ROYAL AUTHORITY AND COMMONPLACE SIMILITUDES IN FRENCH NATURAL-PHILOSOPHICAL POETRY

DUCHESNE'S *GRAND MIROIR DU MONDE* AND DU BARTAS'S *SEPMAINE*

Kathryn Banks

Commonplace metaphors and royal authority in natural-philosophical poetry

During the turbulent final decades of the sixteenth century in France, royal authority was profoundly challenged. At the same time, Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas's *Sepmaine, ou la creation du monde* (*The Week or the Creation of the World*) became an unprecedented publishing phenomenon, and inspired a number of imitations. The genre spawned by the *Sepmaine* has primarily natural-philosophical and religious concerns, and only very recently have any of its contributions to political debate been analysed.[1] However, dotted about in these long poems are polemical representations of royal authority and of the relationship between kings and their subjects, topics which were a source of intense anxiety in late sixteenth-century France. This discussion of monarchy within natural-philosophical poems is dependent upon the very common analogy between nature and human society, between the natural world and the societal one. The underlying similarity between nature and society was the foundation of a wide variety of more specific analogies, such as those between the human body and the body politic, between animal communities and human societies, or between the sun and the king. These are 'commonplaces' in the sense that they represent common cultural material in late sixteenth-century France, and, furthermore, were the basis for various similitudes – in the sense of particular instances

[1] See my *Cosmos and Image in the Renaissance: French Love Lyric and Natural-Philosophical Poetry* (Oxford, 2008), chapt. 2, pp. 64-80, 87-90. See also J.-R. Fanlo, 'La Matière de l'œuvre: à propos du "premier jour"', *Cahiers textuel* 13 (1993), pp. 115-131; Banks, 'Interpretations of the Body Politic and of Natural Bodies in Late Sixteenth-Century France', in: A. Musolff and J. Zinken, eds, *Metaphor and Discourse* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 205-218.

of making and developing likenesses[2] – which appeared in commonplace books.[3]

As I have shown elsewhere, Du Bartas makes a provocative and controversial argument against nascent absolutism by formulating the body politic analogy in an original way.[4] Several poets who imitated both Du Bartas's style and his presentation of the world through a Biblical lens furthermore shared his practice of evoking political concerns through commonplace analogies between the natural and the societal. This chapter will examine, alongside Du Bartas's *Sepmaine*, Joseph Duchesne's *Grand Miroir du monde*. Like Du Bartas's poem, Duchesne's *Grand Miroir* depicts the created cosmos, whereas others of Du Bartas's imitators, such as Jude Serclier and Michel Quillian, focus upon the apocalypse.[5] Moreover, comparing Duchesne's depiction of kingship with that of Du Bartas is particularly interesting since, although both men were Huguenots in the service of Henri de Navarre, Duchesne wrote a decade later than Du Bartas, when a fundamental shift had taken place in the debate about kingship and Navarre's relationship to it. As I shall go on to explain, when Du Bartas was writing the *Sepmaine*, royal authority was undermined by some elements of Protestant political thought and by armies led by Navarre; by contrast, a decade later, it was challenged less by Protestants than by hard-line Catholics, and Navarre was next in line to the throne. Furthermore, both Du Bartas and Duchesne emphasise the validity of arguments from nature, lending weight to their use of commonplace analogies between the natural and the human

---

[2] For Erasmus and Rudolph Agricola, similitudes operated primarily in rhetoric, although they constituted a place of humanist dialectic; by the third quarter of the sixteenth century, though, they were 'being secured to the chains of reason supplied by Aristotelian logic' (A. Moss, 'Thinking Through Similitudes', paper delivered at the fifty-first annual meeting of the Renaissance Society of America, University of Cambridge, April 7, 2005); see also Moss's contribution to this volume, pp. 1-17 (11-12).

[3] For example, one comparison for the monarch collected by Erasmus in a commonplace book of similitudes is – like some I will discuss from poetry – based upon the sun's bestowal of heat and light upon humankind: *Ut sol non alius est pauperi, alius diviti, sed omnibus communis: Ita princeps personam spectare non debet, sed rem* ('Just as the sun is no different towards the poor man or towards the rich man but is the same towards all, so the prince must not pay attention to status but to reality'; cited from Conrad Lycosthenes's re-organisation of the *Parabolae* (Lyon, 1614), p. 96, my transl.).

[4] Banks, *Cosmos*, chapt. 2, pp. 64-80, 87-90.

[5] M. Quillian, *La Derniere Semaine ou consommation du monde* (Paris, 1596); J. Serclier, *Le Grand Tombeau du monde, ou jugement final* (Lyon, 1606).

worlds, and thus to their depictions of kingship. On the seventh 'day' of his *Sepmaine* (which is structured by the Creation narrative as recounted in Genesis), Du Bartas revisits the Creation of the previous six days and emphasises the importance of the natural world in providing lessons for the human one, and then proceeds to dedicate the second half of his seventh 'day' to such lessons.[6] Similarly, Duchesne states that humankind should be ashamed, given the loyalty and love manifested by animals, and then goes on to give humanity a series of lessons in fidelity from the animal kingdom.[7] Turning to manifestations of hatred or aggression in animals, Duchesne finds lessons for humanity there too.[8] In short, natural-philosophical poetry in the style of Du Bartas was one of those Renaissance discourses in which similarity was a central epistemological category, and the similarity between the natural and the societal or political was an important one. Indeed, while the representation of the natural world is justified for these poets by its status as an image of its Creator (as Du Bartas says explicitly and Duchesne's title suggests), it seems also to be validated by its ability to provide lessons for human society.

The *Grand Miroir* was first published in 1587. Then, in 1593, when controversy concerning monarchy and Navarre had become extremely acute, an enlarged edition was published which made even greater use of commonplace analogies to form arguments about kingship. I would argue that the 1593 edition, in common with some apocalyptic poetry, bears witness to an increasing politicisation of the genre popularised by Du Bartas; it also allows us to trace the representation of kingship – by a Huguenot in the service of Navarre – over the years during which the League most radically challenged royal authority while Navarre fought to conquer what, after 1589, he considered his own kingdom. However, these issues are beyond the scope of this study, which will analyse Duchesne's 1587 depiction of royal authority through commonplaces, namely the similarities of kings both to the sun and also to 'royal' animals, in this case the ichneumon.[9] I will compare this to Du Bartas's use of similar commonplaces to construct a very different depiction of kingship, a difference that can be attributed at

---

[6] G. de Saluste Du Bartas, *La Sepmaine*, in: U. T. Holmes, J. C. Lyons, R. W. Linker, et al., eds, *The Works of Guillaume De Salluste Sieur Du Bartas* (Chapel Hill, 1935-40), II, pp. 193-440 (Day VII, ll. 435-716).

