‘Sentences, pressées aux pieds nombreux de la poésie’?
Pierre Le Moyne’s Poussin Sonnet of 1643 and its Context

HENRY KEAZOR

In 1643 a slim folio-booklet of 35 pages was published in Paris, bearing the title Basilica in honorem S. Francisci Xaverii a fundamentis extructa, Munificentia illustrissimi viri Domini D. Francisci Sublet de Noyers, Baronis de Dangu, Regi ab intimis consilis, et secretis, &c. A collegii claromontani alumnis, Societatis Iesu, laudata & descripta. As indicated in this title, the volume praises Saint François Xavier, the church of the Jesuit novitiate in the Faubourg Saint-Germain in Paris (Pl. 28), founded in 1630 by the Surintendant des bâtiments, François Sublet de Noyers, in honour of his patron saint François Xavier and inaugurated in 1642.

The thirteen poems, with one exception in Latin, were written by the Pères (not, as claimed in the title, by alumni) of the Collège de Clermont in Paris. The poems describe the building in the rue du Pot-de-Fer/Saint-Sulpice (today rue Bonaparte), famous among the historians of architecture as one of

---

1 I am indebted to Martin Kaufhold (Historisches Institut, Heidelberg), who kindly helped me with the translation of the Latin poems. The booklet was first referred to in A. de Montaiglon, ‘Nicolas Poussin – Lettres de Louis Fouquet à son frère Nicolas Fouquet (1655–1656)’, Archives de l’art français, 12, 2nd ser., 2, 1862, pp. 267–309. Afterwards, it was mentioned by L. Charvet, Étienne Martellange: 1569–1641, Lyons 1874, p. 102; finally, the publication found its way into the bibliographies of works on Pierre Le Moyne and Nicolas Poussin such as H. Chérot, Étude sur la vie et les œuvres du P. Le Moyne (1602–1671), Paris 1887 (reprint Geneva 1971), p. 20, and É. Magne, Nicolas Poussin. Premier peintre du Roi, Brussels, Paris 1914, p. 127, n. 2 (both erroneously indicating Montaiglon’s article as located in the Nouvelles archives de l’art français). In 1664, the booklet was re-edited under the same title, this time printed duodecimo, with some changes in the poems on Vouet and Stella on pp. 28–31.
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Etienne Martellange’s finest creations, in considerable detail. Not only the architecture of the church, destroyed in 1806/07, but also its ornaments are celebrated, among them the chalice, the paten, the lamps, and not least the three altarpieces by Nicolas Poussin, Simon Vouet and Jacques Stella.

The paintings are the subject of four poems: the three pictures are treated together in the poem ‘Princeps laudator (Templi)’ (poem No. IV, attributed on the grounds of the initials ‘G.L.’ to Guillaume Léonard); 


5 Gobillot 1930 (as in n. 3, above), p. 105.

6 See Basilica in honorem S. Francisci Xaverii a fundamentis extructa, Munificentia illustrissimi viri Domini D. Francisci Sublet de Noyers, Baronis de Dangu, Regi ab intimis consiliis, et secretis, &c. A collegii claramontani alumnis, Societatii Iesu, laudata et descripta, Paris 1643 (hereafter: Basilica extructa 1643), pp. 23f. (‘Calix’), pp. 24–7 (‘Patina’), pp. 27–9 (‘Lampas’). The latter two poems were attributed by C. Sommervogel, S.J., Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus, Paris 1960, vol. 2, col. 156 (under ‘Briet, Philippe’) on the grounds of their signatures (‘G.L.’, ‘S.D.’) to Guillaume Léonard and Etienne Dechamps. The author of the other poem (signed ‘F.D.’) has remained anonymous – he could perhaps be identified with a certain ‘Fr. De Langle’, also mentioned in the list published by Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), and he might be identical with a certain P. de Langle, named by the R.P. Rigoleux, S.J. in his Traité de l’homme d’oraison, p. 43 (cited by Sommervogel 1960, vol. 4, col. 1484). For Léonard see likewise Sommervogel 1960, vol. 4, cols 1697ff. These monograms are nevertheless a complicated matter since it has so far escaped notice that only some of them were actually printed in the 1643 edition: only the initials for the ‘Lampas’, ‘F.D.’ (pp. 23f.), for the poem on Vouet’s painting, ‘M.G.’ (pp. 31ff.), for the poem ‘Fundamenta’, ‘P.B.’ (pp. 38f.) and for the poem ‘Conditoris Templi Elogium’, ‘S.D.’ are printed whilst the others were written by hand into the copy in the Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris (Yc 226). Even the word ‘Templi’ in the title of the section ‘Princeps laudator Templi’ was inserted manually in the synopsis. It remains difficult to decide whether these parts were included immediately after the publication of the booklet or whether they were copied from the 1664 re-edition of the booklet where initials are printed. The hand which wrote Le Moyne’s monogram into the 1643 edition made a mistake, giving the initials as ‘P.L.’, in this form also cited by J. Thuillier, ‘Pour un “Corpus Pussinianum”’, in Nicolas Poussin, Actes du colloque 1958, A. Chastel (Ed.), Paris 1960, vol. 2, pp. 49–238 (esp. p. 71), and corrected in idem, Nicolas Poussin, Paris 1994, p. 210, n. 5, whereas they – correctly – figure as ‘P.L.M.’ in the later re-edition, p. 26 (for Le Moyne’s initials see also notes 8 and 16).

7 Basilica extructa 1643, pp. 19–21; for the attribution see Sommervogel 1960 (as in
The two poems dedicated to Poussin’s altarpiece (one in Latin, the other surprisingly in French and in the form of a sonnet) rank among the earliest poetry on the French artist we know today: already published in 1643, they antedate the other eight poems known to have been printed before Poussin’s death in 1665. Furthermore, the one French poem in the booklet is...
interesting to us as it is signed with the initials ‘P.L.(M.)’, a signature which enabled scholars to attribute the verses to the distinguished pen of Pierre Le Moyne (Pl. 32).\textsuperscript{16} Poussin scholarship has so far ignored the fact that the poet himself ‘confirmed’ this attribution by including a slightly revised version of the sonnet in his two books of collected poems (his \textit{Poésies} of 1650 and his \textit{Oeuvres poétiques} of 1671).\textsuperscript{17}

Le Moyne was the first Jesuit to have become famous as a poet;\textsuperscript{18} however, his considerable reputation during his life was followed after his death by obscurity and neglect.\textsuperscript{19} He was born in 1602 and entered the Jesuit order in 1619,\textsuperscript{20} before his participation in the \textit{Basilica extracta},\textsuperscript{21} he had already distinguished himself with royalist poetry: titles such as ‘Le Portrait du Roy passant les Alpes’,\textsuperscript{22} published in 1629, ‘Hymne de la Maiesté au

\[\text{pp. 75–115 and idem 1994 (as in n. 6, above), pp. 160–73; the subjects of Scudéry’s poems, two paintings by Poussin, have so far not been identified in a satisfactory way – but, given the judgement by C. Biet, ‘\textit{Ut poesis pictura}, ou le tableau à l’épreuve du poème, dans Le Cabinet de Monsieur de Scudéry, 1646’, \textit{Littératures classiques}, 11, 1989, pp. 121–49 (esp. p. 124) (‘on peut en effet soupçonner Scudéry de prêter à certains peintres des tableaux qu’ils n’ont probablement pas réalisés’), they could even be Scudéry’s inventions; L’Hermite’s and Saint-Sorlin’s verses merely contain descriptions of Poussin’s \textit{Tancred and Erminia} and his Richelieu-triumphs, the latter interesting for a reconstruction of the Cabinet du Roi at Château Richelieu; Poussin is only mentioned in Berthod’s and Saint-Amant’s poems while Pader’s verses, describing and judging some pictorial themes dear to Poussin, are of somewhat greater interest; finally, de Bie’s verses are epigrammatic in character.}

\text{On the use of Le Moyne’s signature ‘P.L.M.’ in his \textit{Cabinet des devises} (1666), see Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 76. For the poem, see Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), p. 542, no. 3 and Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 5, col. 1361, no. 12. The attribution has never been doubted since it is confirmed by the fact that Le Moyne himself included the poem in his \textit{Poésies}, Paris 1650, p. 510 (under ‘Poésies diverses | Cabinet des peintures’) and, again, in his \textit{Oeuvres poétiques}, Paris 1671, p. 432 (under ‘Tapisseries, et peintures poetiques | Cabinet des peintures’). For the \textit{Oeuvres poétiques} (from where the engraving by Poilly after a portrait by Philippe de Champaigne shown in Pl. 32 has been taken), see also Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 540f., no. XL; for the changed title of the poem in these later re-editions see n. 46, below.}


\text{See Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 15.}

\text{For the life of Le Moyne, see Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 1–29 and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 28–52.}

\text{Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 186ff. dates the beginning of the poet’s maturity to Le Moyne’s arrival in Paris in 1638.}

150
'SENTENCES, PRESSÉES AUX PIEDS NOMBREUX DE LA POÉSIE'? Roy of 1630 or 'Sonnets sur la naissance de Monseigneur le Dauphin' of 1638 preceded his later and more ambitious undertakings which finally should render him famous. His most popular works were the Peintures morales of 1640/43, the Gallerie des femmes fortes published in 1647 and illustrated with engravings designed by Pietro da Cortona and Claude Vignon, and the epic poem Saint Louis ou le héros chrétien of 1653.

