

CONTEMPORARY ANALOGUES TO JOSUAH SYLVESTER'S *DEVINE WEEKES*

PETER AUGER

I

Josuah Sylvester's translation of Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas's *Semaines* (1578, 1584 *et seq.*) was widely read in seventeenth-century Britain, but is known to few non-specialists today.¹ *La Sepmaine* (1578, translated as 'The First Week') describes the seven days of the world's creation, while the unfinished sequel *La Seconde Semaine* (1584, 'The Second Week') retells biblical history from Adam's to David's time. These poems supplement a literal retelling of the Book of Genesis with material taken from such authors as Pliny and Aristotle (on the Augustinian precedent for such writing, see Howell); for example, the Sixth Day of the First Week adheres to Genesis 1:24–2:3 but adds long zoological and anatomical catalogues indebted to classical sources. The *Semaines* were regarded as a successful synthesis of humanist and Protestant forms of knowledge by contemporary poets, scholars and clergymen alike (Auger). Du Bartas was translated into English by at least eight writers, including Philip Sidney (whose version is now lost), but Sylvester's *Devine Weekes, and Workes* (1605 *et seq.*), which contained both 'weeks' as well as the French poet's other 'works', effectively became the standard English translation once published (Sylvester 70–71; Crummé). Du Bartas's popularity in Renaissance Britain is still commonly seen as an historical anomaly whose main literary legacy is found in Book 7 of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667), where the speaker invokes Urania, the Christian muse who in Du Bartas's 'L'Uranie' (1584) appealed for religiously-committed biblical verse. This article argues that *Devine Weekes* is more relevant to early modern literary studies than is usually acknowledged by positioning it alongside lesser-known printed religious poems in English. These contemporary analogues (i.e. works comparable, equivalent, parallel or otherwise similar to *Devine Weekes*) offer new directions in re-evaluating the *Semaines*' place within early modern English literature,

I gratefully acknowledge that this research was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC).

and expanding our awareness of the varieties of seventeenth-century religious poetry.

Devine Weekes cannot be easily placed within a single literary genre. It is undoubtedly a ‘divine’ poem, in that it has a scriptural source (following the classic definition in Campbell, 4–5). The term ‘biblical epic’ is appropriate to Du Bartas’s *Judith* (1573), and would also bring out possible similarities with *Paradise Lost*; however, it underplays the unique properties of *Devine Weekes* and its analogues. In particular, these works tend to have an epistemological dimension which Anglophone critics of seventeenth-century religious poetry have largely overlooked. French-speaking critics who have re-assessed the *Semaines* in the last three decades (in general paying greater attention to *La Sepmaine*) have used terms that translate into English as ‘didactic’, ‘hexaemeral’, ‘scientific’ and ‘encyclopedic’ to describe this aspect of Du Bartas’s poems.² A recent study argues that Du Bartas consciously mixes genres:

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’object d’un éclaircissement. (Giacomotto–Charra 17)

(*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.)

Du Bartas himself resisted categorization of the *Semaines*: in the preface to his *Seconde Semaine*, he wrote that the poem is neither ‘un œuvre purement épique, ou héroïque, ains en partie héroïque, en partie panegirique, en partie prophétique, en partie didascalique’ (‘[not] a purely epic or heroic work, but in part heroic, in part panegyric, in part prophetic, in part didactic’: Du Bartas 220). *Devine Weekes* is also hybrid: the First and Second Weeks are distinct in style, theme and genre. The First contains more natural philosophical and cosmological material, whereas the Second is more biblical and historical. Similarly, Susan Snyder (79) illustrates just how widely the adjective ‘Bartasian’ could be applied to early modern English literature by suggesting that the

First Week was a model for ‘Uranian’ or ‘Christian–scientific’ poetry, and the Second Week inspired divine and heroic poetry. This article does not distinguish so sharply between the two Weeks, since seventeenth-century readers rarely did, and the literary mode (i.e. the general mood and manner) of both weeks is broadly similar. It does, however, recognize that Du Bartas’s influence on English poets is diffuse and often difficult to isolate, so will concentrate on those ‘Christian–scientific’ or ‘hexaemeral’ elements that are found throughout *Devine Weekes*, and particularly in the First Week.

