

JOHN DONNE'S COMMEMORATIONS: AUTHORSHIP AND AFTERLIFE IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

By

CHARLES ADAM GREEN

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

Department of English Literature
School of English, Drama and Creative Studies
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
September 2019

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

This thesis examines commemorative writing by and about John Donne. Taking a case study-based approach focused predominantly on a series of deaths from 1594/9 to 1631, it aims to resituate Donne's literary responses to these events within their fullest possible literary, historical and bibliographical contexts, reading them alongside the commemorative works of his contemporaries and in the light of topical issues of the day. In doing so, it explores how, in hitherto little acknowledged ways, Donne and his contemporaries used such occasions to negotiate and fashion socially, professionally and politically useful identities, both for their subjects and for themselves.

I focus on previously neglected sources, including poems, sermons, wills, diaries, letters and monuments, in order to establish the key points of contention around which commemorative epideictic typically coalesced in these years, and to nuance received views about Donne's attitudes towards commemorative genre and literary publication. Couching this analysis within a broader focus on literary reception, I demonstrate, moreover, how contemporaries read such works and conceptualised their authors in markedly different ways to modern critics, who have tended to dismiss much commemorative writing as unimportant and unedifying.

Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	2
<i>Contents</i>	3
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	4
<i>Abbreviations & Conventions</i>	5
Introduction	11
1. ‘Here needes no marble tombe’: Contextualising <i>Sorrow</i>	26
- ‘This strange chance’: Two Deaths	28
- Genre in <i>Sorrow</i>	46
2. ‘Shee whom we celebrate’: Gender and Authorship in Elegies for Lady Bedford, 1609	63
- ‘that knott of friends’: Epideictic Poetry in Lady Bedford’s Cultural and Literary Circle	66
- Composition and Circulation	77
- Gender, Identity and Audience	83
- ‘your style and old fashion of the Court towards me’: Donne as Courtly Elegist	98
3. ‘Stain’d Realmes of paper black’: Print, Politics, and Forms of Commemoration, 1611–14	111
- The Poet of the <i>Anniversaries</i>	115
- ‘This PRINCE in whom wee liv’d’: Elegising Henry, Prince of Wales	131
- ‘Thou seest me heere at Midnight’: <i>Har</i> and its Contexts	145
4. ‘by her death’: Articulating Loss as Preacher	161
- Revisiting the Disinterred Muse: Anne Donne	165
- Revisiting the Disinterred Muse: Commemorative Poetry in the Church	178
- ‘our blest peacemaker’: Late-Jacobean Commemorations	191
- Preaching Personal Loss	206
5. ‘A Tomb your Muse must to his Fame supply’: Elegising Donne in Print and Manuscript	215
- <i>Poems</i> (1633): Posthumous Poetry as Commemoration	217
- Contextualising the ‘Elegies upon the Author’	222
- Manuscript Elegies for Donne	235
- Commemoration as Canon	244
Conclusion: Authorship and Afterlife	258
Appendices	
I. Letter from Sir Thomas Egerton to the Lord Keeper (HEH EL 77)	265
II. 1609 Elegies in Manuscript Sources	269
III. James Barry’s elegy for King James (Trinity College, Dublin, MS 652)	273
<i>Works Cited</i>	283

Acknowledgements

This PhD has been an unexpected journey on which I have met many wonderful people and incurred many debts. I am grateful, first and foremost, to the Arts and Humanities Research Council, which funded my studies, a host of trips to libraries and conferences in several countries, and a fantastic placement at The National Archives in autumn 2018. Earlier this year I was also lucky enough to take up a three-month fellowship at the Henry E. Huntington Library, California. My work has benefitted enormously from these experiences, and the research, presentations and conversations that they have facilitated. I would like to thank everyone at each institution, and at the various libraries and record offices I have used, who made this thesis possible. An earlier version of chapter five is published in the *John Donne Journal*.

I was often warned before starting this project that doing a PhD is a lonely and isolating slog. That my experience could not have been more different is down in part to the University of Birmingham Graduate School's brilliant postgraduate hub at Westmere House, and to the generosity and friendship of a huge number of colleagues and mentors. Tayler, Matt, Ruth, Cosmin, Antonia, Hannah, Shahmima, Laura, Lizzie, Georgie, Elizabeth, Rob and Katie all helped to make my years in Birmingham the happiest of my life so far, challenging, encouraging and amusing me in all sorts of ways.

While I have attempted to acknowledge comprehensively the wealth of scholarly assistance I have received in my footnotes, several names need special mention here. My supervisor sibling and conference mum Mary Elaine S. Nelson has been a source of encouragement and help since my second year, as has Peter Auger, who I met shortly afterwards. Having taught me palaeography during my MA (2012/13), Daniel Starza Smith has been generous to me throughout my doctoral studies, particularly on a midlands research trip shared by the excellent Dianne Mitchell and Melanie Marshall. A great many people (too many, unfortunately, to list) at the John Donne Society have been similarly supportive since my first John Donne Society Conference in 2017. Katy Mair helped make my time at The National Archives truly enriching, giving me both focus and freedom. The list goes on: the Huntington crew (Georgina, Chloe, Mimi, Phillippa, Allie, Patrick, Sean and Victoria), Dennis Flynn, Andrew Foster (my unexpected neighbour), Michael Dobson and Erin A. McCarthy have all helped me in significant ways. Arnold Hunt and Andy Kesson were both formative influences in my BA and MA years, and have been continual sources of support ever since.

I have been extremely fortunate in my supervisory team. Mary Ann Lund has been an inspirational secondary supervisor who has energised and focused my work at key moments, always managing to sharpen and clarify my thinking. Of course, my greatest debt is to Hugh Adlington, without whom I would probably never have done a PhD. It has been a privilege to work so closely with someone so patient, clever, funny and wise.

Finally, I need to thank my family. My siblings Sophie, Alex and Louisa, plus dog and partners, have all been brilliant in the months leading towards submission. The unfailing support and love of my parents, Diana and Peter, is the foundation upon which I have worked.

Abbreviations & Conventions

Common Abbreviations

See Works Cited for full publication details

Add. MS	Additional Manuscript
Arber	<i>A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640 A. D.</i> , 5 vols, ed. by Edward Arber
Bald, <i>Life</i>	R. C. Bald, <i>John Donne, A Life</i>
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
BL	British Library, London
<i>Cambridge Jonson</i>	<i>The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson</i> , 7 vols, gen. eds David Bevington, Martin Butler and Ian Donaldson
CELM	<i>Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts</i> , 1450–1700, www.celm.ms.org.uk
<i>Critical Heritage</i>	<i>John Donne: The Critical Heritage</i> , 2 vols, ed. by A. J. Smith
CUL	Cambridge University Library
<i>DigitalDonne</i>	<i>Digital Donne: The Online Variorum</i> , http://donnevariorum.tamu.edu/
Folger	Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C.
Grierson, <i>Poems</i>	<i>The Poems of John Donne</i> , ed. by Herbert Grierson, 2 vols
<i>Handbook</i>	<i>The Oxford Handbook of John Donne</i> , eds. Jeanne Shami, Dennis Flynn and M. Thomas Hester
Harl. MS	British Library (BL), Harleian Manuscript
HEH	Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California
Houghton	Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission

Keynes	Geoffrey Keynes, <i>A Bibliography of Dr John Donne, Dean of Saint Paul's</i> , 3rd edn.
<i>Letters</i>	John Donne, <i>Letters to Severall Persons of Honour</i> , ed. by John Donne Jr (1651)
Milgate, <i>Epithalamions</i>	John Donne, <i>The Epithalamions, Anniversaries and Epicedes</i> , ed. by Wesley Milgate
NLS	National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh
NRS	National Records of Scotland (previously the National Archives of Scotland), Edinburgh
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
OESJD	<i>The Oxford Edition of the Sermons of John Donne</i> , gen. ed. Peter McCullough
<i>Poems</i> (1633)	John Donne, <i>Poems, by J. D. with elegies on the authors death</i> (1633)
<i>Poems</i> (1635)	John Donne, <i>Poems, by J. D. with elegies on the authors death</i> (1635)
<i>Professional Lives</i>	<i>John Donne's Professional Lives</i> , ed. by David Colclough
<i>Sermons</i>	<i>The Sermons of John Donne</i> , eds George Potter and Evelyn Simpson
Robbins, <i>Poems</i>	<i>The Complete Poems of John Donne</i> , ed. by Robin Robbins
SP	State Papers
STC	<i>A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640</i> , compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, 2nd edn.
Tobie Mathews	<i>A Collection of Letters made by Sr Tobie Mathews Kt</i> , ed. by John Donne Jr (1660)

TNA	The National Archives, Kew, London
UFLI	<i>Union First Line Index of English Verse</i> , https://firstlines.folger.edu/
<i>Variorum</i>	<i>The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne</i> , gen. eds. Gary Stringer and Jeffrey Johnson
Walton, <i>Lives</i>	Izaak Walton, <i>The Lives of Dr John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr Richard Hooker, Mr George Herbert</i> , 4th edn. (1675)

Journals

<i>ELH</i>	<i>Journal of English Literary History</i>
<i>ELR</i>	<i>English Literary Renaissance</i>
<i>EMLS</i>	<i>Early Modern Literary Studies</i>
<i>EMS</i>	<i>English Manuscript Studies, 1100–1700</i>
<i>HLQ</i>	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
<i>JDJ</i>	<i>John Donne Journal: Studies in the Age of Donne</i>
<i>JEGP</i>	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
<i>LC</i>	<i>Literature Compass</i>
<i>MP</i>	<i>Modern Philology</i>
<i>N&Q</i>	<i>Notes & Queries</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Renaissance Quarterly</i>
<i>SEL</i>	<i>Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900</i>
<i>SP</i>	<i>Studies in Philology</i>
<i>TLS</i>	<i>Times Literary Supplement</i>

Manuscripts

In order to avoid the necessity of repeating lengthy manuscript titles, I always make use of *Variorum* sigla, where available, when referring to these sources – though I at times refer to them by their given names as well. See my works cited for a list of all the sigla I use. For a comprehensive list, see *DigitalDonne* or any *Variorum* volume.

The recent discovery by Gabriel Heaton (Southeby's) of the 'Melford Hall MS', the second largest known collection of Donne's verse, is a significant development in Donne studies. This manuscript, which contains some 139 poems by Donne in a previously unknown hand (c.1625–35), is as yet unsold, having been subject to a temporary export bar by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport in May 2019.¹ I have not, therefore, been able to consider it in this thesis.

Scholarly Conventions

All dates are given in English Old Style (Julian calendar), but the beginning of the year is taken to be 1 January. Unless otherwise stated, years of birth and death and spellings of names are taken from the most up-to-date *ODNB* entries available.

When quoting from early modern texts I have retained original spelling, punctuation, capitalisation and (for printed materials) italics; but I have silently modernised the use of long 's'. I have also expanded some common abbreviations and contractions, giving expanded letters in italics. Where I add words or lines omitted in manuscript sources, I enclose these within square brackets. Deleted words or lines are struck through, inserted words given within carets, and unreadable words or parts of words rendered thus: <xxx>.

¹ See <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/rare-seventeenth-century-poetry-manuscript-at-risk-of-export>>. On the manuscript, see <<http://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/2018/english-literature-online-118411/lot.pr.9X9JP.html>> [accessed 15 September 2019].

Textual formatting and referencing follow Modern Humanities Research Association (MHRA) conventions. Biblical quotations are taken from the ‘Authorised’ King James Version of 1611, unless otherwise stated. Other sources not given abbreviated forms above are given in full when first cited chapter-by-chapter, following which they are given in a short form. All books cited are published in London unless otherwise stated.

Wherever space and convenience have permitted, I have sought to present primary materials and discoveries within the body of my chapters themselves. Those that are too large to be included in this way, but still warranting full reproduction, I have included in my Appendices.

Referring to Donne’s Works

Donne’s poetry is conventionally grouped according to generic categories introduced by *Poems* (1635), the second posthumous edition in which it was collectively printed – a fact that has had far-reaching consequences for its reception history. Typically among the most neglected of these categories, the majority of Donne’s poems commemorating deaths (the *Anniversaries*, ‘Epicedes and Obsequies’ and epitaphs) were also the first to be edited and published in the landmark *Variorum* series (volumes 6 and 8), which attempts to reconstruct, through exhaustive collation of manuscript and printed sources, the words Donne originally wrote. Their early publication in the *Variorum* is undoubtedly a consequence of the notion that these poems are comparatively simple to edit. A far greater proportion were printed within Donne’s lifetime than his other poems, and they are among the easiest to date. Unless otherwise stated, I quote from the *Variorum* wherever available, and, where it is not, from Grierson, *Poems*. At the time of writing, in September 2019, further poetry by Donne available in *Variorum* editions includes the ‘Elegies’ (volume 2), ‘Satyres’ (volume 3),

‘Verse Letters’ (volume 5), and ‘Holy Sonnets’ (volume 7.1). As with manuscripts, when referring to individual poems by Donne I make use of *Variorum* short forms in order to avoid repeating the cumbersome and inconsistent titles often given to them (a full list can also be found at *DigitalDonne* or in any *Variorum* volume). But I endeavour to make it clear, in doing so, to which poem I am referring. When quoting from them, I give line numbers afterwards in brackets.

Like his poetry, Donne’s sermons and letters are currently being edited in ambitious new scholarly editions. *The Oxford Edition of the Sermons of John Donne (OESJD)* groups the 160 extant sermons according to preaching contexts (as opposed to date or type) in sixteen volumes, replacing *Sermons*, a ten-volume edition edited by George Potter and Evelyn Simpson, which was arranged chronologically.² Given that most of the sermons I cite are not yet published within *OESJD* editions, when quoting from the sermons, I use predominantly *Sermons*, giving volume and page numbers in square brackets. Where *OESJD* editions are available, however, I use them, noting that usage within a similar in-text citation. The forthcoming *Oxford Edition of the Letters of John Donne* promises to deliver a first comprehensive scholarly edition of his surviving correspondence, replacing two editions edited by his son, John Donne Jr (*Letters* and Tobie Mathews), and Edmund Gosse’s *The Life and Letters of John Donne* (1899), each of which includes some previously unprinted materials.³ Given that the Oxford *Letters* is not yet published, my quotations are drawn from the earliest printed source available.

² See <https://donesermons.web.ox.ac.uk/home> for more detailed overview.

³ See <http://donneletters.tamu.edu/index.html> for more detailed overview.

Introduction

Being speechless, and seeing heaven by that illumination by which he saw it; he did, as St. *Stephen*, look stedfastly into it, till he saw the Son of man, standing at the right hand of God his Father; and, being satisfied with this blessed light, as his soul ascended, and his last breath departed from him, he closed his own eyes; and then disposed his hands and body into such a posture as required not the least alteration by those that came to shroud him.¹

Commemoration can be a kind of fiction that writes reality. Though the precise moment of John Donne's death spans a fraction of a sentence in Izaak Walton's famous – and famously confabulatory – 'Life', it is the fundamental precondition and justification for the work as a whole. Having died, Donne is a literary, historical and religious subject, symbol and property; and as modern scholarship struggles to uncover Walton's many fictions, it finds them buried deep in its own collective imagination.² Writing Donne's 'Life' in an innovative biographical mode, and curating him in the second edition of his posthumous *Poems* (1635), Walton outmanoeuvred noisy competition and set the agenda that would dominate Donne's afterlife centuries later.³ In many ways, his work exemplifies Irwin's schoolboy provocation in *The History Boys* that 'there's no better way of forgetting something than commemorating it'.⁴

This thesis explores the noisy competition within and against which Donne and his contemporaries, including Walton, attempted to promote such agendas and fictions. Focusing predominantly on a series of deaths from 1594/9 to 1631 on which Donne wrote or was written about, but also on several other notable events, it argues that commemorative poetry and prose written to mark these occasions was more prevalent, subtly allusive and agenda-

¹ Walton, *Lives*, p. 76.

² On Walton's inaccuracies and methods, see David Novarr, *The Making of Walton's Lives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 19–126.

³ Walton's influences and influence are explored at length in Jessica Martin, *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the Rise of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); on the influence of *Poems* (1635), see Erin A. McCarthy, 'Poems, by J. D. (1635) and the Creation of John Donne's Literary Biography', *JDJ*, 32 (2013), 57–85.

⁴ Alan Bennett, *The History Boys* (New York: Faber and Faber; repr. 2006), p. 25.

driven than has hitherto been recognised. Like all important occasions in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, deaths could elicit literary commemorations from a range of individuals and in a variety of kinds. Unlike other occasions, however, they presented many unique rhetorical and contextual parameters within which those kinds – funerary elegies, epitaphs, sermons, prose narratives and memorial publications, along with monuments, consolatory letters, wills and other documents – found particular modes of expression. Classical generic and rhetorical traditions intermixed in literal and figurative ways with the religious rituals and spaces that governed occasions of death. At the same time, deaths presented conspicuous political, economic, familial and social crises into which writers and preachers could insinuate meaning and appeal for patronage. But while a great deal of scholarship has unpacked the structural and rhetorical dimensions of these genres in detail, and with specific reference to certain texts (such as Donne’s *Anniversaries* (1611–12)), no sustained and contextually-integrated study of Donne’s commemorative writing on occasions of death has yet been attempted.⁵

This is surprising for several reasons. The most obvious is that Donne has long held a reputation for being something like ‘the foremost English poet – as well as the greatest English prose-writer – of death’ – a view reinforced by a general scholarly consensus that he was among the most influential early modern English elegists and funerary preachers.⁶ ‘Like Spenser’, as Dennis Kay has shown, ‘Donne gave a voice to a generation. Unlike him, he

⁵ The most important study to focus on Donne and the *Anniversaries* is Barbara K. Lewalski, *Donne’s Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: the Creation of a Symbolic Mode* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973). Influential studies in contemporary rhetorical and genre history more broadly include Ruth Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950); Louis Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century* (Yale University Press, 1954); O. B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1962); Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1991).

⁶ John Donne, *The Complete English Poems*, ed. by C. A. Patrides (Everyman’s Library, 1991), p. 30.

achieved this initially – and primarily – through funeral verses.⁷ Likewise (though to a lesser extent), the subject of death in Donne’s sermons has prompted extended analysis and critique.⁸ A second set of reasons emerges from a scholarly consensus regarding the integrated nature of these kinds of writing in this period. As much scholarship has shown, the inbuilt rhetorical conservatism of formal epideictic modes, coupled with the contexts of constraint attendant upon contemporary funerary occasions, led commemorative poets and preachers to pursue new and subtle forms of innovation, *genera mixta*, and publication strategy.⁹ A consequence of this, as several critics have established, is that they began also to engage in new kinds of intertextual and self-reflexive allusion, mimicry, and insinuation. Andrea Brady notes, for instance, that ‘Elegists and other writers of critical epideictic often represent themselves and their readers as members of embattled communities united by artistic and political sympathies.’¹⁰ Equally, Brady demonstrates how this pervasive communality gave rise to various forms of epideictic contestation.¹¹ Thus, though historians and literary critics have long been aware that occasions of death created communally oriented commemorative discourses, those discourses remain curiously underexplored, even in relation to canonical authors such as Donne. Responding to this, my analysis offers new perspectives on topical issues and controversies attendant on such occasions, demonstrating how intertextual commemorative epideictic typically coalesced around a small number of specific points of contention.

⁷ Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 123.

⁸ See, for instance, Bettie Anne Doebler, *The Quickening Seed: Death in the Sermons of John Donne* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1974), particularly pp. 1–6; Arnold Stein, ‘Handling Death: John Donne in Public Meditation’, *ELH*, 48 (1981), 496–515; Jonquil Bevan, ‘*Hebdomada Mortium*: The Structure of Donne’s Last Sermon’, *RES*, 45 (1994), 185–203.

⁹ Rosalie Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance* (University of California Press, 1973), pp. 8, 10–11. See also Lewalski, *Donne’s Anniversaries*, pp. 7 and 175–201 (on the analogous nature of Donne’s *Anniversaries* and contemporary funeral sermons).

¹⁰ Andrea Brady, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century: Laws in Mourning* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 141.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 131–73.

Generic fluidity is one key justification for the broad theme of literary ‘commemoration’ considered by this thesis. Substituting focus on any specific funerary genre with a predominantly case-study-based approach to individual deaths, I place historical contexts at the heart of my analysis, drawing out the circumstances, texts and communities relevant to those contexts. In doing so, I find ways of reading behind formal constraints and into implicit arguments and allusions. I also follow both contemporary and modern practice. While ‘commemoration’ could denote any ‘calling to remembrance, or preserving in memory, by some solemn observance’, it was also a shorthand for funerary or anniversary texts or events written or held in honour of deceased individuals.¹² Donne’s printed funeral sermon of 1627 on Lady Magdalen (Herbert) Danvers was, for example, published as *A Sermon of Commemoration*.¹³ Similarly, in recalling some of the notable attendees at Donne’s funeral, Walton reflects on the need for ‘a commemoration’ of them ‘by a pen equal to their own, which none have exceeded’.¹⁴ This usage likewise follows the lexis of much modern scholarship – notably Robin Robbins’s designation of Donne’s funerary verses as ‘Commemorations’ rather than ‘Epicedes and Obsequies’.¹⁵ Moreover, it confers further advantages: it makes conceptual room for discussions of texts not strictly rooted in specific or known funerary contexts (and thus not traditionally grouped with ‘funerary’ verse and prose), but which share important features with those that are. It fosters cognisance of how literary ‘commemoration’ could be a fluid conceptual idea manifested in a variety of textual forms (Donne’s secular verse, for instance, frequently puts on ‘solemn observance[s]’ of ostensibly fictional deaths – especially the speaker’s own – as a kind of dramatic affectation). Finally, it promotes a broader application of an important and well-studied aspect of commemorative elegy, perhaps best put by Samuel Taylor Coleridge:

¹² *OED*, n. 2a.

¹³ John Donne, *A Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danuers, late Wife of S^r. Iohn Danuers* (1627).

¹⁴ Walton, *Lives*, p. 55.

¹⁵ Robbins, *Poems*, pp. 731–805.

Elegy is a form of poetry natural to the reflective mind. It *may* treat of any subject, but it must treat of no subject *for itself*; but always and exclusively with reference to the poet. As he will feel regret for the past or desire for the future, so sorrow and love become the principal themes of the elegy. Elegy presents every thing as lost and gone, or absent and future.¹⁶

While definitions of funerary elegy contemporary with Donne (which attempt to ground and distinguish commemorative literary forms through prosodic characteristics and in relation to specific funerary contexts) are at odds, in many ways, with this passage, the inherent self-reflexivity Coleridge ascribes to the genre ('always and exclusively with reference to the poet') derives from ancient precedents and is reinforced by a wealth of modern scholarly approaches.¹⁷ Tracing this classical 'inheritance' in the early modern period, Peter Sacks's psychoanalytical exploration of English canonical pastoral elegy describes the 'elegiac' act broadly as a substitutive displacement of a lost precedent in a complex literary dynamic of self-effacement and self-projection.¹⁸ This is also to locate within elegy a fundamental tension between the objectives of communality/exemplarity and individuality.¹⁹ Historicist studies have generally endorsed such a view, emphasising the demonstrable intensification of this tension in post-Reformation England, particularly in the wake of Edmund Spenser's innovations in vernacular elegy, which stress the importance of 'communal mourning'.²⁰ Elegies are 'essay[s] in poetic tradition', poems 'made out of other poems'.²¹ Their continual attachment to such a tradition and their commonplace nature in late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth-century England was a consequence not only of a commensurate explosion in print and manuscript circulation, but also of the persistence of the

¹⁶ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Specimens of the Table Talk of the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, II (John Murray, 1835), p. 268. Quoted and discussed in David Kennedy, *Elegy* (Routledge, 2007), p. 4.

¹⁷ See, for instance, George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesy* (1589), pp. 37–39, 45–46.

¹⁸ Peter Sacks, *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), particularly pp. 34–37. See also G. W. Pigman, *Grief and Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), which applies 'contemporary psychological theory in a study of Renaissance elegy' (p. 5) – particularly to the contentious subject of grief.

¹⁹ See Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, p. 10.

²⁰ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 61.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 78, 201–02; Kennedy, *Elegy*, p. 5.

rhetorical pedagogical traditions of *imitatio* and *aemulatio* that helped make elegy a prototypical voice-finding form for aspiring writers and courtiers.²² Few scholars, however, have considered how the fluidity of early modern commemorative genres led ‘elegiac’ self-reflexivity and self-fashioning to become characteristic of ‘commemorative’ writing more generally – just as few scholars have tested these arguments against specific case studies in a historically rigorous manner.

In doing so, this thesis contributes towards several recent developments in several scholarly fields. The broadest is the study of early modern ‘literary’ authorship as a developing cultural construct. Though frequently neglected by historians and literary critics, the commemorative contexts and communities I consider have much to reveal about the authorial self-fashioning of major authors such as Ben Jonson, Thomas Carew, Francis Beaumont and George Herbert – and how it interacted in both competitive and corroborative ways. At the same time, these materials suggest the sometimes complex processes through which authors established the reputations of others, setting the terms through which those subjects later came to acquire particular kinds of cultural and canonical importance. To offer one example (discussed in my fifth chapter), while critics have tended to consider Henry King’s ostensibly defensive elegy for Donne as indicative of his ‘anxiety of influence’ and Waltonian discomfort with the notion that Donne’s literary corpus might be appropriated by non-ecclesiastical fellow elegists such as Carew, a fuller contextualisation of this poem suggests to me that in it, and the publications in which it first appeared, King sought more assertively and proactively to fashion his own literary identity alongside that of Donne – and was, for many centuries, read in such terms.²³

²² Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 5; Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, pp. 19–20. On imitation in contemporary literary culture, see G. W. Pigman, ‘Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance’, *RQ*, 33 (1980), 1–32.

²³ The longstanding influence of Harold Bloom’s critical paradigm (to which my quotation refers) is one contributing factor to readings hitherto offered this poem. See Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

In pursuing the theme of authorship, my work builds on the scholarship of Kevin Pask, Stephen B. Dobranski, Margaret J. M. Ezell, and Erin A. McCarthy, who investigate particularly the various inflections of print publication upon authorial identities and literary culture, as well as more recent, interdisciplinary work by Patricia Phillippy, and the burgeoning field of reception studies.²⁴ This scholarship builds on Jerome J. McGann's influential concept of the 'mediated' or 'socialised' text, according to which the meanings of texts and the authorial identities they work to construct are realised through a complex weave of social interactions.²⁵ Of particular importance to my discussion of textual communities and authorial identities is the work of Michelle O'Callaghan, who has shone light on centres of early modern literary sociability often overlooked by literary criticism, the overlapping coteries and clubs of the writers who inhabited them, and the specific, often localised forms of literary activity in which they engaged.²⁶

My focus on recovering hitherto ignored or unknown examples of literary sociability, interpreting commemorative texts in the light of as many kinds of evidence as possible, leads my work also to engage with the related field of bibliographical studies. Along with McGann, this has been greatly influenced by D. F. McKenzie's argument for greater interdisciplinarity between what he terms 'the sociology of texts' and traditional bibliography.²⁷ Recent studies in the area – including much of that cited above – have transformed the landscape of early modern literary studies, raising awareness of the highly nuanced ways in which sixteenth and

²⁴ Kevin Pask, *The emergence of the English author: Scripting the life of the poet in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Stephen B. Dobranski, *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Margaret J. M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); McCarthy, 'Poems, by J. D. (1635)'; Patricia Phillippy, *Shaping Remembrance from Shakespeare to Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018). Notable works of reception study on Donne include Ernest W. Sullivan II, *The Influence of John Donne: His Uncollected Seventeenth-Century Printed Verse* (University of Missouri Press, 1993); Dayton Haskin, *John Donne in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Judith Herz, 'Under the Sign of Donne', *Criticism*, 43 (2001), 29–58.

²⁵ Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

²⁶ Michelle O'Callaghan, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

²⁷ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, repr. 1999).

seventeenth-century authors, scribes and readers produced, circulated and read literary (and non-literary) texts. Seminal monographs by Harold Love, Arthur F. Marotti, H. R. Woudhuysen and Peter Beal have, in various ways, mapped key aspects of contemporary print and manuscript artefacts and culture, arguing for their central and interwoven importance in shaping the ‘institution’ of early modern literature.²⁸ Building on these foundations, Joshua Eckhardt’s *Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry* (2009) approaches the field via a specific genre and its manuscript collectors, and Lara M. Crowley’s *Manuscript Matters* (2018) brings new manuscript evidence to bear specifically on readings of Donne’s poetry and prose.²⁹ All current work on early modern manuscript poetry is also indebted to Beal’s *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* (1980) – now digitised and updated as the *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts, 1450–1700* (*CELM*) – and the *Union First Line Index of English Verse (UFLI)*, originally compiled by Carolyn W. Nelson, and digitised in 2009. While *CELM* and *UFLI* both contain gaps and omissions (particularly relating to prose, non-canonical and non-English works), they offer indispensable routes and clues towards new manuscript discoveries, and the various kinds of artefactual evidence of early circulation, interpretation, and authorial reputation that manuscript sources can provide.

As the recent publication of Crowley’s book suggests, Donne studies have been blessed by this surge of scholarly activity – a consequence both of Donne’s enduring popularity and a response to the fact that, in spite of his obvious attempts to restrict the

²⁸ Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Cornell University Press, 1995); H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1559–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). The description of early modern English literature as an ‘institution’ is Marotti’s, pp. 63, 166, 207, 209, 320.

²⁹ Joshua Eckhardt, *Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Lara M. Crowley, *Manuscript Matters: Reading John Donne’s Poetry and Prose in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018). See also *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England*, ed. by Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Starza Smith (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

circulation of his writings, he was by far the most transcribed poet of the period. In Beal's words, 'the sheer quantity of manuscript copies of poems by him which still survive (4,000-odd texts in upwards of 260 manuscripts) – and which must be only a fraction of the number once in existence – indicates beyond doubt that Donne was the most popular English poet from the 1590s until at least the middle of the seventeenth century'.³⁰ Scholarly work on Donne's poetry has also been catalysed by exhaustive study of its manuscript witnesses by *Variorum* editors, much of which is made available in a variety of scholarly resources hosted by the *Variorum* webpage, *DigitalDonne*. Along with *CELM* and *UFLI*, these resources have been central to much of my analysis of Donne's commemorative verse, facilitating both my examination of manuscript sources and the quantitative analyses I have carried out into the distribution of commemorative texts within them.

Bibliographical methodologies have also opened up important new avenues for the study of Donne's biography, from which this thesis also benefits. R. C. Bald's *John Donne. A Life* (1970) remains the foundational work on which biographical studies can build. Yet subsequent scholarship has shown how Bald remains, in important ways, under the spell of Waltonian contrivances; and new discoveries have added much colour, context and ambiguity to his portrait – particularly relating to Donne's personal and professional relationships, and the vexed debate over his religious identity. Key books in this area include Marotti's hugely influential *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (1986), Dennis Flynn's *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (1995), David Colclough's edited volume *John Donne's Professional Lives* (2003), and Daniel Starza Smith's *John Donne and the Conway Papers* (2014).³¹ This work

³⁰ Peter Beal, 'John Donne and the circulation of manuscripts', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume 4*, ed. by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 122–26 (p. 122).

³¹ Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, repr. ed. (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1986); Dennis Flynn, *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); Daniel Starza Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers: Patronage and Manuscript Circulation in the Early Seventeenth Century*.

has also served as a useful check on John Carey's *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (1981), which adopts a compelling but frequently misleading biographical methodology based on reconstructing Donne's psychological experiences through the prism of his apostasy, ambition, and consequent imaginative yearning for absolutes.³²

Marotti's designation of Donne as a 'coterie poet', 'virtually all' of whose verse demonstrates an essential 'coterie character', paved the way for the kinds of argument I make about commemorative poetry in particular.³³ Several caveats are, however, required here: while Marotti's critical paradigm has been remarkably successful in directing readers' attention to the 'rich interplay of text and context' that 'has been falsified since [the] posthumous publication [of Donne's verse] in 1633 as a poetical corpus', its widespread application to early modern manuscript literature has led to some problematic assumptions about the contemporary exclusivity, anonymity and sociability of such texts.³⁴ One of these is an uncritical predisposition for reading contemporary manuscript poems as competitive artefacts plugged into uniformly interconnected communities of 'coterie' 'insiders'.³⁵ Mindful of this risk, my analysis of commemorative coteries and their competitive elements (along with my usage of these words) is both cautious and grounded in demonstrable internal and external evidence – including, but not limited to, arguments arising from the specific kinds of generic conventions and expectations adumbrated above.

The same can be said for the biographical structure of this thesis, which, in adopting Donne as its exemplar, and his life as its central narrative thread, reassesses pivotal moments in that life and its early afterlife, along with key scholarly debates about them. To a

³² John Carey, *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (Faber and Faber, 1981; new edn. 2008).

³³ Marotti, *Coterie Poet*, p. 19.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³⁵ For a useful critique of this predisposition, see Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 14–17. For a more general (and recent) reflection on the topic of literary coteries, see Will Bowers and Hannah Leah Crummé, 'Introduction', in *Re-evaluating the Literary Coterie, 1580–1830: From Sidney to Blackwood's*, ed. by Will Bowers and Hannah Leah Crummé (Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), pp. 1–14.

significant extent, the materials I am investigating make this approach an obvious one.

Donne's commemorative writing includes among the most conspicuous poems and sermons he wrote. The *Anniversaries*, 'ELEGIE On the vntimely Death of the *incomparable Prince, HENRY*' (*Henry*) and *Sermon of Commemoration* for Lady Danvers are, unusually, works that he decided to print within his lifetime, and so represent important case studies in his authorial self-fashioning. Moreover, many of the commemorative texts Donne wrote – particularly poems – were written as contributions towards key patronage and social relationships, and at often transitional moments in his personal and professional lives. As such, rereading them within their broadest historical and literary contexts can bring fresh insight to current understanding of Donne's literary, professional and social interactions and intentions. Indeed, the works themselves frequently invite biographical readings: to give two obvious examples, Donne's 'Obsequyes vpon the Lord HARRINGTON' (*Har*), written in 1614, shortly before Donne entered the Church, and sent to his most important literary patron, Lucy Harington Russell, Countess of Bedford, closes with a famous conceit:

That in thy Graue I do interre my Muse
Which by my greefe, greate as thy worth, being cast
Behind hand; yet hath spoke, and spoke her last. (256–58)

In a similar sort of way, Donne's final sermon, *Deaths Duell* (preached on 25 February 1631) was posthumously published in 1632 with a subtitle describing it, on the authority of 'his Maiesties houshold', 'the doctors owne funerall sermon'.³⁶ King's elegy for Donne, printed with it, describes the event:

Thou, like the dying Swanne, didst lately sing
Thy Mourfull Dirge, in audience of the King;
When pale lookes, and faint accents of thy breath,
Presented so, to life, that peece of death,
That it was fear'd, and prophesi'd by all,
Thou thither cam'st to preach thy Funerall. (Grierson, *Poems*, I, 29–34)

³⁶ John Donne, *Deaths duell, or, A consolation to the soule, against the dying life, and liuing death of the body Deliuered in a sermon at White Hall, before the Kings Maiesty, in the beginning of Lent, 1630* (1632).

In subject and tone, Donne's valedictory, self-commemorative textual performances are consciously curatorial of his own biographical narrative; and as a consequence, they have become keystones in his biography. Like Walton, Donne was, to some extent, able to write the 'Life' of Donne through commemorative fictions about his own various and imagined deaths.

These examples – particularly that of *Deaths Duell* – are well studied, and I do not focus on them except where I am able to offer new perspectives or evidence about their wider literary or historical contexts. For the same reason, I do not specifically consider *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624), which, though written at least in part in the expectation of death, cannot be considered 'commemorative' in the way am using the term. The majority of Donne's commemorative works, however, have received surprisingly little sustained attention; and with the exception, to some extent, of Barbara K. Lewalski's *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise* (1973) and Isaac Irabor Elimimian's *A Study of Rhetorical Patterns in John Donne's Epicedes and Obsequies* (1987) – of which a mere four copies appear to survive worldwide – they have been subjected to little literary analysis in their entirety.³⁷ In attempting to remedy this critical neglect, and provide a first sustained and contextualised study of commemorative writing by and about Donne, I nonetheless focus considerably more on poetry than prose. This is predominantly a consequence of the fact that extant commemorative poems by and about him are more numerous than prose works, less studied, spread over a larger number of occasions, and date from a much larger historical period within his life. They therefore provide far greater opportunities for the kinds of contextual research and analysis I have pursued.

³⁷ Lewalski offers brief surveys of both the 'Epicedes and Obsequies' and funerary sermons (pp. 43–70 and 201–15 respectively); Elimimian's very limited study considers only Donne's adoption of Aristotelian rhetoric in these poems. See *A Study of Rhetorical Patterns in John Donne's Epicedes and Obsequies* (New York: Vantage Press, 1987). For extant copies of the book, see <https://www.worldcat.org/title/study-of-rhetorical-patterns-in-john-donnes-epicedes-and-obsequies/oclc/39532545?referer=br&ht=edition> [accessed 16 August 2019].

The five chapters of this thesis begin with a relatively narrow historical focus and gradually expand to consider broader periods, trends and themes. Thus, the first chapter attends to the potential contexts and significance of a single poem, Donne's earliest and least studied funerary elegy, *Sorrow*. Beginning with a survey of the potential occasions on which this untitled and obscure poem might have been written, I focus in this chapter on the two most plausible and compelling: the death of Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, in 1594, and the death of Sir Thomas Egerton Jr in 1599. In doing so, I consider the potentially profound (and neglected) biographical implications of *Sorrow*'s occasion by situating it at the core of a longstanding and controversial scholarly debate about Donne's religious identity in the latter decades of the sixteenth century. Using this contextual ambiguity, moreover, as a basis from which to reconsider *Sorrow*'s genre, and generic distinctions within contemporary commemorative verse more generally, I compare the elegy with other poems Donne wrote in the 1590s that explore themes of loss in a broader sense, arguing that, whatever its occasion, it exemplifies and innovates, in unusual ways, the creative potential and flexibility of contemporary elegy.

Chapter two establishes, to an extent not hitherto realised, the thematic, social and bibliographical contexts of twelve poems written to commemorate the deaths of two women in Lady Bedford's household in the summer of 1609, and Donne's positions within them. As the author of four of these poems, I argue, Donne, alongside fellow elegist Sir Henry Goodere, sought simultaneously to engage with a wider group of male poets, and to distance himself from them, cementing his position as Lady Bedford's personal household laureate. Reconstructing the perceptible and potential relationships between all twelve poems, their early manuscript circulation, and evidence for their early reception, I show how Donne's more intimate elegiac exchange with Lady Bedford in the poems *BoulRec* and *BoulNar*

nonetheless corresponds with the broader theme of gender that permeates the wider group. I also reaffirm the generally accepted view of the sequence in which these poems were written.

Bookending chapters two and three with discussions of Donne's *Anniversaries*, I seek to incorporate these poems, in new ways, into the broader contextual and thematic concerns of both. Thus, chapter three begins by demonstrating how the distinctive authorial persona Donne develops in the *Anniversaries* ties into his emergent identity as a religious controversialist and prose satirist in print, establishing an elegiac mode implicitly opposed to the militancy of the period's dominant Spenserian epideictic ethic, and a poetic persona designed to exemplify a consensus-seeking Jacobean conformity. Tracing the impact of this innovation in elegies written to commemorate Prince Henry and Sir John Harington, the latter parts of the chapter show how, in different ways, Donne continued to utilise the cultural and political capital of the poet of the *Anniversaries* in the years leading up to his ordination in 1615.

Revisiting received views about Donne's reluctance to write commemorative works – even for those with whom he was personally close – chapter four considers commemorative poetry and sermons he composed and preached after entering the Church. While several critics have suggested how personal losses suffered by Donne in this period – particularly that of his wife, Anne, in 1617 – had a transformative effect on his sense of ordained selfhood, no sustained study of this relationship in his late commemorative writing has yet been pursued. Drawing together strands of continuity between texts hitherto associated with private and public loss in these years, this chapter attempts such a study, arguing that these strands represent compelling (if, ultimately, inconclusive) evidence for Donne's habits of expression in relation to personal loss, and consistent elements within his politic churchmanship in the late Jacobean period.

As noted above, my final chapter reconsiders elegies written to commemorate Donne after his death in 1631, reading them in the light of print and manuscript contexts and sources not previously discussed. In doing so, I present several original arguments about *Poems* (1633): that it was almost unprecedented as a single-author book of poetry pursuing a demonstrably commemorative publication strategy, that Henry King is likely to have been involved to some extent in its construction, and that the forms of competitive and corroborative intertextuality critics have often traced in the ‘Elegies upon the Author’ ought to be read rhetorically as well as in relation to genuine concerns about Donne’s afterlife. In considering hitherto unacknowledged elegiac responses to Donne’s death in other print and manuscript sources, I show how the elegiac strategies initiated by the ‘Elegies upon the Author’ not only gave rise to a wider competitive elegiac discourse about Donne’s legacy in seventeenth-century manuscript and print culture, but established, in important ways, the contestatory context and literary materials through which later writers and critics – including Walton – would engage with Donne.

1. 'HERE NEEDS NO MARBLE TOMBE': CONTEXTUALISING *SORROW*

Sorrow, the earliest of what are now referred to as the 'Epicedes and Obsequies', is an occasional poem without an occasion. It addresses no particular reader, lamenting the death of an unnamed man; and its earliest transcribers and editors, both in manuscript and print, give to it no consistent title, subject, date, or, arguably, genre. As numerous critics have shown, and this thesis will further demonstrate, the notion of the 'elegiac' was in Donne's day unfixed and fast-changing; but the textual transmission and reception of *Sorrow* reveals how poetry caught between what have become dominant generic categories, or untethered to specific historical and biographical contexts, can fall into remarkable obscurity. The two first print editions of Donne's poetry encapsulate *Sorrow*'s generic ambiguity. Early 'Group 1' manuscripts, from which the earliest edition of *Poems* (1633) and the modern *Variorum* edition draw their copy-texts of the poem, include it within numbered sequences of his amorous 'elegies', imitating a Roman elegiac tradition modelled in contemporary works such as Thomas Campion's *Poemata* (1595).¹ The reshuffled second edition of *Poems* (1635), like various other manuscript witnesses for *Sorrow*, moves the poem to the end of the 'Epicedes and Obsequies', providing it with a mysterious new title: 'Elegy on the L. C.'²

Modern editors have inherited and perpetuated these problems. Though most follow the example of *Poems* (1635), a number have not: Helen Gardner, for instance, reverts to the ordering of 1633, and is one of many to reject or revise the 1635 title.³ Moreover, though *Sorrow* is nowhere doubted to be a poem by Donne, it is omitted from two key modern

¹ The *Variorum* edition uses the text of NY3 (written in the hand of Donne's close friend Sir Rowland Woodward) almost intact. *Poems* (1633) presents a very similar text, to which *Poems* (1635), introduces some readings reminiscent of a different 'family' of manuscript transmission. See *Variorum*, VI, pp. 104–05.

² *Poems* (1635), p. 274.

³ To 'A Funeral Elegy to L. C.'. See *The Elegies and the Songs and Sonnets*, ed. by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p. 26. *Variorum*, VI, p. 103, retitles the poem simply as 'Elegia'.

editions of his verse – those of Wesley Milgate and Robin Robbins – without explanation. Milgate’s introduction refers to the poem only tersely, stating that it ‘seems both immature and experimental’; Robbins cites it in his introduction to the ‘Love-Elegies’, noting its association with those poems, and the broader 1590s ‘fashion’ for writing elegies ‘in the Horatian sense [...] to denote any poetic lament, but especially the Petrarchan love-lament’.⁴ It might be tentatively suggested that, like Gardner, he intended to include the poem here.⁵ But the absence of *Sorrow* from these major scholarly editions has not, to my knowledge, drawn comment in the combined five decades since their publication.

This chapter explores the literary and historical contexts of two possible occasions for the poem: the deaths of Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, on 16 April 1594, and Sir Thomas Egerton Jr on 23 August 1599, first son and namesake of Donne’s then employer the Lord Keeper (a suggestion originally made by I. A. Shapiro in 1980).⁶ Surveying the available evidence for these possibilities, the chapter offers new contextual readings of *Sorrow* alongside hitherto unexplored poems, letters and other documentary evidence, situating it at the crux of a pivotal biographical question concerning Donne’s early Catholicism and Catholic connections. As I hope to show, Donne’s ‘early and tentative experiment in this kind of poetry’ simultaneously invites and rejects such autobiographical and contextualised readings, abandoning much of contemporary elegiac and funerary convention in an unusually personal lament.⁷ Thus, the poem serves as a useful starting point for the explorations of

⁴ Milgate, *Epithalamions*, p. xxv; Robbins, *Poems*, p. 288.

⁵ *Sorrow* is absent from Robbins’s selections of Donne’s ‘Love-Elegies’, ‘Commemorations’ and ‘Dubia’ (defined, p. 926, as ‘Some of the poems printed as Donne’s in the seventeenth century but probably or definitely wrongly’). Whereas Milgate may simply have ignored the poem, Robbins’s citation of it suggests that its absence in his edition is both accidental, and, ironically, a consequence of the generic ambiguity he describes. (Robbins also lists it in his ‘Abbreviations’, p. xxvii.) I would like to thank the edition’s co-general editor, Paul Hammond, who kindly responded to my query about this poem and agreed with this interpretation of its absence.

⁶ I. A. Shapiro, ‘The Date of a Donne Elegy, and its Implications’, in *English Renaissance Studies: Presented to Dame Helen Gardner in honour of her Seventieth Birthday*, ed. by John Carey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 141–50.

⁷ Grierson, *Poems*, II, p. 204. Milgate’s assessment of the poem is surely a paraphrase of these words.

authorial identity, autobiography and afterlife that this thesis attempts to undertake.

Commemorating a specific person and place of formative significance to the poet, *Sorrow*'s generic and autobiographical opacity distils and problematises the methodologies of the discipline that has not been able to accommodate it. Arguing, in response to this, that the poem's ambiguity likely results from the modern imposition of an overly rigid conception of elegiac genre, the chapter concludes with a reconsideration of its generic orientation, reading it alongside a wide variety of potential analogues.

'This strange chance': Two Deaths

The idea that Donne wrote commemorative elegies as a young man is suggested by Izaak Walton's later elegy on him, in which Walton alludes to such verse alongside Donne's 'Satyres' and philosophical 'Poetrie':⁸

Did he give *dayes*
Past marble monuments, to those, whose praise
He would perpetuate? Did hee (I feare
The dull will doubt:) these at his twentieth year? (Grierson, *Poems*, I, 29–32)

Donne's 'twentieth year' was 1592; Walton was born in 1591. It is therefore less likely that Walton refers with any specificity to Donne's actual commemorative writing than to a general, retrospective idea of him as a youthful prodigy who might have written it. As has already been mentioned (and will be discussed further in chapter five), Walton undoubtedly played some part in editing *Poems* (1635), which, like his later 'Life', emphasises Donne's early precocity in verse, and his intimacy with the well-to-do, frequently at the expense of editorial veracity. It may therefore be that Walton supplied the title 'Elegy on the L. C.' included within it, which might in turn mean that this title is a product of the sophisticated biographical – or hagiographical – inclinations so evident elsewhere in Walton's Donne.

⁸ This is noted in *Variorum*, VI, pp. 537, 547.

Despite this possibility, and the fact that the initials are nowhere to be found in extant manuscript copies of the poem, they have since been accepted and interpreted in a wide variety of ways.⁹ In chronological order of suggestion, these names include Henry Carey, first Baron Hunsdon and Lord Chamberlain (*d.*1596); Egerton's father the Lord Chancellor Ellesmere (*d.*1617 – by which time he had reached that lofty position); William Brydges, Lord Chandos (*d.*1602); and Lionel Cranfield, whose father Thomas died in 1595.¹⁰ Most of these are simply suggestions based on which men Donne might have known with the initials 'L. C.', coupled with a general consensus that the poem is early.¹¹ Gardner argues on precisely this premise (there being 'no other friend or acquaintance of Donne with these initials') that the 1635 editor/s must have mistaken 'to' for 'on', and that the elegy was written 'to' a son, but 'on' a father.¹² Shapiro's argument that the elegy's subject is Egerton assumes the opposite.¹³ The identification of Henry Carey, the only to originate from the seventeenth century, derives from an annotation in a copy of *Poems*, by *J. D.* (1639), probably in the hand of Giles Oldisworth, who likewise accepts the initials, supplying what he believed were their missing letters.¹⁴ As Bald notes, however, Oldisworth's identification of 'the L. C.' is not supported by any other evidence, internal or external.¹⁵

⁹ HH4, part 1 of the the so-called 'Haslewood-Kingsborough MS' (which contains *Sorrow*), contains these initials in the margins of an entire section of Donne's verse, pp. 64–109. No reason for this is immediately apparent. The only other exceptions are much later manuscript annotations to copies of *Poems*, including C10 and OJ1. Even H6, the 'O'Flahertie MS', which groups the poem alongside Donne's other funerary elegies and is widely acknowledged as the manuscript underpinning the *Poems* (1635), offers only the generic title 'Elegy funer.', p. 164.

¹⁰ These names were first proposed, respectively, by Giles Oldisworth some time after 1639, C. E. Norton in 1895, E. K. Chambers in 1896, John Sampson in 1921, and Helen Gardner in 1965. See *Variorum*, VI, pp. 547–48.

¹¹ Grierson notes that the presence of the poem in SN2 and SN3 (so-called Hawthornden MSS VIII and XV), which otherwise contain no poems later than 1609, strongly suggests that *Sorrow* was also written earlier than that year. Grierson, *Poems*, II, p. 203.

¹² Gardner, *The Elegies*, pp. 145–46.

¹³ Shapiro, 'The Date of a Donne Elegy', pp. 144–45. For the avoidance of confusion, in this chapter I refer to the son by name ('Egerton'/'Sir Thomas Egerton' etc.), but the father by the position he had at that time ('the Lord Keeper'/'the Lord Chancellor').

¹⁴ The copy is CUL Keynes B.4.8. (STC 7047). See Sampson, 'A Contemporary Light upon John Donne', in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 7 (1921): 82–107 (pp. 95–98).

¹⁵ Bald, *Life*, p. 78.

None of these suggestions takes the elegy as far back as 1592, and, in the absence of any compelling evidence for all but Shapiro's argument, the most plausible explanation for the title remains that Walton et al either assumed the elegy to be about the powerful Lord Chancellor Ellesmere – presumably from reading it and knowing that Donne had worked for him – and/or decided to impose such an interpretation for biographical reasons. It is worth noting, briefly, the extent to which this kind of Waltonian intervention continues to dictate the qualitative judgements of modern critics, whose own methodological agendas have shaped in surprisingly diverse ways their (typically cursory) responses to *Sorrow*. To offer one example: while, as Dennis Kay notes in his survey of contemporary funerary elegy, the poem is 'generally disliked' and seen to lack 'distinction, either in thought or expression', Arthur F. Marotti's biographical and contextual approach arrives at the precise opposite conclusion, arguing that in *Sorrow* Donne deploys statesmanlike language 'with a kind of calm missing in the more-importunate earlier and later verse', foregrounding his status as 'a securely employed young courtier'.¹⁶ Just as historicist literary criticism works hard to recover context and to read occasional works in new ways, the 1635 editor/s knew its value to contemporaries whose critical practices were, in some ways, not so different.

Both Kay and Marotti accept Shapiro's argument that *Sorrow* was written to commemorate Egerton, for which some compelling circumstantial evidence survives.¹⁷ At the time of Egerton's death, Donne lived with and worked for Egerton's father the Lord Keeper (later Lord Chancellor Ellesmere) at York House, just off the Strand. He would have known, perhaps intimately, every member of that household. Moreover, it is possible that Egerton was instrumental in securing this auspicious position for Donne back in late 1597 or early

¹⁶ Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 91–93; Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, repr. ed. (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1986), pp. 118–19.

¹⁷ Janel Mueller's recent chronological edition of selected writings by Donne, which includes the elegy, endorses Shapiro's arguments: *John Donne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 370–72.

1598. Pleading for reemployment by the Lord Keeper in a letter of early 1602, shortly after his disastrous elopement with Anne More and consequent dismissal, Donne would appeal to the memory of such a recommendation in an attempt to soften the older man's resolve:

I had a desire to be your lordships servant; by the favor which your good Sonns love to me obtained, I was 4 years your lordships Secretary, not dishonest, nor greedy. The sickness of which I died, yes, that I began in your lordships house, this love. Where I shall be buried, I know not.¹⁸

Donne had served with Egerton in the 1597 'Islands Voyage', led by Robert Devereux, the Earl of Essex, on which Egerton was knighted. In August 1599, a mere two years later, Egerton was fatally wounded, again fighting under Essex, in an abortive attempt to put down Tyrone's rebellion.¹⁹ While Donne did not participate in this campaign, it was nonetheless personally significant to him in a number of ways. As Daniel Starza Smith notes, the forthcoming scholarly edition of Donne's letters will show that it was at this time, from Ireland, that Donne's future friend Henry Goodere (who was himself there knighted by Essex) first wrote to him.²⁰ What is more, their friendship and literary correspondence are known to have progressed at pace from this first point of contact, with Donne sending Goodere a copy of several paradoxes only the following year, adding that 'I meane to acquaint you with all mine' writing, and expressing faith 'upon the religion of your friendship that no copy shall be taken [...] to my satyrs there belongs some feare and to some elegies

¹⁸ John Donne, *John Donne's Marriage Letters in The Folger Shakespeare Library*, ed. by M. Thomas Hester, Robert Parker Sorle and Dennis Flynn (Washington, D. C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 2005), p. 47. Dennis Flynn casts doubt over whether this 'good sonn' is Egerton Jr: 'The only son of the Lord Keeper with whom we know Donne had any close friendship was Egerton's stepson Francis [Wolley], who took the newlywed couple in after their wedding and gave them a house at his Pyrford estate'. See 'Donne's Wedding and the Pyrford Years', *Handbook*, pp. 471–81 (p. 471). Wolley inherited this estate aged sixteen (in early 1600), after which, as Bald notes (*Life*, p. 109), he probably moved there quite quickly. It should be noted, however, that in a previous essay, Flynn suggested that Donne not only owed his secretaryship to Egerton, but that he was relatively idle in his post, relying on this friendship to sustain it. Flynn suggested this on the basis that Donne's signature does not much appear in administrative documents from these years. See Flynn, 'John Donne in the Ellesmere Manuscripts', *HLQ*, 46 (1983), 333–36.

¹⁹ Shapiro, 'The Date of a Donne Elegy', pp. 142–43.

²⁰ Daniel Starza Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers: Patronage and Manuscript Circulation in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 199.

and these perhaps, shame'.²¹ These letters, and Goodere's presence in Ireland alongside Egerton, were not known to Shapiro; but they add weight to the notion that, at a time of increasing political tension, Donne was familiar to a network of Essex's campaigners and supporters, for whom Egerton had become something of a figurehead.

Prior to this Donne and Egerton might have met at or through the Inns of Court: Egerton was admitted to Lincoln's Inn on 15 January 1587/88, and Donne arrived there in May 1592, having spent one year at nearby Thavies Inn. The latter part of Donne's residence at Lincoln's Inn may also briefly have overlapped with that of Egerton's younger brother John, who matriculated in March 1595.²² Information about Egerton's impressive funeral, held on 26 September 1599 at Chester Cathedral, survives in the notebook of a later Lancaster herald. It reveals not only that Donne attended, but that he occupied an especially honoured position in the funerary procession, bearing the sword of the deceased.²³ As Louis A. Knafla notes, this event, like Egerton's workforce in general, included a strong Lincoln's Inn contingent of some fifteen alumni, who would probably also have socialised together at a dinner at the Bishop's Palace that evening.²⁴ The vibrancy of contemporary poetic culture at the Inns of Court raises the intriguing possibility that commemorative poems for Egerton were written, circulated or otherwise shared around this time, as they often were by parties of mourners travelling on 'long funeral journeys' such as this.²⁵

²¹ Quoted and discussed in Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, p. 205. The identification of Goodere as this letter's recipient was first made in Dennis Flynn, "'Only in Obedience" to Whom? – The Identity of a Donne Correspondent', *LC*, 6 (2009), 424–32.

²² On Thomas's Lincoln's Inn dates there have been some errors in scholarship. Louis A. Knafla incorrectly states that he arrived at Lincoln's Inn in the same year as Donne (1592). While Bald is not so specific, he nonetheless assumes the likelihood of a meeting between (Thomas) Egerton and Donne without offering any corroborating evidence. See Knafla, 'Mr Secretary Donne: The Years with Sir Thomas Egerton', *Professional Lives*, pp. 37–71 (pp. 41, 43); Bald, *Life*, pp. 53, 91, 104. The admissions register for Lincoln's Inn states clearly that Egerton was admitted on 15 January 1587/88.

²³ BL Harl. MS 2129, fol. 67^r. Bald transcribes this document in full in *Life*, pp. 105–06.

²⁴ Knafla, 'Mr Secretary Donne', pp. 47, 53–54.

²⁵ Donne remained familiar with many of these men for decades to come. For example, the brothers Thomas and William Ravenscroft, who were close relations of Egerton, were also 'louing friends' of Christopher Brooke, and would later be members of Donne's St Dunstan's-in-the-West congregation in the 1620s. See Clayton D. Lein, 'Revisiting the Records: Donne at St. Dunstan's', *JDJ*, 31 (2012), 1–60 (pp. 4–7). Brooke, one of Donne's closest friends, had acted as Donne's surety when he himself first arrived at Lincoln's Inn: see Bald, *Life*, p. 55.

One person who was not able to attend the funeral, however, was Egerton's own father. Essex's growing volatility called the Lord Keeper back to an emergency Privy Council meeting, following which Essex was banished from Court. By the time Donne returned to York House, the dashing Earl, mutual friend and former commander of Egerton and himself, was probably being held there as a prisoner.²⁶ Writing to Robert Sidney on 4 October, Rowland Whyte described the unpredictable drama of his fall:

[Essex] in priuate Came to the COURTE at Nonesuch the twentie eight of September 1599. where hee prostrated himself beefore the Queene: who gaue him good wordes, and sayd hee was welcome: & willed him to goe to his lodging, and rest him after so wearie a iournie: the second of October he was committed to the custodie of the Lorde Keeper²⁷

Shockwaves from this political tectonic shift were profoundly and personally felt by Donne and his colleagues, their sadness at the death of a companion surely amplified by the disgrace of the Earl he had so recently and impetuously served.²⁸ Fellow secretaries and friends, such as Sir Henry Wotton, who remained in Essex's service, were required suddenly to search for employment elsewhere.²⁹ But beyond even the disillusionment and pain aroused by these developments, the atmosphere at York House was deteriorating. As Paul E. J. Hammer notes, Essex 'was never the same again', undergoing 'physical and mental breakdown' in the days, weeks and months immediately following his arrest.³⁰ Writing to Wotton, Donne described him as a spectre who 'withers still in his sicknes & plods on to his end in the same place where *you* left vs'.³¹ The Lord Keeper, who had himself been a friend of Essex, complained

On the sharing of epitaphs when travelling to heraldic funerals, see Clare Gittings, *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England* (Croom Helm, 1984), p. 170.

²⁶ Bald, *Life*, p. 106.

²⁷ Quoted in John Nichols's *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources*, IV, eds. Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elizabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 87.

²⁸ As Shapiro notes ('The Date of a Donne Elegy', p. 142), a letter from Henry Cuffe to Edward Reynolds, dated 14 August 1599, reveals that Egerton had been 'once appointed' to deliver a letter to Lady Warwick, 'but by his importunity he hath obtained leave to stay' in Ireland. HMC, *Salisbury MSS*, IX, p. 298.

²⁹ Bald, *Life*, pp.

³⁰ Paul E. J. Hammer, *Elizabeth's Wars: War, Government and Society in Tudor England, 1544–1604* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 2003), p. 216.

³¹ Quoted in Bald, *Life*, p. 108.

that ‘this house is made a prison of so long continuance’ – a reality rendered unignorable by the requirement, despite incarceration, for Essex to continue receiving the domestic services of ‘a household within a household’, as befitted his status.³² Tragedies compounded tragedies: the Lord Keeper’s beloved second wife Elizabeth soon began to develop the illness that would take her life, and a lengthy consolatory letter from her brother Sir George More (Donne’s future father-in-law) adds that their father Sir William was likewise in a ‘greeuous sicknes’ at this time.³³ Finally, the death of William Lambard, the Lord Keeper’s deputy in the Rolls office, would have been yet another significant blow.³⁴ Since arriving at York House at the conclusion of a year in which the Lord Keeper had married Elizabeth, and his only daughter Mary had married Francis Leigh, Donne had probably never known it so grief-stricken.³⁵

Though we do not know at what point *Sorrow* was written, this context allows for a suggestive reading of its conspicuously deictic opening lines. I reproduce the whole poem below:

Sorrow, who to this house, scarce knew the way	
Is, Oh, heire of it, Our all is his pray.	
This strange chance claymes strange Wonder; and to vs	
Nothing can be so strange, as to weepe thus.	
Tis well his lifes lowd speaking works deserve	5
And giue prayse to, our cold tongs could not serve.	
Tis well he kept teares from our eyes before	
That to fit this deepe ill we might haue store.	
Oh yf a sweete bryer clymbe vp by a tree	
If to a Paradise that transplanted bee	10
Or felld and burnt for holy sacrifice	
Yet that must wither which by it did rise;	
As we for him dead: Though no family	
Ere riggd a soule for heauens discouery	
With whom more Venturers more boldly dare	15

³² Quoted in Steven W. May, ‘Donne and Egerton: the court and courtship’, *Handbook*, pp. 447–59 (p. 449); see also J. H. Baker, ‘Egerton, Thomas, first Viscount Brackley (1540–1617)’, *ODNB* (2015) [accessed 21 February 2019].

³³ HEH EL 74. Elizabeth would die on 20 January in the new year (see Bald, *Life*, p. 109).

³⁴ May, ‘Donne and Egerton’, p. 449.

³⁵ A list of attendees at the latter survives in the Egerton Family Papers (HEH EL 1000), offering some corroboration of Bald’s suggestion that there had been ‘no lack of young people in the household to which Donne was [...] familiarly admitted’. Bald, *Life*, p. 96.

Venter their states with him in ioy to share.
 We loose what all frinds lov'd, him; he gaines now
 But life by Deathe, which worst foes would allow;
 If he could haue foes, in whose practise grew
 All Vertues whose names subtile schoolemen know. 20
 What ease, can hope that we shall see him, beget,
 When we must dy first, and cannot dy yet?
 His Children are his pictures, Oh they bee
 Pictures of him dead, senseless, cold as hee.
 Here needes no marble tombe; since he is gone 25
 He and about him, his, are turn'd to stone.

Sorrow's central metaphors, contained within four loosely related sections of eight, eight, six and four lines, may further reinforce the identification of Egerton as its subject. The first establishes the poem's distinctive *habitus*, emphasising that the monstrous presence of 'Sorrow' is alien and unfamiliar to its inhabitants, for whom the poet speaks. As Shapiro notes, the word 'heir' in the second line 'is forced and a straining of sense', and a possible reference to the death of a first-born son.³⁶ Following this is a section exploring two linked analogies for the poem's subject: a strong tree and, in death, a vessel 'riggd [...] for heauens discouery' (14). In the third section the poem turns directly to the issue of death, and the consolation customarily provided by eternal salvation. Finally, the speaker argues against the need for a funeral monument, asserting that 'His Children' are themselves frozen into graveyard stone – a startling conceit consistent with the fact that Egerton had three young daughters when he died.³⁷

The ostensible seafaring metaphor of the second section has sometimes been used to identify the poem's subject with military expeditions of the kind in which Egerton participated. John Sampson, for instance, tentatively dates it to the year of the Cadiz expedition (1596) in which Donne participated (though Egerton did not).³⁸ However, this

³⁶ Shapiro, 'The Date of a Donne Elegy', p. 144.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 144. Their names were Elizabeth, Mary and Vere. It seems to me unlikely that these lines refer to adult offspring, which goes some way towards discounting Oldisworth's later identification of the poem's subject as Henry Carey, whose sons were in their forties when he died.

