THE SEMAINES’ DISSEMINATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND UNTIL 1641

Most educated English and Scottish readers in the Stuart period knew of Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas’s Semaines (1578, 1584 et seq.), usually in Josuah Sylvester’s translation, Devine Weekes (1605 et seq.).¹ This article is about how the Semaines’ readership expanded and diversified between the date of the first printed English-language translations of Du Bartas’s poetry in 1584 and the final seventeenth-century re-issue of Sylvester’s translation in 1641.² 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.³ As more printed editions became available the number of references to Du Bartas increased, and


² Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas, The Historie of Iudith in Forme of a Poeme, trans. by Thomas Hudson (Edinburgh, 1584); James VI and I, The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Diuine Art of Poesie (Edinburgh, 1584); and Du Bartas his Divine Weekes, and Workes, trans. Joshua Sylvester (London, 1641). The main English translations from the Semaines (in most cases sections from the poems only) are those by Sir Philip Sidney (now lost; see note 15 below), James VI (printed 1591), William Lisle (printed 1595, 1598, 1625 and 1637), Thomas Winter (printed 1603 and 1604), Robert Barret (c. 1600, see note 9), William Scott (c. 1600, see note 8) and Josuah Sylvester (printed between 1592 and 1641). For publication details, see The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste, Sieur du Bartas, trans. Josuah Sylvester, ed. Susan Snyder, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), I, 70-71.

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.

The *Semaines* consist of two poems: *La Sepmaine* (1578, translated as the ‘First
Week’), which describes the seven days of Creation with long sections about contemporary
science, cosmology and natural history; and the more biblical-historical *La Seconde Semaine*
(1584, the ‘Second Week’), only four Days of which (corresponding to the first four
historical ages) were completed. Although the poems are stylistically and thematically
diverse, they are treated as a single work in this article because the early modern writers
discussed make no significant distinction between them. Critics have deliberated over
whether the *Semaines* are better described as ‘didactic’, ‘encyclopedic’, ‘hexameral’ or
‘scientific’ poems, but Du Bartas evaded tidy generic distinctions when he claimed that
neither poem was ‘un œuvre purement épique, ou héroïque, ains en partie héroïque, en partie
panégorique, en partie prophétique, en partie didascalique’ (‘a purely epic, or heroic work, but
in part heroic, in part panegyrical, in part prophetic, in part didactic’).4 ‘Divine’ is probably the
most common epithet used by early modern English-language writers to describe Du Bartas
and his poetry, and this term is best understood using Du Bartas’s ‘L’Uranie’ (1574), which
was also being read and translated in England and Scotland at this time (James VI made the

---

4 *The Works of Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur Du Bartas: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and
Reprints; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935-8; repr. 1977), i, 220. For recent discussion of
the *Semaines*’ genres see, for example, Violaine Giacomotto-Charra, *La forme des choses: poésie et savoirs
dans la Sepmaine de Du Bartas* (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2009) and Yvonne Bellenger, *Du
first English translation, published in 1584). The poem reports an appeal by Urania, the Christian muse, for serious, religiously committed verse based on Scripture. The epic poem *Judith* (1574) was Du Bartas’s first attempt at biblical poetry, but the *Semaines* were his best-known ‘divine’ work, and most references in English to ‘Du Bartas’ in this period connote them. As a verse composition (in alexandrines, rendered in pentameter by Sylvester) written by someone described as a ‘poet’ in the seventeenth century, the *Semaines* would today be described as ‘literature’, but this term risks being unsympathetic to the poems’ non-fictional content and close links with other branches of learning: the *Semaines* intertwine poetry, classical learning, natural philosophy, world history and rhetoric. This ambitious combination was both attractive and useful in the seventeenth century: Du Bartas, unlike Petrarch, Ludovico Ariosto, Torquato Tasso and other post-classical poets, was cited in many English-language treatises, sermons and other prose works. Two important, and related, causes for the poet’s distinctive reputation, this article seeks to show, were James VI and I’s admiration for Du Bartas and the multiple editions of *Devine Weekes*.

This article examines the *Semaines*’ dissemination using the more than 150 English printed books in the period 1584-1641 that refer to Du Bartas. Much of this material is

---

5 See also Lily Bess Campbell’s classic study, *Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth-Century England* (Cambridge; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), 4-5.