'Peintures', 'Galleries' – titles already chosen by Le Moyne for some of his early works point to the poet's affinity with the realm of art. Indeed, Poussin's painting was not to remain the only work of art commemorated in Le Moyne's verses: in his Oeuvres poétiques, published in Paris the year of his death 1671, we find a sonnet on Guido Reni's Magdalen which is stylistically very close to the sonnet on Poussin.

Le Moyne aspired to create a connection between poetry and art: in the 'Advertissement' of his Peintures morales of 1642, he proudly claimed: 'Fay...'

See Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 57ff. and p. 506, no. III, Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 5, cols 1357ff., no. 3 and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 31ff.

22 See Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), p. 507, no. IV, Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 5, col. 1358, no. 4 and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 33.

23 See Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), p. 508, no. VIII, Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 5, col. 1359, no. 8 and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 35.

24 See Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 80ff. and pp. 509ff., no. X, Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 5, cols 1359ff., no. 10 and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 37, 40.

25 1640 (part I), 1643 (part II), re-edited in a revised version in 1645. See Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 80ff. and pp. 509ff., no. X, Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 5, cols 1359ff., no. 10 and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 37, 40.


27 Newly edited in a completed version in 1658; see Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 5, col. 1366, no. 23, Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 527ff., no. XXI and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 8, 45ff.

28 See also Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 208: 'The relationship between poetry and the visual arts is often very close in Le Moyne's work, but he is never in any doubt as to the great superiority of the former'.

29 See Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), col. 1370, no. 44 and Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 50ff. The poem is already inserted into the Poésies, Paris 1650, p. 510 (under 'Poésies diverses: Cabinet des peintures'); concerning the Poésies, see Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 524ff., no. XIX.

30 On the poem on Reni, see Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), pp. 197ff.
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ajouté la Poésie à la Peinture; ce que personne n’a auoit entrepris avant moy: elles sont alliées, & se ressemblent en beaucoup de choses; & i’ay crû que si elles sont treuuees si agreeables, & si elles donnent tant de plaisir à l’esprit & à la veuë, quand elles sont separees, elles recreuroidrent vn nouueau lustre, & s’embelliroient mutuellement, & comme par contagion, quand elles seroient mises l’une auprez de l’autre ...

Since Le Moyn knew the poems by Giambattista Marino, he probably did not mean to say that he was the first to devote verses to paintings – Le Moyn rather claimed to have developed a new kind of poetic description, inspired by the example of painting and aiming – in a very Aristotelian way – at arousing and purifying the public’s

32 'I have added poetry to painting, something that nobody has done before me: they are connected and resemble each other in many respects; and I have thought that if they are perceived as pleasant to such a degree and if they are giving so much delight to the mind and to the eye when they are separated, they will yield a new splendour and will embellish each other, as by contagion, when they are put together ...'; Pierre Le Moyn, Les Peintures morales, Paris 1645 (second edition), 'Advertissement necessaire a l'instruction du Lecteur', n.p. [p. 9].

33 In his Traité du poème héroïque (reprinted under the title 'Dissertation du poème héroïque' in the Oeuvres poétiques, Paris 1671), a poetological text prefacing his Saint Lovys ou la Sainte Couronne Reconqvue, Le Moyn (cited here after the unpaginated edition of 1658 [pp. 71f.]) shows himself informed about 'les Imitateurs du Marin'. Concerning this topic, see also Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 44 and esp. pp. 114f.; concerning the Traité in general see Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 250ff.; for the Saint Lovys see ibid., pp. 527ff., no. XX and Sommervogel 1960 (as in n. 6, above), col. 1366, no. 23.

34 See the interpretation in M. Albrecht-Bott, Die bildende Kunst in der italienischen Lyrik der Renaissance und des Barock, Wiesbaden 1976, p. 22. Nevertheless, Marino conspicuously remains absent in the list of conceptual predecessors (prudently restricted to ancient authors such as Philostratus, Tacitus, Lucian and Callistratus) which Le Moyn compiles in the 'Advertissement' to emphasize his own merits: 'Mais les Tableaux & les Statuës de ces Autheurs estans en prose, ie pense auoir fait pour le contentement du Lecteur, plus que n’ont fait tous ceux qui m’ont precedé. l’ay ajouté la Poésie à la Peinture ...

emotions and at directing them towards higher and more noble goals. Or, as Le Moyne writes in his *Traité du Poème Héroïque*: ‘La perfection des Grands est la fin de la grande Poesie ...’  

‘Ce n’est donc pas assez qu’il (le poète) purifie les Passions des Grands; il faut encore qu’il forme, il faut qu’il acheme en eux les Vertus. ... d’exciter en l’Ame des Grands, l’admiration des grandes Vertus & de l’Honneste Heroique.’  

To achieve all this, to ‘instruire en diuertissant’, poetry, as the highest form of expression, seems more suited than prose, since – as also Montaigne wrote in his *Essais*: ‘tout ainsi que la voix, contrainte dans l’étroit canal d’une trompette, sort plus aigue et plus forte, ainsi me semble il que la sentence, pressée aux pieds nombreux de la poésie, s’eslance bien plus brusquement et me fiert d’une plus vive secousse’.  

So much for theory – what about practice?  

Let us take a look at the French sonnet Le Moyne wrote in order to celebrate Poussin’s altarpiece, showing *The Miracle of St Francis Xavier resuscitating the daughter of an inhabitant of Kagoshima in Japan*. Since the poem has so far not been studied in-depth and has been transcribed only in a very unreliable way, its original 1643 version is here given in full:

36 ‘The perfection of noble men is the goal of grand poetry ...’; Le Moyne 1658 (as in n. 33, above), p. [97].  
37 ‘It is therefore not enough that the poet purifies the passions of noble men, but he should also form and perfect the virtues within them ... inspiring in the souls of noble men admiration of great virtues and heroic uprightness.’ Ibid., p. [99]. See also Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 68 and esp. p. 69: ‘Almost all of his poetry is moved by the same spirit of impressing, dazzling, or overwhelming the reader ...’. Le Moyne 1645 (as in n. 32, above), p. 15; on pp. 11ff. he lists the passions he is dealing with in order to achieve this goal.  
38 Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 58 and p. 209: ‘Poetry differs ... not in the depiction of scenes and events, but in the bold and extraordinary images with which it conveys them, and especially the emotions which they arouse ...’.  
39 ‘Just as the voice of the trumpet sings out clearer and stronger for being forced through a narrow tube, so too thoughts, pressed into the metres of versification, leap forth more vigorously, striking me with a livelier shock.’ Michel de Montaigne, *Essais*, A. Micha (Ed.), Paris 1969, Book I, chapter 26: ‘De l’institution des enfans’, pp. 193f. Indeed, Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 128, n. 27 has discovered many reminiscences of Montaigne in Le Moyne’s prose text of the *Peintures*, vol. 1, pp. 697f.  
40 Montaiglon, who re-published the sonnet for the first time in 1862 (as in n. 1, above), p. 307, consulted the 1643 *folio*-edition (even though caring little for the punctuation of this edition), while Chéret 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), pp. 19f. obviously cites the In-12 *editio altera* of 1664.
Is it the person or the image of the great XAVIER, who forces here heaven's rigorous laws?

Yes, it is he who resuscitates, and at the same time with his faith is doing a famous deed upon someone dead.

Everything in him is a miracle, all his face is telling,
His eyes have ardour, his gesture has voice,
The miracle he is performing enraptures the Japanese,
And the rapture makes them speechless.

Sure, that in this painting by a divine effort, the prayer of a saint is raising someone from the dead –
This is a miracle, alien to nature:

But what is astonishing us completely
Is the fact that a saint, without yet leaving his tomb,
Is here gloriously resuscitated before Judgement Day.

42 The version quoted by Thuillier 1960 (as in n. 6, above), p. 71 and idem 1994 (as in n. 6, above), p. 159 is unreliable: Thuillier here omits the comma whilst introducing a comma in the first line of the first tercet; in the second line of the second tercet, he again omits it. In the last line of the second quartet, he renders 'le rauissement' as 'ce rauissement'. Moreover, his orthographical modernizations are not always consistent (sometimes he substitutes 'I' for 'J' ['Japonnois' / 'Japonnois'], sometimes he does not ['Jugement']).