³⁸ Sampson, 'A Contemporary Light upon John Donne', pp. 97–98.

issue has also been the source of some debate. Taking a slightly different tack, Gardner suggests that these lines indicate mercantile interests within the family of the deceased, noting that Thomas Cranfield was an original member of the Baltic Company, and had suffered financial losses in the earlier 1590s: ‘Donne’s lines, declaring that the family might safely “venture their states” on the dead man’s prospects of heaven, look like a graceful reference to a not wholly successful business career.’³⁹ Certainly, the word ‘discouery’, which is used in similar metaphors by Donne exclusively in the context of exploration, could connote the location of international trade routes. In the *SecAn*, for instance, the speaker describes Elizabeth Drury’s ‘value’ in such terms:

Shee, in whose body (if wee dare prefer
This low world, to so high a mark, as shee,)
The Western treasure, Esterne spiceree,
Europe, and Afrique, and the vnknown rest
Were easily found, or what in them was best;
And when w’haue made this large Discoueree (226–231)

Likewise in *Sat3*, the poet demands of his addressee, the incurious ‘Foole and wretch’, ‘Hast thou couragious fyre to thaw the yce | Of frozen north discoueryes [...]?’ (93, 21–22). In *Sickness*, he would again adapt the conceit, this time figuring his own body as a map spread out upon his sickbed (6–10). The words ‘Venturer’ and ‘Venter’ also carry the connotations informing Gardner’s argument, meaning both ‘One who ventures, in various senses; an adventurer’, and ‘One who undertakes or shares in a commercial or trading venture’ (the *OED* cites their specific incidence in *Sorrow* as an example of the former, not the latter – correctly, in my view).⁴⁰ However, this metaphor is not here applied to military expedition or to commerce, but to fellowship and ‘heauens discouery’ – a transfiguration perhaps more affecting and intelligible if applied to Egerton, who did not die amidst the familial and

³⁹ Gardner, *The Elegies*, p. 146. It is true that Donne and Lionel Cranfield were later connected through the literary and intellectual circle who met at the Mitre Tavern, but (as Gardner notes) there is no evidence linking them in 1596. On Cranfield within this group, see Menna Prestwich, *Cranfield: Politics and Profits Under the Early Stuarts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 94–99.

⁴⁰ *OED*, n.1a, c. [accessed 1 March 2017].

pastoral comforts of ‘this house’, but away from home, in Dublin Castle. Denying the necessity of such comforts, the speaker consoles his ‘family’ and flatters their diligence in his spiritual edification. Furthermore, this interpretation of the metaphor allows it to echo the sense of that which precedes it: figured both as a ‘tree’ and a ‘riggd’ vessel, the deceased man’s soul is the vehicle through which ‘we’ ‘rise’, and ‘Venturers’ ‘boldly dare | Venture their states with him in ioy to share.’⁴¹ While ‘riggd’ could also represent a statement about the subject’s preparedness for Heaven – ‘riggd’ in heavenly finery – this would not readily account for the metaphor’s textual position in this way, nor the speaker’s use of ‘Venturers’/‘Venter’. Both expeditionary and Aesopean metaphors are also easily applicable to Donne’s potential acknowledgement that he owed his profession to a friendship with Egerton; and it nonetheless remains plausible that Donne’s lines, like his position at the funeral, recall the fraternity of ‘Venturers’ who sailed together in the summer of 1597, out of which such a friendship might have arisen.

The commemorative strategies evidently invested in Egerton’s funeral give further weight to this supposition. In general terms, heraldic funerals of this period were subject to strict regulations that were carefully enforced by the College of Arms, and sometimes even government officials. Such events powerfully asserted monarchical and aristocratic authority and continuity, doing so through the rigid semiotics of neo-chivalric ritual and display. As one contemporary rulebook makes clear, heraldic oversight nominally insured ‘the interment of a nobleman not only for the well ordering of the funeral but also for this intent that it may be known unto all men that the defunct died honourable, without any spot of dishonesty’.⁴² Consequently, as Clare Gittings has noted, ‘Strict protocol had to be observed in the procession, with position determined by status’; but while this procession was customarily

⁴¹ The Rowland Woodward copy-text (NY3) links these two thoughts both grammatically, with a colon, and metrically, at the exact mid-point (by syllable) of line 13.

⁴² Quoted in Gittings, *Death, Burial and the Individual*, p. 174. On the heralds’ wider responsibilities, such as supervising the use of black cloth (‘blacks’) and visual art, see pp. 166–72.

organised by the supervising heralds, in some cases funeral groups would arrange themselves, which suggests that a degree of flexibility might sometimes have been possible.⁴³ As one of Egerton's principal mourners, Donne would have participated in the offering, 'the most dramatic and important part of the whole heraldic funeral', during which he would have carried the sword to the minister.⁴⁴

The key questions, then, are how and why, at this event, Donne, as a relatively junior member of the Lord Keeper's entourage, came to occupy such an esteemed position. One document that survives in the Egerton Family Papers offers a clue, demonstrating that, despite being unable to attend the funeral in person, the Lord Keeper was nonetheless personally involved in proceedings.⁴⁵ This is a working manuscript of Egerton's Latin epitaph in the Lord Keeper's hand, not previously considered, which reveals both his authorship of this text and the central significance of Egerton's participation in the Islands Voyage (on which Donne had participated) and Irish campaign to the Lord Keeper's commemorative strategy.⁴⁶ In the lineated fair copy version (and another hand), these references become the most prominent part of the epitaph, following its tapering first section with lines of abrupt rhythm and repetition:

Thomas Egerton Miles
Filius primogenitus Thoma Egerton
Militis Baronis du Ellismere
Cancellarij Anglia
In Anglia natus

⁴³ Such was the case at the funeral of Sir John Stowell. Ibid., pp. 178, 173. See also Ralph Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480–1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 259–60; David Cressy, 'Death and the social order: the funerary preferences of Elizabethan gentlemen', *Continuity and Change*, 5 (1989), 99–119. For a specific study of heraldic funerals Cheshire and Lancashire, see W. E. DiTraglia, 'Out of this transitory life': death, commemoration and the heraldic funeral in Tudor and Stuart Cheshire and Lancashire' (Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Birmingham, 2005).

⁴⁴ Gittings, *Death, Burial and the Individual*, p. 176–77.

⁴⁵ Knafla, notes ('Mr Secretary Donne', p. 44) that Donne would have become 'fully aware of the Lord Keeper's personal tastes and dislikes, his cultural, religious, and political ideas, and his associates, friends, and contacts.' He was 'a workaholic, a man who demanded complete loyalty [...] and who did not suffer fools. For those who lived with him, he wore his views on his sleeve, and expected them to be acknowledged and appreciated.'

⁴⁶ HEH EL 1005. The Bridgewater Calendar entry for this manuscript does not mention its authorship by the Lord Keeper.

In Insula Asores Dignitate militari jungintus
In Hibernia Morte immatura praeceptus
Occubuit in christo XXIII Die Augusti
Anno D M D XC IX Ætatis suae 25

Victurus cum mortua mors fuerit
Hic Corpus requiescit
In Coelo Anima Litatur⁴⁷

For obvious reasons, Essex is not named; but the specificity of the epitaph's references to the two islands on which Egerton was knighted by him and died in his service is unmistakeable, given not only within the epitaph's central section (describing the active part of his life) but at its exact mid-point (lines six to seven of thirteen). Here, then, is a clear rationale both for Donne's position at the funeral and the central metaphors of *Sorrow*. In a similar way, the epitaph's final line may encapsulate certain specific aspects of Egerton's death – by which, as will be discussed below, the Lord Keeper was deeply affected. Translating variously as 'to obtain', 'to give favourable omens from sacrifice', and 'to make an acceptable offering (to)': 'Litatur' brings with it a transactional tension: Egerton is simultaneously a payment to Heaven and a sacrificial offering for his family.

This is potentially significant, given that Egerton's last words to the Lord Keeper, which survive in a remarkable and (again) hitherto-unexplored letter written shortly before his death, are preoccupied by grief and shame at his great financial profligacy, alluding repeatedly to a summary 'of my debts [...] enclosed'. Densely and emotively written, with many corrections and insertions, the text is structured like a will, moving from a confirmation of the author's 'perfecte memory, & good vnderstandinge', through an admission of sinfulness, a profession of faith, an apology to the Lord Keeper for having 'runne in debt', a list of bequeathments and duties to be completed, and, finally, to an extraordinary valediction 'from yr Deade son'.⁴⁸ Running through its protestations of reassurance and deference, along

⁴⁷ This text is transcribed from HEH EL 1003, which also contains several other epitaphs for others in the family, noting their location in St Mary's Church, Doddleston (where Egerton was also buried).

⁴⁸ HEH EL 77. For a full transcription, see Appendix I.

with its various administrative requests, are an emphasis upon the patrilinear hierarchy in which he takes his place (beneath God and his ‘Erthly’ father, ‘who next to God I ever most feared’), and his insistence upon his own ‘prodigality’, which he attempts to backdate as ‘the greatest & vaynest of my expence’, ‘long agoe at lest 4 or 5 yeares’.⁴⁹ Among Egerton’s provisions for his ‘poore Daughters’ and ‘poore wife’, who are left in the charge of the Lord Keeper, is his wish that ‘some small remembrances may be bestowed amongst my frendes, that the[y] maye knowe if he had lived longer he would have ever have loved his frend honestly’. Frustratingly, no names are given, so we cannot know whether Donne may have been one of those intended or assumed to be included by this request. However we read the letter, and epitaph in which the Lord Keeper might, in a sense, have answered it, both are texts in which the rigidity of convention and literary form collide with the turbulence and emotional imprecision of personal loss.

While the second part of this chapter will further demonstrate and contextualise the military emphasis of Egerton’s funeral in further considering the generic orientation of *Sorrow*, I will now turn to consider the poem’s second possible subject, Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange. Stanley’s candidature rests in large part on biographical arguments first made in Dennis Flynn’s landmark revisionist study of *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (1995). Flynn supposes that in 1585, having just arrived at the University of Oxford as a thirteen-year-old recusant, Donne was sent away by his uncle, the Jesuit missionary Jasper Heywood, to be one of the ‘waiting gentlemen’ for Henry Stanley, fourth Earl of Derby, in his embassy to invest the French King Henry III with the Order of the Garter – a position to which Donne purportedly returned later in spring 1587. The claim is made on the strength of two surviving documents listing servants in Derby’s household, in which the

⁴⁹ A series of letters from the Lord Keeper to John Egerton (HEH EL 176–80, 195–96) reveals the extent of his later anxiety about the wellbeing of this second son, which may suggest some lasting regret about the death of Thomas. The letters were written upon an outbreak of plague in 1607–08.

names ‘Mr John Donnes’ (1585 retinue) and ‘Mr Jhon Downes’ (1587 ‘Checkerowle of my L. the Earle of Derbies Householde Servants’) appear. Assuming that these refer to the same person (Donne), given the consistency of other names between the lists, Flynn suggests that Donne remained abroad with Derby’s second son William between 1585 and 1587, travelling to Italy and Spain, and enjoying a long and formative association with the Stanley household upon his return. This would provide an apt setting for *Sorrow*:

Between terms and in summers, Donne would live with the Earl and his family at their Lancashire estates: Knowsley, New Part, and Lathom. At other times Donne would be in London at the Earl’s house in Cannon Row, Westminster; or with the Earl, he would be attending the Queen, acquiring that familiarity and easy condescension toward the Court and courtiers so evident in his writings and in the pose and motto of his 1591 portrait.⁵⁰

Flynn reads Donne’s position at the funeral of Sir Thomas Egerton not as a mark of friendship but in the light of this and similar affiliations, through which Donne had gained a reputation for ‘remarkable honour’ among ‘scions of Lancashire and Cheshire Catholic gentry (followers of the Stanleys, Earls of Derby), many of whom attended the funeral’.⁵¹ As Flynn also notes, Derby’s granddaughters (‘Anne Stanley Brydges, Lady Chandos; Francis Stanley Egerton, Countess of Bridgewater; and Elizabeth Stanley Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon’) were well known to Donne in later life, and his references to an early acquaintance with the latter in ‘the house where I served at first’ might make more sense if he had stayed for extended periods with her family in the 1580s.⁵² At the time of Stanley’s sudden death in April 1594, seven months after that of his father, they would have been about fourteen, eleven and seven years old, again matching the specific references and tone of

⁵⁰ Flynn’s account of these teenage years is informed particularly by his reassessment of this early portrait, a version of which survives in the so-called ‘Marshall Engraving’ (in which Donne also holds a sword), and by a close reading of Donne’s autobiographical preface to *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610), in which Donne alludes, Flynn argues, to past intimacy with houses of the English Catholic nobility. See *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), pp. 5, 9, 134–35, 172. I am, as it happens, indebted to Dennis for suggesting Stanley as a possible subject of *Sorrow* to me.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 176–77.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 172. See *Letters*, pp. 184–86 (pp. 184–85).

Donne's elegy. Curiously, Stanley's widow Alice would go on to marry the Lord Keeper just ten months after the death of Elizabeth Egerton in January 1600.⁵³

Though Flynn's arguments have met with a fair amount of scepticism among scholars, there are several additional reasons to consider Stanley as *Sorrow*'s subject.⁵⁴ The most striking is the insistent repetition of 'strange' in its third and fourth lines ('This strange chance claymes strange Wonder; and to vs | Nothing can be so strange, as to weepe thus'), which can read simultaneously as punning references to Stanley's title and the controversial circumstances of his death, about which there was much speculation. An initial autopsy carried out by Sir George Carew, Dr John Case and numerous physicians found that 'his disease could be no other than flat poisoning'; but this was soon overtaken by the assumption that witchcraft played a key role – not least in the subsequent (official) report by Carey and Sir Thomas Egerton (Sr).⁵⁵ John Stow's detailed account of Stanley's 'strange sicknes and death' offers a supplementary 'true report of such reasons and confectures, as caused many learned men to suppose him to be bewitched', noting 'strange dreames, or diuinations of diuers graue men, which happened before or about the time of his sicknes' – as witnessed by 'Goborne one of his secretaries attending then vpon him', 'one master Halsall', and 'His spirituall physitions [...] the bishop of Chester, and master Lee his chaplaine.'⁵⁶ It is just possible that Donne's closing conceit ('He and about him, his, are turnd to stone'), with its apparent evocation of sorcery, refers obliquely to this context.

Unfortunately, no contemporary commemorations and little documentary evidence survives to shed further light on the immediate personal consequences of Stanley's death. The

⁵³ David Kathman, 'Stanley, Ferdinando, fifth earl of Derby (1559?–1594)', *ODNB* (2013) [accessed 3 March 2019].

⁵⁴ As Marotti notes in a review of *Ancient Catholic Nobility* (*JEGP*, 96 (1997), 610–12 (p. 610)), the record is 'frustratingly short on firm biographical evidence' for such major claims.

⁵⁵ Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth Maclean, *Lord Strange's Men and Their Plays* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014) p. 332.

⁵⁶ John Stow, *The Annales of England, Faithfully collected out of the most autenticall Authors, Records, and other Monuments of Antiquitie* (Ralph Newbery, 1600), pp. 1275–78.

Stanley Papers, now incorporated into the Egerton Family Papers, are very limited in this regard, as are the family papers now held at the Liverpool Archives and the Derby Collection at Knowsley Hall (Merseyside).⁵⁷ About the wider political and legal contexts surrounding this death, however, more is known; and this detail adds somewhat to the picture of strangeness described by the physicians who examined Stanley's body. Politically, this context derives largely from the actions of Richard Hesketh, a Jesuit spy who had approached Stanley shortly after the death of his father, offering him support should he attempt to claim the English throne. Despite his Catholic loyalties, Stanley turned Hesketh over to the authorities, who executed him.⁵⁸ The Hesketh Plot has resulted in some farfetched speculations: Francis Edwards, for instance, argues that it was coordinated by the Cecils, who might even have been responsible for Stanley's untimely death.⁵⁹ The legal significance of his death, on the other hand, is that it initiated a lawsuit that his widow, Alice, fought for thirteen years against her late husband's brother, in order to secure the terms of his will.⁶⁰ A letter survives in Lambeth Palace Library, MS 3203 from shortly after the death of Ferdinando, in which Alice thanks the Earl of Shrewsbury for attending his funeral, and appeals for his support in this cause.⁶¹ As with Donne's final conceit in *Sorrow*, it is possible that the poem's jarring reference to heirdom (in which 'Sorrow' 'Is, Oh, heire of it') might allude to the severely indebted and divided family that Stanley, in dying without a male heir, had left behind.

⁵⁷ My thanks to Vanessa Wilkie for generously sharing her research on this with me, and to Stephen Lloyd of Knowsley Hall for responding to my enquiries.

⁵⁸ Kathman, 'Stanley, Ferdinando'.

⁵⁹ Francis Edwards, *Plots and Plotters in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002), pp. 169–81.

⁶⁰ See Barry Coward, *The Stanleys, Lords Stanley, and Earls of Derby, 1385–1672: The Origins, Wealth, and Power of a Landowning Family* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983), p. 37; Louis A. Knafla, 'Spencer [married names Stanley, Egerton], Alice, countess of Derby (1559–1637)', *ODNB* (2008) [accessed 29 August 2019].

⁶¹ Lambeth Palace Library, MS 3203, fol. 14.

Finally, it is easy to find other reasons why, at this time in his life, Donne might have been drawn to elegising such a man as Stanley. Quite apart from any Catholic sympathies or previous intimacy the two men might have shared, Lord Strange was one of the most decorated literary figures in Elizabethan London. Strange's Men, of which he was patron, was the country's leading theatrical company, comprising many of the players and playwrights who later became the mainstay of the Lord Chamberlain's Men – possibly including William Shakespeare. He also patronised numerous poets, including Robert Greene, Richard Hopkins, Anthony Munday, George Peel, George Chapman, Thomas Nashe, and Edmund Spenser; and a letter sent from Thomas Kyd to Sir Thomas Puckering corroborates Christopher Marlowe's earlier claim that he was also 'very wel known' to Stanley.⁶²

While considering Stanley as the subject of *Sorrow* throws up some suggestive possibilities, there are several issues to acknowledge. First and most obvious is that he died at Lathom House, in Lancashire, and was buried in nearby Ormskirk.⁶³ No surviving evidence suggests either that Donne stayed there at this time, or that he travelled the two-hundred miles from his Lincoln's Inn lodgings to attend the funeral on 28 May.⁶⁴ While it is possible that *Sorrow*'s prominent spatial anchors – 'this house', 'Our', 'vs', 'we', 'Here' – construct a merely imagined domestic locality, their unusual specificity surely makes this unlikely. Secondly, it is unclear whether the second piece of contextual information given in the

⁶² Kathman, 'Stanley, Ferdinando'. The Kyd quotation is cited and discussed in Manley and Maclean, *Lord Strange's Men*, p. 162.

⁶³ Notable members of the Stanley family were buried in the so-called Derby Chapel, in the Church of St Peter and St Paul, Ormskirk. According to Michael Ockenden, when the third Earl of Derby died in 1572, he gave instructions for the south east chancel at Ormskirk to be used for this purpose. See *Tower and Steeple: The Story of Ormskirk Parish Church* (Ashby: Ashby-de-la-Zouch Museum, 2002), p. 9. Mona Duggan cites a recollection of 1893 that the Derby Chapel, now bricked up, contains tankards, goblets, swords and coronets placed on these coffins. See Duggan, *Ormskirk: A History* (Stroud: The History Press, 2007), p. 110. I would like to thank Allison Ellis, who searched the church on my behalf, and David Blake of Lancashire Record Office, for helping me to discover their whereabouts.

⁶⁴ Little is known about this funeral, which is incorrectly stated as having taken place on 6 May in Kathman's ODNB entry for Stanley. The correct date can be found in the Lancashire Anglican Parish Registers, Lancashire Archives Pr 2886/1.

poem's first line (that 'Sorrow' 'scarse knew the way' to 'this house') could refer to the seven-month interval between Stanley's death and that of his father or is contradicted by it. It certainly appears to be the case that the Stanley family, like the Egertons, had suffered no other recent bereavements. Thirdly, Donne's references to past cohabitation with the Stanley girls may be explicable without requiring any hypothesis for his long-term service of their family: following the death of their father, they were placed under the wardship of the Lord Keeper (Sir Thomas Egerton Sr), and stayed for a time in York House after their mother then married him in late 1600. Though there may only have been a few months' shared residence between Donne and Elizabeth Stanley, this could have provided opportunity enough for a friendship to form in 'the house where I served at first'.⁶⁵

In summary, then, the question of *Sorrow's* subject remains open. But having considered, in this section, the available evidence for the two most plausible and suggestive identifications, it is nonetheless possible to offer some basic comparisons between them. The evidence for Egerton is undoubtedly the more comprehensive and secure. While Donne is known to have been a notable participant at Egerton's funeral, even the most basic acquaintance he might have shared with Stanley is a matter ultimately of mere conjecture. Moreover, the evidence and arguments I have presented with respect to Egerton's death and funerary commemoration have reinforced and added to the case first made by Shapiro. The central metaphors of Donne's poem appear to reflect the commemorative interests of the Lord Keeper, who could have arranged for Donne to carry his son's sword; and Donne's relatively recent service in the Essex campaigns against Catholic Spain was surely at least as relevant to his selection for this task as any reputation for 'remarkable honour' he might have obtained in the earlier service of local Catholic families. The Lord Keeper, whose business it was to execute the state's anti-Catholic regime, had long since turned away from the old

⁶⁵ John Yoklavich, 'Donne and the Countess of Huntington', *Philological Quarterly*, 43 (1964), 282–88 (p. 282–83).

religion.⁶⁶ That said, absence of evidence is not necessarily evidence of absence. The ‘strange chance’ *Sorrow* describes with such opaque and personal specificity appears ultimately to be something the poem withholds. The next part of this chapter considers why.

Genre in *Sorrow*

Where my above analysis focuses on ‘conclusive’ criticism and scholarship, this section considers ‘implicative’ readings and possibilities.⁶⁷ For historians and literary critics, as for contemporaries of Stanley and Egerton, deaths were and are the apparently infallible framing devices within which histories are viewed and made, whether through ritual and literary commemoration or the application of its textual witnesses to historical and biographical narratives which – as Flynn acknowledges – may ultimately offer only ‘probable (not certain) solution[s]’ to the problems those narratives face.⁶⁸ While a greater number of (known) contemporary commemorations survive relating to Egerton’s death than to Stanley’s, the remaining part of this chapter does not pursue one context at the expense of the other. Seeking, rather, to complicate matters further, it brings these little-explored materials to a broader contextualisation of elegy in the 1590s, and *Sorrow* within that context. Calling attention to the framework itself, I hope to show, can facilitate a useful re-evaluation of both historicisms: the untitled, uncategorised, yet deeply and deliberately allusive commemorative elegy, and the forms of reading, editing or interpreting that have sought to revive, retitle and categorise it.

⁶⁶ Baker, ‘Egerton, Thomas, first Viscount Brackley’.

⁶⁷ For a recent discussion of this useful distinction, see Andrew H. Miller, ‘Implicative Criticism, or the Display of Thinking’, *New Literary History*, 44 (2013), 345–60.

⁶⁸ Flynn, *Ancient Catholic Nobility*, p. 1. Knafla’s essay (‘Mr Secretary Donne’), which is presented at least partially as a rebuttal of Flynn’s claims (pp. 37–38, 44), makes some unjustified assumptions about Donne and the Egertons of its own. Most notable is the assertion (p. 48) that ‘Donne wrote poems for family occasions, and wrote a prose account of the entertainments for Queen Elizabeth at York House in 1601 that Sir John Davies, the predecessor poet-lawyer at Egerton’s household, had undoubtedly helped prepare.’ I have been able to find no evidence to support this.

What kind of elegy is *Sorrow*? As Dennis Kay notes, the word had only recently been applied to English funerary verse by Edmund Spenser, whose *Shepherd's Calendar* (1597) revolutionised the genre, and who was its 'dominant influence' and 'presiding genius'.⁶⁹ In *The Arte of English Poesy* (1589) George Puttenham distinguishes between 'Poeticall lamentations' broadly conceived, and poetic responses to death, which he defines as occasional verses comprised of a finer taxonomy of forms distinguishable primarily by their usage within commemorative contexts: 'Obsequies', 'Epicedia', 'Monodia', 'sermons', and, from classical Rome, 'orations funerall and commendatorie', along with elegiac verse. The latter is described here merely in the formal, classical terms for which it had hitherto been known, with vague connotations of mourning: 'a pitious maner of meetre, placing a limping Pentameter, after a lusty Exameter, which made it go dolourously more then any other meeter'. (This is the definition also given in Thomas Campion's formally-focused *Observations in the art of English poesie* (1602).)⁷⁰ But when, in a chapter on epitaphs, Puttenham objects to the bastardisation of that form in 'these late times', he hints at a broader recent usage of 'elegy':

They be ignorant of poesie that call such long tales by the name of Epitaphes, they might better call them Elegies, as I said before, and then ought neither to be engrauen nor hanged vp in tables. I haue seene them neuertheles vpon many honorable tombes of these late times erected, which doe rather disgrace then honour either the matter or maker.⁷¹

Other than in these quotations, Puttenham does not explicitly connect 'elegy' with funerary contexts; rather, any contextual orientation he ascribes to it refers to 'amorous *Elegies* in court' – of the kind with which *Sorrow* has sometimes been associated.⁷² Yet while a great deal of scholarship has considered the underpinnings of early modern elegy in epideictic rhetoric and classical and continental love poetry, far less attention has been paid to the

⁶⁹ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 90, 125–26.

⁷⁰ Thomas Campion, *Observations in the art of English poesie* (1602), pp. 25–26.

⁷¹ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesy* (1589), pp. 37–39, 45–46.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 106.

overlap and interplay within and between its various species over time or with reference to specific examples.⁷³ This is surprising, given that, as Francis White Weitzmann has long since noted, distinguishing too strongly between them – particularly in elegy sequences of the Elizabethan *fin de siècle* (such as Campion's), so notable for their imitations of Ovid, Propertius and Tibullus – risks anachronism: 'Having discovered that the identifying trait of the ancient genre, its metrical form, resisted naturalization in English, they applied the name to poems which paralleled in spirit and substance the works of the classic elegists', in which respect 'they found the ancient elegy variable between limits widely apart'.⁷⁴ Thus, contemporary elegies could imitate classical biographical and literary elements ostensibly unrelated even to amorous and commemorative contexts. *Sorrow*'s editorial and contextual instability, as we have seen, is a product of some of this complexity. Yet the poem has not been considered on the terms of the generic ambiguity that has characterised its bibliographical afterlife. As a means to doing so, I propose, reading the poem in the light of various literary contexts with which contemporary commemorative elegies – both generally and in specific relation to Donne – may reasonably be associated, demonstrates the manifold ways in which it can be read.

The first, largest and most obvious literary context relates to contemporary funerary commemoration in the 1590s and the conventions that governed poetic responses to it. These provide two key and interrelated points of contention with which *Sorrow* undoubtedly engages: the ethics of grief and the traditions of heraldic and Spenserian commemoration. As

⁷³ See, for example, O. B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1962); Barbara K. Lewalski, *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: the Creation of a Symbolic Mode* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973); Andrea Brady, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century: Laws in Mourning* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), Chapters 1 and 2. On the influence of Ovid and continental elegists such as Petrarch and Pierre de Ronsard on Donne in particular, see Donald L. Guss, *John Donne, Petrarchist: Italianate Conceits and Love Theory in The Songs and Sonets* (Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1966), pp. 145–49.

⁷⁴ Weitzmann, 'Notes on the Elizabethan Elegie', *PMLA*, 50 (1939), 435–43 (pp. 435, 42). For a more recent articulation of this point, see R. V. Young, 'The Elegy', *Handbook*, pp. 134–48 (particularly p. 136).

Puttenham notes, one contextually-related way of distinguishing between non-commemorative and commemorative lamentations was to gauge their affective properties. While the former work like ‘a medicine to the ordinary sicknes of mankind [...] making the very greef it selfe (in part) cure of the disease’, the latter function differently, ‘making one dolour to expell another, and in this case, one short sorrowing the remedie of a long and grievous sorrow’.⁷⁵ As these quotations suggest, sorrow could lead or amount both to a physiological malady and a more serious shortcoming of religious faith, and was conceptualised, diagnosed and treated within a highly multifaceted medico-philosophical and spiritual framework.⁷⁶ Puttenham’s substitutive notion of commemorative elegy also reflects the surrogative symbolisms that have been seen to govern funerary ritual.⁷⁷

Following the death of his son the Lord Keeper received numerous letters counselling him in different ways on the dangerous effects of extreme sorrow, which together reveal the extent to which his grief (and that of York House) was known. The letter from More presents this advice in lengthy theological terms, emphasising the reassurance of divine providence: ‘Bothe sortes, as well the good as the bad, ar vnder his [God’s] hand’.⁷⁸ Similarly, the Earl of Northampton draws an analogy between the Lord Keeper and Job, softening his advice within the praise-giving conventions of *paraenesis*.⁷⁹ Another letter, from Robert Cecil, is notable for urging an uncompromising and comparatively austere rigorism. Cecil rests his case on a trio of arguments, providentialist, pragmatic and patriotic, offering an abstracted version of Egerton’s life narrative compatible with the terms of heraldic commemoration:

But my L. I doubt not but your wisdom will abridge the Time, in w^{ch} griefs are remedied, and yo^r experience of y^e world, make you compatible wth these Accidents, w^{ch} are common, and vnavoydable, It is not therefore (beyond Natures tribute w^{ch}

⁷⁵ Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesy*, pp. 38–39.

⁷⁶ See Erin Sullivan, *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), Chapter 2 (particularly p. 109)

⁷⁷ Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, pp. 32–41. On effigies (one particularly obvious example of this), see pp. 211–21.

⁷⁸ HEH EL 74.

⁷⁹ HEH EL 72. This letter was sent slightly later, after the death of Elizabeth Egerton.

flesh and blood can not withhold in some *proportion*) fitt for yo^r Place and yo^r Person to mourn, when y^e blow is past, and not to be prevented, and y^e Arm y^t strook it powerfull, and not contented If his stroaks be repined at/. especially when he y^t made him hath him, and lent him you so long, till he had don honour to his Country and to his howse.⁸⁰

Casting a long shadow over the deaths of men such as Egerton was the extraordinary precedent of Sir Philip Sidney, who died in 1587 fighting Spanish forces in the Low Countries. His funeral procession of February 1588, which comprised some 700 mourners, is depicted in a series of engravings by Thomas Lant that together capture its powerful military focus, with soldiers and insignia positioned at the very front of the spectacle.⁸¹ At the same time, for reasons that are still not entirely clear, Sidney's death elicited a sudden and unprecedented outpouring of elegiac poems and publications from London and university presses.⁸² Most of these demonstrate how Sidney was mourned rather as a national symbol than for any personal characteristics, the most plausible rationale for which is that he represented a militantly Protestant faction that was acquiring powerful political and literary representation in these years – including Spenser and many of his imitators.⁸³

Two large collections of manuscript verse, among other poems written on the death of Egerton, insist upon the circumstantial parallels between his death and that of this decorated forbear. One of the collections, by the Lord Keeper's new chaplain Nathaniel Harris, survives in two presentation copies.⁸⁴ The other, an octavo volume bound in gold-tooled vellum, is attributed to one 'Aerius Naso' of Brasenose College, Oxford, where Egerton was himself a student.⁸⁵ Written in a combination of Latin and Greek, in shape poems, eclogues, elegies and

⁸⁰ For a full transcription and discussion of this letter, see *The Egerton Papers*, ed. by J. P. Collier (The Camden Society, 1840), p. 305. My transcription here is taken directly from HEH EL 71.

⁸¹ Roger Kuin, 'Hieroglyphics of Nobility: The Banners in Sir Philip Sidney's Funeral Procession', *Sidney Journal*, 33 (2015), 1–25 (pp. 2, 4–6).

⁸² See Gavin Alexander, *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney 1586-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 57–58. See also Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 272.

⁸³ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 67–69. On the Sidney faction, and Spenser's place within it, see Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 28–47.

⁸⁴ HEH EL 1002 and HEH EL 1008. The copies are very nearly identical.

⁸⁵ HEH EL 1007.

epitaphs, these volumes serve largely (like much commemorative poetry) to demonstrate the literary versatility and learning of their authors. One poem in Harris's collection, titled 'Linguas calluit, Latinā, Græcā, Gallicā & Italicam', even applies a conventional inexpressibility topos to his several languages in order to justify listing these talents to his reader.⁸⁶ Beyond this, the poets limit their literary exercises within the relatively narrow thematic scope pertaining to the Sidneian knight: Egerton's contemporary affiliations with Oxford University, his service of Essex, the circumstances of his death, his honour and skill in warfare, and his premature death – clothing each with far-reaching classical allusions.

Spenser's later commemoration of Sidney in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (1595) develops further Spenserian innovations in commemorative elegy during this decade – particularly how it could explore and inhabit the authorial identities and literary creations of its subjects. Spenser's Sidneian elegies are deeply, even structurally, allusive and specific, constructing pastoral scenes within the recognisable environs of Sidney's *Arcadia* (1590) that also gesture outwards into 1590s literary London.⁸⁷ Twelve lines in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, for instance, are given over to lamenting the more recent death and poetic identity of Stanley, here presented as the poet Amyntas:

There also is (ah no, he is not now)
 But since I said he is, he quite is gone,
 Amyntas quite is gone and lies full low,
 Hauing his Amaryllis left to mone.
 Helpe, O ye shepheards helpe ye all in this,
 Helpe Amaryllis this her losse to mourne:
 Her losse is yours, your losse Amyntas is,
 Amyntas floure of shepheards pride forlorne:
 He whilest he liued was the noblest swaine,
 That euer piped in an oaten quill:
 Both did he other, which could pipe, maintaine,

⁸⁶ HEH EL 1008, fols 3^r–4^v. As Bald notes (*Life*, p. 97), Harris only replaced John King (the future Bishop of London) as the Lord Keeper's chaplain in 1600. These gifts surely therefore represent an attempt by Harris to win the favour and respect of a new or potential employer.

⁸⁷ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 52–59. On the importance of poetic structure 'as a species of consolation' in these poems, see pp. 48–52.

And eke could pipe himselfe with passing skill.⁸⁸

The practice of setting elegiac narratives within quasi-fictional settings is also taken up in a poem written for Egerton, a copy of which also survives, apparently unexamined, in the Egerton Family Papers. Titled ‘An Epitaphe Armoriall upon the heroicall & thrice renowned knight Sr Thomas Egerton’, it was written by William Segar, Norroy king of arms, who had himself been one of the heralds to carry Sidney's hatchments in his funeral in February 1588.⁸⁹ At Egerton's Chester funeral he followed immediately behind Donne, carrying ‘the cote’. Unsurprisingly, given Segar's position, the ‘Epitaphe Armoriall’ combines the influences noted above with the lexis of heraldic symbolism:

In siluer feilde wth Sable Bordered
A Lyon Rampant Gules behould is sett
Betweene three fatall Pheons Ordered
Mortall in Couler, & as Mortall whett

To Irish Isle I may Compare this feild
Bordered wth Boggs, darke woods, & danger^d parts
The Lyon him y^t bore this Martiall Shield
The Phaons furious Irish wth their darts

But nether Boggs, nor woods, nor darts could daunt
This noble Lyons Couraige, till y^{et} death
Takeing the Rebells part made secreat haunt
& wth his dart depriu'd him of his breath

Oh cruell death Oh Natures greatest foe
What hast thou donn to kyll this worthy wight
Thy worst is past his fame shall over goe
Thy dart in reach & line in thy dispight

And in his Ashes shal another Rise
Like to the Phoenix kind y^t neuer dyes⁹⁰

‘Gules’ (‘red’), ‘Phaons’ (‘arrows’) and ‘A Lyon Rampant’ are all features of the Egerton family crest, in which a red (and ‘Rampant’) lion is flanked above-left, above-right and

⁸⁸ Edmund Spenser, *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (William Ponsonby, 1595), sig. C2^r. On Spenser's reference to Lord Strange as a poet (who ‘piped in an oaten quill’), see Steven May, ‘Spenser's “Amyntas”’: Three Poems by Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, Fifth Earl of Derby’, *MP*, 70 (1972), 49–52.

⁸⁹ Anthony R. J. S. Adolph, ‘Segar, Sir William (1554–1633)’, *ODNB* (2016) [accessed 13 March 2019].

⁹⁰ HEH EL 1004.

directly below by three downward-facing arrowheads. Segar transforms this into a kind of allegorical dream vision, set in an Irish wilderness ‘Bordered wth Boggs, darke woods & danger^d parts’, and in the lofty archaisms of its Chaucerian-Spenserian precedents. The poem reads also as a possible companion poem to the Lord Keeper’s epitaph, whose ‘Martiall’ focus on this ‘thrice renowned knight’ Segar appears to have been careful to emulate.

Whether or not it was written for Stanley or Egerton, then, *Sorrow*’s most conspicuous commemorative and elegiac analogues and contexts are dominated by the interwoven ethics, politics and literary sensibilities of militant Protestantism and its neo-chivalric codes. Donne’s poem might have been shocking to its earliest readers; it undoubtedly bears out Kay’s argument that he more generally sought ‘to create a vernacular non-pastoral elegiac idiom, quite distinct from the outmoded heraldic laments, and from those of Spenserians or neoclassicists’.⁹¹ Whereas heraldic, Spenserian and neoclassical commemorations glossed and fictionalised the specifics of death and grief, *Sorrow* confronts such details with an unusual and unflinching force – even compared to the other ‘Epicedes and Obsequies’ Donne himself wrote. Accordingly, the poem stages an almost total rejection of the kinds of rigorist argument directed at the Lord Keeper, and the modes of funerary and elegiac commemoration that explicitly and implicitly reinforced them. As we have seen, from its first trochaic word, ‘Sorrow’ (‘who to this house, scarce knew the way’), and its first line, it substitutes any public orientation for an exclusive, private and domestic sphere in which genuine sadness can find an expression distinct from politicised funerary display, allegory and symbolism. To borrow a distinction from Tom Lutz, Donne in *Sorrow* is concerned with grief (‘one’s personal experience of loss’), rather than mourning (‘grief gone public’).⁹²

⁹¹ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 122–23.

⁹² Tom Lutz, *Crying: A Natural and Cultural History of Tears* (W. W. Norton, 1999), p. 222. This distinction also discussed in Kennedy, *Elegy*, pp. 35–37.

These emphases are further revealed both in the poem's arguments and in its unique structure. In his influential study of Donne's many and obscure classical sources for the 'Epicides and Obsequies', W. M. Lebars notes that *Sorrow* is anomalous for lacking the Roman three-part structure of lament, panegyric, and consolation that Donne's later funeral poems all 'exhibit, with minor variations'.⁹³ While in the poem's third section the speaker does recite the conventional consolation of 'life by Deathe', this argument is enclosed by two restrictive caveats:

We loose what all frinds lovd, him; he gaines now
But life by Deathe, which worst foes would allow;
If he could haue foes, in whose practise grew
All Vertues whose names subtile schoolemen know.
What ease, can hope that we shall see him, beget,
When we must dy first, and cannot dy yet? (17–22)

Describing the mere mundane practicalities of this 'life by Death', these restless, sulking lines simultaneously reinforce a consolatory certainty whilst rejecting the manner in which it is customarily articulated. The speaker's stated impatience for death is conveyed in 'an obsessive, edgy manner' captured by irregular metre and lineation – as in the conversationally-enjambed and decasyllabic twenty-first line.⁹⁴ But while this section of the poem merely constrains, rather than outright denying, the formal consolation of Christian salvation, the following and final section represents a more total rejection of the tripartite structure identified by Lebars:

His Children are his pictures, Oh they bee
Pictures of him dead, senseless, cold as hee.
Here needes no marble tombe; since he is gone
He and about him, his, are turnd to stone. (23–26)

With this chilling conceit, Donne overturns a commonplace poetic topos of immortality through offspring – developed perhaps most famously in Shakespeare's 'Fair Youth' sonnets

⁹³ W. M. Lebars, 'The Influence of the Classics in Donne's Epicides and Obsequies', *RES*, 23 (1972), 127–37 (pp. 122–29). The poem's lack of consolation leads Kay (*Melodious Tears*, p. 92) to identify it as 'an elegy or funeral song whose focus is on the immediate response to death'.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

– and argues for a literal and physical monumentalising of human emotion in human form, explicitly denying the commemorative efficacy of conventional monumental masonry. As Puttenham’s censure of epitaphic prolixity suggests, funerary monuments and inscriptions were becoming ever more controversial in the latter Elizabethan period, capable ‘rather’ to ‘disgrace then honour either the matter or maker’ – and would continue to do so into the seventeenth century, when, according to Joshua Scodel, the procurement of grand tombs became a ‘veritable craze’.⁹⁵ Donne’s lines may therefore reflect something of the later sentiment of Ben Jonson, who would write in a verse letter ‘To Sir Henry Neville’ that ‘Thy deeds unto thy name will prove new wombs, | Whilst others toil for titles to their tombs.’⁹⁶ While some relatively conventional classical and contemporary literary devices are also used in *Sorrow*, these are nonetheless incorporated into Donne’s personal and personally revealing elegiac mode. The ‘Aesopean metaphor’ of the aged oak and the youthful briar (or ‘elm and the vine’) who dies without its protection and support is used, for instance, in Spenser’s February Eclogue (*Shepherd’s Calendar*), but is here applied directly to the speaker and his ‘house’, in a manner that reflects a genuine debt of gratitude on Donne’s part.⁹⁷ Likewise, if the poem’s opening repetition of ‘strange’ does refer to the identity of its subject, this could represent a restyling of the ‘invocational’ figure of *anakaleishtha*, or even the ‘classical burial ritual’ of *vocatio*, ‘the calling three times upon the name of a dead person whose body is not available for burial’.⁹⁸

While the commemorative contexts and analogues surveyed above are undoubtedly important for reading and interpreting *Sorrow*, its highly unusual arguments, tone and

⁹⁵ Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1991), p. 16. For a more general overview of this trend, see pp. 19–41.

⁹⁶ *Cambridge Jonson*, V, p. 181.

⁹⁷ On this image in the poem, and its probable derivation from Catullus and Horace (rather than Spenser), see John L. Pollock, ‘A Note on Donne’s ‘Elegie on the L. C.’, *N&Q*, 21 (1974), 92–93; Spenser, *The Shepherd’s Calendar Conteyning twelue Æglogues proportionable to the twelve monethes* (1579), pp. 3–8.

⁹⁸ On *anakaleishtha*, conventionally a kind of mental ‘propping’ in which the repeated name becomes substitutive, or *anaclytic*, of the deceased, see Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph*, pp. 24–26. On *vocatio*, see p. 100.

autobiographical specificity render it resistant to the simply commemorative categorisation critics have attributed to it. Certainly, some of the poem's sentiment appears to turn up elsewhere in Donne's writings. In his Christmas day sermon of 1627, for example, he considers the superficiality and contingency of heraldic 'Honour', urging his listeners instead towards Christian humility:

If thou ask thy self *Quis ego*, what am I? and beest able to answer thy selfe, why now I am a man of title, of honour, of place, of power, of possessions, a man fit for a Chronicle, a man considerable in the Heralds Office, goe to the Heralds Office, the spheare and element of Honour, and thou shalt finde those men as busie there, about the consideration of Funerals, as about the consideration of Creations; thou shalt finde that office to be as well the Grave, as the Cradle of Honour; And thou shalt finde in that Office as many Records of attained families, and escheated families, and empoverished and forgotten, and obliterate families, as of families newly erected and presently celebrated. [VIII, 141]

Yet the earliest dateable commemorative text Donne wrote does not shy away from notions of 'honour', 'place', 'power', 'Chronicle' or militancy. This is the epigram written during Essex's Cadiz expedition (1596) to commemorate the death of Sir John Wingfield (*Wing*), one of the twelve honour guard in Sidney's funeral procession,⁹⁹ whose famously heroic exploits were honoured in Cadiz Cathedral 'with all the funeral solemnities of warre, the Drums and Trumpets sounding dolefully':¹⁰⁰

Beyond th'old Pillers many'haue trauailed
Towards the Suns cradle, and his throne, and bed.
A fitter Piller our Earle did bestow
In that late Iland; for he well did know
Farther then Wingefield no man dares to go.

According to M. Thomas Hester, this poem, which could conceivably have been written from an eyewitness perspective of Wingfield's death, celebrates its subject as 'an embodiment of the Hercules emblem' – a portrayal wrapped up in a jingoistic taunt of the sailors' Spanish foe. Like all political factions, the followers of Essex subscribed to a certain set of ethical

⁹⁹ See John Nichols's *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources*, III, eds. Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elizabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 327–28.

¹⁰⁰ These are the contemporary words of Sir George Buc, which are quoted in Bald, *Life*, p. 84.

precepts and behavioural affectations to which Donne here also adheres.¹⁰¹ They are seen clearly, for instance, in Essex's short consolatory letter to the Lord Keeper, written from the 'cursed cuntry' in which Egerton died, which states a craving for death in something like the comradely manner of *Sorrow*: 'Shew your strength in lyfe. Lett me, yf yt be Gods will, shew yt in taking leave of the world and hasting after my friends.'¹⁰² But while *Wing* is, generically and (probably) contextually, distinct from *Sorrow*, adopting in the 'Planudean form of the sepulchral epigram' 'an abbreviated transfer of [such] cultural codes and values', it also bends those generic expectations in a fusion of what Hester describes as a 'lapidary' style with the satirical and deflationary 'sting' of Martial's Roman mode, demonstrating that 'no metaphor can be subjected to the imperialism of any single hermeneutic'.¹⁰³ In this way, *Wing* further recommends a more open generic framework within which to approach *Sorrow*, and to reconsider Donne's apparently simple engagements with the politicised ethics of Protestant commemoration in these years. Similarly, it further highlights the persistent fact that, like all of Donne's other 'Epicedes and Obsequies' (and *Anniversaries*), *Wing* was written for a subject of noble status whose identity Donne, his copyist friends and the scribes and collectors who transmitted his verses to wider readers were typically careful to preserve. *Sorrow* remains the only exception.

Shapiro gives over much of his short study of *Sorrow* to a consideration of its place among Donne's amorous elegies – particularly to the possible consequences of dating it, in that bibliographical context, to late 1599. In doing so, he suggests that the poem marks 'a *terminus ad quem* for some Love Elegies and a *terminus a quo* for others' on the basis of a

¹⁰¹ In Michelle O'Callaghan's useful summary, these coalesced into 'a doctrine that combined aristocratic and civic virtues and valued the honourable bonds of blood and friendship [...] coupled with a Tacitean perspective that viewed the court as riven by intrigue, jealousy and ambition; a world where private behaviour and words were continually and dangerously implicated in the public world of politics.' See *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) pp. 22–23.

¹⁰² *The Egerton Papers*, p. 304.

¹⁰³ M. Thomas Hester, 'Donne's Epigrams: A Little World Made Cunningly', in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 80–91 (pp. 81–82, 84).

somewhat shaky presumption that the sequence of elegies in which *Sorrow* was transcribed may represent ‘the order in which they were composed’.¹⁰⁴ Certainly, as was noted at the beginning of this chapter, *Sorrow*’s inclusion alongside the love elegies in key manuscript witnesses such as NY3 (written by Rowland Woodward) prompts a discussion about its generic relationship with those poems. Ascribing to this bibliographical grouping no obvious significance, however, *Variorum* editors summarise the issue thus:

The question is whether *Sorrow* is not also the single representative of a distinct kind [of elegy], Donne’s initial experiment with the genre of the epicede, whose association with these love poems rests on no stronger a basis than their sharing the generic label ‘elegy’ [...] In the upshot, we do not find evidence to justify deviating from traditional editorial practice and have located *Sorrow* among its generic fellows elsewhere.¹⁰⁵

But *Sorrow* is not, in many ways, so ‘distinct’ from those other elegies. As James Winny notes, some of the defining characteristics of Donne’s ‘Love Elegies’ are their tantalising ‘particularity of reference to environment and circumstances’, and their ‘allusive technique’.¹⁰⁶ Likewise, Young argues that ‘The restless personae of the Elegies, with their unedifying opinions about women and blasphemous treatment of religion, are extreme dramatic embodiments of the inner conflicts of Elizabethan society itself.’¹⁰⁷ Such observations are so strikingly similar to those set out above in relation to *Sorrow* that they do not require any further exposition. Instead, this chapter concludes by briefly considering the potential implications of two final contextual arguments relating to Donne’s amorous elegies and lyrics, each of which has illuminated readings of poems that were probably written close to the deaths of Stanley and Egerton. Approaching *Sorrow* via these analogues rather than

¹⁰⁴ Shapiro, ‘The Date of a Donne Elegy’, pp. 145, 48. Admittedly, as Smith (*John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 182–85) has more recently suggested, Woodward may have incorporated some authorial sequencing into his transcriptions of Donne’s verse letters in NY3. So Shapiro’s suggestion is not entirely baseless.

¹⁰⁵ *Variorum*, II, pp. lxxv–lxxvi.

¹⁰⁶ James Winny, *A Preface to Donne* (Routledge, 2014), p. 148.

¹⁰⁷ Young, ‘The elegy’, p. 146.

traditional funerary contexts can, I would suggest, provide new ways of reading this earliest ‘epiciede’ as well.

The first argument relates to the elegy usually called ‘The Bracelet’ (*ElBrac*), but which Jonson (according to William Drummond) referred to as ‘verses of the lost chain’, which he had learned ‘by heart’.¹⁰⁸ In an essay of 2004, Tom Cain argues that this poem was written at least partially as an articulation of Donne’s anger and guilt in response to his brother Henry’s death in 1593, following his arrest for harbouring the Catholic seminary priest William Harrington (later executed) in his lodgings at Thavies Inn – a short walk from Donne at nearly Lincoln’s Inn. While the evidence for this claim is not conclusive, it is highly suggestive: within a broader context of antagonism between ‘English traditionalist’ Catholics such as Harrington and the more radical and militant Jesuits, William Clark’s *Replie unto a Certaine Libell Set Forth by Fr Persons* (1603) argued that rumours ‘indirectly’ but deliberately spread by Harrington’s Jesuit opponents had been the real cause of his arrest. At a point in his life when Donne seems personally to have grappled with his Catholic and Jesuit heritage, Cain argues, his sense of betrayal and loss found oblique expression in the numerical, alchemical and emblematic symbolisms of *ElBrac*, which is generally thought to have been written around this time. In particular, a mooted pun on Donne’s (and/or Henry’s, and/or their mother’s) name, and the surprisingly incongruous digression that follows it are evocative of such a theme:¹⁰⁹

But, thou art resolute; Thy will be done;
Yet with such anguish, as her onely sonne
The Mother in the hungry grave doth lay,
Unto the fire these Martyrs I betray. (79–82)

In a similar manner to the funerary context in which the speaker of *Sorrow* situates that poem, *ElBrac* is unquestionably an amorous elegy first and foremost. Its primary generic

¹⁰⁸ William Drummond, ‘Informations to William Drummond of Hawthornden’, *Cambridge Jonson*, V, p. 365.

¹⁰⁹ Tom Cain, ‘Elegy and Autobiography: ‘The Bracelet’ and the Death of Henry Donne’, *JDJ*, 23 (2004), 25–57 (quotations taken from pp. 34–35, 38–39, 53).

orientation, a dramatic complaint made ‘Upon the losse of his Mistresses Chaine, for which he made satisfaction’, is conspicuously worn.¹¹⁰ But Cain’s imaginative reading is a recognition of the possibility that, like *Wing* and many of Donne’s most famous lyrics, the poem might establish such an orientation in order to complicate and implicate that generic guise in other ways. Exploring a perhaps similar generic fusion under the guise of commemorative elegy, it is likewise possible to read other kinds of elegiac inflection in *Sorrow*. If *Sorrow* was written in 1594 for Stanley, for instance, Henry’s death would have been a relatively recent event, and the fearful ‘crisis over Catholicism’ that Cain, like John Carey, locates within *ElBrac* could conceivably have remained a live one. As such, the guardedness of the speaker’s allusions to ‘this house’, and the withholding of the subject’s identity might become more readily explicable. Moreover, it is possible to read into *Sorrow*’s seafaring imagery the themes of Ovidian exilic elegy within the loose structure of its funerary form – recollecting a past in which such ‘Venturers’ ‘Ventur[ed] their states with him’. It is to this supposed period of exile that Flynn dates Donne’s Latin epigrams, in which such themes are perceptible.¹¹¹

Another possible subtext for *Sorrow* is suggested by Ilona Bell’s influential arguments about Donne’s early courtship of and early marriage to Anne More, periods to which, in two articles, she attributes three letters extant only in the Burley MS (LR1) and ‘The Curse’ (*Curse*), respectively. The letters, which ‘contain the first substantive information about Donne’s wooing of Ann[e]’ reveal Donne as someone who ‘consistently place[s] love above personal ambition’, and whose ‘expressions of intense passion and hints of consummated love’ respond ‘to a sequence of events that created great stress for them both

¹¹⁰ This subtitle was first given to the poem much later, in the second edition of *Poems* (1635), p. 89.

¹¹¹ Flynn, *Ancient Catholic Nobility*, pp. 183–84.

and made him fear, desperately, that the affair might end'.¹¹² Writing on a similar theme in *Curse*, Bell's second article argues, Donne encodes within an ostensibly misogynistic poem for Anne the information that he 'loves her, that someone has told her father about Donne's courtship, and that Sir George is not only irate but determined to make her break her privy contract' with him. This argument is made on the strength of an apparent reference in one of the LR1 letters to Donne's reason for writing *Curse*, and the supposed identity of the informant to which it refers (one Edward Nevville).¹¹³ As Knafla notes, the date of Donne's first meeting with Anne is not known; but Egerton's funeral party in Doddlestone, to which Sir George probably brought Anne, is one possibility.¹¹⁴ In any case, their marriage followed less than fifteen months after Egerton's funeral; and Bell's arguments give rise to the possibility that the 'strange chance' of nascent courtship or romantic intrigue amidst the 'Sorrow' of that time provoked in Donne's commemorative elegy its intimate, arresting, informal tone, at one remove from the publicly-oriented funerary tributes of the others.

The latter part of this chapter has thus sought to demonstrate how, within the various literary contexts and generic frameworks that may plausibly be associated with *Sorrow*, Donne's earliest elegy stands out as a unique and uniquely unplaceable poem. Whether read as a rejection of the Spenserian and heraldic modes otherwise applied to the death of the Sidneian knight, as a reflection upon a shared past with a sodality of recusant family friends, or a personal lament amid an emergent intimacy, it remains open to interpretation in a manner unlike any other commemoration Donne wrote. As the following chapter will show, subtexts of intimacy and personal address to living recipients are a central feature of the next group of

¹¹² Ilona Bell, "'Under Ye Rage of a Hott Sonn & Yr Eyes": John Donne's Love Letters to Ann More', in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 25–52 (pp. 26–27).

¹¹³ Ilona Bell, "'if it be a shee": The Riddle of Donne's "Curse"', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry*, ed. by M. Thomas Hester (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 106–39 (pp. 123–25).

¹¹⁴ Knafla, 'Mr Secretary Donne', p. 54. See also Bald, *Life*, p. 109.

commemorative elegies Donne wrote, in the summer of 1609. Having eloped with Anne, and suffered the consequences of her father's wrath, he came to rely on the support of patrons for whom deaths presented real-world financial, professional and literary opportunities.

2. 'SHEE WHOM WE CELEBRATE': GENDER AND AUTHORSHIP IN ELEGIES FOR LADY BEDFORD, 1609

In the summer of 1609, exactly three months apart, two prominent kinswomen of Lucy Harington Russell, Countess of Bedford and patron to John Donne, died from sudden illnesses in her country residence at Twickenham Park. These women were Lady Bridget Markham, Lucy's cousin (4 May), and Cecilia Bulstrode (4 August), a well known courtier.¹ Though he had rarely composed commemorative verse, Donne wrote at least three, and probably four, funerary elegies for Lady Bedford in response to these deaths (*BedfShe*, *Mark*, *BoulRec* and *BoulNar*) – poems that are now understood by critics to form a kind of poetic sequence, following a basic narrative first proposed by Herbert Grierson.² This narrative rests on the plausible assumption that another elegy, 'Death bee not proude, thy hand gaue not this blowe', was written by Lady Bedford in response to one of these poems, and is consequently the only poem she wrote that is known to survive.

Manuscript evidence generally supports this theory. 'Death bee not proude' is attributed to Lady Bedford in two of seven manuscript witnesses (B30 and O30),³ and a further three (O21, Y3, and B47) combine it with Donne's elegies *BoulRec* and *BoulNar* (the latter with *BoulNar*; the other two with *BoulRec*) as if it were a concluding section to them in each case.⁴ A similar sort of relationship is suggested in C9, which also includes 'Death bee not proude' untitled, and immediately after *BoulNar*, but separates the poems with a dotted

¹ John Considine's short *ODNB* entry for Bulstrode remains the primary biographical account available: 'Bulstrode, Cecily (1584–1609), *ODNB* (2004)' [accessed 03 April 2019].

² Grierson, *Poems*, II, pp. cxliii–cxlv. *BedfShe* is the only of these poems whose occasion is less than certain, although the arguments put forward by Claude J. Summers for it being the first of Donne's 1609 elegies are the most credible thus far offered by critics. See Summers, 'Donne's 1609 Sequence of Grief and Comfort', *SP*, 89 (1992), 211–231 (p. 216).

³ B30, fol. 269^r, and O30, fol. 39^r. The former gives the elegy's subject as Lady Markham.

⁴ O21, p. 122, Y3, pp. 118–19, and B47, fol. 94^r. The latter also merges *BoulNar* somewhat with *BoulRec* on fol. 93^r, including no visual break other than virgules, and no separate title for *BoulNar*. My thanks to Dolores Colón and Diane Ducharme at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library for examining Y3 on my behalf.

line.⁵ In HH1 it again follows *BoulNar*, untitled, but is attributed to Francis Beaumont.⁶ The poem's obvious parallels with Donne's own – now famous – sonnet *HSDeath* offer a tantalising glimpse of how this poetic sequence, and the relationship from which it emerged, might have drawn on or influenced an intricate history of poetic dialogue and exchange.⁷ We catch a glimpse of such activities in a short letter Donne wrote to Lady Bedford, which requests copies of poems by her that she had permitted him to read on a recent visit to Twickenham Park, promising to keep them from wider circulation:

I Do not remember that ever I have seen a petition in verse, I would not therefore be singular, nor adde these to your other papers. I have yet adventured so near as to make a petition for verse, it is for those your Ladiship did me the honour to see in Twicknam garden, except you repent your making; and having mended your judgement by thinking worse, that is, better, because juster, of their subject. They must needs be an excellent exercise of your wit, which speake so well of so ill: I humbly beg them of your Ladiship, with two such promises, as to any other of your compositions were threatnings: that I will not shew them, and that I will not beleieve them; and nothing should be so used that comes from your brain or breast. If I should confesse a fault in the boldnesse of asking them, or make a fault by doing it in a longer Letter, your Ladiship might use your style and old fashion of the Court towards me, and pay me with a Pardon. Here therefore I humbly kisse your Ladiships fair learned hands, and wish you good wishes and speedy grants.⁸

This evidence sets the scene for a basic outline of events in summer 1609, as understood by critics since Grierson. In Claude J. Summers's useful paraphrase, this looks something like the following: 'Donne attempts to assuage the Countess's deeply felt grief at the loss of first [in *BedfShe* and *Mark*] one and then a second friend [in *BoulRec*]; Lady Bedford objects [in the poem 'Death bee not proude'] to the terms of his mourning; and he revises to satisfy her objections [in *BoulNar*].'⁹ While the question of Donne and Lady Bedford's objectives for these poems has provoked some debate, their basic designation as a 'dynamic sequence' is not in question.¹⁰

⁵ C9, fol. 48r.

⁶ HH1, fols 27v–28r.

⁷ On these parallels as potential evidence for dating the composition of *HSDeath*, see *Variorum*, VII.1, p. 297; R. V. Young, 'The religious sonnet', *Handbook*, pp. 218–32 (p. 225).

⁸ *Letters*, pp. 67–68.

⁹ Summers, 'Donne's 1609 Sequence', pp. 212–13.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

However, while Donne's 1609 elegies are some of the most transcribed commemorations for these two women in contemporary manuscript sources (*Mark* and *BoulRec* being the most and second most, respectively), they also represent only part of a much wider grouping of texts that was 'artefactually' preserved in similar ways.¹¹ An extraordinary necrophilic elegy by Francis Beaumont, one of seven poems in this grouping not by Donne, is the third most common; and, discounting Lady Bedford's poem, the remaining six include tributes by notable poets and close friends of her and Donne, including Sir Henry Goodere, Sir Edward Herbert, Ben Jonson and Nicholas Hare – most of which have, like Beaumont's elegy, received little to no critical attention. In addition to this, a Latin epitaph for Lady Markham survives, largely unnoticed by scholars, in the Church of St Mary the Virgin, Twickenham, where both women were buried. Its authorship is unknown.

These texts prompt hitherto little explored questions about the early contexts in which poetic commemorations for Markham and Bulstrode were written and read, the limits of contemporary elegiac decorum within those contexts, and the reputations and motives of the authors behind them. Reading them as a complete group, within early manuscripts and alongside other evidence indicative of their early social and literary contexts, this chapter looks to shed new light on these neglected topics. Following an overview of the complex and often satirical uses of epideictic verse within Lady Bedford's literary circle after her rise to prominence in the early Jacobean period, the chapter moves to consider the composition and early circulation of the 1609 elegies, and their authors' likely objectives for them – which, I argue, centre on masculinised negotiations of authorial identity intimated within proxy arguments about misogyny and elegiac decorum. My findings suggest that Donne (and to some extent Goodere) sought both to rise above the noise of elegiac competition, establishing

¹¹ As *Variorum* editors have noted, *Mark* and *BoulRec* 'both appear in thirty of the forty-three manuscripts containing at least one of the elegies', and of these, twenty also include the fourth most-transcribed poem, Donne's *BoulNar*. See *Variorum*, VI, p. 114.

an exclusive intimacy with Lady Bedford in the archaic ‘style and old fashion of the Court’, and, on some level, to participate with it.

Exploring the elegiac subplot he shared with Lady Bedford in the chapter’s final section, I consider how, set against this context, and the carefully accretive social inventions of Donne’s many other letters and poems for her, Lady Bedford’s apparent response to Donne represents a subtle poetic challenge not only to the theological bent of *BoulNar*, but the masculinised terms of the wider elegiac grouping with which it was also associated. In a broader sense, the materials considered in this chapter provide a useful case study for how communities of elegists relied upon specific contextual factors and allusions that are not always visible to critics, but which become increasingly so when these texts are read in their broadest literary, biographical and bibliographical contexts, sensitive to the frequently heterogeneous readings, juxtapositions and intrigue of manuscript compilers who read such poetry in a far more nuanced way than modern readers have tended to read it.

‘that knott of friends’: Epideictic Poetry in Lady Bedford’s Cultural and Literary Circle

The speaker of Francis Beaumont’s ‘Elegy on the Lady Markham’ admits to complete ignorance of his subject, yet proceeds to justify the poem on precisely the premise that her value, for him, is realised only by ‘a report’ of her death:

I never saw thy face, nor did my heart
Urge forth mine eyes unto it whilst thou wert
But being lifted hence, that which to thee
Was deaths sad dart, prov’d *Cupids* shaft to me.