6 This figure does not include manuscript references (there are more than fifteen) or translations of the *Semaines*. There are many further references (over sixty) from the period 1641-1700 that are not discussed here. All these references were collated from data gathered by Abbot and Prescott (see footnote 3), and supplemented with other critical articles relating to Du Bartas’s British reception, and keyword searches on Early English Books Online-Text Creation Partnership (EEBO-TCP) and other databases for ‘Bartas’, ‘Sylvester’ and variants. These data do not necessarily offer a complete picture of Du Bartas’s reception: in particular, this topic’s important Scottish context is not apparent from direct print references to Du Bartas (and is consequently underrepresented in this article too). For the strengths and limitations of EEBO as a research tool, see Anders Ingram,
mentioned by Anne Lake Prescott in her valuable book-chapter on Du Bartas’s English reception. In addition to incorporating numerous references that have not been discussed previously, this article builds on Prescott’s work by placing a methodological emphasis on how individual readers respond 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 simply to ‘Du Bartas’. ‘Du Bartas’ often acts as a proper noun for a French poet, but it 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 article focuses on the changing social and intellectual contexts of ‘Du Bartas’ references, looking for consensus where it exists and drawing connections between sources when relevant.

This article also benefits from the recent recovery of a late-Elizabethan poetic treatise, William Scott’s ‘The Modell of Poesy’ (c.1599). Scott’s treatise is a major surviving work of


Renaissance literary criticism, and contains numerous references to Du Bartas that praise and categorize the *Semaines*; the manuscript of ‘The Modell’ also contains Scott’s translation of the first two Days of *La Sepmaine*. The present analysis is informed and sharpened by an awareness of ‘The Modell’, but does not explicitly integrate Scott’s work with Du Bartas’s British reception more generally—this task is undertaken in the doctoral research associated with this article.  

This more closely contextualised account of Du Bartas’s British reception tries to show how, why, where and when the poem’s perceived value developed. It is difficult to identify exactly when the *Semaines*’ popularity peaked (1615 is the median date of publication for printed references until 1641), or when it began to decline: John Dryden’s remark that Sylvester’s translation is ‘abominable Fustian’ in the 1681 *Spanish Fryar* (A3r) indicates that opinion was turning against the *Semaines* towards the end of the century, but there are many references from the period 1640 to 1700 which show that Du Bartas’s works were still read in earnest. The three sections that follow concentrate on different groups of readers. The first begins with Gabriel Harvey’s *Pierces Supererogation*, and focuses on the physical book Harvey read and annotated, 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.

---


9 Another manuscript deserving more critical attention is Robert Barret’s translations from *La Seconde Semaine* (MS V. b. 224 (Folger)); see Anne Lake Prescott, ‘An Unknown Translation of Du Bartas’, *Renaissance News*, 19 (1966), 12-13.

Gabriel Harvey’s praise for the *Semaines* is among the earliest and most quoted (by later critics) tributes to Du Bartas’s poetry. 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 enrauished Poet’. The standard interpretation of this passage is that it shows that Du Bartas’s 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 Vrany, and his hellish Furies: but hath readd a most valorous Martial Lecture vnto himselfe in his owne victorious Lepanto […]’. Harvey mentions here James’s translations of ‘L’Uranie’ in *Essayes of a Prentise, in the Diuine Art of Poesie* (1584) and ‘The Furies’ (II.i.2) in *His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres* (1591; in the section of this passage not quoted, Harvey mentions kings who ‘render an accompt of their vacant hours’). 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 a selection of translations from Du Bartas’s works by Joshua Sylvester (1592), all three of which were bound together around 1592 into a book that Harvey annotated. 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 maner the only Poet of Divine: and worthy to be allledged of them, as Homer is quoted of Philosophers.’ Harvey’s public, printed utterance about Du Bartas arose from his private reading of James VI’s poetry, some of it from a book 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.

