knowledge and Textual Meaning in Augustine's Interpretation of Genesis: The Three Functions of Natural Philosophy', in *Nature and Scripture in the Abrahamic Religions*, ed. by Jitse M. van der Meer and Scott Mandelbrote (Leiden, 2008), pp. 117-45.

³⁶ Maury Thibaut de Maisières, *Les Poèmes Inspirés du début de la Gènesè à l'époque de la Renaissance* (Louvain, 1931).

composed further sections. Clapham's method is comparable to Sylvester's in that he takes Genesis 1 as his 'Poemes text' (A4v) for interpretation ('text' here also connotes the subject of a sermon). He presents his material in an accessible, instructive way for others, supplying 'necessarie marginall notes for relieuing of the young student' (titlepage). Yet even this 'hexaemeral' poem bears little similarity to the *Semaines* in method, style or structure, and a broader definition of 'hexaemeral' is needed to accommodate Du Bartas' poems.

The term 'hexaemeral' has mostly been used in English literary criticism when discussing *Paradise Lost*.³⁷ Barbara Lewalski admired Milton's ability to transcend the genre: the design of Raphael's description of creation in Book 7 is 'vastly superior to that of its literary progeny', namely Lucretius, Ovid and Du Bartas, while Lewalski found that Milton 'eschews the lengthy catalogues and the encyclopedic lore characteristic of the genre, offering instead a sharply focused description of the wonders and processes of creation'.³⁸ In arguing that Milton superseded the *Semaines*, Lewalski plays down the possibility that the *Semaines* ever represented a coherent poetic mode. However the differences between both poems can be pursued through a broad comparison of the two most important English poems based on Genesis, *Devine Weekes* and *Paradise Lost*.

The two poems versify different material from Genesis: *Paradise Lost* primarily relates the Eden narrative in Genesis 2:4-3:24, and *Devine Weekes* describes the hexaemeron (from the Greek, 'in six days') of Genesis 1:1-2:3. There is a brief hexaemeron in *Paradise Lost*, Book 7, but it is a speech spoken by Raphael to Adam; similarly, Adam and Eve appear in Sylvester's 'Eden' and subsequent sections of the First Day of the Second Week, but the narrative is interrupted by descriptive sections that list, for example, trees in the Garden of Eden (II.i.1.501-630). The two long poems adopt modes that parallel features in their main biblical source material: in broad terms, the characters and setting of the Eden narrative enable such

³⁷ M. I. Corcoran, *Milton's Paradise with Reference to the Hexameral Background* (Washington, D.C., 1945); Russell M. Hillier, 'Spatial Allegory and Creation Old and New in Milton's Hexaemeral Narrative', *SEL* 49 (2009), 121-43.

³⁸ Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Paradise Lost and the Rhetoric of Literary Forms* (Princeton, 1985), p. 45.

elements of *Paradise Lost* as its well-drawn protagonists and imagined locations; meanwhile, the hexaemeral narrative correlates with *Devine Weekes'* philosophical and theological interpretation of how God formed and sustains the natural world. Sylvester's translation attempts an objective, factual description of the Creation in verse, while *Paradise Lost* is an imaginative narration of the Fall with various features that dramatize the story, such as its vivid characterization. The representations of God the Father provide a strong point of contrast: God in *Paradise Lost* is a dramatic character who intervenes in human affairs, speaks to other characters and can perform human actions such as smiling (5.718), but in Sylvester's translation the deity is an immanent creative force who is described using more abstract language: 'Before all Time, all Matter, Forme, and Place; | God all in all, and all in God it was: | Immutable, immortall, infinite, | Incomprehensible, all spirit, all light, | All Majestie, all-selfe-Omnipotent, | Invisible, impassive, excellent' (l.i.44-48).³⁹

We can pursue these contrasts by looking more closely at the scriptural origins of both poems. Modern biblical criticism has identified differences between the two Genesis sources that offer a strong analogy, and perhaps even an underlying cause, for such stylistic and structural features. Seventeenth-century scholars noticed inconsistencies between accounts of humankind's creation in the hexaemeral and Eden narratives; there were subtle and sustained disagreements on the issue, but it was widely agreed that the first two chapters of Genesis should be read together: the prevailing view was that 'the first must be considered a summary and anticipation of the second, which supplies in greater detail the method of operation'.⁴⁰ It was not until the following century that theologians saw these tensions within the Book of Genesis as irreconcilable, and there is still no firm consensus about their cause.⁴¹ The voice

³⁹ *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler (London, 2007). Bible references are from the Authorized Version.

⁴⁰ Arnold Williams, *The Common Expositor* (Chapel Hill, 1948), pp. 66-67.

⁴¹ The influential 'Documentary Hypothesis' argues that four separate sources are used in the Pentateuch, but this has been challenged by the 'Fragmentary Hypothesis', which argues that more sources were used, and the 'Supplementary Hypothesis', which contends that a single author expanded his or her material. See also Joseph Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch* (London, 1992), 60-67; R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch* (Sheffield, 1987) and G. I. Davies, 'Introduction to the Pentateuch', in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. by John Barton and John

found in Genesis 1:1-2:3 and elsewhere in the Pentateuch is known today as P (referring to the Priestly codex, where God is called ‘Elohim’), while the Eden narrative and other sections were written by J (after ‘Yahweh’). E. A. Speiser’s descriptions of P’s and J’s literary style are useful for drawing out divergences between the early modern poems under discussion. Speiser writes that J is ‘not only the most gifted biblical writer, but one of the greatest figures in world literature. If so much in the Book of Genesis remains vivid and memorable to this day, the reason is not merely the content of the tales but, in large measure as well, the matchless way in which *J* has told them’.⁴² Though Mary Nyquist justifiably describes *Paradise Lost* as ‘the product of an ideologically overdetermined desire to unify the two different creation accounts in Genesis’, Milton’s poem holds particular attributes in common with Speiser’s sketch of J, such as a continuous narrative organized using conjunctions and different tenses, dialogue between characters, eloquent phrasing (e.g. ‘bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh’ (Genesis 2:23)), and meditations on providence and morality.

The P-voice exemplifies a kind of literature that is less familiar today: like Sylvester, P offers a monologic, factual description that largely does without figurative language, and this emphasis explains the ‘generally stilted language and the circumscribed range of interests’ (p. xxvi). Such writing contains more appositive and parallel structures that can be read discontinuously, while its setting and imagery are abstracted (e.g. ‘fowl of the air’ (Genesis 1:28)). Speiser speculates that the P-voice related an account of Creation that would have been authorized by an institution and shared by a whole community: ‘The end result would thus represent the carefully nurtured product of a standing scholastic committee, so to speak, in regular session since the inchoate beginnings of ethnic consciousness in Israel’ (p. xxvi). The

Muddiman (Oxford, 2001; repr. 2010), pp. 12-38 (13-15). See also Mary Nyquist, ‘The Genesis of Gendered Subjectivity in the Divorce Tracts and in *Paradise Lost*’, in *Re-Membering Milton*, ed. by Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson (London, 1987), pp. 99-127 (p. 102).

⁴² *Genesis*, ed. by E. A. Speiser (Garden City, N.Y., 1964; repr. 2008), p. xxvii.

authorial voice in *Devine Weekes* is similarly more authoritative and earnest than J, and consequently less imaginative and expressive.

This analogy has an ideological as well as an aesthetic dimension. P offers a conservative vision of creation that expects unreserved assent and submission to a higher power; whereas for J, ‘man is not a mere marionette, as he is in P’s scheme of things. Rather, the individual is allowed considerable freedom of action, and it is this margin of independence that brings out both his strengths and weaknesses’ (p. xxviii). In a seventeenth-century British context, then, P would be more likely to suit a royalist discourse than a republican one. This putative association matches the strong monarchical emphasis in the early reception of Du Bartas that was traced in earlier chapters, and the desire to fashion shared systems of knowledge in poems like Fletcher’s which seek to complement empirical investigation with moral discussion. These trends may be relevant to *Devine Weekes*’ relative obscurity after the seventeenth century: the political, moral and epistemological outlook presented by the *Semaines* was favourable to the aristocracy and to a more conservative Calvinist viewpoint, but ultimately left the poems on the wrong side of political developments in the later seventeenth century.

This correlation between P and *Devine Weekes* has some resonance in the structures of knowledge of early modern religious poetry. *Devine Weekes* is a ‘hexaemeral’ poem in the specific sense of being structured around the biblical six days of creation and first historical ages, and more generally in that it describes foundational truths about the world. Specific features of early modern poetry editions arguably correlate to such ‘hexaemeral’ forms: finding devices such as indexes and marginalia to promote discontinuous reading; anonymous narratorial voices, as seen in Davies of Hereford’s poetry; and Protestant poetry that combined with humanist learning and methods of instruction. This poetry of description or

instruction incorporates the *Semaines*' appeal as non-fictional writing, and as a rhetorical and structural model for similar poems.

There are two initial problems with this framework. The first has been illustrated throughout this thesis by showing how far reading experiences of the *Semaines* differed according to the editions being used. Writers are reading many different texts, which offered selections from across the whole *Semaines*, are composed in French, English and Latin, and which were attributed both to Du Bartas and his translators. This thesis has represented this diversity, rather than flattening out the *Semaines*' reception into a single template. There is no universal concept of the *Semaines* as a work that exists independent of the texts within which they were read. The second difficulty is naming this historical mode and finding coherent groups of texts that represent it. With this general paradigm of 'hexaemeral poetry' in mind, however, we can at least seek to find religious poems with similar structures in English even if there is no common term for them.

The term 'hexaemeral poetry' is not in itself that helpful when discussing English verse: neither division into seven days, merging of secular and sacred learning, engagement with Scripture, a quest for empirical objectivity; nor influence from Du Bartas encapsulate the salient features of all the poems discussed in this and the previous chapter. *Devine Weekes* is not systematic enough for the alternative term 'encyclopedic' to be helpful: the term still implied the union of learning into a 'metaphysically significant plan'.⁴³ Sylvester only uses the term 'enciclopedie' when describing language-learning before Babel: 'We reacht betimes that Castles highest part, | Where th'*Enciclopedie* her darlings Crownes, | In signe of conquest, with eterne renownes' (II.ii.2.257). The poems' formal ingenuity instead reaches towards infinite

⁴³ Neil Kenny, *The Palace of Secrets: Béroalde de Verville and Renaissance Conceptions of Knowledge* (Oxford, 1991), p. 13.

variety and Miernowski's 'discours sur discours infiniment divers'.⁴⁴ A term like 'encyclopedia' allows us to compare poems like Davies of Hereford's and Sylvester's to work towards their similarities in structure and circumstances of composition: Davies of Hereford's poetry is at least 'encyclopedic' in its content, in that it ranges between canonical sources of knowledge, but not in structure.

Devine Weekes also contains 'didactic' elements without being rigidly pedagogical.⁴⁵ Alastair Fowler has discussed Sylvester's translation as a 'didactic kind' of poem, alongside such works as Dionysius Cato's *Distichia* (printed multiple times in Latin), Marcellus Stellatus Palingenius' *Zodiacus Vitae* (used as a textbook in schools, and first published in Barnaby Googe's translation in 1560), Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and Virgil's *Georgics*.⁴⁶ Only *Zodiacus Vitae* contains the same cosmological ambition as *Devine Weekes* and adopted a comparable structural device (with the twelve zodiac signs), though Sylvester's work was not read in formal educational settings. *Devine Weekes* was more intended for private study, as was a poem like Robert Underwood's *New Anatomie* (London, 1605, reprinted as *The Little World* in 1612), which contains a dream vision modelled on a biblical source (Ecclesiastes, Chapter 12; A1v) that compares the body to a house and a city which is 'wittie, and pleasant to be read, and profitable to be regarded' (1612 edition, titlepage).

The possibility of encapsulating such poetry under a single term looks ever less likely if we roam more widely. There are several other works with generic similarities to *Devine Weekes* that also imitate Sylvester's style. Edward Cooke's *Bartas Junior* (1631) is a version of humankind's creation in heroic couplets with similar rhetorical figures and diction to *Devine Weekes*. In *Little Timothie his Lesson* (1611; repr. 1632, 1699 and 1716; see Chapter 3.iii above) Edmund Graile acknowledged Du Bartas and Sylvester as literary models (A4v) for his

⁴⁴ 'a discourse about an infinitely diverse discourse'. Miernowski, *Dialectique et connaissance*, p. 117.

⁴⁵ On Renaissance didactic literature, see *What Nature Does Not Teach*, ed. by Juanita Feros Ruys (Turnhout and Abingdon, 2008) and *Didactic Literature in England, 1500-1800*, ed. by Natasha Glaisyer and Sara Pennell (Aldershot, 2003).

⁴⁶ Fowler, 'Didactic Kinds' (and on genre theory in general, *Kinds of Literature* (Oxford, 1985)).

‘Summary relation of the Historicall part of holy Scripture, plainly and familiarly comprised in Meeter’ (titlepage). Joseph Fletcher’s pentameter account of mankind’s destiny, *The Historie of the Perfect-Cursed-Blessed Man* (1628) is coloured by Sylvester’s example. Thomas Peyton’s *The Glasse of Time* (1620), which was dedicated to Prince Charles, gives an overview of the first two historical ages in heroic couplets, also with argument stanzas and marginalia to guide readers. John Norden’s poems *Vicissitudo Rerum* (1600, reprinted as *A Storehouse of Varieties* in 1601) and *Labyrinth of Mans Life* (1614) explore cosmological and moral questions in rhyme royal and heroic couplets respectively.⁴⁷ Benlowes’s *Theophila* (1652; Du Bartas praised on G1r) and Joseph Beaumont’s *Psyche* (1648) are later poems that offer extended meditations on divine love and the soul’s progress, and could also be associated with the renewal of divine poetry led by Du Bartas and his English translators.

All of these examples show, just by listing them, that Sylvester’s translation belonged within a tradition of religious poetry that used contemporary knowledge to gain a more objective understanding of Christian truth, within a literary mode whose formal structures and stylistic register share more in common with *Devine Weekes* (and, by extension, the P-voice) than *Paradise Lost* (and the J-voice). *Devine Weekes* was lauded as an innovative fusion of divine poetry and knowledge in a form that was comprehensive, accessible and entertaining, but it seems unlikely that the poems alone launched this wider movement, though they offered a strong precedent. The *Semaines* were a pioneering example of syncretic Protestant poetry that drew deeply on non-fictional sources to develop a vision of the universe and its creation of startling breadth. They were public religious poems, remarkable for how closely they were interwoven within contemporary literary culture. In witnessing how the *Semaines* were read, interpreted and imitated throughout this thesis, I hope to have shed new light on how early modern non-lyric scriptural poetry was conceived, perceived and received.