From here follows a disturbing visualisation of Markham’s inanimate corpse in the ‘trimm’d bed’ of her grave, over which the poet’s shifting fantasies range grotesquely. Luxuriating in the physical passivity and accessibility of this female body, he appeals to his imagined readers’ bawdy misogyny against living women, and the trappings, expenses and

inconveniences of conventional romantic courtship. Finally, he identifies a wider community of fellow commemorators/sexual competitors – ‘You Wormes (my Rivals)’ – and directs these explicitly penetrative agents of vermiculation towards a commemorative textual production of his choosing:

Have ye not yet enough of that white skin,
 The touch whereof, in times past, would have been
 Enough t’ have ransom’d many a thousand soule
 Captive to Love? If not, then upward roule
 Your little bodies, where I would you have
 This Epitaph upon her forehead grave.
*Living, she was young, faire, and full of wit;
 Dead, all her faults are in her forehead writ.*¹²

How and why was this poem, so uniquely distasteful by modern standards, written, circulated and read in the early seventeenth century? Situating it within its early historical and bibliographical contexts offers no easy answers, but provides a useful starting point for the survey with which this chapter begins. At first glance, as Philip J. Finkelpearl notes, Beaumont’s elegy seems like a ‘direct challenge’ to one Donne wrote for the same occasion (*Mark*), which argues that ‘as the tyde doth wash the slymie beach, | And leaues embroidered workes vpon the sand, | Soe is her fleash refin’d by Deathes cold hand’ (18–20). Thus, Beaumont’s is easy to read as a satire of the ‘commercial’ motivations behind such hyperbolic tributes, who might perhaps be identified with the ‘Wormes’ and ‘Rivals’ he addresses. But the available external evidence complicates any single reading of the poem. Lady Markham’s family was close to that of Elizabeth Hastings, Countess of Huntington (as was Donne), and a later (1616) elegy written for Beaumont himself by the clergyman and poet Thomas Pestell, a longstanding servant of that family, describes Beaumont’s ‘Elegy on the Lady Markham’ as a fitting and enduring monument ‘which still fresh shall be’ in ‘everlasting brasse’ – alongside other widely-circulated elegies he wrote for the ladies Elizabeth Sidney (Countess of Rutland) and Penelope Clifton. Moreover, Finkelpearl

¹² Francis Beaumont, *Poems* (1653), sigs D8^r–E1^r.

observes, Beaumont's commemorations of these other women share something, if less extreme, of the 'repulsively witty' 'Petrarchan cataloguing' of the female body evident in the elegy for Markham.¹³

To date, no study of Beaumont's 'Elegy on the Lady Markham' in manuscript has been carried out – though, like contemporary manuscript poetry generally, it is beginning to garner such interest.¹⁴ At least twenty-nine full or partial manuscript witnesses of the poem survive, which together show both that it was interpreted and copied in various ways, and that this extensive manuscript transmission was characterised by some consistent associations. Scribal paratexts relating to Beaumont's poem do not suggest that it was regarded as especially objectionable by contemporaries, and thus mostly reinforce Finkelppearl's conjectures. None reveal serious misgivings about its 'Inuictive' elements (as described within the miscellany belonging to Nicholas Burghe (O3)), and only a minority seek to amplify them.¹⁵ (The manuscript formerly belonging to Edward Denny (HH4), for instance, offers the poem the grimly sardonic title 'Amor posthumous'.)¹⁶ One of the most striking manuscripts is the so-called Welbeck MS (NP1), which offers a generic categorisation of the poem that, like Pestell's elegy, explicitly points up its fitness for purpose. Carefully organising this poetic miscellany along generic lines, and distinguishing in its first two sections between 'Laudatory Epitaphs' and 'Epitaphs Merry & Satirical', the manuscript's (unknown) compiler includes Beaumont's elegy within the former – a designation made especially notable by the evident care with which generic distinctions are observed throughout the volume. Further subgenres of 'Epitaphs', including epitaphs about falsely

¹³ Philip J. Finkelppearl, *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 21–25.

¹⁴ I would like to thank Meghan Kern, who is currently working on an MA thesis about the poem (including collation of manuscript sources), for her generous email correspondence on this topic.

¹⁵ The full title given in O3 is 'On his deseased M^ris an Inuictiue Eligie', p. 76.

¹⁶ HH4, pp. 10–11. For a detailed account of this manuscript, see Joshua Eckhardt, *Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 258–61.

rumoured deaths, and epitaphs that are knowingly misattributed, are meticulously titled and sequenced within these selections.¹⁷ Another is the small and ostensibly commemorative manuscript volume in the so-called Digby MSS, previously owned by one ‘Mrs. A. H. Bright’, in which the latter part of Beaumont’s elegy is included alongside laudatory tributes for Lady Venetia Digby.¹⁸

Most extant manuscript copies of Beaumont’s poem also include it in close proximity to contemporary ‘Laudatory’ elegies by Donne, as well as Beaumont’s other elegies on Rutland and Clifton. A typical example is B46, a carefully-arranged collection of almost exclusively Donnean verse in a single, professional hand, which contains Beaumont’s Markham elegy immediately preceding Donne’s, without explanation or qualification.¹⁹ Another is B16, an octavo volume compiled chiefly by William Strode’s cousin Daniel Leare.²⁰ Indeed, this appears to be only one aspect of a broader and largely unrecognised association between Beaumont and Donne as contemporary and comparable elegists in early manuscript sources. As Grierson (and by extension Milgate) notes, Beaumont’s ‘execrable’ Markham elegy is sometimes even attributed to Donne – and at least one such manuscript, O21 (the ‘Phillipps MS’) also attributes the Rutland elegy to him.²¹ In a related way, B13, the ‘Skipwith MS’, and its sibling manuscript C1, the ‘Edward-Smyth MS’, appear to attribute other elegies on Beaumont himself to Donne.²²

¹⁷ These sections cover pp. 1–32 and 37–46 respectively. Beaumont’s elegy is transcribed on pp. 21–22. The Portland MS, and another by the same scribe (Folger MS V.a.103) are discussed at greater length in Joshua Eckhardt, *Manuscript Verse Collectors*, pp. 55–66, 271–73.

¹⁸ On this manuscript, see Daniel Starza Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers: Patronage and Manuscript Circulation in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 210–12.

¹⁹ Of the 107 poems listed in *CELM*, only three – Beaumont’s elegy (fols 19^r–20^r) and two lyrics by Jonson and Edward Herbert (fols 69^v–71^r) are not by Donne.

²⁰ B16, fols 47^v–50^r. On this manuscript, see Eckhardt, *Manuscript Verse Collectors*, pp. 235–37.

²¹ Grierson, *Poems*, II, p. 209; Milgate, *Epithalamions*, p. 177. For the Markham and Rutland elegies in O21, see pp. 199–202 and pp. 139–43, respectively. There is no mention of Beaumont’s elegy in *Variorum*, VI.

²² Fols 44^r–45^r (‘Vnto they euerlasting lasting memory’) and 17^v–18^r (‘Yet fond philosophy will peake and dare’). These poems are not included in the substantial selection of commendatory verses that prefaces the posthumous *Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and Iohn Fletcher* (1647), and neither are listed either in *CELM* or the *UFLI*. On the relationship between B13 and C1 see Lara M. Crowley, *Manuscript Matters: Reading John Donne’s Poetry and Prose in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

To some extent, especially given the arguments presented in the latter part of the previous chapter, this should not be too surprising. Donne was known for lascivious and misogynistic amorous elegies of his own; and early modern manuscript compilers would often juxtapose seemingly incongruous materials such as these when they shared a theme (Lady Markham) or exemplified an authorial analogue (Donne and Beaumont). As Arthur F. Marotti notes, manuscript verse compilers, seemingly ‘preoccupied with death’, collected ‘hundreds of serious elegies and epitaphs as well as comic and satiric epitaphs and elegies about political enemies, social inferiors, and other figures of scorn’.²³ Marotti suggests three basic categories of verse with the widest circulation in the early seventeenth century, that seem, at least partially, to explain the apparently broad appeal of Beaumont’s poem: model epitaphs/elegies, poems expressive of ‘general cultural beliefs’ and poems about the lives and inner circles of elites.²⁴ Moreover, as Erin A. McCarthy has recently shown in a quantitative analysis of all known miscellanies containing Donne’s verse that can be associated with female readers, scribes, manuscript owners and compilers, many such ‘agents’ were actively interested in reading, collecting and circulating ostensibly misogynistic literary works.²⁵ But the slippage I have noted between the ‘Laudatory’ and the ‘Satirical’ – as well as the amorous and the commemorative – reveals a reading public accustomed to perceiving elegiac poetry in a very different way to modern critics. As such, these manuscript witnesses prompt the search for a deeper contextual understanding of the relationships between these poems, and, more broadly, these kinds of poems.

2018), p. 31. Building on Peter Beal’s observations on this topic, Crowley notes that the manuscripts share the same watermarks, and so might have a ‘shared origin’.

²³ Marotti, *Manuscript, Print*, p. 129.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 129–30.

²⁵ ‘Reading Women Reading Donne in Manuscript and Printed Miscellanies: A Quantitative Approach’, *RES*, 69 (2018), 661–85 (particularly p. 672). For a general overview on women in the manuscript system, see Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (London, Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 48–61.

While the lofty solemnity, increasing ubiquity and hyperbolic excess of commemorative poetry made it an obvious vehicle for satire, parody and libel in the early seventeenth century, it is predominantly to certain competitive and masculinised contexts, such as university, Inns of Court and tavern fraternities that this has been traced. Among others, Michelle O’Callaghan has shown how contemporary ‘wits’ writing in such environments negotiated an unstable tension between *jocus* and *serium*, around which humanist principles for learned and improvisational literary play (*lusus*) were enacted – especially in short forms amenable to literary caricature and pseudo-ceremonialism.²⁶ In particular, epitaphs and epigrams, and subgenres of both (such as riddle epitaphs and logogriphs), negotiated a ‘cult of sententious brevity’ that fed off a contemporary explosion in vernacular versifying within these contexts.²⁷ But commemorative verse of all kinds was ready-made to accommodate satirical ‘inversion’, whereby ‘low’ style was deployed in the service of ‘high’ subject matter, alongside various forms of competitive and corroborative intertextuality.²⁸

Recent attention to the coalescence of literary groups and activities around prominent aristocratic women such as Lady Bedford, Mary Herbert (Countess of Pembroke), and Lady Mary Wroth has, however, shown another side to the literary and political landscape of late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth-century England. Peter Davidson, Jane Stevenson and Julie Crawford describe these women as ‘devisers’ and ‘Mediatix’ figures whose militant Protestantism and political influence reached far beyond the domestic sphere: they were ‘symbolic representatives’ of the Sidney-Essex alliance, with which Lady Bedford’s husband

²⁶ Michelle O’Callaghan, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 50, 66–69, 8.

²⁷ Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 50–52, 60–61.

²⁸ O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, p. 89.

rebelled in 1601.²⁹ Issues of gender, religion and politics thus underpinned and catalysed the voluminous literary outputs of their court circles in different ways from those of the more traditional and established centres of literary sociability surveyed by O’Callaghan, placing new constraints and topicalities upon the wits who engaged with them. As dedicatee of over fifty printed works, many explicitly propagating hard-line puritan and militant viewpoints, Lady Bedford was a particularly conspicuous ‘Mediatrice’ figure.³⁰ Scholarly attention to the political significance of her career and reputation supplements earlier, but still relatively recent, acknowledgements of her prominence as a court masquer, literary patron, political go-between, and member of Queen Anne’s bedchamber – into which she was able to promote both Markham and Bulstrode by 1607.³¹

Recent criticism has also shone light into the domestic contexts wherein women actively participated in satirical and sociable literary activity. Coterie such as these could enable affiliates, including women, ‘to challenge decorum and exert considerable intellectual pressure on Renaissance notions of laughter’, including through the exploration of contemporary misogynistic tropes.³² An oft-cited illustration of such inclinations on Lady Bedford’s part is her solicitation of a copy of Donne’s satires from Ben Jonson, who sent them with an accompanying verse of his own.³³ Even more suggestive, however, is the

²⁹ Peter Davidson and Jane Stevenson, ‘Elizabeth I’s Reception at Bisham (1592): Elite Women as Writers and Devisers’, in *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, ed. by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 207–26; Julie Crawford, *Mediatrice: Women, Politics and Literary Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 8–9. ‘Mediatrice’ is a term Donne uses to describe Lady Bedford in a letter to Sir Henry Goodere. See *Letters*, p. 193.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

³¹ Margaret Maurer ‘Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford, and the Terms of John Donne’s “Honour is So Sublime Perfection”’, *ELH*, 47 (1980), 205–234; Barbara K. Lewalski, ‘Lucy, Countess of Bedford: Images of a Jacobean Courtier and Patroness’, in *The Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 52–77.

³² O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, pp. 160–61. See also pp. 158–59 on a pair of verse epistles written between John Hoskyns and Lady Jacob, his wife, which typify a format of answer-poetry ‘derived from the rhetorical exercise of *in untramque partem*’, ‘in which the misogynist complaint or praise of woman is disputed by a respondent’.

³³ Ben Jonson, ‘To Lucy, Countess of Bedford, with Mr. Donnes Satyres’, *Cambridge Jonson*, V, pp. 160–61.

possibility that Twickenham Park was a nexus for the writing and circulation of literary ‘Newes’ pieces – pithy, formulaic gobbets of mock-journalism that satirised the culture and denizens of contemporary court life. These texts, which are associated particularly with individuals from her circle, including Sir Thomas Overbury, Sir Thomas Roe, John Cocke, Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, Donne, Cecilia Bulstrode, Lady Anne Southwell and perhaps Anne Clifford, appear to have circulated in ‘rounds’ from the final months of Elizabeth’s reign until Bulstrode’s death in 1609.³⁴ A number were included as supplementary materials in posthumous editions of Sir Thomas Overbury’s *The Wife*, with additional texts added up to its seventh impression of 1616.³⁵ Whether or not such games actually took place, or were merely fabricated for a print readership (as John Considine has argued), the early years of King James’s reign were alive with the kinds of literary competition, topical satire and travesty from which they would have drawn.³⁶ Donne’s *Catalogus librorum satyricus*, or ‘Courtier’s Library’, which has recently been backdated to 1605, makes for one suggestive analogue.³⁷

The best-known contemporary commentary on this literary coterie, and most obvious starting point for an exploration of it, is presented in Ben Jonson’s notorious ‘Epigram On The Court Pucelle’, a satirical poem written about Bulstrode. It begins by accusing its subject

³⁴ The inclusion of Lady Anne Southwell and Anne Clifford is suggested by Lesley Lawson in *Out of the Shadows: The Life of Lucy, Countess of Bedford* (Hambledon Continuum, 2007), p. 79.

³⁵ See *The ‘Conceited News’ of Sir Thomas Overbury and His Friends*, ed. by James E. Savage (Gainsville Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968), pp. xvii–xxiii; Robert W. Halli Jr, ‘Cecilia Bulstrode, “The Court Pucell”’, in *Subjects on the World’s Stage: Essays on British Literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. by David G. Allen and Robert J. White (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1995), pp. 295–312 (pp. 297–99). On dating these texts see Melanie Faith, ‘Correcting the Date of the Conceited Newes’, *N&Q*, 53 (2006), 505–08.

³⁶ John Considine, ‘The Invention of the Literary Circle of Sir Thomas Overbury’, in *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000), pp. 59–74.

³⁷ On this, and the discovery in 2016 of a new manuscript witness (WA2) in Westminster Abbey Library, see Daniel Starza Smith, Matthew Payne and Melanie Marshall, ‘Rediscovering John Donne’s *Catalogus librorum satyricus*’, *RES*, 69 (2018), 455–487. One further analogue is a court libel (available in HMC, *Salisbury MSS*, XVII, pp. 114–15), possibly by Bulstrode, that elicited the anger of both Sir Edward Coke and William Cecil. While unable to track down the author of this libel, they were able to discover that Bulstrode possessed a copy of it. See Lawson, *Out of the Shadows*, pp. 78–79.

of an undisclosed ‘censure’ of the poet, before moving into a satirical retort couched in an overtly sexualised description of her ‘chamber’: ‘the very pit | Where fight the prime cocks of the game for wit’ (3–4). Shortly afterwards, the speaker appears to allude to the sorts of literary games described above, figuring Bulstrode’s poetic creations as products of aberrant sexual violence:

What though with tribade lust she force a muse,
And in an epicene fury can write news
Equal with that which for the best news goes
As airy, light, and as like wit as those? (7–10)

The ‘Informations to William Drummond of Hawthornden’, which records a reading of this poem by Jonson to Drummond, also preserves an explanatory comment by the author. Jonson recalls that a copy of it ‘was stolen out of his pocket by a gentleman who drank him drowsy, and given to Mistress Bulstrode; which brought him great displeasure’.³⁸ Perhaps also related to this is a prefatory letter to Jonson’s later elegy for Bulstrode, which expresses regret about ‘some prejudices they have had injuriously of me’. It must be assumed that ‘they’ identifies the circle under discussion without naming it. The elegy itself, punctuated by allusions to Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women*, looks like a palinode for the ‘Epigram’; but while some relationship between the poems is highly likely, the elegy’s precise nature may be difficult conclusively to establish.³⁹ ‘Pucelle’, French for ‘honest woman’, had by this period acquired an ironically inverted double meaning, engendering an interpretive tension between transgressive and chaste models of femininity that encapsulates a spectrum of potential readings of the poem as a whole.⁴⁰ Jongsook Lee, for instance, argues that it (like Jonson’s

³⁸ William Drummond, ‘Informations to William Drummond of Hawthornden’, *Cambridge Jonson*, V, p. 390. As Lawson notes (*Out of the Shadows*, p. 82), Jonson elsewhere tells Drummond that his ‘Verses on the Pucelle of the Court Mistriss Boulstred’ was one of his favourite poems to recite.

³⁹ A further epitaph by Jonson, beginning ‘Wilt thou hear what man can say | Hear a little reader stay’, which is reminiscent of Jonson’s elegy on Bulstrode, is titled as a poem for her in some manuscript witnesses, including O36, fol. 25^v, and B35, fol. 30^v. It is not, however, included in *Cambridge Jonson*.

⁴⁰ Colin Burrow glosses it as ‘Court whore’ in Ben Jonson, ‘An Epigram on the Court Pucelle’, *Cambridge Jonson*, VII, p. 194. One conspicuous precedent to whom the epithet was frequently applied was Joan of Arc, also known as Joan la Pucelle. On this, and its etymology, see Craig Taylor, *Joan of Arc: La Pucelle* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 47–48.

occasional poems more generally) should not be read either as a clear-cut record of personal interactions or as a reliable biographical portrait, but in light of Jonsonian epideictic conventions and the ‘communities’ of poetic creations such literary relationships had hitherto established. Panegyric and satire stand as necessary and ‘complementary’ aspects of Aristotelian epideictic rhetoric, equally applicable to the same ‘idealised’ subjects – as in Jonson’s two poems about Bulstrode – and establishing a rational dichotomy of ‘types’ and ‘anti-types’ that Jonson actively sought to emphasise when juxtaposing such works in print.⁴¹

James E. Savage has argued that the ‘Epigram on the Court Pucelle’ might be read as an insinuation of its author into something of an ‘uninvited’ ‘referee and custodian of the rules’ of the ‘Newes’ game, establishing the game’s key subject areas in the act of lampooning one of its protagonists: ‘What though she talk and can at once with them | Make state, religion, bawdry, all a theme?’ (11–12).⁴² Whether or not this is true, the receptiveness of Bulstrode’s circle to intertextual epideictic poetics is further suggested by another poem written for Bulstrode around this time. This amorous elegy, apparently by Sir John Roe, seems directly opposed to Jonson’s unusual implementation of the commonplace conceit of poetry as sexual conquest (itself, as Lee notes, an inversion of ‘the traditional image of a poet ravished by divine fury’):⁴³

Shall I goe force an Elegie? abuse
My witt? and break the Hymen of my muse
For one poore houres love? Deserves it such
Which serves not me, to doe on her as much? (1–4)⁴⁴

⁴¹ Jongsook Lee, ‘Who Is Cecilia, What Was She? Cecilia Bulstrode and Jonson’s Epideictics’, *JEGP*, 85 (1986), 20–34 (particularly pp. 27–28). See also Jack D. Winner, ‘Ben Jonson’s *Epigrammes* and the Conventions of Formal Verse Satire’, *SEL*, 23 (1983), 61–76.

⁴² Savage, ‘*Conceited Newes*’, pp. lvi–lxii; *Cambridge Jonson*, VII, pp. 194–95.

⁴³ Lee, ‘Jonson’s Epideictics’, p. 30.

⁴⁴ I am quoting the text of SN3 as printed in Grierson, *Poems*, I, pp. 410–11, which dates the poem to 1602. It was first printed in *Le prince d’amour; or the prince of love. With a Collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs By the Wits of the Age* (William Leake, 1660), pp. 109–10, where it is attributed to Donne. H. L. Meakin argues for the presence of ‘extra-textual links’ between in the poems in *John Donne’s Articulations of the Feminine* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 53.

Roe presents his ‘muse’ and ‘wit’ as vulnerable and feminised entities that he is unwilling to ‘abuse’ on the behalf of a neglectful female addressee. While it is (again) impossible to prove beyond doubt that these poems relate to each other, and in what way, further evidence for some kind of relationship is found in the fact that Jonson later recycled Roe’s elegy, largely unaltered, throughout a lengthy passage of dialogue in *The New Inn* (1629). He was therefore probably aware of it, and, at least by 1629, in possession of a copy.⁴⁵ Moreover, when he returns to the subject of poetry in the elegy’s closing lines, Roe offers a further and broader rejection of the competitive literary ‘sport’ described in and exemplified by Jonson’s ‘Epigram’:

But why doe I thus travaile in the skill
Of despis’d poetrie, and perchance spill
My fortune? or undoe myself in sport
By having but that dangerous name in Court?
I’le leave, and since I doe your poet prove,
Keep you my lines as secret as my Love. (33–38)

Roe’s final request to retire poetry to the intimate sphere of romantic correspondence might represent a genuine plea, given both that he is thought to have pursued Bulstrode romantically, and that his poem can be read as a genuine sexual proposition to its addressee.⁴⁶ Adding yet further complexity to this picture is the possibility that Roe’s brother, Sir Thomas, was also romantically attached to Bulstrode – at least by the time of her death, one year after that of John.⁴⁷ A letter of Donne’s to George Garrard, the brothers’ cousin, seems to depict a lover’s grief after her death:

I came from thence upon Thursday, where I left Sir Tho. Roe so indulgent to his sorrow, as it had been an injury to have interrupted it with my unusefull company. I have done nothing of that kinde as your Letter intimates, in the memory of that good Gentlewoman⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Act two, scene six, lines 196–232. For a concise breakdown of these allusions, see Ben Jonson, *The New Inn*, *Cambridge Jonson*, VI, pp. 239–40.

⁴⁶ For this argument, see Considine, ‘Bulstrode, Cecily’.

⁴⁷ R. C. Bald considers this possibility at some length, concluding that Thomas Roe probably was Bulstrode’s lover by this point. Bald, *Life*, pp. 177–78. See also Ribeiro Alvaro, ‘Sir John Roe: Ben Jonson’s Friend’, *RES* 24 (1973), 153–64 (p. 161).

⁴⁸ *Letters*, p. 39.

Fragmentary and incomplete though it is, this evidence adumbrates a distinct and dynamic social and literary circle whose participants, men and women, explored heterosexual love, identity, and intellectual ideas through the circulation of challenging, intertextual and often satirical epideictic verse. Of course, as I note in my introduction, care must be taken when attempting to describe ‘coterie’ verse such as this, particularly when pursuing its competitive and intertextual characteristics and allusions. Digging deeper into these areas in this chapter’s latter sections, I rest my case on a number of factors that build in specific ways on the broad context set out above: the kinds of poems these are, centring on specific and shared points of contention; their number, and their concentration in manuscript sources; the unusually full evidence of specific conduits for their manuscript transmission that survives; and the strength of internal evidence for such readings.⁴⁹ I also build on a forthcoming essay by Michelle O’Callaghan, which argues that elegies written for Markham and Bulstrode constituted a coterie publication event at least insofar as they envisage and construct ‘coterie’ conditions of communication and circulation.⁵⁰ Reading all of the 1609 elegies in this manner, and tracing their subsequent percolation in manuscript sources, can offer partial routes across the cultural and historical distance from which we view them.⁵¹

Composition and Circulation

Lady Bridget Markham was buried fifteen days after her death, and Cecilia Bulstrode just two days after hers.⁵² It would not be surprising if all the surviving elegies for these women were written before or very shortly following these funerals: as Andrea Brady and others

⁴⁹ The term ‘socially dialogic’ is borrowed from Marotti, *Manuscript, Print*, p. 159.

⁵⁰ The essay will form part of a larger volume, edited by Daniel Starza Smith and Nadine Akkerman, focused on the literary and cultural significance of Lady Bedford. I would like to thank Michelle for generously sending me an advance copy.

⁵¹ On the social uses of scribal ‘publication’ in literary communities, see Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 177–230.

⁵² London Metropolitan Archives, DRO/174/A/01/003, fol. 37^r.

have noted, funerary elegies rely on a communally and spatially oriented language rooted in the occasion of death and its ritual commemoration – particularly the image of the hearse, coffin, or tomb, onto which these poems were figuratively (and sometimes literally) affixed.⁵³ They were, like ‘Newes’ lists, topical pieces, necessarily written at speed. An extant cover letter to Ben Jonson’s ‘Epitaph on Cecilia Bulstrode’, which survives alongside the poem in the original holograph manuscript, enables us to speculate on how, and how quickly, some of the 1609 elegies were composed:

See what the obedience of friendship is, and the hazard it runs. This I have done, straitened with time (as your man knows) to let you know your power in me. If it be well (as I think it is, for my invention hath not cooled so much to judge) show it, though the greater wits have gone before. It hath somewhat in it *moris antique*, and suggesting the suddenness of it may pass. For till your letter came, I was not so much as acquainted with the sad argument, which both struck me and keeps me a heavy man. Would God I had seen her before, that some that live might have corrected some prejudices they have had injuriously of me. By your next commodity write me your liking of it, and some news. I will answer it with your other request if I can for my business, which is now very weighty to me, by reason of some embarkings.⁵⁴

Written onto the exterior face of this packet, as it was folded when dispatched, are the words ‘To my right worthy Friend m^r. Geo: Garrard’. This is the same friend to whom Donne describes the ‘indulgent’ grief of Sir Thomas Roe, and who appears to have acted as gatherer of at least some elegies written for Bulstrode, perhaps in order to present them to Lady Bedford at the imminent funeral. If so, they were written and collected within roughly forty-eight hours of her death. Jonson writes both ‘straitened with time (as your man knows)’, suggesting that this courier was physically waiting on him in the act of composition, and in the knowledge that ‘the greater wits’ have already penned similar tributes – a reference, probably, to information contained within ‘your letter’, but whose inexactness might

⁵³ Andrea Brady, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century: Laws in Mourning* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 5, 68.

⁵⁴ Houghton JnB 102. I have here quoted the version in *Cambridge Jonson*, III, p. 371 (‘Letter 11, To George Garrard with *Epitaph on Cecilia Bulstrode*’), which reproduces the autograph manuscript text.

(depending on Garrard's precise words) indicate either a shared knowledge of who those poets were, or an assumption of their identity based on prior connections.

As Appendix II shows, these poets overlap strongly with the group connected with Cecilia Bulstrode in the earlier 1600s.⁵⁵ One possible outlier in this respect is Beaumont – though as Mark Bland has shown, Beaumont was almost certainly familiar with the other elegists from his time at the Middle Temple at the turn of the century, through the literary circle of the Countess of Rutland, and through another network of literary acquaintances often associated with the Mermaid Tavern in Cheapside:

The broader importance of the literary and social connections that can be traced between the Inner and Middle Temples as well as the secretariats (particularly that of Essex) during the late 1590s, is that this group subsequently fused as the literary coterie associated with the Countesses of Rutland and Bedford in the first decade of the seventeenth century. In turn, it is these connections which have left their trace across the verse miscellanies from the period, in which the poems of Jonson, Donne, Beaumont, Edward Herbert, Overbury, Pembroke, Sir John Roe, Rudyerd, and Wotton frequently appear.⁵⁶

Such traces have been found in key manuscripts containing elegies for Markham and Bulstrode, and are amply supplemented by a more comprehensive examination of manuscript witnesses for these poems – many of which are not listed in either *CELM* or *UFLI*.⁵⁷ B40, a miscellany composed almost entirely in a single (unknown) secretary hand, containing all four Donne elegies, and which is, like NP1, evidently deliberate and thematic in its layout, contains a notable collection of poems that undoubtedly evokes the coterie associations of Cecilia Bulstrode's so-called 'pit'. Accompanying a heavily annotated scribal copy of Overbury's *The Wife* is a cluster of poems by and about Sir Thomas Roe, Jonson and

⁵⁵ No manuscript witnesses for Jonson's 'Epigram on the Court Pucelle' are listed in *UFLI* or *CELM*. While Colin Burrow suspects that this poem, which was printed only posthumously (in *The Underwood*), was thought too provocative for print at an earlier stage, its absence from manuscript sources is nonetheless perplexing. See *Cambridge Jonson*, VII, p. 194.

⁵⁶ Mark Bland, 'Francis Beaumont's Verse Letters to Ben Jonson and "The Mermaid Club"', *EMS*, 12 (2005), 139–79 (p. 141).

⁵⁷ Marotti, for example, notes that HH1 (the 'Bridgewater MS') bulks large in its representation of the 'coterie' behind elegies for Markham and Bulstrode. See *Manuscript, Print*, p. 169.

Bulstrode (including Roe's 'Shall I goe force'), nearly all of which are dated to 1602–03.⁵⁸ Donne's elegies on Markham and Bulstrode, which follow shortly afterwards, are likewise arranged with clear paratextual indications of context and sequence, alongside other poems he wrote for Lady Bedford.⁵⁹ As was mentioned above, these are relatively typical features in manuscript witnesses for Donne's 1609 elegies: the vast majority of miscellanies containing more than one of these four poems (thirty-five out of thirty-nine) reproduce at least two of them in the sequence described above, and/or alongside similar paratextual indications that they represent a series of related or interrelated texts.⁶⁰

What becomes immediately apparent when scanning the distribution of manuscript witnesses for 1609 elegies for Markham and Bulstrode in their entirety is that Donne's four poems appear to circulate as a discreet group in the earliest and most authoritative manuscripts containing his poetry. With the important exception of B30, notable 'Group 1' manuscripts B32, C8, O20 and SP1 contain only 1609 elegies by Donne, as do key 'Group 2' manuscripts B7, CT1, DT1 (the source of *Variorum* copy-texts for *Mark*, *BoulRec*, and *BoulNar*), H4, B40, TT1 and WN1.⁶¹ 'Group 3' manuscripts are somewhat more eclectic: C9 and H6, for instance, contain a combination of other 1609 elegies alongside Donne.⁶² An outlier, once again, is Beaumont's elegy, which appears both in C2 (Group 1) and B46 (Group 3). It is also contained in a further key manuscript volume, B11, which, though it contains none of Donne's elegies, can be located close to an important figure in their early circulation: Goodere.

⁵⁸ Fols 75^r–81^v and 101^v–04^v, respectively. A similar selection of verses by and about Roe is included in HH4 (part one of the Haslewood-Kingsborough MS), pp. 168–69, including a verse letter sent from his brother, likewise dated to 1603.

⁵⁹ Fols 113^r–17^v. *BoulNar* (fol. 17^r–v), for instance, is titled 'Another Elegie vpon the Death of M^{ris} Bowlstred'. Peter Beal tentatively dates the volume to the 1620s.

⁶⁰ These are B7, B8, B16, B30, B32, B40, B46, B47, C1, C2, C8, C9, CT1, DT1, EU3, H4, H5, H6, H7, H8, HH1, HH5, NP1, O20, O21, O36, SN2, SN3, SN4, SP1, TT1, WN1, Y2, and Y3.

⁶¹ Michelle O'Callaghan notes in her forthcoming article that B30 and O30 appear to share a common source, and that B30, the earlier of the two, might be dated as early as 1610.

⁶² On these manuscript groups, see 'Manuscripts Listed by Traditional Classification', *DigitalDonne*.

While the Jonson holograph indicates that Garrard was a central figure in soliciting and collecting elegies for Cecilia Bulstrode, another letter, sent from Donne to Goodere on 14 August – eight days after Bulstrode’s funeral, and therefore almost certainly after Garrard’s man had waited on Jonson and his elegy – reveals that it was Goodere who delivered Donne’s second Bulstrode elegy to Lady Bedford:

Since therefore I am but mine own Secretary (and what's that?) I were excusable if I writ nothing, since I am so: Besides that, your much knowledge brings you this disadvantage, that as stomachs accustomed to delicacies, finde nothing new or pleasing to them when they are sick; so you can hear nothing from me (though the Countrey perchance make you hungry) which you know not. Therefore in stead of a Letter to you, I send you one to another, to the best Lady, who did me the honour to acknowledge the receipt of one of mine, by one of hers; and who only hath power to cast the fetters of verse upon my free meditations: It should give you some delight, and some comfort, because you are the first which see it, and it is the last which you shall see of this kinde from me.⁶³

Further corroborating both Lady Bedford’s authorship of ‘Death bee not proude’ and that poem’s intertextual relationships with *BoulRec* and *BoulNar*, this letter also recalls a long-established convention for Donne sending ‘one to another, to the best lady’, via this friend. Goodere’s importance as a contemporary scribe and disseminator of literary texts has been well-recognised in recent years, as has his role as a conduit through which Donne’s literary courtship of Lady Bedford (with whom Goodere had longstanding family ties) played out.⁶⁴ B11, a composite folio of manuscript ‘separates’ bound and arranged in the nineteenth century, is the ‘principal repository of Conway Papers literature’, a largely scattered archive containing a large number of manuscript poems sent and written by Goodere, and evidencing an established tradition of literary manuscript circulation between Goodere and the first Viscount (Edward) Conway.⁶⁵ This folio contains the only known witness for Goodere’s

⁶³ *Letters*, pp. 116–17.

⁶⁴ See Part 2 of Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers* (pp. 171–307). Crawford discusses the above letter, and the poetic exchange to which it relates, in *Mediatrix*, pp. 144–45. On Goodere’s family ties with Lady Bedford, see Lawson, *Out of the Shadows*, p. 69; Dennis Flynn, M. Thomas Hester and Margaret Maurer, ‘Goodere at Court, 1603–1610: The Early Jacobean Decline of a Catholic Sympathiser and its Bearing on Donne’s Letters’, *JDJ*, 31 (2012), 61–98 (pp. 75–82).

⁶⁵ Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 165–66, 261–63.

elegy on Lady Markham, in his own hand. As noted above, it also contains, from an unknown source, Beaumont's Markham and Rutland elegies, which were probably sent to Conway, as a pair, sometime after Rutland's death in August 1612.⁶⁶ The same two elegies appear, in the same order, in C2, shortly after *Mark, BoulRec* and Donne's 'Obsequyes vpon the Lord Harrington the last that dyed' (*Har*), a further commemorative poem Donne later wrote for Lady Bedford, in 1614. Furthermore, as Daniel Starza Smith notes, Goodere's apparent proximity to Beaumont's elegy is suggested by the presence of a poem by him alongside it in the Bright collection (Digby MSS), which may also indicate 'a Conway Papers connection' in that material.⁶⁷

One possible exception to the rule that Donne's elegies were, initially at least, kept separate from others' is his first elegy for Bulstrode, which might have been included with those collected by Garrard. Donne's letter of 14 August to Goodere, written a mere ten days after her death, and enclosing a response to a response to an elegy he had already written (for which time must have passed), strongly suggests that Donne, like others, wrote his initial elegy for Bulstrode – probably *BoulNar* – very shortly after she died. As the following section of this chapter will show, *BoulNar* undoubtedly interacts with the tributes of others, particularly that of Herbert. However, while this evidence makes some association between Donne's elegy and 'the greater wits' highly plausible, the question of whether it was initially included among them is nonetheless complicated by his probably contemporaneous letter to Garrard (describing Roe's grief), in which he responds, presumably, to the same request Garrard sent to Jonson:

I have done nothing of that kinde as your Letter intimates, in the memory of that good Gentlewoman; if I had, I should not finde any better use of it, then to put it into your hands. You teach me what I owe her memory; and if I pay that debt so, you have a

⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 315, 318.

⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 210–12.

part and interest in it, by doing me the honour of remembering it: and therefore it must come quickly to you.⁶⁸

Donne denies having yet written an elegy, but promises that any such poem he does write ‘must come quickly to you’. While it is clear that his second elegy on Bulstrode, answering Lady Bedford’s, was sent via Goodere, the explanatory and indefinite manner in which Donne refers to it (‘I send you one to another, to the best Lady, who did me the honour to acknowledge the receipt of *one of mine*, by one of hers’) implies that he had not sent his first by the same means. Either Donne ultimately did follow through on his promise to Garrard, very shortly after making it, or he found some other way of delivering his first Bulstrode elegy to Lady Bedford. In either case, it is clear that his preferred channel for sending the second, more intimate poem, was Goodere. Further exploring the relationships between these elegies, and situating Donne’s *BoulRec* within them, the following section considers the central theme of gender within commemorations written for both Bulstrode and Lady Markham as a whole.

Gender, Identity and Audience

Affixed to the chancel wall in a dark corner of the Church of St Mary the Virgin, Twickenham, is a further commemorative tribute, possibly the first to have been written in the summer of 1609. This is a large Latin epitaph for Lady Markham, finely carved onto a plain black stone tablet. Almost entirely overlooked in studies of the poems discussed in this chapter,⁶⁹ it is, however, reproduced and translated in Anthony Beckles Willson’s 2015 book

⁶⁸ *Letters*, p. 39. Italics mine.

⁶⁹ Lawson (*Out of the Shadows*, pp. 201) and Summers (‘Donne’s 1609 Sequence’, p. 216) provide cursory glosses on the epitaph, though neither offers any substantive analysis of it.

on the church's monuments.⁷⁰ The text itself, though well preserved, is relatively difficult to make out without the help of a stepladder and torch:⁷¹

BRIGIDÆ
LECTISSIMÆ PIISIMÆ, INNOCENTISSIMÆ.
FÆMINÆ TAMEN
HOC AUTEM UNO, QUO SEXUS DIGNIOR SEXUM FASSÆ
QUOD MATER FUIT, CÆTERA VIRI:
QUÆ GENERI SUO
QUO JACOB: HARRINGTONI, EQ: AV: JO: BARONIS
DE EXTON FRAT. FILIA FUIT:
ITAQ: INCLITÆ LUCIÆ COMITÆ DE BEDFO:
SANGUINE, (QUOD SATIS) SED & AMICITIA PROPINQUISSIMA
QUANTUM ACCEPIT, ADDIDIT SPLENDORIS.
ET
SER^{IMÆ} ANNÆ MAG: BRIT: REG: DAN: REG. F:
CUI AB INTERIORI CAMERA ACCEPTISS^Æ
QUÆQUE LITIGANTIB. IN ILLA DE SUPERIORITATE SINGULIS VERTUTIB:
AD SUMMUM DEI TRIBUNAL UT LIS, DIRIMERITUR,
PROVOCAVIT
MIGRAVIT
MATURAVIT
ANTE IN DEFUNCTO MARITO ANTO: MARKHAM, EQ: AV. SEMI-MORTUÆ
ADHUC IN EJUS LIBERIS IO: ROB: HENR: FRANC^A: SEMI-SUPERSTITIS,
DEPOSITUM HIC SERVARE VOLUERE
AMICI EJUS MÆSTISS: S ECESSIT 4° MAI A° SALUTIS SUÆ 1609, ÆTAT 30°

As Willson notes,

The style invites speculation: who composed the Latin? Translation, perhaps attempted [in Willson's book] for the first time since 1609, has presented difficulties, and may only be an approximation to the original text, possibly drafted in English. It is likely that Lucy helped to compose the text, seeking help with the Latin. She could have provided the biographical details, leaving another to include the tribute to herself as First Lady of the Bedchamber to the queen. As one of her admiring protégés, John Donne is, surely, a candidate as the author.

Willson is correct in doubting the accuracy of his translation, almost certainly correct in identifying Lady Bedford as a key influence behind the Latin, and possibly correct in questioning her ability to write it. While John Florio's dedication to Lady Bedford in his 1598 Italian-English dictionary, *The Worlde of Wordes*, describes her 'conceited industrie, or

⁷⁰ Anthony Beckles Willson, *The Church of St Mary the Virgin Twickenham, The Memorials and Ledgerstones* (St Mary's Church, Twickenham, 2015), pp. 23–24.

⁷¹ I would like to thank Diana Wells, Archivist at The Twickenham Museum (across the road from St Mary's) for taking the time to show me the church and its archives.

industrious conceite, in Italian as in French, in French as in Spanish, in all as in English’, her ability as a Latinist is not mentioned.⁷² The question of Donne’s authorship – or partial authorship – is, however, beyond the immediate scope of this chapter. Only one of the identifying characteristics with which John Sparrow attributes to Donne Sir Robert Drury’s 1615 epitaph (*EtRD*) is in evidence here (the use of ‘the unusual “secessit”’, which also occurs in the epitaphs for Elizabeth Drury (*EtED*) and Anne Donne (*EtAD*)), and none of the most persuasive (such as the phrase ‘anno aetatis [...] et sui Jesu [...]’, which ‘is tantamount to a signature’ in epitaphs by him).⁷³ As will be seen, however, Donne was very close to Lady Bedford’s household at this time; and his elegy for Lady Markham (*Mark*) echoes some of the key arguments and emphases of her epitaph. Willson’s final suggestion should not, therefore, be entirely discounted.

But even without knowing who wrote the actual words of Lady Markham’s epitaph, as I hope to show in this section, those words represent an overlooked and important part of the commemorative discourse that emerged in response to the deaths of Lady Markham and Cecilia Bulstrode in 1609, witnessing to the central and interrelated issues of gender and homo/heterosocial community within that discourse, and calling into question the commemorative and authorial conventions sustained and explored by them. Beginning with the epitaph, this section surveys and contextualises the full range of commemorative elegies written for Markham and Bulstrode, highlighting their allusive and contestatory features, and suggesting some possible objectives and insinuations behind them.

The epitaph’s complex negotiation of gender derives predominantly through its representation of marriage.⁷⁴ While the fact of Bridget’s marriage to Anthony Markham is

⁷² John Florio, *A Worlde of wordes, or Most copious, and exact dictionarie in Italian and English* (1598), sig. A2^v.

⁷³ John Sparrow, ‘Two Epitaphs by John Donne’, *TLS*, 208 (1949).

⁷⁴ Given that Willson’s translation of the epitaph contains some major errors, I do not quote it from it here, instead describing just some of its key features with direct reference to the Latin text. My thanks to P. Ruth Taylor-Briggs for her help with this.

introduced shortly after her name (as was conventional in contemporary epitaphs for women), this pronouncement is both redacted – Anthony remaining nameless – and couched within an explicit distinction between her exclusive virtue as a woman/mother and the more general virtues she shared with him, expressed through an inbuilt contrast between ‘HOC [...] UNO’ (‘in this one respect’) and ‘CÆTERA’ (‘in all other respects’) (3–6). Having glossed the marriage in this way, the epitaph proceeds to explore its significance predominantly insofar as it facilitated feminised bonds of family and friendship – details of which follow in an expansive sweep of superlative affiliations (9–14). Anthony is simultaneously centralised and marginalised: when, in the epitaph’s twentieth line, his name and rank are finally given, these details are presented without embellishment, and balanced by a further acknowledgement that, though Lady Markham mourned his death (‘Half dying by the death before her of her husband’ (20)), his provision of her motherhood and offspring (in whom she is ‘Still half surviving’ (21)) sustained her afterwards as an independent woman.

Thus, whilst satisfying the generic expectations of contemporary epitaphs about women, which tend to focus on their subjects’ fulfilment of primary socio-cultural roles such as motherhood and chastity, the first and last sections (1–8 and 16–23) of Lady Markham’s epitaph nonetheless insist upon her agency and individuality. Moreover, the royally-affiliated circle of ladies (‘INTERIORI CAMERA’/‘inner chamber’) with whom she became associated through Lady Bedford (who became something of a guardian to Lady Markham and her children after Anthony’s death) occupies the structural and thematic centre of the epitaph (lines 9–14), typically reserved for the definitive, active part of the life represented.⁷⁵ The emphatic manner in which this central alliance is qualified betrays a degree of self-reflexivity: ‘SANGUINE, (QUOD SATIS) SED & AMICITIA PROPINQUISSIMA’/‘to whom she was very closely related by blood (which is enough), but also by friendship’.

⁷⁵ On these circumstances, see Lawson, *Out of the Shadows*, pp. 78–82.

Widowhood was a culturally and legally precarious status in early modern England, simultaneously threatened and threatening. Widows' deaths, and the deaths that created them, could bring these tensions to a pitch, precipitating sometimes protracted legal disputes – as in the case of Alice (Spenser) Egerton, Countess of Derby – among other forms of conflict. There are some obvious reasons for this cultural anxiety. Widows accessed the public, masculinised arenas of legacy, policy and wealth management without necessitating male oversight. At the same time (and as a consequence), widowhood was a stock trope through which male elegists characterised poetic inspiration in negotiations of literary inheritance, in often physical terms: exposing themselves to a laureate's 'phallic dominance', as Andrea Brady has shown, elegists expressed misogynistic violence 'against women, whose creativity (literary and biological) is prohibited or subjected to the Muses of feminised Poetry, and against male elegists themselves'.⁷⁶

Markham's widowhood and homosocial ties are the salient characteristics of her posthumous biography. They are referred to, for instance, in the Twickenham parish register, which describes her as 'The Ladie Bridgit Markame widdow who dyed in y^e Ladie of Bedfords house in y^e parke'.⁷⁷ In this context, it seems reasonable to suppose that the ostentatious misogyny of Beaumont's 'Elegy on the Lady Markham', centred, as it is, on an imagination of Markham's inanimate physical body, betrays something of the masculinised elegiac trope of restraining feminine/widowed, agency. At the same time, Beaumont's elegy clearly evokes and exaggerates coterie associations recognisable to the kind of broader and predominantly male readership apparently described in Jonson's 'Epigram on the Court Pucelle' – traces of which can be found in a variety of manuscript poems and adaptations of Beaumont's elegy itself. Another poem exploring the depiction of women's foreheads as

⁷⁶ Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, pp. 165–66. On widowhood in particular, see pp. 172–73.

⁷⁷ London Metropolitan Archives, DRO/174/A/01/003, fol. 37^r. Cecilia Bulstrode's entry, just below, refers to her as 'M^{rs} Boulstred out of the parke'.

epitaphic writing surfaces, for instance, appears in B31, HH5, EU3, and LR2.⁷⁸ This is almost certainly by Nicholas Hare, one of Bulstrode's elegists, whose initials are included with it in LR2, EU3 and possibly B31:⁷⁹

If each mans fault were in his forehead writt,
 Lines only would be read, and books reiected;
 Nor hatt, nor hooode, nor crowne would easie sitt,
 And lowest foreheads would be most affected;
 The holy hermite would be apprehended
 In crimes unthought of till wee read them there,
 Reputed virgins would, thirteene once ended,
 In colour full of guiltines appeare;
 Nor I my selfe, that should my selfe knowe best
 Nor thou, deare Mistress, should bee then exempted;
 We should be both in many tongues profest,
 Thou for thie yeildinge, I for having tempted:
 Bee not discourag'd. I no reason see
 Thou shoulds't for my sake any falte avowe;
 Let mee stand censurd, and thou censure free,
 Thy falts bee written on thie husbands browe.⁸⁰

Beginning with a generalised overview of 'mans' hypocrisies and corruptions, these lines fasten on the misogynistic trope of feminine inconstancy in a second person address to the poet's 'deare Mistriss'. But this speaker-participant, 'having tempted' the illicit deed his logical corollary identifies as a general sin, offers a conspiratorial, Christ-like resistance to the public guilt he acknowledges as its typical consequence. In a similar way, an extra couplet inserted near the end of Beaumont's elegy in C2 combines the ideas of bodily epitaphic writing with Christian redemption, but insists upon the atoned identity revealed by that textual self: 'That done, vpon her bosome make yor feast, | Where, in a Crosse, graue Jesis on her brist.'⁸¹ In LR2 a more ambiguous couplet is added directly below Beaumont's elegy, in a different hand, which reiterates and universalises his closing lines whilst

⁷⁸ Fols 253, 99^{r-v}, 111^r, and p. 29, respectively.

⁷⁹ *UFLI* notes that the copy in B31 also contains these initials. On Nicholas Hare's authorship of this poem and 'Here do repose', see John Carey, 'The Poems of Nicholas Hare', *RES*, 11 (1960), 365–83 (pp. 366–67).

⁸⁰ This transcription (based on HH5, the 'most authoritative text') is included in Carey, 'The Poems of Nicholas Hare', p. 374.

⁸¹ C2, fol. 84^v.

venerating those ‘rare’ women in whom beauty and chastity cohere. This is given the title ‘Beautyes Epitaph’: ‘On Beauties browe is this Inscription plac’t. | ‘Tis rare to finde a person faire, and Chaste.’⁸² In reading and adapting Beaumont’s ‘Elegy on the Lady Markham’, then, contemporaries negotiated the public identity of the feminine elegiac subject – both particular and generalised – within a broader negotiation of wit and decorum, concealment and disclosure. In different ways, all three remaining elegists of Markham likewise engage with these central themes of femininity, widowhood and homo/heterosocial friendship. One of these is an anonymous poem that survives in three manuscript copies (B30, O30 and HH5), two of which (B30 and O30) title it ‘An Epitaph vppon the Ladye Markham’:

A mayde, a wiefe, shee liu’d, a wydowe, dyed,
her virtue through all womans state was varied,
the wydowe, bodye, wch this vayle doth hide
keepe in, expecting to be highlie marryed,
when that great bridegroom from the clouds shall call
and ioyned, each to his owne, himself to all /⁸³

The subject of widowhood provides a basic conceptual platform for the pair of contrasted conceits on which this poem is based, exploring what Jesse Lander calls the ‘conventional triad of maid, wife, and widow’.⁸⁴ These changing ‘states’ of womankind (throughout which, the poet claims, Markham has exemplified feminine inconstancy) are made analogous to the more general spiritual ‘states’ of man, through which she is saved.⁸⁵ This poem’s governing conceit, therefore, is its reconfiguring of death as a kind of widowhood separating the body from the soul: the body, hidden behind ‘this vayle’, awaits the return of Christ (its ‘great bridegroom’) and its consequent resurrection.

⁸² LR2, p. 77.

⁸³ I quote here from B30, fol. 252^r. This text is very similar to that of O30, fol. 30^r, which is likely to derive from it. The poem is included on fol. 10^r in HH5.

⁸⁴ Jesse Lander, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 170–71.

⁸⁵ HH5 reads ‘states’ in line two, which I use here merely for clarity.

Donne and Goodere, on the other hand, engage with these themes very differently. In his formal elegy for Lady Markham (*Mark*), Donne very clearly attempts to assert the same emphases as Lady Markham's epitaph, distancing his speaker from any expectation either to endorse or refute gendered or misogynistic tropes. He argues, rather, that Lady Markham's life demonstrates the validity of heterosocial friendship on its own terms, thereby removing any such imperative to account for her (or womens') 'titles' and/or gender in elegiac verse:

How fit for vs, how euen, and how sweet
 Howe good in all her titles, and howe meet
 To haue reform'd this forward heresie,
That women can noe parts of friendship bee. (55–58)

This closely reflects the opening lines of Donne's contemporaneous elegiac verse letter *BedfShe*, which, as Summers notes, develops 'the familiar paradox of two-in-one, especially the Platonic idea of the inseparability of friends, the "one soul in bodies twain" topos':⁸⁶

You that are she and you, that's double shee,
 In her dead face, halfe of your selfe shall see;
 Shee was the other part, for so they doe
 Which build them friendships, become one of two;
 So two, that but themselves no third can fit,
 Which were to be so, when they were not yet;
 Twinnes, though their birth Cusco, and Musco take,
 As diuers stares one Constellation make;
 Pair'd like two eyes, have equall motion, so
 Had you dy'd first, a carcasse she had beene;
 And wee your rich Tombe in her face had seene; (1–11)

Nonetheless, traces of that broader elegiac discourse are perceptible in Donne's verse. They are suggested, for instance, in the speaker's punning conflation of Markham's physical, feminised beauty with her spiritual status of 'Grace' as a regenerate Christian – the latter (also) emphatically stated in her epitaph ('PROVOCAVIT | MIGRAVIT | MATURAVIT'):

Nor doe they die which are not loath to dye,
 Soe shee hath this and that Virginitie.
 Grace was in her extreemly diligent,
 That kept her from sinn, yet made her repent: (37–40)

⁸⁶ Summers, 'Donne's 1609 Sequence', p. 217. Lawson (*Out of the Shadows*, p. 102) notes that Lady Bedford suffered an illness in June 1609 (between the deaths of Lady Markham and Bulstrode), suggesting that Donne may have written *BedfShe*, at least partially, as a response to it.

As Robbins notes, the application of ‘Virginitie’ to carnal (‘that’) and spiritual (‘this’) ‘death’ draws on the trope of “chaste widowhood” after sin has died in her⁸⁷ – the adoption and interpretation of which suggests some level of engagement and familiarity with the materials and themes that otherwise circulated in response to Lady Markham’s death.

Donne’s awareness of Beaumont et al. is made a near certainty by one further analogous poem with which Donne was almost certainly familiar, and which undoubtedly also engages with Beaumont’s elegy. At ninety lines, Goodere’s elegy for Lady Markham is by far the longest of any written either for her or Bulstrode. Its strategy, closely aligned with that of *Mark*, is conspicuously opposed to that of Beaumont.⁸⁸ In particular, the following lines read as a direct refutation of Beaumont’s elegy, comparable with Donne’s description of Markham’s body:

What shee is now and where the best can tell
that knew her goodnes and did love it most
The worst might guesse, and bee reclaym’d from hell;
had they but seene that parting of her ghost
Death could not once deforme her countenance,
but shee made ghastly death looke lovely sweete
Over our bodyes what predominance
have blest soules when wth heavnly joyes they meete? (47–54)⁸⁹

Distinguishing between ‘the best [...] that knew her goodnes and did love it most’, and ‘The worst’, who speculate on ‘What shee is now’, physically or spiritually, Goodere establishes a commemorative factionalism that informs the entirety of this poem, and which, along with aspects of its imagery and argument (as well as its length), suggests a significant level of collaboration – or perhaps even co-authorship – with Donne. Goodere’s descriptions of Markham’s ‘high ascent’ to heaven, which the speaker resolves not to lament, but to contemplate (14), is highly characteristic of Donne’s *Anniversaries*, both in making the

⁸⁷ Robbins, *Poems*, p. 742.

⁸⁸ By way of comparison, *Mark* runs to 62 lines, and *BedfShe* 44.

⁸⁹ The text of B11 is transcribed by Daniel Starza Smith in ‘The Poems of Sir Henry Goodere: A Diplomatic Edition’, *JDJ*, 31 (2012), 99–164 (pp. 108–111).

liminal, transitional soul an object of study and in describing its progress towards Heaven in conflated astrological-soteriological terms (famously adapted in Donne's exploration of the 'new Philosophy' in *FirAn* (205)). Moreover, the poem's central claim that, in her present state, Markham represents a Pauline 'glass' (I Corinthians 13. 12), through which elegist and reader may discern her 'Grace', strongly resembles Donne's later commemoration of Sir John Harington (*Har*). The relevant lines from Goodere are these:

And as her happines is now at full
 So to contemplate all perfections there,
 So ours is to contemplate such a soule
 through w^{ch} as glasse his Gloryes beames appeare.
 But to distinguish collours there must runne
 together light, cleere sight, & fitting space.
 And to descerne good soules; Grace is the sunne
 The Eye a pure mind, frendshipp th' aptest place.
 And in this distance (deere) I doe beholde
 Wth purity (w^{ch} thy hart taught to myne)
 by cleare beames of that Grace w^{ch} thyne doth holde,
 How brightly thy soule in yt Grace dothe shine.
 W^{ch} gracious Providence did hence exhale,
 knowing that after her our hartes would goe.
 So to rayse vp our thoughtes from this low vale,
 to Heav'n the fountaine whence true bewtyes flow. (67–82)

Though long in the habit of conveying Donne's poems to Lady Bedford, Goodere was himself an often clumsy courtier and poet, and is known to have suffered a fall from her favour at some point in 1608.⁹⁰ Undoubtedly, his elegy, in collaboration with Donne's, seeks to assert and establish personal intimacy with her household, claiming, through its central argument, that true perception of Markham's virtue and election depends on 'cleere sight, & fitting space'. While Goodere's articulation of that intimacy verges, at intervals, on the amorous, exploring a twofold response to Markham's death that the poem's first line ('My love and greefe are ev'nly great and true') establishes, and describing Markham as 'my belov'd' (63), 'deere' (75), and in terms of personal adoration (45)), this is, however, also

⁹⁰ Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, p. 204.

explicitly clarified as the affection of ‘frendshipp’ – ‘th’aptest place’ to discern the ‘grace’ of the deceased. As in *Mark*, a pun on ‘grace’ is possible here.

The elegies for Lady Markham thus demonstrate how satirical and laudatory epideictic and commemorative verse could draw simultaneously on broadly applicable tropes and rhetorical conventions; loosely biographical conceits; and specific, metapoetical dynamics. One further and important consideration, however, is authorial identity. Beaumont was, like Jonson, part of an emergent class of professional poet-playwrights somewhat distinct from the authorial model of the ‘courtly literary suitor’ Donne sought to exemplify (otherwise pursuing ‘a graver course, then of a Poet’).⁹¹ The Jonsonian writer occupied a nascent and somewhat precarious cultural space often peripheral to the traditional centres of gentlemanly literary sociability that existed in the early seventeenth century. As O’Callaghan notes, Jonson himself exemplified the ‘buffoon or *scurra* figure’, ‘the professional dinner guest who socialises with the elite, but is not of their class’.⁹² In the later 1609 elegies for Cecilia Bulstrode – which, as we have seen, were mostly gathered by George Garrard – the issue of authorial identity weighs heavily, interwoven with each of the other elements identified above.

Explicating his own ‘Epitaph’ on Cecilia Bulstrode in his letter to Garrard, for instance, Jonson betrays the centrality of his authorial identity to the act of composing a commemorative verse among other poets: ‘If it be well (as I think it is, for my invention hath not cooled so much to judge) show it, though the greater wits have gone before. It hath somewhat in it *moris antique*, and suggesting the suddenness of it may pass.’ His emphasis on the classical legacy and lineage on which his tribute draws, bound up, as it is, with his broader self-fashioning as England’s paradigmatic classical poet-scholar, illustrates the

⁹¹ The term ‘courtly literary suitor’ is borrowed from Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, repr. ed. (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1986), p. 202. Donne describes his aim, professionally, to take ‘a graver course, then of a Poet’ in a letter to Goodere. See *Letters*, p. 103.

⁹² O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, pp. 53–54.

imperative to self-definition in coterie poetic commemorations of this kind. The poem itself is as follows:

Stay, view this stone; and, if thou beest not such,
Read here a little, that thou mayst know much.
It covers, first, a virgin; and then one
That durst be that in court: a virtue alone
To fill an epitaph. But she had more:
She might have claimed t' have the Graces four,
Taught Pallas language, Cynthia modesty,
As fit to have increased the harmony
Of spheres, as light of stars. She was earth's eye,
The sole religious house and votary,
With rites not bound, but conscience. Wouldst thou all?
She was 'Sell Bulstrode. In which name I call
Up so much truth, as, could I it pursue,
Might make the fable of good women true.⁹³

Jonson deploys a conventional epitaphic form to subtly probe the compromised question of Bulstrode's virginity about which he previously wrote in his 'Epigram on the Court Pucelle'. Following a commonplace 'topos of the speaking stone', appealing to the *viatores*, or wayfarers, who might otherwise pass by the imagined site of Bulstrode's tomb, the speaker comes quickly to this central issue.⁹⁴ In a manner comparable to Hare's 'If each mans fault', he states the impossibility of maintaining such a reputation 'in court'. However, in arguing that Bulstrode possessed praiseworthy qualities beyond this 'virtue' of virginity (itself sufficient 'To fill an epitaph'), Jonson's poem couches that central focus in a cursory and conventionally hyperbolic catalogue of Bulstrode's other virtues, universalised in the stock register of classical, Jonsonian, allusion. The poem's central claim may therefore be somewhat ironic: arguing against a myopic focus on virginity and feminine honour, the poet concentrates his reader's attention on just that issue – to the extent that one manuscript scribe (that of O3) felt compelled to title the poem 'Vppon A Virgine w^{ch} Liued and died att Courte'.⁹⁵ Framing praise within the language of exceptionalism, notably in its final line,

⁹³ Jonson, 'Letter 11', pp. 370–71.

⁹⁴ Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph*, pp. 115–16.

⁹⁵ O3, p. 187.

Jonson's 'Epitaph' also reaffirms the misogynistic prejudice whose efficacy it denies in a single instance. This, too, might account for the poem's circulation alongside bawdy and satirical epitaphs, and Beaumont's elegy, in B23, an early seventeenth-century quarto miscellany, mostly written in a single hand.⁹⁶

In O30, a professionally-produced folio verse miscellany containing a large number of 1609 elegies, Jonson's poem is followed by 'Another [by] Sir Edw: Harbert'.⁹⁷ This poem, otherwise present in four manuscript sources, figures 'Death' as a masculine threat to Bulstrode's feminine virtue. Its apostrophising of a grotesquely personified death strongly resembles the cluster of texts that (probably) make up the initial part of Donne and Lady Bedford's elegiac dialogue: *BoulRec*, Lady Bedford's 'Death bee not proude', and *HSDeath*, in which death is described as 'Mighty and dreadfull' (2). Interweaving tetrametric, dimetric and pentametric lines, Herbert's elegy shifts gradually from a lively to a solemn, declamatory tone:

MEthinks Death like one laughing lyes,
Shewing his teeth, shutting his eys,
Only thus to have found her here
He did with so much reason fear,
And she despise.

For barring all the gates of sin,
Death's open wayes to enter in,
She was with a strict siege beset,
To what by force he could not get,
By time to win.

This mighty Warrior was deceived yet,
For what he, muting, in her powers, thought
Was but their zeal,
And what by their excess might have been wrought,
Her fasts did heal.

Till that her noble soul, by these, as wings,
Transcending the low pitch of earthly things,
As b'ing reliev'd by God, and set at large,
And grown by this worthy a higher charge,

⁹⁶ B23, fols 33^r–35^v. On this manuscript, see Eckhardt, *Manuscript Verse Collectors*, pp. 237–39.

⁹⁷ O30, fol. 36^v.

Triumphing over Death, to Heaven fled,
And did not dye, but left her body dead.⁹⁸

Figured as a physically threatening man, death's inauspicious besiegement of Bulstrode can again be read both as a spiritual battle for salvation and in the physical terms of sexual assault. Having withstood Death's corporeal advances, Bulstrode overcomes him by 'b'ing reliev'd by God, and set at large', moving beyond his merely physical reach by rendering her soul disembodied, her body unkillable. This emphasis is also identical to that of the final non-Donnean elegy written for her – that of Hare:

Here do repose, but in lamented waste,
And figure out the sisters needlesse hast
Those limbs, which, had heauen timelie glorified
Butt like the spiritt they owd, had neuer died;
Here lies the least of her whose noblest parts
Obtaine a tombe within our broken hearts.⁹⁹

The third stanza of Herbert's elegy likewise engages with the further issue of religious identity that forms, as Summers has shown, a central point of contention in Donne's elegiac disputation with Lady Bedford. Describing Death's mistaken belief that Bulstrode's virtue was animated merely by 'zeal', Herbert registers an unmistakeable critique of her and Lady Bedford's militant religion, checking this with the caveat that any such predisposition was tempered by Bulstrode's observance of godly 'fasts'. Likewise accusing Death of a misstep, Donne's *BoulRec* raises this same point, layering censures of the sins Bulstrode and others might have committed had she lived – ambition, 'superstition', 'proud delight', slander – into an dense series of qualifications and observations:

Thou shoulst haue staid and taken better hold,
Shortly ambitious, Couetous, when old
Shee might haue prou'de; And such deuotion
Might one haue stray'd to superstition
If all her virtues must haue growne, yet might

⁹⁸ *The Poems, English & Latin, of Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), pp. 20–21. This edition's text is identical, bar a missing 'g' from 'Muting' in line twelve, to that of the posthumous *Occasional verses of Edward Lord Herbert, Baron of Cherbery and Castle-Island deceased in August, 1648* (1665), pp. 20–21.

⁹⁹ Carey. 'The Poems of Nicholas Hare', p. 375. This copy-text, once again, is taken from HH5.