43 In the 1664 edition the abbreviations have been expanded; see also n. 44.

44 See n. 43, above.
When Le Moyne inserted these alexandrines in the editions of his Poésies in 1650 and in his Oeuvres poétiques in 1671, he not only changed the orthography and the punctuation in some lines (separating for example in the first stanza the third and the fourth line by a colon and structuring some lines anew with the help of commas), he also made major changes in lines three and four of the first stanza. Whilst line three in the original version immediately answers the question asked in the first line ("Est-ce du grand Xavier la personne ou l'image") with a 'oui, c'est luy qui reuit', line three in the later version gives an answer by saying 'C'est luy-mesme, il reuit'; more in line with the ideal dramaturgy of a sonnet, the full impact of the answer is


In the Poésies 1650 (as in n. 16, above), p. 510 (under 'Poésies diverses | Cabinet des peintures'), the same happens in stanza two at the end of the second line (after 'voix') and in the Oeuvres poétiques 1671 (as in n. 16, above), p. 432 (under 'Tapisseries, et peintures poetiques | Cabinet des peintures') in stanza two at the end of the first line (after 'visage'). In both re-editions, the poem carries the title 'S. Xavier ressucitant vn mort. De Poussin.'. this heading is in accord with the poem itself where the Saint is called by his second name whilst the original titles in both editions of the Basilica extracta in 1643 and 1664 give his full name: 'SAINCT FRANCOIS XAVIER RESVSCITANT VN MORT.' Since the editio altera of 1664 does not reflect these changes at all (whilst alterations were made in the other poems – see n. 1, above), it is likely that no one from Le Moyne's circle was involved in this re-edition.

See the version in the Poésies 1650 (as in n. 16, above), p. 510 (under 'Poésies diverses | Cabinet des peintures'): I. 'Est-ce que du grand Xavier la personne ou l'image ....' II. 'La meruelle qu'il fait ravit ces Iaponnois;' III. 'Certes, qu'en ce tableau par vn divin effort, | La prieve d'vn Saint fasse reuivre vn mort, | C'est bien vnne meruelle estrange a la Nature;' IV. 'C'est qu'vn Saint sans quitter encor le sepulture ....' Le Moyne, who (following the preface of the 'Imprimeur' in the Poésies had 'reueu aux heures de son loisir, toutes les Poesies' changed again some lines for the 1671 edition. Thus, the differing passages (containing also a small misprint) in the Oeuvres poétiques 1671 (as in n. 16, above), p. 432 are: I. 'Est-ce que du grand Xavier la personne ou l'image ... De sa foy, sur un mort, vn glorieux ouvrage.' II. '... son geste a de la voix; | La meruelle qu'il fait, rait ces japonnois; | Et le ravissmenr [sic] leur oste le langage.' III. 'Certes, qu'en ce tableau, par vn divin effort, | La prieve d'vn Saint, fasse revivre vn mort ....'.

See Mönch 1955 (as in n. 45, above), p. 33 and Mönch 1957 (as in n. 45, above), p. 402, who describes the relation between the octave and the sextet verses in terms such as 'tension' and 'easing' or 'premise' and 'conclusion'.
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transferred to the last two lines of the sonnet where the hyperbolic claims of the described picture are fully played out:

vn Sainct, sans quitter encor la sepulture,
    Y ressuscite en gloire auant le Jugement.

But since these changes also had repercussions on the rhythm of the surrounding verses, Le Moyne had to alter the sequence of their elements. Thus,

Ouy, c'est luy qui reuit, & qui tout à la fois
De sa foy sur vn mort fait vn illustre ouurage. 49

had to become

C'est luy-mesme, il reuit, & fait tout à la fois,
De sa foy sur un mort vn glorieux ouurage.

The alliterative and almost anaphoric repetition of the verbs ‘fait’, ‘fois’ and ‘foy’ is given greater emphasis, and the whole poem finally turns out to be not just a composition enlivened by contrasts and antitheses such as the ‘gesticulating voice’ of the Saint opposed to the Japanese, deprived of speech by astonishment, but a ‘poetic fugue’ 50 (as Théophile Gautier put it when characterizing the sonnet form in general) on the crucial words ‘miracle-merveille’, ‘revivre’, ‘ravir’ and ‘ravissement’. Some of these words are furthermore employed to bind together the quartets and the tercets (see the ‘revit’ in line three, returning in the second line of the first tercet under the form ‘revivre’ as does ‘merveille’ in lines seven and eleven).

But of what kind are the ‘sentences’, put into this fugue and thus ‘pressées aux pieds nombreux de la poésie’?

Whoever is acquainted with the poetry of Pietro Aretino or Giambattista Marino will immediately recognize the topos expressed in the tercets: the notion of a dead person resuscitated by the painter and thus given a higher state of existence had already been explored by Aretino – and I just quote two lines from his sonnet on Titian’s (now lost) portrait of Francesco Vargas:

In carne io l’ho partorito mortale,
    Tu procreato divino in pittura .... 51

49 Perhaps in order to reduce the excessive use of the beginning ‘C’est’ in the first, the third and the fourth stanza, Le Moyne in both the editions of 1650 and 1671 eliminated the ‘C’est’ in stanza IV, line 2 and replaced it with the simpler ‘Est’.

50 In his study on Baudelaire’s Fleurs du mal, cited here after Mönch 1957 (as in n. 45, above), p. 408.

In the flesh I have given birth to him as a mortal being,
You made him divine in painting ....

as well as by Marino, who even supplies the model for verses on a painting depicting a resuscitation. In his madrigal 'Il figlio della Vedova di Naino di Paolo Veronese', Marino expresses the awe and amazement felt at the might of the painter who equals the powers of Christ when calling back to life the dead son:

Sorgi, sorgi a la luce,
(PAOLE il comanda) o Giovinetto morto.
Eccoti già risorto, e senso e moto
a dispetto di Cloto
un color spiritoso in te produce.
Certo l'alta virtù de la parola,
ch'a Morte empia t'invola,
è stata per miracolo novello
partecipata a quel divin pennello.

Come, come into the light,
(Paul is giving the order), oh dead youth.
There you are, already resuscitated, and sense and motion, defying Clotho,
are producing a vivid colour in you.
Sure, the great power of the word
which saves you from impious death
has by unheard-of miracle been
bestowed upon this divine brush.

In his analysis of Le Moyne's poems, Richard Maber has noticed that his originality frequently consists 'in taking a conventional concept to extremes'; here, too, in an attempt to top a common concept, the poet emphasizes the fact that Poussin in his painting not only resuscitates the dead daughter but also the miracle-working Saint Francis Xavier himself — a poetic strategy as typical of Le Moyne's style as is the contraction of his two favourite expressions 'merveille'/'chose étrange' into 'merveille étrange' in


53 Marino 1979 (as in n. 52, above), vol. 1, p. 56, no. 15. See in this respect also Marino’s ‘Lazaro risuscitato di Luca Cangiasi’, vol. 1, p. 64, no. 28. The topos of the ‘Immortal pennello’ as ‘l'uccisor di morte’ became very frequent concerning Guido Reni — see for example J. L. Colomer, ‘Un tableau “littéraire” et académique au 17e siècle: L’Enlèvement d’Hélène de Guido Reni’, Revue de l’art, 90, 1990, pp. 74–87, for this quotation see there p. 82 and n. 58.

54 Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 221.

55 Idem, p. 197 sees this idea as inspired by Le Moyne’s effort to close with a neat antithesis.
line three of the second tercet. The originality of the Marinesque contention of the Saint’s resuscitation\(^{57}\) is further drawn into question by the fact that it is also referred to by Père Guillaume Léonard, the author of the Latin poem on all three altarpieces, in his praise of Poussin’s picture.\(^{58}\)

Much of the Latin poem seems today to be of limited interest since it focuses on puns on the names of the artists: concerning Jacques Stella, for example, the obvious association of the words ‘star’ (‘Stella’) and ‘sun’ is used to establish a hierarchy of day and night, bright and dark; Poussin is claimed to be the ‘Sol pictorum’, but concerning Stella’s painting we learn that

\[
\ldots\text{non tamen est huius Solis lux tanta, propinquum obscuret ut Stellae iubar} \ldots
\]

The section of the Latin poem devoted to Poussin’s painting uses similar, obvious puns: the French painter is introduced as ‘le Poussin, Gallus pictor’, and in the sequel this interplay between the name ‘Poussin’, meaning ‘little chicken’ in French, and the ‘Cock’, the symbolic animal of France, is developed further:

\[
\ldots\text{patrij retinere velis si nominis umbram,} \\
\text{Pullum latiné nuncupes.} \\
\ldots\text{Galli soboles, ait, inclyta patris}^{60}\]

Since Poussin had the honour to paint the main altarpiece he is addressed directly in the Latin verses, whereas Stella and Vouet are referred to in the third person singular. The Latin verses on Poussin furthermore go beyond mere puns by dealing with the represented subject. In this respect, already the

\(^{56}\) See the examples listed by Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 190.