[7] J. Duchesne, *Le Grand Miroir du monde* (Lyon, 1587), pp. 147-150. All citations from the *Grand Miroir* are from this edition, except where reference is explicitly made to the 1593 edition.

[8] Duchesne, *Le Grand Miroir*, pp. 150-153. See also the 1593 edition, p. 577.

[9] Duchesne also compares kings to the four cosmic elements (*Le Grand Miroir*, pp. 157-159).

least in part to the changing political climate in the 1580s. Finally, I will analyse more directly what this comparison can tell us about the functioning of commonplace analogies, both in general and in natural-philosophical poetry in particular. However, before doing so, it will be useful to remind the reader of some late sixteenth-century French history, placing the focus upon the crucial question of royal authority in the period up to 1587.

Royal authority in late sixteenth-century France

The latter decades of the sixteenth century witnessed profound challenges to the French monarchy, in the form of active resistance, criticism of the king, and theoretical elaborations of limits upon royal power. In the wake of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572, in which the royal family were implicated, Protestant 'monarchomachs'[10] argued that royal power was constitutionally limited, and that kings who abused their power could legitimately be resisted. These ideas were influential amongst moderate Catholics as well as Protestants. The fifth civil war (1575-1576) saw Protestants and Catholic *Malcontents* (under the leadership of Navarre and Condé) raising armies together in open rebellion against the king, Henri III. In the south and west, institutions, usually called *assemblées politiques*, developed to lead resistance to royal authority. Du Bartas wrote his *Sepmaine* in this context, beginning its composition at least as early as 1574 and first publishing it in 1578.[11] Meanwhile, in 1576, he became Navarre's *écuyer tranchant* and fought in his service, as well as participating in the Academy at the Court of Navarre and serving there as a kind of court poet.[12]

From the late 1570s, hard-line Catholics also challenged royal authority, with consequences which would be of much greater magnitude. The relatively far-reaching concessions made to the Protestants in the 1576 Peace of Monsieur implied for many that their new king was not committed to defeating heresy. For the first time, a Catholic League was organised on a national level to fight the Huguenots independently of the crown. The League's oath demanded full allegiance to the head of the League, thus undermining the primacy of fidelity to the king.[13] The League was initially short-lived, but reappeared in 1584 following the death of the duke of An-

[10] For example, François Hotman (*Francogallia*, 1573) and Théodore de Bèze (*Du Droit des magistrats*, 1574).

[11] Du Bartas, *Works*, I, p. 12.

[12] Du Bartas, *Works*, I, pp. 11-12; F. A. Yates, *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1947), p. 123, n. 3.

[13] F. J. Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries: The Political Thought of the French Catholic League* (Geneva, 1976), pp. 55-56.

jou, which placed Navarre, a Protestant, next in line to the throne, at least according to the customary rules of succession. The new League of 1584 had far greater membership than before, comprising not only an association of nobles but also an urban organisation that would be larger and more visible. It was motivated by a desire to prevent Navarre's accession as well as to protect Catholicism more generally; it also wished to maintain – in the face of the increasing intrusion of the monarchy – the privileges and freedoms of the clergy, the nobility, and the members of the city communes.[14] Meanwhile, Navarre – who, despite leading troops against royal armies, had been careful to protest his fidelity to the king – portrayed his goals as identical to those of the royal family, presenting the League as their common enemy, as well as that of religion and of France.[15]

At the same time, France was beset by serious social and economic problems. Its civil populations witnessed violence at a 'dramatically elevated point of intensity', which relativised even the atrocities of the earlier wars, and which was perceived as an 'inhuman' and unprecedented 'predation';[16] armed bands of robbers infested the countryside engaging in pillage and assault.[17] Economically, too, France was in crisis, and royal policy in this area alienated almost every segment of society.[18] Taxes caused discontent, especially since the king was seen to bestow great opulence upon a very small number of the *noblesse moyenne*, his *mignons*; this was criticised even by moderate observers, and was a consistent theme in League pamphlets after 1585.[19] The king also bestowed upon his favourites honours including the governorships of towns. In addition, while many nobles were in a poor financial situation, it had become increasingly difficult to obtain credit, and tax-collectors and money-lenders – often resented all the more since they were Italian – made good profits.[20]

---

[14] Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries*, pp. 32-33, 56; J. Barbey, *Etre roi: le roi et son gouvernement en France de Clovis à Louis XVI* (Paris, 1992), pp. 246-253; H. A. Lloyd, *The State, France, and the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1983), pp. 134-144.

[15] J. Garrisson, *Henri IV* (Paris, 1984), pp. 112-127.

[16] D. Crouzet, 'Le Règne de Henri III et la violence collective', in: R. Sauzet, ed., *Henri III et son temps* (Paris, 1992), pp. 211-225 (pp. 211, 212, my transl.).

[17] J. H. M. Salmon, *Society in Crisis: France in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1975), esp. pp. 207-211.

[18] Salmon, *Society*, p. 196.

[19] Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries*, pp. 30-34.

[20] Salmon, *Society*, pp. 206-216. See also the chapter by D. Cowling in this volume, pp. 117-132.

Furthermore, Henri III failed to satisfy the keenly-felt need for a strong leader; he seemed to escape into 'cloistered unreality' rather than to confront the challenges facing him in any sustained or coherent manner.[21] Great importance was placed upon the king's presence to his subjects, one of the 'essential resources of royal authority',[22] but, as Jacques-Auguste de Thou complained, Henri 'never gets on a horse or shows himself to his people as his predecessors have always done'.[23] Nor did he live up to the ideal of the *roi guerrier* (warrior king),[24] an integral part of the French ideology of kingship.[25] Accused of engaging in homosexuality with his elegant *mignons*, he was perceived to lack virility and military prowess;[26] moreover, he was repeatedly forced into humiliating capitulations.