⁴⁷ There has been some debate as to whether the surveyor and devotional writer are the same person; see Mary Hampson Patterson, *Domesticating the Renaissance* (Madison, N.J., 2007), 327-33.

The first conclusion to draw about the *Semaines*' place in English literature is that the francophone criticism surveyed in the introduction was right to emphasize the generic variety and informational uses of the poems. The *Semaines* are almost certainly the most prominent example of instructive, Scripture-based religious poetry in late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century Europe, and their influence is present indirectly in many later religious poems which offered modernizing interpretations of Scripture. Their unusual popularity in England and Scotland was undoubtedly linked to the poems' diplomatic associations in the late-sixteenth century and their symbolic status as Calvinist religious epics in Jacobean England. While this final chapter has illustrated the *Semaines*' appeal as a possible model for divine philosophical poetry, it has not shown that their ubiquity made them a conscious model for later writers, outside of contextually specific circumstances. This thesis has argued for the literary historical importance of Du Bartas' *Semaines* not just by presenting a narrative account of different responses, but by showing how studying the processes of reception adjusts our critical understanding of the poems' significance over time. More than most poems, their appeal only becomes apparent after sensitive historicized analysis of contemporary responses: some knowledge of the rhetorical, practical, theological, political and bibliographical contexts of the poem is almost essential for recognizing their importance, and perhaps for appreciating them today as well.

The *Semaines* epitomize a contemporary desire to synthesize different fields of knowledge, both in how the poems were written and translated, and in how readers subsequently took them apart. They were probably the final poems in Europe genuinely valued for presenting a poetic vision of total coherence in theological, political and epistemological affairs and methods. The poets surveyed in this chapter held a shared cultural assumption about how far such unity was possible, and some drew on the *Semaines* when writing their own verse. A 'Bartasian poetics' is not a fixed structure of early modern verse composition, but a conceptual framework for large poems open to incorporating fragments of

verse and text that are subsequently dispersed into new contexts. The *Semaines* were central works in the endless circulation of ideas, quotations, and memorable phrases from Scripture, vernacular poetry and prose in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The poems were revered less for what they represented or how they could be admired from a distance, and more for the textual collaboration, assimilation and accumulation they enabled between English-speaking writers and Du Bartas. These relationships were the defining aspect of Du Bartas' and his poetry's contemporary popularity in England and Scotland observed in this thesis: the poems were cherished and adapted for many purposes and in different spheres while it remained topical and desirable to do so.

Conclusion

The diverse, context-sensitive readings of the *Semaines* recorded in this thesis can only be consolidated into a single interpretation or historical narrative by placing the poems' availability for response and re-use at the very heart of any account of Du Bartas' extraordinary success in late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England and Scotland. These heriocal or epic poems won the support of many readers, helped by James VI and I's enthusiasm and a translation by Josuah Sylvester that made the whole *Semaines* available in English where earlier translators had offered partial, more restricted versions. 'The *Semaines*' still did not become an entirely stable concept, however, for readers focused on particular sections of the poems and made fluid connections with other works by Du Bartas and Sylvester. The poem's great syncretism and idealism generated many practical applications in prose and verse, including several obscure works, like Browne's *Sacred Poems* and Boyd's *Zions Flowers*, where the *Semaines* are a constitutive influence. It is worthwhile thinking about a 'Bartasian poetics' in so far as other Christian humanist poets who sought to honour God through sacred poetry inspired by secular learning also imitated Du Bartas' strategies for compiling information from Scripture and other sources, as well the *Semaines*' rhetoric and structures. Such a poetics is characterized by the fluid negotiation between the *Semaines*, their sources and later works that take them as source: the poems were a great reservoir of divine and philosophical verse.

John Dryden's remark that Sylvester's translation was 'abominable Fustian' in the 1681 *Spanish Fryar* (A3r) may indicate that opinion was turning against the *Semaines* towards the end of the seventeenth century, yet the *Semaines*' popularity between 1640 to 1700 has been underestimated; there are around 90 references to Du Bartas in printed treatises and other prose works from this period, few of which have been discussed.¹ The poems' continued

¹ Figures based on EEBO-TCP keyword searches; see Chapter 3, footnote 3.

presence may be much stronger in non-fictional prose than in poetry. Indeed, the *Semaines* may only have a weak relationship with Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which is a more assertively individualistic work than anything Du Bartas wrote. It would be worth looking closely at Milton's certain references to Du Bartas and his use of blank verse to determine whether he intentionally broke away from the more socially and imaginatively conservative heroic couplets that Sylvester had helped to make famous. Anne Bradstreet's *Quarternions* (1678) and Lucy Hutchinson's *Order and Disorder* (1677) should also be examined when investigating the *Semaines*' continued poetic influence, as should the reasons why Du Bartas' Christian humanism was ultimately driven to obsolescence.

The *Semaines* and their British responses in print and manuscript are valuable evidence for reconstructing Renaissance habits of reading and writing. By presenting a more historicized appreciation of these poems, this thesis has shown that the *Semaines* are embedded in Renaissance literary culture, and are not a deviation from it. Adrienne Rich, one of the few twentieth-century writers to praise Du Bartas, captures something of this historical appeal when describing Sylvester's translation as having 'a vitality of sheer conviction about it; one can understand its mesmeric attraction for an age unglutted by trivial or pseudo-momentous information'.² The poem is not an allegory, but is attractive in its simplicity: a writer in 1820, probably Charles Lamb, recommended the poems for those 'who are fond of poetry in its innocence and repose,—who love it when it treats of the quiet and elementary beauties of the external world, or when it describes the simple manners of mankind in an early state'.³ This thesis has shown that this instinctive admiration for the *Semaines*' learning and moral sincerity corresponded in the seventeenth century to a system of ideas that synthesized Calvinism, humanism and sympathy for the monarch, and facilitated a tremendous breadth of literary engagement.

² *Works of Anne Bradstreet*, ed. by Jeannine Hensley (Cambridge, MA, 1967), p. xii.

³ 'Observations on Sylvester's Du Bartas, with Specimens', *Olliers Literary Miscellany in Prose and Verse* 1 (1820), pp. 62-79 (p. 62). The ascription to Lamb is based on a loose-leaf note by H. Buxton Forman in the Harvard copy.

Responses to the *Semaines* are a stimulus to more sensitive interpretations of early modern non-lyric divine poetry more generally. *Devine Weekes* is the most visible work within a neglected corpus of early modern printed divine and religious poetry that exploited the compatibility between humanist learning and Scripture. These poems parallel different aspects of Sylvester's translation: its seven-day structure; its broadly royalist, ecclesiologically conservative assumptions; catalogues of information; textual apparatus such as marginalia; and a tendency to be read discontinuously. In order to pursue their wider significance in early modern religious literature, we would need to have a better sense of how these other works use Scripture and other source material, their literary models, their publication history, their readership, how they were read and how they circulated in print and manuscript. The analogues to *Devine Weekes* introduced in the final chapter illustrate how much has yet to be recovered about divine poetry in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the need for subtler distinctions between its different forms. The *Semaines* is an important case study within the larger project of observing how and why early modern writers imitated Scripture.

This thesis has uncovered new directions for understanding the textuality of early modern religious culture; i.e. how doctrine and belief were negotiated and enacted through textual engagements.⁴ Despite important studies that have shown the scriptural basis of early modern divine poetry, there is still much to learn about how and why English and Scottish poets interacted with the Bible in literary contexts.⁵ Du Bartas is one of several Huguenot and Catholic poets writing in French whose contribution to British religious and literary culture has been underestimated. Sylvester and other English readers of Pibrac's *Quatrains*, Jean Bertaut's and Pierre Matthieu's poetry (see Chapter 3.iii) all deserve further attention, as does the wider Huguenot presence in English religious verse: indeed, further work on Sylvester's

⁴ See, for example, Brian Cummings, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation* (Oxford, 2002); Katrin Ettenhuber, *Donne's Augustine* (Oxford, 2011).

⁵ Studies in this area include: Philip West, *Henry Vaughan's Silex Scintillans* (Oxford and New York, 2001); Elizabeth Clarke, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs* (Basingstoke, 2011); and David Norton, *A History of the Bible as Literature: Volume One* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 237-73.

literary career and professional networks would quickly bring to light other poets whose presence in England has barely been recognized, including Odet de la Noue, Pierre Duval, Godfrey Goodwin, Henry Smith and Girolamo Fracastoro, as well as Sylvester's literary associates like Robert Roche and John Vicars. The depth of the later connection between Francis Quarles and Sylvester deserves more attention too, particularly to discover how similar Quarles' scriptural poetry (which circulated widely in seventeenth-century manuscripts) was to the non-lyric poems discussed in this thesis; Zachary Boyd's manuscripts (Chapter 5.ii) also deserve much closer attention. A study of biblical verse paraphrase in early Stuart England would provide a good focus for research that extended the findings of this thesis by showing how Du Bartas' *Judith* and the manifesto in 'L'Uranie' inspired these and other divine poems based on biblical narratives. The layered intertextuality in a work like Sylvester's *Job Triumphant*, a 'metaphrase' of Job based on a paraphrase by Sébastien Rouillard, illustrates the complex exchanges involved in early modern biblical responses in verse that this thesis has begun to elucidate.⁶

In seventeenth-century Britain, the Bible remained a crucial textual site for negotiating an individual's stance on authorship, originality, divine inspiration and religious doctrine. The *Semaines* help us to understand how individual readers explored their relationship with secular learning and the Christian faith by studying, translating and imitating vernacular religious poetry.

⁶ Vaganay, 'L'oeuvre d'un évêque français', 110.

Appendix: Synopsis of Du Bartas' *Semaines*

Titles as found in Holmes's edition and Sylvester's *Devine Weekes*. Year of publication is for the first French edition. Biblical cross-references are based on notes in Snyder's edition.

La Sepmaine ou Creation du Monde (1578)

- Le Premier Jour (I.i; the First Day): Creation, day and night (Gen. 1:1-5)
- Le Second Jour (I.ii; the Second Day): four elements (water, air, earth, fire; Gen. 1:6-8)
- Le Troisiesme Jour (I.iii; the Third Day): land, seas, vegetation (Gen. 1:9-13)
- Le Quatriesme Jour (I.iv; the Fourth Day): stars, sun (Gen. 1:14-19)
- Le Cinquiesme Jour (I.v; the Fifth Day): sea creatures and birds (Gen. 1:20-23)
- Le Sixiesme Jour (I.vi; the Sixth Day): land animals and humans (Gen. 1:24-31)
- Le Septiesme Jour (I.vii; the Seventh Day): God observes created world, Sabbath (Gen. 2:1-3)

La Seconde Semaine ou Enfance du Monde (1584-1603)

Premier Jour: Adam (II.i; 1584)

- Eden (II.i.1; Eden): Adam in the Garden (Gen. 2:4-17)
- L'Imposture (II.i.2; The Imposture): temptation, fall, exile (Gen. 3)
- Les Furies (II.i.3; The Furies): sickness, war, death, vices
- Les Artifices (II.i.4; The Handy-Crafts): trades, crafts, Cain and Abel (Gen. 4)

Deuxieme Jour: Noah (II.ii; 1584)

- L'Arche (II.ii.1; The Arke): ark, flood (Gen. 7-9)
- Babylone (II.ii.2; Babylon): tower of Babel, European languages and cultures (Gen. 11:1-9)
- Les Colonies (II.ii.3; The Colonies): new tribes and settlements
- Les Colomnes (II.ii.4; The Columnnes): Seth's Pillars, i.e. mathematics and astronomy

Troisieme Jour: Abraham (II.iii; 1591-1603)

- La Vocation (II.iii.1; The Vocation; 1603): destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 12-19)

Les Peres (II.iii.2; The Fathers; 1591): sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22: 1-18)

La Loy (II.iii.3; The Law; 1593): Moses, Exodus narrative (Exod., Numbers and Deut. 28-33)

Les Capitaines (II.iii.4; The Captains; 1603): Joshua, Deborah, Samuel (Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel 1-10)

Quatrieme Jour: David (II.iv; 1591-1603)

Les Trophées (II.iv.1; The Trophies; 1591): David crowned, Goliath, Bethshaba (1 Samuel 11-31, 2 Samuel)

La Magnificence (II.iv.2; The Magnificence; 1591): Solomon's reign, his temple (1 Kings 1-10, Wisdom of Solomon)

Le Schisme (II.iv.3; The Schisme; 1591/ 1603): Roboam, Jeroboam, Elijah, Elisha, Jonah (1 Kings 11-2 Kings 8, Jonah)

La Decadence (II.iv.4; The Decay; 1603): Monarchs from Ahab to Zedechiah (2 Kings 9-25 (2 Chronicles 21-36:21))

Addendum: Du Bartas' Visit to Scotland and England in 1587 This is a preprint version of an article published in *Notes and Queries* 59 (2012), 505-508. Available at: <http://nq.oxfordjournals.org/content/59/4/505/>

Urban Tigner Holmes and John Coridon Lyons pointed out that Du Bartas was travelling from England when he visited Scotland in 1587, declaring that he landed in England on 7 May and arrived in Scotland on the 25th, probably having travelled over water to Leith.¹ Closer inspection of the state papers, however, corrects this account and yields valuable new details about Du Bartas' itinerary. These findings make us more aware of the nature of Du Bartas' visit, his role as a conduit between the English, Scottish and Navarrese courts, and how his diplomatic service may have affected his poetry's early reception in England.

In a letter dated 30 March/ 9 April to Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's principal secretary, Du Pin (Henri de Navarre's secretary of state) vouched for Du Bartas' character:

You will learn from M. du Bartas, the bearer, the state of our affairs. His name and fame are known to all. You will know him by sight, and will find in his actions piety, uprightness and fidelity. The King has given him *congé* only that he may kiss the hands of the Queen your sovereign and dedicate himself to her service, not wishing him to go further unless it should be to fulfil what may be commanded him by her Majesty, counting all service done for her as greater than if done to himself. He is trusty and faithful; you may use him confidently in anything you judge fitting.²

A postscript informs Walsingham that Du Pin will 'leave it to M. du Bartas to tell you many particulars, that I may not weary you by a long letter'. Du Bartas was probably not with Walsingham in London during April, though: a letter from Paul Choart, Seigneur de Buzanval on 1 May informed Walsingham that Du Bartas had prepared a sonnet that day to present to him on behalf of the Queen.³ Du Bartas may well have arrived shortly afterwards, and took his leave in a meeting with the Queen on 8 May, as reported in a letter from Walsingham to

¹ Holmes et al., I, 20-1; citing Francisque Michel, *Les écossais en France, les français en Écosse* (London, 1862), II, 107-15.