\(^{58}\) Nevertheless it seems very likely that Le Moyne was the creator of this pointe; see also n. 54.

\(^{59}\) ‘... the light of this sun is not bright enough to obscure Stella’s splendour nearby.’ The last verses from Cossart’s Latin poem (‘Minoris alterius Arae Tabula quam pinxit Stella’) employs similar arguments. It is also worth noting that Le Moyne’s as well as Léonard’s poems are original inasmuch as they both refrain from using the hackneyed acclamation of the respective painter as a new Apelles, amply utilized by Cossart and Michel Guillonnet in their – comparatively talkative – poems on Stella and Vouet. Perhaps not accidentally Guillonnet (\textit{Basilica extracta} 1643, p. 33) closes his poem on Vouet with the thought: ‘Sed tacuisse iuvat (neque enim quod muta poesis | Eloquitur pictura; loquax pictura poesis | Enarrare valet) superant miracula vatem’.

\(^{60}\) ‘... if you want to preserve a shadow of his paternal name, you might call him “Pullum” [little chicken] in Latin. ... Famous offspring of a French Father ....’ In Vouet’s case, the equivalent of these puns on the names Stella and Poussin is the use of an anagram (the letters ‘S-i-m-o-n-V-o-e-t-i-u-s’ are rearranged as ‘sine vitio sum’).
title of the section differs from those of the other two: ‘Tabula quam pinxit Stella’ and ‘Tabula quam pinxit Voëtius’ are the laconic titles of these poems whilst the verses on Poussin’s painting are entitled ‘Principis Altaris tabulam, cuius argumentu(m) est redditu puellae à Xauerio vita, fecit Le Poussin, Gallus pictor’. The poem closes with the topos also found in the French poem:

Prodigium quamvis Xaverius edat in Illā,
Animamque reddat Virgini,
Tu tamen hunc superas; dat enim vitam iste Puellae,
Sed ipse das Xaverio.61

In order to better understand and appreciate the two poems on Poussin’s work, we need to consider the painting in question since its commission, its making and its iconography were highly problematic. Nicolas Poussin was less than enthusiastic about the project when he received the order for the painting in June 1641: having been urged to come to Paris in October 1640, he felt himself overburdened with far too many projects of far too little ambition. Furthermore, when he received the measurements for the projected altarpiece (the greatest of the few public commissions he executed), he immediately lamented not only the great pressure exerted upon him by the short time granted for the execution (he was already involved in other projects and he should have delivered the work within four months);62 he also complained that his studio was too small to shelter the huge canvas of 4.44 x 2.34 metres63 (indeed, when the picture in 1778 – after the suppression of the Jesuit order in France in 1763 and the sale of its possessions on 14 March 176464 – was to be transported to the Apartement du Roy au Louvre it was...

61 ‘Xavier here might have worked miracles, giving back the spirit of life to a virgin, but you have exceeded him; because he has resuscitated the girl but you have resuscitated Xavier himself’.

62 See C. Jouanny, ‘Correspondance de Nicolas Poussin’, in Archives de l’art français, N.P., vol. 5, Paris 1911: letters from 3 August 1641 (Jouanny, p. 87), 20 September 1641 (Jouanny, p. 97) and 21 November 1641 (Jouanny, p. 106): ‘quadrone’, ‘troppo fretta’. See also p. 107, n. 1, the quotation from Roland de Chambray’s Traité: ‘peint avec une grande précipitation et pendant l’hyver’. Given this pressure, it seems rather unlikely that Poussin first had to execute a modello, as sold in the Dufourny sale: M. H. Delaroche, Catalogue des tableaux, dessins et estampes composant l’une des collections de feu M. Léon Dufourny ..., Paris 1819, 2nd edn, p. 54, lot 87, where a picture (canvas, 58 x 36 pouces = ca. 147 x 91 cm) is listed, believed to be ‘l’étude de celui que le Poussin a peint pour le maître-autel du noviciat des jésuites’; the price for this piece – following the copy in the British Library (786.1.46) where the selling prices are noted by hand – was 71 – 95 (no currency specified).

63 Letter from 2 July 1641: Jouanny (as in n. 62, above), p. 83.

64 See Gobillot 1930 (as in n. 3, above), p. 89 and pp. 98f. G. Wildenstein, Les graveurs de Poussin au XVIIe siècle, Paris 1957, p. 218, no. 87 nevertheless indicates the selling date as 1763 (reporting also that the painting was sold to Louis XV). He is seconded by A. Blunt, The Paintings of Nicolas Poussin. A Critical Catalogue.
suggested to cut it down ‘par le haut et par le bas, et corriger par ce moyen sa forme désagréable’—a plan which fortunately was immediately abandoned because judged impracticable). But when Poussin finally delivered the painting at the beginning of the year 1642, polemics started: infuriated by the King who had greeted the newly-arrived Poussin in 1640—‘Voilà Vouet bien attrapé’ (Here we have Vouet being nicely outwitte)—the envious Vouet started a campaign against the painting. He had obviously learnt from the diatribe he himself had suffered only one year before when his painting of the Apotheosis of St Louis (today Musée des Beaux-Arts at Rouen) for the church Saint-Louis-des-Jésuites was accused of copying so shamelessly an Assumption of the Virgin by Annibale Carracci that Vouet’s saint still showed female features. Henri Sauval remarked: ‘Ce n’est pas assés dans une figure d’y remarquer une tete & un habit d’homme, il faut que le reste soit d’homme aussi ...’


‘It is not enough to see in a figure the head and dress of a man, the rest should likewise be fitting for a man.’ Sauval 1724 (as in n. 65, above), p. 464. In spite of the fact that the iconography of the apotheosis of St. Louis tends to lack characteristics that clearly distinguish it from the apotheoses of other saints, Chérot 1887/1971 (as in n. 1, above), p. 26 sees Le Moyne inspired by Vouet’s painting when describing the same episode in his Saint Louis ou le héros chrétien.
Vouet now levelled the same kind of criticism at Poussin: he accused him of having copied his Christ from the antique and criticized him severely for not having depicted a merciful God but a ‘thundering Jupiter’ (a depiction which, by the way, would have pleased the marinesque poet Giuseppe Battista who – in his poem ‘Lo studio delle lettere’ – likewise called the Christian God by the name of ‘Giove’). That all this was just a subterfuge for a slanderous polemic can easily be demonstrated with two sets of observations:

When conceiving the figure of Christ, Poussin indeed had taken the thundering Jupiter from the Column of Trajan (Pl. 33) as his starting-point, but he had blended this motive with elements taken from Raphael’s Transfiguration (Vatican, Pinacoteca; Pl. 34) – as he had already done before

---

69 See Jouanny 1911 (as in n. 62, above), p. 147 where Poussin’s famous answer is reported: ‘qu’il ne peut, dis-je, et ne doit jamais s’imaginer un Christ en quelque action que ce soit, avec un visage de torticolis ou d’un père douillet, veu qu’estant sur la terre parmi les hommes, il estoit mesme difficile de le considérer en face.’ See for this also André Félibien, Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellens peintres anciens et modernes, Trevoux 1725, vol. 4, VIII. Entretien, pp. 40, 49.


71 See also Pietro Sante Bartoli, Colonna Traiana eretta dal senato e popolo romano all’Imperatore Traiano Augusto nel suo foro in Roma, s.d. (1667), pl. 18, no. 133.

72 Only Sauval 1724 (as in n. 65, above), p. 462 suggests that Poussin was suspected of having copied from the Column of Trajan: ‘... les soupçonneux la croyent prise de la Colonne Trajanne ...’ For the ‘Jupiter tonnant’ see Jouanny 1911 (as in n. 62, above), p. 147; for the Column of Trajan see C. Cichorius, Die Reliefs der Traianssäule, Berlin 1836, vols. 2 – 3 (text), pp. 116f. and S. Settis, La Colonna Traiana, Turin 1988, p. 288. For the French fortuna critica of the reliefs see P. Morel, La Colonna Traiana e gli artisti francesi da Luigi XIV a Napoleone I, Rome 1988, pp. 81–3, nos 28–9 where drawings by Edmé Bouchardon and an anonymous artist after the ‘Jupiter Tonans’ are published (Paris, Musée du Louvre; inv. F. 20.24080/RF 38.618).