No other English translations of the Semaines had been published by 1593, though plenty of French editions must have been circulating. There was some activity in Latin which hints at Du Bartas’s prestige: 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 Philip Sidney (Exequiae Illustrissimi Equitis, D. Philippi Sidnaei, Gratissimae Memoriae ac Nomini Impensae (1587), D3r, E2v and K1r); Robert Ashley, a school-friend of Sylvester, produced a Latin version of ‘L’Uranie’ while at the Middle Temple; Hadrian Damman’s Sepmaine translation was published (under James’s auspices) in Edinburgh in 1600; and Gabriel de Lerm’s translation of the same work, first published in Paris in 1583, was printed in London in 1591 and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. Poets like Philip Sidney and Edmund Spenser would have read the French; Sidney wrote a now-lost English translation, probably of the

---

12 Relle, ‘Some New Marginalia’, 403.


whole first Sepmaine, and Spenser, according to Harvey, enjoyed ‘the fourth day of the first
weeke of Bartas’. Harvey doubtless knew the French too, since in A New Letter of Notable
Contents (1593) he laments the absence of Du Bartas translations (A4r). Abraham Fraunce’s
Lawyers Logicke (1588) names ‘Bartas’ (B3r) as a great European poet; published in the
same year, Fraunce’s The Arcadian Rhetoricke advertises on the titlepage that it contains
French quotations from ‘Salust his Iudith, and both his Semaines’.

Those around Harvey clearly knew, or were expected to know, Du Bartas’s poetry
too. Barnabe Barnes, an Elizabethan religious poet, 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 leaue with a Sonnet of that Muse, that honoreth the Vrany of du
Bartas and yerselfe: 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)

Barnes also exalts Du Bartas as the archetypal divine poet in the preface to his Divine
Centurie of Spiritual Sonnets (1595, A3r). Barnes is an addressee of the prefatory letter in
Pierces Supererogation along with two others who are likely to have known Du Bartas’s
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. Chute was close to Harvey by 1592, and his printer for Beawtie

---

15 Moore Smith (ed.), Harvey’s Marginalia, 161 (lines 8-10). The evidence for Sidney’s translation is
16 Howard Jones, ‘Thorius, John (b. 1568)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford University Press,
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). Chute is among the first writers to praise Du Bartas’s endurance when referring to ‘the weewe 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 in these works implicitly chides his opponent for not appreciating contemporary poetry. Nashe responded in Have with you to Saffron-Walden (1596): ‘I never so much as in thought detracted from Du Bartas, Buchanan, or anie generall allowed moderne Writer, howere Gnimelfe Hengiest [Gabriel Harvey] here guies out’.

This cluster of references centred on Harvey shows 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. Based on the initials ‘I.H.’ found after a prefatory verse, it is plausible that John Hoskins was linked with the 1595 translation of the First Day (otherwise considered anonymous), and that other Middle Templars were aware of it too. Thomas Churchyard probably translated part of the

---


Fifth Day, though only a paraphrase survives. 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 ‘Bartas sweet Semaines’ and ‘all Translators that doe striue to bring/ That stranger language to our vulgar tongue’. In The Kings Prophecie: or Weeping Ioy (1603), which was composed for James I’s coronation, Hall asserted a desire to emulate ‘thy Bartas selfe, whose sacred layes/ The yeelding world doth with thy selfe admire’ (ll. 117-18). Hall’s reference to Du Bartas’s ‘sacred layes’ helps form a favourable impression of Hall’s 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.

Marston’s and Hall’s references to the Semaines imply that the poems were known to a slightly wider public by the late 1590s. Two Elizabethan plays provide supporting evidence that Du Bartas’s name was known to cultured readers and audiences in London and the universities. One is Christopher Marlowe’s The Massacre at Paris (1594), which contains a minor character, ‘Bartus’, who serves the King of Navarre, as did his real-life counterpart. The other is the final Parnassus play performed at St. John’s College, Cambridge, which contains a request for a copy of Du Bartas: ‘SIRRHA boy remember me when I come in[to]

---

20 Thomas Churchyard, Churchyards Challenge (London, 1593), A5r-v and X1v-2v; see also A Musicall Consort of Heauenly Harmonie (compounded out of manie parts of musicke) called Churchyards Charitie (London, 1595), E4v and G4r.


Paules Churchyard to buy a *Ronzard & Dubartas* in French […].

23 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. 24 This detail is good evidence that Du Bartas’s works—and printed books—were being distributed there at that time.