This article identifies these important but neglected features of Sylvester’s translation of the *Semaines*, and then shows where they occur in other seventeenth-century English poems. The first section discounts *Paradise Lost* as a valuable analogue to *Devine Weekes* by considering differences between the early modern works that are paralleled in their biblical source. The second section introduces seventeenth-century poems that possess similar ‘hexaemeral’ or ‘didactic’ qualities in order to suggest several directions for pursuing *Devine Weekes*’ significance and its contemporary appeal. This selective analysis looks to improve our historical consciousness of Sylvester’s translation, while introducing a network of religious poems at the interface of divine poetry, natural philosophy and history in the early seventeenth century, and showing the need for further research on religious poetry contemporary with Du Bartas’s and Sylvester’s works.

II

There are fundamental structural differences between *Devine Weekes* and *Paradise Lost*, even though both poems are based on Genesis. These dissimilarities are manifested in the poems’ contrasting representations of God the Father. 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).³ In Sylvester’s translation the deity is an immanent creative force who is described using more abstract language: e.g. ‘Before all Time, all Matter, Form, and Place,/ God all in all, and all in God it was:/ Immutable, immortall, infinite,/ Incomprehensible, all spirit, all light,/ All Majestie, all–self–Omnipotent,/ Invisible, impassive, excellent’ (1.i.54–58). The line ‘immutable, immortal, infinite’ is the single line from Sylvester’s translation that appears unchanged in *Paradise Lost* (though see Coffin Taylor): ‘Thee Father first they sung omnipotent,/ Immutable, immortal, infinite,/ Eternal king; thee author of all being’ (3.372–74). In *Devine Weekes*, these adjectives are given as inherent properties of the divine

being, but in *Paradise Lost* they become epithets that the Son reports back to the Father.

This intertextual moment highlights a crucial difference between these poems' literary modes: Sylvester's translation is 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. An underlying reason for this disparity is that the 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' (ii.i.1) 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 (ll. 500–630). 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 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.

Modern Biblical criticism has identified differences between the two Genesis sources that offer a strong analogy, and perhaps an underlying cause, for these stylistic and structural features. Though seventeenth-century scholars noticed inconsistencies between accounts of humankind's creation in the hexaemeral and Eden narratives, 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.⁴ The voice 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 of 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' (xxvii). Speiser's sketch of J suggests various attributes common to *Paradise Lost*, 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’ (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 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’ (xxvi). The authorial voice in *Devine Weekes* is similarly more authoritative and earnest than J, and consequently less imaginative and expressive.

This broad 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; by contrast, ‘[i]n J’s world view...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 his strengths and weaknesses’ (xxviii). In a seventeenth-century context, then, we would expect P to be more closely aligned with royalism, and J with republicanism. Indeed, the publication of *Devine Weekes* (which was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 22 November 1604) may well have been delayed until after James VI and I’s accession in 1603, since the Scottish king was a known admirer of Du Bartas and his poetry: the two met in 1586/7, and James commended Du Bartas’s poetry in his *Basilikon Doron* (1:15–18). In pursuit of patronage, Sylvester included over thirty pages of prefatory material to the king in *Devine Weekes*. Thus one way of understanding *Devine Weekes*’ relative obscurity in most accounts of Stuart literature is that the static political, moral and epistemological outlook encouraged by both the P-voice and *Devine Weekes* brought with it a poetic style on the wrong side of political developments in the later seventeenth century.

The correlative links between P and *Devine Weekes* are a starting-point for retrieving some sense of this historically significant poetic mode. They suggest salient characteristics of *Devine Weekes* that are present in other seventeenth-century religious poems, notably ‘hexaemeral’ structures of knowledge and tone of voice, and non-fictional or instructive content in 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. The 1608 and later editions of Sylvester’s translation listed the topics covered in each Day of the First Week: ‘In the 1. Day, The Chaos. 2. Day, The Elements. 3. Day, The Sea & Earth. 4. Day, The Heavens, Sun, Moon, etc. 5. Day, The Fishes and Foules, 6. Day, The Beasts and Man. 7. Day, The Sabaoth’ (B8v: STC 21650; typography modernized; for The Second Week see, e.g., B1r, P7r, Q8r). Contents pages, printed marginalia, Argument stanzas and ‘an index of the hardest words’, would all have helped contemporary readers to navigate the book, and also encouraged non–serial reading: many poems analogous to *Devine Weekes* have similar textual devices, and were consulted in a similar way.