By the end of 1584, the League held the northern and eastern part of France, as well as most large towns in the country.[27] In the 1585 Treaty of Nemours, Henri III complied with many of the League's demands, revoking all the former edicts of pacification, forbidding the practice of Protestantism, and urging French Catholics not to recognise Navarre as his successor. This did not restore the king's authority or enable him to take over the Guise war-machine: he was obliged to surrender key towns to the League, and, furthermore, various League forces attempted to impose the Treaty of Nemours by force, acting under the leadership of Henri de Guise rather than that of the king. In response, the union of Protestants and moderate Catholics was reborn under the leadership of Navarre, Condé, and Montmorency, and Navarre criticised a peace made with 'rebels' at the expense of 'obedient subjects' and with 'foreigners' at the expense of 'the princes of the blood'.[28]

Navarre's supporters and the League engaged in a particularly intense war of pamphlets in 1585. Moderate Catholics – including several powerful

---

[21] N. M. Sutherland, 'Henri III, The Guises and the Huguenots', in: K. Cameron, ed., *From Valois to Bourbon: Dynasty, State and Society in Early Modern France* (Exeter, 1989), pp. 21-34 (p. 22).

[22] J. Boutier, A. Dewerpe, and D. Nordman, *Un Tour de France royal: le voyage de Charles IX (1564-1566)* (Paris, 1984), p. 293, my transl..

[23] Quoted and transl. in M. P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 102.

[24] Sutherland, 'Henri III', pp. 23, 22.

[25] Barbey, *Etre roi,* pp. 229-234.

[26] A. Jouanna, 'Faveur et Favoris: l'exemple des mignons d'Henri III', in: Sauzet, ed., *Henri III*, pp. 155-165.

[27] D. Buisseret, *Henry IV* (London, 1984), p. 17.

[28] Quoted and transl. in Buisseret, *Henry IV*, pp. 18-19.

nobles between 1585 and 1587 – flooded to Navarre's side,[29] motivated by a concern for France and the fundamental laws that defined it, as well as by Gallicanism.[30] Furthermore, in the face of increasingly severe threats to monarchy, a growing number considered strong royal power to be the safest option, adopting 'a sceptical and quietist form of stoic moral and political thought (...) hostile to any justifications of political activism or resistance'.[31] A new emphasis was placed upon loyalty and obedience to the king,[32] and upon recent and increasingly absolutist theories of monarchy.[33] Meanwhile, Navarre strengthened his reputation as a strong leader and military commander.[34]

1587 saw Navarre's famous victory over royal troops at Coutras. In the same year a memo circulated between Leaguer towns which made loyalty to the king conditional upon his fighting heresy, while casting into grave doubt whether he had done so; the conditions were being created for May 12, 1588, the Day of the Barricades, when the king would flee Paris, leaving the town and its institutions of government in the hands of the League. It is in this atmosphere that Joseph Duchesne published his *Grand Miroir du monde*. The poem is dedicated to Navarre, and the dedicatory epistle expresses confidence that the poem will be well received, citing the warm welcome accorded to the poet by Navarre upon his last visit to Gascony as evidence that Navarre will also welcome his poem. This is an indication of Duchesne's attempt to gain a post with Navarre; he was successful in this attempt and thus able to describe himself in the 1593 edition of his poem as a 'Conseiller et Medecin ordinaire du Roy' ('Adviser and Physician to the King'). In his 1587 preface to the reader, Duchesne stated that he had started the poem about three years earlier. He therefore wrote it in the years between 1584 and 1587, when royal authority was very much weakened by a reinvigorated League, and when Navarre was allying himself with royalty more closely than ever before and beginning to garner more support as heir to the throne.

---

[29] Buisseret, *Henry IV*, pp. 18-21.

[30] Garrisson, *Henri IV*, pp. 123-125.

[31] Q. Skinner, 'Montaigne and Stoicism', in: *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1978), II, pp. 275-284 (p. 276).

[32] Barbey, *Etre roi*, pp. 243-245.

[33] Salmon, *Society*, pp. 216-218.

[34] Buisseret, *Henry IV*, pp. 15-25.

The sun-king

While nature had both positive and negative examples for humanity, the heavens – as the most perfect part of the universe, seeming almost to partake of divinity – were to be emulated. In other words, if the king was similar to the sun, then it was incumbent upon him to be as similar to the sun as possible. Indeed, during the civil wars the activities of the Palace Academy and court festivities aimed to replicate cosmic harmony in the French kingdom and to reproduce the just monarchy.[35] The natural-philosophical poetry of Du Bartas and Duchesne explores how kings need to behave in order to realise this ideal: the similarity between sun and king is elaborated to show how kings might act in order to emulate, in their kingdoms, the heavenly relationships between the sun and the universe.

The image of the sun had an obvious potential to glorify the king; it was, of course, commonly used for God. Unsurprisingly, then, it was to be most famously associated with the absolutist king par excellence, Louis XIV. It became popular in France in the sixteenth century, the period during which concepts of absolute royal power were elaborated and negotiated.[36] However, Du Bartas employs the comparison with the sun to castigate kings who fail to live up to their solar counterparts. Like his use of the body politic analogy, it is concerned with kings who do not take adequate care of all of their subjects, and contains thinly veiled criticism of the French king. However, whereas the former focuses on royal massacre, the latter is concerned with favouritism, with some subjects being looked after much better than others.

Du Bartas does not explicitly name Henri III, but he contrasts the sun with 'those kings' who neglect their royal responsibilities by enriching a few members of their court at the expense of the rest of their people, and by spending all of their time in one region while 'abandoning' to 'unwise princes' the government of the rest of the provinces. This description certainly recalls contemporary perceptions of Henri III's favours, both of opulence and of governorships. References to *voluptez* ('sensual pleasures') and *apas*[37] further bring to mind the insinuations made about the sexual nature

[35] Yates, *The French Academies*, esp. pp. 36-76, 118-122, 236-274.

[36] Barbey, *Etre roi*, p. 191.