***

The printed references mentioned so far do not indicate much close engagement with either Du Bartas’s 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. The *Semaines* were admired for being *dulce* and *utile*; as William Scott writes, ‘Bartas hath minced and sugred [Natural knowledge] 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. As the remainder of this article will show, the Semaines’ practical value came to play an 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 appears to quote from authors ‘one should read for stylistic development more than for grammatical study’. Eliot is upfront in his preface that he has taken ‘a score or two of verses out of Bartasius’. He includes over sixty lines of original translations from the Semaines: forty lines from ‘Les Colonies’ in praise of France; three extracts from ‘Babilone’ on Elizabeth, Scaliger and Cicero; and a five-line quotation from the Fifth Day about the lark. Other references focus on Du Bartas’s 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’; the speaker in one practice dialogue asks to ‘let me see the first and second weeke of Bartas in French’; while a third, adapting a comment attributed to Ronsard (and also recycled by William Drummond), mistakenly claims that ‘the Christian Poet William Sallustius, Lord of Bartas, 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’. Importantly, Eliot is elsewhere indebted to Goulart’s commentary on

26 Scott, ‘Modell of Poesy’, fol. 11.
27 Kibbee, For to Speke, 121.
28 John Eliot, Ortho-epia Gallica (London, 1593), B3r.
29 Ibid., J3v-4r (this translation is reproduced from his The Suruay or Topographical Description of France (London, 1592), A3r-4v); L1r-2v, F1r-v, G2r; and T2r.
'Babilone’ for information about European languages and literatures. 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. Harvey marks numerous Du Bartas allusions and translations throughout the work; however, 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 heroicall, & diuine Wittes: most braue, & souerain Poets next Homer, & Virgil; still my two singular Types, Bartas also an inspired & diuine spirit.’ On sig. H1r Harvey writes ‘braue Du Bartas’ and the following sentence: ‘Bartas, for the 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 literary personalities than in Eliot’s translations or material from the Goulart commentary.

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


32 Caroline Brown Bourland, ‘Gabriel Harvey and the Modern Languages’, Huntington Library Quarterly, 4 (1940), 85-106 (99-102). Harvey’s copy is held by the Huntington Library and is available on Early English Books Online.
well as French-English parallel texts, and Eliot was using an annotated French edition of the *Semaines*. William Lisle’s translations of ‘Babilone’ (1595) and ‘Les Colonies’ (1598) made sections of Goulart’s commentary and marginalia available in English, which is an early indication that the *Semaines*’ factual content was being appreciated. Apart from Fraunce in *The Arcadian Rhetoricke*, Thomas Lodge is the only other writer in the 1590s to cite the *Semaines* as a reference source. Lodge eventually published a complete translation of the *Semaines*’ commentary in 1621 (Lisle was the only other person to translate from them into English), which was re-issued three times in 1637-38. In *A Fig for Momus* (1595) Lodge quotes a reference to the numbers three and nine in ‘Les Colomnes’, and in *Wits Miseries* (1596) offers a fourteen-line original translation from ‘Les Furies’ in English introduced by three lines from the French. 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 Belvedere* (both 1600). Other writers, however, based their knowledge of Du Bartas on the French. Alexander Hume’s praise for Du Bartas’s ‘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 virtuous, & noble actes of good men: nor yet the extolling of liberall


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

sciences: But thou hast notable examples in the French toong set foorth by Salust of Bartas. Francis Thynne praises Du Bartas’s contribution to French literature in a prefatory verse to a 1602 edition of Chaucer’s works. He alludes to the ‘seuen daies’, which did not become available in English for another three years: ‘What fame Bartas vnto proud France hath gained/ By seuen daies world Poetically strained.’ 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’. Goulart’s marginalia, translated in full for the 1605 Devine Weekes, made the poem’s organisation 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 1605 edition brought much more of the text together within a single volume: it contained translations of La Sepmaine and the first two Days of La Seconde Semaine, and after two supplementary publications provided versions of the Third and Fourth Days of La Seconde Semaine (I and II Posthumus Bartas (1606, 1607)), the 1608 edition made the complete poem available in English. These publications made it easier for individuals to quote from the Semaines, for Du Bartas’s poetry was now available in a single quarto volume, with argument stanzas and Goulart’s marginalia as useful finding devices. There is more work to be done on how these textual features affected (and reflected) contemporary reading experiences of the Semaines, but it is clear that Devine Weekes effectively became the standard English translation:

36 Alexander Hume, Hymnes (Edinburgh, 1599), A4v.
37 The Workes of our Ancient and Lerned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer (London, 1602), B1r.
38 Ibid., A5r.
39 Snyder is right to conclude that Sylvester must have used the 1589 Chouët or a later edition, such as the 1591 Haultin edition, which contained Goulart’s marginalia. See Snyder (ed.), Divine Weeks, I, 68-9.
references to ‘Du Bartas’ in seventeenth-century English printed books are almost always taken from this translation.