Abundant virtue'haue bred a proud delight,
 Had shee perseuer'd Iust, there would haue growne
 Some that would sinn, misthinking shee did sinn
 Such as would call her Friendshipp Loue, and faine
 To sociableness a name prophane,
 Or sin by tempting, or not dareing that
 By wishing, though they neuer told her what.
 Thus might'st thou haue slayne more soules, hadst thou not crost
 Thy self; and to triumph, thy army lost.
 Yet though these ways bee lost, thou hast left one
 Which is, immoderate grief that shee is gone.
 But wee may scape that sin, yet weepe asmuch,
 Our teares are due because wee are not such.
 Some teares that knott of friends her death must cost,
 Because the Chaine is broke, though noe linke lost. (55–74)

Donne's somewhat thin justification for the single, pervasive sin Death has managed to provoke within Lady Bedford's 'knott of friends' – 'immoderate grief' – recalls the complaint of *Sorrow* ('What ease, can hope that we shall see him, beget, | When we must dy first, and cannot dy yet? (21–22)) discussed in the previous chapter: 'Our teares are due because wee are not such [dead].' Perhaps like Jonson, then, Donne's lines rehearse a relatively banal argument that serves to draw attention towards an implicit censure of his subject, whilst simultaneously critiquing the readiness of poets such as Jonson to give 'to sociableness a name prophane'.

Such subtle insinuations become increasingly perceptible when these poems, like those of Donne and Lady Bedford, are read collectively. Reinforcing the likelihood that both Donne and Herbert's elegies were among those of the 'greater wits' collected by Garrard, their deep similarities also suggest how elegies thus solicited were often products of a peer-reviewed and self-conscious composition process. Furthermore, along with the other comparative readings of elegies for Bulstrode presented in this subchapter, this evidence not only reaffirms the received sequencing of Donne's elegies for her (*BoulRec* being the first), but raises the intriguing possibility that Lady Bedford, in responding to *BoulRec*, was responding also to broader discursive elements within the anthology of poems presented to

her. Reading their overlapping commentaries and arguments, she was compelled to respond to just one, drawing Donne away from the public, performative and conventionally male-dominated arena of the elegiac coterie, and back into the intimate patronage relationship within which he also sought to operate.

‘your style and old fashion of the Court towards me’: Donne as Courtly Elegist

In a letter to Goodere, written, probably, in early August 1609, Donne voices his concern for Cecilia Bulstrode, predicting her imminent death:

I fear earnestly that Mistresse *Bolstrod* will not escape that sicknesse in which she labours at this time. I send this morning to aske of her passage of this night; and the return is that she is as I left her yesternight [...] the History of her sicknesse, makes me justly fear that she will scarce last so long, as that you when you receive this letter.¹⁰⁰

This brief passage reveals a good deal about Donne’s position within Lady Bedford’s household ‘at this time’, combining something of a pastoral function with the uniquely profiled laureateship evident in his elegies and other poems for her. The easy tone of references to his recent visitation of Bulstrode’s sickbed, ‘the History of her sicknesse’ (details of which are not considered necessary for inclusion), and quickfire correspondence with Twickenham Park gives a clear impression of habitual action.¹⁰¹ Having first brought Donne to Lady Bedford’s attention, and continually facilitated his correspondence with her (probably from the beginning of 1608), Goodere is here the recipient of a Twickenham Park bulletin comprised entirely of Donne’s insights and observations.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ *Letters*, pp. 215–16.

¹⁰¹ Marotti suggests (*Coterie Poet*, p. 222) that ‘The Fever’ (*Fever*) might have been written about Bulstrode’s illness.

¹⁰² As Smith notes (*John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 203–04), the forthcoming scholarly edition of Donne’s letters will argue that Donne’s first letter to Lady Bedford is that beginning ‘Madam, Amongst many other dignities’, and was probably sent as a new year’s gift in early 1608. Lawson (*Out of the Shadows*, p. 72), suggests that it might have been Lucy’s younger brother, Sir John Harington, who enabled Donne’s first ‘direct contact’ with her, in April 1606.

As Julie Crawford has shown, extant correspondence from Donne to Goodere relating to Lady Bedford commonly exhibits a ‘triangulation’ of indirect communications between Donne and her, suggesting that he often actively intended for Goodere to reveal or otherwise relay his words and sentiments to her.¹⁰³ Donne’s euphemistic flattery (of ‘another, [...] the best Lady, who did me the honour to acknowledge the receipt of one of mine, by one of hers; and who only hath power to cast the fetters of verse upon my free meditations’) in his letter of 14 August indicates that he probably had such intentions for it, and thereby wanted to inform Lady Bedford that his enclosed elegy was ‘the last which you shall see of this kinde from me’ more firmly than could have been possible via direct address. What is more, Donne’s letters and indirect messages to Lady Bedford reveal that his correspondence and relationship with her was powerfully inflected by theological and political concerns. She may, for instance, have discussed and read early drafts of his earliest significant printed work, *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610), which argues that English Catholics should take the Oath of Allegiance to King James. Set against this context, Crawford suggests that ‘Donne and Bedford’s poems on Bulstrode’s death serve as the best index of the religiously and politically charged nature of [their] exchange.’¹⁰⁴

Building on these observations, the final part of this chapter explores the interrelated significance of gender to this commemorative exchange, and to Donne’s conception of his role as an elegist within it and the two years that followed. Reconsidering his more private elegiac correspondence with Lady Bedford as a subsection to the wider context described above – alongside part of which, as I have shown, *BoulRec* was probably delivered to her – it argues that Lady Bedford’s intervention represents a challenge not merely to the religio-political terms of Donne’s elegy, but also the gendered literary terms and identities it exemplifies, which ‘Death bee not proude’ appears to elide and overwrite in its first four

¹⁰³ Crawford, *Mediatrice*, pp. 139–40.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 146–47.

words. Contextualizing this further, the chapter concludes by considering the new patronage relationship Donne pursued with the Drury family from around the end of the following year, similarly adopting something of the culturally ambiguous role of a household chaplain, friend and laureate.¹⁰⁵ As I hope to show, reading Donne's *Anniversaries* (1611/12) alongside his remarks about their early reception provides a key analogue for his earlier commemorative poems for Lady Bedford, suggesting how the intimate poetic strategies that he, like Goodere, worked to establish in them were ultimately contradicted and undermined by the kinds of opportunistic masculine self-definition with which 'Death bee not proude' obliquely takes issue. Publishing the *Anniversaries* to commemorate a fourteen-year-old girl he had never met, Donne soon demonstrated the validity of Beaumont's ostensible critique of the opportunistic male elegist who 'never saw thy face'.

'Death bee not proude' is generally considered to be a response to three particular aspects of *BoulRec*. The first, and perhaps most important, is its somewhat Catholic emphasis on the power of Death to insinuate itself 'twixt Iust men and Grace' (44), which might have offended or challenged Lady Bedford's Calvinist sensibilities.¹⁰⁶ The theological subject of 'Grace', Crawford notes, is a source of enduring debate between Donne and her in their poetic and epistolary correspondence, and is here evident both in her speaker's immediate insistence, addressing Death, that 'Sinne was her captiue whence thy power doth grow' (2), and later injunction to 'Goe then to people curst before they were' (21) – an explicit endorsement of double predestination, about which she knew Donne had some reservations.¹⁰⁷ Donne's bizarre arguments about Death's missed opportunities in taking

¹⁰⁵ On the ambiguous nature of chaplaincies, see Kenneth Fincham, 'The roles and influence of household chaplains, c.1600–c.1660', in *Chaplains in early modern England: Patronage, literature and religion*, ed. by Hugh Adlington, Tom Lockwood and Gillian Wright (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 11–35.

¹⁰⁶ See, for instance, Grierson, *Poems*, II, pp. 215, *cxliii–v*; Summers, 'Donne's 1609 Sequence', pp. 225–28.

¹⁰⁷ Crawford, *Mediatrice*, pp. 144–45. The H6 text of 'Death bee not proude' published in *Variorum*, VI, pp. 234–36, is that which I am citing.

Bulstrode so young – which, as noted above, resemble Herbert’s third stanza – represent a likely provocation on this point. Adding further weight to these arguments is the fact that, uniquely among Donne’s ‘Epicedes and Obsequies’, *BoulRec* appears to have been subject to some early, perhaps authorial, revisions to two lines in particular (arguing that Death is ‘reclaym’d of God’ (32) and that ‘Had shee perseuer’d’ to live in ‘Abundant virtue’, a consequent ‘proud delight’ might have caused others to fall into sin (61)) – both of which relate explicitly to these soteriological points of contention.¹⁰⁸

The second undoubtedly contentious feature of *BoulRec* is its somewhat rigorist critique of tears and outward mourning, which Donne’s speaker calls the ‘sin’ of ‘immoderate grief that shee is gone’ (70–71), before somewhat contradictorily asserting that ‘Some teares that knott of friends her death must cost, | Because the Chaine is broke, though noe linke lost’ (73–74). By contrast, Lady Bedford’s poem describes ‘these hot teares’ as ‘The mourning livery giuen by grace, not thee [Death] | Which wills our soules in these streames washd should bee’ (23–26). These assertions about Christian conduct in grief are also bound up in Lady Bedford’s third key – though implicit – assertion to Donne: the necessity of providing an unambiguously positive account of Bulstrode’s deathbed. She writes:

Blind were those eyes saw not how bright did shine
Through fleshs misty vale those beames divine
Deafe were the eares, not charmd with that sweete sound
Which did i’t spirits instructed voyce abound
Of flint the Conscience did not yeeld and melt
At what in her last Act it sawe and felt. (29–34)

As Summers notes, these lines suggest that Donne was either absent from Bulstrode’s actual death, despite having called on her not long before, or, having been there, had ‘failed to comprehend the lesson of her final repentance and contrition’ – an argument perhaps reflected in Donne’s use of the determiner ‘that’ in describing Lady Bedford’s ‘knott of

¹⁰⁸ *Variorum*, VI, pp. 131–32.

friends', which implies distance and separation.¹⁰⁹ Deathbeds in this period were an intensely scrutinised set piece in the lives of Christian subjects (particularly for those with puritan leanings), about whom polemical accounts were becoming increasingly common – whether witnessing to the exemplary conduct indicative of salvation or casting aspersions about it.¹¹⁰ Thus, drawing on a broader strain of confessional division, Lady Bedford's marked and exclusionary emphasis on a godly community of true witnesses strongly reaffirms the kinds of intertextual elegiac opposition critics have outlined. As Summers notes, Donne's obsequious emphasis upon the efficacy of Bulstrode's deathbed in *BoulNar* – 'which may be intended to expose the entire poem (and perhaps the Countess's as well) as an exercise in insincerity' – picks up this issue in his final poem:¹¹¹

Had'st thou stay'd there, and look'd out at her eyes,
All had ador'd thee that nowe from thee flyes.
For they let out more light, then they tooke in,
They told not when, but did the day begin (17–18)

Her body left with vs, least some had sed
Shee could not dye, except they sawe her dead' (53–54)

To date, however, no critic has much considered the significance of gender to this elegiac dialogue. Yet even without allusion to the wider, closely integrated groupings of elegies by male 'wits' to which it may respond, gender can provide a highly suggestive lens through which to read 'Death bee not proude'. As David Kennedy notes, scholarly accounts of 'female elegy' by feminist critics such as Melissa F. Zeiger and Celeste M. Schenck have long emphasised its focus on the provision of 'a place of exchange' and 'shared interiority' 'as opposed to individual [masculine] poetic achievement' and agonistic competition, a

¹⁰⁹ Summers, 'Donne's 1609 Sequence', p. 227.

¹¹⁰ My forthcoming article ('"Now the Lord hath made me a spectacle": Deathbed Narratives and Devotional Identities in the Early Seventeenth Century', in *People and Piety: Devotional Identities and Religious Writing in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Elizabeth Clarke and Robert W. Daniel (Manchester: Manchester University Press)) will consider this subject in more detail. For a recent account of the *ars moriendi* in England, see Peter Carlson, 'The Art and Craft of Dying', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern English Literature and Religion*, ed. by Andrew Hiscock and Helen Wilcox (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 634–49.

¹¹¹ Summers, 'Donne's 1609 Sequence', p. 229.

greater concern for ‘attachment than [masculine] separation’, and the derivation of consolation ‘more from recuperation than from [masculine] compensatory substitution’ – as exemplified, for instance, in the extraordinary precedent of *Hecatodistichon* (1550), a poem comprised of 104 Latin distichs written by Anne and Jane Seymour to commemorate the death of Marguerite de Navarre.¹¹²

Any funerary poem by Donne might be said to focus on masculine ‘poetic achievement’ and heavily intellectualised forms of ‘compensatory substitution’. With the possible exception of *Sorrow*, Donne’s ‘Epicedes and Obsequies’ have been aptly described as poems that develop bleakly nihilistic propositions *ad absurdum* ‘only to discover consolation by reversing the argument’.¹¹³ This is amply demonstrated in the 1609 elegies he wrote for Lady Bedford. The central conceit of *Mark*, for instance, that ‘Man is the world, and Death the Ocean’ (1), figures death as an all-pervasive imposition that ‘breakes our banck when ere it takes a friend’ (6). ‘In her’, however, the speaker later adds, these waters ‘hath made noe breach’ – justifying this with a revision of his argument in a commonplace geographical topos: ‘They say, when the Sea gaines, it looseth too’ (29), and a subsequent distinction between ‘Carnall death’ and ‘th’elder death’, to which ‘our Soule’ is ‘subiect’ (30–32).¹¹⁴ In *BoulRec* Death’s power is once again reasserted, the poet revoking the arguments of one or both of *Mark* and *HSDeath*: ‘Death I recant, and say, vnsaid by mee | What ere hath slipt, that might diminish thee’ (1–2). As if to outmanoeuvre those previous poetic contrivances, the argument that follows is far more threatening, conjuring an appalling, ravenous personification of Death:

Th’earths face is but thy table, and the meate

¹¹² David Kennedy, *Elegy* (London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 84–87.

¹¹³ Claude J. Summers, ‘The epicede and obsequy’, *Handbook*, pp. 286–97 (p. 292). The exception of *Sorrow* is mine, not Summers’s.

¹¹⁴ As Grierson and Lebars note, the figure of the sea that simultaneously destroys land as it creates it is widespread in both classical and contemporary texts, and in a wide range of genres. Donne would later use it in some of his own sermons. See Grierson, *Poems*, II, pp. 211–12; W. M. Lebars, ‘The Influence of the Classics in Donne’s Epicedes and Obsequies’, *RES*, 23 (1972), 127–37, p. 131.

Plants, Cattle, men, dish'd for Death to eate,
In a rude hunger nowe hee millions drawes
Into his bloudie, or plaguy, or starued iawes (5–8)

As this argument – so similar to that of Herbert's elegy for Bulstrode – develops further, the speaker moves into an interrogative, second person voice that dominates much of the rest of the poem:

O strong, and long liu'd Death, howe cam'st thou in?
And howe without Creation didst beginn?
Though hast and shalt see dead before thou diest
All the fower Monarchies, and Antechrist.
Howe could I thinke thee nothing that see nowe
In all this All, nothing els is but thou (21–26)

Whilst fatally undermining Death by subtly introducing the notion that he himself is mortal ('before thou diest'), these lines nonetheless continue to pursue *BoulRec*'s central proposition. Moreover, in doing so, they appear logically to contradict the argument of *HSDeath* whilst simultaneously inviting stylistic and thematic comparisons with it – in exploring, for instance, death's egalitarian aspects:

Thou art Slaue to Fate, Chance, kings, and desperat men,
And dost with poyson, warr, and sicknesse dwell;
And Poppy or Charmes can make vs sleepe as well,
And easier then thy stroke, why swellst thou then? (*HSDeath*, 9–12)

Thus, *BoulRec* appears to be obliquely focused upon Donne's own accretive poetic inventions within Lady Bedford's circle. In 'Death bee not proude', on the other hand, an insistent communality and 'shared interiority' is written 'on our hearts, her memoryes best Tomb' (27), and the notion of communal grief is figured as a recuperative and cleansing spiritual process in which 'soules' are 'washt'. Lady Bedford's emphasis on mourning as a healing process is further reflected in the structure of the elegy, the final section of which, in a manner somewhat similar to *BoulRec*, is signalled by a switch in grammatical voice:

Weepe not nor grudge, then, to haue lost her sight.
Taught thus, our after staye's but a short night.
But by all soules, not by corruption choked,
Let in high rayed notes that power bee invoked.

Calme the rough Seas by which shee sayles to rest
From sorrowes heere to a kingdome ever blest
And teach this Himme of her with Ioye, and sing
The Graue no conquest gets, death hath no sting. (35–41)

Addressing ‘that knott of friends’ for the first time, the speaker enacts something of a Donnean elegiac reversal, moving from an emphasis on the ‘mourning livery giuen by grace’ gently to reassure the elect community of the consolation that awaits. But the analogy through which this is developed works simultaneously further to justify those tears and to figure them as an incentive to collective spiritual action. Mourning has created ‘rough Seas by which shee sayles to rest’ – a tear-like environment whose conditions, the speaker insists, can be eased through worshipful commemoration. These characteristics are strongly echoed in Lady Markham’s epitaph, which, in emphasising the importance of *amicitia* in communal, localised mourning, presents funerary commemoration as a fundamentally shared project, noting that Markham’s dejected (and implicitly female) friends chose the site of her burial collectively:

DEPOSITUM HIC SERVARE VOLUERE
AMICI EJUS MÆSTISS: S ECESSIT 4° MAI A° SALUTIS SUÆ 1609, ÆTAT 30°

While care must be taken with stylistic arguments of this kind, these readings are thus notably consistent with feminist expositions of gender in commemorative elegy, especially when set against the wider anthology of interconnected masculine elegies with which *BoulRec* is also associated. Furthermore, I would suggest, they reinforce the received view of Donne and Lady Bedford’s exchange, specifically the notion that ‘Death bee not proude’ was written as an elegiac corrective to *BoulRec* – whether or not that corrective betrays any serious antagonism or is at least equally driven by developing elegiac conventions.¹¹⁵ As Cedric C. Brown has suggested, *BoulRec* could conceivably have been written as a deliberate rhetorical provocation to Lady Bedford, eliciting such a response – a theory that would account for its

¹¹⁵ Crawford likewise questions whether there was any ill feeling between the pair in *Mediatix*, p. 128.

apparently self-reflexive allusions to *Mark* and *HSDeath*, and fit the poem into Donne's apparently longstanding concern (as Brown notes) continually to reinforce and reiterate his position as her intimate friend and 'courtly literary suitor' above others.¹¹⁶ As merely one of a number of 'wits', he might have taken this attention-seeking objective to newly conspicuous lengths, combining this catalogue of allusions to past poetic creations with references to the gossip subtexts of that broader, male coterie.

However Donne intended for Lady Bedford to read *BoulRec*, he would soon abandon his pursuit of her favour in exchange for a new relationship with the Drurys – and more specifically, perhaps (as the following chapter will show), with Lady Anne (Bacon) Drury. The standard account of how he first contacted this family is that he offered his services to them after the death in December 1610 of their only remaining daughter, Elizabeth, in the form of 'A Funerall Elegie' (*FunEl*) and/or his 'Epitaph for Elizabeth Drury' (*EtED*) – presumably in frustration at having not having made sufficient professional ground through his relationship with Lady Bedford.¹¹⁷ R. C. Bald's *Donne and the Drurys* (1959), which remains the standard scholarly account of this new affiliation, suggests that Donne might have achieved it via his brother-in-law, William Lyly, who was a good friend of the Drurys, and through whom his sister Anne had presumably known Elizabeth for many years.¹¹⁸

The theme of gender in *FunEl* and the *Anniversaries* (1611/12) Donne subsequently printed to further (and repeatedly) commemorate her in print has been thoroughly excavated by critics. Its central significance is brilliantly unpacked by Lindsay A. Mann in particular, who identifies a huge range of typological identifications, *figurae* and literary analogues at work in the poems' expansive, digressive hyperbole for the 'Shee whom', the speaker insists 'we celebrate' (*SecAn*, 448). These include: the pagan idea of the *anima mundi*, the fertility or

¹¹⁶ Cedric C. Brown, 'Presence, Obligation and Memory in John Donne's Texts for the Countess of Bedford', *Renaissance Studies*, 22 (2008), 63–85, pp. 71–75.

¹¹⁷ Bald, *Life*, p. 240.

¹¹⁸ R. C. Bald, *Donne and the Drurys* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959). pp. 83–84.

vegetation deity, the legend of Astraea, the *foemina praecllentia* ('excellent woman') tradition of Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa, Chaucer's *The Book of the Duchess*, the influence of the Italian *stilnovisti* (Dante and Petrarch), commemorations of Elizabeth I, the figure of divine Wisdom from the book of Proverbs, the bride of the Song of Solomon, the Virgin Mary, and Christ.¹¹⁹ At the same time, however, critics have shown how this elaborate exploration of feminine virtue is also significantly distorted by Donne's masculinised emphasis on his own authorial ingenuity and identity – or, as Maria Mitchell puts it, 'the paradox of the centrality and peripheral nature of woman' in these poems. A subject on the verge of sexual maturity, Elizabeth Drury is a mere vehicle for a poetic exercise Donne makes available to a community of implicitly male readers, as is suggested in lines combining the misogynistic trope of Eve's culpability for original sin with the contemporary association of orgasm and death (*la petite mort*): 'One woman at one blow, then kill'd vs all, | And singly, one by one, they kill vs now' (*FirAn*, 106–07).¹²⁰ Donne's consistent view of the *Anniversaries* as statements of poetical ability is further reflected in the letter he later wrote to Sir Robert Ker to preface his '*Hymne to the Saynts and To the Marquesse HAMILTON*' (*Ham*), which describes them as 'my vttermost when it was at best', adding that in them 'I did best when I had least Truth for my subiect'.

This strikingly recalls the coterie dynamics evident in elegies and poems about Lady Markham and Bulstrode, suggesting both Donne's easy familiarity with them and the ease with which he could combine them with loftier epideictic verse – writing elegies for two sets

¹¹⁹ Lindsay A. Mann, 'The Typology of Woman in Donne's "Anniversaries"', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 11 (1987), 337–50. On the *foemina praecllentia* tradition in particular, see Graham Roebuck, 'The anniversary poem', *Handbook*, pp. 273–84 (p. 277). For a more general survey of criticism on this subject (written before 1996), see *Variorum*, VI, pp. 293–317. The most recent essay since then, by Kathryn Walls, suggests that through a Donnean pun on 'druery', an archaic term for 'Ane Ring set with ane rich Rubie', is used in *FunEl* to explore Elizabeth's nascent sexuality and to identify her as a Bride of Christ. Kathryn Walls, 'Elizabeth Drury as "druery" in John Donne's "A Funeral Elegy"', *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes, and Reviews*, 31 (2018), 73–75.

¹²⁰ Maria Mitchell, 'Gender, Genre, and the Idea of John Donne in the *Anniversaries*', in *Donne and the Resources of Kind*, ed. by A. D. Cousins and Damian Grace (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2002), pp. 106–19 (pp. 108–09, 111).

of readers. While Jonson would famously later complain to Drummond ‘That Donne’s *Anniversary* was profane, and full of Blasphemies’ and that ‘if it had been written of the Virgin Mary it had been something’, many readers in the former category, as the following chapter will show, responded to these poems with the sincerest form of flattery.¹²¹ About the latter category, however, Donne was compelled specifically to comment by a letter from Garrard (the collector of those earlier elegies) – to whom he replies:

Of my Anniversaries, the fault that I acknowledge in my self, is to have descended to print any thing in verse, which though it have excuse even in our times, by men who professe, and practise much gravitie; yet I confesse I wonder how I declined to it, and do not pardon my self: But for the other part of the imputation of having said too much, my defence is, that my purpose was to say as well as I could: for since I never saw the Gentlewoman, I cannot be understood to have bound my self to have spoken just truths, but I would not be thought to have gone about to praise her, or any other in rime; except I took such a person, as might be capable of all that I could say. If any of those Ladies think that Mistris Drewry was not so, let that Lady make her self fit for all those praises in the book, and they shall be hers.¹²²

At first glance, given the strength of Donne’s still relatively recent connection to Lady Bedford, his reference to ‘any of those Ladies’ offended by his printed verses appears to be a pointed one. However, given that one of his only extant verse holographs, ‘A Letter to the Lady Cary and Mrs. Essex Rich’ (*Carey*), was probably written shortly before Garrard’s letter reached Donne, and was written to two women Donne probably did not know, his reference can be read in more general terms. As Smith notes, *Carey* is written in such a manner as to anticipate a backlash against the *Anniversaries* and to demonstrate an ‘almost provocative confidence’ in writing to/about noblewomen Donne did not know. Moreover, in responding to that backlash when it came, Donne’s sardonic, unfeasible challenge to ‘those Ladies’ – to ‘make her self fit for all those praises in the book’ – may be interpreted both as an incitation to virtue and to dying.¹²³ The *Anniversaries* and their early reception thus offer a

¹²¹ Drummond, ‘Informations’, p. 361.

¹²² *Letters*, pp. 238–39.

¹²³ Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 244–46.

suggestive perspective on Donne's conception of subjects 'fit' for commemorative praises, and for the gendered forms of reading those praises could be designed to elicit.

A further poem survives, however, in which Donne dramatically inverts this rule in a mock 'Epitaph on Himself', usually addressed 'To the Countess of Bedford' in manuscript witnesses (*BedfCab*):

THat I might make your Cabinet my tombe,
And for my fame which I love next my soule,
Next to my soule provide the happiest roome,
Admit to that place this last funerall Scrowle.
Others by Wills give Legacies, but I
Dying, of you doe beg a Legacie.

While it is not clear when Donne wrote this poem, it is often read as an apology for the *Anniversaries*, begging 'a Legacee' from the former patron he had alienated in printing the praises of another.¹²⁴ At the same time, however, it is a text rhetorically and deliberately exposed to the same kind of reading as Beaumont's forehead epitaph – as an explicit statement, in other words, of what this chapter has attempted to read into textually and contextually implicit features. Foregoing the public stone of a traditional epitaph, and proposing that his addressee enclose his missive instead forever within her most intimate personal space, the poet sacrifices 'my fame, which I love next my soule' in an act of masculine submission that pointedly excludes the competitive scrutiny of fellow male elegists. Nonetheless, the intimacy this poem works to construct remained (or would become) exactly the kind of masculine performance it purports to eschew, entering the realm of manuscript transmission in which readers would deliberately seek out its titillating subtext. One such example survives in B2:

That I might make yo^r bed my closing tombe,
And for my fame, w^{ch} next my soule I loue,
Next to my soule prouide the happiest roome
Admit to that place this last funeral frowne.
Mens testaments giues Legacies, but I

¹²⁴ See, for instance, Brown, 'Presence, obligation and memory', p. 76.

Dying, of you (Deere) begs a Legacie.¹²⁵

This chapter has described the commemorative occasions this mock-epitaphic gesture might have sought to evoke. Having situated all extant commemorative texts for Lady Markham and Cecilia Bulstrode in their fullest historical, bibliographical and literary contexts, I hope to have demonstrated both the thematic importance of gender within those contexts, and Donne's twofold participation with the coterie dynamics of a wider group of male wits alongside the demands of an intimate household laureateship. Donne's ambivalent approach to coterie commemorative poetry will be considered further in chapter three, as will his relationship with Lady Bedford, for whom he would once again write an elegy, in which he would once again feel compelled to respond to the legacy of his own *Anniversaries*.

¹²⁵ Transcribed in Crowley, *Manuscript Matters*, p. 224. Fol. 98^v in B2.

3. 'STAIN'D REALMES OF PAPER BLACK': PRINT, POLITICS, AND FORMS OF COMMEMORATION, 1611–14

At the beginning of an elegy on the death of John Donne's former employer, the Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, in 1617, Hugh Holland announces that England's poets have gone missing. Asking his reader to go and find one, he supplies a catalogue of those former 'Witts' and 'Priests bredd in the temples of the Muses' who might be better suited to his task: 'yee Campions'; 'yee Jonsons'; 'yee Daniells, Draytons, Chapmans'; 'thou dainty Dauies longe agoe soe named'; 'thou Syren Hosken'; 'my Martyin'. After these names he at arrives at Donne, who gets a lengthier description:

Delicious Donne, once Delius secretarie
(and his) who can soe well his verses varie
As when he sigh'd & sange his daintie Drury.
he chaunce maie tire the swannelike Alabaster:
of Latin, Greeke, and English Muses Master. /¹

Holland was not wrong. The poets he cites represent a core membership of several overlapping literary circles that had, by the middle of the 1610s, fallen relatively quiet, having coalesced around the 'Sirenaical gentlemen' associated with Thomas Coryat and Prince Henry's court earlier in the decade, and largely disbanded after the so-called 'Addled Parliament' of 1614.² This had coincided with Donne's now famous abjuration from poetry in what was probably the last poem he wrote before taking holy orders in 1615, his 'Obsequies vpon the Lord HARRINGTON the last that dyed' (*Har*).

Exemplifying an increasingly commonplace elegiac tendency to reflect and pronounce upon the subjects of poetry and poets, Holland's 'funerall Elegie vpon the death of

¹ HEH, EL 1018.

² Michelle O'Callaghan, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 96, 156–57. Holland had collaborated with Jonson, Hoskyns, Martin and Jones on the poem 'Inviting a friend to supper', which, O'Callaghan notes (p. 73), might be seen as a 'companion poem' to the well-known 'Convivium Philosophicum' written by the group.

the right Honorable THOMAS Viscount Brackley’ establishes Donne as the most conspicuous contemporary exponent of commemorative verse, two years after his ordination. Most intriguing, perhaps, is the parenthetical and punning reference to William Alabaster, whom Holland suggests ‘chaunce maie’ make a fitting subject for Donne to ‘tire’ (‘To plaster or decorate (a building)’ in elegy – an apparent reference to literary and biographical parallels between the two men.³ More specifically, however, Holland’s debt to Donne is implicitly and explicitly identified as ‘when he sigh’d & sange his daintie Drury’ in the *Anniversaries*: poems amounting to over a thousand lines, about a fourteen-year-old girl Donne had never met, that were printed over half a decade before Ellesmere’s death, in 1611/12. Running to 378 English lines (numbered by a line count in its left margin), in a single manuscript presentation copy in the Egerton Family Papers, the format of Holland’s elegy somewhat resembles that of the Donnean precedent it acknowledges.

This poem, not hitherto noted by critics, is one of several in manuscript and print to remember Donne-the-poet particularly as the poet of the *Anniversaries*.⁴ Jasper Mayne’s elegy on Donne, first printed in the latter’s posthumous *Poems* (1633), contains an oft-cited acknowledgement of the shadow cast by his ‘Poëme of that worth’ (‘so farre above its Reader, good, | That wee are thought wits, when ’tis understood’) over the genre/s of poetic commemoration; and a further unidentified elegist of Donne, one ‘L: de C:’ (considered in chapter five) probably does likewise in lamenting an inability ‘in as glorious & as high a line’ to ‘Speak thee, as thou has others dead, in thine [elegy]’.⁵ Writing later in the seventeenth century to Gertrude (Aston) Thimelby, Herbert Aston summons ‘You Heliconian sisters’ to ‘Infuse in to me all your choicest straines’, ‘that stupid I, | May sing your great Queenes

³ *OED*, v.3, 3. [accessed 30 August 2019]. The literary and biographical parallels between Donne and Alabaster are many, yet hitherto little explored. On Alabaster, see Francis J. Bremer, ‘Alabaster, William (1568–1640)’, *ODNB* (2007) [accessed 30 August 2019].

⁴ It is not listed in *CELM*, *UFLI*, or *Critical Heritage*.

⁵ Grierson, *Poems*, I, p. 382; O36, fol. 43^r.

prayse, in uerse as high, | As strong lin'd donne; the soule œf of poetry | Exprest his progresse; and Anatomy'.⁶ The strength of Donne's association with the *Anniversaries* might even be gauged by later misattributions of printed elegies to him – particularly elegies on Prince Henry, such as Henry King's 'Keep station, nature' in a *Collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs By the Wits of the Age*, appended to *Le prince d'amour* (1660).⁷

As I began to show in my previous chapter, this reputation, and the poems that forged it, were also controversial in the years that immediately followed their publication, drawing fire from some of the very contemporaries cited by Holland. As Jesse Lander has shown in his reading of further printed poetic responses to the *Anniversaries* by Sir John Davies in *The Muses Sacrifice* (1612), the obscure elegiac mode of the poet whose readers 'are thought wits, when 'tis understood' was accused of undermining the customary didacticism of epideictic, both in precluding the moral improvement of readers unable to comprehend it, and, worse yet, straying into blasphemy through excessive praise. Studied as a coherent whole, *The Muses Sacrifice* mounts a consistent critique of 'false learning' and 'degenerate and corrupt [printed] books' that is intricately bibliographically and textually allusive to the *Anniversaries*, overwriting and 'correcting' their ostensible elitism and insincerity, attacking the evident influence and identity of their author, and reasserting the case for a broadly Spenserian poetic ethics capable of defending the health and vitality of 'the *Common-weale*'.⁸

Building on these insights, this chapter explores how, in the politically and personally turbulent years that followed the print publication of Donne's *Anniversaries* and preceded his ordination, literary commemoration became a prominent forum for debate about the nature

⁶ This poem survives only in the verse miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler, HEH HM 904, which is transcribed and annotated in *The Verse Miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler: A Diplomatic Edition*, ed. by Deborah Aldrich-Watson (Tempe, Ariz.: Renaissance English Text Society, 2000), p. 128. My thanks to Rosalee Pipitone for sharing this reference with me.

⁷ *Le prince d'amour; or the prince of love. With a Collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs By the Wits of the Age* (1660), pp. 108–09.

⁸ Jesse Lander, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 170–79.

and function of poetry and poets in the context of ‘the *Common-weale*’. That the *Anniversaries* themselves, among the most inscrutable poems in the English language, ‘shook the literary firmament’, firmly establishing the ‘vernacular non-pastoral elegiac idiom’ Donne had been developing within the unprecedented outpouring of elegiac publications that followed the death of Prince Henry in November 1612, are well-established arguments; and I do not propose merely to re-state them here.⁹ Rather, attempting to account for that inscrutability, the complex self-presentational strategies within which it was couched, and its impact in elegies for Henry and a series of works written on the death of Sir John Harington in 1614, I aim to show how the textual and material forms of commemorative epideictic in and after the *Anniversaries* became keyed into religio-political debate in new ways – specifically in probing, through a polarisation of Donnean and Spenserian modes, the central political division that existed between Henry’s (and Harington’s) militantly Protestant faction, and the more irenic religio-political aims of his father.¹⁰ Tracing the thread of a transformative period in Donne’s life, moreover, I consider how the quasi-autobiographical mode Donne develops in his commemorative works for Drury, Henry and Harington ultimately became a subject in itself, which both Donne and his contemporaries were, for many years, unable to ignore.

⁹ Graham Roebuck, ‘The anniversary poem’, *Handbook*, pp. 273–85 (p. 273); Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 122–23; Claude J. Summers, ‘W[illiam] S[hakespeare]’s A Funeral Elegy and the Donnean Moment’, *EMLS*, 7 (2001), 1–22 (p. 11). On the *Anniversaries*’ influence on elegies written for Prince Henry, see Barbara K. Lewalski, *Donne’s Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: the Creation of a Symbolic Mode* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 312–17.

¹⁰ Though scholars tend to spell Harington with a single ‘r’ (Bald being one exception), this is at odds with almost all contemporary references to the name. For the sake of simplicity, however, I stay with modern convention.

The Poet of the *Anniversaries*

Printed, uniquely among Donne's poems, in two bespoke, standalone publications (and two further unauthorised editions in 1621 and 1625), the *Anniversaries* challenge long-influential scholarly paradigms about the so-called 'stigma of print' and Donne's identification as a 'coterie' or 'manuscript' poet.¹¹ The following passage from Donne's Paris letter to George Garrard on 14 April 1612, cited in the previous chapter, is probably his fullest comment on this subject, and is worth revisiting:

Of my Anniversaries, the fault that I acknowledge in my self, is to have descended to print any thing in verse, which though it have excuse even in our times, by men who professe, and practise much gravitie; yet I confesse I wonder how I declined to it, and do not pardon my self: But for the other part of the imputation of having said too much, my defence is, that my purpose was to say as well as I could: for since I never saw the Gentlewoman, I cannot be understood to have bound my self to have spoken just truths, but I would not be thought to have gone about to praise her, or any other in rime; except I took such a person, as might be capable of all that I could say.¹²

For obvious reasons, this letter has tended to draw readers' attention towards Donne's explication of his epideictic mode, his anxiety about the reception of 'my Anniversaries' at home, and his apparent regret about having 'descended to print any thing in verse'. What has gone largely without comment, however, is that he couches this apology within a subtle observation that this 'have excuse even in our times, by men who professe, and practise much gravitie'. We can be confident that Donne took care over this message because it closely echoes, in both sense and wording, another, which, addressing 'many censures of my book, of Mrs. Drury', and 'my descent in Printing any thing in verse'/being 'gone down to print verses', explains that they represent not '*just truth*', but the best that I could conceive; for that [would have] been a new weaknesse in me, to have praised any body in printed verses, that

¹¹ As set out in J. W. Saunders, 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', *Essays in Criticism* 1 (1951), 139–164; Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, repr. ed. (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1986).

¹² *Letters*, pp. 238–39.

had not been capable of the best praise that I could give.’¹³ The letters appear to constitute or derive from a shared press release.

While critics have long acknowledged that the early 1610s saw Donne ‘nearer to being a professional author than at any other period of his life’, and have more recently begun to explore this idea in greater depth and seriousness, the *Anniversaries* have remained resistant to integration within or alongside the authorial identity Donne sought to establish in *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610), *Conclave Ignatii/Ignatius his Conclave* (1611) and his mock-panegyric verses in *Coryats Crudities* and *The Odcombian Banquet* (1611).¹⁴ The first part of this chapter argues that the *Anniversaries* were conceived as poems that ‘professe, and practise much gravitie’, and are thus designed be read as companion pieces to Donne’s contemporaneous works of prose controversy, satire, and verse. Self-consciously and self-revealingly Donnean, they stamp an emergent satirist-controversialist authorial signature onto the period’s most didactic and inherently conservative poetic genre, simultaneously intertwining his various authorial reputations. In doing so, I argue, Donne fashions and articulates an intellectually and self-consciously complex commemorative mode that, in resisting simplistic didactic exegesis, signals a conformist poetic sensibility opposed to religio-political militancy, and depicts its author as a consensus figure around whom similarly-minded individuals and poets of various religio-political stripes can gather. At the same time, as Lander argues (and as I began to show somewhat in my previous chapter), the *Anniversaries* are grounded in certain coterie dynamics designed to evoke – and provoke – such a community of independent and exemplary readers.¹⁵

¹³ Ibid., p. 75. Italics mine.

¹⁴ Bald, *Life*, p. 200; Lander, *Inventing Polemic*, p. 146. Most recently, the first chapter of Katherine Rundell’s 2016 doctoral thesis argues for ‘alternative Donnes’ ‘invested in crafting a literary career’ through ‘strategic’ ‘presentational manoeuvres and poetic self-fashioning’, comparable with ‘Marston, Fletcher, Hall, Jonson and Spenser’. “‘And I am re-begot’: The textual afterlives of John Donne” (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2016), pp. 11, 22, 34, 39–40.

¹⁵ Lander, *Inventing Polemic*, p. 170.

Holland's description of the *Anniversaries* as poems in which Donne's 'verses varie' neatly encapsulates this idea and anticipates their unstable critical reception. Typically, they have prompted a two-fold response from critics: acknowledgement that they are unreadable according to any fixed literary scheme or tradition, and an often elaborate and introspective pursuit of a scheme, idea or organising principle with which to read them. In his influential book-length classification of Renaissance literary criticism, O. B. Hardison devotes an entire chapter to the poems, drawn to how they exemplify and recast didacticism as it systematised and justified early modern poetry.¹⁶ Likewise, in Louis Martz's ground-breaking 1954 study of *The Poetry of Meditation*, the *Anniversaries*' 'unusual construction' provokes a far broader thesis about the influence of continental meditative literatures and traditions upon seventeenth-century English verse, and a proposal to redraw critical and conceptual ideas generally around the early modern (not modern) intellectual frameworks they offer – 'meditative' over 'metaphysical', in particular.¹⁷ Martz provided a taxonomy for making structural sense of the *Anniversaries* that paved the way for others to grapple with their unique *genera mixta* by situating them within various literary and theological contexts.¹⁸ In particular, Barbara K. Lewalski emphasises how the analogues Martz identifies fed into an 'emergent Protestant meditative tradition', and a uniquely Donnean 'symbolic mode'. Rather than figuring Elizabeth Drury merely as a 'departure point' for a meditative or rhetorical exercise, 'the speaker customarily insists that meditation upon and praise of a particular

¹⁶ O. B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1962), p. xii. The *Anniversaries* are the only poems to be given chapter-length consideration, pp. 163–86. See also Ruth Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950), p. 5.

¹⁷ Louis Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), pp. xi, 4.

¹⁸ Martz, pp. 222–223, 227. Patrick Mahony takes up these 'widely accepted' structural divisions in his rhetorical exposition of the poems: "'The Anniversaries': Donne's Rhetorical Approach to Evil", *JEGP*, 68 (1969), 407–13 (p. 408). Harold Love likewise builds on them in 'The Argument of Donne's *First Anniversary*', *MP*, 64 (1966), 125–31.

[regenerate] person upon a specific occasion is the means to discovery of the highest spiritual truth'.¹⁹

For all this, Rosalie Colie's observation that 'after all the explication of background and foreground, [the *Anniversaries*] still seem fundamentally unexplained' is surely still apposite. While these and many other highly compelling readings have brought the influence of early modern natural philosophy and philosophical poetry, the Platonic-Stoic Logos figure, anatomy, Petrarchan epideictic, elegy, meditation, *contemptus mundi*, *consolatio philosophiae*, *compositio loci*, *oratorio iudicalis* and Pyrrhonian scepticism to bear on the poems, such scholarship often feels unhelpfully siloed and myopic, ignoring the wider question of why Donne would write in such a multifaceted way.²⁰ The *Anniversaries*' 'literary pluralism', as Colie notes, seems to 'deprive them of unity' – and this observation tallies with much of their early reception.²¹ The best-known contemporary response to the poems, Ben Jonson's apparent censure to William Drummond 'That Donne's *Anniversary* was profane, and full of Blasphemies'; that 'if it had been written of the Virgin Mary it had been something'; and that Donne 'deserved hanging' 'for not keeping of accent' reveals how the poems were likewise read by contemporaries expecting them to fall within a more recognisable field of poetic analogues and a clearer ethical framework.²² Even Jonson's metrical criticism might not be entirely facetious: as Andrea Brady points out, epideictic

¹⁹ Lewalski, *Donne's Anniversaries*, pp. 6-7, 73-74. Lewalski's argument has since been contested at length by Edward Tayler, who argues for a reading of the poems based on Aristotelian-Thomist thought (*Donne's Idea of a Woman: Structure and Meaning in "The Anniversaries"* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991)); and in an essay by Lindsay Mann, who argues that the poems do not centre on the deceased as regenerate ideal, but as a 'hyperbolic idea' ('The Typology of Woman in Donne's "Anniversaries"', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 11 (1987), 337-50 (pp. 337, 39-40)).

²⁰ Rosalie L. Colie, "all in peeces": Problems of Interpretation in Donne's *Anniversary Poems*, in *Just So Much Honor: Essays Commemorating the Four-Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of John Donne*, ed. by Peter A. Fiore (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1972), pp. 189-218 (pp. 189-192). Harold Love ('The Argument of Donne's *First Anniversary*', pp. 127-28) argues for the presence of an *oratorio iudicalis* structure 'quite apart' from the Ignatian tradition. The argument for reading the *Anniversaries* as endorsements of Pyrrhonian scepticism, the most recent intervention of this kind, is advanced by Zoe Gibbons, 'Vicissitude of Tears: Temporal Experience in Donne's *Anniversaries*', *SP*, 116 (2019), 101-123.

²¹ Colie, "all in peeces", p. 205.

²² William Drummond, 'Informations to William Drummond of Hawthornden', *Cambridge Jonson*, V, p. 361.

didacticism functioned both through content and prosodic regularity as a check on potentially dangerous passions stirred by upheaval and loss.²³ Shortly into *FirAn*, the speaker describes his task thus:

But though it be too late to succour thee,
Sicke world, yea dead, yea putrified, since shee
Thy'intrinsique Balme, and thy preseruatiue,
Can neuer be renew'd, thou neuer liue,
I (since no man can make thee liue) will trie,
What we may gaine by thy Anatomy. (55–60)

And though she haue shut in all day,
The twi-light of her memory doth stay;
Which, from the carcasse of the old world, free,
Creates a new world; and new creatures be
Produc'd: The matter and the stuffe of this,
Her virtue, and the forme our practise is. (73–78)

Within these lines are several clear signals about the *Anniversaries*' conscious establishment and departure from a number of generic precedents and expectations. The speaker's panegyric focus and habitual adoption of plural first person pronouns ('we', 'our') recall classical and patristic funeral orations, as does his conventional insistence that the proper subject for praise is virtue, which the encomium, in classical and renaissance epideictic theory, should properly model for the purpose of imitation.²⁴ Several critics have noticed how the structure, argument and generic range of the *Anniversaries* is particularly similar to that of Donne's later funeral sermons, investing them with various kinds of religious and ecumenical authority.²⁵ Most conspicuously, however, the speaker's first reference to himself

²³ On the association of the '*techne* of prosody with ethical self-discipline', see Andrea Brady, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century: Laws in Mourning* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 175. On the more general centrality of 'content' as defining of epideictic rhetoric, see p. 10.

²⁴ This idea is prevalent in the rhetorical prescriptions of Plato, Aristotle, Menander, Cicero, Quintilian, and early modern rhetoricians including Scaliger, Minturno and Puttenham. See Lewalski, *Donne's Anniversaries*, pp. 16–21. On funeral orations by the Church Fathers (who 'had emphasized the didactic purposes of praises of the deceased far more strongly than had the classical orators', with lasting consequences for Christian commemorative traditions), see pp. 175–79.

²⁵ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 104–107. Milgate, (*Epithalamions*, p. xl), argues that 'the only 'genre' which can accommodate all the qualities to be found in the poems [...] is, indeed, the sermon of the kind which Donne himself composed'. For Mahony ('Donne's Rhetorical Approach to Evil', pp. 410–13), the poems, like the sermons, are predominantly reflections on how sinful/fallen man can be brought to God, given that man's tripartite soul (comprised of memory, understanding and will) is inhibited by an original sin that jeopardises his ability to (re)discover him. The rhetorical strategies of both sermons and poems, he contends, appeal first to the

(‘I’, triply rhymed) is as nonchalant anatomist, a writer of what was a fashionable and contemporary literary genre and methodological idea.²⁶

The textual and material forms in which this ‘I’ is presented provide keys to understanding it. The *Anniversaries* are comprised of not one, but three different elegies by Donne, and two commendatory verses by Joseph Hall, that evidently evolved into what became known collectively by that name. The titular poem of the first (1611) edition, a sparse octavo titled *AN ANATOMY of the World. WHEREIN, BY OCCASION OF the vntimely death of Mistris ELIZABETH DRURY the frailty and decay of this whole world is represented* was in the second (1612) quarto edition, also titled ‘The First Anniuersarie’ (*FirAn*), where it was joined by ‘The Second Anniuersarie. OF THE PROGRES of the Soule. Wherein: BY OCCASION OF THE Religious Death of Mistris ELIZABETH DRVRY, the incommodities of the Soule in this life and her exaltation in the next, are Contemplated.’ The first of these publications also contained a shorter ‘Funerall Elegie’ by Donne (*FunEl*), and Hall’s ‘To the Praise of the Dead and the Anatomy’ (*Praise*); the latter was joined also by Hall’s ‘The Harbinger to the Progress’ (*Harb*), and introduced marginalia and certain typographical changes to the texts. The poems, not circulated in manuscript, were, with the possible exception of *FunEl*, fundamentally conceived for a print readership, and published thus ‘with Donne’s acquiescence and presumed cooperation’.²⁷

Several features within these publications associate them obliquely with Donne’s contemporary prose works. The most obvious of these relate to the fact that the *Anniversaries*, like those texts, are framed by playful disclosures and concealments of

most accessible of the fallen faculties: ‘memory’ (as in line 74); and both allude to the canticle of Moses (a call to remembrance) in so doing. The poems also specifically address ‘hearers’.

²⁶ See Richard Sugg, ‘Donne and the Uses of Anatomy’, *LC*, 1 (2004), 1–13; Gibbons, ‘Vicissitude of Tears’, pp. 110–11.

²⁷ *Variorum*, VI, pp. 38–40. The four seventeenth-century editions are denoted by *Variorum* editors by the letters a, b, c and d. *Variorum* copy-texts are taken from the earliest editions in each case: a for *FirAn*, *FunEl* and *Praise* and b for *SecAn* and *Harb*.

authorial identity that anticipate and derive meaning from the intuitions of informed readerships. Donne's name does not appear in the *Anniversaries*, *Conclave Ignatii*, or on the title page of *Pseudo-Martyr* (though it is included below the book's dedicatory epistle to King James VI/I). As Graham Roebuck has shown, the 'rhetorical anxiety' and 'concern about readerly misprision' evident in *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Conclave Ignatii*, particularly in the former's autobiographically-revealing 'Advertisement to the Reader', were carefully tethered to an undisclosed yet identifiable authorial identity that readers sometimes inserted scribally onto the works' title pages – as is the case with Robert Burton's copy of *Conclave Ignatii*.²⁸ The *Anniversaries* fashion anonymity in a similar way: the printer of the 1611 and 1612 editions, Samuel Macham, would have been known for a prior association with Joseph Hall, Donne's (also anonymous) collaborator on the volumes; and the subtitle of *SecAn* closely echoes that of an earlier poem by Donne, now best known as 'Metempsychosis' (*Metem*).²⁹ At least one copy of the *Anniversaries*, a 1621 edition (STC 7024) in the Bodleian Library (Tanner 876), contains handwritten speculations about the author on one of its title pages.³⁰

At the same time, the *Anniversaries* are full of allusions to other manuscript poetry by Donne, through which they further construct an autobiographically and stylistically eclectic authorial persona consistent with that of his printed prose. An example of this occurs in the most famous passage in *FirAn*: mocking the theological redundancy of the 'new Philosophie' (205) in which 'Man hath weau'd out a net, and this net throwne | Vpon the Heauens, and now they are his owne. | Loth to goe vp the hill, or labor thus | To goe to heauen, we make heauen come to vs' (279–82), *FirAn* is one of several works in which Donne recycles and 'completes' the figure of the 'hill of truth' on which 'Truthe dwells' (*Sat3*, 80–81) – identified in Augustine with the Christian Church. As Lindsay A. Mann notes, the speaker's

²⁸ Graham Roebuck, 'From Donne to Great Tew', *JDJ*, 32 (2013), 25–54 (pp. 27–33, 38–39).

²⁹ These details are noted by Lander, *Inventing Polemic*, p. 160; Gibbons, 'Vicissitude of Tears', p. 122.

³⁰ In this example, the title page to *SecAn*.

exploration of this image can also be associated with the ‘call to spiritual alertness’ in his self-identification as ‘The Trumpet’ in the final lines (528) of *SecAn* – a role that combines multiple ‘Donnes’ in a ‘prophetic satirist’ ‘I’.³¹ The longstanding nature of Donne’s reputation as a satirical author, on whose currency these lines conspicuously draw, is suggested in a contemporary rebuke to *Pseudo-Martyr* by the Jesuit Thomas Fitzherbert:

it had byn much more for his reputation to haue kept himself within his compasse, and not to haue passed vltra crepidam, that is to say, beyond his old occupation of making Satyres (wherein he hath some talent, and may play the foole without controle) then to presume to write books of matters in controuersy, which are to be scanned and sifted by learned men, and require much more substance, then his skambling studies, and superficial knowledge can afford.³²

This is not an allusion to Donne’s contemporary prose satire, *Conclave Ignatii*; Fitzherbert’s censure refers, rather, to ‘his old occupation’ as a manuscript author, as distinct from a writer of ‘books of matters in controuersy’. Combining both authorial voices, the poet of the *Anniversaries* rejects the distinction on which Fitzherbert’s censure is based, encroaching the satirical mode of ‘his old occupation’ upon the purview of ‘learned men’. What is more, as critics such as Martz have shown at length, the poet affects and incorporates the voices and arguments of such ‘learned men’ from across the confessional divide. In one passage of anaphoric imperatives to ‘Thinke’, for example, the speaker of *SecAn* exhorts his own soul to confront the reality of a future death attended by ‘Satans Sergeants’, and to ‘thinke that but for Legacies they thrust; | Giue one thy Pride, to’another giue thy Lust’ (102–04). This recycles the central conceit of *Will*, in which the speaker cynically bequeaths the ‘Legacies’

³¹ Mann, ‘Typology of Woman’, pp. 346–47. M. Thomas Hester describes the ‘Jeremiadic trumpet’ speaker thus in *Kinde Pitty and Brave Scorn: John Donne’s “Satyres”* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1982), pp. 4, 53. Robbins associates the ‘self-image of preacher as trumpet’ with Donne’s sermon of 12 February 1619 (Isiah 58. 1), Robbins, *Poems*, p. 922. On its significance more generally, Murray Roston notes that the image of the hill is most frequent in Donne’s writing concerned with the uncertain efficacy of religious meditation to discover spiritual truth, such as his 1627 Trinity Sunday sermon preached at St Dunstan’s (Revelation 4. 8): ‘Donne and the Meditative Tradition’, *Religion & Literature*, 37 (2005), 45–68 (pp. 53–54). Roston uses these examples to argue that despite the sincerity of his Protestantism, Donne remained deeply engaged with Ignatian and Catholic meditative practices, which are manifest in his inwardly focused, personal, non-linear, paradox-centred, generically fluid and typically non-consolatory meditative mode.

³² Thomas Fitzherbert, *A supplement to the discussion of M. D. Barlowes Answere* (St Omer, 1613), p. 107.

of his body and mind to those who least need them, and takes up a trope of exhorting ‘my Soule’ to confront hard truths that were associated with Catholic directories like François de Sales’s *Introduction to the Devout Life* (1609): ‘Remember these things, my soul, and tremble.’³³ At the same time, as Zoe Gibbons notes, the *Anniversaries* share a number of images with *Conclave Ignatii*, whose populated moonscape is evoked, for instance, in certain descriptions of ‘new hells’.³⁴

The *Anniversaries*’ oblique association with Joseph Hall represents one further important and neglected aspect of how they draw together various threads of Donne’s reputation as a manuscript poet – and, more contemporaneously, a printed one. As I will show later in this chapter, Donne’s mock-panegyric poems in *Coryats Crudities* – printed the same year as the *Anniversaries* (1611) – engage with print anonymity in ways highly comparable to the works cited above. In one key respect worth mentioning here, however, they exemplify a developing trend for printing coterie poetry that the *Anniversaries* also, in a little-unacknowledged way, develop.³⁵ A number of suggestive parallels between the *Anniversaries* and Hall’s prefatory poems bear this out, in ways that reinforce Donne’s emphases upon exegetical difficulty and restraint. Most obviously, the arguments of Hall’s poems augment and supersede the methods and conceits of the poems they accompany. The first poem, *Praise*, transposes the central claim of *FirAn* (that the world is a decaying body classifiable through anatomical dissection) to describe Donne’s poem itself as a ‘world of wit’ discoverable through reading (2). Likewise, *Harb* insists further upon the pre-eminence of Donne’s literary powers over ‘the bold pride of vulgar pens’ (*Praise*, 20) by adapting the kinds of flight analogy deployed in *SecAn*:

Thinke that a rusty Peece, discharg’d, is flowen
In peeces, and the bullet is his owne,
And freely flies: This to thy soule allow,

³³ Quoted in Roston, ‘Donne and the Meditative Tradition’, p. 58.

³⁴ See Gibbons, ‘Vicissitude of Tears’, p. 116.

³⁵ On this in *Crudities*, see O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, p. 56.

Think thy sheel broke, thinke thy Soule hatch'd but now.
 And thinke this slow-pac'd soule, which late did cleaue,
 To'a body, and went but by the bodies leaue,
 Twenty, perchance, or thirty mile a day,
 Dispatches in a minute all the way,
 Twixt Heauen, and Earth (*SecAn*, 181–89)

In Hall's poem, this Donnean image of the soul as a bullet shot heavenwards (which also appears in *Dissol*, 20–24), undergoes a perspectival shift, figuring the poet of the *Anniversaries* himself as a flying object exclusively capable of keeping pace, for a time, with that '*Which long agoe had'st lost the vulgar sight*':

*I enuie thee (Rich soule) I envy thee,
 Although I cannot yet thy glory see:
 And thou (Great spirit) which her's follow'd hast
 So fast, as none can follow thine so fast;
 So farre as none can follow thine so farre,
 (And if this flesh did not the passage barre
 Had'st raught her) let me wonder at thy flight
 Which long agoe had'st lost the vulgar sight
 And now mak'st proud the better eyes, that thay
 Can see thee less 'ned in thine aery way* (*Harb*, 17–26)

Hall's lines are a marked rebuke to the censures of poets like Jonson – unable, the speaker insinuates, to 'see' Donne's 'aery way'. Similarly, later in the poem, Hall explicitly defends the controversial Petrarchan epideictic method (traditionally associated with 'likening a beloved woman to the Virgin or the Deity') Donne takes to such extremes: 'Still vpwards mount; and let thy makers praise | Honor thy Laura, and adorne thy laies' (35–36).³⁶ Hall's instruction, like its print context, functions simultaneously as a precise explication of a literary method and a divine authorisation of the authorial vehicle through which that method manifests 'thy makers praise'. Accounting for the passage of time since Drury, 'the Sunnes Sunne [...] Did set; t'were Blasphemy, to say, did fall' (3, 5), *SecAn* is no less defiant, directly reversing the terms of Jonson's allegation against their maker/s. These poems further reveal, therefore, the extent to which the *Anniversaries*, as print publications, insist upon the

³⁶ Colie, "all in peeces", p. 210.

identity, inimitability and generic promiscuity of the author/s they decline to name. Yet at the same time, as I have begun to show, those identities represent important components within the religio-political sensibilities that the poems portray and defend. Unpacking this more closely, the remaining part of this subchapter will focus particularly on the autobiographical features at work within and alongside the *Anniversaries*' coterie dynamics, and how these amplify their central aims as I comprehend them.

Hall's identity as a preacher with shared affiliations to Donne and the Drurys is an integral component within the autobiographical orientation of the *Anniversaries*. In 1601, having probably long been familiar with Donne's poetry in manuscript, Hall was singled out for the vacant chaplaincy at Hawstead by Lady Drury – a position he held until 1607, when he became a royal chaplain in the household of Prince Henry.³⁷ While Lady Drury is undoubtedly the most important member of this family in literary terms, she is also a figure about whom relatively little is known. R. C. Bald's 1959 monograph *Donne and the Drurys*, the work that first brought her to critics' attention, provides an account of the Redgrave Muniments of the Bacon family from which Anne married Sir Robert Drury in 1592, three months after his knighthood by the Earl of Essex at the siege of Rouen.³⁸ What we do know is that in 1658, the Fourth Baronet and second Sir Edmund Bacon (c1633–1685) had an inventory drawn up of all documents held at Redgrave Hall, which consisted of over 180 boxes of court rolls, bailiff's accounts, state documents and family papers dating from the thirteenth century, including two that had arrived shortly after Lady Drury's death in 1624. Among the letters and documents belonging to her, contained in these two boxes, are '25

³⁷ On Hall's likely inclusion among Donne's early manuscript readers, see Alan MacColl, 'The Circulation of Donne's Poems in Manuscript', in *John Donne: Essays in Celebration*, ed. A. J. Smith (London: Methuen, 1972), pp. 28–46 (p. 34). On the 'active steps' Lady Drury took to fill the vacancy at Hawstead, see R. C. Bald, *Donne and the Drurys* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp. 49–50.

³⁸ See <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/member/drury-sir-robert-1575-1615>> [accessed 4 December 2017].

ould letters sowed together of Mr. Jo. Donne', now missing from the archive.³⁹ Beyond this record, and a number of letters and dedications to/from other correspondents, survive the family monuments and epitaphs in Hawstead, and the otherworldly painted panels of Lady Drury's small closet room, which have more recently been the subject of book-length study.⁴⁰ Donne and Hall's intimacy with Lady Drury and her household would have been known to many, and, like the identity of the *Anniversaries*' printer Samuel Macham, implicitly established Hawstead as the central context out of which they emerged – defined, perhaps, against the more militant counter court circle of Lady Bedford.

What is known of this context reinforces this idea. Hall left Hawstead after unsuccessfully petitioning Sir Robert for a raise, and went on to print a letter 'Concerning my Remooeall' from 'S^r ROBERT DRVRY, and his Lady' very shortly afterwards in a 1608 book of *Epistles* dedicated to Prince Henry.⁴¹ Glimpses of an enduring literary friendship with Lady Drury are perceptible, however, in another letter to her, preserved in the Redgrave Muniments, in which Hall sends a 'New-Yeaes gift' (probably, as Bald says, Hall's own *Salomons Divine Arts, drawne out of his Proverbs and Ecclesiastes* (1608)). A postscript refers to a second book, which Hall asks Lady Drury to obtain for him: 'I am by promise indebted to Sir Edm. Bacon (to whom I owe more) certayne Latin verses of *Barclais* which I am ashamed that for my life I cannot come by: let him I beseech your La: know my care of my word.'⁴² This would have been the second part of Barclay's *Euphormionis Lusinini Satyricon*, printed in Paris in 1607, a savage and anti-Jesuitical Menippean satire dedicated to James I/VI, that brought Barclay renown across much of Europe.⁴³ Hall was himself well

³⁹ Bald, *Donne and the Drurys*, pp. 2–4. The Redgrave Muniments are now held at the University of Chicago Library.

⁴⁰ H. L. Meakin, *The Painted Closet of Lady Ann Bacon Drury* (Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 2016; first publ. by Ashgate Publishing, 2013). Meakin reproduces all the panels, which are now on public display at Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich.

⁴¹ Joseph Hall, *Epistles The first volume: Containing II. Decads* (1608), pp. 91–95.

⁴² Quoted in Bald, *Donne and the Drurys*, pp. 62–64.

⁴³ Nicola Royan, 'Barclay, John (1582–1621)', *ODNB* (2008) [accessed 4 December 2017].

known for verse satire: his *Virgidemiarum*, published in six books a decade previous to the *Satyricon*, in 1597/98, damns religious hypocrisy and Catholic impiety in a manner highly sensitive to contemporary English and continental precedents, such as England's 'Spencer', France's 'Salust', Tuscany's 'Ariost', whom he bids 'Yeeld vp the Lawrell girlond ye haue lost' and make space for a new generation.⁴⁴ Biographical and literary parallels between Donne and Hall, presented in the *Anniversaries*, will be readily apparent.

A 'mediatrix'/'deviser' figure somewhat akin to Lady Bedford, Lady Drury was also at the centre of a local intellectual clerical and literary network that was, for its size, notably prolific in print. As Bald notes, Hall's successor at Hawstead was Ezekiel Edgar, brother of Eleazer, the London stationer and joint publisher with Samuel Macham.⁴⁵ Drury was close to George Estey/Estye, the puritan Rector of Bury St Edmunds until his death in 1601, whose posthumous *Certaine godly and learned Expositions vpon diuers parts of Scripture* (1603) is dedicated to her, and whose *Most Sweete and comfortable Exposition, vpon the tenne commaundements* thanks her 'kindnesse to me'.⁴⁶ Estey's Latin epitaph, by 'I. H.' (presumably Joseph Hall), survives in St Mary's Church, Bury St Edmunds.⁴⁷ According to Patrick Collinson, Estey was 'a youthful prodigy', and the man who replaced him, William

⁴⁴ Joseph Hall, *Virgidemiarvm, Sixe Bookes. First three Bookes, Of Tooth-lesse Satyrs* (1597), p. 11. Scott R. Pilarz notes that as well as stoking infamous literary antagonisms with and between John Marston, Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe, Hall was Robert Southwell's 'earliest detractor'. See *Robert Southwell and the Mission of Literature, 1561–1595: Writing Reconciliation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. vii–xx.