[37] This term can have a sexual meaning, denoting the 'female charms which excite male desire', a sense which the *Grand Robert* dates to the beginning of the seventeenth century. In addition, the *Robert Historique* explains that the term already had the figurative meaning (as opposed to its literal meaning of the bait used to catch an animal) of 'ce qui attire' ('that which attracts') as early as 1549; E. Huguet's *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle* (7 vols, Paris, 1925–67, I, pp.

of Henri's attraction to his favourites. 'That sort of king', Du Bartas suggests, fails to live up to the image of monarchy inscribed in the heavens, since the sun makes its presence felt throughout its 'kingdom', visiting all areas within a day, and greeting its subjects:

> Je veux, o cler flambeau, chanter que tu n'es pas
> De ces rois qui, pipez par les flateurs apas
> D'un ou deux de leur court, tout un peuple apauvrissent
> A fin que de ses biens deux ou trois s'enrichissent;
> Qui, charmez des douceurs de mille voluptez,
> Ne hantent, partiaux, qu'une de leurs citez,
> Et n'aymans qu'un païs, à de mal-sages princes
> Abandonnent le soin du reste des provinces,
> Car à chaque pays dans l'espace d'un jour
> Tu donnes le bon-soir, tu donnes le bon-jour.[38]

> I want, oh bright flame, to sing that you are not one of / Those kings, who deceived by the flattering lures / Of one or two of their court, impoverish a whole people, / So that two or three get richer from their wealth; / Who, charmed by the sweetnesses of a thousand pleasures of the senses, / Frequent, being partial, only one of their towns, / And loving only one region, to unwise princes / Abandon the care of the rest of their provinces, / For to every region in the space of a day / You say good evening, you say good day.

After thus evoking the sun's passage through the sky during the course of a day, Du Bartas proceeds to describe the seasons (IV, 599-646). He admits that, at any one time of the year, some receive more of the sun's heat than others and thus experience spring while others experience autumn. However, the sun nonetheless bestows its bounty equally upon all areas of its 'kingdom': it varies its path each day so that the various areas receive increased amounts of the sun's heat 'in turn' ('de rang' (600), 'par ordre alternatif' (602)).

252-53) explains, giving an example from love lyric, that the verb *appaster* could mean *séduire* (*to seduce*).

[38] *La Sepmaine*, 'Day' IV, ll. 585-594. This is the text from 1578. In the 1581 edition, the king abandoned 'towns' to 'base people' ('des personnes viles') rather than 'provinces' to 'unwise princes', a transformation probably motivated by disapproval of the relatively low social status of the *mignons*; the sense of *vil* is social as well as moral, and could be opposed to *noble*. All translations are my own, and prioritise the goal of comprehension by the modern reader of English.

Duchesne's discussion of the sun also depicts a 'king' travelling around his 'kingdom' and also describes how the seasons are dependent upon the sun's gift of heat. Like Du Bartas, Duchesne refers to the constellations through which the sun passes and, in his description of spring, mentions the birds, Cupid, and the relationship between Zephyrus and Flora. However, whereas Du Bartas observes that different places all experience spring in turn, for Duchesne, spring is itself a place, and it gains the special attentions of the sun-king. Spring is a town into which the king makes a royal entry, and to which he grants particularly generous privileges:

Muse, mon cher souci, dicte-moy quelque vers,
Pour pouvoir saluer l'œil beau de l'univers:
Uranie aide-moy à celebrer l'entree
Du beau Latonien à la face doree.
Desja l'astré Mouton, au poil d'or tout frisé,
A de belle verdeur son portail lambrissé,
Où ses beaux estendarts, pour accroistre la joye,
Tous semés de bourgeons, le Mois guerrier desploye,
Tandis que ce grand Prince, une fois tous les ans,
Passe par la cité de son aimé Printemps.
Oyez chanter Iö, voyez comme les rues
Des champs, des bois, des prés, y sont toutes tendues
De tapis fleuronnés, de mille et mille fleurs,
Enrichis de l'esmail de leurs belles couleurs.
Voyez comme desja on parfume la place
Du logis du Taureau, dedans lequel il passe:
Quel honneur luy feront les deux Amycleans,
Les deux Bessons couplés, eschevins du Printemps?
Ils luy vont au devant en pompe et à la file,
Avec eux tout l'honneur de leur Maison de Ville:
Ceux qui vont tout devant les Freres estoilés,
C'est l'escadron leger des Menestriers aislés,
Qui, en lieu de haut-bois, de clairons, de trompettes,
Font retentir tout l'air avec leurs chansonnettes.
Zephire vient apres, et s'attend, le mignard,
Recevoir de sa Flore un gracieux regard.
L'Amour marche à costé, et avec eux apporte
Le Poile tout brodé de fleurs de toute sorte.
Voyez comme desia ils descouvrent leurs chefs,
Font hommage à leur Roy, lui presentent les clefs
De leur belle Cité, et le Roy, d'une veuë
Toute agreable aussi, ses bons sujets saluë,

Et, Prince liberal, confirme de nouveau
Les privileges deus de droict au Renouveau,
Sur toute autre saison, lui ottroyant puissance
D'accroistre, conserver, et de donner naissance
Aux choses d'ici bas : le tout signé du seing
Des accords, des odeurs, et de l'air plus serain.
(*Le Grand Miroir*, pp. 128-130)

Muse, my tender care, dictate me some verses, / So that I can greet the handsome eye of the universe: / Urania help me to celebrate the entry / Of the handsome Latonian[39] with the golden face. / Already the starry Ram, with its golden hair all curly / Has decorated its gate with beautiful greenery, / Where the warrior Month (March),[40] to increase the joy, / Unfurls its beautiful standards, all strewn with buds, / While this great Prince, once every year, / Passes through the town of his beloved Spring. / Hear them sing 'Io', see how the paths, / Of the fields, the woods, the meadows, there are all bedecked / With tapestries thick with blossom, with thousand upon thousand of flowers, / Enriched with the variegation of their beautiful colours. / See how already they perfume the square / Of the dwelling of the Bull, through which he passes: / What honour will be done to him by the two Amycleans, / The two Twins lodged together,[41] *eschevins*[42] of Spring? / They march before him with ceremony and in line, / With them all the honour of their Town Hall: / Those who march just before the starry Brothers, / Are the light squadron of winged Minstrels, / Who, in place of oboes, of clarions, of trumpets, / Make all the air echo with their sweet songs. / Zephyrus comes next, and trusts, the charming one, / That he will receive from his Flora a gracious gaze. / Love[43] walks next to them, and with them carries / The ceremonial canopy all embroidered with all sorts of flowers. / See how already they uncover their heads, / Pay homage to their King, present him with the keys / To their beautiful Town, and the King, looking / Just as kindly (on them), greets his good subjects, / And, bountiful Prince, confirms again / The privileges due by right to Spring, / Over every other season, granting it the power / To increase, preserve, and give birth / To the things here below: all this signed with the signature / Of agreements, of scents, and of more peaceful air.