² *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, 1558-1589*, ed. by Sophie Crawford Lomas (London, 1927), 21.1, 260-61.

³ Lomas (ed.), *Calendar*, p. 287.

Archibald Douglas (who was posing as Scottish ambassador in London).⁴ A meeting of the Privy Council on the same day, attended by Walsingham, led to Du Bartas and his company (which included his secretary Henri de Sponde, brother of the poet Jean), being issued with a passport for safe passage through England: he had ‘latelie come over into England to see her Majestie and the Realme, [and] did also, with her Majesties good favour and license, repaire from hence into the Realme of Scotland’.⁵

Travelling by the post horses mentioned in the passport, Du Bartas may well have taken two weeks to travel along the London-Holyhead road to James. A letter dated 12 May from Richard Douglas, who was in Edinburgh, to his brother Archibald comments that James’ ‘good meaning [towards Navarre] will increase at Du Bartas’ arrival’; the poet may not yet have arrived by 22 May, since another letter reports James’ excitement at the prospect of welcoming him, after hearing news contained in an earlier letter from Archibald on 3 May: ‘Of that his Majesty was so glad that he could not contain to say that he [Du Bartas] was the welcomest man that came to him this long time, which he should be about to let him understand at his arrival.’⁶ From these letters we can infer that Du Bartas was probably already in London on 3 May and that having left on the 8th or shortly afterwards by road, he arrived at Edinburgh Castle on about the 23rd.

Other letters sent between the Douglasses record that Du Bartas and James travelled up to Falkland on 27 May, and that on 7 June the French poet was ‘with his Majesty in very good credit’.⁷ Two letters dated 17 July indicate that Du Bartas’ Scottish visit was being monitored by Henri III and his ambassador, and by noblemen like the Earl of Mar.⁸ Roger

⁴ *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire*, ed. by S. R. Scargill-Bird (London, 1889), III, 253 (item 533). Herbert Maxwell, *A History of the House of Douglas* (London, 1902), I, 290-91.

⁵ *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, ed. by John Roche Dasent (London, 1897), xv, 73; Michel, *Les écossais en France*, p. 108.

⁶ Scargill-Bird (ed.), *Calendar*, pp. 254-5 (items 536 and 537).

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 259-62 (items 540 and 542).

⁸ *Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603*, ed. by William K. Boyd (Edinburgh, 1915), IX, 455 (item 368) and 452-3 (item 367).

Aston reported to Walsingham that the marriage negotiations were on-going in August, and a final letter written by Richard Douglas, contradicting Courcelles' account, records that Du Bartas had not yet left Scotland on 22 September, but was awaiting a fair wind in order to sail home from Dumbarton.⁹

In retracing the details of Du Bartas' embassy to England and Scotland, we learn that he did not just travel to Scotland to discuss a royal marriage, but met more widely with members of the Elizabethan court, helping to ease tensions after the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, which had happened just three months earlier. He probably kissed Elizabeth's hand, and was certainly acquainted with Walsingham. He was a trusted agent in diplomatic communications between England, Scotland and France during a difficult period in relations between the three. Du Bartas' visit to England shows that the French poet's popularity was not solely nurtured at the Jacobean Scottish Court, but that he was certainly known personally both as emissary and poet south of the border as well in the 1580s. Du Bartas' example indicates new directions, following recent work by Timothy Hampton and others, for pursuing relations between French, Scottish and English literature and late-sixteenth century diplomatic culture.¹⁰

⁹ Boyd (ed.), *Calendar*, p. 478 (item 387) and Scargill-Bird (ed.), *Calendar*, p. 282 (item 587).

¹⁰ Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy* (Ithaca, N.Y., and London, 2009) and see, for example, *Diplomacy in Early Modern Culture*, ed. by Robyn Adams and Rosanna Cox (Basingstoke, 2011).

Bibliography of Works Cited

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University

Osborn b137: Edward Sparke, *Learned and Pious Poems*.

Osborn b148: William Smith's commonplace book, dated 5 August 1665.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Add. B. 8: notebook of Henry Coley.

Add. C.281: Robert Barret, *The Sacred Warr*.

Ashmole 51: Ann Bowyer's commonplace book.

Bodley 165: containing James VI's translations.

Eng. poet. e. 40: mid-eighteenth century verse miscellany.

Eng. poet. f. 9: verse miscellany copied by Henry Champernowne, c. 1623.

Eng. poet. f. 25: notebook, probably compiled by Edward Natley, c. 1635-41.

Rawl. poet. 117: verse miscellany copied by Christopher Wasse, seventeenth century.

Rawl. poet. 142: commonplace book, c. 1630-50.

Rawl. poet. 153: verse miscellany, c. 1640.

Rawl. poet. 160: verse miscellany, c. 1640.

Tanner 169: commonplace book of Sir Stephen Powle.

British Library, London

Add. 10310: transcriptions from Zachary Boyd's *Zion's Flowers*.

Add. 24195: containing James VI's translations.

Add. 25707: seventeenth-century verse miscellany.

Add. 34781: transcriptions from Boyd's *Zion's Flowers*.

Add. 36748: Tristram Risdon, *Peritinerary of Devon*, c. 1633.

Add. 81083: William Scott, *Model of Poesy* and translations from *La Sepmaine*.

Egerton 923: seventeenth-century verse miscellany.

Harleian 7518: transcriptions from Boyd's *Zion's Flowers*.

Harleian 7578: transcription of *Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace*.

Royal 17 A 41: presentation copy of Sylvester's translation of 'Les Colonies'.

Stowe 962: seventeenth-century verse miscellany.

Cambridge University Library

Add. 8460: miscellany in verse and prose by Elizabeth Lyttelton (c. 1665-1714)

[<http://www.perditamanuscripts.amdigital.co.uk/collections/doc-detail-search.aspx?documentid=20457§ionid=20531&imageid=42359&previous=-1&searchmode=true>].

Folger Shakespeare Library; Washington, D.C.

V.b.224: Robert Barret, translations from *La Seconde Semaine*.

V.b.303: assorted parliamentary and legal documents.

V.a.339: miscellany of Joseph Hall (c. 1650; probably not bishop of that name), with forgeries by John Payne Collier.

V.a.245: verse miscellany (c. 1640).

V.a.345: verse miscellany (c. 1630).

W.b.455: collection of verse epitaphs (c. 1705).

Glasgow University Library

Gen 151: transcriptions from Zachary Boyd's *Zion's Flowers*.

Gen 386: miscellaneous sermons by Boyd.

Gen 393-94: Boyd, *Zion's Flowers*.

Gen 400: Boyd, *Four Evangelists*.

Gen 401: Boyd, *English Academie*.

Houghton Library, Harvard University

Eng 966.7: commonplace book containing poems by John Donne.

Leeds University Library

Lt 91: seventeenth-century verse miscellany, possibly by Henry Gould

[http://scriptorium.english.cam.ac.uk/manuscripts/images/index.php?ms=Leeds_Lt_91&page=1].

Mitchell Library, Glasgow

33 (numbered series): transcriptions from Boyd's *Zion's Flowers*.

Princeton University Library

RTC01 no. 62: Elizabeth Isham's 'Book of Remembrance'

[<http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/ren/projects/isham>].

Public Records Office

PROB 11/112: will of James Bisse, Doctor of Divinity, Canon Residentary of the Cathedral Church of Wells, Somerset.

PROB 11/188, fol. 11: will of Sir James Cambell.

Printed Works

Acts of the Privy Council of England: vol. 15, ed. by John Roche Dasent. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1897.

Adams, Thomas, *The Happines of the Church*. London, 1619; ESTC 120.

Allott, Robert, *Englands Parnassus*. London, 1600; ESTC 380.

——— *England's Parnassus*, ed. by Charles Crawford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

The Two Bookees of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Advancement of Learning, Divine and Humane. London, 1605; ESTC 1164.

Barnfield, Richard, *Orpheus: his Journey to Hell*. London, 1595; ESTC 1060.

Baynes, Paul, *An Epitomie of Mans Misery and Deliuerie*. London, 1619; ESTC 1641.

- Benlowes, Edward, *Theophila*. London, 1652; Wing B1879.
- Bloys, William, *Meditations upon the XLII Psalme*. London, 1632; ESTC 3140.
- Bodenham, John, *Bodenham's Belvédère or The Garden of the Muses*. London, 1600; ESTC 3189.
- Bolton, Robert, *Some Generall Directions for a Comfortable Walking with God*. London, 1626; ESTC 3251.
- Boyd, Zachary, *Battle of Newburne*. Glasgow, 1643; Wing B142.
- *Garden of Zion*. Glasgow, 1644; Wing B3906.
- *Four Poems from "Zion's Flowers"*, ed. by Gabriel Neil. Glasgow, 1855.
- Boys, John, *An Exposition of the Proper Psalms used in our Liturgie*. London, 1616; ESTC 3458.
- Bradstreet, Anne, *Several Poems*. Boston, 1678; Wing B4166.
- Works of Anne Bradstreet*, ed. by Jeannine Hensley. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1967.
- Brathwaite, Richard, *The English Gentleman*. London, 1630; ESTC 3563.
- Breton, Nicholas, *The Soules Immortale Crowne Consisting of Seaven Glorious Graces*. London, 1605; ESTC 3701.
- Browne, Edward, *Description of an Annuall World and Sacred Poems, Or Briefe Meditations, Of the day in generall and of all the dayes in the weeke*. London, 1641; Wing B5102, B5102A and B5106.
- Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire*, ed. by S. R. Scargill-Bird. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1889.
- Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603: vol. 9*, ed. by William K. Boyd. Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1915.
- Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, 1558-1589: vol. 21.1*, ed. by Sophie Crawford Lomas. London: Longman, 1927.
- Chapman, George, *Hymnus in Noctem*. London, 1594; ESTC 4990.
- Poems of George Chapman*, ed. by Phyllis Brooks Bartlett. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- The Workes of our Ancient and Lerved English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer*. London, 1602; ESTC 5080.
- Churchyard, Thomas, *Churchyards Challenge*. London, 1593; ESTC 5220.

- *A Muscicall Consort of Heavenly Harmonie (compounded out of manie parts of musicke) called Churchyards Charitie*. London, 1595; ESTC 5245.
- Clark, John, *Formular Oratione*. London, 1637; ESTC 5355.
- Colvil, Samuel, *Mock Poem, or, Whiggs Supplication*. London, 1681; Wing C5426.
- Cooke, Edward, *Bartas Junior*. London, 1631; ESTC 5667.
- Crompe, John, *Collections out of S. Augustine and some few other Latine writers upon the first part of the Apostles Creed*. London, 1638; ESTC 6048.
- Dalechamp, Caleb, *Artis poeticae et versificatoriae encomium* (1624), in *Latin Treatises on Poetry from Renaissance England*, ed. and trans. by J. W. Binns. Signal Mountain, TN: Summertown Texts, 1999.
- Darcie, Abraham, *The Honour of the Ladies: or, a True Description of Their Noble Perfections*. London, 1622; ESTC 6271.
- The Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. by Robert Krueger, with introduction and commentary by Ruby Nesmer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Davies of Hereford, John, *Mirum in Modum*. London, 1602; ESTC 6336.
- *Microcosmos*. London, 1603; ESTC 6333.
- *Summa Totalis*. London, 1607; ESTC 6337.
- Complete Works of John Davies of Hereford*, ed. by Alexander Grosart, 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1878; repr. 1986.
- Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden*, ed. by L. E. Kastner, 2 vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1913.
- Dryden, John, *The Spanish Fryar, or, The Double Discovery*. London, 1681; Wing D2368.
- The Works of Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur Du Bartas: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and Variants*, ed. by Urban Tigner Holmes, John Coriden Lyons and Robert White Linker, 3 vols. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935-38; repr. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1977.
- *La Semaine (texte de 1581)*, ed. by Yvonne Bellenger. Paris: Nizet, 1981.
- *La Seconde Semaine (1584)*, ed. by Yvonne Bellenger. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1991.

- *Les Suites de la Seconde Semaine*, ed. by Yvonne Bellenger. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1994.
- *The Historie of Judith in Forme of a Poeme*, trans. by Thomas Hudson. Edinburgh, 1584; ESTC 21671.
- *Thomas Hudson's Historie of Judith*, ed. by James Craigie. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1941.
- *L'Uranie ou Muse Celeste de G. de Saluste Seigneur du Bartas*, trans. by Robert Ashley. London, 1589; ESTC 21673.
- *A Canticle of the Victorie obtained by the French King, Henrie the fourth, at Yvry*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1590; ESTC 21669.
- *Guilielmi Salustii Bartassii Hebdomas*, trans. by Gabriel de Lerm. London, 1591; ESTC 21656.
- *The Triumph of Faith, The Sacrifice of Isaac, The Ship-Wracke of Jonas. With a song of the victorie obtained by the French king, at Yvry*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1592; ESTC 21672.
- *The First Day of the Worldes Creation: or of the First Weeke of that most Christian poet, W. Salustius, Lord of Bartas*, trans. by anon.. London, 1595; ESTC 21658 and 21658.5.
- *Babilon, a part of the Seconde weeke of Guillaume de Saluste seigneur du Bartas, with the commentarie, and marginall notes of S.G.S.*, trans. by William Lisle. London, 1595; ESTC 21662 and 21662a.
- *The Colonies of Bartas*, trans. by William Lisle. London, 1598; ESTC 21670.
- *The Second Weeke or Childhood of the World, of the noble, learned and divine Salustius, Lord of Bartas*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1598; ESTC 21661.5.
- *Bartasias; qui de Mundi Creatione Libri Septem*, trans. by Adriaan Damman. Edinburgh, 1600; ESTC 21657.
- *The Second Day of the First Weeke*, trans. by Thomas Winter. London, 1603; ESTC 21659.
- *The Third Dayes Creation*. London, 1604; ESTC 21660.