III

Du Bartas directly inspired several Christian ‘hexaemeral’ poems in European languages (de Maisières): Torquato Tasso’s *Le Sette Giornate del Mondo Creato* (‘The Seven Days of the World’s Creation’) in 1607, Alonso de Acevedo’s *Creacion del Mundo* (‘Creation of the World’) in 1615, Gaspare Murtola’s *Della Creazione del Mondo* (‘Of the World’s Creation’) in 1608 and Don Felice Passero’s *L’Essamerone* (‘The Hexaemeron’) in 1609. There are no equivalent poems in English, however, and the term ‘hexaemeral’ has mostly been used when discussing *Paradise Lost* (Corcoran; Hillier). Barbara Lewalski admired Milton’s ability to transcend the genre:

Raphael’s prototypical hexaemeral epic [in Book 7] meets this formidable challenge with a design vastly superior to that of its literary progeny [Lucretius, Ovid and Du Bartas] and precisely suited to Adam and Eve’s situation. He [Milton] eschews the lengthy catalogues and the encyclopedic lore characteristic of the genre, offering instead a sharply focused description of the wonders and processes. (Lewalski 45)

Lewalski does not, however, name vernacular English examples of poems with ‘lengthy catalogues and the encyclopedic lore characteristic of the genre’. The only contemporary writer to attempt an original description of the seven days of creation in English appears to be the controversial preacher Henoah Clapham, though his *Elohim or Ælohim–triune* (1601: STC 5329) describes the first day of Creation only in

thirteen sections; the poem is marked on the title–page as the ‘First Part’, but Clapham does not appear to have composed further sections. Clapham’s method is comparable to Sylvester’s in that he takes Genesis 1 as ‘The 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 marginal notes for relieuing of the young student’ (title–page). The only other work to mention which is primarily about the Creation is John Swan’s prose description, *Speculum Mundi* (1635: STC 23516), which is announced on the title–page as containing ‘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’. This hexameron is written with awareness of Sylvester’s translation: Swan quotes from the First Week almost fifty times (along with other works like Edward Topsell’s *Historie of Four-footed Beastes* (1607) and John Gerard’s *Herball, or Generall Historie of Plantes* (1597)), and even imitates Sylvester’s verse in several places (¶¶1v, 2S3v, 3B2v, 3E3v). Swan’s use of the First Week as a source for factual information shows how authoritative Sylvester’s account of the Creation was, but Clapham and Swan are alone in writing strict hexamers that are analogous specifically to the First Week.

A more promising direction in which to pursue analogues are poems that use the week as a structuring device, and are in a sense fruitful extensions of *Devine Weekes*. A good example is John Davies of Hereford’s *Summa Totalis* (1607: STC 6337), which versifies natural philosophy taken from Pierre de la Primaudaye’s *L’Academie Française* in seven sections representing seven days (Vickers 24–25). Davies wrote verses for editions of Sylvester’s translation in 1605 (B6r) and 1608 (2N5v–7r), and probably imitated *Devine Weekes* by adopting a seven–section division for a non–fictional, consciously learned and anonymously voiced work. Davies had already written two similar poems: *Mirum in Modum* (1602: STC 6336), and *Microcosmos* (1605: STC 6334). All three poems are heavily descriptive, and contain printed marginalia and section divisions to facilitate discontinuous reading: they confirm that *Devine Weekes* did have near–contemporary precedents in English poetry. Phineas Fletcher’s *The Purple Island* (1633: STC 11082) is another good parallel, which again was printed with marginalia and twelve canto divisions that facilitate reading in parts. It was probably written in the 1610s, and appears to incorporate elements from the Sixth Day on human anatomy (Stanwood; Du Bartas is named on A2v). The poem offers an allegorical description of the human body narrated over seven days, and combines scientific, religious, and moral themes: critics

have tended to concentrate on Fletcher's anatomical descriptions in the first six cantos, but the second half of the poem deals exclusively with moral matters (Mitchell). Daniel Featly observed in a preface to the poem that self-knowledge is preliminary to understanding of the divine: 'He that would learn *Theologie*, must first studie *Autologie*. The way to God is by our selves' (4r). This commitment to approaching God by understanding the human body is present in the Sixth Day too: 'There's under Sunne (as *Delphos* God did show)/ No better Knowledge then *Our selfe to Know*' (1.vi.419–20). *The Purple Island* and *Devine Weekes*, like Davies's long poems, share a vision of study and learning as aids to spiritual progress.