[39] Apollo.
[40] The French word for March is *mars* which also, as in English, designates the Roman god of war; hence the 'warrior month' signifies March.
[41] Castor and Pollux, the constellation of Gemini.
[42] (In most northern towns) elected figures presided over by a *maire*.
[43] Cupid.

The privileges of sixteenth-century French towns varied, but those granted to the town of Spring seem particularly generous, giving it creative powers above any other season. Thus, whereas Du Bartas used the comparison between king and sun to suggest that all subjects and all places should be treated equally by the king, Duchesne uses it with precisely the opposite sense: it is 'natural', following the example of the heavens, that some towns have special privileges, just as spring is granted particular rights by the sun. These privileges are 'due by right' to the town of Spring.

However, the king's confirmation of privileges seems to reflect an equally positive attitude on the part of the town towards its king. Kings often did confirm a town's privileges during a royal entry, as if in thanks for the welcome accorded. However, during the civil wars, towns which had failed to manifest sufficient loyalty to the king did not always have their privileges renewed; this had been the subject of protest in Paris, for example, where the League dominated the Bureau of the *Hôtel de Ville*, the municipal government, and thus was able to thwart the king in his dealings with the city.[44] It seems difficult to imagine, though, that the town of Spring could have been anything but entirely loyal. Royal entries were intended to demonstrate the 'eagerness, respect and joy' inspired by the king in his subjects,[45] and the citizens of Spring show ample evidence of these. The celebration is explicitly a source of 'joie' ('joy'), and the eagerness of the inhabitants to welcome their king is demonstrated by the repetition of 'déjà' ('already'): they are keen to play their roles in the celebrations as soon as possible. The town authorities honour the king in the customary fashion, by processing before him and bearing a ceremonial canopy for him. They demonstrate their respect by immediately removing their hats and paying homage to him, and their obedience is represented symbolically in the usual way; that is, by handing him the keys to their town. Finally, while French towns during royal entries were generously bedecked with triumphal arches, theatrical scenes, and other sorts of painted or sculpted decorations, Spring is beautifully decorated with buds, flowers, colours, and scents, while the birds sing like minstrels ('Menestriers aislés').

In short, Spring forms a striking contrast to those towns which, in 1587, were already allied with the League and clearly challenging the king's authority. While the League demanded the renewal of privileges, the example of Spring shows that privileges are confirmed for those 'good subjects' who eagerly welcome and obey their king; privileges cannot be demanded, it seems, but rather have to be earned. Just as, through its display of colours,

---

[44] Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries*, pp. 32-33, 42-43, 56; Barbey, *Etre roi*, pp. 246-253; Lloyd, *The State*, pp. 134-144.

[45] Boutier, *Un Tour*, pp. 293-294, my transl.

buds, and scents, the spring celebrates most the sun's presence, and has the special privilege of being more productive and creative than the other seasons, so towns that celebrate their king will be rewarded by him. Duchesne does not say explicitly that disloyal towns will be less well rewarded, and abandons his analogy with royalty when he discusses the sun's role in the other seasons; nonetheless, whereas he aligns the privileges of obedient towns with spring's power over life and growth, once the sun has 'galloped' through summer in five lines, the poet emphasises the association of autumn and winter with death and finitude (pp. 132-134).

Several lexical items in the passage bear meaning in relation to both nature and politics, thus operating on both levels of the analogy. For example 'entrée' is both an astronomical term and a political one, considered proper to denote the 'entry' of the sun into a constellation as well as that of a king into a town. 'Esmail' and 'fleuronnés' arguably both evoke human decoration as well as natural splendour: *esmail* referred both to the diverse colouring of flowers and also to enamel; *fleuronner* meant *to blossom* but also evokes *fleuron* which, according to Cotgrave,[46] designated primarily a fleuron, a flower-shaped ornament used in architecture, which, of course, would be a particularly pertinent symbol in a celebration of a French monarch. This trait is particularly strong in the final line quoted above. 'Accords' refer both to the harmonious relations that exist in the heavens – to cosmic harmony – and also to agreements or treaties, a meaning which is all the more present here given that the 'accords' are 'signed'. Similarly 'serain' implies both a cosmos without meteorological disturbances and also the 'peace' obtaining between the king and the subjects of an obedient town like Spring. *Odeur*, which had a much wider range of meanings than *scent*,[47] could refer to the way in which an action was interpreted, for example by the king,[48] and thus suggests here both the cosmic beauty of spring and also political harmony. This lexical practice arguably strengthens the persuasive and epistemological weight of the comparison between sun and king: the fact that 'entrée' designates both a royal entry and a solar one increases the sense of similarity between the two, the sense that they are essentially examples of the same phenomenon, but occurring in different domains; the term 'accord', by designating both cosmic harmony and political

[46] R. Cotgrave, *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (London: Adam Islip, 1611), unpaginated.

[47] Banks, *Cosmos*, pp. 51-55 (p. 54).

[48] In one of his many letters to the king during 1570 and 1571, Navarre feared that his actions might be presented to the king in such a way as to make the latter receive them 'de mauvaise odeur' ('with a bad *odeur*'): quoted by Garrisson, *Henri IV*, p. 48.

agreement, reinforces the implication that the latter should mirror the former.[49]

Royal entries routinely made use of cosmic imagery and mythological heroes to elevate the king's status. Duchesne's analogy provides an account of how a king should behave in order properly to correspond to his cosmic counterpart. His suggestion that kings should reward obedience contrasts with the French king's reaction to the League: as Navarre put it, the 1585 Treaty of Nemours rewarded rebellion. Duchesne strongly suggests that – in order to live up to the heavenly ideal of kingship – the king ought to ally himself with his 'good subjects' rather than his rebellious ones. Furthermore, Duchesne presents the sun-king making his presence felt to his subjects. Royal entries reaffirmed royal authority and symbolically enacted the (ideal) relationship between king and town. They had been extensively employed during a long royal tour of France in 1564-1566, intended to strengthen the position of a young Charles IX following the first of the civil wars; they also presented Navarre, a Protestant, as an integral part of the royal family.[50] While, in 1587, Henri III seemed distant from his subjects and was singularly failing to exert his authority, Duchesne linguistically enacted the royal entry, along with its affirmation of royal power and of the bond between king and subject; like the many reports of actual entries, the poem re-presents the already highly symbolic ritual but, in Duchesne's case, in the absence of any 'original' event.