- *Devine Weekes, and Workes*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1605; *ESTC* 21649, 21649a and 21649a.5.
- *Devine Weekes, and Workes*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1608; *ESTC* 21650.
- *Du Bartas his Devine Weekes and Workes*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1611; *ESTC* 21651.
- *Du Bartas his Devine Weekes and Workes*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1613; *ESTC* 21652.
- *Los siete dias de la semana, sobre la criacion del Mundo.*, trans. by Francisco (Josepho?) de Cáceres. Amsterdam, 1613.
- *Du Bartas his Divine Weekes, and Workes*. London, 1621; *ESTC* 21653.
- *Die Andere Woche* ('The Second Week'), trans. by Tobias Hübner. Köthen, 1622.
- *Part of Du Bartas English and French*, trans. by William Lisle. London, 1625; *ESTC* 21663.
- *Erste Woche* ('The First Week'), trans. by Tobias Hübner. Leipzig, 1631.
- *Du Bartas his Divine Weekes, and Workes*. London, 1633; *ESTC* 21654.
- *Foure Bookes of Du Bartas*, trans. by William Lisle. London, 1637; *ESTC* 21663a.5.
- *Die Erste und Andere Woche* ('First and Second Weeks'), trans. by Tobias Hübner. Köthen, 1640.
- *Du Bartas his Divine Weekes, and Workes with all the other workes*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1641; Wing D2405.
- *The Ark. A Poem*, trans. by Josiah Burchett. London, 1714.
- *The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste, Sieur du Bartas*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester, ed. by Susan Snyder, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Eliot, John, *The Suruay or Topographical Description of France*. London, 1592; *ESTC* 7575.
- *Ortho-epia Gallica*. London, 1593; *ESTC* 7574.
- Eronnelle, Pierre, *The French Garden*. London; 1621; *ESTC* 10514.
- Evans, Edward, *Verba Dierum, or, The dayes report of Gods glory*. Oxford, 1615; *ESTC* 10584.
- Evans, John, *Evance. 1613. A new almanacke and prognostication*. London, 1613; *ESTC* 440.

- *New Almanacke and Prognostication*. London, 1630; ESTC 441.6.
- Favyn, André, *The Theater of Honour and Knight-hood*, trans. by Anthony Munday (?). London, 1623; ESTC 10717.
- Flecknoe, Richard, *Miscellania or, poems of all sorts, with divers other pieces*. London, 1653; Wing F1231.
- Fletcher, Joseph, *The Historie of the Perfect-Cursed-Blessed Man*. London, 1628; ESTC 11078.
- Fletcher, Phineas, *The Purple Island*. Cambridge, 1633; ESTC 11082.
- Fletcher, Giles and Phineas, *Poetical Works*, ed. by Frederick Boas, 2 vols. London and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908-09.
- Foster, Thomas, *Plouto-Mastix*. London, 1631; ESTC 11202.
- Fotherby, Martin, *Atheomastix clearing Foure Truthes, against Atheists and Infidels*. London, 1622; ESTC 11205.
- The Works of William Fowler*, ed. by H. W. Meikle, J. Craigie and J. Purves, 3 vols. Edinburgh, W. Blackwood and Sons, 1914.
- Fraunce, Abraham, *The Arcadian Rhetorike*. London, 1588; ESTC 11338.
- Gainsford, Thomas, *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittain*. London, 1610; ESTC 11526.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, *Weimarer Klassik: 1798-1806: Sämtliche Werke, vol. 6.1*, ed. by Victor Lange. Munich: Hauser, 1986.
- ‘Rameaus Neffe’ in *Leben des Benvenuto Cellini; Diderots Versuch über die Malerei; Rameaus Neffe: Sämtliche Werke, vol. 7*, ed. by Norbert Miller and John Neubauer. Munich: Hauser, 1991.
- Gokin, Thomas, *Meditations upon the Lords Prayer*. London, 1624; ESTC 11983.
- Gordon, Patrick, *The Famous Historie of the Renowned and Valiant Prince Robert surnamed the Bruce King of Scotland etc.* Dort, 1615; ESTC 12066.
- Goulart, Simon, *A Learned Summary upon the Famous Poeme (the first and second Weeke) of William of Saluste lord of Bartas*, trans. by Thomas Lodge. London, 1621; ESTC 21666; repr. 1637 (ESTC 21667) and 1638 (ESTC 21668).
- Graile, Edmond, *Little Timothe his Lesson*. London, 1611; ESTC 12171; repr. 1632 (ESTC 12172), 1699 (Wing 1476A) and 1716.

- anon., *Haec-vir: or, The Womanish-Man*. London, 1620; ESTC 12599.
- Hakewill, George, *An Apologie of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World*. London, 1627; ESTC 12611; expanded edition, London, 1635; ESTC 12613.
- Hall, Joseph, *Virgidemiarum*. London, 1597; ESTC 12716.
- The Poems of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter and Norwich*, ed. by Arnold Davenport. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1969.
- Harcourt, Robert, *A Relation of a Voyage to Guiana*. London, 1613; ESTC 12754.
- Hart, James, *Klinike, or The Diet of the Diseased*. London, 1633; ESTC 12888.
- Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, ed. by Charles G. C. Moore-Smith. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1913.
- *Fovre Letters, and certaine Sonnets*. 1592; ESTC 12900; repr. Plaistow: Curwen Press, 1922.
- *Pierces Supererogation*. London, 1593; ESTC 12903.
- Heylyn, Peter, *Mikrocosmos*. Oxford, 1625; ESTC 13277.
- Hilton, John, *Catch that Catch Can*, ed. by John Playford. London, 1652; Wing H2036.
- Hinde, Samuel, *A Free-will Offering*. London, 1634; ESTC 13511.
- Hoskins, John, *Directions for Speech and Style*, ed. by Hoyt H. Hudson. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935.
- The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638*, ed. by Louise Brown Osborn. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.
- Hume, Alexander, *Hymnes*. Edinburgh, 1599; ESTC 13942.
- Hunt, Nicolas, *The New-Borne Christian*. London, 1631; ESTC 13990.
- Jackson, John, *Ecclesiastes, The Worthy Church-man*. London, 1628; ESTC 14297.
- James VI and I, *His Majesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres*. Edinburgh, 1591; ESTC 14379.
- *The True Lawe of Free Monarchies*. Edinburgh, 1598; ESTC 14409.
- *Lusus Regius, Being Poems and Other Pieces*. Westminster: Constable, 1901.

- The Basilicon Doron of King James VI*, ed. by James Craigie, 2 vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1944.
- The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. by James Craigie, 2 vols. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1955.
- Ben Jonson: Works*, ed. by C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52.
- Lodge, Thomas, *A Fig for Momus*. London, 1595; ESTC 16658.
- *Wits Miserie*. London, 1596; ESTC 16677.
- The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe, Volume V: 'Tamburlaine the Great' and 'The Massacre at Paris'*, ed. by Edward J. Esche and David Fuller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- The Poems of John Marston*, ed. by Arnold Davenport. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1961.
- Martin, James, *Via Regia. The Kings Way to Heaven*. London, 1615; ESTC 17509.
- The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith. London: Pearson Longman, 2003.
- Milton, John, *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler, 2nd edition. Harlow: Longman, 2007.
- Monro, Robert, *Monro his Expedition with the Worthy Scots Regiment (called Mac-Keyes Regiment) levied in August 1626*. London, 1637; ESTC 18022.
- Montaigne, Michel de, *The Essayes*, trans. by John Florio. London, 1603; ESTC 18041.
- Nash, Thomas, *Quaternio: or, a Fourfold Way to a Happy Life*. London, 1633; ESTC 18382.
- *Miscelanea or A Fourefold Way to a Happie Life*. London, 1639; ESTC 18384.
- The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. by R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1910.
- Nebuchadnezzars Fierie Furnace* [by Zachary Boyd], ed. by Margarete Rösler. Louvain: Ch. Uystpruyst, 1936.
- Oxford, University of, *Oxoniensis Academiae funebre officium in memoriam honoratissimam serenissimam et beatissimam Elisabethae, nuper Angliae, Francia, et Hiberniae Reginae*. Oxford, 1603; ESTC 19018.

- *Academiae Oxoniensis pietas erga serenissimum et potentissimum Iacobum Angliæ Scotiæ Franciæ et Hiberniæ Regem, fidei defensorem, beatissimæ Elisabethæ nuper Reginæ legitimè & auspiciatissimè succedentem*. Oxford, 1603; ESTC 19019.
- anon., *The Three Parnassus Plays (1598-1601)*, ed. by J. B. Leishman. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1949.
- Peele, George, *The Love of David and Faire Bethsabe, with the Tragedie of Absolon*. London, 1599; ESTC 19540.
- *The Love of David and Faire Bethsabe, with the Tragedie of Absolon*, ed. by Elmer Blistein, in *The Dramatic Works of George Peele*, ed. by R. Mark Benbow et al., 3 vols. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970, III.
- Prynne, William, *Histrion-mastix*. London, 1633; ESTC 20464.
- Purchas, Samuel, *Purchas his Pilgrimage*. London, 1613; ESTC 20505.
- Rogers, Nehemiah, *A Strange Vineyard in Palaestina in an exposition of Isaiahs parabolical song of the beloued, discovered*. London, 1623; ESTC 21199.
- Rowlands (Verstegan), Richard, *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*. Antwerp, 1605; ESTC 21361.
- Sanford, John, *Le Guichet François*. London; 1604; ESTC 21736.
- Selden, John, *Tithes of Honour*. London, 1614; ESTC 22177.
- Simson, Archibald, *Heptameron, the Seven Dayes*. Saint Andrews, 1621; ESTC 22566.
- Southey, Robert, *The Doctor* (1848), ed. by Maurice H. Fitzgerald. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1930.
- Spenser Variorum: Minor Poems, vol. 1*, ed. by Charles Grosvenor Osgood and Henry Gibbons Lotspeich. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1943.
- Poems of John Stewart of Baldynneis*, ed. by Thomas Crockett, 2 vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1913.
- Stoneham, Matthew, *Two Sermons of Direction for Judges and Magistrates*. London, 1608; ESTC 23290.
- Stow, John, *Survey of London*. London, 1618; ESTC 23344.

Stradling, Sir John, *Divine Poemes in Seven Severall Classes. Written to his most excellent Majestie Charles, by the grace of God King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, etc.* London, 1625; ESTC 23353.

Swan, John, *Speculum Mundi*. Cambridge; 1635; ESTC 23516.

Sylvester, Josuah, *The Parliament of Vertues Royal*. London, 1614; ESTC 23581.

————— *The Second Session of the Parliament of Vertues Reall*. London, 1615; ESTC 23582.

————— *Complete Works*, ed. by Alexander B. Grosart, 2 vols. 1880; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969.

anon., *'The Taming of a Shrew': Being the Original of Shakespeare's 'Taming of the Shrew'*, ed. by Frederick S. Boas. London: Chatto and Windus, 1908.

————— *The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto*, ed. by Stephen Roy Miller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Valentine, Henry, *Foure Sea-Sermons*. London, 1635; ESTC 24574.

Vaughan, William, *The Arraignment of Slander Perjury Blasphemy, and other Malicious Sinnes shewing Sundry Examples of Gods Judgements against the Ofenders*. London, 1630; ESTC 24623.

Wanley, Nathaniel, *The Wonders of the Little World or, A General History of Man*. London, 1673; Wing W709.

Ward, Samuel, *A Coal from the Altar, to Kindle the Holy Fire of Zeale*. London, 1615; ESTC 25039.

Zouch, Richard, *The Dove*. London, 1613; ESTC 26130.

Other Sources

Pre-1800

Acevedo, Alonso de, *Creacion del Mundo*. Rome, 1615.

Alexander, William, *Medulla historiae Scoticae*. London, 1685; Wing A917.

Arber, Edward, ed., *A Transcript of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.*, 5 vols. London, 1875-91.

Aristotle, *Poetics*, ed. by D. W. Lucas. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1968; repr. 1990.

Ascham, Roger, *The Schoolemaster*. London, 1570; ESTC 832.

- Augustine, Saint, *City of God*, trans. by Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin, 1972; re-issued, 2003.
- Bacon, Francis, *Essayes. Religious Meditations. Places of Perswasion and Dissawsion. Seene and Allowed*. London: 1597; ESTC 1137.
- *Bibliotheca Baconia, or, A collection of choice English books all in folio*. London, 1686; Wing B273.
- Banister, John, *Historie of Man*. London, 1578; ESTC 1359.
- Barret, Robert, *The Theorike and Practike of Modern Warre*. London, 1598; ESTC 150.
- Beaumont, Joseph, *Psyche*. London, 1648; Wing B1625.
- Bentley, Thomas, *Monument of Matrones*. London, 1582; ESTC 1892.
- Boyd, Zachary, *The Last Battell of the Soule in Death*. Edinburgh, 1628; ESTC 3446a.5.
- *Cleare Forme of Catechising, before the giving of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. Glasgow, 1639; ESTC 3446.
- *The Songs of the Old and New Testament in Meeter*. Glasgow, 1648; Wing B3910.
- Selected Sermons of Zachary Boyd*, ed. by David W. Atkinson. Glasgow and Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1989.
- Brooke, Samuel, *Catalogus librorum bibliothecae reverend. & eruditi viri D. Samuelis Brooke, aulae Catharinae quondam socius*. London, 1681; Wing B4916.
- Browne, Edward, *A Rare Paterne of Justice and Mery [...] Whereunto is Annexed A Meteor, and A Starre*. London, 1642; Wing B5105.
- *A Paradox Usefull for the Times*. London, 1642; Wing B5103.
- *A Potent Vindication for Book-Making, or, An Embleme of these Distracted Times*. London, 1642; Wing B5104.
- *Sir James Cambels Clarks Disaster, by making books, shewing that lying and scandalous pamphlets against the King and Parliament are in great estimation, but bookes of learning and religion little regarded. Exemplified in a compendious letter to John Philpond in Suffolke*. London, 1642; Wing B5107.
- *Time Well Spent*. London, 1643; Wing B5107B.

- *A Compendious and Patheticall Retractation for Book-Making Very Usefull for these Distracted Times*. London, 1643; Wing B5101.
- Busby, Richard, *A Short Institution of Grammar*. Cambridge, 1647.
- Campion, Thomas, *Observations in the Art of English Poesie*. London, 1602; ESTC 4543.
- Cavendish, Margaret, *The Worlds Olio*. London, 1655; Wing N873.
- *The Philosophical and Physical Opinions*. London, 1655; Wing N863.
- The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Clapham, Henoch, *Elohim or Ælohim-triune*. London, 1601; ESTC 5329.
- Coryate, Thomas, *Coryats Crudities*. London, 1611; ESTC 5808.
- Extract from the Despatches of M. Courcelles, French Ambassador at the Court of Scotland. M.D. LXXXVI-M.D. LXXXVII*. Edinburgh: for the Bannatyne Club, 1828.
- Crooke, Helkiah, *Mikrocosmographia*. London, 1615; ESTC 6062.
- Crouch, Humphrey, *England's Jestes Refin'd and Improv'd*. London, 1693; Wing C7277B.
- Daniel, Samuel, *The Defence of Ryme*. London, 1603; ESTC 6260.
- Digges, Leonard, *A Geometrical Practise named Pantometria*. London, 1571; ESTC 6858.
- Drayton, Michael, *England's Heroical Epistles*. London, 1598; ESTC 7193.2.
- *The Battaile of Agincourt*. London, 1631; ESTC 7191.
- Du Nesme, Jean, *The Miracle of the Peace in Fraunce*, trans. by Josuah Sylvester. London, 1599; ESTC 7353.
- Edmonds, Clement, *Observations upon Casars Comentaries*. London, 1609; ESTC 749.
- Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh A.D. 1573-1589*. Edinburgh: Colston and Son, 1882.
- Fletcher, Robert, *The Nine English Worthies*. London, 1606; ESTC 11087.
- Gamon, Christofle de, *La Semaine ou, Création du monde, contre celle du sieur du Bartas*. Lyon, 1609.
- Complete Works of George Gascoigne*, ed. by John W. Cunliffe, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907-1910.
- Goodman, Godfrey, *The Fall of Man, or The Corruption of Nature*. London, 1616, ESTC 12022.