⁴⁵ Bald, *Done and the Drurys*, pp. 63–64. Incidentally, John Marriot, a later publisher of many of Donne's posthumous works, served as an apprentice under Eleazer. I am grateful to Sean H. McDowell for this information.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50. Estey's will, PROB 11/98/227, fol. 171^v leaves instructions for the printing of such works to John Stoneham, a fellow graduate of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. A book of his private (and predominantly Latin) letters, which survives as BL Add. MS 24191, does not contain any further correspondence with Lady Drury or her husband. Estey was presumably attentive in keeping this record up-to-date, given that its final entry, fols 87^{r-v}, is in a much weakened hand. I have been unable to locate any further correspondence in any of the three branches of Suffolk Record Office.

⁴⁷ This is, at least, the attribution of Stephen Wright, 'Estye, George (1560/61–1601)', *ODNB* (2008) [accessed 20 June 2019]; and Karl A. Gelpke, *ESTEYS of England And America* (1970), p. 107. The latter work, which contains an English translation of the epitaph by John Quinn, is accessible online at <[http://www.estey-gen.info/Estey-Of-England-And-America.pdf](http://www.estey-gen.info/Estey%20Of%20England%20And%20America.pdf)> [accessed 20 June 2019]. I would like to thank Katie Jackson, Assistant Parish Minister at St Mary's, for sending me photographs of the epitaph itself.

Bedell, ‘one of the most distinguished scholars and divines of the coming age’.⁴⁸ The circle also included William Hall, Richard Brabon and Thomas Edmonds. Among the most interesting surviving letters concerning Lady Drury are two from another local minister, Thomas Daynes, that reveal her interest in controversial points of doctrine, and her position within a multi-directional and perhaps disputatious correspondence also involving Bedell and Hall about an austere sermon relating to the Canons of 1604.⁴⁹

Though it is impossible to know how much time Donne spent at Hawstead, the *Anniversaries* are self-consciously products of his engagement with the Drurys’ interwoven religious, literary and political contacts and activities.⁵⁰ Beyond the collaboration with Hall, this is most obvious in *SecAn*’s deictic reference to the continental travels Donne embarked on with the Drurys from April to August 1612, the purposes of which are still somewhat unclear:

Here in a place, where mis-deuotion frames
A thousand praiers to saints, whose very names
The ancient Church knew not, Heauen knows not yet,
And where, what lawes of poetry admit,
Lawes of religion haue at least the same,
Immortal Maid, I might inuoe thy name.
Could any Saint prouoke that appetite,
Thou here shouldst make mee a French conuertite.
But thou wouldst not; nor wouldst thou be content,
To take this, for my second yeeres true Rent,
Did this Coine beare any other stampe, then his,
That gaue thee power to do, me to say this. (511–22)

Donne used this trip at least in part – and in some cases unsuccessfully – to pursue meetings with various individuals, among them the Archbishop of York’s son Toby Matthew (a controversial Catholic convert), Nathaniel Rich, Sir Edward Conway, and reforming

⁴⁸ Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), p. 479.

⁴⁹ Transcribed in Bald, *Donne and the Drurys*, p. 51.

⁵⁰ Bald (*Life*, pp. 242–43, 265) notes that he seems largely to have kept to London lodgings, and that his family were probably moved from Mitcham to the Isle of Wight before taking up residency in Drury Lane ‘between Michaelmas 1612 and Lady Day 1613’.

Catholic figures such as Edmond Richer, the Syndic of the Sorbonne.⁵¹ While care must be taken with partial evidence of this kind, a number of factors point to the notion that Donne was at this time engaged in building a reputation as a consensus figure and representative of the King. His concern to engage with irenic Catholic figures on the continent, for instance, may be gauged in several ways. One is that a quarto edition of *Conclave Ignatii* was also printed in Hanau, Germany, possibly even before the London (duodecimo) edition was entered into the Stationers' Register by Thomas Morton (on 24 January 1611).⁵² That at least fifteen copies of this book survive, particularly in regions noted for religious tension in the early seventeenth century, suggests that Donne's anti-Jesuit satire was fundamentally conceived and marketed for a continental audience.⁵³ Additionally, as Johann P. Sommerville notes, the arguments presented by *Pseudo-Martyr* are reminiscent of 'a small group of Catholic defenders of the Jacobean oath, including William Barret, William Warmington, the Franco-Scot John Barclay, and most of all the Benedictine Thomas Preston (who wrote under the name of Roger Widdrington)'.⁵⁴ Breaking *SecAn*'s fourth wall, Donne spells out, at his clearest, a distinction between the 'lawes of poetry' within which the *Anniversaries* operate (centred on 'the 'stampe' of God on poet and Christian subject) and the 'Lawes of religion' within which they do not. The various forms of literary and confessional subterfuge in which the poems partake – which their very title, evoking the 'month's mind', or anniversary mass, of Catholic worship, evokes – are thereby confirmed as the provocative poses of an ex-Catholic print author 'in a place, where mis-deuotion frames', whose intricate epideictic

⁵¹ See Johann P. Sommerville, 'John Donne the Controversialist: The Poet as Political Thinker', *Professional Lives*, pp. 73–95 (pp. 92–93); Bald, *Donne and the Drurys*, pp. 96–97; Daniel Starza Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers: Patronage and Manuscript Circulation in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 241–44. Smith notes that a letter of 16 August 1612 (*Letters*, pp. 187–90) describing some of Donne's movements to Goodere, including his meeting with Conway, is mistakenly headed 'To my much honoured friend S^r T. Lucy.'

⁵² Arber, III, p. 204.

⁵³ Willem Heijting and Paul R. Sellin, 'John Donne's "Conclave Ignatii": The Continental Quarto and Its Printing', *HLQ*, 62 (1999), 401–21.

⁵⁴ Sommerville, 'John Donne the Controversialist', pp. 92–93.

mode demands of his readers the kinds of interconfessional engagement that he was probably undertaking through diplomatic means.⁵⁵

The *Anniversaries* have been described as the works of ‘a critical and self-critical craftsman’, ‘a collection deliberately and openly written with reference to its generic resources’: to – in Donne’s own words – ‘all that I could say’.⁵⁶ Similarly, they are works that derive meaning from authorial ‘resources’: building blocks of the kind of ‘life-narrative’ Kevin Pask locates at the heart of a Foucauldian conception of emergent early modern authorship.⁵⁷ In the final forty lines of *FirAn*, ‘I’ and ‘Me’ appear five times, the speaker rendering his ‘great Office’ analogous to that of Moses (469), and offering a further, final justification for the publication he has created: ‘fame’: ‘Verse hath a middle nature: heauen keeps soules, | The graue keeps bodies, verse the fame enroules.’ (473–74). It is an argument carried into *SecAn*, anticipating a poetry-writing readership whilst categorising the *Anniversaries* as ‘Hymnes’, which ‘may worke on future wits, and so | May great Grand-children of thy praises grow’ (32–33). While the rest of this chapter will explore the many ways in which the sense and form of these lines were self-fulfilling, establishing elaborate funerary ‘verse’ publications as a fitting monument to ‘fame’, it will also look to consider how the discerning, moderate political sensibility modelled by Donne and Hall in these poems became a central point of contention in elegies written to commemorate Prince Henry.

⁵⁵ Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, pp. 52, 54. On the poems’ imitation of the cult of sainthood, see Colie, “‘all in peeces’”, pp. 213–24.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 192; Maria Mitchell, ‘Gender, Genre, and the Idea of John Donne in the *Anniversaries*’, in *Donne and the Resources of Kind*, ed. by A. D. Cousins and Damian Grace (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2002), pp. 106–19 (pp. 108–09).

⁵⁷ Kevin Pask, *The emergence of the English author: Scripting the life of the poet in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 2.

‘This PRINCE in whom wee liv’d’: Elegising Henry, Prince of Wales

The sudden death of Prince Henry Stuart on 6 November 1612, at the age of eighteen, was and remains the defining feature of his posthumous biography. In scale and kind, his funeral, one month later, was almost without precedent, comprising a mile-long procession of two thousand mourners, an elaborate hearse, and – uniquely for an English prince – a life-sized effigy.⁵⁸ A more immediate form of commemoration, however, was the explosion of over fifty elegiac publications in print, many of which emerged within days of Henry’s death, and within which all but perhaps four major poets and playwrights of the period are represented.⁵⁹ These tributes, and a great many others that survive only in manuscript, brought to a pitch contemporary deliberations about the ‘lawes of poetry’ whose repercussions were felt for years.

Henry’s death was many things to many people, and its potential significance is difficult to overstate. Namesake to King Henry VIII, and brother to Princess Elizabeth, he was to the country at large a living embodiment of British history, a symbol of Tudor-Stuart lineage, and a promise of future greatness. To his father he was both an heir and a rival, whose militant Protestantism had ignited a counter court and a counterweight to the ambivalent religious policy of the day, leading much of Protestant Europe to place its hopes in the young prince.⁶⁰ Some quarters of this opposition bristled openly in the wake of its

⁵⁸ The funeral was held on 7 December. See Roy Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales and England’s Lost Renaissance* (Pimlico, 1986), p. 1; Jennifer Woodward, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England 1570–1625* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997), pp. 148–65; Elizabeth Goldring, ‘“So iust a sorrowe so well expressed”: Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration’, in *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, ed. by Timothy Wilks (Southampton Solent University in association with Paul Holberton publishing, 2007), pp. 280–95.

⁵⁹ According to Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 124, the only major figures not to contribute (or whose tributes are not yet known of) were Ben Jonson, Samuel Daniel, Michael Drayton, and William Shakespeare. For surveys of these publications, see pp. 124–203; Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 272; E. C. Wilson, *Prince Henry and English Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1946), pp. 132–33.

⁶⁰ For a recent overview, see Anthony Milton, ‘New Horizons in the Early Jacobean Period’, *Handbook*, pp. 483–94. On Prince Henry as a political figurehead, see J. W. Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, A Study of 17th Century Personation* (New York: AMS Press, 1978). Kenneth Fincham describes Prince Henry’s household as an echo chamber for ‘the incessant drumbeat of militant evangelical Protestantism’ in ‘The roles and influence of household chaplains, c.1600–c.1660’, in *Chaplains in early modern England*:

leader's passing. Lewis Bayly, one of Henry's household chaplains, was one of several preachers to direct a strongly providentialist interpretation of the catastrophe towards an indictment of James's government – in this case, directly accusing Privy Council members of Roman Catholic sympathies.⁶¹ Writing to Dudley Carleton about the fallout from this sermon, John Chamberlain describes with distaste both the rhetoric of such 'pulpit hornets' and the outpouring of printed verse that accompanied them:

The same day the princes funeral was kept here, there was a solemne obsequie for him at Oxford wth a sermon and a funerall oration after yt at S^t maries and the like in the afternoone at christ church, both w^{ch} places were hangd and furnished wth blacks. and they have set out a booke of Latin elegies and funerall verses. our cambrige men are nothing so forward nor officious only I heare of some verses are set out or geven to some few but not publickly sold⁶²

To the poets who elegised Henry he had also been a patron or potential patron, to whom over 125 books had been dedicated, and whose death represented a potentially serious career setback.⁶³ Nonetheless, the religio-political noise in which their near-mandatory commemoration took place was unignorable, 'inevitably' turning it, in Dennis Kay's words, into 'a series of exercises in Protestant poetics'.⁶⁴ At the same time, it was wound up with commemorations of a different kind: having been postponed by Henry's death, Princess Elizabeth's marriage to the Elector Palatine went ahead on 14 February 1613, at King James's insistence that it not be delayed any further.⁶⁵ Many elegists, including Donne, went on to write epithalamia for the newlyweds three months later; many elegies written for Henry, possibly including Donne's, anticipate this union within and alongside their laments. The literary features of elegies for Henry have been surveyed at some length, particularly insofar as they explore, assert and muddy a distinction between 'Spenserian' poetics

Patronage, literature and religion, ed. by Hugh Adlington, Tom Lockwood and Gillian Wright (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 11–35 (p. 16).

⁶¹ Strong, *Henry*, p. 31.

⁶² TNA SP 14/71, fol. 122^r.

⁶³ As was the case for George Chapman, whose career, according to Kay, 'never recovered'. See *Melodious Tears*, p. 198. On dedications to Henry, see Wilson, *Prince Henry*, p. 173.

⁶⁴ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 134.

⁶⁵ On the process behind the wedding's rescheduling, see Wilson, *Prince Henry*, pp. 158–63.

(characterised by ‘aureate’ diction, community focus, and allegorical depictions of Neoplatonist ‘transcendent truth’), and the kind of epideictic mode exemplified by Donne’s *Anniversaries*.⁶⁶ Broadly speaking, the ‘Spenserians’ are seen to include Sir Arthur Gorges, the anonymous author of *Great Britains Mourning Garment* (1612), John Taylor, James Maxwell, William Browne of Tavistocke, Christopher Brooke, George Wither, Sir John Davies, Drummond, Giles Fletcher, William Basse (who identifies himself as Colin Clout’s ‘heir’), and George Chapman. Characteristic of Donne’s ‘program for poetry’ are the elegies of Edward Herbert, Henry King, Henry Goodere, and, to some extent, Cyril Tourneur.⁶⁷ These examples consistently show, however, that even where factional oppositions and inheritances are most stridently and explicitly emphasised, the poetic modes adumbrated by critics were, to a great extent, fluid and interchangeable.

The second part of this chapter builds on the first in considering the manifestation of this literary and political tension in one commemorative anthology in particular: *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* – the book in which Donne’s *Henry* was printed. Moving beyond predominantly rhetorical and genre-based approaches, it explores the bibliographical, social and political features and contexts represented in this book via an investigation of its coterie dynamics. Beginning with the suggestion that *Coryats Crudities*, as well as the *Anniversaries*, present key analogues for *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*’s inventive approach to printing a poetic coterie, I argue that, within this context, Donne and his imitators consciously and conspicuously sought to establish a community of discerning commemorators, as exemplified by the *Anniversaries*, in a moment of intense political upheaval – doing so through publishing a demonstrably competitive and intellectual group of elegies. While such competitive elements have been acknowledged by a number of critics, my approach differs insofar as I

⁶⁶ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 124–203 (particularly pp. 136, 166–68 and 176–77); Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic*, pp. 59–95.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

seek to integrate them within a consistent ‘Donnean’ poetic ethic in these years, foregrounding the centrality of a politically moderate public poetic identity within that ethic, and suggesting – as the latter part of this chapter will show in detail – that such competitive and idiosyncratic characteristics may be defined in opposition to the repetitive and politically simplistic commemorative style characteristic of more militant, Spenserian tributes. Moreover, in further establishing competitive coterie dynamics as a deliberate and politically inflected elegiac gesture, as well as a controversial one, I ground my arguments in considerations of little-studied manuscript witnesses for key elegies in Donne’s immediate circle, showing how these materials further reinforce that central claim, and, finally, bring these arguments to bear on specific (yet ambiguous) patronage contexts behind Donne’s elegy.

The most influential literary product of Prince Henry’s court circle was not a commemoration of his death, but *Coryats Crudities*, a parodic fusion of travelogue, prose romance and Menippean satire fundamentally invested in print as a means of representing authorship, identity and the social and intellectual world of the prince, to whom it is dedicated. The book was printed in early 1611, closely followed by a sequel, *Coryats Crambe* (which entered the *Stationers’ Register* on 7 June), a spin-off (unauthorised) version of its mock-panegyric verses (*The Odcombian Banquet*), and, later in the year, Donne’s *FirAn*.⁶⁸ Most notable of its features is this selection of fifty-nine mock-panegyric verses by men of considerable political, professional and literary standing (including two poems by Donne: *Coryat* and *Macaron*), whose identities are brought to bear upon its manifold figurative approaches to reading and learning – among them early modern dietary theory, ‘pseudoerudition’, degeneracy, and the contemporary idea (exemplified later by Robert

⁶⁸ O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, pp. 102, 124; Arber, III, p. 208.

Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*) that books can bring about physical change in readers.⁶⁹ As Katherine A. Craik has shown, Coryat's mock-panegyrists were highly aware of these elements, and 'earnestly expecting' *Crudities*'s appearance in print.⁷⁰

Like the *Anniversaries*, *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* invites comparison with *Coryats Crudities*. Joshua Sylvester, its editor, was, like Coryat, a member of Prince Henry's court, and in receipt of a pension from him.⁷¹ Moreover, according to Dennis Kay, *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* was funded by Princess Elizabeth.⁷² In a bid, perhaps, to do justice to these affiliations, the book's creators sought a completely innovative approach to commemorative printing, using solid ink-black blocks and elaborate woodcut skeletons in its margins and the entirety of its title and verso pages, into which text and royal arms are set in negative. The large number of bibliographical notices tucked into extant copies attests to the book's complexity and uniqueness as a 'remarkable printing artefact of macabre typography'.⁷³ It went through three early editions. The first two contain the titular elegy by Sylvester, along with poems in English, Latin, French and Italian by Walter Quin, a long-time servant of the Stuarts and tutor to Prince Henry.⁷⁴ The most significant changes appear in the third edition, to which poems by Joseph Hall, 'G. Q.', and 'I. S.' were added, and which was appended by a further collection of 'Svndry Fvneral Elegies, On the Vntimely Death of the most excellent Prince Henry; Late, Prince of Wales. Composed by seuerall Avthors'. These contain poems by 'H. L.', 'R. S.', George Garrard, Hugh Holland, Donne, Sir William Cornwallis, Sir

⁶⁹ Thomas Coryat, *Coryats crudities hastily gobbled vp in five moneths trauels* (1611), sigs. D3^r–D4^r. Donne's mock-panegyric verse ('Oh, to what heighth will loue of greatnesse driue') is followed immediately by a Latin macaronic poem by him ('In Eundem Macaronicon').

⁷⁰ Katherine A. Craik, 'Reading "Coryats Crudities"' (1611), *SEL*, 44 (2004), 77–96.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 78; Susan Snyder, 'Sylvester, Joshua (1562/3–1618)', *ODNB* (2004) [accessed 30 June 2019].

⁷² Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 195.

⁷³ This quote is taken from one such notice kept with Bodl. J–J Sidney 135, a first-edition copy (*STC* 23576). Others may be found in CUL Keynes B.5.6. (*STC* 23578) and CuL, SSS 32. 2 (*STC* 23576). Some examples, such as Keynes B.5.6. and Bodl. J–J Sidney 136 (a third-edition copy (*STC* 23578) have been given decorative modern bindings that echo the thematic concerns of the book.

⁷⁴ Sidney Lee and J. K. McGinley, 'Quin, Walter (c1575–1641)', *ODNB* (2004) [accessed 1 July 2019].

Edward Herbert, Sir Henry Goodere, and Henry Burton (in that order).⁷⁵ Quin, Donne and Goodere had each also contributed verses to *Coryats Crudities*.

Like *Coryats Crudities*, and perhaps more than any other tribute to Henry, *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* brought the visual and material elements of printed commemorations into the store of figurative elements out of which it was textually and imaginatively composed. In doing so, as Holland seems to note, the book also became a simulacrum of a public building whose walls/margins are decked in mourning blacks: ‘The *Court* doth mourne, and all with *black* is walled’.⁷⁶ One trope to gain particular currency in later works was the conflation of ink with tears of mourning. Adopting this in his elegy on Donne (discussed in chapter five), for instance, Sir Francis Kynaston interprets the image of the black page as a sign of elegiac overabundance (or perhaps overkill) – a satirical comment on the ubiquitousness of elegists who would weep/write over each other’s laments to the extent that no white space remains available:

Ile not assay after so many eies
Haue drown’d themselues, the world in Elegies
So many learned penne haue with their incke
Stain’d Realmes of paper black, that one would thinke
The world had put on mourning, and no line
Was verse but was an Epitaph of thine⁷⁷

In textual terms, *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* is self-consciously fluid and complex. Its third edition alone is divided into ten issues by *Variorum* editors, though further subdivisions may yet be discernible.⁷⁸ This is a feature of the book about which the prefatory verse to the

⁷⁵ The identities of ‘H. L.’ and ‘R. S.’ are unknown.

⁷⁶ Joshua Sylvester, *Lachrymae Lachrymarum or The Spirit of Teares Distilled for the vn-tymely Deth of The incomparable Prince, Panaretyvs. By Ioshua Syluester. The third Edition, with Addition of His Owne* (Humphrey Lownes, 1613), sig. D2^v. Further citations from this book given in brackets.

⁷⁷ London Metropolitan Archives, ACC/1360/528, f. 3^v rev.

⁷⁸ These are known as 12a–j, with 12a, the earliest version, providing the *Variorum* copy-text for Henry (see *Variorum*, VI, p. 163). Having compared this text with those of various printed copies, I have been able to discover no textual variants. According to a note kept with Bodl. J–J Sidney 135 (a rare second edition copy), by Sheila Markham, the first and second editions may be distinguished by the fact that the former features a colophon on its final leaf, which is replaced in the latter by a woodcut border. To my knowledge, however, no comprehensive bibliographical study of *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* has yet been undertaken and/or published.

‘Svndry Elegies’, ‘To the seuerall Authors of these surrepted Elegies’ (by ‘H. L.’ and ‘R. S.’) comments directly:

*If any grieue to vndergoe the Press;
You All (almost) haue suffered it, for less:
If (which we feare) som-where we miss your Text;
Better inform’d, wee’l mend it in the Next.*

Referring, undoubtedly (but perhaps not only), to the *Anniversaries*, in which both Donne and Hall had ‘suffered’ ‘the Press’ ‘for less’, these lines describe a memorial volume that is improvisatory, fluid, immediate, and incomplete, evoking simultaneously an openness to newcomers and a coterie exclusivity that the elegies themselves explore. As Michelle O’Callaghan has pointed out with regard to *Coryats Crudities*, printed ‘coterie’ poems like the mock-panegyrics prefacing that volume were in some cases evidently written after printing had begun, allowing their authors similarly to ‘converse with the book and other participants’.⁷⁹ In a possible reference to the visual tone of *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, George Garrard argues that its materials are in fact wasted on what he perceives to be an undignified competitive strain among his fellow elegists:⁸⁰

*With idle Rime wee blot white spot-les papers
(Whose best vse is to make Tobacco Tapers)
There, striuing to out-strip each others braine,
We show how vaine we are, to shew our veine (sig. D1^r)*

Garrard’s lines obviously recall Jonson’s well-known, albeit third-hand, recollection of Donne’s explanation for his elegy, ‘That Donne said to him he wrote that epitaph on Prince Henry, ‘Look to me, faith’, to match Sir Ed. Herbert in obscureness.’⁸¹ Here, then, we arrive at the central point of contention identified above, and the legacy of the self-reflexive, coterie-inflected, textually complex, politically sceptical and discerning elegiac mode Donne had developed in the *Anniversaries*, which he conspicuously carries through into the ‘Svndry

⁷⁹ O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, p. 106.

⁸⁰ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 196, similarly describes Henry Burton’s poem, the last of the ‘Svndry Elegies’ as a ‘self-referential allegory’ about the book itself; though Burton does not mention its physical features.

⁸¹ Drummond, ‘Informations’, p. 365.

Elegies’, and which was evidently impossible to ignore for other writers of commemorative verse. Even Sylvester, whose tribute is the first in *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* – a poem printed two editions before the ‘Svndry Elegies’ were added – opens the volume with a veiled reference to the poet of the *Anniversaries*:

How-euer, short of Others *Art* and *Wit*,
I knowe my powers for such a Part vnfit;
And shall but light my Candle in the *Sunn*,
To doe a work shall be so better *Donne* (sig. A2^r)

Despite the obvious topicality and influence of Donne’s poems, it is notable that Sylvester’s first act as archetypally ‘Spenserian’ editor-poet is to allude to the intellectual ‘powers’ of their author.⁸² To some extent, however, the integration of the ‘Svndry Elegies’ within a ‘socially dialogic’ print context is bibliographically suggested by the fact that, with the exception of the final poem (Henry Burton’s ‘A Pilgrim’s sad Obseruation vpon *a disastrous Accident, in his Trauaile towards the HOLY-LAND*’), they share their titles (‘*ELEGIE* On the vntimely Death of the *incomparable Prince, HENRY*’) with each other, each poem/title numbered, one to six.⁸³ No rationale for their precise sequencing is readily apparent.⁸⁴ But the textual juxtaposition fashioned by bibliographical uniformity invites the kinds of intertextual reading and writing Garrard and Jonson/Donne provoke and locate within the elegies.

It is worth noting here that Donne’s approach to writing printed coterie poetry in *Coryats Crudities* is highly consistent with that of the *Anniversaries* and ‘Svndry Elegies’. O’Callaghan’s reading of his longest poem in the book, *Coryat* (titled ‘*Incipit Johannes Donne*’ in the book, following a format many of the other mock-panegyrics likewise share), makes numerous veiled references to the *Anniversaries*: the ‘motif of the anatomy’ and ‘the metaphoric riches from the East and the West’ that Donne brings to an interrogation of the

⁸² On Sylvester as poet and editor, see David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 195; Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 184.

⁸³ The phrase ‘socially dialogic’ is once again borrowed from Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (London, Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 159.

⁸⁴ Kay likewise discerns no organising principle in the sequencing of the poems. *Melodious Tears*, p. 185.

‘language of praise and the status of print publication’.⁸⁵ Having cynically emphasised the book’s merely physical and material uses, his poem ends with an uncertain turn:

And yet, I thinke this true;
As *Sybils* was, your booke is mysticall,
For euery peece is as much worth as all.
Therefore mine impotency I confesse;
The healths which my braine beares, must be farre lesse;
Thy Gyant-wit o’ rethrowes me, I am gone,
And rather then reade all, I would reade none. (Sig. D4^v)

These lines both endorse and withdraw from the composite work and social dynamic in which they appear. As a result, as O’Callaghan notes, they ‘isolate and thereby distinguish [Donne] within the print coterie’.⁸⁶ Additionally, in referring to ‘wit’ as a kind of alcoholic stamina or gregariousness, they provoke speculations and distinctions about forms of ability ‘wit’ might otherwise denote – including the new species of anatomical and panegyric ‘*Art* and *Wit*’ Donne was himself was about to publish.

We may therefore take Donne’s apparent statement of intent ‘to match Sir Ed. Herbert in obscureness’ as a legitimate starting point for reading *Henry*, while allowing the remark all the scrutiny and scepticism it would bear even (or perhaps especially) if we knew it represented Donne’s exact words. Herbert’s elegy sets out a rabbit warren of cumulative philosophical conjectures about the nature of souls, in which his speaker discovers a fairly typical epideictic consolation and rationale for praise in a resolution to ‘Vertuous growe, | Only in Memorie that HEE was so’. Arriving at this thought, he decides not to ‘question more | Whether the Soule of Man be Memorie; | As Plato thought’, but to accept Plato’s rational doctrine as a basis upon which ‘to liue’ and as an incentive for keeping ‘that Memorie, | Which being HIS, can therefore neuer dye’ (Sigs F2^r–^v). Donne’s elegy is likewise framed around the convoluted articulation of an epistemological problem: how can faith, and its auxiliary, reason, remain possible now that Prince Henry – ‘The only Subiect REASON

⁸⁵ O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, pp. 124–25.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 117–18.

wrought vpon' (70), whose faith had offered a rational proof and manifestation of 'All that Faith could credit Mankinde *could*' (19–20) – is dead? The answer is offered by a sudden and somewhat contrived realisation:

But, now, for vs with busie *Proofs* to come
 That w'haue no *Reason*, would proue we had some:
 So would iust *Lamentations*. Therefore Wee
 May safelier say, that Wee are dead, then *Hee*.
 So, if our *Griefs* wee doo not well declare,
 W'haue double Excuse; *Hee* is not *dead*, Wee are.
 Yet would not I dye yet; for though I bee
 Too-narrow, to think HIM, as *Hee* is HEE
 (Our *Soule's* best Bayting and *Mid-period*
 In her long *Journey* of *Considering* GOD)
 Yet (no Dishonor) I can reach Him *thus*;
 As *Hee* embrac't the *Fires* of *Loue* with vs. (77–88)

The poem's turning point arrives with a series of self-reflexive arguments about the poem itself, which, in constructing 'busie *Proofs*' of reason's redundancy, has become self-defeating. What is more, its 'iust *Lamentations*' reignite reason and faith because they activate a Pauline vision in which corporeal living is shown to be the actual 'death' that precedes heavenly 'life'.⁸⁷ From this verdict, and its corollary death-wish (somewhat similar to those in *Sorrow* and *BoulRec*), the speaker resolves not (literally) to die, because memory of Henry's example provides sufficient reason and faith through which to live virtuously. Figuring Henry as a '*Mid-period*' for 'Our *Soule's*' '*long Journey* of *Considering* GOD', the speaker recalls the spiritual '*Journey*' of *SecAn*, and adopts the same Pauline idea of the 'glass' on which the *Anniversaries* and much of Donne's commemorative verse centres.

As is probably clear from the above paraphrase, *Henry* does indeed 'match', and exceed, Herbert's elegy in 'obscurity'. Thirty-four lines the longer, syntactically, metrically and allusively knottier, it nonetheless presents a similar method and a similar argument. An intertextual relationship between the poems is further suggested by one of nine extant manuscript witnesses for *Henry*, O29, which reproduces it after Herbert's elegy, in the

⁸⁷ Robbins, *Poems*, p. 771, notes clear textual parallels here with Ephesians 2. 5. and Colossians 3. 1, 3.

same hand, and in what was evidently sent as a letter.⁸⁸ In a manner reminiscent of *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, the poems are given the exact same titles ('An Elegie uppon ye Prince is death'); but as *Variorum* editors have shown, this copy of *Henry* derives from a separate manuscript source, rather than print.⁸⁹ Herbert's name is, however, given below his elegy/preceding Donne's; and 'Made by M^r Donne' is written below Donne's, on what became one of the letter's exterior faces – identifying the manuscript as early witness (before 'M^r Donne' became Dr Donne).⁹⁰ Intriguingly, on each of the three sides on which Donne's elegy appears, it has been crossed through diagonally by a later hand – a possible indication that an early reader was displeased with it.⁹¹ Whatever the explanation, the manuscript witnesses to a scribal underpinning for the poems in which readers – and perhaps the elegists themselves – shared and interacted with elegies for Henry as competitive companion pieces in the Donnean mode.

Further manuscript evidence reveals another, unprinted elegy related to Donne's circle, and further light on the socially-integrated manner in which both it and Goodere's elegy, which directly imitates Donne's, were composed.⁹² Given that this unprinted poem survives in the 'para-Goodere' hand, and also appears in B13 (the so-called 'Skipwith MS'), one possible attribution as to its author is William Skipwith (c.1654–1610), who was a friend of Goodere.⁹³ An exhortation to 'Weepe' and an advertisement for the decanted tears of mourning, it represents a rallying call to fellow elegists, and is written with a strong

⁸⁸ While the coincidence of Donne and Herbert's elegies in O29 is noted by Kay, *Melodious Tears*, p. 196, he does not discuss it in any further detail. It is not noted by *Variorum* editors.

⁸⁹ *Variorum*, VI, pp. 163–173. The poem belongs to C9/H6 'subfamily' of manuscript witnesses as opposed to that of DT1 and H4.

⁹⁰ O29, fols 91^r–92^v.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, fols 91^v–92^v. It is possible to establish that this was a later intervention because the ink used to draw these crosses has on fol. 92^r spilt and slipped across the crease of the letter as it would have been when unfolded.

⁹² By item the poems are SP 14/71/49A–B; by folio they are SP 14/71 fols 81–82. On these manuscripts, see Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, p. 163.

⁹³ B13, fol. 40. On Goodere's literary friendship with William Skipwith, and the 'para-Goodere' hand, see Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 216–18. According to *UFLI*, the anonymous elegy also appears in O17, p. 47.

communal emphasis, purportedly the day after Prince Henry's death. Goodere's elegy is also an extended justification of mourning, resolving 'neither [to] aske relief | Nor counsell now of anie, but my Grief', but ultimately discovering consolation through a rational recognition of the forms of value on which mourning is predicated (sig. F3^r). It therefore presents similarities both with this anonymous elegy and that of Donne – with which, as Terry G. Sherwood has shown, it shares some specific methods and allusions to Augustine's *City of God* (and Donne's own *Metem*).⁹⁴ We know, furthermore, that another working manuscript copy of Goodere's elegy (in B11) was also sent to Edward Conway – another friend and potential patron with whom he later frequently shared verse, and who had, as noted above, recently met with Donne on the continent in late summer 1612.⁹⁵ Taken together, these fragments of evidence are richly suggestive about the forms of sociable manuscript exchange that underpinned and resulted from the competitive intertextuality characterising Donnean elegies for Henry in print.

Donne's elegy is, however, the most pointedly allusive of these poems, and in a manner that both directly reinforces the consistent political sensibility I have been describing and develops within it an unexpected turn. The speaker's lengthy descriptions of empirical evidence for Henry's 'faith' are couched within praises of his father, whose 'greatest Instrument' (32) he was, and who would, it is implicitly and disingenuously suggested, have tempered his son's militarism such that Henry would have 'conuey[ed] and tye[ed] | This soule of *Peace* through CHRISTIANITIE', making 'This *general Peace* th'eternall ouertake' (33–34). At the very end of the poem, however, the speaker explicitly imagines his '*Lines*' in the hands of another reader:

Oh! May I (since I liue) but see or hear
That *Shee-Intelligence* which mov'd This *Sphear*,

⁹⁴ Terry G. Sherwood, 'Reason, Faith, and Just Augustinian Lamentation in Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry', *SEL*, 13 (1973), 53 – 67. Sherwood argues that the elegies of Herbert, Donne and Goodere were written in that order, with each taking cues from that which precedes it.

⁹⁵ Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 242–44.

I pardon Fate my Life. Who-e'r thou bee
 Which hast the noble *Conscience*, Thou art *Shee*.
 I coniure Thee by all the *Charmes Hee* spoke,
 By th'Oathes which only you *Two* neuer broke,
 By all the *Soules* you *sigh't*; that if you see
These Lines, you wish I knew *Your Historie*:
 So, much as *You Two mutual Heauens* were *here*,
 I were an *Angel singing* what *You* were. (89–98)

Forgiving 'Fate' for his corporeal life, because a certain 'Shee-Intelligence' likewise still lives within 'This Sphear', the speaker speculates that he may lead her to 'wish I knew' the 'Historie' in which she and the prince '*Two mutual Heauens* were'. It is not clear to whom this refers: critics have suggested Queen Anne, Princess Elizabeth, or a potential suitor, such as Frances (Howard) Devereux, who was at around this time courting Sir Robert Carr, first Earl of Somerset, whom she would marry on 26 December 1613.⁹⁶ Certainly, the 'Shee-Intelligence' is at least reminiscent of the 'Phænix-Bride' and 'Shee-Sunne' figure in Donne's contemporaneous '*Epithalamion Vpon Frederick Count Palatine and the Lady Elizabeth married on S^t. Valentines day*' (*EpEliz*, 29, 85), depicted as an Elizabeth Drury type subject from whom 'All lesser birds will take theyr Iollity' (32), and whose union with the Elector Palatine will cause 'all men [to] date Records from this thy Valentine' (42). While it is possible, as Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers have argued (following Wesley Milgate and John T. Shawcross), that Donne does not refer to an actual person, but to 'the angelic intelligences controlling the heavenly spheres of the Ptolemaic universe', the marked specificity of these lines, and their consistency with the forms of direct authorial address noted above in *SecAn*, surely makes this unlikely.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ Kay (*Melodious Tears*, p. 195) argues that Princess Elizabeth is 'the more likely' of these candidates. For a basic overview of critical perspectives, see *Variorum*, VI, pp. 609–10.

⁹⁷ Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers, 'Contexts and Strategies: Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry', *JDJ*, 19 (2000), 205–22 (p. 218). Pebworth and Summers also note (pp. 215–17) that Donne's father-in-law, Sir George More, who had in 1610 been made Prince Henry's Treasurer and Receiver-General, might have requested that he write an elegy.

The identity of the ‘Shee-Intelligence’ is potentially significant because the poem’s many overlapping and shifting patronage contexts plug directly into the broader question of Donne’s vocation, on which recent scholarship has shed considerable light. Between 1610 and Henry’s death, particularly following the death of Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, in May 1612, the political influence of Somerset grew meteorically, resulting in a probable rivalry between him and Prince Henry, a longstanding friend and associate of Essex, Frances’s then husband. Speculation about a love triangle between Somerset, Frances and Henry has ultimately proved inconclusive; but it remains, nonetheless, a possibility.⁹⁸ On the basis of purely internal evidence, given the apparent implausibility that an ‘oath’ would apply to a mother or a sister, Donne’s lines certainly seem like a reference to a lover.

Though Donne, who would also write an epithalamion (*Eclog*) for Somerset and Frances, was undoubtedly a beneficiary of Somerset’s rise to power, his objectives for this new patronage relationship have until recently proved opaque, leading scholars to follow Bald’s assumption that he only belatedly turned to a career in the ministry (in 1615), having after the 1614 ‘Addled Parliament’ made one ‘supreme and final effort to secure state employment’ via Somerset.⁹⁹ As Jeanne Shami has shown, however, this gets the matter exactly the wrong way round: extant correspondence from Donne to Somerset and others reveals in fact that the two men were writing at ‘cross-purposes’, Somerset not realising that Donne’s real inclinations lay with the Church. This led to a precarious situation in which Donne, so as to remain in Somerset’s favour and ultimately secure the kind of employment he wanted, felt compelled both to apply for secular posts and to celebrate a controversial

⁹⁸ See Strong, *Henry*, pp. 32–34. That romance had previously been a known concern for Henry is suggested by a chatty letter of April 24 1608 from Sir Henry Wotton, in which Wotton updates the prince on a number of matches being made in Europe at that time, before reassuring him: ‘Methinks, I see youre Highnesse start at this list of mariages and bestowing of Princes daughters wherewith I haue presumed to intertayne you. Feare not, Sir, Theare wilbe left for you a good wife I warrant you and what soeuer she be she shalbe glad of it.’ BL Harl MS 7007, fol. 108^r.

⁹⁹ Bald, *Life*, p. 289.

marriage (about which Lady Bedford, for one, was ‘scandalised’) in verse – a responsibility he complains about in another letter to his friend Sir Robert Ker, probably written in November 1613:¹⁰⁰

If my Muse were onely out of fashion, and but wounded and maimed like Free-will in the *Roman Church*, I should adventure to put her to an Epithalamion. But since she is dead, like Free-will in our Church, I have not so much Muse left as to lament her losse.¹⁰¹

The closing lines of *Henry*, like its flattery of King James, are a likely supplication for patronage that undoubtedly ties somehow into this dense timeline of vocational deliberation and professional manoeuvring. But as this subchapter has attempted to show, the forms of flattery in which Donne here engages are more sophisticated than critics have hitherto acknowledged, however they might be specifically directed. In this moment of explicit outreach, Donne both reaffirms and utilises the consistent public poetic persona first announced in the *Anniversaries*, whose rhetorical and intellectual ability, anti-militancy and loyalty equip him for the patronage he seeks. What is also clear, and what the last section of this chapter will explore further, is that at some point, probably between the writing of *Henry* and the summer of 1613, the poet of the *Anniversaries* began searching for ways to kill his muse.

‘Thou seest me heere at Midnight’: *Har* and its Contexts

An opportunity came with the death on 27 February 1614 of Prince Henry’s closest friend, Sir John Harington, second Baron Harington of Exton and brother to Lady Bedford. Fifteen months after the death of Henry, and six after that of their father (and John’s namesake), it was the last in a quick succession of highly significant deaths within this family and the

¹⁰⁰ Jeanne Shami, ‘Donne’s Decision to Take Orders’, *Handbook*, pp. 523–36 (especially pp. 529–33). See also Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, pp. 258–61.

¹⁰¹ *Letters*, p. 270.

political faction they represented. The first Baron had long served as a guardian to Princess Elizabeth, keeping her household accounts, taking a key role in organising the ‘Pomp and Glory’ of her wedding, and protecting her from murderous Catholic plots.¹⁰² The second, his only male heir, had been a promising young courtier who, in the words of Sir Henry Wotton, would ‘one day govern the kingdom’, and whose death was closely associated with those that it had followed. Consoling his wife Bess after the death of their son in 1617, Sir Walter Raleigh, who had been Prince Henry’s tutor, reflected:¹⁰³

I WAS loathe to write, because I knewe not how to comforte you; and, God knowes, I never knewe what sorrow meant till nowe. All that I can say to you is, that you must obey the will and providence of God; and remember, that the Queene’s Majestie bare the losse of Prince HENRY with a magnanimous harte, and the Lady HARRINGTON of her onley sonne.¹⁰⁴

Given such circumstances, and the particular cast of mind with which Henry’s faction had faced the catastrophe of his death, it is not surprising that Harington was commemorated in a manner highly analogous to that of his friend, resulting in two effusive print publications that (though comparatively modest in scope) echo many of its features.¹⁰⁵ As Ted-Larry Pebworth has shown in the only critical study hitherto to consider these apparently ‘concerted’ materials – behind which, he suggests, Lady Bedford was the coordinator – the manuscript poem Donne sent to her to mark that same occasion ‘is extraordinary for its silences’,

¹⁰² These are the words of William Camden, quoted in *Variorum*, VIII, p. 365. Among the expenses listed in Lord Harington’s account in advance of the wedding (TNA E 407/57/2) are forty-eight shillings ‘Paid to an Apothecary for unycornes horne & Cardius benedictus water for her gr[aces] service at severall tymes’. Ruth Selman suggests that this refers to walrus or narwhal tusk, and may have been bought for its known anti-poison properties – which is suggestive about anxieties surrounding such a politically significant event. See Ruth Selman, ‘Royal weddings in history: a Stuart Valentine’, <<https://blog.nationalarchives.gov.uk/royal-weddings-history-stuart-valentine/>> [accessed 8 July 2019].

¹⁰³ See Simon Healy, ‘Harington, John, Second Baron Harington of Exton (1592–1614)’, *ODNB* (2004) [accessed 30 August 2019].

¹⁰⁴ Walter Raleigh, *The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh: Letters*, II, ed by Edward Edwards (Macmillan, 1868), p. 359.

¹⁰⁵ This worldview is encapsulated in Thomas Gibson’s long dedicatory epistle to Harington, written shortly before his death, which includes something of a homiletical address: ‘Now the world decayes, and the daies of our life is shortened. We heare daily of the death of Infants, children, young men, yea Princes taken away in the prime and strength of their yeares’. Gibson, *The Blessing of a Good King. Deliuered in Eight Sermons vpon the storie of the Queene of the South* (1614), sig. B2^r. While no publications were produced specifically to commemorate the first Baron, a Latin letter and epitaph survive in LR1 (the Burley MS), fols 250^v–51^r which appear to focus on him.

praising Harington only ‘by means of negative formulas and indirection’, and maintaining the pointed political ambivalence of *Henry*.¹⁰⁶ Building on these observations in light of the arguments set out above, the final part of this chapter begins with a broader consideration of the literary and material forms through which the ‘concerted’ coterie publication event Pebworth identifies was realised. In looking back to Henry’s death, I suggest, Harington’s puritan elegists sought consciously both to present a thematically and formally integrated series of tributes in the Spenserian tradition and to respond to the enduring influence of Donne’s *Anniversaries*. Writing a highly opportunistic elegy under those same dark – and self-made – shadows, and bringing the poet of the *Anniversaries* into direct contact with the patron he had earlier abandoned, Donne’s subtly subversive poem represents a nuanced turning away from his famous poetic persona, appealing to the more intimate authorial model with which he had previously honoured Lady Bedford.

What is known of Harington’s reputation and friendship with Henry can usefully illuminate the political and intellectual underpinnings behind the commemorations that followed his death. Harington exemplified the interests of Henry’s court, and was frequently praised ‘in the contemporary language of technological experiment, exploration and military engagement’ – ideas with which Donne, as Ann Hurley has noted, engages obliquely in *Har*.¹⁰⁷ At the same time, print dedications to Harington in works such as Thomas Draxe’s Latin phrasebook, *Calliepeia* (1607), and George Thompson’s *Vindex Veritatis Aduersus Ivstvm Lipsivm Libri duo* (1606), reveal his enduring association with certain forms of classical erudition that were keenly adopted in contemporary puritan and neo-stoic discourse.¹⁰⁸ As Aysha Pollnitz has shown, a cache of Latin letters between Harington and

¹⁰⁶ Ted-Larry Pebworth, “‘Let Me Here Use That Freedom’: Subversive Representation in John Donne’s ‘Obsequies to the Lord Harington’”, *JEGP*, 91 (1992), 17–42 (pp. 31, 38).

¹⁰⁷ Ann Hurley, ‘Colliding Discourses: John Donne’s “Obsequies to the Lord Harington” and the New Historicism’, *Renaissance and Reformation*, 18 (1994), 57–76 (particularly pp. 70–71).

¹⁰⁸ Thomas Drax, *Calliepeia or a rich store-house of proper, choise, and elegant Latine words and phrases, collected for the most part out of all Tullies works* (1607); George Thompson, *Vindex Veritatis Aduersus Ivstvm*

Henry dating from the former's continental travels (1608–09) reveals the boys' own engagement with Senecan and Tacitean 'practical wisdom', despite (or perhaps because of) King James's censure against Tacitean learning in *Basilikon Doron* (1599). In one letter, Harington asks the Prince to help him with a difficult passage from Agricola.¹⁰⁹

In every sense, then, Harington was set to become a fully-fledged servant of Henry's future government – a prospect into which everything about him was invested, and which he had eagerly embraced on behalf of those around him. He was the ideal courtier whose virtues and abilities were seen through the prism of his friendship and service of the Prince.¹¹⁰ On a practical level, however, this meant that the fate of his family was intimately connected with that of Henry, whose death, compounded with debts left by the first Baron, left them in a precarious financial situation. Harington's will, completed eight days before his own death, makes no fewer than eight references to 'my debts', leaving the bulk of his newly-acquired estate to his 'deerelie beloued mother the Ladye Anne Harrington' and his sisters 'sister Lucien nowe wife of Edward Earle of Bedford' and 'the Ladye ffrauncys nowe wife of Sr Robert Chichester knight'.¹¹¹ In a remarkably forthright letter to Somerset nearly three months after her son's death, Lady Harington demands he make good 'on those promyses I haue wth much fauor receued of yow' – in the absence of which, she adds, her debts have 'almost doubled':

Lipsivm Libri duo. Prior insanam eius religionem politicam, fatuam nefariamq; de Fato sceleratissimam de Fraude doctrinam refellit (1606). Drax had translated William Perkins's works into Latin to make them available to a continental readership – see Stephen Wright, 'Draxe, Thomas (d.1618/19)', *ODNB* (2004) [accessed 30 August 2019].

¹⁰⁹ The letters survive in BL Harl MS 7007 (this particular one on fol. 224^r, followed by Henry's reply on fols 226^r–27^r). Aysha Pollnitz, 'Humanism and Education', in *Prince Henry Revived*, pp. 22–64 (pp. 51–52). For a more general overview of Seneca and Tacitus in the period, and the 'common interest' in them demonstrated by Henry's network, see J. H. M. Salmon, 'Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 169–88 (particularly pp. 175–76).

¹¹⁰ James' Cleland's *Hero-paideia, or The institution of a yovng noble man* (1607), p. 38, cites John as a ready example of an 'honest, and discreet man that is neither flatterer, gamester, or otherwise vitiouslie giuen' – the sort of friend that can be the making of a true 'Scholler' or prince through honest friendship.

¹¹¹ PROB 11/123/378.

It hathe not Bin my vse to breake wth those haue wth good will lent me their money,
but my estate is much changed, and I am alone not onely burthened wth an Infynite
debt, but w^{ll} not suffer the honno^r of the dead to perysh wth them¹¹²

Lady Harington and Lady Bedford both feature heavily within the printed – or ‘official’ – commemorative tributes written for John, which monumentalise the reputation he had established in life. Though he does not consider them, Pebworth’s conjecture that Lady Bedford solicited these materials is borne out by a number of factors. One derives from the fact that the largest book published in Harington’s honour, Richard Stock’s anthologised funeral sermon *The Chvrches Lamentation for the losse of the Godly* (1614), emphasises Harington’s affiliation with Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (which he attended in 1607/08), suggesting that a university network provided some of the impetus behind the elegists mobilised to contribute towards it.¹¹³ Prefacing and appending the volume, in accompaniment to a portrait of Harington and images of his family arms, are prominent verses by one ‘*I. P. Cantabri. Col. Syd. Suss.*’, added to which are three poems (one Latin, two English) by Francis Hering (/Herring) and one by Sir Thomas Roe.¹¹⁴ Given that at least five books held in Sidney Sussex College Library are known to have been formerly owned by Lady Bedford, her influence in this respect is highly plausible.¹¹⁵ Another factor is that an unprinted manuscript elegy by Sir Arthur Gorges, which does not appear to relate directly to the other poems and tributes written for Harington, nonetheless describes his ‘Tomb’ as built ‘in Bedfords brest’.¹¹⁶

¹¹² SP 14/77 fol. 40. The letter is dated 18 May.

¹¹³ Richard Stock, *The Chvrches Lamentation for the losse of the Godly: Deliuered in a Sermon, at the funerals of that truly noble, and most hopefully young Gentleman, Iohn Lord Harington, Baron of Exton* (1614).

¹¹⁴ The identity of ‘I. P.’ from Sidney Sussex College is not clear. Four individuals matching these initials and Harington’s dates of residence are listed in *Alumni Cantabrigienses* – but none stands out as an obvious candidate. (John Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), Pt 1, III.)

¹¹⁵ According to a basic search of the university library catalogue, *iDiscover*, <http://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/primo-explore/search?query=any,contains,countess%20of%20bedford&tab=cam_lib_coll&search_scope=SCOP_CAM_ALL&vid=44CAM_PROD&lang=en_US&offset=0> [accessed 30 August 2019].

¹¹⁶ *The Poems of Sir Arthur Gorges*, ed. Helen Estabrook Sandison (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 130–31. This poem survives in a single manuscript copy, BL Egerton MS 3165, a collection of Gorges’s poems in which it follows an elegy for Henry.

The second printed work, which, as Pebworth suggests, was probably also conceived at Lady Bedford's 'instigation', being dedicated both to her and Lady Harington (in that order), is Abraham Jackson's *Sorrovves Lenitive*.¹¹⁷ Jackson, the Harington family chaplain,¹¹⁸ establishes the women as central characters in this lengthy poem, introducing them, in its first stanza, as 'Two mournfull Ladies, in affection one, | (His wofull Mother, and his Sister deere)', who 'From troubled thoughts, shed torrents christall cleere' (sig. A3^r). Even more direct is the speaker's later ventriloquy of Lady Harington and her dying son:

O thou my dearest deare, and louing Childe ;
 Best part of me, deriued from my wombe:
 The sole Idea of thy Father milde,
 My staffe of age to guide me to my Tombe!
 Art thou extinct? hath life forsaken thee?
 Hast thou relinquish'd all the world and me? (sig. A4^v)

His life was seasoned with the thoughts of Death.
 Witnesse his sanctimonious purity,
 Witnesse his words spoke with his latest breath,
 To you his wofull Mother sitting by.
Lord IESV come, to thee my soule I giue,
Thou dy'dst for me, that I with thee might liue. (sig. C2^v)

This narrative strategy reflects that of contemporary puritan funeral sermons and hagiographical biographies, whose authors (as was mentioned in the previous chapter) took great care to chronicle the virtuous passing of their protagonists, doing so in an often lengthy biographical 'lean to' (or eulogy) at the end of the sermon proper.¹¹⁹ Stock echoes this focus on Harington's 'carriage and comforts' in death, insisting that 'wee cannot doubt but that it was very religious, and these very great'.¹²⁰ In a similar way, the constituent parts of *The*

¹¹⁷ Abraham Jackson, *Sorrovves Lenitive. Written Vpon occasion of the Death of that hopefull and Noble young Gentleman, John Lord Harrington, Barron of Exton* (1614); Pebworth, "'Let Me Here Use That Freedom'", p. 40.

¹¹⁸ See Gordon Goodwin and Vivienne Larminie, 'Jackson, Abraham (1588/9–1646?)', *ODNB* (2004) [accessed 30 August 2019].

¹¹⁹ On the 'lean to' in contemporary funeral sermons, see Ralph Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England 1480-1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 311. One of the earliest English deathbed narratives to script the final words of a real person in this way is Philip Stubbes's *A Christall Glasse for Christian Women. Containing, A most excellent Discourse, of the godlie life and Christian death of Mistresse Katherine Stubbes* (1592), sig. C2^v.

¹²⁰ Stock, *Lamentations*, pp. 94–95. The biographical part of Stock's sermon covers fully pages 61–94.

Chvrches Lamentation and *Sorrovves Lenitive* repeatedly reaffirm specific biographical details about Harington (exemplifying another developing trend in such composite commemorative publications), along with Stock's central, deeply providentialist argument: that the community ought not to mourn for Harington, but for themselves – and God's evident judgement upon them:

The taking away of the godly, especially by an ordinary hand of God cannot be sinne, but a punishment for sinne, and that which is manifested to be a very fearefull one. Then must wee, then ought wee to sigh and grone, to sorrow and mourne vnder this, as a very heavy iudgement: wee shall performe herein no vnfitting thing, nothing vnworthy of vs, whatsoeuer we be, or whosoever we be¹²¹

While the conspicuous thematic parallels between these materials – especially their emphasis upon Harington's 'religious and civic ideals' as 'patron of the church and pillar of the commonwealth' – are well studied by Pebworth, a number of striking literary features within them reveal how this religio-political message is also manifested in a carefully curated literary production, particularly in establishing a clear lineage with the Spenserian poetic modes developed in elegies for Henry.¹²² The most obvious of these is the six-line stanzaic form used in elegies by Hering, 'I. P.' and Jackson, which derives from Gorges's monumental *The Olympian Catastrophe* – 'the largest and most ambitious work' written for Prince Henry, according to Kay (at 196 stanzas/1176 lines) – and several other poems, among which are John Taylor's *Great Brittain, all in Blacke* (1612), which entered the Stationers' Register the very day after Henry died, and James Maxwell's *The Laudable Life, And Deplorable Death, of our late peerlesse Prince HENRY* (1613).¹²³ The form, rhymed *ababcc*, is very similar to *ottava rima* (*abababcc*) in that it facilitates the development of an episodic narrative verse in which argument is repeatedly checked by emphatic rhetorical turns. As

¹²¹ Ibid., pp. 22–23.

¹²² Pebworth, "Let Me Here Use That Freedome", p. 30.

¹²³ Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 144, 153. Unusually, Gorges's poem was not initially printed but produced as an elaborate presentation manuscript that survives in the Egerton Family Papers (HEH EL 1130). John Taylor, *Great Brittain, all in Blacke. For The incomparable loss of Henry, our late worthy Prince*. (1612); James Maxwell, *The Laudable Life, And Deplorable Death, of our late peerlesse Prince HENRY. Briefly represented. Together, with some other Poemes* (1613).

Wallerstein notes, such forms were hallmarks of a Spenserian poetic sensibility, and King James ‘considered *ottava rima* a particularly solemn rhythm’.¹²⁴ In some of his saddest lines, describing Lady Harington’s grief, Hering uses this form to build a consolatory counterpoint into this stanzaic structure:

What heart can now conceiue the wofull plight,
Of that sad Lady, that at once despoild
Of Husband, Sonne, of all that to her might
Contentment yeeld; Her face with teares besoyld,
Her brest with swellings, throbs and sighs quite rent,
If heau'n had not both strength and comfort sent. (sig. II^v)

Roe’s elegy does not follow exactly the same form, but it nonetheless consists of sextets (rhymed *aabbcc*) presented in an episodic manner. These appear as single stanzas underneath a range of headings – ‘*To the Booke*’, ‘*To the World*’, ‘*To England*’, ‘*To his Mother, and sisters*’, ‘*To his Friends*’, ‘*To the Arts*’, ‘*To Religion*’, and ‘*To Death*’ (sigs H3^r–^v) – which formalise a further thematic emphasis carried throughout the printed commemorations for Harington, all of which are at pains to demonstrate the variety of contexts and spheres in which his death is felt. This emphasis is further echoed in an epigram and poem by Renold Elstrack, printed underneath a separately circulated etching of Harington, that also survive in EU3 alongside a partial transcription of Roe’s elegy (from print). The elegy considers his many roles as ‘An humble noble: an vn wauering youth | vndoubling courtier: vndisparridg’d knight | fearing but god: loving but good and Truth’.¹²⁵

In more subtle ways, of course, these elegies, like many written for Henry, also bear out the influence of the *Anniversaries*, combining a vernacular non-pastoral mode, a self-reflexive emphasis upon the praise of virtue, prominent third person pronouns, and

¹²⁴ Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic*, p. 91. On James’s endorsement of Spenserian poetics, see Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, pp. 195–214.

¹²⁵ EU3, fol. 43^v. On these texts in print, and for a reproduction of the engraving, see Pebworth, “‘Let Me Here Use That Freedome’”, pp. 24, 28. A further transcription of Roe’s elegy appears in Corpus Christi (Oxford) MS 318, fols 203^r–^v. That this derives from *The Chvrches Lamentation* is evident from a margin note, in the same hand, that reads: ‘R. Stockes Sermon at his Fun. pr. Lond. 1614.’ Roe’s elegy has been the subject of a single, very limited study by Bolton Corney, who transcribes it and makes some basic observations about the book in which it was included: ‘Sir Thomas Roe: On the Death of Lord Harington, 1614’, *N&Q*, 105 (1870), 9–10.

descriptions of a degenerate world.¹²⁶ Donne's influence is particularly evident, however, in Jackson's poem, which, I suggest, represents a conscious fusion of Spenserian and Donnean modes that constructs an authorial persona highly analogous to that of the *Anniversaries*. Certain parallels are immediately apparent in the sheer length of the poem – seventy-three stanzas (438 lines) – and its presentation in an elegant, minimalist quarto edition, with a broad, thematic title and decorative bordering throughout. The dedicatory epistle, which describes the book as '*meditations of Comfort*', compares the speaker's office to that of a physician – an idea explored further at one point in the poem itself:

And as an Art-instructed Surgeon,
 (That hath search't all the corners of a wound)
 Doth not so leaue his Patient but vpon
 The gash, layes healing Salues to make him sound:
 So must I now (that haue so launc't your grieffe)
 Apply some *Cataplasme* for reliefe. (sig. B2^v)

Analogies of this sort were common in contemporary sermons, which would often figure the preacher as 'the physician to the body politic'; but the manner in which this parallel is here expressed is highly reminiscent of the poet-anatomist of *FirAn*.¹²⁷ Moreover, in a broader sense, these lines exemplify a witty, digressive speaker, drawn to poetic role-play, who repeatedly calls attention to the identities and discursive methodologies available to him as 'a Poet'. Justifying his ventriloquy of Lady Harington, for instance, the speaker notes: 'Thus might a Poet shadow what she said' (sig. A3^r). In another stanza, this self-reflexivity combines strikingly with an ink/tears conceit alluding to the length of the poem, for which the speaker offers a justification that looks back to elegies for Henry:

As I was writing this conceiued moane;
 Mine eyes did let fall drops into mine Inke,
 Moysting againe its drinesse: whereupon
 My sympathizing Muse gan thus to thinke.
 I must not leaue these Ladies in this plight:

¹²⁶ On prominent third person pronouns as a legacy of the *Anniversaries*, see Kay, *Melodious Tears*, pp. 163–64.

¹²⁷ See Mary Morrissey, 'John Donne as Conventional Paul's Cross Preacher', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) pp. 159–78 (p. 159).

For Inke made liquid bids me more to write. (sig. B2^r)

Further arguments and images reminiscent of the *Anniversaries* include the speaker's adumbration of a 'symbolic mode' comparable to that which Lewalski attributes to Donne ('Except that part of me that is diuine, | Wherein th' *Idea* of my God is found' (sig. A5^v)); his comparison of Harington's body to 'a Mansion' (sig. C1^v), recalling Donne's comparison of Drury's to 'a Palace' (*FirAn*, 36); and his description of 'Death' as a process which, 'for him' [Harington], is 'but a Page, | That lights a Taper to an vpper Stage' (sig. C4^r) – strikingly evocative of the following lines in *SecAn*:

Thinke then, My soule, that death is but a Groome,
Which brings a Taper to the outward romme,
Whence thou spiest first a little glimmering light,
And after brings it nearer to thy sight (85–88)

These observations prompt several questions. While Pebworth argues that Donne's political ambivalence in *Har* is expressed via his 'extraordinary' neglect of such thematic concerns as are expressed in Lady Bedford's coordinated publications, it is not known in what order elegies for Harington were written and circulated. Donne could have written and sent *Har* before or after any others were published, and may or may not have been aware of them. Likewise, while it is possible that Jackson wrote *Sorrovves Lenitive* as a general exercise in the elegiac mode Donne had popularised, he may also have sought to respond to Donne in a more specific way, and/or to pre-empt any such tribute Donne might have sent to his former patron on such an occasion. Several partial answers on these points can be found in a letter Donne wrote to Goodere shortly afterwards, in which he reveals his former hope that *Har* might have moved Lady Bedford to pay his debts prior to ordination, his disappointment that she has not, and various circumstances attendant upon that decision. Speaking thus candidly, as he does, 'Of my Lady Bedford', Donne asks, somewhat facetiously, that his friend 'burn the Letter',

for I would say nothing of her upon record, that should not testifie my thankfulness for all her graces. But upon this motion, which I made to her by letter, and by S^r Tho. Roes assistance, if any scruple should arise in her, she was somewhat more startling, then I looked for from her: she had more suspicion of my calling, a better memory of my past life, then I had thought her nobility could have admitted: of all which, though I humbly thank God, I can make good use, as one that needs as many remembrances in that kinde, as not only friends but enemies can present, yet I am afraid, they proceed in her rather from some ill impression taken from D. Burges, then that they grow in her self [...] I am almost sorry, that an Elegy should have been able to move her to so much compassion heretofore, as to offer to pay my debts; and my greater wants now, and for so good a purpose, as to come disingaged into that profession, being plainly laid open to her, should work no farther but that she sent me 30 l. which in good faith she excused with that, which is in both parts true, that her present debts were burdensome, and that I could not doubt of her inclination, upon all future emergent occasions, to assist me.¹²⁸

Describing a hardening of sentiment against him in Lady Bedford, which he attributes to the influence of her puritan physician, John Burges (/Burgess), Donne expresses concern at his need for financial assistance – acknowledging, nonetheless, that her own difficult situation has restricted her. What has not hitherto been noted, however, is the possible significance of Sir Thomas Roe’s assistance in ‘this motion’. In appealing to Roe – an elegist of Harington himself – to deliver *Har* to Lady Bedford, it is quite possible that Donne would have discovered something of the commemorative tributes she was coordinating and/or financing. Similarly, there may be a suggestion of such an awareness in the letter with which Donne sent his elegy to Lady Bedford, which suggests ‘that hee which bestowes any cost vpon the dead, obliges him which is dead but not the heyre’. Considered the other way around, Donne’s description of Lady Bedford’s increasingly radical circle, and the general feeling against him personally that was fomenting within it, provides a suggestive context against which to consider those tightly integrated tributes. Whether or not this puritan suspicion had any significant bearing on them, or him, Donne’s elegy, like Jackson’s, was yet required to respond to elegiac precedents and a broader commemorative discourse that he had himself significantly politicised and polarised.

¹²⁸ *Letters*, pp. 218–19.

As such, *Har*, like *Sorrovves Lenitive*, is a long elegy – the fourth longest poem Donne ever wrote, at 258 lines – that both exemplifies and reflects upon the elegiac mode he had created. It is no accident that Ernest B. Gilman describes it as ‘a kind of [...] third “Anniversary”’.¹²⁹ *Har* picks up where *SecAn* left off, addressing a soul in flight ‘Twixt heauen and earth’ (7), passing ‘the Sunne’ (83) and ‘looking vp to heauen’, ‘downe to vs’ (5). Developing this analogue in a conventional Pauline epideictic argument, the speaker also claims a characteristically Donnean perspectival insight:

Thou at this Midnight seest mee, and as soone
As that Sunne rises to mee (Midnights noone)
All the world growes transparent, and I see
Through all both Church and State in seeing thee,
And I discern, by fauour of this light,
My selfe, the hardest Obiect of the sight.
God is the glasse: As thou, when thou dost see
Him who sees all, seest all concerning thee:
So, yet vnglorifyd, I comprehend
All, in these mirrours of thy ways and end.
Though God bee our truly our Glass through which we see
All, since the beeing of all things is hee (25–36)

As Pebworth notes, these lines begin what becomes ‘an elaborate pattern of references to church and state’ that ‘insistently call attention’ to the politically inflected terms with which Harington is otherwise consistently commemorated. Moreover, whilst foregrounding the unique perspicacity of Harington’s liminal soul, and that which is available to him ‘in seeing thee’, the speaker also describes an *Anniversaries*-style epistemological crisis that problematises and relativises the entire concept of virtue, undermining the project on which Lady Bedford and her elegists were working.¹³⁰ Developing this thought with explicit reference to Harington, the speaker articulates a second argument that is carried through the

¹²⁹ Ernest B. Gilman, *The Curious Perspective: Literary and Pictorial Wit in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1978), pp. 176–77.