For both Du Bartas and Duchesne, then, the image of the travelling sun-king provided a foil for the problematic functioning of monarchy in France. Both poets employed a rhetorical strategy dependent upon the commonplace notion of a relationship of analogy and emulation between the earth and the heavens, appealing to the notion that the functioning of the heavens must be the right one, and that the human world should mirror the heavenly world. Both poets suggest that the king should make his presence felt in his kingdom. However, whereas Du Bartas is highly critical of the monarchy, in the late 1580s Duchesne was more concerned to bolster royal authority than to undermine it. He uses the same commonplace as Du Bartas in order to focus on the behaviour of subjects as well as kings, depicting at length the idealised obedient subjects of Spring. Thus Duchesne linguistically reaffirms the bond between monarch and subjects, representing it as one of loyalty and obedience.

---

[49] Du Bartas also – and often to a more extreme degree – uses lexical items which bear meaning in relation to both levels of a comparison, thus making it hard to dissociate the two levels (see Banks, *Cosmos*, chapt. 1-2).

[50] Garrisson, *Henri IV*, pp. 32-34.

The ichneumon: the ruthless 'roi guerrier' and the enemies of the 'bien public'

While the depiction of the sun affirms royal authority, that of the ichneumon (pp. 151-153) calls for it to be vigorously asserted. Comparing the king to an ichneumon was not as common as comparing him to the sun. Du Bartas had discussed the ichneumon without referring to kingship (*Works*, VI, pp. 235-266), and so Duchesne politicises a subject that was not political in the earlier poem. However, comparisons between human society and the animal world were common, as were, more specifically, those between kings and 'royal' animals, although dolphins, eagles, and bees were more usual choices. Duchesne introduces the ichneumon as a 'Rat Pharaonien', which, as Goulart observes in his commentary to the 1593 revised edition of the *Grand Miroir* (p. 413), is like calling the creature a 'royal rat', since Pharaoh was the title of the ancient Egyptian kings.[51]

The ichneumon is a small animal closely related to the mongoose. Yet, in Pliny's account in his *Natural History* (VIII. 36-37), it cleverly defeated both snakes and crocodiles; it created a 'coat of armour' from mud in order to withstand the snake's attack, and it darted down the sleeping crocodile's throat in order to consume the larger animal from within.[52] In Duchesne's *Grand Miroir*, the ichneumon, like the sun, is presented as one of nature's positive examples. The ichneumon, as depicted by Duchesne, is a brave fighter and a skilful 'military' tactician. The poet tells us that he has chosen to end book 4 with this creature, since any retreat should be led by 'le chef plus vaillant' ('the most valiant leader'). Duchesne makes use of the notion of a creature able, through cunning strategy, to defeat animals much bigger than itself. He contrasts the small size of the ichneumon with the greatness of its soul or spirit, apostrophising the 'petit animal magnanime de cœur' ('small animal great in soul').[53] This 'royal' animal is celebrated for its ability to defeat forces apparently greater than itself, if not through might then through diligence ('Si non avec la force, avec son industrie'), and employing wisdom ('sagesse') and bravery ('brave cœur').

---

[51] The ichneumon was often called a *rat de Pharaon*, for example in Jacques Amyot's popular translation of Plutarch's *Moralia*; however, Duchesne's slightly different formulation potentially has rather different connotations, as Goulart highlights.

[52] See also Plutarch's *Moralia*, 966d and Aristotle's *Historia animalium*, 612a 16.

[53] 'Magnanime' meant 'noble-souled' (whereas its modern meaning is 'generous'). Its meaning was thus closer to that of its Latin root (*magnus animus*), and Duchesne appears to have this Latin root in mind here, given the juxtaposition of the ichneumon's small size with its 'cœur' described as 'magnanime'.

On the other hand, the ichneumon is described as 'cruel' and depicted as ruthless and determined. It seeks out and destroys the eggs of its enemies, as well as waging war upon older members of the species; it gnaws snakes' heads or drowns them, and kills the crocodile by eating its liver and drinking its blood until it is entirely hollow. Moreover, the ichneumon takes pleasure in defeating its enemies, 'feasting' on the crocodile's liver and 'joyfully making merry' as it consumes its body from within.[54] However, all this violence is in a worthy cause: Duchesne tells us that snakes and crocodiles would otherwise make Egypt uninhabitable.

Duchesne hints throughout this discussion that the behaviour of this 'royal' animal has – or should have – a human equivalent. The ichneumon is described as acting 'pour le bien du public' ('for the public good'), an expression which would more normally be used with reference to human society than the natural world, and which indeed was frequently used precisely to justify recourse to arms during the wars, being employed by both the League and supporters of Navarre in the mid-1580s.[55] Furthermore, the ichneumon's violent action sounds very much like military activity, since Duchesne consistently uses vocabulary pertinent to human battle: 'livrant encor bataille' ('engaging battle again'); 'l'attache, et l'assaut' ('attacks him and assails him'); 'la sentinelle' ('the sentry'); 's'armant' ('arming himself'); 'soudain il eschelle / Le fort Crocodilois, et se fourre dedans / Par l'huis plus dissolu' ('suddenly he scales the Crocodilian fort, and penetrates it by the loosest gate'); 'donnant ainsi l'alarme' ('raising the alarm'); 'ce nouvel assaut' ('this new attack'). Furthermore, not only is the ichneumon anthropomorphised as a courageous leader ('le chef plus vaillant'), as we have seen, but also the crocodile is represented anthropomorphically as 'ce grand Brigand d'aguet' ('this huge Brigand on the look-out'); more generally, crocodiles and snakes were two of many animals used by authors of pamphlets to characterise their opponents.[56]

Thus, by celebrating the actions of this 'royal' animal, Duchesne provides an ideal portrait of a king. The king, Duchesne suggests, should be a brave and skilful military leader, seeking out enemies of the public good in order to destroy them ruthlessly and even joyfully. With bravery, determination, and military cunning, the poet implies, the king can defeat even en-

---

[54] '[S]e festoye, / A ton mortel regret des lobes de ton foye, / S'abbruve de ton sang, et s'esgaye, joyeux, / Dans ton corps, jusqu'à tant qu'il l'ait rendu tout creux' (p. 152).