Another poem with a comparable purpose that uses the week division is the panegyric *The Soules Immortale Crowne Consisting of Seaven Glorious Graces* (1605: STC 3701) by Nicholas Breton, which is described on its title-page as being 'devided into seaven dayes Workes'. The poem makes no reference to the week-division other than the running headers on each page. In fact, 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: STC 12169), which was published in the previous year with the same unusually extravagant title-page borders first used in Thomas Bentley's *Monument of Matrones* (1582: STC 1892). Breton's poem may seem less of a promising analogue to *Devine Weekes* because it only addresses moral topics, but there is an important point of similarity: *Soules Immortale Crowne*, like Sylvester's translation, contains a title-page dedication to James I. Breton (or his printer, Humfrey Lownes, who also printed *Devine Weekes*) probably adopted the biblical hexaemeron to emphasize the king's own perfect 'immortale crowne', and possibly to invoke Sylvester's translation too. Sylvester's translation was evidently perceived as a royalist text, as the comparison with P suggested, and *Soules Immortale Crowne* appears anxious to adopt a similarly deferential, conservative tone. Other panegyrics are also potential analogues to the *Semaines*, such as William Leighton's *Virtue Triumphant, Or a Lively Description of the Fovre Vertves Cardinall* (1603: STC 15435).

The centre of power is also a centre of learning in both the biblical hexaemeron and the early modern poems considered above: in seventeenth-century England and Scotland, James VI and I modelled himself as a scholar-king immersed in humanist culture. The aristocratic connection also matters because courtiers, as well as being important patrons for literature, led the way with developing natural philosophy and early modern science; for example, the nobility then owned the best

natural historical collections in Europe (Findlen). The physician and poet Thomas Moffet, who served the Herbert family at Wilton, showed how close the relationship between natural philosophy and poetry could be in *The Silkwormes, and their Flies* (1599: STC 17994), which is a versified natural history of silkworms that combines mythological material with practical information about cultivation. *The Silkwormes* may have consciously followed the *Semaines*: Moffet knew of, and had probably read, Sidney's translation (Moffet 12 and 74). His poem illustrates another aspect of the early modern association between learning, poetry and authority, which *Devine Weekes* magnified by dealing with both spiritual and temporal power.

Devine Weekes was lauded as an innovative fusion of divine poetry and knowledge in a form that was comprehensive, accessible and entertaining. Simon Goulart's massive commentary on the *Semaines* facilitated such use of the poems; it was translated into English by Thomas Lodge, and printed in 1621, 1637 and 1638 (STC 21666–68). William Scott, who translated the first two Days of *La Sepmaine*, praised the poems' learning highly: he identifies the *Semaines* as a 'heroical poem' in which Du Bartas 'opened as much Naturall Science in one weeke, conteyninge the storie of the Creation, as all the rable of Schoole-men and Philosophers haue done since Plato and Aristotle' (Scott 11r). Scott observed that Du Bartas 'minced and sugred [natural knowledge] for the weakest and tendrest stomak, yet throughly to satisfie the strongest judgements'. Clearly *Devine Weekes* was a resource for instruction, but the poems are not purely 'encyclopedic' or 'didactic', since the poems' generic diversity is an essential characteristic of the poems' presentation of knowledge. *Devine Weekes* is not systematic enough to be called 'encyclopedic', since in the early modern period that term implied the union of learning into a 'metaphysically significant plan' (Kenny 13). 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 variety: as Jan Miernowski writes, the *Semaines* are a 'discours sur discours infiniment divers' ('a discourse about an infinitely diverse discourse': Miernowski 117). Likewise, *Devine Weekes* contains 'didactic' elements without being an explicitly or rigidly pedagogical work.⁵ 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 (STC 19148)), Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and Virgil's *Georgics* (Fowler). Only *Zodiacus Vitae* contains the same cosmological ambition as *Devine Weekes* and adopts 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* (1605: STC 24519; 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'.