- Grahame, Simion, *Passionate Sparke of a Relenting Minde*. London, 1604; ESTC 12169.
- Greville, Robert, Baron Brooke, *Catalogus librorum ex bibliotheca nobilis cujusdam Angli [i.e. Baron Brooke]*, ed. by Gabriel Sangar and Nathaniel Ranew. London, 1678; Wing S681.
- Hakluyt, Richard, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation made by Sea or Over-Land [...]*. London, 1599-1600; ESTC 12626.
- Hall, Joseph, *Epistles the first volume: Containing II. decads*. London, 1608; ESTC 12662.
- Harington, John, *Orlando Furioso in English Heroical Verse*. London, 1591; ESTC 746.
- Heroldt, Johann, and William of Tyre, *De bello sacro continuatae historiae libri vi. commentarijs rerum Syriacarum Guilhelmi Tyrensis archiepiscopi additi*. Basel, 1560.
- Herring, Richard, *Pietas Pontificia*, trans. by John Vicars. London, 1617; ESTC 13247.
- Hutchinson, Lucy, *Order and Disorder*, ed. by David Norbrook. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Jerome, Stephen, *Origens Repentance*. London, 1619; ESTC 14513.
- Workes of Benjamin Jonson*. London, 1616; ESTC 14751.
- King, Philip, *The Surfeit to A B C*. London, 1656; Wing K515.
- La Noue, François de, *The Politicke and Militarie Discourses of the Lord de La Noue*, trans. by Edward Aggas. London, 1587; ESTC 15215.
- Leighton, William, *Virtue Triumphant, Or a Lively Description of the Foure Vertues Cardinall*. London, 1603; ESTC 15435.
- Lisle, William, *A Saxon Treatise concerning the Old and New Testament*. London, 1623; ESTC 160.
- Magnan, Pierre, *Journee du Voyage du Monde faicte sous la conduite de l'Uranie*. Montpellier, 1621.
- Catalogus variorum et insignium librorum instructissimae bibliothecae clarissimi doctissimiq; Viri Thomae Manton, S.T.D.*, ed. by William Cooper. London 1678; Wing M519.
- Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe, Volume II: Doctor Faustus*, ed. by Roma Gill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- The Memoires of Sir James Melvil of Hal-hill*, ed. by George Scott. London, 1683; Wing M1654.
- Maisonfleur, Étienne de, *Les Cantiques du Sieur de Maisonfleur Œuvre auquel ont este adionstex en ceste edition plusieurs opuscules spirituels Recueillis de divers auteurs, etc.* Paris, 1586; Rouen, 1613.

- Morley, Thomas, *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke*. London, 1597; ESTC 18133.
- Murtola, Gaspare, *Della Creazione del Mondo*. Venice, 1608.
- Nash, Thomas, *Gymnasiarchon: or, the School of Potentates*. London, 1648; Wing, E3526A.
- Nashe, Thomas, *Nashes Lenten Stuffe*. London, 1599; ESTC 18370.
- Naudé, Gabriel, *Instructions concerning erecting of a library presented to my lord, the President De Mesme by Gabriel Naudeus [...]; and now interpreted by Jo[hn]. Evelyn, Esquire*. London, 1661; Wing N247.
- Nepos, Cornelius, *The Lives of Epaminondas, of Philip of Macedon, of Dionysius the Elder, and of Octavius Caesar Augustus*, trans. by Thomas North. London, 1602; ESTC 20071.
- Nicander, *The Poems and Poetical Fragments*, ed. by A. S. Gow and A. F. Scholfield. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1997.
- Norden, John, *Vicissitudo Rerum*. London, 1600; ESTC 18642; repr. as *A Storehouse of Varieties*. London, 1601; ESTC 18643.
- *Labyrinth of Mans Life*. London, 1614; ESTC 18611.
- Oppian's Halieuticks With an account of Oppian's life and writings, and a catalogue of his fishes*, trans. by William Diaper and John Jones. Oxford, 1722.
- Ovid, *Heroycall Epistles*, trans. by George Turberville. London, 1567; ESTC 18940.
- Palingenius Stellatus, Marcello, *The Zodiacke of Life*, trans. by Barnabe Googe. London, 1560; ESTC 19148; 1576 (ESTC 19151).
- Passero, Don Felice, *L'Essamerone*. Venice, 1609.
- Peacham, Henry, *Garden of Eloquence*. London, 1593; ESTC 19498.
- Perkins, William, *The Arte of Prophecying*. London, 1607; ESTC 19735.4.
- Peyton, Thomas, *The Glasse of Time*. London, 1620; ESTC 19824.
- Phillips, Edward, *Theatrum Poetarum*. London, 1675; Wing P2075.
- Phillips, John, *Sportive Wit*. London, 1656; Wing P2113.
- Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romaines*, trans. by Thomas North. London, 1603; ESTC 20068.

- Powell, Thomas, *Humane Industry*. London, 1661; Wing P3702.
- Primaudaye, Pierre de La, *The French Academie*, trans. by Thomas Bowes, Richard Dolman and William Phelp. London, 1618; ESTC 15241.
- Puttenham, George, *The Arte of English Poesie*. London, 1589; ESTC 20519.
- Raleigh, Walter, *The Discoverie of the Large, Rich, and Bewtiful Empire of Guiana*. London: 1596; ESTC 20634.
- Roche, Robert, *Eustathia, or The Constance of Susanna*. London, 1599; ESTC 21137.
- Risdon, Tristram, *Chorographical Description or Survey of the County of Devon*. London, 1714; repr. 1811.
- Rosseter, Philip, *A Booke of Ayres, Set Foorth to be Song to the Lute, Orpherian, and Base Violl*. London, 1601; ESTC 21332.
- Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. by G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd edition. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- *The Taming of the Shrew*, ed. by Ann Thompson, updated edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Sheppard, Samuel, *Epigrams Theological, Philosophical, and Romantick also the Socratick Session*. London, 1651; Wing S3161.
- Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. by Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan Van Dorsten. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Smith, G. Gregory, ed., *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904; repr. 1950.
- Sylvester, Josuah, *Lachrymæ Lachrymarum*. London: 1613; ESTC 23578.
- Tasso, Torquato, *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The Recoverie of Hierusalem*, trans. by Richard Carew. London, 1594; ESTC 23697.
- *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The Recoverie of Jerusalem*, trans. by Edward Fairfax. London, 1600; ESTC 23698.
- *Le Sette Giornate del Mondo Creato*. Viterbo, 1607.
- Taylor, John, *The Nipping and Snipping of Abuses*. London, 1614; ESTC 23779.

- Tyre, William of, *A History of Deeds Done beyond the Sea*, trans. by Emily Atwater Babcock and August C. Krey, 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Underwood, Robert, *New Anatomie*. London, 1605; ESTC 24519; repr. as *The Little World*. London, 1612; ESTC 24519.5.
- Ursinus, Zacharias, *Doctrinae Christianae Compendium*. Cambridge, 1585; ESTC 24529 and 24530.
- Vesalius, Andreas, *Andreae Vesalij [...] suorum de humani corporis fabrica librorum epitome*. Basel, 1543.
- The Whole .xii. Bookes of the Aeneidos of Virgill*, trans by Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne. London, 1573; ESTC 24801; repr. 1584; ESTC 24802.
- Webbe, William, *A Discourse of English Poetrie*. London, 1586; ESTC 25172.
- Winstanley, William, *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets*. London, 1687; Wing W3065.
- Wither, George, *Abuses Stript, and Whipt. Or Satirical Essayes*. London, 1613; ESTC 25891.
- Wood, Anthony à, *Athenæ Oxonienses: An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford*, ed. by Philip Bliss, 4 vols. 1691-95; London, 1813-20.
- Zanchi, Girolamo, *The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination Stated and Asserted*. Perth, 1793.

Later Works

- Abbot, William Richardson, 'Studies in the Influence of Du Bartas in England, 1584-1641'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of North Carolina, 1931.
- Adams, Robyn, and Rosanna Cox, eds, *Diplomacy in Early Modern Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Aldis H. G., et al., *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*. London: Bibliographical Society, 1910 [accessed through <http://www.bbti.bham.ac.uk/>].
- Alexander, Gavin, *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney, 1586-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- 'William Scott and the Dating of George Wyatt's Sonnets', *NQ* 59 (2012), 58-60.

- Allen, Elizabeth, 'Barrett, William (*b. c.*1561, *d.* in or after 1630)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1521>].
- Anderson, Ruth L., 'A French Source for John Davies of Hereford's System of Psychology',
PQ 6 (1927), 57-66.
- anon., 'Some Account of the Life and Writings of Zachary Boyd', in John MacUre, *The History of Glasgow*. Glasgow, 1736; repr. Glasgow: Hutchinson and Brookman, 1830, pp. 355-63.
- anon., 'Nova et Vetera', *British Medical Journal* 1: 9 May, no. 3358 (1925), 890.
- Arthos, John, *The Language of Natural Description in Eighteenth-Century Poetry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949.
- Ashton, Harry, *Du Bartas en Angleterre*. Paris: E. Larose, 1908.
- Atkinson, David W., 'Zachary Boyd and the Ars Moriendi Tradition', *Scottish Literary Journal* 4.1 (1977), 5-16.
- 'Zachary Boyd: A Reassessment', in *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Scottish Language and Literature*, ed. by Roderick J. Lyall and Felicity Riddy. Stirling and Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 1981, pp. 438-456.
- 'Boyd, Zachary (1585–1653)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3119>].
- Attridge, Derek, *Well-Weighed Syllables: Elizabethan Verse in Classical Metres*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Auger, Peter, 'Recreation and William Alexander's *Doomes-day* (1637)', *Scottish Literary Review* 2.2 (2010), 1-21.
- Baldwin, R. G., 'Phineas Fletcher: His Modern Readers and His Renaissance Ideas', *PQ* 40 (1961), 462-75.
- 'Dubious Claims for the Anatomy in "The Purple Island"', *NQ* 9 (1962), 377-78.
- Banderier, Gilles, 'Tobias Hübner, traducteur des *Pères de Du Bartas*', *Germanistick* 13 (1998), 1-6.
- 'Du Bartas et l'ars memorativa', *Tangence* 87 (2008), 31-45.
- Barbolani, Cristina, 'Las Traducciones al Castellano de la *Première Semaine* de Du Bartas', in *Imágenes de Francia en las letras hispánicas: Coloquio celebrado en la Universidad de*

- Barcelona, 15 a 18 de novembre de 1988*, ed. by Francisco Lafarga Maduell. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 1989, pp. 209-16.
- Barbour, Reid, *Literature and Religious Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Bath, Michael, and Betty Willsher, 'Emblems from Quarles on Scottish Gravestones', in *Emblems and Art History*, ed. by Alison Adams. Glasgow: Department of French, University of Glasgow, 1996, pp. 169–201.
- Bawcutt, Priscilla, 'Crossing the Border: Scottish Poetry and English Readers in the Sixteenth Century', in *The Rose and the Thistle: Essays on the Culture of late Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood. East Linton: Tuckwell, 1998, pp. 59-76.
- 'James VI's Castalian Band: A Modern Myth', *Scottish Historical Review* 80 (2001), 251-59.
- Bayne, Ronald, rev. James Kirk, 'Jack, Thomas (d. 1598)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14513>].
- Bayne, T. W., rev. Willy Maley, 'Hudson, Thomas (d. in or before 1605)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14040>].
- Beal, Peter, 'Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-century Commonplace Book', in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985-1991*, ed. by W. Speed Hill. Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1993, pp. 131-47.
- Beall, Chandler B., 'John Eliot's "Ortho-epia Gallica" and du Bartas-Goulart', *SP* 43 (1946), 164-75.
- Beekman, A., *Influence de Du Bartas sur la littérature néerlandaise*. Poitier: A. Masson, 1912.
- Bellenger, Yvonne, *Du Bartas et ses divines Semaines*. Paris: SEDES, 1993.
- and Jean-Claude Ternaux, *Bibliographie des écrivains français: Du Bartas*. Paris: Memini, 1998.
- *Le temps et les jours dans quelques recueils poétiques du XVIe siècle (Scève, Louise Labé, Ronsard, Du Bellay, Desportes, Du Bartas, D'Aubigné)* Paris: Champion, 2002.

- ‘Propos liminaire’ and ‘État present des études sur Du Bartas en France depuis 1970’, *OC* 29 (2004), 9-26.
- Benstock, Shari, ‘At the Margin of Discourse: Footnotes in the Fictional Text’, *PMLA* 98 (1983), 204-25.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan, ‘Empedocles in the English Renaissance’, *SP* 65 (1968), 67-80.
- Berek, Peter, “‘Tamburlaine’s’ Weak Sons: Imitation as Interpretation Before 1593’, *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982), 55-82.
- Blair, Ann, ‘Humanist Methods in Natural Philosophy: The Commonplace Book’, *JHI* 53 (1992), 541-51.
- ‘Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550-1700’, *JHI* 64 (2003), 11-28.
- ‘Natural Philosophy’, in *The Cambridge History of Science, vol. 3: Early Modern Science*, ed. by Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 365-406.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*. London: SCM, 1992.
- Boas, Frederick S., [Review of] Langdale, A. B.: *Phineas Fletcher. Man of Letters, Science and Divinity*’, *MLR* 33 (1938), 430-31.
- Borris, Kenneth, *Allegory and Epic in English Renaissance Literature: Heroic Form in Sidney, Spenser, and Milton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- and Clark Meredith Donaldson, ‘Hymnic Epic and *The Faerie Queene*’s Original Printed Format: Canto-Canticles and Psalmic Arguments’, *RQ* 64 (2011), 1148-93.
- Bourland, Caroline Brown, ‘Gabriel Harvey and the Modern Languages’, *HLQ* 4 (1940), 85-106.
- Boutcher, Warren, “‘A French Dexterity, & An Italian Confidence’”: New Documents on John Florio, Learned Strangers and Protestant Humanist Study of Modern Languages in Renaissance England from c.1547 to c.1625’, *Reformation* 2 (1997), 39-109.