The *Semaines*’ status as major Jacobean poems is confirmed by the five further editions of Sylvester’s translation that appeared after 1608 (in 1611, 1613, and folio editions of Sylvester’s works in 1621, 1633 and 1641), each of which contained the same extravagant paratextual material making a direct association between James and Du Bartas. James’s accession had brought publicity and authority to the *Semaines*’ potential use as a reference source. James VI was among the first British admirers of Du Bartas’s poetry, and was closely involved in the first British translations (and indirectly in their distribution, through the Vautrolliers). He was certainly known to others within the so-called ‘Castalian Band’, such as William Fowler and William Alexander. Du Bartas visited the Scottish Court in 1587, and was warmly received by James; Du Bartas was reportedly sent off with a gold chain and other expensive gifts. James and Du Bartas translated each other’s work around this time too. Through James Du Bartas’s reception in Scotland influenced English readers. James made his support for Du Bartas clear 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. *Basilikon Doron*’s ‘To the Reader’ remarks that ‘it [the work] must be taken of all men, for the true image of my very minde, and forme of the rule, whiche I haue

---


42 James Doelman, “‘A King of Thine Own Heart’: The English Reception of King James VI and I’s *Basilikon Doron*, *Seventeenth Century*, 9 (1994), 1-9 (1).
praescriued to my selfe and minde’. 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. 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 bee read by any Prince, or other good Christian; so would I especially wish you to bee well versed in them’. James’s request for good English Christians ‘to bee well versed’ in Du Bartas’s works posited Du Bartas’s poetry, and the Semaines in particular, as a significant cultural object: ‘well versed’ suggests that readers should be conversant with the poems’ learning. Less than a year later, the phrase was quoted by Thomas Winter in the preface to Prince Henry which introduces his translation from the Third Day.

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’s name was known in Oxford and Cambridge at the time of the

---


45 Craigie (ed.), Basilicon Doron, 1, 199 (lines 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.

46 The Third Dayes Creation (London, 1604), A2r-v.
British readers may never have been truly ‘well versed’ in the *Semaines*, but the association with James seems to remain 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 *La Seconde Semaine* that gives the translator John Molle ‘iust occasion to presume of your Maiesties gracious acceptance in this behalfe’ (A2r). Francis Bacon’s *Advancement of Learning* (1605) contains a Du Bartas reference that again recalls a specific quotation from the *Semaines*. Dozens of Stuart writers similarly emphasize their work’s continuity with the *Semaines*, and in doing so demonstrate that they are 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 king’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.

***

The *Semaines* were widely seen as Du Bartas’s ‘no lesse learned then Christian weeke’. The lawyer Richard Zouch noted that the *Semaines* are more contemplative than didactic:

___


48 *The Twoo Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Advancement of Learning, Diuine and Humane* (London, 1605), E1v.

‘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.’ 50 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’. 51 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 ‘modern Distiques’ that the Puritan William Prynne cites 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. 52 The poems probably represented conformity, both to a Jacobean ecclesiastical consensus and to standards of humane learning; Prescott argues that Du Bartas’s works slaked ‘the increased thirst for explicitly religious or unfeigned moral verse’ (203). The Semaines were a good fit for preachers wishing to show moderation without descending to heathen sources: ‘The occasional rhetorical flourish could also serve as a defence against established 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.’ 53

At least eighteen prose texts written by clergymen and published between 1608 and 1635 refer to Du Bartas. These sources mention the Semaines for their information about the natural world and history. Du Bartas’s name is mentioned in published sermons by Thomas


52 William Prynne, Histrio-mastix (London, 1633), 5O1v; Richard Rowlands (Verstegan), A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence (Antwerp, 1605), G2r.

Adams, Paul Baynes, Edward Evans, Thomas Foster, Samuel Hinde, John Jackson, Matthew Stoneham, Henry Valentine and Samuel Ward. Similar citations 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. George Hakewill, whose royal connections were also strong, cites Du Bartas twenty times in *An Apologie of the Power and Providence of God in the Gouernment of the World* (1627). All these references are further evidence that James’s presence helped to establish the poems’ suitability in religious discourse at this time. These references draw widely from the *Semaines*, but most are brief marginal citations and need not all 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. And M’ Drayton (the Miracle of Poets) in his *Map of Miracle*’. 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 describe this volume [the world-book] call Du Bartas as witness’ (223). There are four priests who do so: Samuel Hinde, John Boys, Edward Evans and Nehemiah Rogers. As an example, 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*’ organising conceit, localized to the same couplet. It was useful, especially for Puritan-minded preachers, to adopt vivid metaphors but present them as products of fallible human minds.  