New Anatomie provides a good analogue to *Devine Weekes* as a religious poem that assimilates Scripture with contemporary knowledge, even though there are major differences in narrative point-of-view and style. There are several other works with generic similarities to *Devine Weekes* that also imitate Sylvester's style. William Alexander's *Doomes-day* (1637) is almost a continuation of the *Semaines*: it provides a vast apocalyptic vision of the Last Judgement divided into twelve 'Houres' that contain long sections naming different creatures and historical characters stanza-by-stanza. Edward Cooke's *Bartas Iunior* (1631: STC 5667) 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: STC 12171; repr. 1632, 1699 and 1716) Edmund Graile acknowledged Du Bartas and Sylvester as literary models (A4v) for his 'summary relation of the Historicall part of holy Scripture, plainely and familiarly comprised in Meeter' (title-page). Thomas Peyton's *The Glasse of Time* (1620: STC 19824), which was dedicated to Prince Charles, gives an overview of the first two historical ages in heroic couplets, with argument stanzas and marginalia to guide readers. John Norden's poems *Vicissitudo Rerum* (1600: STC 18642, reprinted as *A Storehouse of Varieties* in 1601) and *Labyrinth of Mans Life* (1614: STC 18611) explore cosmological and moral questions in rhyme royal and heroic couplets respectively.⁶ Edward Benlowes's *Theophila* (1652; Wing B1879; Du Bartas praised on G1r) and Joseph Beaumont's *Psyche* (1648; Wing B1625) 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 did not only influence individual seventeenth-century poets, but 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).

IV

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 royalist (and ecclesiologically conservative) assumptions, catalogues of information, textual apparatus such as marginalia, and a tendency to be read in parts. The decline in popularity of *Devine Weekes* and its analogues during the seventeenth and later centuries indicated changed cultural attitudes to science, politics, theology and poetry—though Anne Bradstreet's *Quarternion* (1678) and Lucy Hutchinson's *Order and Disorder* (1677) are two further analogues from later in the century that both followed the *Semaines*.

The analogues identified in this article can contribute to understanding *Devine Weekes*' contemporaneity and reclaiming some sense of its relevance. *Devine Weekes* belonged within a lively tradition of popular religious writing that comprehended and communicated new forms of knowledge within a unified Christian world-view. In order to pursue these connections more fully, we would need to have a better sense of how these other works use Scripture and other source material, their publication history, their readership, how they were read, and their other literary models. More work on how the sapiential books of the Bible (especially Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes) offered instruction would be valuable. The analogues to *Devine Weekes* introduced in this article strengthen the case for a reappraisal of the translation along the lines of recent francophone criticism on the *Semaines*. They also 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.

NOTES

Abbreviations

STC Short Title Catalogue

¹ See Prescott, ‘Du Bartas’ and ‘Du Bartas and Renaissance Britain’. See also Auger. Cummings (591–92) summarizes criticism on Du Bartas in English.

² See Bellenger, ‘État present des études sur Du Bartas’. Bellenger and James Dauphiné led the positive reappraisal of the *Semaines* in the 1980s. Dauphiné’s publications include *Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas*, and the edited conference proceedings *Du Bartas, Poète Encyclopédique du XVIIe Siècle*. Bellenger published editions of the *Semaines*, and the essay collection *Du Bartas et ses divines Semaines*.

³ All line references to *Paradise Lost* are from Fowler’s edition, references to *Devine Weekes* are from Snyder’s edition, and references to the Bible are from the King James Version.

⁴ 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 Blenkinsopp 60–67; Whybray; Davies 13–15). In seventeenth-century England 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’ (Williams 66–67). Mary Nyquist describes *Paradise Lost* as ‘the product of an ideologically overdetermined desire to unify the two different creation accounts in Genesis’ (Nyquist and Ferguson 102).

⁵ On Renaissance didactic literature, see Ruys, and Glaisyer and Pennell.

⁶ There has been some debate as to whether the surveyor and devotional writer are the same person: see Patterson.

WORKS CITED

- Auger, Peter. ‘The *Semaines*’ Dissemination in England and Scotland until 1641’. *Renaissance Studies* (forthcoming).
- Bellenger, Yvonne. ‘État present des études sur Du Bartas en France depuis 1970’. *Oeuvres et Critiques* 29 (2004): 12–26.
- Bellenger, Yvonne, ed. *Du Bartas et ses divines Semaines*. Paris: SEDES, 1993.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*. London: SCM, 1992.