- Braden, Gordon, Robert Cummings and Stuart Gillespie, eds, *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English: Volume 2: 1550-1600*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Braspart, Michel, *Du Bartas: poète chrétien*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1947.
- Braunmuller, A. R., *George Peele*. Boston: Twayne, 1983.
- Braunrot, Bruno, *L'Imagination poétique chez Du Bartas: éléments de sensibilité baroque dans la Création du monde*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973.
- Brenner, Robert, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653*. London and New York: Verso, 2003.
- Brereton, Geoffrey, *An Introduction to the French Poets: Villon to the Present Day*. London: Methuen, 1956.
- Brown, Richard Danson, *The New Poet: Novelty and Tradition in Spenser's 'Complaints'*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999.
- Budgen, Frank, *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses'*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Burgess, Glenn, 'The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered', *EHR* 107 (1992), 837-61.
- Burke, Victoria E., 'Ann Bowyer's Commonplace Book (Bodleian Library Ashmole MS 51): Reading and Writing Among the "Middling Sort"', *EMLS* 6.3 (2001), 1.1-28.
- Burnett, Archie, 'Annotations to Milton', *NQ* 29 (1982), 28-32.
- 'Sylvester's Du Bartas, Marvell and Pope', *NQ* 29 (1982), 418-19.
- Burrow, Colin, 'Holland, Hugh (1563–1633)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13527>].
- Bush, Douglas, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660: Jonson, Donne and Milton*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Cambers, Andrew, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Cameron, James K., 'Some Continental Visitors to Scotland in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries', in *Scotland and Europe 1200-1850*, ed. by T. C. Smout. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986.

- Campbell, Lily Bess, *Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth-Century England*. Cambridge and Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.
- Campbell, Mary Baine, 'Literature', in *The Cambridge History of Science, vol. 3: Early Modern Science*, ed. by Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 756-72.
- Capp, Bernard, *English Almanacs, 1500-1800: Astrology and the Popular Press*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press 1979.
- 'Coley, Henry (1633–1704)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5899>].
- 'Evans, John (b. 1594/5?, d. in or after 1659)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53669>].
- 'Swan, John (bap. 1605, d. 1671)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38039>].
- Carscallen, James, 'English Translators and Admirers of Du Bartas, 1578-1625'. Unpublished B.Litt thesis, University of Oxford, 1958.
- Cave, Terence, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Cazamian, Louis François, *A History of French Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Ceard, Jean, 'Les Transformations du Genre du Commentaire', in *L'Automne de la Renaissance 1580-1630: XXIIe Colloque international d'études humanistes, Tours 2-13 Juillet 1979*, ed. by Jean Lafond and André Stegman. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1981.
- Charlton, Kenneth, *Women, Religion and Education in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Chartier, Roger, 'Texts, Printings, Readings', in *The New Cultural History*, ed. by Aletta Biersack and Lynn Hunt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989, pp. 154-75.
- *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. by Lydia G. Cochrane. Cambridge: Polity, 1994.
- Cheffaud, P. H., *George Peele (1558-1596?)*. Paris: F. Alcan, 1913.

- Clarke, Elizabeth, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Clarke, Tristram, 'Cockburn, John (1652–1729)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5774>].
- Cohen, Stephen, 'Between Form and Culture: New Historicism and the Promise of a Historical Formalism', in *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements*, ed. by Mark David Rasmussen. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002, pp. 17-41.
- Colclough, David, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Cole, Emma, 'Note on Anonymous Criticism of Sandys and Sylvester as Translators', *NQ* 58 (2011), 380-81.
- Connolly, Annaliese, 'Peele's *David and Bethsabe*: Reconsidering Biblical Drama of the Long 1590s', *EMLS* Special Issue 16 (2007), 9.1-20.
- Corbett, John, 'The Prentise and the Printer: James VI and Thomas Vautrollier', in *The Apparelling of Truth: Literature and Literary Culture in the Reign of James VI*, ed. by Kevin J. McGinley and Nicola Royan. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2010, pp. 80-93.
- Corbett, Margery and Ronald Lightbown, *The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-page in England 1550-1660*. London, Henley and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Corcoran, M. I., *Milton's Paradise with Reference to the Hexameral Background*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1945.
- Corser, Thomas, *Collectanea Anglo-poetica: or, A Bibliographical and Descriptive Catalogue of a Portion of a Collection of Early English Poetry* 52 (1860), 193-99.
- Cotterill, Anne, *Digressive Voices in Early Modern English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Cousin, John W., *A Short Bibliographical Dictionary of English Literature*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1910.
- Craik, T. W., 'Some Notes on the Text of Peele's "David and Bethsabe"', *NQ* 23 (1976), 208-10.

- Crane, Mary Thomas, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Crawford, Charles, 'Belvedere, Or the Garden of the Muses', *Englische Studien* 43 (1911), 198-228.
- 'J. Bodenham's Belvedere', in *The Shakespeare Allusion-Book*, ed. by C. M. Ingleby et al., II, pp. 489-518.
- Creore, A. Emerson, 'The Language of Du Bartas'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Johns Hopkins University, 1940.
- 'Du Bartas: A Reinterpretation', *MLQ* 1 (1940), 503-26.
- 'Ronsard, du Bartas, and the Homeric Comparison', *CL* 3 (1951), 152-59.
- 'Word-Formation in Du Bartas', *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance* 15 (1953), 192-208.
- Cressy, David, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Crowley, Lara, 'Donne, not Davison: Reconsidering the Authorship of "Psalm 137,"' *Modern Philology* 105 (2008), 603-36.
- Crum, Margaret, *First-Line Index of English Poetry, 1500-1800, in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969 [accessed through Folger Union First Line Index of English Verse 13th-19th Century (bulk 1500-1800) <http://firstlines.folger.edu/>].
- Crummé, Hannah Leah, 'William Scott's Copy of Sidney', *NQ* 56 (2009), 553-54.
- Crundell, H.W., 'Notes on *The Taming of a Shrew*', *NQ* 163 (1932), 309-10.
- Cummings, Brian, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Cummings, Robert, ed., *Edmund Spenser: The Critical Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge, 1971.
- 'Recent Studies in English Translation, c. 1590-c. 1660: Part 2: Translations from Vernacular Languages', *ELR* 39 (2009), 586-615.

- ‘The Aestheticization of Tyrannicide: Du Bartas’s *La Judith*’ in *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies Across the Disciplines*, ed. by Kevin R. Brine, Elena Ciletti and Henrike Lähnemann. Cambridge: OpenBook Publishers, 2010, pp. 201-12.
- ‘Reading Du Bartas’, in *Tudor Translation*, ed. by Fred Schurink. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, pp. 175-96.
- Daemen-De Gelder, Katrien A. L., ‘The Letters of Adriaan Damman († 1605), Dutch Ambassador at the Court of James VI and I’, *Lias* 31:2 (2004), 239-48.
- Dagens, Jean, ‘Du Bartas, humaniste et encyclopédiste dévot’, *Cahiers de l’Association internationale des études françaises* 10 (1958), 9-24.
- Dauphiné, James, *Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas: poète scientifique*. Paris: Société d’édition “Les Belles Lettres”, 1983.
- ed., *Du Bartas, poète encyclopédique du XVII^e siècle: colloque international, faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Pau et des pays de l’Adour, 7, 8 et 9 mars 1986*. Lyon: La Manufacture, 1988.
- ed., *Du Bartas: 1590-1990: actes du colloque international d’Auch-Le Bartas-Pau: 6-8 avril 1990*. Mont-de-Marsan: Éditions InterUniversitaires, 1992.
- and Marie-Luce Demonet, eds, *Du Bartas et l’expérience de la beauté: “La semaine” (jours I, IV, VII)* Paris: Champion, 1993.
- and Paul Mironneau, eds, *Du Bartas: actes des premières journées du Centre Jacques de Laprade tenues au Musée national du Château de Pau, le 19 novembre 1993*. Pau: J & D Éditions, 1994.
- *La bibliothèque de Du Bartas*. Paris: H. Champion, 1994.
- transcribed, ‘David Jones, Senior, Watchmaker, of Merthyr Tydfil, 1861’, *Merthyr Historian* 10 (1999), 265-67.
- Davies, C. S. L., ‘The Youth and Education of Christopher Wren’, *EHR* 123 (2008), 300-27.
- Davies, G. I., ‘Introduction to the Pentateuch’, in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. by John Barton and John Muddiman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001; repr. 2010, pp. 12-38.

- Deed, S. G., Jane Francis and Frank Chalton, eds, *Catalogue of the Plume Library at Maldon, Essex*. Maldon: Plume Library Trustees, 1959 [<http://library.thomasplumeslibrary.co.uk/HeritageScripts/Hapi.dll/search1>].
- Delepierre, Joseph Octave and Félix Priem, eds, *Précis analytique des documents que renferme le dépôt des archives de la Flandre-occidentale, à Bruges*. Vol. 8; 11. Vandecasteele-Werbrouck, 1851.
- DeNeef, A. Leigh, 'The Poetics of Orpheus: The Text and a Study of "Orpheus His Journey to Hell" (1595)', *SP* 89 (1992), 20-70.
- Doelman, James, "'A King of Thine Own Heart': The English Reception of King James VI and I's *Basilikon Doron*", *SC* 9 (1994), 1-9.
- 'The Accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', *SEL* 34 (1994), 19-40; reprinted in *King James I and the Religious Culture of England*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000. pp. 20-38.
- Donaldson, Ian, "'The Fripperie of Wit': Jonson and Plagiarism', in Kewes (ed.), *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*, pp. 119-33.
- Droz, Eugénie, *Jacques de Constans: l'ami d'Agrippa d'Aubigné; contribution à l'étude de la poésie protestante*. Geneva: Droz, 1962.
- Duffell, Martin J., *A New History of English Metre*. London: Legenda, 2008.
- Dunnigan, Sarah, *Eros and Poetry at the Courts of Mary Queen of Scots and James VI*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Eggert, Paul, 'Brought to Book: Bibliography, Book History and the Study of Literature', *The Library* 13 (2012), 3-32.
- Ettenhuber, Katrin, *Donne's Augustine: Renaissance Cultures of Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ewbank, Inga-Stina (née Ekeblad), 'The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe: A Note on George Peele's Biblical Drama', *English Studies* 39 (1958), 57-62.
- "'What words, what looks, what wonders?": Language and Spectacle in the Theatre of George Peele', in *The Elizabethan Theatre: V*, ed. by G. R. Hibbard. London: Macmillan, 1975, pp. 124-54.

- Fell-Smith, Charlotte, rev. Elizabeth Haresnape, 'Sandford, John (c.1565–1629)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24639>].
- Ferguson, Gary, 'Sixteenth-Century Religious Writing', in *The Cambridge History of French Literature*, ed. by William Burgwinkle, Nicholas Hammond and Emma Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 188-95.
- Ferris, John, 'Ashley, Robert (1565–1641)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/763>].
- Findlen, Paula, 'Jokes of Nature and Jokes of Knowledge: The Playfulness of Scientific Discourse in Early Modern Europe', *RQ* 43 (1990), 292-331.
- Finkelppearl, Philip J., *John Marston of the Middle Temple: An Elizabethan Dramatist in his Social Setting*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- 'Davies, John (1564/5–1618)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7244>].
- Fleming, Juliet, 'Afterword', *HLQ* 73 (2010), 543-52.
- Foster, Joseph, ed., *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, 4 vols. Oxford and London: Parker, 1891-92.
- Fowler, Alastair, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- 'The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After', *New Literary History* 34 (2003), 185-200.
- *Renaissance Realism: Narrative Images in Literature and Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- 'Didactic Kinds', in *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English: Volume 2*, ed. by Braden et al., pp. 194-200.
- Frontain, R. J., 'The "Curious Frame" of Chapman's *Ovids Banquet of Sence*: 2 Samuel 11', *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 31 (1987), 37-43.
- Garapon, Robert, 'Sur la Renommée posthume de Ronsard et de Du Bartas de 1590 à 1640', *OC* 6 (1981), 53-59.

- Genette, Gérard, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln, Nebraska, and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Giacomotto-Charra, Violaine, *La forme des choses: poésie et savoirs dans la Semaine de Du Bartas*. Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2009.
- Glaisyer, Natasha and Sara Pennell, eds, *Didactic Literature in England, 1500-1800: Expertise Constructed*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Glatzer, Paula, *The Complaint of the Poet: The Parnassus Plays*. Salzburg, 1977.
- Gosse, Edmund, *The Jacobean Poets*. London: John Murray, 1894.
- Graham, Timothy, 'Early Modern Uses of Claudius B.IV', in *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*, ed. by Rebecca Barnhouse and Benjamin C. Withers. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000, pp. 287-313.
- Grazia, Margreta de, 'Shakespeare in Quotation Marks', in *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*, ed. by Jean I. Marsden. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991, pp. 57-71.
- Greene, Thomas M., *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Gregerson, Linda, *The Reformation of the Subject*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gregory, E. R., 'Du Bartas and the Modes of Christian Poetry in England'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oregon, 1965.
- 'Du Bartas, Sidney, and Spenser', *Comparative Literature Studies* 7 (1970), 437-49.
- Grente, Georges, *Jean Bertaut, abbé d'Aunay, premier aumônier de la reine, évêque de Séez (1552-1611)*. Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1903, pp. 179-87.
- Grolier Club, *Catalogue of Original and Early Editions of some of the Poetical and Prose Works of English Writers from Wither to Prior*, 3 vols. New York: privately printed, 1905.
- Grossman, Marshall, 'Literary Forms and Historical Consciousness in Renaissance Poetry', *Exemplaria* 1 (1989), 247-64.
- Groves, Peter L., *Strange Music: The Metre of the English Heroic Line*. Victoria, B.C.: English Literary Studies, University of Victoria, 1998.

- Grundy, Joan, *The Spenserian Poets: A Study in Elizabethan and Jacobean Poetry*. London: Edward Arnold, 1969.
- Hackel, Heidi Brayman, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hale, John, *Milton's Languages: The Impact of Multilingualism on Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hamilton, A. C., *The Structure of Allegory in the Faerie Queene*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Hampton, Timothy, *Fictions of Embassy*. Ithaca, N.Y., and London: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- Hardison, O. B., *Prosody and Purpose in the English Renaissance*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Harris, Victor, *All Coherence Gone*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Harrison, Peter, 'Reinterpreting Nature in Early Modern Europe: Natural Philosophy, Biblical Exegesis and the Contemplative Life', in *The Word and the World: Biblical Exegesis and Early Modern Science*, ed. by Kevin Killeen and Peter J. Forshaw. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 25-44.
- Healy, Thomas, 'Sound Physic: Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island* and the Poetry of Purgation', *RS* 5 (1991), 341-52.
- Hearne, Thomas, *A Letter, containing an account of some antiquities between Windsor and Oxford*. Oxford, 1725.
- Heather, Noel, *Du Bartas, French Huguenot Poet, and his Humorous Ambivalence*. Lewiston, N.Y., and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1998.
- Hedde, Donna, ed., *Roland Furious: A Scots Poem in its European Context*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Hepburn, Ronald W., 'Godfrey Goodman: Nature Vilified', *Cambridge Journal* 7 (1953), 424-34.
- 'George Hakewill: The Virility of Nature', *JHI* 16 (1955), 135-50.
- Hillier, Russell M., 'Spatial Allegory and Creation Old and New in Milton's Hexaemeral Narrative', *SEL* 49 (2009), 121-43.
- Hillman, Richard, 'La création du monde et *The Taming of the Shrew*: Du Bartas comme intertexte', *Renaissance and Reformation* 27 (1991), 249-58.