¹³⁰ See, for instance, Donne’s famous lines about the ‘new Philosophy’ in *FirAn* (205–18).

rest of the poem. As in *Henry*, the speaker praises Harington merely for what he might have become:¹³¹

And had fate ment to t'have had his virtues told
It would haue let him liue to haue bin old
So then that virtue in season, and then this,
Wee might haue seene, and sayd, that now hee is
Witty, now wise, now temperate, now iust (69–73)

Politically, formally, stylistically and structurally, then, the poet is here identified firmly as the poet of the *Anniversaries*.¹³² At the same time, however, these lines weave a pointedly introspective vein into the poem, directing the telescopic soul from ‘Church and State’ towards ‘My selfe, the hardest Obiect of the sight’ – and at a characteristically Donnean moment of authorship, in which ‘All the world growes transparent’. While the following chapter will consider the significance of midnight in relation to Donne’s articulations of genuine personal loss, the speaker’s repeated emphasis upon it here (in lines fifteen, twenty-five and twenty-six) provides an important temporal setting for this poem’s self-reflexive subtext. The idea that midnight represents a part-corporeal moment in which a deeper, ecstatic perception becomes possible was in this period linked to shifting meteorological conceptions of the ‘middle region’ between the physical universe and the heavenly realm.¹³³ In his sermons, as Joan Webber has suggested, Donne is frequently drawn to invoking it as an imaginative setting in which the self is uniquely vulnerable to the divine, without the props

¹³¹ Pebworth, “‘Let Me Here Use That Freedome’”, p. 31.

¹³² Isaac Irabor Elimimian has suggested that, in a manner evocative of the *Anniversaries*, *Har* follows a seven-part structure based on Aristotelian and Ciceronian oratory. Elimimian breaks the poem down into an *exordium* (1–40), *narratio* (41–68), *divisio* (69–104), *confirmatio* (105–64), *confutatio* (156–206), *peroratio* (207–42), and *digressio* (243–58). See ‘The Dedicatory Letter as a Rhetorical Device: The Example of Donne’, *Classical and Modern Literature*, 6 (1986), 127–36 (pp. 130–34).

¹³³ A chapter in an unpublished PhD thesis by Alan James Hogarth explores this topic in *Har*, noting comparisons with the ‘ecstatic lunar voyage’ of Donne’s *Ignatius*, which similarly registers the poet’s interest in the competing metaphysics of his day. Increasingly sceptical of Aristotle’s ‘closed system’, Hogarth argues, Donne ‘seeks to reconcile atomic theory with a Neoplatonic ideal of the world’s soul, in order to preserve a material vision of existence which he failed to effect in the Anniversary poems’. See Hogarth, ‘The End of Motion: John Donne and the Final Cause in Natural and Moral Philosophy’ (Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Strathclyde, 2013), pp. 139–43. An adapted version of this chapter is forthcoming in the *Review of English Studies*, 2019 (Winter), which I have not yet been able to consult.

and camouflage of ‘external things’.¹³⁴ Thus, the midnight context in *Har* seems to serve simultaneously to foreground Donne’s approaching ordination, to expose and scrutinise his authorial self, and to evoke, by implication, a time when ‘an Elegy should have been able to move’ his reader ‘to so much compassion’. This self-searching midnight author reappears, finally, in the poem’s most famous lines:

And though in no degree I can expresse
Grieffe in Great Alexanders greate Excesse
Who at his frinds death made whole Townes devest
Theyr walls and Bulwarkes that became them best
Doe not, fayre Soule, this sacrifice refuse
That in thy Graue I do interre my Muse
Which by my greefe, greate as thy worth, beeing cast
Behind hand; yet hath spoke, and spoke her last. (251–58)

In what could conceivably be a further reference to the commemorative tributes of others, and to his own position as an outsider to ‘frinds’ he cannot match, whose lugubrious Spenserian mode he can ‘in no degree’ ‘expresse’, the speaker fashions an emphatic turn of his own. This ending has stoked a good deal of critical discussion – not least because Donne did write poems in later life (on the very day of his ordination, as the following chapter will consider), and overblown rhetorical gestures are highly common elsewhere in his occasional verse.¹³⁵ What is more, the specific elegiac conceit of the dead, interred or moribund muse was not exclusive to Donne, and only sometimes appears to have been intended seriously by other poets. It is adopted, for instance, in Gorges’s shorter elegy for Prince Henry, which closes with the lines: ‘Soe sings my Zeale the notes that sorrow weeps | Which antheme sung my Muse for ever sleepes.’¹³⁶ On the other hand, however, Jonson would later use it in his ‘Eupheme; or, The Fair Fame Left to Posterity of That Truly Noble Lady, the Lady Venetia

¹³⁴ Joan Webber, *Contrary Music: The Prose Style of John Donne* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963), pp. 105–06.

¹³⁵ See *Variorum*, VI, p. 645.

¹³⁶ Gorges, *Poems*, p. 130.

Digby’ – which, as David Riggs notes, ‘was the last lyric poem, apart from three slight occasional pieces, that he would ever write’.¹³⁷

Donne refers once more to his adoption of the conceit in a letter to Goodere sent later in 1614, in relation to the mooted printing of his poems in an edition dedicated to Somerset. Asking his friend for ‘that old book’ (of his own poems), he notes that he would particularly like a verse letter addressed to Lady Bedford to feature within it, adding that it does not much matter if Goodere has ‘applied any pieces’ of any such poem since becoming its custodian:

I must do this, as a valediction to the world, before I take Orders. But this is it, I am to aske you; whether you ever made any such use of the letter in verse, *A nostre Countesse chez vous*, as that I may not put it in, amongst the rest to persons of that rank; for I desire very very much, that something should bear her name in the book, and I would be just to my written words to my L. Harrington, to write nothing after that. I pray tell me as soon as you can, if I be at liberty to insert that: for if you have by any occasion applied any pieces of it, I see not, that it will be discerned, when it appears in the wholepiece.¹³⁸

As David Novarr argues, this letter indicates that Donne ‘meant the words’ of *Har* ‘seriously’.¹³⁹ But the question that remains is in what way he meant them. As we have seen, establishing the death of his muse had been a concern to him for several months at least. This was a premeditated announcement, and Donne expected Goodere to acknowledge it. One interpretation is that he wanted to acquire an old poem in order to avoid the necessity of writing any new one, staying ‘just to my written words to my L. Harrington’ in a general sense. Another is he sought only to avoid this necessity because it would involve Lady Bedford learning that he had not been ‘just’ to those ‘written words’. Pebworth suggests, without justification, that the ‘Muse’ to which Donne refers is ‘not the muse of poetry in general or even the muse of secular poetry, but the muse of the poetry of patronage’.¹⁴⁰ As the following chapter will show, however, Donne’s ‘disinterred muse’ would prompt him to

¹³⁷ David Riggs, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 339.

¹³⁸ *Letters*, pp. 197–98.

¹³⁹ David Novarr, *The Disinterred Muse: Donne’s Texts and Contexts* (London: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 102–03.

¹⁴⁰ Pebworth, “‘Let Me Here Use That Freedome’”, p. 42.

write all kinds of poems – including patronage poems – in the early years of his ministry. Certainly, early readers of *Har* seem to have taken Donne at his word – particularly compilers of ‘Group 2’ manuscripts, which frequently include *Har* as his last poem.¹⁴¹ This chapter has, I hope, facilitated a more nuanced interpretation of Donne’s gesture, that some such contemporary readers might perhaps have understood: that the poetic self from which Donne withdraws, and who could not be roused to commemorate his previous employer in 1617, was the public poet of the *Anniversaries*.

¹⁴¹ These are: B7, CT1, DT1, H4, B40, TT1, TT2 and WN1. See ‘Manuscripts Listed by Traditional Classification’, *DigitalDonne*.

4. 'BY HER DEATH': ARTICULATING LOSS AS PREACHER

John Donne is often associated with two interrelated attitudes towards dead people: cynical opportunism and cold intellectualism. In John Carey's influential opinion, he is 'incapable of the funereal note', seeing death as a cerebral and 'athletic' obstacle for spirit and body, 'almost never sad, and never simply sad'.¹ He is a reluctant elegist, if one at all. 'Unlike Ben Jonson,' David Novarr notes, 'Donne did not write elegiac poetry for those closest to him; his elegies and epicedes are characterised by his intellectual ability and his erudition, not by a sense of personal loss'. Evidence of this 'lifelong disinclination' is located in a series of absences: no tributes of any kind for his children, Edmund Spenser, Queen Elizabeth, Viscount Brackley, William Shakespeare, Richard Martin ('though he was urged to do so and apologised profusely' in a letter to Sir Henry Goodere), Queen Anne, Lady Drury, Francis Bacon, Lady Bedford, or Goodere himself.² What he did write is 'addressed not so much to the memory of the dead as to the pocket of the living'.³

These views hold some truth, as we have seen – but only in part. A growing (and little-acknowledged) body of scholarship has become increasingly sceptical of the received idea that Donne did not mourn the loss of loved ones in literary form. An elegy for Shakespeare, long since attributed to William Basse, was printed and attributed to Donne in *Poems* (1633); and while I am dubious about his authorship of this poem, the question has been probed enough, perhaps, to be worth revisiting.⁴ A clearer consensus has emerged,

¹ John Carey, *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (Faber and Faber, 1981; new edn. 2008), pp. 200–01.

² David Novarr, *Disinterred Muse: Donne's Texts and Contexts* (Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 126, 196. Graham Roebuck closely follows Novarr's argument in 'The epicede and obsequy', *Handbook*, pp. 286–97 (p. 287).

³ Grierson, *Poems*, II, p. 209.

⁴ Brandon S. Centerwall uniquely argues for a Donne attribution, suggesting that the shorter, fourteen-line version printed in *Poems* (1633), p. 149, appears to be an early draft that was later altered by two additional lines once the poet's call for Shakespeare's exhumation from Stratford for burial in Westminster Abbey had become untenable – following which Donne might have 'allowed' Basse to take responsibility for the poem. Centerwall notes that the editor/s who decided to include it in *Poems* (1633) was/were more accurate in his/their attributions than the editor/s of *Poems* (1635), that Basse did not include it in two key anthologies of his verse

however, with regard to Donne's writings on the death of his wife, Anne, on 15 August 1617. Following M. Thomas Hester's extraordinary close reading of the epitaph Donne wrote for Anne (*EtAD*), a series of essays on two poems in particular – the sonnet *HSShe* and *Noct* – have established a strong critical tradition for regarding all three texts as analogous commemorations of her. Largely neglected by critics, but nonetheless strikingly similar to these poems, is *Dissol*. Despite contention over individual aspects of these works, a remarkably consistent portrait of an elegiac poetic persona is described by this criticism, in which the significance of personal loss is filtered through an introspective exploration of the speaker as an ordained and avowedly celibate preacher, a vehicle for ambivalent sexual and spiritual desire, and an aging Christian.⁵ Like much of this thesis, this criticism has begun to explode a view of the 'elegiac' and 'commemorative' as simple or discreet generic or rhetorical categories, demanding an assessment of both as diffuse concepts that writers like Donne invoked on a range of occasions – predominantly, but not limited to, individual deaths.

There are several obvious justifications for approaching Donne's post-ordination writings, particularly those concerned with loss, as part of an ongoing exploration of personal vocation and religious identity – justifications found both in the internal consistency of themes, forms and allusions evident within these works, and other evidence about the personal, liturgical, political, professional, literary and social contexts underpinning them. In

subsequent to Shakespeare's death, that the poem features characteristically Donnean *epanorthosis* ('your threefold fourfold tombe'), that a copy of the poem in Basse's hand contains an ostensibly inexplicable error, that the poem is of a superior quality to Basse's other verse, and that a very similar fourteen-line elegy for Spenser by Francis Thynne survives only in a presentation manuscript given to the Lord Keeper in 1600, when Donne was his employee. 'Who Wrote William Basse's "Elegy on Shakespeare"?: Rediscovering a Poem Lost from the Donne Canon', in *Shakespeare Survey*, ed. by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 267–84.

⁵ Hester's essay, originally published as "'miserrimum dictu': Donne's Epitaph for His Wife' in *JEGP*, 94 (1995), 513–29, was republished the following year in a volume he edited, which elicited and assembled much of this scholarship: "'*Faeminae lectissimae*": Reading Anne Donne', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 17–34. Six of its thirteen chapters consider Donne's response to Anne's death. Following Hester, and most other critics, I spell Anne with an 'e', rather than without one. See pp. 12–13 for Hester's useful overview of this issue.

the dedicatory epistle to his *Devotions Vpon Emergent Occasions* (1624), Donne describes his ordination as one of his ‘three *Births*’, alongside his ‘Naturall’ birth, ‘*when I came into the World*’, and the ‘*preter-naturall Birth*’ of his recovery from sickness.⁶ The new seal he adopted in 1615 is one obvious example of a way through which he symbolically marked this change, and recent scholarship on his developing signature provides further confirmation of such habits of self-fashioning.⁷ Of course, pursuing this theme in Donne’s post-ordination commemorations carries with it a risk of anachronism, as does any view of a uniform or coherent ‘late’ period in an author’s life. Modern conceptions of elegy, for instance, as a (not necessarily poetical) articulation of deep personal loss, are powerfully inflected by psychoanalytical and continental philosophical thinking.⁸ Likewise, Gordon McMullan has shown in detail how the idea of ‘late writing’ exists now predominantly as a product of cultural constructions that took root in the eighteenth century; and recent scholarship on Donne as a preacher has made clear the dangers of mining his sermons for biographical and psychological insight at the expense of attentiveness to their historical and rhetorical contexts.⁹

In pursuing it, this chapter takes its cues not only from Donne’s habits of self-fashioning and the body of criticism on *EdAD*, *HSShe*, *Noct* and (to some extent) *Dissol* adumbrated above, but new readings and evidence relevant to the elegiac and commemorative strategies Donne developed after entering the Church. In four sections, it

⁶ John Donne, *Devotions Vpon Emergent Occasions, and the several steps in my Sicknes* (1624), sigs A2^r–A4^v.

⁷ See Clayton D. Lein, ‘Donne: The Final Period’, *Handbook*, pp. 601–15 (p. 603); Bald, *Life*, pp. 305–06. Evidence of changes to Donne’s signature after his ordination were presented in the 2018 exhibition ‘John Donne’s Books at the Middle Temple: Reading and Writing’, curated by Hugh Adlington and Renae Satterley.

⁸ David Kennedy offers a pertinent overview of the influence of Freudian, Heideggerian and Lacanian perspectives, particularly as these have been applied to poetry written by Thomas Hardy on the death of his wife Emma. *Elegy* (Routledge, 2007), pp. 58–68.

⁹ Gordon McMullan, *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). On Donne’s sermons see, for example, Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, ‘Revisiting the study of the English sermon’, in *The English sermon revised: Religion, literature and history 1600–1750*, ed. by Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 2–21 (p. 7).

focuses on four relatively narrow historical episodes from Donne's sixteen years in ministry that correspond to occasions of personal and public loss in different ways, considering, in each case, hitherto understudied and unstudied 'elegiac' texts and contexts in which Donne and his affiliates – particularly George Herbert – responded to these events. Drawing together evidence for integrated readings of Donne's commemorations of Anne, and other early examples of poetic self-fashioning and patronage seeking within the Church, the first two sections suggest some distinguishing factors between private and public commemorations Donne wrote before commencing his Deanship of St Paul's Cathedral on 20 October 1621. In the second section I present new circumstantial evidence for the composition and early circulation of Donne's lengthy verse translation of Lamentations (*Lam*) in the early 1620s, arguing for its essentially public nature as a response to Protestant losses on the continent.

Building on these distinctions, the third and fourth sections of the chapter consider Donne's public and private commemorations of loss (respectively), and some of their lesser-studied contexts, from the pulpit. Grouping together a cluster of extant commemorative sermons (and one poem, *Ham*) Donne preached and wrote within a year of the death of King James, the third section analyses these texts in light of the local and broader religio-political contexts through which the terms of commemorative discourse in the early 1620s took on specific charges, and against which Donne's own status as an archetypal Jacobean preacher and conformist reached its height. While the rhetorical features of these texts have been considered and compared to some extent – namely in one chapter-length study by Barbara K. Lewalski – they are not yet much read within their contemporary and interrelating contexts.¹⁰ One exception to this is Donne's sermon preached at the funerals of Sir William Cockayne in 1626, which has received lengthy analysis by Peter McCullough, and on which I do not

¹⁰ Barbara K. Lewalski, *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: the Creation of a Symbolic Mode* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 174–215. This will, of course, change with forthcoming work by *OESJD* editors.

focus.¹¹ The final section considers two sermons of early 1627 preached on occasions of personal loss for Donne: the Easter Day sermon of March, delivered at St Paul's Cathedral shortly after the deaths of Goodere (just seven days previously) and his daughter Lucy (in January); and the *Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danvers*, which he printed alongside an extensive and hitherto neglected body of elegiac Latin poetry by George Herbert, her son, later in the year. While the first of these sermons may, I suggest, represent – albeit obliquely (as with his elegies for Anne) – Donne's only surviving response to the death of his friend, it is the very conventionality of the latter sermon publication that marks out its personal significance to him.

Revisiting the Disinterred Muse: Anne Donne

In his influential monograph, *The Disinterred Muse* (1980), Novarr identifies fourteen poems written – or possibly written – by Donne after he took orders. Of these, ten relate almost certainly to specific historical events: two (*GHerb* and *Tilman*) are concerned with ordinations, two (*HSShe* and *Sidney*) with the deaths of women, one (*Christ*) with Donne's 1619 departure for Germany with the Doncaster Embassy, one (*Apoth*) with the canonization of Ignatius of Loyola, one (*Stat*) prefaces Donne's *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, two (*Sickness* and *Father*) reflect on those same (or perhaps similar) 'Emergent Occasions', and one (*Ham*) is a formal elegy on the death of a nobleman. The holy sonnets *HSVex* and *HSShow* and the twelve-line prayer translation *Gaz* contain no clear internal indications that they were written on or about specific occasions, though they might have been. *Lam*, on the

¹¹ Peter McCullough, 'Preaching and Context: John Donne's Sermon and the Funerals of Sir William Cokayne', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 213–64.

other hand, seems likely to be a response to some kind of tragedy; but its potential contexts are broad and widely debated.¹²

That the ‘occasionality’ of Donne’s poetry has often been invoked as a step towards gauging how he ‘moved beyond [...] occasion and used his verse as a means of self-expression’ has led both to the neglect of occasional poems by him, including many listed above, in favour of “‘free-will-offering[s]’”, and to an implicit, misleading, dichotomy between ‘occasion’ and the idea of ‘self-expression’.¹³ While Novarr is right to warn that once biographical readings are presented for poems from uncertain contexts (particularly readings that concern Donne’s marriage) these are difficult to dislodge from readers’ minds, they can, used carefully and cumulatively, also reinforce contextual approaches where external evidence is absent or lacking.¹⁴ Moreover, the conceptual divorce of poetic occasion and poetic self-expression is no less problematic than an over-readiness to absorb poems into a romanticised biographical framework, nor any less rooted in Romantic notions of poetic inspiration as something like ‘the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings’.¹⁵ Taking a comparative approach to poems written in the first years of Donne’s ministry, the first two parts of this chapter build on Novarr’s analyses, showing how the private and public themes, forms and provocations of Donne’s ‘Disinterred Muse’ are deeply interwoven with historical, liturgical and biographically significant occasions.

Donne’s epitaph for Anne (*EdAD*), the only extant text he unquestionably wrote to commemorate her death, is, like *Noct*, not counted in the above list – presumably because Novarr does not consider it to be a poem. Alongside Anne, *EtAD* may also have been

¹² Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 94–205. Though this count includes the satirical *Apoth* (‘Apotheosis Ignatij Loyolae’), Novarr acknowledges that Donne’s authorship of this poem is far from certain (pp. 157–61). The dating of a further poem addressed to Richard Andrews (‘De Libro Cum Mutuaretur’ (*Libro*)) has since been attributed to the period 1614–31 in an article by Hilton Kelliher, ‘Donne, Jonson, Richard Andrews and the Newcastle Manuscript’, in *EMS*, 4 (1993), 134–173. On this, see also Robbins, *Poems*, p. 118.

¹³ Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, p. 115.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

¹⁵ William Wordsworth, ‘Preface to Lyrical Ballads’, in *Romanticism: An Anthology*, third edn., ed. by Duncan Wu (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), pp. 495–507 (p. 498).

intended to commemorate at least one other family member, a stillborn child she outlived for five days, who was probably buried with her ‘in the Chancell, on the North side, at the upper end’ of the Church of St Clement Danes the following day.¹⁶ The epitaph can no longer be found in the public stone of that building, which was largely reconstructed at the end of the seventeenth century; but it does survive in several manuscript witnesses, including one of the only extant holographs of Donne’s verse, now held in the Folger Shakespeare Library.¹⁷ The text is as follows, followed by Hester’s useful working translation:

Annæ					
Georgij	{	More de	{	Filiæ	
Roberti		Lothesley		Soror :	
Willelmj		Equit :		Nept :	
Christophorj		Aurat :		Pronept :	5
Foeminæ lectissimæ, dilectissimæque;					
Coniugi charissimæ, castissimæque;					
Matrj piissimæ, indulgentissimæque;					
Xv annis in coniugio transactis,					
Vii post xii ^m partum (quorum vii superstant) dies					10
Immani febre correptæ,					
(Quod hoc saxum farj iussit					
Ipse, præ dolore Infans)					
Maritus (miserrimum dictu) olim charæ charus					
Cineribus cineres spondet suos					15
Nouo matrimonio (annuat Deus) hoc loco sociandos					
Iohannes Donne					
Sac: Theolog: Profess:					
Secessit					
A° xxxiiii° Ætat: suæ et sui Iesu					20
CIO D C xvii°					

¹⁶ John Stow, *The Survey of London: Containing The Original, Increase, Modern Estate, and Government of that City, Methodically set down*. (1633), p. 889. Bald describes Anne’s death at some length in *Life*, pp. 324–29, noting also that it is mentioned in a letter from Jean l’Oisau de Tourval to Francis Windebank, and reproducing both churchwardens’ accounts of the funeral expenses and the account books of Nicholas Stone, who carved the monument. On the basis of similarities (in price and date) with Stone’s monument for Martha Garrard, Bald suggests it probably similarly ‘consisted of a panel to contain the inscription surrounded by a cartouche’ (p. 326).

¹⁷ Folger MS L.b.541 (F1). The other witnesses, which include B27, B41, B42, C9 and H6, are products of a combination of contemporary antiquarian, biographical and literary interest in the epitaph. B41, a product of the former, is an elaborately presented folio containing ‘A Collection of Monuments in divers Churches with most of the Coats of Arms painted’. B42, which demonstrates clear biographical interest (also from the Lansdowne MSS), includes it alongside John’s own epitaph (*EtSP*) and a short entry of ‘Memoirs of D^r JOHN DONNE’, fols 102^r–03^r.

Avg: xv.

[Anne
Daughter of [Sir] George More, of Loseley, Gilt/Golden Knight, Sister of [Sir] Robert More,
Grand-daughter of [Sir] William More,
Great-grand-daughter of [Sir] Christopher More;
A woman most choice/select/read, most beloved/loving/well-read,
A spouse most dear, most chaste,
A mother most loving/merciful/pious/dutiful, most self-sacrificing/indulgent;
Fifteen years in union/covenant completed,
Seven days after the twelfth parturition (of whom seven survive)
By a savage/immense/ravishing fever hurriedly-carried-off/seized
(Wherefore this stone to speak he commanded
Himself, by/beyond grief [made] speechless [Infant/infant])
Her husband (most miserable/wretched to say/designation/assertion) once dear to the dear
His own ashes to these ashes pledges [weds]
[in a] New marriage (may God assent) in this place joining together,
JOHN DONNE
Doctor of Theology.
She withdrew
In the 33rd year of her age, hers and Jesus's
1617[th]
August 15.]¹⁸

As Hester has shown in great detail, *EdAT* is suffused with linguistic, formal, calendrical, biblical and biographical resonances. In six distinct sections it comprises a panoply of readings that bear, in different ways, upon its occasion and the entwined histories of its subject and author: an opening ‘tetrad’ (2–5) drily represents the ‘aristocratic paternity’ of the More family; introducing Anne, an “‘aureate” triad’ (6–8) erupts with poetic ingenuity and harmony in uniformly twelve-syllable lines of three words (emphasising ‘the trinity of threes’); a three-line section (9–11) describes and poetically enacts the effects of time and death/absence upon Anne/the epitaph (their union here figured as a type of Christic ‘marriage’ to the Church and her death as a consequence of the speaker’s procreative interventions in her life); a five-line ‘epithalamic pledge’ (12–17) identifies the speaker ‘within the terms of [her death’s] divine pattern’ as a ‘divine infans’; and a three-line conclusion (18–20), names him (in whose Latin name ‘anne’ literally inheres) and supplies

¹⁸ Hester, “*Fæminæ lectissimæ*”, pp. 20–21.

the long-deferred neutral verb ‘secessit’ (‘she/he withdrew’), applicable both to her and to him. Finally, three lines record biographical information about Anne’s passing. Uniquely among epitaphs Donne composed (though similarly to Lady Markham’s) this includes her final age (33) and date of death (August 15), which are, Hester argues, significant in at least two ways: August 15 is the Feast of the Assumption of Mary, and Christ was 33 when he ascended into Heaven; Anne is thus a ‘Marian analogue’ and an embodiment of their marriage’s typological identification. Fifteen, equivalent to the years of their marriage, is also a number Bellarmine (and Donne through him) considered ‘ominous’ for numerous biblical echoes. More generally, the epitaph exhibits complex ‘visual emblematics’ and ‘multivocal’/‘translingual’ wordplay.¹⁹ Though it may betray some lingering wariness about the scandal with which the Donnes’ marriage began, it evidently satisfied the men listed in its opening lines.²⁰

Subsequent scholarship on *Noct*, *HSShe* and Donne’s broader literary tendencies reveals highly suggestive parallels with Hester’s reading, reinforcing the notion that these elegiac poems were also written to commemorate Anne’s death. At the same time, as Hester notes, the epitaph itself is ‘elegiac’ in the sense that it emphasises, at least as much as the death of its subject, that occasion’s profound implications for the poet-husband speaker.²¹ Speculations about the occasion of *Noct* focus predominantly on the fourth of its five nine-

¹⁹ Hester, *Ibid.*, pp. 17–34. I refer in this overview to *Variorum* line numbers (which count ‘Annæ’ as line 1) rather than Hester’s (which do not).

²⁰ Bald (*Life*, p. 325) notes that *EtAD* ‘was apparently sent to Sir George More for his approval’, and that the holograph’s survival among the Loseley family papers implies it was kept for sentimental value. Bryan Rivers argues that it attempts retrospectively to moderate the scandal of elopement on the premise that ‘lectissimæ’ is a punning reference to the *Homily of the State of Matrimony*, a widely-read tract dating back to 1563 that encourages husbands ‘to study how to exercise [their] authority in a godly manner by diligently learning the particular, unique qualities of [their] spouse’ – one example being that the *Homily* plays on the cognate/homonymic notion of agricultural ‘husbandry’. The point of this, Rivers suggests, was that Donne sought to present his elopement with Anne as an act interpretable as endorsing of, not betraying, common Jacobean values surrounding marriage – as ‘a continuation of his long campaign of self-vindication’. Bryan Rivers, “Faeminae Lectissimae Dilectissimaeque”: John Donne’s Epitaph on his Wife, and the Elizabethan *Homily of the State of Matrimony*, *N&Q*, 59 (2012), 94–96.

²¹ Hester, “*Faeminae lectissimæ*”, p. 23.

line stanzas, which identifies a deceased female subject and explicitly describes an ‘elegiac’ process of this kind:

But I am by her death, (which word wrongs her)
Of the first nothing, the Elixer grown;
Were I a man, that I were one,
I needs must know; I should preferre,
If I were any beast,
Some ends, some means; Yea plants, yea stones detest,
And love; All, all some properties invest;
If I an ordinary nothing were,
As shadow, a light, and body must be here. (28–36)

The notion that this enigmatic presentation of subject and speaker responds to a deeply felt personal loss is reinforced by the fact that *Noct*, which survives in only seven manuscript witnesses, was apparently kept from wide circulation.²² Noting its structural similarity to ‘The Canonization’, Kate Gartner Frost’s comprehensive essay reads the poem as a *parasceve* and ‘ratification’ of a vow of celibacy Walton attributes to Donne after Anne’s death, showing how that structural arithmetic, along with the alchemical, astrological, theological and liturgical processes it describes, combine in a spiritually autobiographical emphasis on ‘personal conversion from prophane to sacred love’. The ‘yeares’ and ‘dayes’ ‘midnight’ (1) – the Feast of St Lucy, on which the poem states its moment of midnight authorship (13 December) – is the date on which Donne dated his will, made public his intention to take orders, and perhaps married Anne. Additionally, the poem’s forty-five-line length recalls Donne’s age at her death, an age notable for its association with religious conversion in Gregorian and Petrarchan thinking.²³ Further contextual frameworks more recently suggested include the apophatic traditions of Dionysian negative theology, which might account for the poem’s alchemical discovery of ‘the nothingness that denotes a soul’s union with her divine beloved’; and, in a manner consistent with *EdAD*, the possibility that

²² These are B7, C9, CT1, DT1, H4, H6 and WN1. On this as an indication of privacy and composition in 1617, see Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, repr. ed. (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1986), p. 232.

²³ Kate Gartner Frost, “‘Preparing towards her’: Contexts of *A Nocturnall upon S. Lucies Day*”, in *John Donne’s “desire of more”*, pp. 149–71 (particularly pp. 154–55, 158 and 161).

‘cross-lingual’ wordplay on the Spanish phrase ‘*dar la luz*’ (‘to give birth’/‘to give the light’) constitutes a mournful description of the circumstances of Anne’s death, which echo the ‘inversion of light and darkness in St. Lucy and her festival day’. Such a strategy, as Nichols notes, invites comparison with the central argument of *Deaths Duell*, which derives from a pun on ‘issues’ in Psalm 68. 20 (‘vnto GOD the Lord *belong* the issues from death’), fashioning the paradoxical conceit that the ‘issues from death’ are in fact new lives.²⁴

While Walton’s insistence that Anne’s death provoked ‘a voluntary assurance’ from Donne ‘never to bring [his seven children] under the subjection of a step-mother’ must be approached with scepticism, no evidence exists to suggest that Donne ever entertained the notion of remarriage; and further studies of both *Noct* and *HSShe* have called attention to how these poems’ explorations of fleshly and spiritual love are of a piece with their inward focus on the ontological significance and lived experience of ordination and celibate life.²⁵ Along with two other holy sonnets (*HSShow* and *HSVex*), *HSShe* survives in manuscript only in the ‘Westmoreland MS’ (NY3), and is, almost without exception, attributed to the years immediately following Anne’s death.²⁶

Since She whome I lovd hath payd her last debt
 To Nature, and to hers, and my good is dead
 And her Soule early into heauen rauished,
 Wholy in heauenly things my Mind is sett.
 Here the admyring her my Mind did whett
 To seeke thee God; so streams do show the head,
 But though I have found thee, and thou my thirst hast fed,
 A holy thirsty dropsy melts me yett.
 But why should I begg more love, when as thou
 Dost woe my Soule, for hers offering all thine:
 And dost not only feare lest I allow
 My Love to Saints and Angels, things diuine,

²⁴ Jennifer L. Nichols ‘Dionysian Negative Theology in Donne’s “A Nocturnall upon S. Lucies Day.”’, *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 53 (2011) 352–67 (pp. 353); Lauren La Torre, ‘Dar La Luz: Illuminating John Donne’s “A nocturnall upon S. Lucies day, Being the shortest day.”’, *JDJ*, 27 (2008) 103–120 (particularly pp. 108, 119–20).

²⁵ Walton, *Lives*, pp. 41–42.

²⁶ See *Variorum*, VII.1 pp. 432–33. Considering the NY3 sonnets together, Novarr (*Disinterred Muse*, pp. 115–27) accepts that the *HSShe* is probably late and written about the death of a woman Donne loved, but stops short of identifying her as Anne.

But in thy tender iealousy dost doubt
Lest the World, fleshe, yea Deuill putt thee out.

Superficially, the speaker's first announcement – that 'Since She whom [he] lovd' has gone 'early into heauen' his 'Mind is sett' 'Wholy in heauenly things' – could without difficulty be substituted for Walton's recollection that, 'burying' 'his tears' and 'all his earthly joys in his most dear and deserving wives grave', Donne 'betook himself to a most retired and solitary life'.²⁷ But having made explicit his epideictic justification for 'admyring her' (that in doing so his 'Mind' is 'whett | To seeke thee God') the speaker delivers, at the poem's exact mid-point, a central and surprising confession. As Novarr notes, similarities between these lines and others in Donne's widely-circulated *Christ* (1619) make it easy to read this as a post-ordination admission that 'new circumstances have not changed [Donne] as he expected they would'.²⁸ The sestet that follows is a searching and ambiguous exploration of loss and love implicitly prompted by the poem's initial epideictic argument: if the speaker's 'Mind is sett' 'in heauenly things' through the death of his beloved, his meditations might also be compromised by his residual, fleshly, attachment to 'her'. Anne's identification in *HSShe* is not much debated, but the degree and nature of her poetical 'presence' within this triangulated dynamic is. For example, while Frances M. Malpezzi suggests that the poem's 'central conceit', governed by images of water and thirst, testifies to a harmonic definition of corporeal marriage as 'the prototypic relationship between marital partners and between the soul and God', Teresa M. DiPasquale argues for a solipsistic speaker guilty about his part in Anne's death, and loath to substitute his masculine status as her worldly lover for a spiritually bridal identity with God in the Church.²⁹

²⁷ Walton, *Lives*, p. 42.

²⁸ Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 128–31.

²⁹ Frances M. Malpezzi, 'Love's Liquidity in "Since she whom I lovd"', in *John Donne's "desire of more"*, pp. 197–203 (pp. 197–98); Teresa M. DiPasquale, 'Ambivalent Mourning in "Since she whom I lovd"', in *John Donne's "desire of more"*, pp. 183–95. See also Achsah Guibbory, 'Fear of "loving more": Death and the Loss of Sacramental Love', in *John Donne's "desire of more"*, pp. 204–27.

A similar ambiguity hangs over *Dissol* – a poem almost entirely ignored in Hester’s edited volume on Anne, but which contains marked thematic and linguistic similarities with *EtAD*, *Noct* and *HSShe*. That this is a poem about a dead woman – real or imagined – is conveyed by its first words:

SHee’is dead; And all which die
 To their first Elements resolve;
 And wee were mutuall Elements to us,
 And made of one another. 5
 My body then doth hers involve,
 And those things whereof I consist, hereby
 In me abundant grow, and burdenous,
 And nourish not, but smother.
 My fire of Passion, sighes of ayre,
 Water of teares, and earthly sad despaire, 10
 Which my materialls bee,
 But neere worne out by loves securitie,
 Shee, to my losse, doth by her death repaire,
 And I might live long wretched so
 But that my fire doth with my fuell grow. 15
 Now as those Active Kings
 Whose foraine conquest treasure brings,
 Receive more, and spend more, and soonest breake:
 This (which I am amaz’d that I can speake)
 This death, hath with my store 20
 My use encreas’d.
 And so my soule more earnestly releas’d,
 Will outstrip hers; As bullets flowen before
 A latter bullet may o’rtake, the powder being more.

Having made this emphatic announcement, the speaker moves into a multifaceted deliberation of the physical and spiritual processes activated by its truth, and their implications for him, on the basis of a central conceit that they were ‘made of one another’ in a balanced elemental admixture. The conceit leads onto to a two-part thought process: first, a consideration of how the elemental imbalance brought about by her absence has caused his ‘materials’ to ‘abundant grow’; and second, a realisation that in this new ‘burdenous’ state of excessive ‘fire’, his capacity to ‘use’ those ‘materials’ has risen commensurately with his ‘store’ – and may yet enable his soul to catch hers when he dies. Two essays by Jay Levine and Roberta Albrecht have considered how, within the various alchemical, philosophical and

occult frameworks through which these arguments operate, the final image of the bullet shot heavenwards (which recalls that of *SecAn*, discussed in the previous chapter) explores a conceptual relationship between death and orgasm that was commonplace in the early seventeenth century. Between them, they locate a tension within its representations of death and sexual love that corresponds closely with that which Malpezzi and DiPasquale identify between death and marriage in *HSShe*. Arguing that *Dissol* is a ‘twofold’ elegy combining funerary and erotic concerns, Levine associates it with a vein of contemporary Ovidian poetry known for a thematic focus on sexual impotence, and corresponding notions of ‘physical unity’ – a theme the poem develops through explorations of bodily disintegration, alchemical process, marital annulment and orgasm.³⁰ Considering a broader range of allusions (most importantly Heraclitus’s doctrine of primordial fire) and arguing for the poem’s emphasis on the procreative power of the speaker’s ‘store’ (an alchemical ‘combination of male and female seeds, which become golden and rarefied offspring’), Albrecht arrives at the opposite conclusion.³¹

Neither essay considers the poem’s occasion. While the idea that it might have been written about Anne is briefly suggested by John T. Shawcross, it is not elsewhere taken seriously, and peremptorily dismissed by Arthur F. Marotti, who argues that its imagery would have been ‘singularly inappropriate’ for a clergyman.³² This imagery is far from incongruous, however, with the literary context I have described; and it is surprising that the elegy has not hitherto been considered within it – especially given that, like *Noct* and *HSShe*, *Dissol* survives in very few manuscript witnesses, and (as Helen Gardner has suggested) its absence from ‘Group 1’ sources indicates a likely composition date after 1614 (alongside

³⁰ Jay Levine, “‘The Dissolution’: Donne’s Twofold Elegy”, *ELH*, 28 (1961), 301–15 (pp. 307, 314–15).

³¹ Roberta Albrecht, ‘Alchemical Augmentation and Primordial Fire in Donne’s “The Dissolution”’, *SEL*, 45 (2005), 95–115 (particularly pp. 97, 106).

³² John T. Shawcross, ‘Some Rereadings of John Donne’s Poems’, *JDJ*, 16 (1995), 45–62 (p. 50–51); Marotti, *Coterie Poet*, p. 232.

Noct, with which, she notes, it is ‘linked by theme’).³³ The poem shares relatively obvious thematic parallels with the analogues I have suggested: an exploration of death and romantic love in the context of an arcane alchemical process (with a potentially procreative subtext), an apparent focus upon religious vocation and conversion implied by its consideration of personal application, and a conflation of amorous and commemorative concerns. Moreover, I would suggest, it contains two specific linguistic parallels with *Noct*, both of which relate to that poem’s twenty-eighth line (the first of the stanza quoted above): ‘But I am by her death, (which word wrongs her)’. The first is the three-word elegiac formation ‘by her death’, which appears in the thirteenth line of *Dissol*: ‘Shee, to my losse, doth by her death repaire’. The second is the speaker’s parenthetical expression of discomfort over the word ‘death’, which is identical to the proleptical parenthesis in the nineteenth line of *Dissol*: ‘This (which I am amaz’d that I can speake) | This death, hath with my store’.

The recent discovery by Hugh Adlington of Donne’s annotated copy of a 1616 Parisian edition of the works of Peter Abelard may shed further light on the question of Donne’s preoccupation with and ambivalence about corporeal love after Anne’s death. This book, held in Lambeth Palace Library (A46.3/AB1H) contains Abelard’s letters and various works of religious commentary, with Donne’s signature and motto on its title page. While his characteristic vertical pencil markings can be found at intervals in the margins of numerous sections of the book, they appear with particular density ‘on most pages’ of Abelard’s well-known correspondence with Heloise, in which, in the context of lost love, she expresses an internal struggle to throw off old, sensuous desires.³⁴ In a similar way, further evidence for the indexing of Donne’s writing with his emotional and biographical experiences may be

³³ *The Elegies and the Songs and Sonnets*, ed. by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 218.

³⁴ Hugh Adlington, ‘Seven More Books from the Library of John Donne’, *The Book Collector*, 67 (2018), 528–33 (p. 529); and in expanded form in Adlington, ‘Seven New Books from Donne’s Library’, paper given at the John Donne Society Conference, 28 June 2018, Lausanne, Switzerland.

possible through corpus linguistics approaches: one such (forthcoming) study on extant sermons by Donne and his contemporaries will, for instance, suggest a collocative relationship between his invocation of ‘midnight’ and linguistic indications of deeper personal reflection. This has obvious relevance for critical readings of both *Noct* and *Har* (as discussed in the previous chapter), both of which establish midnight settings from which to explore corporeal and spiritual planes of reconciliation, and the speaker’s shifting identity.³⁵ As Joan Webber has suggested, the setting of midnight seems to have had a kind of personal significance to Donne in imaginative terms:

Donne’s ‘association of midnight with depression and horror [...] is personal [...] He thinks of midnight as a time when the self, deprived of reliance upon all external things, is thrown back upon its own resources and is entirely subject both to awareness of God’s justice or mercy and to the consequences of its own spiritual emptiness or well-being.’³⁶

On their own, of course, these findings are of limited significance: just as Donne may have read and annotated his book much later than 1617 (or even just before it), the midnight settings of *Noct* and *Har* can exist as imaginative constructions unrelated to consequential occasions and changes in Donne’s life. Taken together and alongside the parallel readings outlined above, however, they add to a compelling body of circumstantial evidence for identifying Anne as the deceased subject of *Noct*, *HSShe* and *Dissol*, and those poems themselves as comparable and fundamentally ‘elegiac’ introspections.

Finally, it may also be worth considering the reverse proposition: that the most transcribed amorous poet of early modern England, who risked an auspicious career and perhaps his life to elope with a woman far his social superior, did not privately commemorate her loss in verse fifteen years later – or that any such works have not survived. Donne’s

³⁵ Hugh Adlington et al., ‘A Corpus Stylistics Approach to the Sermons of John Donne and his Contemporaries’, *Scientific Studies of Literature* (forthcoming). As with the above citation, my thanks are once again due to Hugh for making me aware of this, and for permitting me to mention it here.

³⁶ Joan Webber, *Contrary Music: The Prose Style of John Donne* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963), pp. 105–06.

fellow clergyman and friend Henry King wrote elegies for his wife (also Anne), who died seven years after Anne Donne, that went on to circulate widely in manuscript. The best known, his ‘Exequy To his Matchlesse never to be forgotten Friend’ has even inspired something of a modern tradition for imitating early modern precedents in commemorations of spousal deaths: Peter Porter’s poignant ‘An Exequy’ explicitly states its formal model ‘as [when] Bishop King | Once hymned in tetrametric rhyme | His young wife, lost before her time’.³⁷ Similarly, Stephen Edgar, another Australian poet, uses the form and given title of *Noct* to elegise his wife in ‘Nocturnal’.³⁸ It is likely, as Novarr suggests, that Donne wished to avoid comparisons with such ‘sweet poetical’ clerical contemporaries as King, of the kind made by John Chamberlain, by circulating such elegies widely.³⁹ The popularity of spousal elegy was beginning to acquire increasing energy in manuscript miscellanies and commonplace books, in which readers, writers and compilers developed their own kinds of early modern fan fiction in prosopopoeical and misattributed poetry purporting to shed biographical light on the private lives of figures like Donne – even before Walton’s ‘Life’ made his marriage the pivotal event in his posthumous biographical arc.⁴⁰ As Erin A. McCarthy notes, it is even possible to read the structure of the second (1635) edition of Donne’s posthumous *Poems*, which preceded Walton’s ‘Life’ (though was certainly influenced by Walton), as a conscious mimicry of an imagined, autobiographically arranged,

³⁷ *The Poems of Henry King*, ed. by Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 68–72. See also ‘The Anniverse. An Elegy’, written six years later, pp. 72–73; Peter Porter, *Collected Poems* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 247.

³⁸ For a recent close reading of this poem and its relationship with *Noct*, see Jonathan F. S. Post, ‘Reading Donne: A Sentimental Journey’, in *John Donne and Contemporary Poetry*, ed. by Judith Scherer Herz (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 61–73.

³⁹ Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 157–58.

⁴⁰ See Deborah Aldrich Larson, ‘Donne’s Contemporary Reputation: Evidence from Some Commonplace Books and Manuscript Miscellanies’, *JDJ*, 12 (1993), 115–130.

holograph manuscript, whose closing lines recall Donne's famous 'John Donne, Ann Donne, Un-done' 'epithalamium'.⁴¹

In establishing the salient characteristics of poetry Donne (ostensibly) wrote to commemorate Anne, this chapter section has attempted to set out a thematic key for identifying and understanding his articulations of that personal loss. Though, in the poems *EdAD*, *Noct*, *HSShe* and *Dissol*, these characteristics are developed in ways that appear to refer with striking specificity to Anne, it is nonetheless possible to detect similar tendencies more widely in his writing. As the following sections of this chapter will show, both private and public forms of commemorative poetry and prose Donne wrote and preached having entered the Church demonstrate similarly self-reflexive and thematic patterns, developing, in both private and public ways, his interwoven articulation of vocation and loss in a variety of private and public contexts.

Revisiting the Disinterred Muse: Commemorative Poetry in the Church

The second part of this chapter considers commemorative poetry Donne wrote between 1618 and 1621/22 that relates more explicitly to his new role as preacher. In doing so, it both builds upon arguments made above with respect to Donne's introspective explorations of ordained selfhood, and it moves in a new direction, describing an emergent public persona analogous to (and associated with) the poet of the *Anniversaries*. It focuses predominantly on three poems: a commemoration in which Donne reflects directly upon the subjects of vocation and ordination (*Tilman*), a quasi-elegiac commemoration of a biblical verse translation (*Sidney*), and a verse translation of Lamentations written, I argue, to commemorate a public catastrophe in the early 1620s (*Lam*). Linking these poems together,

⁴¹ Erin A. McCarthy, 'Poems, by J. D. (1635) and the Creation of John Donne's Literary Biography', *JDJ*, 32 (2013), 57–85 (p. 80). Ernest W. Sullivan, II describes Donne's punning phrase thus in 'Donne's Epithalamium for Anne', in *John Donne's "desire of more"*, pp. 35–38.

along with their private/coterie and public contexts, is Lara M. Crowley's recent reattribution to Donne of a short verse translation of Psalm 137 ('By Euphrates flowry side'), printed in *Poems* (1633), but typically attributed to Francis Davison.⁴² As I hope to show, Crowley's reattribution facilitates a number of fresh approaches to these poems that relate particularly to Donne's early self-fashioning within the Church. This chapter section is indebted to her insights.

Donne is known to have written two verse letters on the subject of ordination after taking orders: *GHerb* and *Tilman*. *GHerb* was sent to George Herbert shortly after Donne's own ordination, and *Tilman* to one Edward Tilman – about whom little is known – on the occasion of his, three years later.⁴³ While the precise nature of Donne's relationships with both men at this time is largely unknown, it is likely that they were all, to some extent at least, sharing poems with one other. This notion derives from Novarr's persuasive suggestion that lines 79–80 in Herbert's 'Church Porch' bear a striking resemblance to line 30 in Donne's *Tilman*, and (somewhat less persuasively) that Donne seems both to have imitated Herbert and expected him to notice.⁴⁴ *Tilman* is a response to a poem Tilman sent to Donne (extant in NP1 and O34), in which he expresses reluctance to enter holy orders due to a sense of personal unworthiness. As Gardner points out, Donne's reply is notable for its absences: making no attempt to address the specific concerns that have been put to him, Donne instead focuses on the status and lived experience of ministry from 'a worldly point of view', evoking a sense of what is lost and gained in ordination.⁴⁵ The speaker sets out a series of penetrating questions about his addressee's worldly and spiritual experiences of that event,

⁴² Lara M. Crowley, *Manuscript Matters: Reading John Donne's Poetry and Prose in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 121–72. For a diplomatic transcription of 'Psalm 137' in the 'Skipwith MS' (B13), fols 16^v–17^v, along with an overview of the evidence for Donne and Davidson attributions, see pp. 127–38.

⁴³ For what is known about Tilman, see Allan Pritchard, 'Donne's Mr. Tilman', *RES*, 24 (1973), 38–42.

⁴⁴ Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 104–07, 109–13.

⁴⁵ *The Divine Poems*, ed. by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 127–32 (particularly p. 129).

advising him to ‘Let then the world thy calling disrespect, | But goe thou on, and pittie their neglect’ (35–36). Describing the ‘titles and preheminences’ of the vocation, the speaker’s terminology and emphases reveal much about Donne’s conception of it. Specifically, it is of ‘preachers’ that he speaks:

Maries prerogative was to beare Christ, so
 'Tis preachers to convey him, for they doe
 As Angels out of clouds, from Pulpits speake;
 And blesse the poore beneath, the lame, the weake.
 If then th'Astronomers, whereas they spie
 A new-found Starre, their Opticks magnifie,
 How brave are those, who with their Engine, can
 Bring man to heaven, and heaven againe to man?
 These are thy titles and preheminences,
 In whom must meet Gods graces, mens offences,
 And so the heavens which beget all things here,
 And the earth our mother, which these things doth beare,
 Both these in thee, are in thy Calling knit,
 And make thee now a blest Hermaphrodite. (41–54)

Donne’s final couplet recalls the ambiguous gender dynamics of *HSShe*: ‘knit’ of ‘the heavens’ and ‘the earth our mother’, the preacher undergoes something analogous to a sex change. Whether or not its thirtieth line imitates or is imitated by Herbert’s ‘Church Porch’, *Tilman* may, in a small way, be considered a product of a likely clerical coterie dynamic in which Donne either anticipated/arranged a broader readership than the addressee alone, or such a readership emerged independently of Donne’s intentions, eliciting Herbert’s later intertextual allusion back to *Tilman* (which might be read as something of a clerical coterie manifesto). Indeed, Crowley proposes a further intertextual allusion between the thirteenth line of ‘Psalm 137’ (‘Our mute Harpes, vntun’d, vnstrunge’) and the twenty-second line of Herbert’s ‘Denial’ (‘Therefore my soul lay out of sight, | Untun’d, unstrung’) – suggesting that the colleagueship of Donne and Herbert was of greater personal and literary significance than has hitherto been recognised.⁴⁶ Of course, ostensible textual borrowings between biblical

⁴⁶ Crowley, *Manuscript Matters*, pp. 169–71. Herbert’s ‘Denial’ here quoted from *The English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 289.

verse translations such as this can be inherently misleading due to the fact that they share sources; and making them persuasive therefore requires exhaustive study of all the possible biblical translations out of which they may have arisen (study that is beyond the scope of this thesis). Nonetheless, this would represent a further suggestive echo of the kind of verse-sharing context Novarr proposes.

Crowley also identifies striking literary parallels between ‘Psalm 137’ and the famous Sidneian psalter Donne later praised in *Sidney*; but she does not fully consider their literary and contextual significance to that poem.⁴⁷ *Sidney*, which Novarr dates convincingly to the death of Mary (Sidney) Herbert, Countess of Pembroke, on 21 September 1621, begins by declaring that biblical verse translations such as ‘Psalm 137’, *Lam*, and the speaker’s ostensible subject (its given title is ‘Upon the translation of the Psalms by Sir Philip Sidney’) are fundamentally misguided compositions, thrusting ‘into strait corners of poore wit’ that which is ‘cornerlesse and infinite’ (3, 4).⁴⁸ Predictably, the Sidneian psalter is then excepted from this censure:

Fixe we our prayes therefore on this one,
That, as thy blessed Spirit fell upon
These Psalmes first Author in a cloven tongue;
(For 'twas a double power by which he sung
The highest matter in the noblest forme;)
So thou hast cleft that spirit, to performe
That worke againe, and shed it, here, upon
Two, by their bloods, and by thy Spirit one;
A Brother and a Sister, made by thee
The Organ, where thou art the Harmony. (7–16)

Donne’s apparently surprising decision to celebrate a verse translation written decades earlier, and, in doing so, to argue that all other such verses represent mere fetters of ‘poore wit’ upon God’s word, might, given his possible authorship of ‘Psalm 137’, represent an

⁴⁷ Crowley argues (*Manuscript Matters*, pp. 152, 161) that *Sidney* ‘calls to mind’ ‘Psalm 137’ in its emphasis on the musicality of the Sidneian psalter, noting also that the stanzaic form of ‘Psalm 137’ is identical to Psalm XXXVIII in it.

⁴⁸ Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 155–57.

elaborate modesty topos – a possibility made likelier by what is known of the poem’s intended function and the identity of its intended recipient. Arguing that *Sidney* was written specifically for the attention of William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke (George’s fourth cousin and Mary’s son), Novarr identifies it persuasively as a supplication for patronage at a time when Donne was eager for promotion within the Church, drawing on a number of valid external factors to make this case.⁴⁹ Donne was known to and liked by Pembroke, who in 1619 had mentioned him in a letter to James Hay, Viscount Doncaster, while Donne was away with him on the continent: ‘I beseech your Lordship commend my best loue to M^r Doctor Dunn.’⁵⁰ Thus, the various textual parallels Crowley identifies between ‘Psalm 137’ and the Sidneian psalter may represent a conspicuous subtext intended for recognition by this prominent literary patron.⁵¹

Moreover, the internal political and self-presentational strategies Donne deploys in *Sidney* further reinforce the identity of Pembroke as its intended recipient, and supply revealing insight into Donne’s sense of public self-fashioning in 1621. Like each of the commemorative poems described above, *Sidney* is a text whose subtext is the identity of its author-speaker; unlike those texts, it is a patronage poem invested in a portrayal of that author-speaker as a sympathetic and capable public figure. In particular, the poem is insistently attentive to questions of English national – and literary – identity, and the significance of the Sidneian psalter to both:

Two that make one Iohn Baptists holy voyce,
And who that Psalme, Now let the Iles rejoyce (17–18)

They shew us Ilanders our joy, our King,
They tell us why, and teach us how to sing (21–22)

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 155–57. That the poem survives in only one manuscript source (H6), suggests also that it was intended for a specific reader. Robbins, *Poems*, p. 580 offers no further insight into the poem’s occasion.

⁵⁰ Quoted in Bald, *Life*, p. 351.

⁵¹ Pembroke’s prominence as a literary patron attracted numerous commemorative poems about his mother, including a popular elegy by William Browne of Tavistock. See Gillian Wright, ‘A commentary on and edition of the shorter poems of William Browne of Tavistock in British Library MS Lansdowne 777’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow, 1998), particularly pp. 114–15.

The songs are these, which heavens high holy Muse
 Whisper'd to David, David to the Iewes:
 And Davids Successors, in holy zeale,
 In formes of joy and art doe re-reveale
 To us so sweetly and sincerely too,
 That I must not rejoyce as I would doe
 When I behold that these Psalmes are become
 So well attyr'd abroad, so ill at home
 So well in Chambers, in thy Church so ill,
 As I can scarce call that reform'd untill
 This be reform'd; Would a whole State present
 A lesser gift than some one man hath sent?
 And shall our Church, unto our Spouse and King
 More hoarse, more harsh than any other, sing? (31–44)

Pembroke was known for his anti-Spanish views and sympathy for the international Protestant cause, with historical links to the Essex faction. A longstanding rival of Somerset, he had, along with Archbishop George Abbot, been instrumental in facilitating the rise of Buckingham as James's new favourite, and profited – initially, at least – from the younger man's success.⁵² *Sidney* is designed specifically to move such a reader. Having established the central importance of the Psalms to the spiritual health of 'us Ilanders', and the Sidneian psalter ('this one' (7)) as the means through which that national edification may adequately function, the speaker deploys the imaginative trick of describing, extensively, the diminished status of a fictional, alternative, England/English in which that translation does not exist. The poem thus stokes the indignation of its reader by contriving a vision in which the country's very identity as a 'reform'd' nation is erased, before reintroducing, in its last twelve lines (45–47) a status quo in which it is not. On one level, the urgency with which *Sidney* asserts this national requirement for biblical verse translation undercuts and contradicts the protestations of the poem's opening, obliquely presenting Donne – an author, himself (perhaps), of such works – as a fit representative of the 'Church' and 'State' he diagnoses. On

⁵² Pembroke became Lord Chancellor in the same year (1615) Donne took orders. See Victor Slater, 'Herbert, William, third earl of Pembroke, (1580–1630)', *ODNB* (2004) [accessed 29 July 2019].

another, that diagnosis strongly suggests an understanding of biblical verse translations as poems significant and applicable to the needs of public, rather than private, devotion.

This has a direct and hitherto little-recognised bearing on Donne's verse translation of 'The Lamentations of Jeremy' (*Lam*), the third longest poem he wrote and the final poem I will consider in this section.⁵³ While all critics agree that *Lam* was probably written as a commemoration of some kind of tragedy, opinions differ widely as to its likely date and context, including whether or not it was written and circulated as a response to a significant public event or as a more private exercise. This is, of course, a tension that runs through the text itself: according to Walton, Donne preached on Lamentations 3. 1 at St Clement Danes after the death of Anne – a scriptural verse that exemplifies the prophet's lyrical, first-person articulation of public grief: 'I Am the man which have affliction seene, | Under the rod of Gods wrath having beene' (quoted from *Lam*, 177–78).⁵⁴ Donne's seeming application of his various sources to his own state (as argued by William B. Hunter), and the fact that the sermon Walton mentions would have coincided with liturgical readings from Lamentations at the time of Anne's death, inform the argument that *Lam* might be a private commemoration or devotional exercise written in August 1617.⁵⁵

Similarly reading *Lam* as a private work, John Klaus influentially identifies it as the poem Donne encloses with an earlier letter to Goodere from Mitcham – a re-written version of a biblical verse translation 'made long since, at Sea' but subsequently lost. Donne asks that this work be given to Lady Bedford:

⁵³ Behind the two *Anniversaries*. *Har* is the fourth longest. Though Kirsten Stirling notes that the 'ideal of liturgical poetry' presented by *Sidney* 'speaks of "the Church", implying communal, liturgical prayer rather than individual devotion', she does not consider the possible implications of this distinction for reading *Lam*. 'Liturgical Poetry', *Handbook*, pp. 233–41 (p. 235).

⁵⁴ Walton, *Lives*, p. 43. Walton adds that 'indeed, his very words and looks testified him to be truly such a man'. Another sermon on the same text does survive in *Fifty sermons. preached by that learned and reverend divine, John Donne* (1649), pp. 445–55 – though it does not appear to be the one Walton describes, and is titled 'Preached at St. Dunstons'. The occasion of this sermon is not known.

⁵⁵ See William B. Hunter, 'An Occasion for John Donne's "The Lamentations of Jeremy"', *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews*, 12 (1999), 18–23.

I Send you here a Translation; but it is not onely to beleeeve me, it is a great invention to have understood any piece of this Book, whether the gravity of the matter, or the Poeticall form, give it his inclination, and principium motus; you are his center, or his spheare, and to you as to his proper place he addresses himself. Besides that all my things, not onely by obligation, but by custome, know that that is the way they should goe. I spake of this to my L. of Bedford, thinking then I had had a copy which I made long since, at Sea, but because I finde it not, I have done that again: when you finde it not unseasonable, let her see it; and if you can think it fit, that a thing that hath either wearied, or distasted you, should receive so much favour, put it amongst her papers: when you have a new stomach to it, I will provide you quickly a new Copy.⁵⁶

The exilic themes of *Lamentations* lead Klaus to posit original composition dates in the late-1580s, when Donne may have travelled abroad as a Catholic refugee, and during Donne's expeditionary voyages with the Earl of Essex in 1596–97. Likewise exploring the book's contemporary polemical resonances as a much-debated portrayal of divine providence, Klaus also suggests that Donne's conspicuous use of a textual source by Immanuel Tremellius gives his translation a significant Protestant spin: rejecting St Jerome's depiction of the sacking and occupation of Jerusalem in 597 BC as a consequence of its inhabitants' abuses against the city's clergy, Tremellius (and Donne) render those inhabitants victims of an unjust enemy without.⁵⁷ In keeping with this emphasis, Reuben Sánchez has more recently argued that Donne's ventriloquy of the prophet Jeremiah in *Lam* amounts to a typological self-fashioning symbolic of his religious and vocational 'turning' towards God prior to ordination.⁵⁸

Several additional factors, however, combined with the reading of *Sidney* offered above, make an early date less likely. The first is the reattribution of 'Psalm 137' to Donne, which Crowley persuasively identifies as the poem enclosed with Donne's letter to Goodere: sharing *Lam*'s specific subject and exilic theme, she argues that the shorter translation could more plausibly have been written while at sea – provoked, perhaps, by the sacking of Cadiz

⁵⁶ *Letters*, pp. 207–08.

⁵⁷ John Klaus, 'The Two Occasions of Donne's "Lamentations of Jeremy"', *SP*, 90 (1993), 337–59. On the particular importance of one English source for Donne's poem (based on the Geneva version), see Ted-Larry Pebworth, 'John Donne's "Lamentations" and Christopher Fetherstone's *Lamentations* (1587)', in *Wrestling with God: Literature and Theology in the English Renaissance*, ed. by Mary Ellen Henley and W. Speed Hill (Vancouver, B. C.: n.p., 2001), pp. 85–98.

⁵⁸ Reuben Sánchez, *Typology and Iconography in Donne, Herbert, and Milton: Fashioning the Self After Jeremiah* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 27–70.

in 1596, in which Donne took part.⁵⁹ Accounting for the poem Donne sent from Mitcham, Crowley thus removes the most serious obstacle to dating *Lam* to the early 1620s – as Gardner and Novarr both suggest – and for reading it, alongside *Sidney*, as a public commemoration written for a specific public purpose or context.⁶⁰ One further possible source of insight into the context of Donne’s poem, not hitherto acknowledged, is contained alongside a later elegy sent to Donne by one James Barry on the occasion of King James’s death in 1625. This lengthy poem (some 161 lines), which survives in two manuscript sources, is prefaced in both by a prefatory letter ‘To the reuerend, and Learned Doctor Donne: Deane Of S^t Paules’. Signalling an intention ‘to make [...] choise of you [Donne] for my [his] Patrone’, Barry justifies his elegy thus:

It might haue been enough that my owne priuat deuotions, could beare wittnesse wth me of my true sorrowe for the losse of his sacred Matie, but the example of God himselfe, is more then a commaundment, and he when a good Kinge of Judah dyed, vouchafed to descend so lowe, as to be the author of his epitaph, for if we may beliue st Jerome, the lamentations of Jeremy were a funerall elegy, upon the death of the Kinge Josias: Hauinge such a copy to write after, I could not hold my handes till I had finished this, wch (as it is) I lay at your feete, wth his hand, and hart whoe honors, and admires you.⁶¹

Citing the same Jeromian glosses that had historically set the terms of debate over Lamentations in a Reformation context (specifically Jerome’s well-known assertion that the book was written as a funerary elegy for King Josiah), Barry adds that ‘Hauinge such a copy to write after, I could not hold my handes till I had finished this’.⁶² Several interpretations of this reference are possible, the most obvious (and perhaps likely) of which views its referent exclusively as the biblical precedent Barry identifies, which ‘God himselfe’ ‘vouchafed to descend so lowe’ to author. Another, however, reads in these words an allusion to *Lam*

⁵⁹ Crowley, *Manuscript Matters*, pp. 158–71.

⁶⁰ Gardner, *Divine Poems*, pp. 103–04; Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, p. 142.

⁶¹ Trinity College, Dublin MS 652, fols 362^v–363^r. The full text (including letter) covers fols 362^v–366^r. The second – far less legible – witness survives BL Sloane MS 1394, fols 175^v–79^v. It is in this BL witness that the name ‘James Barrye’ is given (fol. 175^v); MS 652 merely includes his initials. A full diplomatic transcription of both letter and poem from MS 652 is included in Appendix III.