73 Sauval 1724 (as in n. 65, above), p. 462: ‘Les envieux & les intelligens disent que Poussin, Raphael & l’Antique ont fait la même figure, ou que Raphael n’en pourrait pas faire une meilleure; les soupçonneux la croyent prise de la Colonne Trajanne, mais les désintérêssés & tous les intelligens tiennent qu’il n’est redevable de la beauté des attitudes toutes divines qu’à son grand genie.’ (‘The envious and the judicious say that Poussin, Raphael and the antique have produced the same figure, or that Raphael could not make a better one; the suspicious think that it
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when executing two other Parisian commissions, the *Moses and the burning bush* (Copenhagen, Statens Museum for Kunst), commissioned in 1641 by Richelieu, and the title-page for the *édition de luxe* of the bible, designed in August 1641 and printed by the Imprimerie Royale (Pl. 35). Although this repeated recourse to the appearance of the pagan god did not remain unnoticed (see the passage in Perrault’s *Les Hommes illustres*: ‘Quelques-uns le blâmèrent aussi d’avoir donné à l’air de teste du Christ de S. Germain en Laye & de plusieurs autres Tableaux quelque chose qui tenont plus d’un Jupiter tonnant que du Sauveur du monde...), Poussin was severely criticized only...
when he—obviously working in a great hurry—re-used the image of the God for his Francis Xavier. Moreover, the critics, so eager in search of weak points, failed to notice that the girl in the left foreground was likewise derived from the antique: the source for the figure gently propping up the resuscitated girl’s head can be detected in the relief of a Meleager-sarcophagus (Paris, Louvre; Pl. 36)76 which Poussin had already consulted when painting his Germanicus thirteen years earlier as well as his first version of the Extreme Unction about nine years earlier. He returned once more to this source in the second version of the Extreme Unction of 1644.77

The slanderous nature of the polemic is further confirmed by the fact that the critics overlooked a detail in Poussin’s painting which—had the critics really been motivated by religious ardour—could have served as a possible point of attack: while the orthodox iconography of St Francis Xavier, established on the grounds of an early posthumous portrait of 1583, held to be faithful and true (Rome, Cappellette di S. Ignazio; Pl. 37),78 shows

the chapel at the Château de Saint-Germain-en-Laye). In all four compositions (Moses, Institution, title page, Francis Xavier) the figures of God or Jesus are not only showing similar gestures (the Eucharist here being excluded), but they also display the same type of hair-do and beard. For the painting in Paris, see Blunt 1966 (as in n. 64, above), pp. 54f., no. 78.

76 For this sarcophagus, see F. Baratte and C. Metzger, Catalogue des sarcophages en pierre d’époques romaine et paleochrétiennne, Paris 1985, pp. 97ff., no. 37.

77 He re-used the posture of this woman a second time in 1647 for the figure of the penitent Magdalen in the second version of the Penance (Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland). Furthermore, the Meleager-sarcophagus provided him with motives when painting the second version of the Extreme Unction in 1644. For the Meleager-sarcophagus as a source for the Germanicus, see already Grautoff 1914 (as in n. 65, above), p. 75 and W. Friedländer, Nicolas Poussin. Die Entwicklung seiner Kunst, Munich 1914, p. 34. For the two versions of the Extreme Unction, see S. C. Emmerling, Antikenverwendung und Antikenstudium bei Nicolas Poussin, Würzburg 1939, pp. 3–7; already Michel-François Dandré-Bardon, Costume des anciens peuples, Paris 1772, vol. 1, cahier V, planche I refers to this source when showing the first version of the Extreme Unction together with an engraving of the sarcophagus. Finally, M. Praz, ‘Milton e Poussin alla scuola dell’Italia’, Romana, 2, 1938, pp. 30–53 (esp. p. 49) has shown that the jamb of the bed in the Saint Francis Xavier—praised by François-Georges Pariset, ‘Les “natures mortes” chez Poussin’, in Actes 1960 (as in n. 6, above), vol. 1, pp. 215–24 (esp. p. 220), as ‘d’un classicisme robuste’—is likewise taken from the antique, citing a detail of the Aldobrandini Wedding (Vatican, Pinacoteca).

78 The posthumous portrait of 1583, today in the Cappellette di S. Ignazio in Rome, was characterized by those who knew the Saint as providing a close likeness; for this painting, see W. Schamoni, Das wahre Gesicht der Heiligen, Leipzig 1938, p. 113. Francisco Zurbárrán when painting his Legado vega Inclán (today: Museo Romántico, Madrid) obviously took the Roman portrait as a model; Zurbárrán’s picture is shown as fig. 7 in D. C. P. Bustamante and D. F. J. Sanchez Canton, Cuarto centenario de la muerte de San Francisco Javier, Madrid 1952 (comment on
the Saint with a full beard, Poussin — in his own words ‘unaccustomed to portraiture’ — departed from this iconographic tradition: although likewise depicting the saint in slight profile with eyes turned upwards, other than e.g. Van Dyck or Rubens (Pl. 38) he gave his Francis Xavier only a very thin

79 See Poussin’s letter to Chantelou from 13 March 1650; Jouanny 1911 (as in n. 62, above), p. 412: ‘Je confesse ingénument que je suis paresseux à faire cet ouvrage auquel je n’ai pas grand plaisir et peu d’habitude, car il y a vingt-huit ans que je n’ai fait aucuns portrait ....’ (‘I admit without embarrassment that I am listless in executing this work which does not please me greatly and in which I have little experience since I have not made a portrait for twenty-eight years.’).


Many of the prominent pictures of Saint Francis Xavier that were painted later, such as the three paintings of Baciccio in S. Andrea al Quirinale (S. Francis Xavier preaching in the Indies, Saint Francis Xavier baptising an Eastern Princess, Death of Saint Francis Xavier), confirm this physiognomy. The only exception so far discovered, a print by Giovanni Giuseppe Dal Sole (1654 – 1719) depicting the dispute of the saint with heathen scholars, does not show him with a heavy beard, but nevertheless gives him the faint indication of a sprouting full beard. It is perhaps this engraving which is described by G. Gori, Notizie istoriche degl’intagliatori, Siena 1771, p. 248 as done after a painting by Lorenzo Pasinelli, showing ‘un S. Francesco Xaverio, che con sante dottrine confonde i Satrapi del Giappone’; for Baciccio’s paintings see R. Enggass, The Painting of Baciccio, University Park 1964, p. 141. Concerning Saint Francis Xavier as a poet, a writer, as well as the subject of poems, sculptures and paintings see Canton 1952 (as in n. 78, above), pp. 23–55: ‘San Francisco Javier en las letras y en las artes españolas’.

81 Cf. his lost painting of St. Francis Xavier (formerly London, Asscher and Welker, destroyed by fire in 1940) which perhaps was commissioned for Il Gesù in Rome, but was later transferred to the Jesuit church in Brussels; see H. Vlieghe, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, part VIII, ‘Saints’, vol. 2, Brussels 1973, pp. 71f., no. 114, missing among the copies listed there is the painting in the second chapel on the left in the church of S. Francesco Saverio at Palermo, traditionally attributed to Pietro Novelli (1603–1647). For the other portraits of the saint, all showing him with a beard, see S. Kimura, ‘Catalogue des portraits de Saint François Xavier au début du 17e siècle’, Bulletin de la Faculté des Arts, Université de Nîbon, 26, 1996, pp. 87–99 (in Japanese); for later depictions of the bearded saint see the images listed by P. G. Lechner OSB, Heiligenporträts. Eine Auswahl aus der Göttweiger Sammlung, exh. cat., Stift Göttweig 1988, pp. 69–79, nos 65 (Gaulil), 66 (Seghers/Bolsward), 67 (Sangiorgi), 68 (Lublinski/Waldreich), 69
beard. Whilst this detail was overlooked, the critics focused on one ear of the depicted Francis Xavier which they judged as being too big. The engraver Etienne Gantrel, when making a print after the painting (Pl. 39), which he dedicated to Père François de la Chaise (1624–1709), corrected the Saint’s appearance by showing him with a thick full beard whilst his companion Jean Fernandez (in the painting even more bearded than Saint Francis Xavier) is depicted in contrast as clean-shaven. The poems in the Basilica extracta do not reflect the polemics of April 1642, preceding the publication of the booklet by only one year.

Some further points still need to be addressed: the miracle performed by Francis Xavier is called an ‘illustre ouvrage’ in the 1643 version of the poem, and ‘glorieux’ in the 1650 version. However one may read ‘illustre’ and ‘glorieux’, be it in the sense of ‘famous’ or of ‘outstanding’, neither meaning is ultimately appropriate since the miracle depicted in Poussin’s painting is in fact highly unusual in the iconography of the missionary. As Saburo Kimura demonstrated in 1988, the resuscitation of the dead Japanese girl was invented only in 1594 by the Jesuit Orazio Torsellino. When writing a biography of Francis Xavier, Torsellino adopted elements from the Historia de Japan by the Jesuit historian Luis Frois, published ten years earlier in 1584. Frois’s report about the Jesuit physician, Luis de Armeida, who had introduced western medicine to Japan and at Kagoshima saved a Japanese girl from a serious illness, was integrated by Torsellino into the story of Francis Xavier: he miraculously calls back from death the daughter of a rich and honoured citizen of Kagoshima.