- Hostington, Brenda M., 'Commerce, Printing, and Patronage', in *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English: Volume 2*, ed. by Braden et al., pp. 47-57.
- Houk, Raymond A., 'Doctor Faustus and *A Shren*', *PMLA* 62 (1947), 950-57.
- Howell, Kenneth J., 'Textual Knowledge and Textual Meaning in Augustine's Interpretation of Genesis: The Three Functions of Natural Philosophy', in *Nature and Scripture in the Abrahamic Religions: up to 1700*, ed. by Jitse M. van der Meer and Scott Mandelbrote. Leiden: Brill, 2008, pp. 117-45.
- Huchard, Cécile, *D'encre et de sang: Simon Goulart et la Saint-Barthélemy*. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2007.
- Hunter, G. K., 'The Marking of Sententiae in Elizabethan Printed Plays, Poems, and Romances', *The Library* 3-4 (1951), 171-88.
- *English Drama 1586-1642: The Age of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Ingleby, C. M., et al., eds, *The Shakespeare Allusion-Book: A Collection of Allusions to Shakespeare from 1591 to 1700*, 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Ingram, Anders, 'Readers and Responses to George Sandys' *A Relation of a Journey begun An: Dom: 1610* (1615): Early English Books Online (EEBO) and the History of Reading', *European Review of History—Revue européenne d'histoire* 7 (2010), 287-301.
- Jack, R. D. S., 'William Fowler and Italian Literature', *MLR* 65 (1970), 481-92.
- 'Poetry under King James VI', in *The History of Scottish Literature, I: Origins to 1660 (Mediaeval and Renaissance)*, ed. by R. D. S. Jack and Cairns Craig. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988, pp. 125-39.
- 'Translating the Lost Scottish Renaissance', *Translation and Literature* 6 (1997), 66-80.
- 'Music, Poetry, and Performance at the Court of James VI', *John Donne Journal* 25 (2006), 37-63.
- Jackson, Kent P., Frank F. Judd Jr and David R. Seely, 'Chapters, Verses, Punctuation, Spelling, and Italics in the King James Version', *The Religious Educator* 7 (2006), 40-64.

- Jacoby, Daniel, 'Rataller, Georg', in *ADB*, vol. 27 (1888), p. 339 [<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd135635349.html?anchor=adb>].
- James, G. F., 'Josiah Burchett: A Newly Discovered Poem', *NQ* 171 (1936), 57.
- Jardine, Lisa, and Anthony Grafton, "'Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past and Present* 129 (1990), 30-78.
- Jenkins, Harold, *Edward Benlowes, 1602-1676: Biography of a Minor Poet*. London: University of London, 1952.
- Jones, Howard, 'Thorius, John (b. 1568)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27335>].
- Jones, Leonard Chester, *Simon Goulart 1543-1628*. Geneva: Georg and Co.; Paris: Libraire Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1917.
- Jones, Richard Foster, *Ancients and Moderns: A Study of the Rise of the Scientific Movement in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Dover, 1982.
- Juhala, Amy L., 'An Advantageous Alliance: Edinburgh and the Court of James VI', in *Sixteenth-century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch*, ed. by Julian Goodare and A. A. MacDonald. Leiden: Brill, 2008, pp. 337-363.
- Keller, Luzius, *Palingène, Ronsard, Du Bartas: trois études sur la poésie cosmologique de la Renaissance*. Bern: Francke, 1974.
- Kelsey, Sean, 'Davies, Sir John (bap. 1569, d. 1626)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7245>].
- Kenny, Neil, *The Palace of Secrets: Béroalde de Verville and Renaissance Conceptions of Knowledge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Kewes, Paulina, ed., *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Kibbee, Douglas A., *For to Speke Frenche Trewely: The French Language in England, 1000-1600*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1991.
- Kiessling, Nicolas K., ed., *The Library of Robert Burton*. Oxford, 1988.
- Killeen, Kevin, 'Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in Early Modern England', *HLQ* 73 (2010), 491-506.
- Kilroy, Gerard, 'Advertising the Reader: Sir John Harington's "Directions in the Margent" [with illustrations]', *ELR* 41 (2010), 64-110.

- Kingsford, C. L., rev. Sarah Bakewell, 'Lapworth, Edward (1574–1636)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16066>].
- Kintgen, Eugene R., 'Reconstructing Elizabethan Reading', *SEL* 30 (1990), 1-18.
- Klein, H. M., 'Florilegium Florilegii: An Example of the Influence of "Englands Parnassus"', *NQ* 20 (1973), 378-79.
- Kocher, Paul H., 'Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*. Part Two', *MLQ* 8 (1947), 309-18.
- Lamb, Charles, 'Observations on Sylvester's Du Bartas, with Specimens', in *Olliers Literary Miscellany in Prose and Verse*, 1 (1820), pp. 62-79.
- Lambin, G., 'Du Bartas et le Style de Peele', *Revue Anglo-américaine* 3 (1925-26), 54-56.
- Lang, John Marshall, *Glasgow and the Barony thereof*. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1895.
- Langdale, Abram Barnett, *Phineas Fletcher, Man of Letters, Science, and Divinity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.
- Langley, Eric F., 'Anatomizing the Early Modern Eye: A Literary Case-Study', *RS* 20 (2006), 340-55.
- Lawrence, Jason, *'Who the devil taught thee so much Italian?': Italian Language Learning and Literary Imitation in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- Lecoq, Jean, *L'idéal et la différence: la perception de la personnalité littéraire à la Renaissance*. Geneva: Droz, 1993.
- Lee, Sidney, *The French Renaissance in England: An Account of the Literary Relations of England and France in the Sixteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- rev. Trevor Dickie, 'Cambell, Sir James (c.1570–1642)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4429>].
- rev. Matthew Steggle, 'Chute, Anthony (d. 1594/5)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5411>].
- rev. Anne Lake Prescott, 'Nash, Thomas (1587/8-1648)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19792>].

- Leedham-Green, E. S., *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Lepage, John Louis, 'Joshua Sylvester's Translation of Du Bartas' *Les Semaines* and the Development of English Poetic Diction'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, 1982.
- 'Eagles and Doves in Donne and Du Bartas: "The Canonization"', *NQ* 30 (1983), 427-28.
- Lesser, Zachary, and Peter Stallybrass, 'The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59 (2008), 371-420.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer, *Paradise Lost and the Rhetoric of Literary Forms*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Lewis, C. S., *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Lievsay, John and Richard Davis, 'A Cavalier Library—1643', *Studies in Bibliography* 6 (1954), 141-60.
- Love, Harold, 'Originality and the Puritan Sermon', in Kewes (ed.), *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*, pp. 149-65.
- Loxley, James, 'Echoes as Evidence in the Poetry of Andrew Marvell', *SEL* 52 (2012), 165-85.
- Mack, Michael, *Sidney's Poetics: Imagining Creation*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2005.
- Mack, Peter, 'Renaissance Habits of Reading', in *Renaissance Essays for Kitty Scoular Datta*, ed. by Sukanta Chaudhuri. Calcutta: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 1-25.
- 'Rhetoric, Ethics and Reading in the Renaissance', *RS* 19 (2005), 1-21.
- Madden, Lionel, ed., *Robert Southey: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1972, repr. 1995.
- Magnien, Michel, 'Une lecture catholique de *La Première Semaine*: Du Monin, traducteur de du Bartas', in Dauphiné (ed.), *Du Bartas, poète encyclopédique du XV^e siècle*, pp. 195-210.
- 'Du Bartas en France au XVII^e siècle', in Dauphiné (ed.), *Du Bartas: 1590-1990*, pp. 45-80.

- de Maisières, Maury Thibaut, *Les Poèmes Inspirés du début de la Gènese à l'époque de la Renaissance*. Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyst, 1931.
- Mallet, Charles Edward, *A History of the University of Oxford*, 3 vols. London: Methuen, 1924.
- Mann, Alastair J., *The Scottish Book Trade, 1500-1720: Print Commerce and Print Control in Early Modern Scotland*. East Linton: Tuckwell, 2000.
- Marcus, Leah S., *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Marotti, Arthur F., 'Bodenham, John (c.1559–1610)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2754>].
- 'Allott, Robert (fl. 1599–1600)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/413>].
- Martin, E., 'Vondel, Joost van den', in *ADB*, vol. 40 (1896), pp. 290-95
[<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118627848.html?anchor=adb>].
- Martin, Henri-Jean and Roger Chartier, eds, *Livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVIIe siècle, 1598-1701*, 2 vols, 3rd edition. Geneva: Droz, 1999.
- Matz, Robert, *Defending Literature in Early Modern England: Renaissance Literary Theory in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Maxwell, Herbert, *A History of the House of Douglas*, 2 vols. London: Freemantle, 1902.
- McClune, Katherine, 'The poetry of John Stewart of Baldynneis (?1540-?1607)'. Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2006.
- McClure, J. Derrick, "'O Phoenix Escossois": James VI as Poet', in *A Day Estivall: Essays on the Music, Poetry and History of Scotland and England and Poems Previously Unpublished: in Honour of Helena Mennie Shire*, ed. by Janet Hadley Williams and Alisoun Gardner-Medwin. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1990, pp. 96-111.
- 'Translation and Transcreation in the Castalian Period', *Studies in Scottish Literature* 26 (1991), 185-98.
- 'Johnston, John (c.1565–1611)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14944>].

- McDermott, James, 'Howard, Charles, second Baron Howard of Effingham and first earl of Nottingham (1536–1624)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13885>].
- McGurk, J. J. N., 'Bodley, Sir Josias (c.1550–1617)', in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2757>].
- McKenzie, D. F., *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Mackenzie, Iain, 'Note on John Swan: The Authorship of *Speculum Mundi* and other Works Attributed to Him', *NQ* 41 (1994), 161-65.
- *God's Order and Natural Law: The Works of the Laudian Divines*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.
- McLaughlin, M. L., *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Mechoulan, Henry, 'La Sepmaine au secours de l'orthodoxie juive à Amsterdam au début du XVII^e siècle', in Dauphiné (ed.), *Du Bartas: 1590-1990*, pp. 427-45.
- Mertner, Edgar, 'Topos und Commonplace', in *Toposforschung: eine Dokumentation*, ed. by Peter Jehn. Frankfurt: Athenäum, c. 1972, pp. 20-68.
- Michel, Francisque, *Les écossais en France, les français en Écosse*, 2 vols. London: Trübner and Cie, 1862.
- Miernowski, Jan, *Dialectique et connaissance dans 'La Sepmaine' de Du Bartas: discours sur discours infiniment divers*. Geneva: Droz, 1992.
- Millet, Olivier, 'La Sepmaine de du Bartas au miroir de la traduction latine de Gabriel de Lerm', *OC* 29 (2004), 101-17.
- Mitchell, Peter, *The Purple Island and Anatomy in Early Seventeenth-Century Literature, Philosophy, and Theology*. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Presses, 2006.
- Morembert, T. de, 'Simon Goulart', in *Dictionnaire de biographie française*, vol. 16 (1985), pp. 737-38.
- Morgan, John, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560-1646*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

- Moss, Ann, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Murphy, Charles Driscoll, 'John Davies of Hereford'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Cornell, 1940.
- 'John Davies's Versification of Sidney's Prose', *PQ* 21 (1942), 410-14.
- Myers, J. N. L., 'The Painted Frieze in the Picture Gallery', *Bodleian Library Record* 3 (1950), 82-91.
- Neil, Gabriel, *Biographical Sketch of the Rev. Zachary Boyd*. Glasgow, 1832.
- Nicolson, Marjorie Hope, *The Breaking of the Circle: Studies in the Effect of the "New Science" upon Seventeenth Century Poetry*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1950.
- Norbrook, David, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, revised edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Norton, David, *A History of the Bible as Literature: Volume One: From Antiquity to 1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Nyquist, Mary. 'The Genesis of Gendered Subjectivity in the Divorce Tracts and in *Paradise Lost*', in *Re-Membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*, ed. by Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson. London: Methuen, 1987, pp. 99-127.
- O'Callaghan, Michelle, *The 'Shepherd's Nation': Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-25*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Osborn, Albert W. *Sir Philip Sidney en France*. 1932; repr. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1974.
- Parker, Ian C., 'Marvell and the "Tygress fell"', *NQ* 52 (2005), 318-24.
- 'Marvell's Use of Sylvester's Du Bartas, II.iv.4.', *NQ* 53 (2006), 172-78.
- 'Marvell's "A Dialogue between the Soul and Body": Probable Sources and Implications', *NQ* 55 (2008), 291-99.
- 'Marvell and the "Tygress fell": A Supplementary Note', *NQ* 55 (2008), 299-300.
- 'Marvell's "Crystal" Mirrour', *NQ* 56 (2009), 219-26.
- Patterson, Mary Hampson, *Domesticating the Renaissance: Protestant Best Sellers, Private Devotion, and the Revolution of English Piety*. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Presses, 2007.

- Pearl, Valerie, *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution: City Government and National Politics, 1625-43*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Peerlkamp, Petrus Hofman, *Liber de vita doctrina et facultate Nederlandorum qui carmina Latina composuerunt*. Harlem: Vincentium Loosjes, 1838.
- Pelissier, Georges, *La vie et les oeuvres de Du Bartas*. Paris: Hachette, 1882; repr. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969.
- Pennant, Thomas, 'Pennant's Second Tour in Scotland', in *A General Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in all Parts of the World*, ed. by John Pinkerton. London, 1809.
- Petrina, Alessandra, *Machiavelli in the British Isles: Two Early Modern Translations of The Prince*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Petti, Anthony G., *English Literary Hands from Chaucer to Dryden*. London: E. Arnold, 1977.
- Philip, Ian, *The Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: The Lyell Lectures, Oxford 1980-81*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Pigman III, G. W., 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance' *RQ* 33 (1980), 1-32.
- Piper, William Bowman, *The Heroic Couplet*. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1969.
- Pohlman, A. J., 'The Purple Island by Phineas Fletcher', *Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin* 18 (1907), 317-21.
- Pollard, A. W., and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and English Books Printed Abroad 1473-1640* [<http://estc.bl.uk>].
- Pomeroy, Elizabeth W., *The Elizabethan Miscellanies, their Development and Conventions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Poole, William, 'The Evolution of George Hakewill's *Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God, 1627-1637*: Academic Contexts, and Some New Angles from Manuscripts', *Electronic British Library Journal* (2010), 1-32.
- Prescott, Anne Lake, 'An Unknown Translation of Du Bartas', *Renaissance News* 19 (1966), 12-13.
- 'The Reception of Du Bartas in England', *Studies in the Renaissance* 15 (1968), 144-73.