Writers like Hakewill and Thomas Nash, author of *Quaternio* (1633) and no relation to his Elizabethan namesake, cite more extensively and directly from the *Semaines*, and often take two or more quotations from the same section, placing them in close proximity. In the above cases, however, 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. 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

---
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associate the sermons with preachers and congregations across the country, from Dalkeith, Midlothian (Simson) and Newcastle (Jerome) to Norwich (Stoneham) and Devon (Foster). Even if the marginal references to Du Bartas were supplied by London printers, they still highlight definite references to Du Bartas in the body of the text: it was clearly reasonable to think that priests and congregations across England and Scotland would know the Semaines and that readers would be familiar with the work. The Semaines were no longer the preserve of cultured Londoners: they were known to educated readers across the country.

The Semaines retained their reputation as an exalted divine work as their readership expanded. Du Bartas’s conceptual ambition and endurance were particularly admired. 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’s time was. Evans, for example, praises Du Bartas for not consuming his days in vain pursuits, but producing a great Day.57 In general, Du Bartas is (as noted above) most often described as a ‘divine’ poet. The physician and poet Edmond Graile, for example, describes Du Bartas’s ‘Poetrie diuine’ in his prefatory verse to Little Timothe his Lesson (London, 1611):

I Leaue 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 crystal streames of rare conceits,

conceiting what they list, of any subiect,

Subiecting whatsoeuer them delights,

57 Evans, Verba Dierum, K1v.
vnto their witte and art, their natures obiect.

To such leaue I, the maiestie,

of Poetrie diuine:

more rife is their dexteritie,

their wittes more ripe then mine. (A8v)

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’s 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’s works during James’s reign, one that led to poetic imitation as well as translation. This examination of primary sources has sought to show that James’s support for Du Bartas’s poetry and the accessibility of *Devine Weekes* facilitated these divergent responses. Du Bartas’s 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., Richard Brathwaite quotes Du Bartas on tortoise-shells providing the origin of music; 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. Du Bartas’s name appears in Jacobean textbooks too: John Sanford’s *Le Guichet François* (1604), a Latin primer produced in Oxford (Sanford also wrote commensatory verses in Thomas Winter’s translations); John Clark’s popular treatise on versification, *Formulae Orat.ione* (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, majestic, and pleasing verse’. Du Bartas’s poetic merits, though sometimes mentioned in passing by prose writers, are usually the primary concern of other Jacobean poets only. He is praised as a poet by poets such as John Taylor, William Browne, Michael Drayton, Phineas Fletcher and Anne Bradstreet. Most of these poets do not just praise Du Bartas in print; they imitate his style as well. John Milton certainly knew the *Semaines*.  

Scott’s ‘Modell’, which claims that the *Semaines* ‘Naturall Knowledge, and *Philosophy*’ is a defining feature, shows the need for more research on how the *Semaines* knowledge is structured and ‘sugred’ for readers. The epistemological uses of the *Semaines* emphasized in this article have not helped their reputation among English-language critics, even though French criticism has conclusively shown their importance for understanding Du
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Bartas’s achievement. A critical reappraisal of the *Semaines* in English could fruitfully begin with the contemporary appeal of combining natural philosophy, religion and rhetoric. Adrienne Rich’s assessment of the *Semaines*, which invokes Bradstreet’s fervour for Du Bartas, is historically grounded in emphasizing the poems’ encyclopedic qualities: Rich finds in Sylvester’s translation ‘a vitality of sheer conviction about it; one can understand its mesmeric attraction for an age unglutted by trivial or pseudo-momentous information’. As copies of the *Semaines* spread across England and Scotland, they created large communities of readers taken with the strength of the poem’s Protestant humanist synthesis. The poem’s popularity was sustained for as long as its learning retained political, religious, cultural and commercial value.

---

62 In addition to the works mentioned in footnote 4, see Yvonne Bellenger, ‘État present des études sur Du Bartas en France depuis 1970’, *Oeuvres & Critiques*, 29 (2004), 12-26 (esp. 16-17).