[55] A. Jouanna, *Le Devoir de révolte: la noblesse française et la gestation de l'État moderne, 1559-1661* (Paris, 1989), esp. pp. 192-193.

[56] J. Pineaux, 'La Métaphore animale dans quelques pamphlets du XVI[e] siècle', in: *Le Pamphlet en France au XVI[e] siècle* (Paris, 1983), pp. 35-45.

emies who appear to be more powerful than himself. The powerful enemies of the king who spring readily to mind are of course the League, who, from the point of view of Navarre, and of many Protestants or Catholics of a *politique*[57] persuasion, were indeed enemies of the king and of the public good. The ideal portrait of a king relentlessly pursuing his clever military strategies differs strikingly from contemporary perceptions of Henri III as a weak leader whose lack of coherent long-term strategy and military skill enabled the League to grow rapidly in strength and effectively to call the shots: whereas Henri III seemed to ignore problems until forced defensively into action, the ichneumon attacks first as a preventative measure. The king of Navarre and heir to the throne of France, on the other hand, had military skills and qualities which made him fit the image of the ichneumon much more satisfactorily.

Duchesne then proceeds, in the concluding lines of book 4, to make his lesson for kings explicit, stating that they should follow the ichneumon's example by banishing trouble-makers from their realms. He also relates the lesson to France specifically, saying that such an action could provide a solution to France's problems. Furthermore, he indicates more clearly the identity of the 'crocodiles' and 'snakes' in France:

> Vous devriez imiter, ô vous Rois, et vous Princes,
> L'ichneumon genereux, chassans de vos provinces,
> Ceste espece d'Aspics que l'on nomme Cracheurs,
> Ces contempteurs de Dieu, tous ces blasphemateurs
> Qui crachent vers le ciel, une poison meschante
> Qui sort à tout propos de leur bouche puante:
> Vous devriez depeupler, de larrons, de meurtriers,
> De brigands inhumains, d'avares, usuriers,
> De gens aime-procés, trestous vrais Crocodiles,
> Vos forests, vos chemins, vos palais et vos villes.
> Ainsi les belles fleurs de l'immortalité
> Couronneroyent vos fronts, ainsi de mon costé
> J'aurois encor un jour de revoir esperance,
> Avec plus de seurté le repos de la France.
>
> You should imitate, o Kings and Princes, / The noble ichneumon, chasing from your provinces, / That species of Asp which one calls Spitters, / Those contemptors of God, all those blasphemers / Who spit towards the heavens an evil

[57] Those who emphasised the need to ensure the survival of the commonwealth, dubbed *politiques* by the most militant Catholics, a term intended to suggest that they placed political considerations above religion.

> poison / Which comes out in relation to all subjects from their stinking mouths: / You should rid of thieves, of murderers, / Of inhuman brigands, of the greedy, moneylenders, / Of lovers of law-courts, just so many true Crocodiles, / Your forests, your paths, your palaces, and your towns. / Thus the beautiful flowers of immortality / Would crown your foreheads, thus as for me / I would one day have again the hope / To see again with more security the respite of France.

Duchesne states quite explicitly that France would benefit from a king who shared the qualities of the ichneumon, and used them to defeat France's enemies (as defined by Duchesne). His use of the conditional ('I would have (…) hope') implies that France does not yet have such a king. He thus provides an account of how Henri III – and perhaps his successor – ought to behave in order to alleviate France's problems. Since Navarre shared the ichneumon's 'military' skills, the ideal of kingship promoted by the poet is one which would support his patron's suitability for the throne. The argument that France requires a warrior king could weigh in the balance for Catholics wavering between the needs of the Catholic religion and the need for a strong monarch.

Duchesne wrote these lines amid a rhetorical struggle to determine who was acting in the interests of the public good and who was undermining it. In 1585, Henri III had promised to rid France of Protestants, but Duchesne's analogy suggests that the real enemies of the public good – those who really deserve to be banished from the kingdom – are those who resemble crocodiles and 'spitting' snakes ('Cracheurs'), those committing violent crimes or 'spitting' blasphemy. More precisely, the 'crocodiles' and 'snakes' include 'blasphemers' who 'spit poison', calling to mind the acrimonious words issuing from Leaguer pulpits and propaganda,[58] perceived, for example by Navarre, as undermining religion as well as the king. The 'thieves', 'murderers', and 'brigands' recall those romping lawlessly through France, and the adjective 'inhuman' applied to the brigands voices the strong contemporary perception of them as inhuman predators, particularly thanks to the analogy with crocodiles, which, earlier in the discussion, were anthropomorphised precisely as 'brigands'; murderers and thieves could also bring to mind those attempting to enforce the Nemours treaty. Duchesne's 'greedy people' could evoke the fiscal officers and money-lenders making huge profits, or perhaps the king's favourites receiving extravagant gifts; the money-lenders are also given an individual mention. Ridding the French

[58] Most of the Parisian clergy, according to contemporary accounts, actively supported the Paris Sixteen (the most powerful cell of the urban League); they comprised its 'most effective weapon', thanks to their power over popular opinion (Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries*, pp. 41-42).

territory of the financiers and usurers might have seemed to Duchesne all the more appropriate, given that many were Italian.[59] As for the lovers of law-courts, it was a common complaint that, thanks to the open sale of judicial office, France had too many lawyers and too much litigation,[60] and Duchesne may have been aware of the strong presence of dissatisfied lawyers in Catholic urban agitation.[61] In short, Duchesne suggests that the king could solve France's troubles by strongly exerting his authority over all of these 'true crocodiles'.

Conclusions

1. Commonplaces and authority: similitudes as creative 'thinking tools'

The depictions of kingship by Du Bartas and Duchesne are both dependent upon the same underlying analogy between nature and society. More specifically, both poets discuss the king's relationship with his kingdom by depicting the sun travelling through the constellations and ordering the seasons. Both poets find it helpful to depict the ideal monarch greeting his subjects and making his presence felt. However, whereas, for Du Bartas, the example of the sun implies that the king should govern over all areas of his kingdom in the same way and treat all his subjects equally, for Duchesne solar monarchy suggests that kings employ discernment in order to treat subjects appropriately in accordance with their merits. Furthermore, while the loyal inhabitants of Spring should be rewarded, another example from the natural world demonstrates that enemies of the king and of the public good – those powerful enemies who 'spit' poison and engage in inhuman violence – should be decisively quashed, with perseverance, bravery, cunning, and perhaps even cruelty and joy; by contrast, in the aftermath of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Du Bartas had used an example from the natural world to warn against the propensity of kings violently to crush their subjects, and thus to suggest (with the Protestant monarchomachs) that royal power should be reined in.[62]

Therefore, while commonplace analogies might (in some discourses at least) have set the parameters of political debate, they did not bear a fixed

---

[59] See the chapter by D. Cowling in this volume, pp. 117-132.