(Hainzelmann), 70 (Wolfgang), 71 (Küsell?), 72 (Küsell?), 73 (Amling), 74 (Amling), 75 (Anonymous), 76 (Anonymous), 77 (Pfeffel), 78 (Anonymous), 79 (Luyken) and 80 (Küsell). For the painting by Jean Le Clerc of a Saint Francis Xavier preaching to the Indians (Nancy, Musée Historique Lorrain de Nancy) where the Saint likewise appears bearded, see S. Kimura, ‘Saint François-Xavier prêchant aux Indiens de Jean Le Clerc’, in A. Reinbold (Ed.), Georges de la Tour ou la nuit traversée, Actes du colloque, Metz 1994, pp. 133–43.


83 See also early descriptions of the Saint, always mentioning his beard (P. Manuel Teixeira: ‘el cabello y barba, negros’ (1694); P. Simón Bayard: ‘la bocca rubiconda e la folta barba’), cited by Canton 1952 (as in n. 78, above), p. 44.

84 Kimura 1988 (as in n. 83, above), pp. 394ff. It should nevertheless be noted that Poussin did not follow Torsellino’s report too faithfully, perhaps in order to better emphasize the emotions depicted in and aroused by his painting; he gave the mother of the resuscitated girl rather than her father a prominent role (see n. 165.
Given these origins, it is no wonder that this event does not form part of the canonical iconography of the taumaturgous Saint. It is indeed very telling that Louis Réau in 1958, when publishing his *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, erroneously listed Poussin's painting as representing a miracle done in India since the Indian episodes – together with the disputation between the Saint and heathen scholars – were the most frequently represented scenes from his life (see, for example, Rubens's painting of 1620 in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna depicting the episode of a dead Indian child resuscitated by the Saint, or two engravings, one by Johann Georg Wolfgang from after 1662 showing Francis Xavier resuscitating a dead Indian, the other by Martin Anton Lublinski and Johann Georg Waldreich from 1675, depicting the disputation).

---

86 See e.g. the cycle of 20 paintings by the Portuguese painter André Reinoso (1610–1641) in the Sacristy of the Jesuit church of São Roque in Lisbon, where the scene of the resuscitation of the Kagoshima girl is suspiciously absent; the only Japanese miracle depicted there concerns the healing of a sick woman; for this painting, as well as for the whole cycle see: V. Serrão, *A lenda de São Francisco Xavier. Pelo pintor André Reinoso*, Lisbon 1993, pp. 90f., no. XVII (São Francisco Xavier curando um enfermo, no Japão), for Reinoso in general see Serrão's entry in *The Dictionary of Art*, J. Turner (Ed.), vol. 26, London 1996, pp. 129f. where the cycle in Lisbon is dated to about 1619. Likewise the scene of the resuscitation of a dead man, illustrated by Serrão on p. 52, does not show the Kagoshima miracle but an event that happened in Ceylon. The picture forms part of a pictorial cycle by Padre Manuel Henriques (1593 – 1654), executed in 1640/50, Sacristia de Sé Nova de Coimbra (once Colégio da Companhia de Jesus); see Serrão, pp. 50–2. Finally, a fresco cycle in the Cloisters of the Convent of La Merced in Quito (Ecuador; datable on the grounds of stylistic evidence to the 18th century) likewise does not include this event – the only miraculous resuscitation shown there is a posthumous miracle, a relic of the Saint reviving a dying child (Warburg photo: V.7.4311).


88 See Lechner 1988 (as in n. 81, above), p. 72, no. 70.

89 Ibid., p. 71, no. 68.
Why did the Jesuits – normally so eager to devise clearly defined iconographic schemes91 – choose such an uncanonical subject for the high altar of the new church? We know from Poussin’s correspondence that this subject was not the only one to have been considered. In a letter of July 1641 the painter reports that he is reading the Lives of St Ignatius and St Francis Xavier in order to find an appropriate subject for the painting, hoping nevertheless that De Noyers’s suggestion to depict the miracle in Japan could be accepted.92 Thus, De Noyers’s proposal does not seem to have been the first choice. Both his suggestion and the final choice might have to do with a tendency observable in the hagiography of St Francis Xavier during these years. In several Jesuit theatre plays, written and performed in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the deeds of the Saint performed in Japan are emphasized, since they were the last acts he accomplished before his death and his entry into Heaven. 93 Already Torsellino’s account of the miracle worked in Japan might reflect a desire to provide the last stage of the Saint’s

91 See e.g. Serrão 1993 (as in n. 86, above), p. 105 in his English summary on the Reinoso paintings: ‘The “absolute modernity” of the series is evidenced in the clear iconographic programme for the paintings laid down in the specific guidelines of the Society of Jesus, in order to record through imagery the miraculous life of the [sic] fifteenth-century saintly missionary, who died in 1552, in order to further the process of his canonization. It was, therefore, important to establish a clear iconography, attractive, strictly accurate, based on known biographical texts ....’ Serrão on p. 105 (perhaps due to a typographical error?) incorrectly states that Saint Francis Xavier was canonized in 1662 (instead of 1622).

92 In a letter of 16 June 1641 Poussin asks if De Noyers could submit an idea for the subject of the painting: Jouanny 1911 (as in n. 62, above), p. 77; 29 June 1641 he still has not received any suggestions concerning this point (ibid., p. 80). Thus, the interpretation of the events given by Thuillier 1974 (as in n. 64, above), p. 101, no. 128 and idem 1994 (as in n. 64, above), p. 257, no. 151, who thinks that the subject was Poussin’s own decision is not correct, whilst Wild 1980 (as in n. 66, above), vol. 1, p. 101 rightly states that the suggestion was due to De Noyers. Interestingly, in the editio altera of 1664 Cossart clearly stresses De Noyers’ possible influence upon the depicted subjects by expanding the hints (p. 35, v. 4f.) given in the 1643 edition (‘... neque linea ducta est | Te sine: pingenti dictabas omnia dextrae.’) to the hyperbolical claim (v. 35ff.): ‘... Sublete: hoc ore docentem | His jussisti oculis hoc pingi simplice cultu. | Et potuit merito tabulae subscribere pictor | Auctorem Subletum: operis nam linea ducta | Te sine nulla fuit: dictabas uncius auctor | Singula, et ingenium artificis radiumque regebas’.

93 See for example the ‘Comoedia de SS: patribus Ignatio et Xaverio’ (Vienna, Handschriften- und Musiksammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 9881), written at the end of the sixteenth century; in act IV the deeds of S. Ignatius in Rome are parallelized with those of S. Francis Xavier in Japan; both plays then narrate the deaths of the saints and the welcome prepared for them in Heaven. For these plays, see also K. Adel, Das Wiener Jesuitentheater und die europäische Barockdramatik, Wien 1960, pp. 6, 51.
life with appropriate deeds – deeds which gained a special importance as they were so close to the Saint’s afterlife in Paradise.

Returning to Le Moyne’s poem, we observe that the iconographic peculiarities mattered to the author as little as the polemics surrounding the work. But if so: what did matter to him? Of what kind are his ‘sentences, pressées aux pieds nombreux de la poésie’? And are there any original thoughts, not already expressed or hinted at by other poets?

In fact, there are: perhaps guided by the inherent dramatic form of the sonnet and sensitized by his own poetic concept of arousing and purifying the public’s emotions and of directing them towards higher and more noble goals, Le Moyne shows himself capable of perceiving an aspect of the painting which succeeding authors were likewise to address: the emotions expressed and provoked by Poussin’s painting.

Tout est miracle en luy, tout parle en son visage,
Ses yeux ont de l’ardeur, son geste a de la voix,
La merveille qu’il fait ravit les Japonnois,
Et ce ravissement leur oste le langage

the second stanza runs.

Even though the topos expressed in the tercets of the sonnet is not – as has been shown – an original one, Le Moyne becomes a precursor within the context of French poetry. The importance of the portrayal of emotions was crucial to him, due to his familiarity both with the Aristotelian concept of poetry and with a specifically Jesuit aesthetics of effect. Like his colleague, Père Menestrier, who in a sonnet of 1681 praised Le Brun as a painter who ‘peint les Passions’ and who ‘rend l’âme visible’, Le Moyne already in 1643

94 T. de Banville, *Petit traité de poésie française*, Paris 1872, here cited after the edition of 1884, p. 202: ‘Enfin, un Sonnet doit ressembler à une comédie bien faite, en ceci que chaque mot des quatrains doit faire deviner – dans une certaine mesure – le trait final, et que cependant ce trait final doit surprendre le lecteur .... C’est ainsi qu’au théâtre un beau dénouement emporte le succès ..., parce que le poète a revêtu ce dénouement d’une forme plus étrange et plus saisissante que ce qu’on pouvait imaginer d’avance.’ (‘Finally, a sonnet has to resemble a good comedy inasmuch as every word of the quartets has to make us guess – to a certain extent – the final feature, and as, on the other hand, this final feature must surprise the reader ... In this manner a good solution is successful in the theatre ... because the poet has given a stranger and more striking form to this solution than expected.’) On the sonnet, appreciated as a dramatic form and even seen in an intimate relationship with drama, see also Mönch 1955 (as in n. 45, above), p. 37 and Mönch 1957 (as in n. 45, above), p. 405.