- ‘Thomas Nash (1588-1648) and Thomas More’, *Moreana: Bulletin Thomas More* 59-60 (1978), 35-41.
- *French Poets and the English Renaissance: Studies in Fame and Transformation*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.
- *Imagining Rabelais in Renaissance England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998.
- ‘Du Bartas and Renaissance Britain: An Update’, *OC* 29 (2004), 27-38.
- Prest, Wilfrid, ‘Hoskins, John (1566–1638)’, in *ODNB*
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13838>].
- Pulsiano, Philip, ‘William L’Isle and the Editing of Old English’, in *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. by Timothy Graham. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2000, pp. 173-206.
- Quint, David, *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature: Versions of the Source*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Radice, Betty, trans., ‘Praise of Folly’, in *Collected Works of Erasmus, vol. 27 and 28*, ed. by A. H. T. Levi. Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Rawlins, Ray, *Four Hundred Years of British Autographs*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1970.
- Raymond, Joad, ‘The Development of the Book Trade in Britain’, in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture: Volume One: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*, ed. by Joad Raymond. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Reichenberger, Kurt, *Du Bartas und sein Schöpfungsepos*. Munich: M. Hueber, 1962.
- ed., *Die Schöpfungswoche des Du Bartas*, 2 vols. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1963.
- Relle, Eleanor, ‘Some New Marginalia and Poems of Gabriel Harvey’, *RES* 23 (1972), 401-16.
- Reynolds, Matthew, *The Poetry of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Richards, Jennifer, ‘Gabriel Harvey, James VI, and the Politics of Reading Early Modern Poetry’, *HLQ* 71 (2008), 303-21.
- and Fred Schurink, ‘Introduction: The Textuality and Materiality of Reading in Early Modern England’, *HLQ* 73 (2010), 345-61.

- Richmond, Hugh M., *Puritans and Libertines: Anglo-French Literary Relations in the Reformation*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1981.
- Rickard, Jane, *Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James VI and I*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- ‘The Cultural Politics of Translation: King James VI and I, Du Bartas and Joshua Sylvester’ in *New Developments in the Literary Culture of the Reign of James VI and I (1567-1625)*, ed. by David Parkinson. Leuven: Peeters, 2012, pp. 97-117.
- Ringler, William A., ed., *The Poems of Philip Sidney*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Roberts, Sasha, *Reading Shakespeare’s Poems in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Ross, I. A. N., ‘Verse Translation at the Court of King James VI of Scotland’, *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 4 (1962), 252-67.
- Ross, Sarah Gwyneth, ‘Esther Inglis: Linguist, Calligrapher, Miniaturist, and Christian Humanist’, in *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*, ed. by Julie D. Campbell and Anne R. Larsen. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009, pp. 159-181.
- Ruys, Juanita Feros, ed., *What Nature Does Not Teach: Didactic Literature in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods*. Turnhout: Brepols; Abingdon: Marston, 2008.
- Saglia, Diego, ‘Nationalist Texts and Counter-Texts: Southey’s *Roderick* and the Dissensions of the Annotated Romance’, *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 53 (1999), 421-51.
- Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin, ‘Anciens Poètes Français: Du Bartas’, *Revue des deux mondes* 1 (1842), 256-75.
- Saintsbury, George Edward B., *A History of Elizabethan Literature*. London: Macmillan, 1887.
- Sampley, Arthur M., ‘The Text of Peele’s David and Bethsabe’, *PMLA* 46 (1931), 659-71.
- Sanders, Eve Rachele, and Margaret W. Ferguson, ‘Literacies in Early Modern England’, *Critical Survey* 14 (2002), 1-8.
- Schlesinger, Emily Kemp, ‘Du Bartas and Sylvester in English Literature’. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Maryland, 1975.

- Schmidt, Gabriela, 'Realigning English Vernacular Poetics Through Metrical Experiment: Sixteenth-Century Translation and the Elizabethan Quantitative Verse Movement', *Literature Compass* 7 (2010), 303-17.
- Schreiber, Roy E., 'Naunton, Sir Robert (1563–1635)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19812>].
- Schurink, Fred, "'Like a Hand in the Margine of a Booke': William Blount's Marginalia and the Politics of Sidney's *Arcadia*", *RES* 59 (2008), 1-24.
- Serjeantson, Deirdre, 'English Bards and Scotch Poetics: Scotland's Literary Influence and Sixteenth-Century English Religious Verse', in *Literature and the Scottish Reformation*, ed. by Crawford Gribben and David George Mullan. Farnham: Ashton, 2009, pp. 161-89.
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.
- and Stephen N. Zwicker, 'Introduction: Discovering the Renaissance Reader', in *Reading, Society, and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. by Sharpe and Zwicker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Sherman, William H., *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Short, Jr., William, 'The Phenomenology of Du Bartas' "Les Sepmaines"'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Rice University, 1979.
- Siebigk, 'Hübner, Tobias', in *ADB*, vol. 13 (1881), pp. 272-3 [<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd120079291.html?anchor=adb>].
- Simoni, Anna E. C., 'John Wodroephe's *Spared Houres*', in *Studies in Seventeenth-Century English Literature, History and Bibliography: Festschrift for Professor T.A. Birrell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by G. A. M. Janssens and F. G. A. M. Aarts. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1984, pp. 211-32.
- Simonsen, Vagn Lungaard, 'Joshuah Sylvester's English Translation of Du Bartas' "La Premiere Sepmaine"', *Orbis Litterarum* 8 (1950), 259-85.
- Sinfield, Alan, 'Sidney and Du Bartas', *CL* 27 (1975), 8-20.
- Slezer, John, *Theatrum Scotiae*, ed. by John Jamieson. Edinburgh: William Paterson; London: Henry Sotheran, 1874.

- Slights, William W. E., *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Smalley, Vera Ethel, *The Sources of 'A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues', by Randle Cotgrave (London 1611): A Study in Renaissance Lexicography*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1948.
- Smith, David L., 'Rudyerd, Sir Benjamin (1572–1658)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24256>].
- Smith, Helen, and Louise Wilson, eds, *Renaissance Paratexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Smith, Nigel, 'Exporting Enthusiasm: John Perrot and the Quaker Epic', in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp. 248-64.
- *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Smyth, Adam, 'Rend and Teare in Peeeces: Textual Fragmentation in Seventeenth-Century England', *SC* 19 (2004), 36-52.
- 'A New Record of the 1613 Globe Fire During a Performance of Shakespeare's King Henry VIII', *NQ* 52 (2005), 214-16.
- Snyder, Susan, 'Donne and Du Bartas: The Progresse of the Soule as Parody', *SP* 70 (1973), 392-407.
- 'Du Bartas', in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. by A. C. Hamilton. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- 'Sylvester, Josuah [Joshua] (1562/3–1618), poet and translator', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26873>].
- de Somogyi, Nick, *Shakespeare's Theatre of War*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.
- 'Barret, Robert (fl. 1586?–1607)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1519>].
- Speiser, E. A., ed., *Genesis*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964; repr. 2008.

- Spufford, Margaret, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981; repr. 1989.
- Stallybrass, Peter, 'Books and Scrolls: Navigating the Bible', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Lotte Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002, pp. 42-79.
- and Roger Chartier, 'Reading and Authorship: The Circulation of Shakespeare 1590-1619', in *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text*, ed. by Andrew Murphy. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, pp. 35-56.
- Stanwood, P. G., 'Fletcher, Phineas (1582–1650)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9738>].
- Starnes, D. T., '*The French Academie* and *Wits Commonwealth*', *PQ* 13 (1934), 211-14.
- 'Some Sources of *Wits Theater of the Little World* (1599) and *Bodenham's Belvedere* (1600)', *PQ* 30 (1951), 411-18.
- Steadman, John, 'Tantalus and the Dead Sea Apples (*Paradise Lost*, X, 547-73)', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 45 (1965), 35-40.
- 'Milton, Fulgentius, and Edward Browne: A Note on the Tantalus Myth', *NQ* 13 (1966), 391-92.
- Stern, Tiffany, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Stevenson, George, ed., *Poems of Alexander Montgomerie*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1910.
- Stewart, Alan, 'Bacon, Anthony (1558–1601)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/988>].
- Stock, Brian, *Ethics through Literature: Ascetic and Aesthetic Reading in Western Culture*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2007.
- Stoicheff, Peter, and Andrew Taylor, eds, *The Future of the Page*. Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

- Strathmann, Ernest A., 'The 1595 Translation of Du Bartas' "First Day"', *HLQ* 8 (1945), 185-91.
- Sykes, H. Dugdale, 'Peele's Borrowings from Du Bartas', *NQ* 147 (1924), 349-51 and 368-69.
- Tamalio, R., 'Guisoni, Ferrante' in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*
 [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ferrante-guisoni_(Dizionario-Biografico)/].
- Taylor, F., 'The Books of Manuscripts of Scipio le Squyer, Deputy Chamberlain of the Exchequer (1620-59)', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 25 (1941), 137-64.
- Taylor, George Coffin, *Milton's Use of Du Bartas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- 'The Strange Case of Du Bartas in *The Taming of A Shrew*', *PQ* 20 (1941), 373-76.
- Taylor, Katie, 'Vernacular Geometry: Between the Senses and Reason', *BSHM Bulletin: Journal of the British Society for the History of Mathematics* 26 (2011), 147-59.
- Teversham, Traviss Frederick. *A History of the Village of Sawston*, 2 vols. Sawston: Crampton, 1942-47.
- Thomas, D. H., 'John Eliot's Borrowings from Du Bartas in his Minor Works', *Revue de littérature comparée* 43 (1969), 262-76.
- Thompson, Ann, 'Dating Evidence for *The Taming of the Shrew*', *NQ* 29 (1982), 108-9.
- Tilley, M. P., 'The Comedy *Lingua* and Du Bartas' *La Sepmaine*', *MLN* 42 (1927), 293-99.
- 'Charles Lamb, Marston, and Du Bartas', *MLN* 53 (1938), 494-98.
- *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.
- Todd, Henry John, ed., *The Poetical Works of John Milton: With Notes of Various Authors*, 6 vols. London: Longman and Co., 1826.
- Tribble, Evelyn B., *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993.
- Upham, Alfred Horatio, *The French Influence in English Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1908.
- Ure, Peter, 'Two Passages in Sylvester's Du Bartas and their Bearing on Shakespeare's *Richard II*', *NQ* 198 (1953), 374-77.

- Vaganay, Hugues, 'L'oeuvre d'un évêque français traduite par Josuah Sylvester', *Revue de littérature comparée* 15 (1935), 109-10.
- Van Dijk, Conrad, "'Those Proud Towers': Paradise Lost, V.907", *NQ* 51 (2004), 361-62.
- Van Dorsten, J. A., *Poets, Patrons and Professors: Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers and the Leiden Humanists*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 1962.
- Venn, John, ed., *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 10 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922-54.
- Verweij, Sebastiaan, 'The Manuscript of William Fowler: A Revaluation of *The Tarantula of Love, A Sonnet Sequence and Of Death*', *Scottish Studies Review* 8 (2007), 9-23.
- Vickers, Brian, *Shakespeare, A Lover's Complaint, and John Davies of Hereford*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Warner, George Frederic, ed., *The Library of James VI, 1575-1583*. Edinburgh, 1893.
- Watson, Foster, *The Zodiacus Vitae of Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus: An Old School-Book*. London: Philip Wellby, 1908.
- Watt, Tessa, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Weller, Philipp, *Josuah Sylvesters Englische Übersetzungen der religiösen Epen des Du Bartas*. Tübingen: G. Schnürlein, 1902.
- Wells, Stanley, 'A New Early Reader of Shakespeare', in *Shakespeare's Book: Essays in Reading, Writing and Reception*, ed. by Richard Meek, Jane Rickard and Richard Wilson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008, pp. 233-40.
- West, Philip, *Henry Vaughan's 'Silex Scintillans': Scripture Uses*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- White, Harold O., *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance: A Study in Critical Distinctions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Whitlock, Baird W., *John Hoskyns, Serjeant-at-Law*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982.
- Whybray, R. N., *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Will, Samuel F., 'An Unpublished Letter of Du Bartas', *MLN* 49 (1934), 150-52.

- Williams, Arnold, *The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527-1633*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.
- Williams, Jr., Franklin B., 'John Bodenham, "Art's Lover, Learning's Friend"', *SP* 31 (1934), 198-214.
- 'Notes on Englands Parnassus', *MLN* 52 (1937), 402-5.
- 'The Bear Facts about Joshua Sylvester, The Woodman', *English Language Notes* 9 (1971), 90-98.
- Williams, Gruffydd Aled, 'The Poetic Debate of Edmwnd Prys and Wiliam Cynwal', *RS* 18 (2004), 33-54.
- 'Prys, Edmwnd (1542/3-1623)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22856>].
- Wimmers, Eric, 'The Style of Josuah Sylvester, Translator of Du Bartas'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Indiana, 1972.
- Wing, Donald, *Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*, 2nd edition. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1972-88 [<http://estc.bl.uk>].
- Witney, Charles, 'Ante-aesthetics: Towards a Theory of Early Modern Audience Response', in *Shakespeare and Modernity: Early Modern to Millennium*, ed. by Hugh Grady. London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 40-60.
- Wolffe, Mary, 'Cary, Robert (*bap.* 1615, *d.* 1688)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4843>].
- 'Risdon, Tristram (*c.*1580–1640)', in *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23668>].
- Wraight, A. D., *Christopher Marlowe and Edward Alleyn*. Chichester: Adam Hart, 1993.
- Yates, Frances, 'The Importance of John Eliot's *Ortho-Epia Gallica*', *RES* 7 (1931), 419-30.
- Zimmermann, Susan, and Garrett Sullivan, eds, 'Forum: The Return of the Author', *Shakespeare Studies* 36 (2008), 19-131.
- Zurcher, Andrew, 'Deficiency and Supplement: Perfecting the Prosthetic Text', *SEL* 51 (2012), 143-64.