⁶² On the currency of this elegiac reading of Lamentations, see Lewalski, *Donne’s Anniversaries*, p. 28.

which, while not explicit, is nonetheless perceptible in Barry's description of his textual model as 'a cobby', the particularity with which he calls attention to it, and, having done so, his specific 'choise' of Donne for his 'Patrone'. If the latter, he may be merely aware of Donne's translation, or familiar with 'a cobby to write after'.⁶³ Either way, his letter would supply a new *terminus ad quem* for *Lam* in early 1625. While the elegy bears no obvious resemblance to that composition, its length, style and allusions reveal a general awareness of Donne's commemorative verse, as does its speaker's insistence that Donne's 'dead muse' 'rather awake [...] thy master' for the occasion at hand. Some of the lines that follow, including the speaker's description of himself as a 'poore prophet', are strongly reminiscent of the *Anniversaries* (particularly *FirAn*):

Let his death teach us what a sea of glasse
This whole worlde is, since he our ioye, who was
The soule of it is fled, and could not be
ffreed from that common fate mortality.
Could knolledge, vertue, greatness or the rest
Of those poore thinges w^{ch} we doe count the best,
Had beene preservations 'gainst death, he then,
Whom we lament, had ouerlu'd all men,

Similarly, the elegy may recall certain features from *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*:

But I can better weepe, then write, myne eyes
By this haue learn'd to shed true Elegyes

Pardon my weakenes, and let this be parte
Of his iust tribute, whoe could wishe to bee
A Chapman, or a Siluester to thee⁶⁴

The likely identity of Barry offers one way of following up the possibility that he knew Donne, and might have known *Lam*. The only scholar hitherto to consider this (Wesley Milgate, though he does not read the letter/elegy in any depth) identifies him as the later first Baron Barry of Santry (1603–73), who graduated BA in 1621 from Trinity College, Dublin,

⁶³ The *OED* shows, unsurprisingly, that both literal (*n.II.* 2 – 'A writing transcribed from, and reproducing the contents of, another; a transcript') and figurative (*n.II.* 4) uses of 'copy' were common in this period [accessed 4 September 2019].

⁶⁴ Trinity College, Dublin, MS 652, fols 363^v, 364^v and 365^r (respectively).

before admission to Lincoln's Inn on 11 July that same year – exactly seven months before Donne left his Readership there, having been made Dean of St Paul's on 20 October. While this attribution is not a certainty, the author's identity as 'an Irishman and a Loyalist' seems beyond doubt, because a further elegy for Christopher Herrys, (whom the poet describes, according to Milgate, as 'an advocate of his country in Parliament'), is attributed to him in one of the two manuscript witnesses for the King James elegy (Trinity College, Dublin, MS 652), immediately following it.⁶⁵ If correct, it is likely that Barry would have heard Donne preach at Lincoln's Inn, and may even have met him. Of all Donne's regular preaching venues, Lincoln's Inn is the one to which, especially at this stage in his career, Donne might have been able to devote the most comprehensive attention: his position, in Bald's words, 'was not merely that of preacher, but rather that of director of the Society's religious life'.⁶⁶

As Emma Rhatigan has shown, Donne's twenty-two extant Lincoln's Inn sermons (a conservative estimate of what he actually preached) demonstrate and negotiate his auditors' awareness of his own biographical and literary ties there, just as they engage with the kinds of contemporary political events that might have provoked him to pen and possibly even share a poem such as *Lam* in a liturgical or social setting.⁶⁷ The poem survives in nine manuscript witnesses, none of which is in Group 1 (suggestive of post-1614 composition), but three of which (OX2a, OX2b and OX2c) reveal that it was, after Donne's death, put to music.⁶⁸ Novarr in particular emphasises how the intricate structure and musicality of

⁶⁵ Wesley Milgate, 'The Early References to John Donne', *N&Q*, 195 (1950), 229–31, 246–47, 290–92, 381–83 (pp. 381–83); W. N. Osborough, 'Barry, James, first Baron Barry of Santry (1603–73)', *ODNB* (2004) [accessed 3 August 2019]. See also Bald, *Life*, pp. 385–86, which follows Milgate's analysis.

⁶⁶ Bald, *Life*, p. 367.

⁶⁷ Emma Rhatigan, "'The sinful history of mine own youth': John Donne preaches at Lincoln's Inn", in *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, ed. by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 90–106; 'Donne's readership at Lincoln's Inn and the Doncaster embassy', *Handbook*, pp. 576–88.

⁶⁸ The full list of witnesses is DT1, H4, H6, HH1, OX2a, OX2b, OX2c, WN1, and Y3. I would like to thank Mary Elaine S. Nelson for her generous correspondence on the Thomas Ford manuscripts at Christ Church Library, Oxford (OX2a–c). I would also like to thank Jeffrey Johnson for responding to my enquiry about the forthcoming *Variorum* edition of Donne's religious verse (7.2), which will present no further substantive findings on *Lam*.

Donne's poem suggests that he intended for it to be used in this way, outlining the 'extraordinary effects' achieved by its 'frequent patterns of end rhyme, the quality of the internal rhyme, the amount of parallel expression with word repetition, the overwhelming emphasis on consonance and assonance'.⁶⁹

Donne's late Readership at Lincoln's Inn may therefore present a particularly promising context within which to situate *Lam*. It is to this congregation that, in his *Sermon of Valediction at my Going into Germany* (preached 18 April 1619), he expresses deep personal trepidation regarding his health and safety shortly before departing with the Doncaster Embassy the following month:

In my long absence, and far distance from hence, remember me, as I shall do you in the ears of that God, to whom the farthest East, and the farthest West are but as the right and left ear in one of us [...] if I never meet you again till we have all passed the gate of death, yet in the gates of heaven, I may meet you all [II, 248]

This lugubrious frame of mind is powerfully evident in a variety of other contemporary sources. Writing to Goodere around the same time, Donne complains that 'I leave a scattered flock of wretched children, and I carry an infirme and valetudinary body, and I goe into the mouth of such adversaries, as I cannot blame for hating me'. The tone of this letter also permits a generous reading of Walton's account of these weeks, in which 'his friends of *Lincolns Inne*' 'feared that his immoderate study, and sadness for his wives death, would, as *Jacob* said, *make his days few*, and respecting his bodily health, *evil* too: and of this there were many visible signs'.⁷⁰ As Bald notes, Donne's focus on those 'friends' upon his return in December was as energetic as his appeals for promotion into the following year – appeals that were, for quite some time, unsuccessful.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 148–50.

⁷⁰ *Letters*, p. 174; Walton, *Lives*, p. 45.

⁷¹ Bald, *Life*, pp. 367–68, 370–74. See also Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 144–45; Clayton D. Lein, Donne: The Final Period', *Handbook*, pp. 601–15 (p. 602).

Thus, during his Readership at Lincoln's Inn, Donne could have had the time, focus and setting in which to write and share a poem such as *Lam*. The final issue to consider is his possible motivation for writing it. Scholars dating the poem to this period (such as Gardner and Novarr) typically associate it with the Elector Palatine's defeat at White Mountain (8 November 1620) and the fall of Heidelberg to Imperial-Spanish forces (19 September 1622); and its potential relevance to such events is certainly clear, as 'the distress of the German Protestants turned men's minds to the captivity of Zion', and frustration mounted against King James's pacific, non-interventionist foreign policy.⁷² As mentioned above, *Lamentations* was in this period subject to frequent confessional appropriations – a conflict on which Donne's translation bears directly, contriving a keenly Protestant inflection in its uses of source material and its subtle portrayal of unjust violence ('Let all their wickednesse appeare to thee, | Doe unto them, as thou hast done to mee' (85–86)). Lincoln's Inn was known – even notorious – for militant Protestantism in these years, and would therefore have been receptive to such a translation.⁷³ Indeed, Donne's poem finds a ready analogue in his *Sermon of Valediction*, an early manuscript of which (c. 1625) demonstrates a notably sharper militancy than its 1661 printed counterpart.⁷⁴ Likewise, Donne's commemorative Gunpowder Plot sermon of 5 November 1622, itself on *Lamentations* 4. 20, reads the book, like Donne's earlier adumbration of biblical verse translation in *Sidney*, specifically in the light of its application to political turbulence and public grief, and even adopts the same typological correlative Barry identifies, describing King James as 'our Josiah' [IV, 261].⁷⁵

In *Christ*, Donne articulates directly, in poetic form, his feelings before leaving for the continent in 1619. Like the prophet of *Lam*, *Christ*'s restless, valedictory speaker hovers

⁷² Gardner, *The Divine Poems*, p. 104; Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 141–48.

⁷³ See Rhatigan, 'Donne's Readership at Lincoln's Inn', pp. 578–79.

⁷⁴ Hugh Adlington, 'John Donne and the Thirty Years' War: Religion, Diplomacy, and Law' (unpublished doctoral thesis, King's College London, 2006), p. 59.

⁷⁵ See also Robbins, *Poems*, p. 588.

between introspective lament and an outward, quasi-liturgical response to religious conflict, in lines of a prosodic regularity and mellifluousness that (as Novarr notes) could fit the poem for public use.⁷⁶ The speaker's twofold sense of private and public responsibility is encapsulated in his 'sacrifice' to God of 'this Iland', 'And all whom I lov'd there, and who lov'd mee' (9–10). At the same time, the poem's second and third stanzas draw on the private themes so prevalent in the elegies of Donne's disinterred muse, exploring the 'amorousnesse of an harmonious Soule' (18) and, in the uneasy matrimonial terms of *HSShe*, its jealous relationship with God.⁷⁷ Finally, as if to announce once again a new period in his life, and to anchor it in the poetry of his past, Donne's speaker concludes in hymning – literally, perhaps, this time – his own death:

Seale then this bill of my Divorce to All,
On whom those fainter beames of love did fall;
Marry those loves, which in youth scattered bee
On Fame, Wit, Hopes (false mistresses) to thee.
Churches are best for Prayer, that have least light:
To see God only, I goe out of sight:
And to scape stormy dayes, I chuse
An Everlasting night. (25–32)

The following sections will consider how Donne balanced concern for public and private grief upon his return, writing and preaching when crisis befell 'this Iland', and when 'Fame' and 'Wit' had propelled him to the centre of national life.

'our blest peacemaker': Late-Jacobean Commemorations

The months that followed King James's death on 27 March 1625 began to witness just such a domestic national tragedy, but of a different kind, and visited by non-human agents.

Contemporary estimates make this outbreak of plague the most severe since the Black Death,

⁷⁶ See Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 129–31.

⁷⁷ For a brief textual comparison of *Christ* and *HSShe*, see *Ibid.*, pp. 128–29.

and worse than all that would follow except in 1665–66.⁷⁸ It therefore represents one further possible occasion for *Lam*, and would have offered a practical opportunity for writing it: moving out of London with ‘some few of my family’ later in June, Donne took up lodgings with Sir John and Lady Danvers in Chelsea, and was kept there, by the severe recrudescence of the disease, till late in the year.⁷⁹ Though the king’s death did not rouse the same sudden astonishment as that of his elder son in 1612, it thus brought with it a protracted and nationwide affliction legible to the providentialist worldview of the times. Certainly, the opening exclamation of *Lam*, ‘HOw sits this citie, late most populous, | Thus solitary, and like a widdow thus!’ (1–2) must have felt relevant in such a situation.

Both the plague and the death of King James were, like the catastrophe depicted by the prophet of Lamentations, significant occurrences within a tense political context, in which Donne held a particular significance of his own. Barry’s ‘choise’ of ‘Patrone’, and the means and occasion through which he made his approach, are indicative of Donne’s contemporary reputation as an exemplar of Jacobean conformity and a product of Jacobean rule – as well as an elegiac poet – at this time. It was the king who had resisted Donne’s earlier attempts to regain secular employment, and who had long encouraged him to enter the Church. Like *Lam*, Barry’s elegy demonstrates deep comprehension of the central ideological fault line that had opened repeatedly in the latter years of James’s reign, heightened particularly by the Spanish match controversy, and that cut through commemorative writing and preaching at his death. As Alastair Bellany has shown in a recent essay on this neglected topic, such texts, from the king’s official funeral sermon by Archbishop John Williams to George Eglisham’s 1626 libel *The Forerunner of Revenge*, circle the discursive space of political division, ‘especially over foreign policy’, opened up by the succession of monarchical power and its

⁷⁸ F. P. Wilson, *The Plague in Shakespeare’s London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 136.

⁷⁹ Quotation taken from a letter to Sir Nicholas Carey. See Bald, *Life*, pp. 472–74.

necessary ‘legitimation’ through commemorative ritual.⁸⁰ References to James’s irenicism recur throughout Barry’s elegy: he reigned, ‘in spight of all his enemies’ and ‘that powder tragedy’, as ‘our blest peacemaker’; ‘he improu’d thee well, for what encrease | Of all good things, hath his establish’t peace | Produc’d in twenty yeares’. Yet this ‘peace’, his final ‘Legacy’ ‘w^{ch} he pursud so farre | That he had banish’d euen the name of warre’, was, perhaps more than at any other time in those ‘twenty yeares’, far from secure.⁸¹

Characteristically of commemorative epideictic, Barry’s ‘Elegie for kinge James’ applies language of stability and continuity to a moment of tense political upheaval.⁸²

It was this central fault line that Donne was compelled to negotiate in his public role as Dean of St Paul’s. While he was to become ‘a visible symbol of continuity between the two reigns’, the succession represented a precarious moment, personally and politically, for Donne and the broadly ecumenical ‘middle way’ he represented.⁸³ Curiously, it is also from the final year of James’s reign, and the first two of Charles’s, that all of Donne’s extant sermons commemorating contemporary deaths (with the exception of *Deaths Duell*) survive: *An Anniversary sermon preached at St. Dunstons* (29 June 1624) [X, 178]; a sermon *Preached at Denmark House, some few days before the body of King James was removed from thence, to his buriall* (April 26, 1625) [VI, 280]; *The First Sermon after Our Dispersion, by the Sickness*, also preached at St Dunstan’s (15 January 1626) [VI, 349]; and the sermons for Sir William Cockayne and Lady Danvers (12 December 1626 and 1 July 1627 respectively). This period therefore represents a relatively focused historical lens through

⁸⁰ Alastair Bellany, ‘Writing the King’s Death: The Case of James I’, in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 37–59 (p. 41). A sense of the breadth of rumour that circulated in response to James’s death is suggested by the official French news pamphlet *Le Mercure François*, which reported James’s final request to his son as nothing less than the restoration of the Elector Palatine’s ‘lands and titles’ (p. 38).

⁸¹ Trinity College, Dublin, MS 652, fols 364^r–365^r.

⁸² As Simon Healy notes, the succession of Charles I created a new political landscape in which war with Spain, previously beyond the frame of political possibility, became possible. ‘Donne, the Patriot Cause, and War, 1620–1629’, *Handbook*, pp. 616–31 (p. 623).

⁸³ Arnold Hunt, ‘The English Nation in 1631’, *Handbook*, pp. 632–45 (p. 632).

which to assess how his funerary and commemorative preaching responded to a rapidly changing political context.

Considering the two St Dunstan's sermons, the Denmark House sermon, and Donne's final commemorative poem (*Ham*) – all preached and written within a year of King James's death – this chapter section considers how, in negotiating and utilizing the hotly contested terms of remembrance at this time, Donne worked to temper religio-political discontent and discontinuity through subtly irenic and self-reflexive commemorative rhetoric. Contextually, these texts invite comparison: preached to the same congregation, the two St Dunstan's sermons capture strands of continuity in Donne's commemorative preaching across the Stuart succession and at markedly different historical moments; the death of the Marquis of Hamilton – for whom Donne composed *Ham* – provoked a frisson of politically-charged speculation that became intimately associated with the early afterlife of his friend the king. My argument owes much to the scholarship of Jeanne Shami, who, while considering only one of these texts, has convincingly portrayed the polarising political context of late-Jacobean England, and Donne's consistent attempts 'to construct a place of doctrinal consensus and communal devotional practice' within it.⁸⁴ Drawing also on the work of Lewalski, I consider, in a new way, what impact, stylistically, rhetorically and politically, Donne's *Anniversaries* might have continued to exert on these efforts, particularly in his commemorative writing, preaching and reputation at the end of James's reign.

For understandable reasons, scholarly debate about Donne's religio-political views in this period is often routed through the (now) most famous thing he ever wrote:

No Man is an Iland, intire of it selfe; euery man is a peece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod bee washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promontorie were, as well as if a Mannor of thy friends, or of thine owne were; Any

⁸⁴ Jeanne Shami, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2003), p. 140.

Mans death diminishes me, because I am inuolued in Mankinde; And therefore neuer send to know for whom the bell tolls; It tolls for thee.⁸⁵

The international, ecumenical perspective implied by Donne's conceit once again fuses the personal and political, the private life of the ordained Christian with the public world he inhabits. That these words, and the text in which they were printed, were imbued with subtle political commentary is also suggested by Donne's dedicatory epistle to the '*Most Excellent Prince*' Charles, whom he reminds, as Shami and Dave Gray have suggested, of his status 'as an authorized political and spiritual adviser', and their shared sustenance by and duties towards 'your *Hignessee Royall Father*' – whose 'liuely *Image*' the prince is.⁸⁶ The position of Donne's *Devotions* (and its famous meditation in particular) as a lightning rod for speculation about his personal views as a preacher makes it one obvious starting point to a brief adumbration of that ongoing debate. Views vary widely. In *Handbook*, for instance, Simon Healy argues that the meditation signals Donne's enduring and unambiguous 'patriotism', support for the international Protestant cause, and frustration at James's non-interventionist foreign policy.⁸⁷ In the same volume, however, Clayton D. Lein likewise acknowledges the meditation's international implications but argues that he was never 'overly identified with any party'.⁸⁸ Similarly, more focused, historicist approaches to the evolution of Donne's pulpit oratory within the shifting religio-political currents of the mid-1620s have produced diverse results. While Donne's 1622 assignment to preach a defence of King James's controversial *Directions to Preachers* at Paul's Cross, and the manner with which that sermon was received, prompts Shami's argument for his consistent advocacy of 'national centrist solidarity' in the years that followed, Achsah Guibbory suggests that from about 1624 onwards, Donne's rhetoric registers a subtle shift towards Arminian anti-

⁸⁵ Donne, *Devotions*, pp. 415–16.

⁸⁶ Ibid., sigs A2^v–A4^v; Dave Gray and Jeanne Shami, 'Political Advice in Donne's *Devotions*: No Man is an Island', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 50 (1989), 337–56 (p. 341).

⁸⁷ Healy, 'Donne, the Patriot Cause, and War', pp. 616–17.

⁸⁸ Lein, 'Donne: The Final Period', pp. 602, 1614–15.

Calvinism.⁸⁹ More broadly, Arnold Hunt argues that preachers would demonstrate a wider range of views than scholars often acknowledge – noting that Donne would often take up a variety of different polemical standpoints in a single sermon.⁹⁰

There are several advantages to approaching the style and religio-political orientation of Donne's pulpit rhetoric and reputation in the months surrounding James's death via sermons he preached at St Dunstan's-in-the-West. As *OESJD* editors are amply demonstrating, preaching venues impacted on sermons in subtle and significant ways; and grouping them by venue and context can thus remove obstacles to assessing changes over time. Donne was made Vicar of St Dunstan's only in spring 1624, and was eager to set out his stall in this new role. Moreover, the St Dunstan's congregation represents a broad church (literally) of Jacobean constituencies, and a good deal of documentary evidence survives within which to situate the two extant commemorative sermons Donne preached there. These records are surveyed in detail in two essays by Baird W. Whitlock and Lein, both of whom suggest that Donne was an attentive and charitable parish incumbent who took care to keep up appearances in the pulpit, at Vestry meetings and at social events.⁹¹

This information is particularly relevant to any study of Donne's commemorative preaching, because these appearances and social events were, with increasing frequency, associated with commemorative occasions, which, from the beginning of the seventeenth century, had begun ever more to punctuate parish life. From 1606 to 1618, three wealthy men

⁸⁹ Jeanne Shami, 'The Cultural Significance of Donne's Sermons', *LC*, 4 (2007), 433–42 (pp. 433–34); *Conformity in Crisis*, pp. 1–35, 182. Guibbory's argument derives from her suggestion that Donne's sermons from this time place an increasing emphasis upon the importance of free will. Achsah Guibbory, 'Donne's Religion: Montagu, Arminianism and Donne's Sermons, 1624–1630', *ELR*, 31 (2001), 412–39.

⁹⁰ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 254–55, 305.

⁹¹ Whitlock, the first to notice that before 1955 no 'systematic study' of these had been made, provided a first step in 'Donne at St. Dunstan's—I', *TLS*, 16 September 1955, p. 548; Whitlock, 'Donne at St Dunstan's—II', *TLS*, 23 September 1955, p. 564. Whitlock's chronological account is largely descriptive, focusing on records in which Donne appears or is referred to. The more recent, substantial and contextually-focused study is Lein's: 'Revisiting the Records: Donne at St. Dunstan's', *JDJ*, 31 (2012), 1–60. The *Churchwardens' Accounts*, *Vestry Minutes*, and *Parish Registers* on which these accounts are based are no longer held at the Guildhall Library in London (as cited by Lein), but have now been moved to the London Metropolitan Archives.

of St Dunstan's left large bequests to the parish on the condition that memorial sermons, services and dinners would be held on days of personal significance to the departed, with sometimes highly particular specifications.⁹² One of them, Henry Adams, 'established a perpetual cycle of five sermons', the fifth of which – the date of Donne's sermon (one of his earliest in the parish) – was a 'major occasion' on the anniversary of his death (St. Peter's Day/29 June), stipulating mandatory attendance of the parish priest, churchwardens and common councilmen. For this Adams also requested that a 'fayer quishion of blacke velvett' be 'boughte and made up and to be layed upon the pulpet for the preacher to leane vpon on the Daye of my ffunerall' – adding his preference that this preacher be the parish priest, rather than the curate, as was more common on such occasions. The records suggest that Donne selected this theatrical occasion as an opportunity to ingratiate himself further with his new congregation – particularly its senior individuals and members of the vestry.⁹³

As Lein notes, however, it is also possible that Donne's arrival into the parish was not without controversy. The period's general mood of anxiety around the perceived rise of English Catholicism within the halls of power, coupled with Donne's known past, and the fact that his recusant mother was yet living with him, may explain the care with which he presents himself in his early St Dunstan's sermons.⁹⁴ He would later describe several parishioners' overblown expectations of him, noting that some 'have defamed me, of a defectiveness towards that Church'.⁹⁵ Situating Donne's three earliest St Dunstan's sermons – not including the Adams anniversary sermon – within the broader context Lein describes, Shami has shown both that, upon arrival at the parish, he set out carefully a consistent vision of his theological *via media*, and that this self-presentational moment forms an important part

⁹² These men were William Crowche (*d.*1606), the merchant tailor Robert Jenkinson (*d.*1617) and Henry Adams (*d.*1618). See Lein, 'Revisiting the Records', pp. 16–20.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 17–20.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 8–13.

⁹⁵ *Letters*, p. 318.

of a broader ‘public discourse of vocation emerging early in 1624’.⁹⁶ Thus, the first St Dunstan’s sermons are revealing of Donne’s contemporary religious identity at a time when preachers were increasingly expected to disclose such personal histories at the pulpit.

The anniversary sermon fits into the scheme Shami describes, but in certain ways specific to the commemorative occasion on which it was preached, which prompts from Donne an insistent anti-Catholic framework. Donne says nothing particular about Adams – even his name – except to insist, in the sermon’s final exhortation, that his gift was not given so much through an ‘intention’ ‘to be yearly remembered himself, as that his posterity, and his neighbours might be yearly remembred to doe as he had done’. This explication of an epideictic method that praises only virtue is couched, however, within a clear distinction between it and the cult of sainthood, in which ‘wanton books’ and ‘wanton pictures’ give rise to ‘additions of torment, as often as other men are corrupted with their books, or their pictures’ [X, 191]. In this sermon, then, Donne responds to the commemorative culture represented by Adams’s anniversary, evoking what Jessica Martin calls the ‘new Protestant culture’ of suspicion for ‘all works commemorating the lives of the dead’.⁹⁷ That such practices as ‘the hanging of blacks in the church’ and the ‘distribution of mourning gloves and ribbons’ ‘had been built in as a social norm’ at this time, as ‘essentially secular’ conventions (at least at actual funerals), however, underlies the pointedness of Donne’s distinction.⁹⁸

Likewise, Donne begins the sermon by sounding a decidedly anti-Catholic and conformist note. Introducing his text, ‘God’s malediction upon the Serpent in Paradise’ (Genesis 3. 24: ‘*AND DUST SHALT THOU EAT ALL THE DAYES OF THY LIFE*’), he immediately identifies ‘a generation derived from this Serpent, *Progenies viperarum*, a

⁹⁶ Shami, *Conformity in Crisis*, pp. 225–26.

⁹⁷ Jessica Martin, *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the Rise of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 18–19.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

generation of Vipers' with the vegetarian Carthusian and regicidal Feuillien sects [X, 178]. Exegetically, the sermon argues for the coterminous oneness of God's judgement and mercy in the fall, emphasising simultaneously that the serpent's fate mirrors ours in both earthly and physical terms. Satan's temptations afflict our bellies, 'the bowels of sin' [X, 184], with subtle immediacy, yet our Godliness, our status as 'partaker of the Divine Nature' [X, 186], allows us to overcome our serpent-like propensity to fall victim to them. As Lewalski notes, this argument is similar to that of the 'general Funeral Sermon' [VI, 351] Donne delivered at St Dunstan's after the plague had largely subsided, in that both develop and explore two contradictory interpretations of scriptural text by 'giving that text different grammatical and interpretive emphases' – thus recalling Donne's 'Epicides and Obsequies' and *Anniversaries*, which, as we have seen, derive structure and imaginative tension from distinctions contrived by rhetorical sleight of hand.⁹⁹

The plague sermon is not, however, nearly so political as the anniversary sermon. Other than this, there are two key distinguishing features between the sermons, beyond the fact that the latter was preached ten months after the death of King James. The first (noted by Lewalski) is that the contradictory arguments of the anniversary sermon are explored in parallel rather than in sequence.¹⁰⁰ The second is that the plague sermon was delivered within a context of ongoing catastrophe, to which it refers with shocking immediacy. Its text, '*For there was not a house where there was not one dead*' (Exodus 12. 30) is used as a basis for exploring, twice through, four kinds of 'house': biblical (the houses of Egypt in which the Angel of Death killed each first-born child), contemporary (the houses of London and England), the 'house' of the body (whose 'first-born' is zeal), and the immediate 'house' of God, in which Donne's auditors listened to his words. Donne's argument arises from a series of misquotations of his text, climaxing with a dramatic shift into the present tense: '*There is*

⁹⁹ Lewalski, *Donne's Anniversaries*, p. 206.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 208.

not a house in which there is not one dead'. Upon consideration of the fourth 'house' ('this house you have seen, and seen in a lamentable abundance, and seen with sad eyes'), however, he produces the pivotal shift in the sermon's argument with a sudden, digressive meditation on the single saving death of 'The Master of the house, Christ Jesus' [VI, 357]. With this change, the biblical text is restored, and Donne insists, furthermore, that the 'super-infinite' [VI, 363] consequences of Christ's sacrifice have fashioned a salvation in which time and tense are irrelevant, both spiritually and physically:

consider upon what ground you tread; upon ground so holy, as that all the ground is made of the bodies of Christians, and therein hath received a second consecration. Every puff of wind within these walls, may blow the father into the sons eyes, or the wife into her husbands, or his into hers, or both into their childrens, or their childrens into both. [VI, 362]

Structurally, thematically and stylistically, then, these sermons are at least reminiscent of Donne's commemorative verse; and it is worth considering both the extent to which he was yet associated with those poems, and what bearing that reputation might have had on his ongoing 'discourse of vocation' at this time. The *Anniversaries* had evidently proved enduringly popular, being reprinted in 1621 and 1625 in two unauthorised editions by Thomas Dew, which were both sold at his shop in the very churchyard of St Dunstan's.¹⁰¹ Undoubtedly, as Novarr suggests, Dew sought to some extent to capitalise upon Donne's prominence as Dean, and these editions may well have angered their author.¹⁰² Yet the parallels in religio-political orientation and literary mode between Donne's public poetic persona of the early 1610s and his self-fashioning as a preacher in the mid-1620s are striking. In the letter he sent to his friend Robert Ker to accompany *Ham* (written to commemorate the death of the Marquis of Hamilton on 2 March 1625, shortly before that of King James)

¹⁰¹ Paul Salzman briefly considers the 1621 edition in *Literary Culture in Jacobean England: Reading 1621* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 134–38. See also *Variorum*, VI, p. 38.

¹⁰² Novarr, *Disinterred Muse*, pp. 157–58.

Donne reflects upon them directly, stating that he was reluctant to write such an elegy at this time in his life:

Sir,

I presume you rather trye what you can doe in mee then what I can doe in verse. You knewe my vttermost when it was at best. And even then I did best when I had least Truth for my subiect. In this present case there is so much Truth as it defeates all Poetry. Call, therefore this Paper by what name you will, and if it bee not worthy of him, nor of you, nor of mee, smother it, and bee that the Sacrifice. If you had commanded mee to haue wayted vpon his body in Scotland, and preached there, I should haue embraced the Obligation with more Alacrity. But I thanke you that you would command that which I was loth to doe. For even that hath giuen a Tincture of merit to the obedience of

Your poore frind and servant
Io: Donne

Whether by Ker or someone else, ‘this Paper’ was eventually given the name ‘*A Hymne to the Saynts and To the Marquesse HAMILTON*’. It is difficult to know exactly how to read Donne’s letter. Looking back on the *Anniversaries* (‘when I had least Truth for my subiect’), his nostalgic apology might betray awareness that interest in his poetic reputation was only accelerating as he grew older, more distinguished and more distant from it.¹⁰³ Without question, however, he expresses pride in the poems (‘what I can doe in verse’/‘my vttermost when it was at best’), deferring to the unquestioned brilliance of his earlier commemorative poems whilst fashioning that deference into a protestation of modesty. More incidentally, the letter expresses a thread of continuity – even interchangeability – between that self and the preacher he has become, who might instead ‘haue wayted vpon his body in Scotland, and preached there’. Its figurative conflation of the poem with ‘the Sacrifice’ works both as a way of imagining the act of poetic creation (something Donne says he did not wish to undertake) and as a representation of ‘this Paper’ as a body fit for ceremonial destruction – a conceit that rings with further connotations related to Donne’s articulation of vocation. The

¹⁰³ As David Colclough notes, it was in the 1620s that Donne’s popularity as a manuscript poet first started to explode. ‘Donne, John (1572–1631)’, *ODNB* (2011) [accessed 2 September 2019].

definite article ('the Sacrifice') evokes the ritual context of Jewish worship, in which the priest was called forth from the community to perform 'sacrifices':

For euery high Priest taken from among men, is ordeined for men in things *pertaining* to God, that hee may offer both giftes & sacrifices for sins. Who can haue compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himselfe also is compassed with infirmitie. And by reason heereof hee ought as for the people, so also himself, to offer for sinnes. (Hebrews 5. 1–3)

Called forth to revive the poet-prophet of the *Anniversaries* – which, as I hope to show, *Ham* undoubtedly does – Donne's letter directs attention to the nature and origin of clerical vocation and authority, and to the tensions of continuity and difference that existed between his own prophetic selves. As Margaret Maurer has also shown, the poem with which he sent it almost certainly reconfirms Donne's concern (whether as elegist or funerary preacher) to defuse political division. This she demonstrates convincingly in a contextualised reading of *Ham* as a response to escalating rumours about Hamilton's deathbed conduct – specifically a charge of a last-minute conversion to Roman Catholicism, which evidently arose, at least in part, from the fact that, following his death on 2 March 1625, his body was said to have 'swelled inmeasurablie [...] specially in his head'. Using a series of letters written in the wake of Hamilton's death, Maurer tracks the progress of this scandal – and Donne's elegy within it – as witnessed by John Chamberlain (from whom this quotation comes); Thomas Erskine, first Earl of Kellie; and Lady Bedford, who knew Hamilton well and was greatly distressed by developments.¹⁰⁴ Ostensibly alluding to this context via a poetic address to the 'Saynts' of Heaven, the opening lines of *Ham* leave no doubt about the ultimate destination of

¹⁰⁴ Margaret Maurer, 'Poetry and Scandal: John Donne's "A Hymne to the Saynts and to the Marquesse Hamilton"', *JDJ*, 26 (2007), 1–33 (quote from Chamberlain taken from p. 6). Maurer's account builds to some extent on that of Novarr (*Disinterred Muse*, pp. 192–209), which, despite setting out some of the contextual detail she surveys, does not much link Donne's poem with it, preferring to read it as indicative of his preoccupations with bodily resurrection. Having looked at all items in the Douglas-Hamilton Papers (NRS) closest to this specific period, I have found no further references to the controversy that followed Hamilton's death. This is not to say, however, that no further evidence exists, as some of the papers remain in private hands. I would like to thank Liz Course (NRS) and Ulrike Hogg (NLS) for their assistance with this research.

Hamilton's soul, probing instead the question of his particular 'ranke' and 'Order' within Heaven:

Whether the soule that now comes vp to you
Fill any former ranke, or make a new
Whether it take a name namd there before
Or bee a name it selfe, and Order more
Then was in Heauen till now (for may not hee
Bee so if every several Angel bee
A kind alone) What ever Order growe
Greater by him in Heauen, wee do not so. (1–8)

Having established this, in lines nine to eighteen, the speaker broaches the subject of Hamilton's corpse subtly, and via the same elegiac mode deployed in *FirAn*: figuring the corporeal world itself as a degenerate and 'Gangreend' (18) body, in which 'The Chappell wants an Eare, Counsell a tongue' (15), and 'all loose a Lymb' (18). Immediately afterwards, however, he addresses the subject directly:

Never made Body such hast to confesse
What Soule was. All former comelynesse
Fledd in a minute when the Soule was gon
And hauing lost that beauty would haue none
So fell our Monasteryes in an instant growne
Not to lesse houses, but to heapes of stone (19–24)

While, as Maurer notes, this analogy of the deceased body with the crumbled ruins of 'our Monasteryes' undoubtedly refers to Hamilton's unusual bodily decomposition, and appears to interlace that reference with a parallel concern for confessional division, Donne's knowledge of the accusations against Hamilton's deathbed conduct remains, for now, no more than a 'safe inference'.¹⁰⁵ What is not in any doubt, however, is that the broader political context in which Hamilton's death was received was intimately linked to the reputation (and, shortly afterwards, the death) of the king. Thus, even if Donne had not known of the reports against Hamilton, the political volatility of his death would nonetheless almost certainly have been apparent to him. Reasons for this are numerous and obvious: Hamilton had participated in

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 5–6.

negotiations for the Spanish match (though he abstained from the final Privy Council vote on the matter), he represented an Anglo-Scottish elite associated with the historically contentious issue of English naturalisation, and he had been personally close to King James for decades.¹⁰⁶ It had been a deathbed wish of the first Marquis, in 1604, for his ‘only and derest Sone’ to be brought into the king’s favour; and much evidence survives to demonstrate that James granted it.¹⁰⁷ Contemporary gift and patronage culture likewise witnesses to their close association, both before and after death. Francis Quarles’s dedication to Hamilton of an early 1625 English verse translation of the Song of Solomon – an Old Testament king with whom King James had long been associated – is one example.¹⁰⁸ Another is William Drummond of Hawthornden’s paired gift in 1627 of copies of *Ham* with Donne’s *First Sermon Preached to King Charles* (1625) to King James’s *alma mater*, Edinburgh University.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, a number of polemical texts connected their deaths with the divisive and scandalous politics of the day. The full title of Eglishman’s infamous 1626 libel, for instance, accuses ‘*the Duke of Buckingham, for poysoning King James and the Marquis of Hamilton*’.¹¹⁰

The typological identification of James with King Solomon forms the central thematic vehicle of Donne’s Denmark House sermon – preached some twenty-three days after that more politically momentous (and individually printed) *First Sermon*.¹¹¹ Its text is Canticles 3. 11: ‘*GOE FORTH YE DAUGHTERS OF SION, AND BEHOLD KING SOLOMON, WITH*

¹⁰⁶ David Stevenson, ‘Hamilton, James, second marquess of Hamilton (1589–1625)’, *ODNB* (2015), [accessed 5 September 2019]; George Hamilton, *A History of the House of Hamilton* (Edinburgh: J. Skinner & Co., Ltd., 1933), p. 375. On the issue of naturalisation, see Michelle O’Callaghan, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 91–92.

¹⁰⁷ NRS GD406/1/62. The king evidently responded promptly, writing to the second Marquis in 4 May to confirm his gift of the abbacy of Arbroath to the second Marquis (NRS GD406/1/10442).

¹⁰⁸ Francis Quarles, *Sions Sonets. Sung by Solomon the King, and Periphras’d by Fra. Quarles* (1625).

¹⁰⁹ See Daniel Starza Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers: Patronage and Manuscript Circulation in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 270. An annotation on the sermon’s title page (shelfmark De.3.21 (STC 7040)) reads: ‘Giuén to king James his colledge by William Drummond.’

¹¹⁰ Robbins (*Poems*, p. 802) lists this alongside a much later (1642) pamphlet titled *Strange Apparitions, or the Ghost of King James, With a late conference between the ghost of that good King, and the Marquess Hamiltons, and George Eglishams, Doctor of Physick, unto which appeared the Ghost of the late Duke of Buckingham, concerning the death and poysoning of King James and the rest*.

¹¹¹ Such was the pressure Donne felt upon preaching it that he turned to Ker for lodgings beforehand, so as to be among familiar surroundings. See Bald, *Life*, pp. 467–68.

THE CROWN, WHEREWITH HIS MOTHER CROWNED HIM, IN THE DAY OF HIS ESPOUSALS, AND IN THE DAY OF THE GLADNESSE OF HIS HEART.' Described by Lewalski as the most unusual of Donne's commemorative sermons, and the most 'especially relevant to the method of the *Anniversaries*' both for 'its fusion of instruction and meditation' and its development of 'the symbolism of James as image of God', this sermon also articulates an unmistakeable political argument that reiterates the advice of his dedicatory epistle in *Devotions*.¹¹² In order to describe this subtext it is necessary first to consider the sermon's general argument, which proceeds from Donne's reading of an 'intimation' into the three 'persons' of his text: speaker, addressees, and subject. The first he identifies with the Church, the second with his auditors, and the third with the '*Head of the Church*' – the dead king and, more pertinently, Christ [VI, 281]. Having established these associations, the sermon moves into a consideration of the instructive elements ('Goe forth', 'behold') within its text, which involve self-examination in the context of 'what thou shalt be after thy death' [VI, 285]. In order to do this, says Donne, we require 'a glasse'; and it is here that he first deictically calls the attention of his listeners to the physical body of the dead king:

Here, at your coming hither now, you have *two glasses*, wherein you may see your selves from head to foot; One in the Text, your *Head, Christ Jesus*, represented unto you, in the name and person of *Solomon* [...] And the dissolution of this great *Monarch*, our *Royall Master*, now layd lower by death then any of us, his Subjects and servants.' [VI, 286]

In addressing, through the prism of this argument, the personal and political upheaval brought about by the Caroline accession, the sermon is remarkably forthright. On a personal level, as in his *First Sermon Preached to King Charles*, Donne's commemoration of James represented a precarious moment in that it required him, like many present, to acknowledge that the 'the fortunes conferred by the old' king now depended upon 'the service of their *new Master*' [VI, 291]: 'that hand that had signed to one of you a *Patent* for *Title*, to another for

¹¹² Lewalski, *Donne's Anniversaries*, p. 212–14.

Pension, to another for *Pardon*' [VI, 290]. As Shami notes, this specific reference forms part of a more general 'discourse of the church as God's means ordained to call men that marks Donne as a true Jacobean divine'.¹¹³ Conveying and responding to this identity in broader, more political terms, the sermon insists throughout upon the subservience of human kings to their spiritual counterpart, whose word authorises the Church, whilst insisting upon the authority and the political sovereignty of those kings: 'you cannot devest your *allegiance* to the *Church*, though you would; no more then you can to the *State*'.¹¹⁴ In addition to this, Donne checks the forces of religious division in a passage that exemplifies his characteristic late-Jacobean conformity – identifying dissent specifically with foreign parts:¹¹⁵

the Church of God, is not so *beyond Sea*, as that we must needs seek it *there*, either in a *painted Church*, on one side, or in a *naked Church*, on another; a Church in a *Dropsie*, overflowne with *Ceremonies*, or a Church in a *Consumption*, for want of such Ceremonies, as the primitive Church found useful, and beneficiall for the advancing of the glory of God, and the devotion of the Congregation. [VI, 284]

Donne's final Jacobean commemoration thus recalls the cluster of printed texts through which he had, in the early 1610s, sought 'fortunes conferred' by King James. As will be demonstrated further in this chapter's final section, this guiding principle and literary energy would remain a central characteristic of Donne's pulpit oratory two years later, shaping his articulation of deeper personal lament.

Preaching Personal Loss

At some point during the two years after Donne's ordination, before the death of Anne, he wrote what Bald describes as 'by far the most moving of all his letters'.¹¹⁶ It concerns the

¹¹³ Shami, *Conformity in Crisis*, p. 265.

¹¹⁴ This emphasis is echoed somewhat in other commemorations for James, such as Francis Hamilton's *King James his Encomium. Or A poeme, in Memorie and Commendation of the High and Mightie Monarch Iames* (Edinburgh: 1626), sig. D3^r.

¹¹⁵ As Shami notes (*Conformity in Crisis*, p. 140), Donne's late-Jacobean sermons consistently emphasise the importance of 'an explicitly national church'.

¹¹⁶ Bald, *Life*, p. 316.

recent death of his sister, Anne Lyly, which left him as the only remaining child of their mother, to whom it is addressed:

The happiness which God afforded to your first young time, which was the love and care of my most dear and provident Father, whose soul, I hope, hath long since enjoyed the light of our blessed Saviour, and had compassion of all our miseries in this world, God removed from you quickly. And hath since taken from you all the comfort, that that Marriage produced. All those children (for whose maintenance his industrie provided, and for whose education, you were so carefullie and so chargeable diligent) he hath now taken from you. All that worth which he left, God hath suffered to be gone from us all.¹¹⁷

While undoubtedly personal, this letter also exemplifies the formal and theological terms within which pastoral consolation in this period was typically couched. Its focus upon and justification of divine providence is immediately and forcefully set out, in a manner that would offend modern sensibilities; and, having established that theological framework, it follows a conventional structure, counselling against excessive sorrow, consoling with the promise of salvation, exhorting its recipient to ‘Joyne with God, and make his visitations and afflictions, as he intended them, mercies and comforts’.¹¹⁸ This method is also strikingly evident in a consolatory letter Donne sent to Lady Kingsmill, a longstanding friend and correspondent, upon the death of her husband in 1625. Proffering no consideration of worldly sorrow until its final sentence (itself followed with ‘*Amen*’), Donne insists, in the austere and emphatic terms of affective preaching, that ‘Nothing disproportions us, nor makes us so incapable of being reunited to those whom we loved here, as murmuring, or not advancing the goodness of him, who hath removed them from hence’.¹¹⁹ Consolation and salvation derive from suffering.

¹¹⁷ Tobie Mathews, pp. 324–25. That Donne was at this time ordained, and his wife Anne yet living, is indicated by its pastoral tone and the following passage (p. 326): ‘For my part, which am onely left now, to do the office of a child; though the poornesse of my fortune, and the greatnesse of my charge, hath not suffered me to expresse my duty towards you, as became me; yet, I protest to you before Almighty God, and his Angells and Saints in Heaven, that I do, and ever shall, esteem my self, to be as stronglie bound to look to you, and provide for your relief, as for my own poor wife and children.’

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 327.

¹¹⁹ *Letters*, pp. 7–8. Bald (*Life*, pp. 186–87) notes that Donne probably met Bridget White through the Herberts, and that a letter he sent to George Garrard while on the continent with the Drurys complains that his correspondence, including to Lady Kingsmill, was not being successfully delivered.

The ‘funereal note’ Carey finds absent in Donne is, to a significant extent, an anachronistic one; and while, as Novarr notes, no commemorative texts survive by him to acknowledge the deaths of many friends and family members, that absence does not necessarily impute coldness or impersonality. As this thesis has shown, the sort of formal literary commemoration with which Donne engaged was typically collaborative, communal, and designed to effect a change it does not name. Where it is private (at least with respect to him) it appears to be generically and thematically ambiguous and diffuse. Understanding both kinds of text, then, requires a comparative and contextualised approach, and an acknowledgement that commemorative writing is a residue of human relationships, interactions and emotions that are ultimately beyond historical recovery. This is especially true for commemorative sermons, and the pastoral and devotional genres connected to them, in print. Responding to loss with formal and liturgical familiarity, such texts are further mediated and marketed into written forms that merely approximate their original contexts of delivery.¹²⁰

That said, Donne’s sermons do contain some notable traces of personal loss, in both explicit and implicit ways. One, the *Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danvers*, preached 1 July 1627, he printed, participating in a well-established genre of memorial publications for distinguished and pious women. Another, of which even Carey takes partial note (following Bald), is the Easter Day sermon preached at St Paul’s on 25 March that same year, shortly after the deaths of Goodere and his daughter Lucy.¹²¹ Considering and comparing these texts, the final part of this chapter draws together the private and public modes discussed above, attempting to read behind the ostensible rigidity and impersonality of Donne’s formal and theological responses to personal loss.

¹²⁰ On the unstable relationship that existed between sermons preached and sermons printed, see Hunt, *The Art of Hearing*, p. 351. See also chapter three for a general overview of how sermons were printed.

¹²¹ Carey, *John Donne*, pp. 96–97, 225; Bald, *Life*, p. 491.

While both Bald and Carey acknowledge that Donne's Easter Day sermon seems to allude to the death of his daughter two months previously, neither takes note of the fact that Goodere had also died a mere seven days before it was preached – a fact that, I suggest, may have a greater bearing on the sermon than has hitherto been noted.¹²² Its text (Hebrews 11. 35) prompts a twofold focus upon the availability (and quality) of Christian resurrection, and its relationship with suffering, in familial and possessive terms: '*WOMEN RECEIVED THEIR DEAD RAISED TO LIFE AGAINE: AND OTHERS WERE TORTURED, NOT ACCEPTING A DELIVERANCE, THAT THEY MIGHT OBTAIN A BETTER RESURRECTION*'. Considering both parts of this text – the benefits of faith, and the 'holy courage' [VII, 351] it provides for facing extreme hardship – in turn, Donne's rhetoric shifts the terms of his text repeatedly from third to second and first person perspectives, particularly in relation to the qualitative nature of resurrection. While this sort of grammatical shift is common in Donne's sermons, and sermons more generally (moving from *divisio* and biblical exegesis into application and exhortation), in applying it to this text Donne constructs passages and digressions that appear to be strikingly specific about loved ones lost to his congregation, and to him.¹²³ Despite anticipating and clarifying that 'we shall have hereafter a glorious association with them in the Resurrection, though we never see our dead raised to life again in this world' [VII, 371–72], he is drawn into considerations of what a conversation with a resurrected (male) friend would be like, and what would have become of their shared intimacy if such a friend did indeed return: 'we know not, what kind of remembrance of this world, God leaves us in the next, when he translates us thither, so neither do we know, what kinde of remembrance of that world, God would leave in that man, whom he should re-

¹²² As Bald notes (Ibid., 490–91), Lucy's death must have arrived suddenly, between a letter of 4 January and her funeral on the 9th.

¹²³ While various structural divisions and sermon forms are prescribed in early-seventeenth century *ars praedicandi* manuals, this basic shift is common among them. See Gregory Kneidel, 'Ars Praedicandi: Theories and Practice', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, pp. 3–18 (particularly pp. 17–18).

translate into this' [VII, 375]. The passage to which Bald and Carey draw attention is an extended application of the text's initial clause at the sermon's structural mid-point, in which Donne considers how his duties to a lost daughter are replicated in God's divine paternity.

Neither, however, considers the sentence immediately preceding it (quoted below):

We think not a friend lost, because he is gone into another roome, nor because he is gone into another Land; And into another world, no man is gone; for that Heaven, which God created, and this world, is all one world. If I had fixt a Son in Court, or married a daughter into a plentiful Fortune, I were satisfied for that son and that daughter. Shall I not be so, when the King of Heaven hath taken that son to himself, and married himself to that daughter, for ever? I spend none of my Faith, I exercise none of my Hope, in this, that I shall have my dead raised to life againe.

This is the faith that sustaines me, when I lose by the death of others, or when I suffer by living in misery my selfe, That the dead, and we, are now in one Church, and at the resurrection, shall be all in one Quire. [VII, 384]

That Goodere's death is a neglected topic in scholarship is probably a consequence of the fact that little evidence survives relating to it, or his later years generally, during which he appears to have encountered serious financial difficulty and depression.¹²⁴ Possibly Donne's sermon represents the only remaining text with which to consider its immediate personal impact, albeit conjecturally. Whilst recognising the limits of Carey's method (and censure against Donne's 'unhappy' 'self-absorption' in this sermon), it is possible to appreciate his description of Donne's final 'climactic paragraphs', which 'grope sublimely for words to express the glory of his own risen state'.¹²⁵ Donne's articulation of spiritual 'desire' for 'a *Better Resurrection*', framed in the sexualised terms of 'holy amorousnesse', 'holy covetousnesse', 'holy ambition, and voluptuousnesse' [VII, 390] recalls once again his private elegiacs for Anne.

While we cannot ever know whether Goodere's death influenced these words, the sermon Donne preached and printed just over three months later for Lady Danvers is notable

¹²⁴ Smith, *John Donne and the Conway Papers*, p. 279. No epitaphs or memorials were erected for him in Polesworth Abbey, though they were for his daughter Lucy and her husband Sir Frances Nethersole. My thanks to Fr Philip Wells for responding to my enquiries about this.

¹²⁵ Carey, *John Donne*, p. 96.

for its biographical specificity, conventionality and simplicity. It is the only sermon of its kind within his oeuvre, and the question arises as to why. Lady Bedford, who died only the previous month, received no such tribute from him. There appear to be two key reasons, both of which are manifest within the sermon itself. The first is that Donne's connection with Lady Danvers remained particularly strong at the time of her death; and having stayed at Chelsea for an extended period in 1625–26, he would have been intimate with many members of her family – one of whom, George Herbert, contributed elegiac poetry to the volume.¹²⁶ The second is that, unlike Lady Bedford at this time, Lady Danvers exemplified what Donne here describes meticulously as the 'rule' of 'mediocrity':

To this consideration of her *person* then, belongs this, that *God* gave her such a *comeliness*, as, though shee were not *proud* of it, yet she was so content with it, as not to goe about to mend it, by any *Art*. And for her *Attire*, (which is another *personal circumstance*) it was never *sumptuous*, never *sordid*; But alwayes agreeable to her *quality*, and agreeable to her *company*; Such as shee might, and such, as others, such as shee was, did weare. For, in such things of *indifferency* in themselves, many times, a *singularity* may be a little worse, then a fellowship in that, which is not altogether so good. It may be *worse*, nay, it may be a *worse pride*, to weare worse things, then others doe. [VIII, 88–89]

Such ostensibly superficial details demonstrate clearly a religio-political outlook consonant with Donne's, to whom she was thus a fitting subject for commemoration in this particular kind of publication. Since the late Elizabethan period, such sermons – about godly women in particular – had begun to appear in print with increasing regularity; and the genre would continue to grow in popularity until about 1640.¹²⁷ Given these associations, it is not surprising to find Donne attacking false piety, emphasising the supervening authority of the 'Super-Catholike' Church above 'all the Churches in the world' [VIII, 73], and articulating

¹²⁶ John Donne, *A Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danuers, late Wife of Sr. Iohn Danuers* (1627) (STC 7049). In quoting from this text, I keep to my convention of using *Sermons* (or *OESJD* where available) with respect to the sermon itself, but quote Herbert's appended poems, by poem and line number (of Latin text), from *The Latin Poetry of George Herbert: A Bilingual Edition*, trans. by Mark McCloskey and Paul R. Murphy (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1965), pp. 123–55.

¹²⁷ See Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), pp. 521–23; Martin, *Walton's Lives*, p. 24. For a survey of a several such sermons printed in a single year (1611), see Helen Wilcox, *1611: Authority, Gender and the Word in Early Modern England* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2014), pp. 183–91.

emphatically a middle-way orientation in his subject, who ‘neuer diuerted towards the *Papist*, in undervaluing the *Scripture*; nor towards the *Separatist*, in undervaluing the *Church*’ [VIII, 90]. As in his anniversary sermon at St Dunstan’s, he also clarifies an epideictic mode that invokes her not ‘as thou art a *Saint in Heaven*’ but ‘as thou didst appeare to us a moneth agoe; At least, appeare in thy *history*; Appeare in our *memory*’ [VIII, 85].

Otherwise, however, the book is a relatively typical one, evoking a community of mourners in a cohesive and collaborative print strategy between its constituent authors and sections. The sermon itself is typically lengthy, with clear structural division between ‘*The Instruction of the Living*’ and ‘*The commemoration of the Dead*’ [VIII, 63] – considerations that are thematically linked via an identification of the biblical text with the deceased subject (what Martin calls the topos of the ‘living sermon’), and a detailed account of her deathbed deriving from *ars moriendi* precedents.¹²⁸ It is this very generic conventionality, I would suggest, that demonstrates the personal affection with which this publication was produced. Adopting a genre to which he was not accustomed, Donne marks out a relatively unusual cultural and literary space for a model of moderate piety noticeably at odds with its typical subjects.

Herbert’s ‘*Memoriae Matris Sacrum*’ is often neglected by critics, despite its unusual size, personal insight and collaborative dimension, reinforcing the biographical emphases of the sermon with which it was published (in emphasising, for instance, Lady Danvers’s lack of ostentation [II. 2. 19–21], charitable work [II. 2. 55–57] and praising her as ‘the triumph and glory | Of womanhood’ [13. 1–2]). Like Donne’s sermon, Herbert also establishes a polemical justification of his literary commemoration, which he levels against ‘those who do not understand’ [II. 2. 65–66]. This is manifest in the collection’s Spenserian pastoral

¹²⁸ Martin, *Walton’s Lives*, p. 28. Bettie Anne Doeblér and Retha M. Warnicke offer a basic survey of the sermon’s formal features in their introduction to a 2006 facsimile edition: *A Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danvers, Late Wife of Sr. John Danvers (1627)* (Ann Arbor: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 2006), pp. 5–33.

imagery and extended ink/tears conceit, through which Herbert's speaker explores and interrogates his own authorship in bodily terms. The theme is likewise echoed in Donne's sermon, which develops an inexpressibility topos to convey the 'Terroures' of a divine judgement that sees through 'the *miserable comforters* of this World': 'If men were made of *teares*, as they are made of the *Elements* of teares, of the *occasions* of teares, of *miseries*, and if all men were resolv'd to *teares*, as they must resolve to *dust*, all were not enough to lament their miserable condition' [VIII, 75].

As an integrated whole, then, the *Sermon of Commemoration* represents a justification of communal mourning predicated upon the fitness of its subject, whom it renders in specific and – according to Edward Herbert – accurate detail.¹²⁹ To modern readers, the genre Donne here adopts can often feel contrived in the extreme; and in many ways, *A Sermon of Commemoration* is no exception. Donne's depiction of Lady Danvers's deathbed, for instance, is positively Waltonian, resembling the quotation with which this thesis began:

This shee expected till it came, and embrac't it when it came. How may we thinke, shee joy'd to see that face, that *Angels* delight to looke upon, the face of her *Saviour*, that did not abhor the face of his fearfullest *Messenger*, Death? Shee shew'd no feare of his face, in any change of her owne; but died without any change of *countenance*, or *posture*; without any *struggling*, any *disorder*; but her *Death-bed* was as quiet, as her *Grave*. [VIII, 91]

The contrast with many of the commemorations considered in this chapter, which develop responses to personal loss in subtle and implicit ways, is striking; and this sermon thus serves as a useful reminder that Donne's 'funerary note', even in moments of personal significance to him, could be manifested in many ways, blurring distinctions between the emotional and the intellectual as critics have tended to comprehend them. As I have sought in this chapter to demonstrate, the various commemorative modes through which Donne articulated loss after his ordination – whether privately, publicly, or both – develop consistently epideictic

¹²⁹ See Doeblér and Warnick's introduction to *A Sermon of Commemoration*, p. 6.

methods that respond to and generate his own shifting identity as an author and preacher, whether within the personal, religious, or political terms and contexts I have described.

Imagining his own bodily putrefaction in *Deaths Duell*, he would do so once more, listing the ‘manifold *deaths*’ to which he had already been subjected, and which he had already, in his commemorative writing, so frequently rehearsed:

Truely the consideration of this *posthume death*, this death after buriall, that after *God*, (with whom are the *issues of death*) hath deliuered me from the *death* of the *wombe*, by bringing mee into the *world*, and from the manifold *deaths* of the *world*, by laying me in the *graue*, I must dye againe in an *Incineration* of this *flesh*, and in a dispersion of that dust. That that *Monarch*, who spred ouer many nations aliue, must in his dust lye in a corner of that *sheete of lead*, and there, but so long as that lead will laste, and that priuat and *retir’d man*, that thought himselfe his owne for euer, and neuer came forth, must in his dust of the *graue* bee published, and (such are the *reuolutions* of the *graues*) bee mingled with the dust of euery high way, and of euery dunghill, and swallowed in euery puddle and pond: This is the most inglorious and contemptible *vilification*, the most deadly and peremptory *nullification* of man, that wee can consider [*OESJD*, III, 238]

As the following and final chapter will show, the ‘*posthume*’ edition in which Donne would, two years later, be ‘published’, would be realised in a manner similarly attentive to the physical fate of this corpus, and similarly ‘mingled’ into and ‘swallowd’ by the poetry that would follow it.

5. 'A TOMB YOUR MUSE MUST TO HIS FAME SUPPLY': ELEGISING DONNE IN PRINT AND MANUSCRIPT

'POEMS, By J. D. WITH ELEGIES ON THE AUTHORS DEATH': so reads the title page of nearly every early edition of John Donne's collected poetry. Long ignored, and jettisoned by most modern editions, the poems that make up the larger part of this title are now increasingly read in relation to a lively outburst of scholarship interested in seventeenth-century reading practices, the development of the single-author book of poetry, and Donne's early reputation and reception.¹ The 'Elegies' conspicuous inclusion in *Poems*, in typography that 'competes' with its enigmatic author and title, is recognised as just one aspect of many by which *Poems* was in 1633 fashioned as a memorial companion volume to the quarto edition of Donne's final sermon, *Deaths Duell*, printed the previous year.² The book's front matter describes it both as 'A scatter'd limbe' for 'the eye of a discernor', and as 'winding sheets' in which Donne is yet 'living', adopting and adapting commonplace notions of 'reliquary embodiment' within the materiality of textual forms.³ Moreover, that its first and second (1635) editions adopt remarkably different yet highly sophisticated editorial

Earlier versions of this chapter were presented in early 2017 at the John Donne Society Conference at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, and at the RECIRC conference 'Reception, Reputation and Circulation in the Early Modern World, 1500–1800', held at the National University of Ireland, Galway. I would like to thank Erin A. McCarthy for her generous feedback on an early draft.

¹ The title was replicated in nearly all seventeenth-century editions: 1633, 1635, 1639, 1649, 1650, 1654 and 1669 (though the latter includes Donne's full name). The slightly altered title of Jacob Tonson's 1719 edition of Donne's *Poems on Several Occasions*. [...] *With elegies on the Author's Death* is the last to retain a clear outward reference to the elegies, which are referred to in a variety of ways by scholars. Following Grierson, and the majority, I call them 'Elegies upon the Author', or simply 'Elegies'. My quotations are also taken from Grierson, *Poems*, in which they are included (I, pp. 371–395). The only other modern editions to include the them are Milgate, *Epithalamions*, pp. 81–107 (for what 'might interest students, not of the writers of the elegies, but of Donne himself', p. lxiv), and Ilona Bell's 2012 edition of Donne's *Collected Poetry* (Penguin Classics), pp. 322–46.

² Ramie Targoff, 'Poets in Print: The Case of Herbert's *Temple*', *Word & Image*, 17 (2001), 140–52 (p. 140). On the title pages specifically, see Stephen B. Dobranski, *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) p. 124; Sidney Gottlieb, 'Elegies Upon the Author: Defining, Defending, and Surviving Donne', *JDJ*, 2 (1983), 22–38 (p. 23). For a more general response to Donne, print, and his seventeenth-century reception, see Katherine Rundell, "'And I am re-begot": The textual afterlives of John Donne' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2016).

³ Leah Marcus explores such instances of 'authorial presence' in *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London: Routledge, 1996), particularly pp. 194–95.

strategies in order to re/shape and re/package this corpus, and to make implicit claims about Donne's biography, has captured a good deal of recent attention.⁴

Yet the story behind these editions remains opaque. What attempts have been made to reconstruct it have tended to consider their inclusion of the 'Elegies' as incidental to the broader commemorative and biographical inflections so evident in them, despite a general consensus that the 'Elegies' are marshalled around points of contention very similar to those articulated formally, visually and textually in those editions: namely, the degree to which the idiosyncratic and often profane manuscript poet Donne could be reconciled (or otherwise) with the Dean of later years, and whether or not he provided a poetic model that it was possible or decorous to imitate.⁵ This chapter begins by suggesting that *Poems* (1633) was in fact highly unusual in its inclusion of these tributes, and that it – and they – contributed significantly towards a seventeenth-century vogue for elegiac posthumous publication in later decades. Seeking a rationale for this innovation, the chapter surveys key literary and social contexts for the 'Elegies' afresh and with reference to relevant and previously unacknowledged print and manuscript sources.

To date, the 'Elegies' have not been considered in manuscript; in doing so, this chapter corroborates and builds upon several arguments hitherto made with respect to the printed poems. One, an observation first made by the late Robert Thomas Fallon, is that they come out of a lively poetic manuscript culture associated particularly with the University of Oxford and its satellite academic circles.⁶ Within this context, I suggest, Henry King is the

⁴ Erin McCarthy has explored the influential biographical construction of 1635 in 'Poems, by J. D. (1635) and the Creation of John Donne's Literary Biography', *JDJ*, 32 (2013), 57–85. For more on biography in the 1635 edition, see Catherine J. Creswell, 'Giving a Face to an Author: Reading Donne's Portraits and the 1635 Edition', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 37 (1995), 1–15 (p. 12); Kevin Pask, *The emergence of the English author: Scripting the life of the poet in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁵ McCarthy is a notable exception with respect to the second edition, arguing that the 'Elegies' seem to have been a catalyst for its major revisions to the first.

⁶ Robert Thomas Fallon, 'Donne's "Strange Fire" and the "Elegies on the Authors Death"', *JDJ*, 7 (1988), 197–212.

likeliest figure to have solicited and gathered the ‘Elegies’ for *Poems* (1633), and thus was probably involved, to some extent at least, in its construction, alongside the publisher Thomas Marriot. Another argument frequently made about the ‘Elegies’ (as suggested above) is that they are characterised by competitive and intertextual features. In considering the contexts in which they were written and first circulated, along with new and unexplored manuscript materials – including other elegies for Donne – this chapter sheds fresh light on this aspect of the poems, arguing that such conflict was at least partially conventional, and demonstrating how widely and playfully, even facetiously, the terms and socially dialogic dynamics established in the printed ‘Elegies’ were interpreted and developed by other elegists, readers and manuscript compilers interested in Donne. Reaching forwards into Donne’s reception history in the chapter’s final section, I consider the extent of the ‘Elegies’ influence over time, how they contributed towards his emergence as a major canonical author, and what this may reveal about the nature of literary canonicity more broadly.