95 Maber 1982 (as in n. 2, above), p. 187: ‘One can only speculate as to the influence that long connection with Jesuit education might have had on him, with its strong emphasis on rhetorical technique ... and dramatic effectiveness.’ Maber, pp. 118f. – obviously without counting the poems on the Magdalen (see, above, n. 31) and the Francis Xavier – states that Le Moyne wrote only a small amount of religious verse.
valued an aspect which later authors likewise were to appreciate. Henri Sauval in 1654 wrote an enthusiastic description of the painting, centered upon the passions and the feelings of the Japanese; he closed his text with the exclamation: 'Il n’y a que Poussin au monde capable d’exprimer ce combat de passions si opposées dans une même personne, & sur un même visage.' 97 While Sauval focussed his attention especially upon the young woman supporting the dead girl, Bellori in his description was more interested in the mother, thrusting herself towards her daughter: 'Qui si rende vivissima l’espressione della madre a’ piedi, che in quel motivo di vita apre le mani per

97 Sauval 1724 (as in n. 65, above), vol. 1, p. 462; the whole passage runs: 'Il a disposé ses figures en sorte qu’elles voyent toutes le miracle, & a remué leurs passions avec un jugement & une adresse qui lui est toute particulière: il a conduit & manié leur douleur & leur joie par degré à proportion des degrés du sang & de l’interêt, ce qui paroit visiblement sur leurs visages, & par leurs attitudes toutes différentes. L’un s’étonne du miracle, l’autre en doute; l’un par sa gaieté temoigne son contentement, l’autre par la continuation de sa tristesse montre qu’il ne s’en rapporte ni au recit d’autrui, ni à sa vu. Une femme au chevet du lit soutient la tête de la personne ressucitée fort navement; elle est plantée & courbée avec une science & une force toute spirituelle & toute à fait merveilleuse. On remarque dans les yeux, la bouche, le mouvement des bras, les plis du visage, & toutes les actions d’une autre qui est au pied du lit, que la douleur qui s’était emparée de son ame, ne cede qu’à grande force à la joie; & cette joie encore ne se fait voir que comme le Soleil dans un temps fort chargé, qui simplement par quelque foible rayon, sans pouvoir percer la nie, à peine donne à connaître qu’il a envie de se montrer. Il n’y a que Poussin au monde capable d’exprimer ce combat de passions si opposées dans une même personne, & sur un même visage.' ('He has arranged his figures in such a manner that they all can see the miracle, and he has stirred their passions with a judgement and a skill which are particular to him: he has directed and handled their grief and their joy according to their different temper and the different degrees of involvement which can be seen on their faces and in their gestures, all completely different. One is astonished at the miracle, the other is doubting it; one is attesting his satisfaction by his cheerfulness, the other, continuing in his sadness, shows that he is caring neither for what he is being told nor for what he is seeing. A woman, standing at the head of the bed, is supporting the head of the resuscitated person with an unaffected manner; she is posed and bending forward with knowledge and with entirely spiritual and absolutely wonderful force. In the eyes, the mouth, the movements of the arms, the wrinkles of the face and all the actions of another woman at the foot of the bed, one can comprehend that grief has seized her soul and is giving way to joy only with difficulty, and yet this joy is showing itself just like the sun in an overcast sky, just making clear with some feeble rays that it wants to show itself, without penetrating the clouds. In the whole world only Poussin is capable of expressing the fight of such contrary passions in one and the same person and on one and the same face.').
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abracciare la filiuola ... altri, che appariscono con la testa, e con le braccia in senso di doglia e di maraviglia...’. 98

From Félibien who rhetorically asks ‘Trouve-t-on d’ailleurs des expressions de douleur, de tristesse, de joie & d’admiration plus belles, plus fortes & plus naturelles que celles qui se voyent dans ce merveilleux Tableau ...? Il n’y a point de figure qui ne semble parler, ou faire connôtre ce qu’elle pense, ou ce qu’elle sent’ 99 to Passeri who praises the ‘mirabile espressione’, 100 and from Passeri to Jacques Thuillier, who in our days honoured the painting by claiming it to be ‘l’école de plusieurs générations’ 101 because of its ‘expression des passions,’ the emotions, affections and sentiments shown in Poussin’s painting have consistently commanded admiration. 102


99 Félibien 1725 (as in n. 69, above), vol. 4, VIII. Entretien, p. 91. See already there p. 39: ‘... celui du Poussin, qui est d’une beauté surprenante, & dont les expressions sont si belles & si naturelles, que les ignorans n’en sont pas moins touchez que les scâvans.’ (‘... the [painting] by Poussin which is of surprising beauty and where the expressions are beautiful and natural to such a degree that the uneducated are touched as much as the educated.’) See finally also Félibien, vol. 3, VI. Entretien, p. 161: ‘On ne peut rien voir de plus beau que les expressions de joie et d’admiration qui s’y rencontrent. ... Il y a des hommes & des femmes, qui ... passent tout d’un coup de la tristesse à la joie, & du désespoir à l’admiration.’ (‘One cannot see anything more beautiful than the expressions of joy and of admiration which one encounters here ... There are men and women who suddenly pass from sadness to joy and from despair to admiration.’).


102 See also the judgement by Lépicié in the preface to his Vies des premiers peintres du Roi, Paris 1752, p. lix: ‘... celui de Poussin dont on admirera toujours la composition, les caractères et la vivacité variée des expressions.’ Nevertheless, the painting was not unanimously acclaimed: voices praising it have always been contrasted by others. Thus, while Bernini obviously liked this work – see Paul Fréart de Chantelou, Journal du voyage du Cavalier Bernin en France, Clamecy 1981, p. 36 (13 June): ‘le tableau du grand autel, et a dit qu’il lui semblait qu’il était du Poussin. Il l’a trouvé fortement beau ....’ – the painter Philippe Vleughles is said to have been left cold by it: ‘ce tableau ne le toucha pas beaucoup’ (cited after Guillet
The author of the Latin poem seemingly remained uninterested in such accomplishments, preferring to play with puns instead; and while the other – comparatively formulaic – Latin poems on the paintings by Vouet and Stella amply use the standard acclamation of the painter as a new Apelles, Le Moyne refrains from such stereotypic phrases and concentrates instead on the emotions shown in the painting:

La merueille qu’il fait rauit ces Iaponnois,
Et le rauissement leur oaste le langage.

and the emotions aroused in the spectator:

l’effet qui remplit tout nostre estonement

Le Moyne certainly did not just want to describe these emotions of awe and amazement, he also tried to emulate and to intensify them in his poem by introducing the final climax of the resuscitation of the Saint by the painter.

His sonnet numbers – as any sonnet should – fourteen lines; the poems on Vouet and Stella count 68 and 63 lines respectively. Even though Le Moyne’s sonnet may not be entirely original, one might nonetheless take it as confirmation of what Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux wrote in his *Art poétique* of 1674: ‘Un sonnet sans défaut vaut seul un long poème.’

---


APPENDIX

From Basilica in honorem S. Francisci Xaverii a fundamentis extracta, Munificentia illustissimi viri Domini D. Francisci Sublet de Noyers, Baronis de Dangu, Regi ab intimis consiliis, et secretis, &c. A collegii claromontani alumnis, Societatis Iesu, laudata & descripta, Paris 1643 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Yc 226)

From

IV. PRINCEPS LAUDATOR (TEMPLI), pp. 19–22.

II: Principis Altaris tabulam, cuius argumentu(m) est reddita puellæ à Xauerio vita, fecit Le Poussin, Gallus pictor.

Tum perrexit, & ecce labor se maximus offert
Maioris.* Angelo viri,
Quem, patrij retinere velis si nominis vmbram,
Pullum Latinè nuncupes.
Vt vidit; Galli soboles, ait, inclyta patris
Te nullus extinguat dies!
Nullus & hanc tabulam violet, qua pulchrius ætas
Nil nostra, nil vetus tuli!
Prodigium quamuis Xauerius edat in Illâ,
Animâque reddat Virgini,
Tu tamen hunc superas; dat enim vitam este Puellæ,
Sed ipse das Xauerio.