- Campbell, Lily Bess. *Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth–Century England*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1959.
- Corcoran, M.I. *Milton's Paradise with Reference to the Hexaemeral Background*. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1945.
- Crummé, Hannah Leah. 'William Scott's Copy of Sidney'. *Notes and Queries* 56 (2009): 553–54.
- Cummings, Robert. 'Recent Studies in English Translation, c. 1590–c. 1660: Part 2: Translations from Vernacular Languages'. *English Literary Renaissance* 39 (2009): 586–615.
- Dauphiné, James, ed. *Du Bartas, Poète Encyclopédique du XVIe 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.
- Dauphiné, James. *Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas: Poète Scientifique*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1983.
- . *La bibliothèque de Du Bartas*. Paris: H. Champion, 1994.
- Davies, G.I. 'Introduction to the Pentateuch'. *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Ed. John Barton and John Muddiman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001; repr. 2010. 12–38.
- De Maisières, Maury Thibaut. *Les Poèmes Inspirés Du Début De La Gènesse À L'Époque de la Renaissance*. Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyst, 1931.
- Du Bartas, Guillaume de Salluste. *The Works of Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur Du Bartas: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and Variants*. Ed. Urban Tigner Holmes, John Coriden Lyons and Robert White Linker. 3 vols. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints; Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1935–8; repr. 1977.
- Findlen, Paula. 'Courting Nature'. *Cultures of Natural History*. Ed. Nicholas Jardine, James Secord and Emma Spary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Fowler, Alastair. 'Didactic Kinds'. *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*. Ed. Gordon Braden, Robert Cummings, and Stuart Gillespie. 5 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. 2:194–200.
- 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.

- Hillier, Russell M. 'Spatial Allegory and Creation Old and New in Milton's Hexaemeral Narrative'. *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 49.1 (2009): 121–43.
- Howell, Kenneth J. 'Textual Knowledge and Textual Meaning in Augustine's Interpretation of Genesis: The Three Functions of Natural Philosophy'. *Nature and Scripture in the Abrahamic Religions: Up to 1700*. Ed. Jitse M. van der Meer and Scott Mandelbrote. Leiden: Brill, 2008. 117–45.
- James I. *The Basilicon Doron of King James VI*. Ed. James Craigie. 2 vols. Edinburgh; London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1944.
- Kenny, Neil. *The Palace of Secrets: Béroalde de Verville and Renaissance Conceptions of Knowledge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Lewalski, Barbara. *Paradise Lost and the Rhetoric of Literary Forms*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Miernowski, Jan. *Dialectique et connaissance dans 'La Sepmaine' de Du Bartas: discours sur discours infiniment divers*. Geneva: Droz, 1992.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler. London: Longman, 1971.
- Mitchell, Peter. *The Purple Island and Anatomy in Early Seventeenth-Century Literature, Philosophy, and Theology*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006.
- Moffett, Thomas. *Nobilis*. Ed. Virgil B. Heltzel and Hoyt H. Hudson. San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1940.
- Nyquist, Mary. 'The Genesis of Gendered Subjectivity in the Divorce Tracts and in *Paradise Lost*'. *Re-Membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*. Ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson. London: Methuen, 1987. 99–127.
- Patterson, Mary Hampson. *Domesticating the Renaissance: Protestant Best Sellers, Private Devotion, and the Revolution of English Piety*. Madison and Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Presses, 2007. 327–33.
- Prescott, Anne Lake. 'Du Bartas'. *French Poets and the English Renaissance: Studies in Fame and Transformation*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978. 167–234.
- . 'Du Bartas and Renaissance Britain: An Update'. *Oeuvres et Critiques* 29 (2004): 27–38.
- Ruys, Juanita Feros, ed. *What Nature Does Not Teach: Didactic Literature in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods*. Turnhout: Brepols; Abingdon: Marston, 2008.
- Scott, William. *The Modell of Poesy*. British Library MS Add. 81083.

- Snyder, Susan. 'Sylvester, Josuah (1562/3–1618)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. 1 July 2011. <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26873>>
- Speiser, E. A., ed. *Genesis*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964.
- Stanwood, P. G. 'Fletcher, Phineas (1582–1650)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. 1 July 2011. <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26873>>
- Sylvester, Josuah, trans. *The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste, Sieur du Bartas*. Ed. Susan Snyder. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Taylor, George Coffin. *Milton's Use of Du Bartas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Vickers, Brian. *Shakespeare, A Lover's Complaint, and John Davies of Hereford*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Whybray, R.N. *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Williams, Arnold. *The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527–1633*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.