[60] Salmon, *Society*, pp. 78-79.

[61] Salmon, *Society*, pp. 247-257; *idem*, 'The Paris Sixteen, 1584-1594: The Social Analysis of a Revolutionary Movement', in: J. H. M. Salmon, *Renaissance and Revolt: Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 235-266.

[62] Banks, *Cosmos*, chapt. 2, pp. 64-80.

meaning that rendered them useful only to proponents of a particular view. While analogies undoubtedly shaped interpretations of events, conversely they were themselves shaped by (contemporary apprehensions of) events. In the terms of Kuhnian paradigms,[63] similitudes between nature and society shaped the sorts of 'questions' asked about royal authority in the final decades of the sixteenth century but did not shape the 'answers' found. Similitudes were part of the linguistic *outillage mental* of late sixteenth-century France, but this *outillage mental* shaped a framework of conceptual possibilities rather than defining one of rigid concepts.[64]

As Ann Moss states in this volume, commonplaces 'constituted in effect the cultural matrix of early modern Europe', yet could be exploited 'to manoeuvre authoritative argument' against commonly-held opinions (pp. 5-6). In the case of similitudes, as distinct from other sorts of commonplace, emphasis should be placed upon the latter, that is, upon their creative potential in the service of a variety of contradictory opinions: while any commonplace might be used in diverse and contradictory ways, the similitude seems particularly rich in creative potential. Indeed, in her discussion of the predilection of preachers for the similitude, Moss states that similitudes provided an 'abundance of opportunities to diversify' (p. 11). Thus similitudes may be more versatile than the metaphors which they develop. Where, as in the depiction of the sun-king, the implications of an analogy are unfolded at some length, diverse arguments can be constructed, for example about kingship. In other words, 'glossing' a similarity enabled a writer to some extent to determine its interpretation rather than be bound by the interpretations which were most commonly applied to it.

2. Analogy and genre: politics in natural-philosophical poetry

In natural-philosophical poetry, political comment appeared in a discussion of the cosmos and thus avoided 'censorship', not only in any literal sense, but also in that readers were not forewarned of the political content they would encounter. Political arguments grounded in nature, while they were

---

[63] In the history of science, T. S. Kuhn's concept of the 'paradigm' has been used to denote a set of basic beliefs which determine the terms of the questions posed at a given moment. See Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, [2]1970) and, for an overview of the varied notions of the 'paradigm', J. Golinski, *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 14-27.

[64] See L. Febvre's *Problème de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1942) and, on *outillage mental* as productive as well as restrictive, Banks, *Cosmos and Image*, pp. 4, 23n, and *passim*.

used in other discourses, also gained potency from their inclusion within a genre which insistently presents the natural world as a source of lessons for humanity, as both an image of the human world and an ideal to which it should aspire: as we have seen, this is both stated explicitly and implied through the use of lexical items which bear meaning in relation to both levels of an analogy.

Moreover, the potentially very powerful role played by the development of similitudes means that the genre of poetry inaugurated by the *Sepmaine* can perform a particularly interesting function in relation to commonplaces and authority. Of course analogies between the natural and the political were precisely commonplace, and were by no means employed only in Christian natural-philosophical poetry. However, this particular genre *invited* the detailed 'unfolding' of similitudes. Du Bartas's language – considered a paradigm of a style often termed 'baroque' – is flamboyantly imagistic.[65] Furthermore, he considered that his poem was, in part, an epic,[66] and used comparisons in the epic style, that is, developing them at length and focussing as much on the subject used for comparison (for example, the king) as on the initial subject-matter (the sun). In addition, Du Bartas was inventive in his use of epic comparisons, whereas some other poets, such as Du Bartas's very well-known contemporary, Ronsard, tended to draw their epic comparisons directly from ancient texts.[67] Duchesne often shares Du Bartas's stylistic practice with relation to comparisons.

Thus, thanks to the generic specificities of their use of similitudes, Du Bartas and Duchesne are able to explore at length – and, crucially, to shape – the implications of the commonplace analogies employed. As a result, Du Bartas voiced an original and polemical formulation of the body politic, and Duchesne similarly used comparisons between the king, the sun, and a royal animal in innovative and provocative ways. Thanks to, first, a particular poetic style and, secondly, commonplace analogies based on nature, politics was explored in natural-philosophical poetry, a departure from more usual genres of political commentary. Du Bartas and Duchesne apparently hope

---

[65] On images in the 'baroque' aesthetic, see A. Baïche, *La Naissance du baroque français: poésie et image de la Pléiade à Jean de La Ceppède* (Toulouse, 1976); W. Floeck, *Esthétique de la diversité: pour une histoire du baroque littéraire en France*, transl. by G. Floret (Paris, 1989), pp. 80-141. On Du Bartas's relation to this aesthetic, see B. Braunrot, *Imagination poétique chez Du Bartas: éléments de sensibilité baroque dans la Création du Monde* (Chapel Hill, 1973).

[66] *Brief Advertissement sur sa première et seconde Sepmaine* (1584), in *Works*, I, pp. 218-224 (p. 220).

[67] A. E. Creore, 'Ronsard, Du Bartas, and the Homeric Comparison', *Comparative Literature* 3 (1951), pp. 152-159.

that poetry might play some role in achieving societal harmony, not simply through the musicality of poetry – considered by some as a potential means of facilitating the descent of heavenly harmony upon France[68] – but rather through the provision of specific lessons as to how harmony can be achieved; in the fraught final decades of the sixteenth century, an important part of this was negotiating the relationship between kings and subjects.

[68] Yates, *The French Academies*, pp. 36-76. Duchesne himself discusses the power of harmony, and wishes he knew a song which could affect the 'deaf atheists' (*Le Grand Miroir*, pp. 130-131).