(* Michel Ange)

(pp. 20–1)

IV. Tabula quam pinxit Stella.

Vix ea finierat, deflexit lumina, Stellæ
Qua prostat excellens opus:
At Sol pictorum, dixit, Prior ille vocatur,
Nec habere creditur parem:
Non tamen est huius Solis lux tanta, propinquum
Obscuret vt Stellæ iubar,
Insignis Stellæ, media de nocte latentis,
Solóque lucentis die.

(p. 21)
'SENTENCES, PRESSÉES AUX PIEDS NOMBREUX DE LA POÉSIE'?

V. Tabula quam pinxit Voëtius.

Hinc cernit Triadem, aduersà quam parte Sacelli
Refert imago nobilis;
Fecerat hanc, tenero Princeps quem norat ab æuo,
Docta Voëtius manu;
Et placuit, dignúsque opifex, ait, ille laboris
Videre Prototypum fui:
In tabula Vitium non est reperire, suóque
Respondit auctor Nomini.*

(* Ex anagrammate, Simon Voëtius, Sine vitio sum.)

G.L. (= Guillaume Léonard)
(p. 21)

IX.
MINORIS VNIVS ARÆ TABULA
QUAM PINXIT VOVET.

Aspice quanta noui se industria prodit Apellis,
Angustâ in tabulâ gemini commercia mundi
Terrarum cælique facit. suprema tabellæ
In superas abiére domos, tenet infima tellus:
Nobile opus secat hinc atque hinc intersita nubes.
Cernis vt ante oculos se numinis explicit ingens
Regia? mentitum vt pictis laquearibus aurum
Fulguret? vt reliquos vincat lux sacra colores,
Eripiátque oculis? vt læuâ parte perennis
Æqueaua cum prole pares stet desuper altâ
Nube sedens? genitor dextrâ, sobolésque sinistrâ
Pendentem in medio discrimine sustinet orbem.
Inter vtrumque vtriusq(ue) catena, & nexus amantis
Incumbit diunus Amor. latè vndique totam
Maiestate domum præsentia Numinis implet,
Spectantúmque oculis insuetà luce retundit.
Quid de te referam vacuà quæ ludis in æthrà
Aligerum manus? in duplicem partita cateruam est.
Hæc, perculsa noua surgentis imagine terræ,
Obstupet, attonitisque oculis miracula spectat.
Illa, suis medium librata per aëra pennis
Præcipitat, mollësque rosas, & lilia spargit,
Lilia diuini in Gallos monimenta fauoris.
Continuo lucis tractu demissa tabellæ
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In dextrum latus, & paudis contermina terris
Apparet nubes. recto stat corpore suprà
Virgo parens, gaudere sub vectore patares:
Augusto titubare tamen sub pondere credas,
Impositæ tanta est nubi reuerentia matris!
At quam te memorem Virgo? quâ voce decorem,
Virtutúmque impressa tuis vestigia membris
Eloquar? immensis fator Vox laudibus impar.
Blanda serenatos animat clementia vultus:
Maiestate gràus frons eminet ardua: nutus
Imperium geniticis habet, sed amabile vocis
Imperium prohibet maior reuerentia nati.
Qualis in ore decor! pietas se quante benignis
Fert oculis! nihil vsque pedes à vertice ad imos,
Quod quâ voce potest, & quâ valet arte, sequacem
Virtutis quamuis tacite non prodat honorem.
Sed quid inhaeremus paruis? quid tamdiu amoris
Virginei in famulos monimentum illustre moramur?
Ecce tibi pallà distantâ vtrimque clientes
Virgo regit, pauidisque, Dei, patrona fauorem
Conciliat; viden’ vt soboli, sua signa sequentem,
Móxque seruituram célestia castra cohortem
Offerat? vt Natus dux annuat æthere ab alto,
Porrectaque manu superas inuitet ad arces?
Scilicet affusis iuuenum lectissima turba
Corporibus tellure iacet: pars veste profanâ
Deposítâ dedit optàe iam nomina Christi
Militiae; sua differri pars altera luget
Gaudia, sacratóque prius corpus amictu
Induat, ignotos sub Virgine iudice mores,
Ambiguâmque probat mentem; sua quisque latentis
Sensa animi gerit in vultu, nutúve recludit.
Huius in ore legas patriae célestis amorem,
Exil(ii)q(ue) dolet ille moras; exæstuat alter,
Et desideriis exosam ad sidera vitam
Exhalat: superos hic mente perambulat axes:
Humanas gemit ille vices: languentibus alter
Arte laboratâ emitit suspiria labris:
Hic amat, ille timet, simul hic amat & timet: omnes
Suspiciunt & amant, omnes mirantur & ardent.
Vsque adeo potuit varios ars indere sensus!
Sed tacuisse iuat (neque enim quod muta poësis
Eloquitur pictura; loquax pictura poësis
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M.G. (i.e. Michel Guillonnet)
(pp. 31-3)

X.
MINORIS ALTERIUS ARÆ TABULA,
quam pinxit STELLA:
SIVE
PUER IESUS IN MEDIO DOCTORUM.

Ore fauete omnes, fatur Deus. Ecce perorat
Doctorum in pluteis æterni copia veri,
Diunus per; & sapentia pectoris hospes
Mollibus è labris aurato flumine currit.
Augusto sedet ore lepos, & blanda superbo
Vertice maiestas. mutus color edere voces
Cernitur ingenuas: aures si fallere posset,
Fallere vox oculos, intentâque lumina posset.
Vox certè, vox illa Dei est. en ore loquentis
Pendet hiâns, pronâque bibit sacer aure senatus,
Admirans puerúmque senem,fabrumque; prophetam:
Et voces amat, & çæli responsa fatetur.
Nec me vana fides, aut mendax ludit imago.
Agnosco sedêsque patrum, Pharisaæque septa:
En vbi consilium sacris de rebus agebant:
En magni Salomonis opus, domus alta Tonantis,
Cara Deo sedes; quà non augustior villa
Aut priscis fuit, aut surget venientibus annis.
Hanc & ab integro faber est molitus Apelles;
Nec clamor fabricantum, aut ferræ stridor acutæ
Tympanâque, trochlearæque, aut crebro malleus ictu
Insonuit. Stetit, vt quondam, sacra Regia pacis,
Pulsibus & nullis, & nullo structa tumultu.
Artificis tantum valuère imitamina dextræ.
En etiam, en sæuæ tridui solata dolorem,
Errorsque viæ varios, audire docentem
Ardet amans genitrix, iuxtâque fabrilia Ioseph
Arma gerens: & se (quanquam est audire potestas
Paupere sub tecto) turbis mirantibus addunt:

105 Et malleus & securis, & omne ferramentum non sunt audita in domo quum
adificaretur. 3. Reg.6.
106 Post triduum inuenerunt illum in Templo. Luc.2.
107 Dolentes quærebamus te. ibid.
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Defixisque inhiant oculis ad cuncta, stupéntque,
Et dantem responsa, & legum arcana mouentem.
Parte alià exultant, & lene frementibus alis
Siderei applaudunt proceres: mirantur & ipsi
Fulgura missa oculis, & paruae fulmina linguae
Sic oculos hominem rapidit vnicus, oràque Diüum,
Diüüm hominümq(ue); sator Diüus puer. Hæc tibi forma
Ante alias placuit, SVBLETE: hant Dædala fecit
Pictoris manus? an tua mens expressit? Apelli
Scilicet auctor eras operis, neque linea ducta est
Te sine: pingenti dictabas omnia dextrx.
Vnus agebat Amor templis efferre superbis
Doctorem puerum, talique efferre figurâ,
Qualis adesse tibi solitus, quum sacra volutas
Interiore domo, curisque excedere iussis
Grandibus, in IESV mens vno fixa quiescit,
Voce vnum votísque vocans: namque ocyus ille
Aduolat, ambrosiisque premens amplexibus hæret,
Et docet irradians, cælique arcana recludit.
Te duce talem oculis IESUM mortalibus offert
Ingeniosa manus. nec opus mirabile pinxit
Vulgaris color; at solers hunc pingere solem
Stella suis potuit radiis. tum lumina soli
Stella dedit; sua sol non parcior, ipse vicissim
Reddet, & æternos Stellæ clarabit honores.
Æternùm radians Stellæ pictura micabit.
Nec radians tantùm, sed erit vocalis, & Echo
Inclyta: diuinæ vocis spectabilis Echo.
Quódque sibi æterno semel est Pater ore loquutus
Ante dies primos, & prima crepuscula Verbum,
Sæpius hæc oculis referens iterabit imago.
SVBLETVM CANET VNA, DEVMQVE LOQVETVR IMAGO.

G.C. (i.e. Gabriel Cossart)
(pp. 33–5)