***Poems* (1633): Posthumous Poetry as Commemoration**

The key unanswered question about *Poems* (1633) concerns editorship, and it will be useful to offer an initial sketch of what is known about this before returning to the ‘Elegies’ themselves. Though Izaak Walton exerts a clear influence on the 1635 edition, arguing in his new prefatory poem ‘This was for youth’ for the lasting hagiographical portrait of Donne that would feature again in his ‘Life’, no one has yet been identified as the principal shaper of the 1633 *Poems*, despite relatively broad recognition that that edition’s text was carefully constructed, probably by a poet.⁷ Walton’s apparent discomfort with the first edition’s juxtapositions of amorous and sacred verse – grouped generically in 1635 so as to

⁷ See Gary Stringer, ‘Editing Donne’s Poetry: From John Marriot to the Donne Variorum’, *Handbook*, pp. 43–55 (pp. 43, 52).

imaginatively distance Dean Donne from his younger self – suggests that he was probably a more peripheral figure in its construction. That said, as a member of Donne’s St Dunstan’s-in-the-West congregation, Walton could have been close to fellow elegist Henry Valentine, Donne’s parish lecturer there, whose early sermons had already been published by Thomas Marriot, and sold at his St Dunstan’s churchyard bookstall.⁸ Henry King, one of Donne’s executors and the first of his elegists in both *Poems* and *Deaths Duell* (where he was joined only by one Edward Hyde), has long been thought a plausible candidate.⁹ A third possibility is John Donne Jr, who would later publish a number of his father’s works with the Marriots, having perhaps obtained copies from King against his wishes – though this probably occurred at a later date.¹⁰ Herbert Grierson’s suggestion that King, as one of Donne’s executors, would have been ‘responsible for or at any rate permitted’ the issue of *Deaths Duell* and the elegies included in it seems a relatively secure basis from which to speculate that he was at least passively involved early on.¹¹ *Deaths Duell*’s gaunt frontispiece engraving of Donne, by Martin Droeshout, was probably drawn from the same sketch used as a basis for Donne’s marble monument, which King and Thomas Mountfort commissioned Nicholas Stone to make.¹²

⁸ Jonquil Bevan, ‘Henry Valentine, John Donne and Izaak Walton’, *RES*, 40 (1989), 179–201 (p. 187).

⁹ David Novarr explores each possibility in *The Making of Walton’s Lives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 31–33. He notes that King’s elegy is ‘one of the few that do not differentiate between the secular and the religious poetry’. King’s two best-known modern editors disagree over whether he edited Donne’s poems. Margaret Crum plays down the possibility, given a lack of evidence and King’s ostensible reticence about the later publication of his own poems; Mary Hobbs follows Grierson’s lead and cites the ‘idiosyncratic rhetorical punctuation’ of 1633 in support. See *The Poems of Henry King*, ed. by Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 14–15; Mary Hobbs, ‘King, Henry (1592–1669)’, *ODNB* (2008) [accessed 7 January 2019]. On the appointment of King and Thomas Mountfort as Donne’s executors, see Bald, *Life*, pp. 391–92.

¹⁰ King wrote to Walton explaining that Donne’s papers had ‘got out of my hands’ and were ‘lost both to me and your self’ (see Bald, *Life*, pp. 532–33). Donne Jr is known to have petitioned Archbishop Laud for the copyright of Donne’s poems against such unlicensed editions as *Poems, By J. D.* in December 1637, though this might not have been a straightforward gesture. See Keynes, p. 73. On Donne Jr’s literary activities in the 1630s and later, see Daniel Starza Smith, ‘Busy Young Fool, Unruly Son? New Light on John Donne Junior’, *RES*, 62 (2010), 538–561 (pp. 539–43).

¹¹ Grierson, *Poems*, II, p. 255.

¹² Stone’s extant account books attest to this. See Richard S. Peterson, ‘New Evidence on Donne’s Monument: I’, *JDJ*, 20 (2001), 1–51 (p. 2). For more on Donne’s monument, see Helen Gardner, ‘Dean Donne’s Monument in St Paul’s’, in *Evidence in Literary Scholarship: Essays in Memory of James Marshall Osborn*, ed. by R. Wellek and A. Riberio (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 29–44.

While the following part of this chapter will dig further into the contexts and relationships underpinning the ‘Elegies’ – and by extension the likeliest architect/s of *Poems* (1633) (giving support to Grierson’s suggestion) – this initial section aims to situate that discussion within the broader bibliographical and literary context of the early seventeenth century. How typical, in 1633, were the ‘Elegies upon the Author’, and the book within which they were printed? Though, as this thesis has shown, a rich store of contemporary precedents existed for the praising of the dead in verse, the practice of printing substantial ‘critical elegy’ anthologies on poets, or posthumous single-author editions of poetry containing them, was in 1633 both unusual and, where it had previously occurred, almost always related explicitly to historical rather than literary concerns. The many volumes printed in commemoration of Sir Philip Sidney in the 1590s bear little resemblance to the ‘Elegies’ for Donne, responding primarily to Sidney’s status as a Protestant military champion and the extraordinary state-sponsored extravagance of his funeral.¹³ Likewise, Sir Thomas Overbury’s *The Wife*, to which elegies on Overbury were added in later editions, and which resembles *Poems* (1633) in advertising this feature on their title pages, represents a response to Overbury’s death as a sensationalised public event.¹⁴ Of course, Donne’s death was also a subject of keen public interest – deliberately cultivated in *Deaths Duell* – but though many of the ‘Elegies’ concern themselves overtly with Donne’s later life, they are titled ‘Elegies on the Author’s Death’, not the Dean’s.

The closest analogues to Donne’s *Poems* are the first (1623) and second (1632) folios of William Shakespeare’s *Comedies, Histories & Tragedies*, which include four and seven

¹³ On Sidney’s funeral and the many elegies written for him, see Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 67–78.

¹⁴ The seventh edition, published in 1616, presents the expanded title: *Sir Thomas Ouerburie his wife, with new elegies vpon his (now knowne) vntimely death. Whereunto are annexed, new newes and characters, written by himselfe and other learned gentlemen* (STC 18909). The subtitle given to the elegies themselves is even more specific: ‘Elegies of seuerall Authors, on the vntimely death of SIR Thomas Ouerburie poysoned in the Tower’, ¶4.

prefatory commemorative verses, respectively. Among them is Ben Jonson's 'To the memory of my beloued, The AVTHOR MR. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE: AND what he hath left vs', a poem John Lyon describes as 'the father' of critical elegy, and which was undoubtedly influential to certain of Donne's elegists – particularly Thomas Carew – in its concern about authorial identity and lineage, and its vision of poetic endurance in print, which renders Shakespeare 'aliue still, while thy Booke doth liue | And we haue wits to read, and praise to giue'.¹⁵ Moreover, Jonson's quasi-ironic approach to authorial legacy and critical elegiac panegyric set an important precedent for the kinds of competitive intertextuality that later surface in *Poems* (1633). The literary history within which he positions Shakespeare is overtly Jonsonian, his central argument ('Thou art a Moniment without a tombe') incorporating his subject into an authorial model he had established for himself in his own *Workes* (1616), which presents him as a prototypical neoclassical poet-for-all-time.

Nonetheless, the elegies included in Shakespeare's posthumous folios are not nearly so prominent as those in *Poems* (1633), and comparatively few in number. That it was to become far more common over subsequent decades for such verses to be included in posthumous editions of plays and poems without explanation, and in ever greater numbers, points to the influence of both books – but *Poems* in particular.¹⁶ As Andrea Brady notes, the two most substantial were the 1647 folio of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, containing thirty-nine commendatory and elegiac poems; and William Cartwright's *Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With other Poems* (1651), which contains fifty-five over 107 pages.¹⁷ The preface

¹⁵ John Lyon, 'Jonson and Carew on Donne: Censure into Praise', *The English Renaissance*, 37 (1997), 97–118 (pp. 98–100, 106). William Shakespeare, *Comedies, Histories & Tragedies. Published according to the True Originall Copies* (1623), front matter.

¹⁶ Based on a chronological search of single-author volumes of poetry listed in the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) between 1550 and 1700. See also Avon Jack Murphy's 'Selective, Annotated Checklist of Critical Elegies Written in England Between 1600 and 1670' in 'The Critical Elegy of Earlier Seventeenth-Century England', *Genre* 5, (1972), 75–105 (pp. 97–105). In the preceding essay Murphy discusses his coinage of the term 'critical elegy', along with some structural and thematic characteristics of the subgenre as he perceives them.

¹⁷ Andrea Brady, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century: Laws in Mourning* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 139.

to the latter cites Donne ('the highest Poet our language can boast of'), and defends its posthumous portrayal of Cartwright with direct reference to Donne's life and career.¹⁸ Most strikingly, it argues that Cartwright wrote some poems 'before He was twenty years old, scarce any after five and twenty', leaning on the trope of (pre-clerical) poetic precociousness as a biographical rationale for the single-author book of poetry. This has a clear precedent in Walton's Donne: 'Did hee (I feare | The dull will doubt:) these at his twentieth year?' (31–32). The influence of Donne's *Poems* is again explicitly stated in the ninth of ten elegies prefacing Thomas Randolph's posthumous *Poems with the Myses Looking-Glasse* (1638), by one R. Gostelow. This citation of Donne's *Poems* is not only immediate, but given with an intertextual quotation of an elegy printed within it by Jasper Mayne:

When *Donne*, and *Beaumont* dyed, an Epitaph
Some men (I well remember) thought unsafe;
And said they did *presume to write, unlesse*
*They could their teares in their expression dresse.*¹⁹

Mayne's elegy '*On D^r. DONNES death*' begins as follows:

Who shall presume to mourn thee, *Donne*, unlesse
He could his teares in thy expressions dresse,
And teach his griefe that reverence of thy Hearse,
To weepe lines, learned, as thy Anniverse

Two further examples show how the model of *Poems* (1633) was further emulated in later decades. One is the explicitly commemorative 1659 edition of Richard Lovelace's *Lucasta*, to which was appended with *Elegies Sacred to the Memory of the Author: By several of his Friends* (1660) – eight poems attempting, in part, to defend Lovelace against the claim that he had become a burden in later life.²⁰ The other is Thomas Beedome's posthumous *Poems*:

¹⁸ A. J. Smith describes this 'memorial edition' in 'Donne's Reputation', in *John Donne: Essays in Celebration*, ed. A. J. Smith (Methuen), pp. 1–27 (p. 3). The preface to the edition describes these verses as 'more than before other Books, and yet we give you not all we have', pp. 5–9.

¹⁹ Thomas Randolph, *Poems with the Myses Looking-Glasse: and Amyntas*. (Oxford, 1638), front matter. I would like to thank James Doelman for alerting me to the Donne reference in this poem.

²⁰ Raymond Anselment, 'Lovelace, Richard (1617–1657)', *ODNB*. The 1659 edition did not actually appear until 1660, when it was published with the elegies, despite the different dating given. See *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, ed. by C. H. Wilkinson, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. lxi–ixll.

Divine and Humane (1641), which contains eleven elegies commending its author – and one by Beedome for Donne – and quite closely resembles Donne’s early editions. Taken together, these examples show, in a hitherto little acknowledged way, that the elegiac and commemorative publication strategy pioneered in *Poems* (1633) had a considerable influence upon the development of posthumous literary publications in the decades that followed it. Building on these observations, the next part of this chapter considers the contextual impetus behind that strategy, and the elegiac intertextuality that was later mimicked so pointedly by poets such as Gostelow.

Contextualising the ‘Elegies upon the Author’

As the above survey has begun to demonstrate, those with university or Royalist affiliations were most likely to be published in this way. The publisher Humphrey Moseley, known for Royalist sympathies, favoured the strategy, and would eventually print several works by Donne (though not, surprisingly, his poems). The Cartwright edition, published by Moseley, even depicts the poet in a university ‘Cloak’, defending this depiction ‘before a Book of Poems’ with reference to classical poet-scholars and their archetypal modern imitator, Jonson, ‘*our ablest Judge & Professor of Poesie*’. In years of fluctuating political and religious tension, posthumous authorship was a commodity not only on London’s bookstalls, but in competing ideologies, social affectations, and literary identities. To fuse it with the anthologised critical elegies of living wits, as publishers like Moseley increasingly did, was to impose a political unification upon it and the social capital of the ‘literary’.²¹ It also gives amplification to the idea that the unusual composition of *Poems* (1633) represents, as Stephen B. Dobranski has influentially argued, ‘part of a larger strategy to create an intimate text,

²¹ Discussed in Brady, p. 139. John Curtis Reed describes how Moseley sought to ‘assert his own position as a critic and guardian of good literature’. See ‘Humphrey Moseley, Publisher’, *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings & Papers*, 2 (1927–30), 57–142 (p. 69).

evoking a manuscript miscellany'.²² The printed work's elegiac design could be woven into its styled miscellaneity, evoking a sense of coterie familiarity between the elegists and the dead laureate.

Demographics thus offer the first clues as to why and how *Poems* (1633) was the first of these publications. Between the 1633 and 1635 editions a total of fifteen elegies on Donne appear (twelve in 1633; fourteen in 1635), the latter seeing Thomas Browne dropped and three others added.²³ These are a Latin elegy by Daniel Darnelly, which replaces Browne as second, and elegies in English by Sidney Godolphin and James Chudleigh. The latter two were inserted into the very middle of the sequence, between those of Izaak Walton and Thomas Carew. In one last change, the elegy of 'R. B.' (usually identified as Richard Busby) was switched with that of Endymion Porter, to become the last poem.²⁴ Other than this, the elegists include Henry King, Edward Hyde, Richard Corbett, Henry Valentine, Jasper Mayne and Arthur Wilson. As Fallon notes, of these fifteen, eleven were associated in some way with the University of Oxford; and of these eleven, six attended or held posts at Christ Church, where an active poetic community was flourishing in these years. A good number also contributed poems towards anthologies of epideictic and commemorative verse that were printed at Oxford.²⁵ Randolph's *Poems with the Myses Looking-Glasse*, cited above, was printed at the university for Leonard Lichfield, and is one such product of this culture. Other

²² Dobranski, *Readers and Authorship*, p. 119–136 (particularly p. 119). See also McCarthy, 'Poems, by J. D. (1635)', p. 61.

²³ It should be noted that the apparently unsigned 'Epitaph' which follows R. B. (pp. 403–04) is sometimes counted as a separate poem in its own right, though it is more frequently taken to be part of R. B.'s elegy. The latter possibility is certainly more likely, given that the 'Epitaph', though bordered off from R. B.'s elegy, is given on the same page as it in the *Poems* (1633) (pp. 403–04), with a large blank space following. If by a different writer it would also be the only unsigned elegy in the sequence.

²⁴ Milgate follows Geoffrey Keynes here, whose identification of Busby is based on Giles Oldisworth's extensive annotations in a 1639 copy of Donne's *Poems* (Keynes B.4.8. at Cambridge University Library). See Milgate, *Epithalamions*, p. 229; Keynes, p. 157. See also Grierson (*Poems*, II, p. 259), who suggests several other possible authors of R. B.'s elegy; and John Sampson's entertaining account of Oldisworth's annotations, which considers the identity of a number of Donne's elegists: 'A Contemporary Light upon John Donne', in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, 7 (1921), pp. 82–107.

²⁵ These publications include 'Carolus Redux in 1623, celebrating the return of Charles, the *Camdeni Insignia* in 1624, on the death of William Camden, and the *Oxoniensis Academiae Parentalia* in 1625, on the death of James I'. See Fallon, 'Donne's "Strange Fire"', pp. 198–201.

than R. B., the elegists that have proven hardest to identify are the Edward Hyde first printed in *Deaths Duell* and the Thomas Browne some have even recently believed to be the famous physician and author.²⁶ These attributions become simpler when the Oxford context is taken into account. Browne, for instance, is much more likely to be the Christ Church graduate and later Chaplain of Charles I, because this Browne appeared in several verse anthologies from Oxford – including, more than once, alongside Donne Jr and other elegists of Donne.²⁷ At least one such anthology has gone hitherto unrecognised in discussions of Donne’s elegists: this is the 1624 collection for John Stanhope, in which a Latin poem by Donne Jr features a single page turn apart from the Christ Church Browne, who would then have been in the final year of his BA.²⁸ This Donne Jr elegy is not recorded by Geoffrey Keynes in his appendix on him.²⁹ For purposes of comparison Browne’s elegy on Stanhope is worth quoting:

Eclipse thy selfe, O thou Diaphanous Light,
 Let sable darknesse canopied in Night,
 Baptize thee thoroughly: drawe and suck vp heere
 Such Sublunarie moisture to thy Sphere,
 That, with a pious prodigie, thy beames
 May transubstantiate themselues to streames³⁰

These lines reverberate with some of the playful theological conceitedness of Donne’s own poetry, as well as Browne’s elegy on Donne. In the latter, provocatively titled ‘To the deceased Author, Upon the *Promiscuous* printing of his Poems, the *Looser sort*, with the *Religious*’, Browne celebrates the messy and difficult nature of Donne’s character and that

²⁶ Claire Preston suggests that Dr Browne ‘might have the stronger claim’ in *Thomas Browne and the Writing of Early Modern Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 25–26. See also Andrew William Barnes, *Post-closet Masculinities in Early Modern England* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2009), pp. 56–57.

²⁷ See Milgate, *Epithalamions*, p. 221, and Fallon, ‘Donne’s “Strange Fire”’, pp. 199–200, 203–05.

²⁸ Dates on Browne are taken from Marika Koblussek, ‘Browne, Thomas (1604–1673)’, *ODNB* (2008) [accessed 6 January 2019].

²⁹ See Keynes, pp. 192–198.

³⁰ The anthology’s full title is *Fvnerall Elegies, Vpon the Most Vntimely Death of the Honourable and most hopefull M^r: Iohn Stanhope, Sonne and Heire to the Right Honourable Philip Lord Stanhope, Baron of Shelford: Who Deceased in Christ-church at Oxford, the 18. Iuly, 1623 (STC 23225)*. Donne Jr’s elegy is on p. 40; Browne’s pp. 42–43.

edition (both punningly described as his ‘phansie’), while mocking the ‘sharper eyes’ of ‘Those’ who wished to bowdlerise either:

When thy *Loose* raptures, *Donne*, shall meet with Those
That doe confine
Tuning, unto the Duller line,
And sing not, but in *Sanctified Prose*;
How will they, with sharper eyes,
The *Fore-skinne* of thy phansie circumsise?
And feare, thy *wantonnesse* should now, begin
Example, that hath ceased to be *Sin*?

And that *Feare* fannes their *Heat*; whilst knowing eyes
Will not admire
At this *Strange Fire*,
That here is *mingled with thy Sacrifice*
But dare reade even thy *Wanton Story*,
As thy *Confession*, not thy *Glory*.
And so will envie *Both* to future times,
That they would buy thy *Goodnesse*, with thy *Crimes*.

In its argumentative obscurity, the boldness of its second person address, the intricacy of its stanzaic construction and the brilliant, taut energy of its metre, this poem imitates a very recognisable Donne.³¹ Browne’s poem engages with the issues at the heart of the ‘Elegies’ and the 1633 edition – the legacy of Donne’s poetical/biographical ‘*Loose raptures*’ in print, and the religious sensibilities that modulate responses to them – more directly than any other poem. Given also that it was the only elegy to be cut in the 1635 edition, and that it has an extraordinary propensity for straightforward misreading, the poem requires careful attention in any consideration of the contexts behind *Poems* (1633).³² The best readings tend to see in it a proposition to read Donne’s secular ‘*Example*’ as his ‘*Confession*’, not his ‘*Glory*’ – as part of a larger Augustinian conversion narrative (a ‘teleological’ conceptualisation of

³¹ Lukas Erne notes how even in the early 1660s Donne’s style of metrical and linguistic ‘compression’ attracted competitive imitation. See ‘Newly Discovered Adaptations of Poems by John Donne, Printed in 1662’, *RES*, 67 (2015), 679–712 (p. 709).

³² It has been called ‘tactless’ (Milgate, *Epithalamions*, p. 221), ‘tasteless’ (MacColl, ‘The Circulation of Donne’s Poems’, p. 32), and ‘almost disagreeable’ (Preston, *Thomas Browne*, p. 26), to cite just a few responses. Edgar Daniels notes that certain aspects of the poem are perhaps deliberately ‘cryptic’: ‘obscure ellipses, ambiguous pronoun references, a shocking conceit, and a puzzling summing up’ among them. See ‘Browne’s TO THE DECEASED AUTHOR’, *The Explicator*, 45 (1988), 19–20.

Donne's biography that informs a number of the elegies, as McCarthy notes).³³ But such critics generally admit that this proposition is not without significant ambiguity. Benjamin Saunders, for instance, notices how, despite containing these 'disruptive erotic energies within the theological box of the confessional', 'something of Donne's subversive desire' remains at large.³⁴ Kevin Pask likewise admits of 'signs of struggle' between the kinds of reading the poem distinguishes.³⁵ Interpreting these as signs of irony, Fallon uniquely suggests that Browne's poem in fact mocks the need for any 'ingenious rationalizations' as a prerequisite for the prudish to read Donne's amorous poetry.³⁶

The poem is tense with interpretive possibilities: does Browne mean only to deride the justifications of the censorious reader, or also of the 'knowing' literary exegete who yet feels it necessary to regard Donne as a repentant sinner? There is something in the verb 'buy' that seems to cheapen the rationale of excusing the 1633 book on the basis that it witnesses to an Augustinian conversion. It may be an allusion (or partial allusion) to Marriot's prefatory poem 'Hexastichon Bibliopolae', which compares the book's 'sheets' with the 'sheet of stone' wound around Donne's 'Statue' in St. Paul's: 'Those sheets present him dead, these if you buy, | You have him living to Eternity'.³⁷ Likewise, 'ceased' feels somehow ironically defunct, as if to expose the contrivance of arguing that verse itself might 'cease' to be sinful. Either way, whether or not the real 'sharper eyes' of those who reframed the 1635 edition misread the poem's 'teleological' argument, saw in its bright irony a satire against all such reasoning, or cut it merely because it no longer accurately described the revised book, this was, ironically, almost certainly a confirmation of its argument.

³³ Benjamin Saunders, *Desiring Donne: Poetry, Sexuality, Interpretation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006), p. 44; Pask, *The emergence of the English author*, pp. 115–17; McCarthy, 'Poems, by J. D. (1635)', pp. 63–65.

³⁴ Saunders, *Desiring Donne*, p. 44. Saunders goes on to discuss the circumcision conceit at length, suggesting that whilst equating 'phallic potency and literary prowess', Browne's elegy recalls post-Reformation debates about the validity of Old Testament Law.

³⁵ Pask, *The emergence of the English author*, p. 117.

³⁶ Fallon, 'Donne's "Strange Fire"', pp. 204–05.

³⁷ *Poems*, (1633), sig. A2^v.

Browne's poem serves as a useful starting point also because it so clearly contradicts a surprisingly prevalent view that elegies on Donne are unusually meagre and taciturn, characterised by 'exhortation to silence' and 'self-obviating' restraint.³⁸ Further study of the contexts and conventions underpinning them provides some suggestive lenses through which to read behind the more orthodox elegiac diffidence apparent elsewhere, and to begin to take seriously Sir Lucius Carey's Jonsonian exhortation to his fellow poets – as well as their responses:

Poets attend, the Elegie I sing
Both of a doubly-named Priest, and King:
In stead of Coates, and Pennons, bring your Verse,
For you must bee chiefe mourners at his Hearse,
A Tombe your Muse must to his Fame supply,
No other Monuments can never die. (1–6)

In two essays, Graham Roebuck has begun to explore how the presence of Cary alongside the second long-unknown elegist (Hyde) in the 'Elegies' may be significant to the interconnected histories behind them and the 1633 *Poems*.³⁹ This Hyde is most likely the man who would become first Earl of Clarendon, later Chancellor of the Exchequer, and who was a student at the middle Temple in the early 1630s. Two seventeenth-century sources attest to this.⁴⁰ A further possible source is a manuscript miscellany of poems largely by Donne and William Strode, once in this Hyde's possession, whose flyleaves contain, alongside signatures and jottings by him, several phrases reminiscent of the elegy for Donne, possibly including its

³⁸ Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, p. 140; A. E. B. Coldiron, "'Poets be silent': Self-Silencing Conventions and Rhetorical Context in the 1633 Critical Elegies on Donne", *JDJ*, 12 (1993), 101–113, (p. 109).

³⁹ Roebuck: 'Elegies for Donne: Great Tew and the Poets', *JDJ*, 9 (1990), 125–35; 'From Donne to Great Tew', *JDJ*, 32 (2013), 25–54.

⁴⁰ These are annotations in Giles Oldisworth's 1639 copy of *Poems*, and a short biography in Anthony Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops Who have had Their Education in The Most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford*, ed. by Philip Bliss, 4 vols (Rivington et al., 1813–20), II, p. 502. In some ways, the future Clarendon might seem a surprising person to find elegising Donne. Grierson (*Poems*, II, p. 255) argues that the elegist is his cousin, the clergyman Edward Hyde (or 'Hide', 1607–59), son of the Salisbury lawyer Sir Lawrence, given both that Clarendon is not otherwise known to have written elegies and that the elegy's original publication context (a sermon) would have better suited a clergyman.

title.⁴¹ While the manuscript may have been through many hands, the identification of this as the pre-gout handwriting of the future Clarendon is beyond reasonable doubt, which at least strongly suggests that the future Clarendon was an active reader of Donne's poetry at around this time.⁴²

More suggestive, however, is that this Hyde was closely associated with Cary and other Donne elegists through the intellectual circle of Great Tew, some twenty miles from Oxford, where Thomas Carew and Sidney Godolphin, as well as (possibly) Henry Valentine and Jasper Mayne debated the theological 'problem of Pyrrhonism' and the future of the English Church in the 1630s.⁴³ The group included Brian Duppa, who was made Dean of Christ Church in 1628, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford in 1632, and was a prominent influence behind many volumes of occasional poetry produced there. Duppa also edited the memorial verse anthology for Ben Jonson, *Jonsonus Virbius* (1638), to which Godolphin, Mayne and King would all contribute elegies.⁴⁴ The Tevians' association with Jonson is well-known, but Roebuck's suggestion that Donne's legacy was also significant to their increasingly Erastian thinktank presents the intriguing possibility that 'an Oxford-Great Tew collaboration' was mobilised in assembling the 'Elegies upon the Author' for the press.⁴⁵ (As Peter McCullough has shown, the posthumous corpus and legacy of Lancelot Andrewes was, in a similar way,

⁴¹ The manuscript is C4 – the so-called 'Edward Hyde MS'. These arguments are set out by Keynes in 'A Footnote on Donne', *The Book Collector*, xxii (1973), Summer, pp. 165–168. See also Sampson, 'A Contemporary Light', pp. 98–103. One thing to note here is that the first poem copied into this volume is titled 'On the death of L Anne', which is similar to that of Hyde's elegy on Donne as it appears in *Poems* (1633) ('On the death of Dr DONNE'). While Hyde might have simply been copying the closest thing to hand, it is also possible that this page reveals him exploring revisions of his elegy for Donne in preparation for *Poems* (1633), perhaps even borrowing the format of his revised title. Hyde's elegy originally appeared as 'An Epitaph on Dr DONNE' in *Deaths Duell* – one of several textual variants which led Milgate (*Epithalamions*, p. 222) to suggest that Hyde 'supplied an altered copy for the later volume'.

⁴² I am grateful to Paul Seaward for offering me his opinion on this.

⁴³ On Valentine's possible connection to the group via Gilbert Sheldon, see Bevan, 'Henry Valentine', pp. 188, 190–91.

⁴⁴ *Jonsonvs Virbivs: or The Memorie of Ben: Johnson Revived By the Friends of the Mvses* (1638). Roebuck explores the possibility that *Jonsonus Virbius* was itself 'conceived' at Great Tew in 'From Donne to Great Tew', p. 42. Also printed in 1638 was George Sandys's *A Paraphrase vpon the Divine Poems*, which contains commendatory verses by King, Carew and Godolphin.

⁴⁵ Roebuck, 'Elegies for Donne', pp. 128–131.

being contested in these years.)⁴⁶ While the question of which individual, or individuals, oversaw this (and how) remains tantalisingly open, it offers a plausible way of thinking about the possible relationships, methods and motivations behind the ‘Elegies’. At the same time, however, any notion of collaboration needs to be considered carefully. While men from both institutions jointly animate and populate the ‘Elegies upon the Author’, and (by extension) the memorial publication within which they were printed, such affiliations may also underpin some of the poems’ characteristically agonistic qualities. Mayne’s satirical lampoon against certain ‘Poor Suburbe wits’ (37) unable to write without alcoholic stimulation, for instance, might represent a less-than-subtle reference to one of these contingents:

Here light your muse, you that do onely thinke,
And write, and are just Poëts, as you drinke,
In whose weake fancies wit doth ebbe and flow,
Just as your recknings rise, that wee may know
In your whole carriage of your worke, that here
This flash you wrote in Wine, and this in Beere (29–34)

Donne’s own verse is widespread in Oxford-based miscellanies, despite the fact that he was physically absent from Oxford for most of his life; his death and the publication of *Poems* seem rather to have excited than displaced this craze.⁴⁷ Arthur F. Marotti’s recent study of Christ Church and the circulation of manuscript verse anthologies there suggests two unsurprising conduits through which Donne’s verse could have ‘got from a London coterie environment to an academic one, where it was frequently copied’: Donne Jr and King – the same individuals most frequently associated with the *Poems* (1633).⁴⁸ Like Richard Corbett,

⁴⁶ Peter McCullough, ‘Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626–1642’, *Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), 401–24.

⁴⁷ See Peter Beal, ‘John Donne and the circulation of manuscripts’, in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume 4*, ed. by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 122–26 (p. 122). On other key Oxford and Christ Church poets, the frequency with which they appear in Oxford miscellanies, see Christopher Burlinson, ‘Richard Corbett and William Strode: chaplaincy and verse in early seventeenth-century Oxford’, in *Chaplains in early modern England: patronage, literature and religion*, ed. by Hugh Adlington, Tom Lockwood and Gillian Wright (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 141–158 (pp. 142–43).

⁴⁸ Arthur F. Marotti, ‘“Rolling Archetypes”: Christ Church, Oxford Poetry Collections, and the Proliferation of Manuscript Verse Anthologies in Caroline England’, *ELR*, 44 (2014), 486–523 (pp. 500–01).

King was a prolific disseminator of both his own manuscript verse and that of other poets, which he commissioned notable scribes such as Thomas Manne to copy and circulate with unusual care.⁴⁹ As Leah Marcus notes, his similar investment in the ‘memorial gesture’ of Donne’s *Poems* and the ‘Elegies upon the Author’ may be implied by the fact that he gave a copy of the book to his nephew John King, personalising it with an autograph cut and pasted from one of Donne’s letters.⁵⁰ All this should be kept in mind when reading King’s elegy for Donne, the first in the sequence and a deceptively assertive poem.

It has been noted that the predominant ordering principle in elegiac anthologies was that they would imitate heraldic procession, with those of high rank and familial closeness to the deceased coming first.⁵¹ Subtle arguments about personal and poetic authority are woven into King’s elegy, alongside its more salient political and professional language. This is apparent even in its title, which is the only among the ‘Elegies’ to use the possessive determiner ‘my’ or to make any claim of personal intimacy with Donne – a fact that is all the more striking given that, in *Deaths Duell*, the poem was given the much more general (and less competitive) title ‘AN ELEGIE ON Doctor DONNE Deane of PAVLS’, which King evidently changed for its later publication context.⁵² Such a strategy is evident in the poem’s opening lines, which introduce the subject of the ‘eminent’ life ‘Beyond our lofty’st flights’ (1–2) in such a way as to draw readers’ attention towards King’s seniority in the context of the ‘Elegies’. Likewise, in building towards the poem’s final and most memorable conceit (‘So Jewellers no Art, or Metall trust | To forme the Diamond, but the Diamonds dust.’ (57–

⁴⁹ Manne was a Christ Church student, Henry King’s chaplain, and later rector at St. Olave’s in London. See Mary Hobbs, *Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992). For more on the ‘impetus’ King gave to Christ Church poetry, see Henry Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 169–70.

⁵⁰ This is the ‘Pforzheimer’ copy held at the University of Texas. See Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance*, pp. 194–95. Targoff describes another 1633 copy (at Harvard) modified in this way in ‘Poets in Print’, p. 141.

⁵¹ See Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, pp. 135–36. The idea of editorship could, surely, also be conceptually consonant with this principle.

⁵² Donne, *Deaths Duell*, p. 33.

58)), the commonplace topos of inexpressibility becomes the very device by which King obliquely re-states his executorship of Donne's estate:

Commit we then Thee to Thy selfe: Nor blame
Our drooping loves, which thus to thy owne Fame
Leave Thee Executor. Since, but thine owne,
No pen could doe Thee Justice, nor Bayes Crowne
Thy vast desert; Save that, wee nothing can
Depute, to be thy Ashes Guardian. (51-56)

Critics have hit on a central elegiac antagonism between this poem and the famous elegy of Thomas Carew, which is believed to have circulated in manuscript before *Deaths Duell* was printed. The argument goes that in poetically opposing Carew's various and highly sexualised imitations of Donne, King betrays his acknowledgement that Carew's poem was sufficiently well-known to justify public rebuke, and attempts to defend Donne's name from such 'unauthorised' and 'non-ecclesiastical' elegists who would draw attention to his youthful misdemeanours and overwrite his status as a paradigm of holy dying.⁵³ Such imitations are not hard to find in Carew:

Of thy brave Soule, that shot such heat and light,
As burnt our earth, and made our darknesse bright,
Committed holy Rapes upon our Will,
Did through the eye the melting heart distill (15-18)

Since to the awe of thy imperious wit
Our stubborne language bends, made only fit
With her tough-thick-rib'd hoopes to gird about
Thy Giant phansie, which had prov'd too stout
For their soft melting Phrases (49-53)

As if in direct response to this provocation, King depicts Donne as a restive 'Spirit' 'Which may revenge' these 'Rapes upon [his] Merit' (25-26). Such mirrored conceits and vocabularies indeed make the poems' strong intertextuality highly likely, but their precise

⁵³ Michael P. Parker, 'Diamond's Dust: Carew, King, and the Legacy of Donne', in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 191-200 (pp. 191-196). See also Lyon, 'Jonson and Carew on Donne', pp. 105-106. On the homoerotic imagery of Carew's elegy, see Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, pp. 167-68.

sequencing and motives are difficult conclusively to establish. It is possible, for instance, that King's defensively authoritarian tone was intended to pre-empt any repeat of the kind of controversy he endured over a decade earlier, after his father John – who ordained Donne – was accused of deathbed conversion to Roman Catholicism.⁵⁴ Taken together, however, King's apparent proximity to Donne's papers and his fellow elegists, his reputation as a manuscript poet, the early appearance of his elegy in *Deaths Duell* (and *Poems*), and the combative rhetorical strategy of that poem prompt a reappraisal of its more conspicuous arguments and reservations. Given also that most elegies for Donne engage to some extent with issues of literary imitation and biographical control, it also seems reasonable to suppose that such arguments may owe more to their literary and social contexts than to genuine literary or ideological discord. We might ascribe to them the kinds of self-reflexive and 'playfully adversarial' 'metapoetics' evident in some of Donne's own verse.⁵⁵

As this thesis has shown at length, elegy was in this period deeply invested in conventions of imitation and contestation. The death of a notable poet, however, brought a particular set of classical precedents to this dynamic, deriving, for instance, from the poetry of the *agon*, according to which (as Jonson's neoclassical elegy for Shakespeare demonstrates) the death of the laureate would conventionally precipitate agonistic elegiac negotiation over notions of poetic lineage and legacy.⁵⁶ For the elegists of *Poems* (1633), as well as its readers, this dynamic would have been further intensified by the fact that these tributes were anthologised in print. It is predominantly as a consequence of these factors, I would suggest, that forms of competitive and corroborative intertextuality are so evident within the printed 'Elegies', and others not printed. Many appear to take cues from King and

⁵⁴ I would like to thank Jonathan F. S. Post for suggesting this to me. On this episode, see Mary Hobbs's introduction to *The Sermons of Henry King (1592–1669), Bishop of Chichester* (Rutherford: Scholar Press, 1992), pp. 16–17.

⁵⁵ These terms are borrowed from Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, repr. ed. (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1980), particularly pp. 20–22.

⁵⁶ See Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, pp. 131–33.

Carew in particular. For example, Walton's elegy seems to begin by directly opposing Carew's praises of Donne's 'language' and 'imperious wit': 'I would not praise | That [his language] and his vast wit (which in these vaine dayes | Make many proud)' (3–4). Shortly afterwards, it stages a prophetic conceit evocative of King's admonition to those who would 'wake' Donne's 'learned Spirit':

God hath rais'd Prophets to awaken them
From stupifaction; witness my milde pen,
Not us'd to upbraid the world, though now it must
Freely and boldly, for, the cause is just. (15–18)

Browne's triple pun on Donne's circumcisable 'phansie' undoubtedly relates somehow to Carew's phallic description of the same, girded, 'giant', and 'stout'. Likewise, Carew's emphatic epitaph is immediately paraphrased in Lucius Cary's opening description – following Carew's poem in the sequence, as it does – of 'a doubly-named Priest, and King' (2). Carew's epitaph is the best known and most influential part of the 'Elegies', and was transcribed into at least one commonplace book as a standalone poem:⁵⁷

*Here lies a King, that rul'd as hee thought fit
The universall Monarchy of wit;
Here lie to Flamens, and both those, the best,
Apollo's first, at last, the true God'd Priest. (95–98)*

Another poem to respond to Carew's elegy, even more directly, is that of Edward Herbert. Though he was a close friend of Donne, Herbert's elegy was not printed in *Poems* (1633), or any subsequent editions. Whether or not this tribute pre-dates that publication or responds to it, it is the only elegy explicitly to praise – or even name – a fellow elegist (Carew). As Joshua Scodel has suggested, this reference may be covertly nuanced by the subtle poise through which Herbert positions himself socially and poetically in this elegy. Whilst ostensibly siding with Carew's sophisticated imitative elegiac mode, and ridiculing the unlettered tributes of other elegists, he seems also to complicate that endorsement by

⁵⁷ See Folger MS V.a.219, fol. 15^v. A margin note reads 'An Epitaph on D^r Donne'. I would like to thank Abbie Weinberg for her help with this and other manuscripts held at the Folger Shakespeare Library.

staging a ‘self-effacing imitation’ of both Carew and Donne.⁵⁸ As with King’s elegy, then, this offers an intriguing example of how the agonistic conventions of critical elegy can shadow its more obvious forms of argumentation:

Having delivered now what Prayses are
It rests that I should to the world declare
Thy Praises Donne. Whom I so loved alive
That wth my witty Carew I should strive
To celebrate thee dead, did I not neede
A language by it self, w^{ch} should excede
All those w^{ch} are in use, for while I take
Those comon words w^{ch} men may even rake
From dunghill witts, I find them so defild,
Slubberd and false, as yf they had exild
Truth and propriety, such as doe tell
So little other thinges, they hardly spell
Their proper meaninge, and therefore unfitt
To blazon forth thy merriits, or thy witte.⁵⁹

As this commemorative strategy demonstrates, elegists cannot circumvent elegiac rhetoric, whether through modesty, or satire, or both; and while literary identities, social groups, religious politics and bibliographical context are important themes and concerns for Donne’s elegists, they are also, equally, manifestations of the kinds of imitative and ‘eristic’ traditions borne of elegiac genre.⁶⁰ This tendency is exemplified in R. B.’s elegy, which, at the end of a 49-line digression attacking Donne’s ‘doctrine-men’ abusers (33) and ‘learn’dst sort’ enviers (54), apologises for being ‘strai’d to Satyre, meaning Elegie’ (64). As the following section will show, reading the ‘Elegies’ in manuscript, and alongside other unprinted elegies for Donne, reinforces this notion, whilst further illuminating the overlapping contexts within which these poems were written and first read.

⁵⁸ Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), pp. 133–34.

⁵⁹ The poem was eventually printed in Herbert’s posthumous *Occasional Verses* in 1665. Its sole known manuscript witness (quoted here) is in British Library MS Add. 37157, fols 19^r–20^r (fols 19^v–20^r quoted), a notebook containing Herbert’s poems and miscellaneous family documents, with some autograph corrections.

⁶⁰ G. W. Pigman describes the idea of ‘eristic’ literary imitation in ‘Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33 (1980), 1–32.

Manuscript Elegies for Donne

Given that *Poems* (1633) was probably designed to resemble a manuscript miscellany, it is strange that manuscript elegies for Donne have yet to be systematically considered. *CELM* and the *UFLI* between them list 31 items containing ‘Elegies upon the Author’ in manuscript, and a further four in which only unprinted elegies are extant. One of these contains the Edward Herbert elegy cited above, two contain an elegy by John King (Henry’s brother, 1595–1639), and a further lone (and hitherto unacknowledged) elegy by one ‘L: de: C:’, survives in the fourth, O36.⁶¹ Another little-explored elegy by Sir Francis Kynaston (1586/7–1642), travels alongside many other manuscript elegies on Donne, mostly unremarked in *CELM*, in London Metropolitan Archives, ACC/1360/528.⁶² After Richard Corbett’s poem (nineteen witnesses), the best-represented of the printed elegies in manuscript is that of King (nine). Carew’s and Mayne’s elegies are present in some way in six, Cary’s in three, and Walton’s in two. No manuscript witnesses appear to survive for the elegies of Browne, Darnelly, Godolphin or Chudleigh.⁶³ It should be noted, however, that these figures may well be underestimations, given both that *CELM* and *UFLI* are evidently not altogether comprehensive, and that poems such as these are often quoted, retitled or adapted in manuscript miscellanies, rather than reproduced intact.

Manuscript evidence reinforces the notion that elegies for Donne were written and circulated very soon after his death, suggesting an initial period in which the Oxford and Great Tew poets jostled openly to write, read and publicise them.⁶⁴ As Scott Nixon notes, a 1632 verse letter from Aurelian Townshend to Carew figures Carew’s elegy for Donne

⁶¹ The John King poem appears in Bodl. MS Rawl. D. 317, fol. 157^r, and British Library MS Harley 6918, fol. 6^v. *CELM* does not list the elegy in this latter volume, but the *Union First Line Index* does. It is also cited in *Critical Heritage*, I, p. 82. BL Add. MS 58215 includes John King’s elegy alongside other elegies on Donne, fol. 82^v.

⁶² *CELM* lists only the elegies of Richard Corbett and Jasper Mayne, but it in fact contains five elegies on Donne, including this poem.

⁶³ I would like to thank Marika Keblusek for corroborating this with regard to Thomas Browne.

⁶⁴ ‘The Printer to the Understanders’ states that ‘it hath pleased some, who had studied and did admire him, to offer to the memory of the Author, not long after his decease’, sig. A2^r.

falling ‘like manna on the Hearse’, revealing beyond doubt that Carew’s elegy had circulated in manuscript well before it was printed in *Poems* (1633).⁶⁵ Another piece of evidence, not hitherto considered, is included in O3, a large composite volume of major early-seventeenth-century poets compiled by the later Royalist captain Nicholas Burghe (*d.*1670). On its first folio sheet is an alphabetical ‘Index of authors names, by WHB. 4/6/31’, in which Corbett’s elegy on Donne is listed. Given that this manuscript is known to have been later owned by Elias Ashmole (1617–92), and these initials probably therefore refer to a relation of Burghe, the dating of this index sixty-five days after Donne’s death (as opposed to the same date in the following century) appears to be legitimate. While he (like all other commentators) does not comment on this index, Marotti notes that the first 165 pages of O3 – within which Corbett’s elegy for Donne is contained (fol. 60^r) – ‘were probably transcribed before 1638’.⁶⁶ Within this narrow sixty-five-day period it is impossible to say with certainty which of the elegists was the first to compose and share their work; but the fact that Corbett’s poem survives in far more manuscript copies than any other elegy on Donne surely puts it in the frame. A self-effacing description of Donne’s would-be epitaphist, it adopts the basic inexpressibility topos used in King’s elegy, but adds ironically the impossible prerequisite that such a poet ‘must be dead’ to qualify for the task. Characteristically of elegies from the period, of course, many elegies for Donne are designed to appear contemporaneous with his death, and close to his funeral – though such references are typically figurative rather than literal. Arthur Wilson, for instance (a man with whom Donne is not known to have been personally familiar) begins his poem with the claim that Donne is ‘Unburied yet’ (2). Adopting a different (though probably no less unreliable) strategy, Walton retrospectively

⁶⁵ Scott Nixon, ‘Carew’s Response to Jonson and Donne’, *SEL*, 39 (1999), 89–109 (pp. 99, 108).

⁶⁶ Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 72–73.

introduces a composition date for his elegy in the 1670 edition of his *Life*, claiming, some thirty-nine years after Donne's death, that it was written on 'April 7. 1631.'⁶⁷

Even taking into account Henry Woudhuysen's caution that extant early modern literary manuscript holdings are skewed in favour of university-related material, it is noticeable how far miscellanies associated with Oxford make up the total containing witnesses for these poems.⁶⁸ Though no part of any manuscript other than O3 is datable to earlier than 1633, the majority are from that same decade – the period in which, as Mary Hobbs notes, verse miscellanies 'reached the height of their popularity'.⁶⁹ The contents of O3 reveal deep interests in Christ Church poetry, literary reputation and the power of poetic commemorations to dictate it. The first poem in the volume is titled 'Doctor Donns valediction to the worlde', a poem often (mistakenly) attributed to Donne in manuscript, and which here sets a thematic tone for much of the collection.⁷⁰ Other notable examples of manuscripts containing elegies for Donne with clear Oxford and Christ Church affiliations include BL Add. MSS 58215 and 78423, B25, and O29. As Marotti has shown, the 'clusters', or 'rolling archetypes' perceptible in Oxford poetic manuscripts offer up 'a set of group attitudes, values, and interests represented in the verse being transmitted through the manuscript system': these were masculine, sometimes misogynistic, 'Bawdy and obscene', merged sycophancy with satire, and, as many of his examples show, travelled frequently on the currents of elegiac commemoration.⁷¹ Donne is a predictable meme to find here.

⁶⁷ Izaak Walton, *The lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert* (1670), p. 88.

⁶⁸ Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney*, p. 157. Woudhuysen describes four main categories of extant poetic miscellanies: courtier collections, those associated with the Inns of Court, those from universities, and those held by private collectors. See pp. 153–73.

⁶⁹ *The Stoughton Manuscript: A Manuscript Miscellany of Poems by Henry King and his Circle, circa 1636*, ed. by Mary Hobbs (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990), p. ix.

⁷⁰ The poem represents something of a subgenre in this manuscript and, perhaps, contemporary poetry generally. Amongst commemorative poems on Sir Francis Bacon (p. 59) and Ben Jonson (p. 97) are 'verses Made by Sr Walter Raleigh the night before hee was beheaded' (p. 59) and 'Mr Robert Herricke his farewell unto poetrie' (pp. 106–07). Other epideictic poems misattributed to Donne include 'Jo: Felton's Epitaph Made by D: Donn' (p. 20) and 'A Corriation wrighten by D. Donn' (p. 49).

⁷¹ Marotti, "Rolling Archetypes", pp. 506–09.

Multiple elegies on Donne exist in seven miscellanies, in which they are, with a single exception, always grouped together.⁷² The elegies of King and Carew co-occur in two 1630s volumes and are in each case copied in the reverse order to that of print. One of these (BL Add. MS 58215) is written principally by Manne, and was carefully and deliberately produced as a basis for further transcriptions. Marotti has demonstrated that it was used thus in the creation of BL MS Harley 6917 and 6918 (B38): a run of poems in both follows roughly the same order to a section of the Manne collection, witnessing to ‘a confluence of poetry from both universities with texts produced in courtly and urban environments’.⁷³ The other volume, St. John’s College, Cambridge, MS S. 23 (James 416), is very similar to Manne’s in its neat presentation, particularly in how it indents and subtly enlarges Carew’s epitaph for emphasis.⁷⁴ It seems reasonable to suppose that in the 1630s the poems – especially those of King and Carew – might have been considered companion pieces in more than just subject matter, but in witnessing to a sequence of elegiac dialogue that was understood by certain manuscript scribes and readers. The largest single collection of manuscript elegies on Donne, Folger MS V.a.219, witnesses to how one later reader of *Poems* copied various excerpts ‘Out of the poems written vpon Dr Dunne’ in a single italic hand: Hyde, Valentine, Walton, Carew, Cary, Mayne, R. B., and Porter are all represented.⁷⁵

Manuscript elegies for Donne reinforce the factional and competitive strains evident in their printed counterparts, taking them to sometimes extreme lengths. John King’s elegy, ‘An Epitaph upon D^r Don’, follows those of Carew, Corbett and Henry King in BL Add. MS 58215. Like many of Donne’s own commemorative and secular poems, it teases with

⁷² The Carew epitaph of Folger MS V.a.219 cited above (fol. 15^v) is separate from the other sections of elegies on Donne copied into this manuscript.

⁷³ Marotti, “‘Rolling Archetypes’”, p. 503–04. The elegies on Donne (by Carew, Corbett, Henry King and John King) cover fols 80^r–83^v.

⁷⁴ See fols 38^v–42^r.

⁷⁵ So too are excerpts by Thomas Randolph, Edward Francis and Robert Herrick. While these are included alongside the elegies on Donne, they are in fact mostly commendatory poems taken from Thomas Randolph’s *The Jealous Lovers. A Comedie presented to their gracious Majesties at Cambridge, by the students of Trinity-College* (Cambridge, 1632).

conventions of hyperbolic blasphemy, building an extended discussion of Christ's final words on the cross – his 'Epitaph' – towards a paraphrase of those words that puns on Donne's name:

That Epitaph Christ vtter'd on the Crosse,
May bee his servants here, in whose great losse,
Somewhat hee seemes to loose for Gain of souls,
For w^{ch} perswasieue power Heav'n him inrolls.
Christs Consummatum was his last, best word,
By his worke actuated. What that Lord
Purchas'd, this Legate preach't, Salvation;
Finish't his Course, rests in his Christ. 'Tis Don.⁷⁶

King's justification for this conceit is subtly developed. His speaker introduces the poem's subject (Donne) with an elusive unstressed determiner ('this') in only the penultimate line, adding surprise to the witty turn waiting on the final word. While the elegy is one of several to pun on Donne's name (Arthur Wilson ('And though th'art *Donne*, yet will preserve thy name' (4)) and perhaps Browne (1) are others), its last line so strongly recalls that of another unprinted elegy – Kynaston's – that it seems highly likely that these poems, like those of Carew and King, engage in some sort of metapoetical dialogue. While King playfully obfuscates his elegiac subject – already established in the poem's title – in order to announce it more prominently in this way, insofar as he then provides a biographical account of that subject, that portrait is distinctly ordinary, pertaining simply to Donne's role as a preacher of 'salvation'.

Kynaston's much longer elegy goes much further. In a likely parody of the typological arguments of Donne's *First Anniversary*, his final lines figure Donne as both Christ crucified and the God of Genesis, eschewing any such clarification or restraint:

O yet (great Donne) if thy great spirit moues
Vpon the deepes of Ignorance or yet loues
Our soule deprived bodies: may it see
By thy owne light this Epitaph of thee
Fiat the first word when the world begunn

⁷⁶ Quoted from BL Add. MS 58215, fol 82^v.

Now chang'd to consummatus est. Tis Donne.⁷⁷

The poem is prefaced by a dedicatory verse epistle, 'To his most worthily honourd M^r.

Thomas Carew', which insists that Carew, not King, is Donne's 'sole executor' (the word

appears twice in the poem), and that Donne 'did conferre' 'in witt his best to you | Of

Poetrie', situating it unequivocally within the contestatory elegiac context described above.

Kynaston appears to have sent this poem to Carew shortly after Donne's death with the

intention that he circulate it: 'Most noble S:^r that I make bold to chuse | You onely Censor of

my mourninge Muse'. It is possible, therefore, that Kynaston sought promotion to the printed

'Elegies', rather than access merely to readers of elegies for Donne in manuscript, and saw

Carew as a conduit to this objective. Several factors, however, make this unlikely. One is the

poem's overt blasphemy, which does not appear designed for such publicity, but rather for

the enjoyment of a particular coterie of manuscript readers. Even if Kynaston had wanted his

poem to be printed, it seems highly implausible that the gatekeepers of *Poems* (1633) –

among them King – would have permitted it, despite the fact that the elegies of Carew and

Browne were deemed fit for inclusion. Indeed, Kynaston's designation of Carew as the

'onely Censor of my mourninge Muse' reads like a pointed reference to such a dynamic,

rejecting the illegitimate poetic authority of another, a pretender who is not Donne's

legitimate heir. This may be further suggested in the verse epistle's closing lines, which,

addressing Carew, develop a similarly arresting modesty topos in which Kynaston withdraws

personally from any such aspirations:

You made for Donne soe even straight and true
That all must say none could doe soe but you
For you haue made him such an Eligie
As to haue such a one a man would die
That were in his best health: To you braue frame
If I might bringe but scaffold bords: That same
Shall bee enough for mee who not aspire
To write lines worthy other fate then fire⁷⁸

⁷⁷ London Metropolitan Archives ACC/1360/528, fol. 4^r rev.

⁷⁸ This poem covers fols 2^v rev.–3^v rev.

The elegies for Donne that accompany Kynaston's in ACC/1360/528 (those of Corbett, Carew, Hyde and Mayne) may be partially transcribed from print – though the presence of these unprinted elegies and some minor textual discrepancies with *Poems* (1633) complicates this. Either way, both Kynaston and this neglected manuscript (whose scribe reveals deep interests in Donne and in elegiac poetry more generally) are ripe for dedicated future study.⁷⁹ For the purposes of this chapter, however, these basic observations readily underline the importance of the competitive literary-cultural contexts in which the 'Elegies' were written and first circulated.

The same may be said of another manuscript elegy for Donne, curiously unacknowledged in scholarship, which survives in O36.⁸⁰ In a manner reminiscent of Cary's elegy, this poem, by one 'L: de: C:', states its author's intention 'to show | the abler pens wch way they ought to flow', and was thus probably written by someone cognisant of the social dynamics through which elegies for Donne were being (or would be) written. Its title is given as 'AN Elegie vpon the death of D^r. Donne'. I transcribe it in full below:

Now thou art dead I write, when breath is gone	
men may y ^e safelier spend opinion	
Thy story had bin lost had it bin writt	
before, scince, then thou hadst not finisht it.	
And much ill manners surely t'would haue ^bin^	5
I the same interim to haue crowded in.	
Sure every man maks vp his history	
but even then when he doth leave to be	
I must confesse my Genius not soe hye	
As such a worth might ask to be prais'd by	10

⁷⁹ Kynaston is an interesting and neglected literary figure in his own right, known, among other works, for his 1635 translation of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* into Latin (*Amorum Troili et Creseidæ*): a university-affiliated literary production that is also prefaced by fifteen commendatory poems by other Oxford poets, including William Strode, Dudley Digges and William Cartwright. Kynaston's poetry and circles of influence – particularly relating to his academy of learning, the *Musaeum Minervae* – are subjects to which I plan to turn in future collaborative work with Alison Shell, who also came across Kynaston's elegy for Donne in ACC/1360/528. I would like to thank Daniel Starza Smith for putting us in touch. For now, the best overview of Kynaston's life is R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Kynaston, Sir Francis (1586/6–1642)', *ODNB* (2004).

⁸⁰ Incidentally, O36 is a manuscript that has previously attracted attention for containing another elegy that Gary Taylor has attributed, on the basis entirely of internal evidence, to Shakespeare. See Brian Vickers, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's Funerall Elegye* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), chapter one. Its single, professional scribe is unidentified, but Peter Beal dates it to the early-mid 1630s.

But be y^t censur'd rather then my will
 to soe much virtue should be counted ill.
 Ambition burneth not in me, my verse
 wth humble wings shall hover bout thy hearse
 & pay y^e rights of many deaths to shew 15
 wth w^t a world of grieffe it thither flew
 where from the Urne though faintly & but weak
 me thinks I see thy mighty fancyes break
 Bevelling 'bout it like the wanton f^{ry}
 Wth nimble wings disposd to may stery 20
 All w^{ch} thy spirit wth a wondro's might
 maynteynes in vigor to inform vs write
 As if y^t destiny had decreed thy Tombe
 more then thy bodyes howse a fruitful womb
 whence spring the rules & matter y^t must teach 25
 the infant world, to poetize & preach
 would I could sing thy merit soe, y^t they
 whoe meet but this might melt for thy decay
 or, in as glorious & as high a line
 speak thee, as thou has others dead, in thine. 30
 But I must rest content, I can but show
 the abler pens w^{ch} way they ought to flow
 I doe but towle the bell as to declare
 W^hat want of ringers in ye belfries are
 And out of piety to thee, Invite 35
 The knowing to remember y^{ee} & write.
 By L: de: C:⁸¹

A basic adumbration of this syntactically ambiguous poem might be presented as follows. It begins (1–8) with a justification topos, noting that only after death may a comprehensive account of Donne's 'story' be written, in spite of the fact that, to some degree, 'every man maks vp his history'. Having established this, the speaker (9–16) moves into a protestation of modesty, acknowledging their insufficient 'Genius' for the task at hand, yet insisting that their 'will' to 'pay' 'rights of many deaths' precludes any affront to Donne's memory. Envisaging Donne's funerary 'hearse', the speaker imagines, deictically (17–20), the flight of his 'spirit' and 'fancyes' rising out of it, before observing (21–22) that Donne's instructive example has been sustained through their enduring activity, even though his 'bodyes howse' has passed away. Thus, the speaker concludes (23–26), Donne's death may be supposed to

⁸¹ O36, fol. 43^r.

have rendered him an even more valuable source of virtue, and – specifically – an even better literary and oratorical model. Ruining their own lack of ‘merit’ in this particular regard (27–30), the speaker acknowledges Donne’s renown specifically as an elegist, before (31–36) resolving that they may discover utility otherwise than in writing an elegy of their own: as a bell-ringer alerting the ‘knowing’ and ‘abler pens’ to the necessity of commemorating Donne. The final couplet, which fashions Donne into a kind of deity, recalls somewhat the closing conceits of Kynaston and John King.

The identity of ‘L: de C:’ is not clear. While the initials’ nobiliary particle suggest an author of Norman descent, there are no obvious close acquaintances of Donne matching that description; and it is impossible to tell whether ‘L’ or ‘C’ refer to a given name, surname, title, man, or woman. Some basic observations are, however, possible. A male elegist is surely the likelier possibility, given the speaker’s comparative self-positioning in the poem’s final lines. Likewise, while there are very few candidates whose given and surnames begin with ‘L’ and ‘C’ (Lucius Cary is the only obvious match here), there are several whose titles would fit – perhaps most plausibly Lord Conway, second Viscount Conway and Second Viscount Killultagh (1594–1655).⁸² The elegy itself offers some further clues. Most notably, the speaker’s insistence upon Donne’s posthumous ability to ‘teach | the infant world, to poetize & preach’ indicates an author equally familiar with Donne’s poetic reputation as his reputation as Dean, and equally (like Carew and Cary) invested in both legacies. Moreover, the speaker appears to anticipate the appearance of Donne’s corpus in print, in which medium ‘the rules & matter’ of poetry and preaching will become more readily accessible to those seeking to imitate him. While it is not clear whether this or any part of the elegy makes any specific allusion to the ‘Elegies upon the Author’ (or *Poems* (1633)), the speaker’s implicit complaint – that such tributes are unduly absent – is shared with several of those other

⁸² Based on a readthrough of Bald’s index in *Life*, pp. 585–627.

poems. Hyde begins with this exact observation: 'I Cannot blame those men, that knew thee well, | Yet dare not helpe the world, to ring thy knell' (1–2); and Valentine begins likewise:

ALL is not well when such a one as I
Dare peepe abroad, and write an *Elegie*;
When smaller *Starres* appeare, and give their light,
Phæbus is gone to bed: Were it not night,
And the world witlesse now that DONNE is dead,
You sooner should have broke, then seene my head. (1–6)

It is also not entirely clear to whom the speaker's final invitation to the 'knowing' refers, given that this appears to complicate their previous concern only that 'abler pens' elegise Donne. It may refer either to those who were personally familiar with him, or to the 'wise' in a broader sense; though the speaker's concurrent exhortation for these poets to 'remember' him implies that intimacy, as well as poetic ability, are here stipulated. As seen above, the issue of personal intimacy with Donne represents one of the central points of contention within the 'Elegies upon the Author'; and while 'L: de C:' does not clearly identify with either side of that debate, it is nonetheless possible that they responded to a more general impression of the elegiac occasion manifested in *Poems* (1633). As the following and final part of this chapter will show, the highly specific competitive and corroborative elements that characterise the earliest elegies for Donne, like the literary and printed forms through which they were published, exerted this sort of influence in the years that followed Donne's death, and have had a lasting influence on his reception history as a whole.

Commemoration as Canon

Towards the end of his 'Life', Walton describes what may remain the only recorded piece of Donne-related graffiti ever to have graced a public building:

The next day after his Burial; some unknown friend, some one, of the many lovers and admirers of his vertue and learning; writ this *Epitaph* with a cole on the wall, over his grave:

*Reader! I am to let thee know,
Donne's Body only, lyes below:
For, could the grave his Soul comprise?
Earth would be richer then the skies.*⁸³

Given that the individual responsible deigned to use such an ephemeral medium, on a grave that would later be destroyed in the Great Fire of London, it will probably never be possible to confirm that this episode ever actually occurred. As a component within a sophisticated biographical mode, however, it readily illustrates how Walton utilised and responded to commemorative poetry in composing the single most influential text ever written about Donne, framing such verses as responses to his subject's 'vertue and learning' above all other concerns. As this chapter has shown, Walton's 'Life' was written into a communal and contestatory commemorative dynamic that the 'Elegies upon the Author' and *Poems* (1633) first established in print. In attempting retrospectively to smother that discourse and streamline the teleological arc of Donne's story, Walton's various editions of the 'Life' selectively reproduce, in various combinations, those of the 'Elegies' that can corroborate its account.⁸⁴ The final part of this chapter explores how, in a hitherto unrecognised way, the 'Elegies' continued to influence Donne's afterlife alongside Walton's biography, as well as within it. Moving chronologically through the nearly four centuries that have passed since Donne's death, it considers, in each period, instances of interaction with the 'Elegies' themselves, and how they both contributed towards and were affected by broader changes in contemporary attitudes towards English literary history, and Donne's status as an author.

⁸³ Walton, *Lives*, p. 77.

⁸⁴ An excerpt from Chudleigh's elegy is included from 1658 that attests to the quality of Donne's preaching, and the elegies of Corbett and Henry King are also reprinted in that edition's closing pages. See *The Life of John Donne, Dr. in Divinity, and Late Dean of Saint Pauls Church* (Richard Marriot, 1658), pp. 48–49. Walton's own elegy is later added to in the 1670 edition. None of these appear in the first edition of the *Life* that prefaces *LXXX sermons preached by that learned and reverend divine, Iohn Donne, Dr in Divinity, late Deane of the cathedrall church of S. Pauls* (1640). Pask (*The emergence of the English author*, pp. 122–23) argues that Walton's biography is 'the prose rendition of the embryonic life-narrative of the early elegies'.

One further seventeenth-century elegy for Donne which survives only in print, and numerous other elegies that refer to him, reveal in highly specific ways the extent of the ‘Elegies’ influence in the decades that followed Donne’s death. The first, by Thomas Beedome, was printed in his posthumous *Poems* (1641) – a publication which, as noted above, appears to have been modelled on *Poems, by J. D.* in its inclusion of elegies on Beedome himself. The elegy’s title, ‘*To the memory of his honoured friend Master John Donne, an Eversary*’, strongly resembles that of King’s elegy on Donne, as do its opening remarks, addressed to Donne’s ‘Blest dust’, and its later apology for disturbing Donne’s ‘ashes’. In what is almost certainly a direct response to King’s warning to those ‘Unworthy’ elegists who may wake Donne’s vengeful ‘Spirit’ (24–25) in this way, the speaker follows this apology with a soothing address to his subject: ‘sleepe, sleepe, best of spirits’. Equally revealingly, Beedome censures two of the overlapping, non-ecclesiastical contingents represented in the ‘Elegies’. The first is the academic circle of Oxford (and perhaps Great Tew) – elegists who merely affect scholarly learning. The second is the Jonsonian elegists – Carew et al – whose superficiality and irreverence is lampooned in a satirical analogy of the so-called ‘Tribe of Ben’ with what Beedome portrays as a primitive and credulous indigenous American ‘tribe’:

Thou were not of those men whose gowne and hood,
Must plead a wisdom, though not understood.
Nor of the tribe of such as easily can,
Drop jests, or vapours upon any man.
These are the Indians, that doe friske and run,
To the false rayes of each supposed Sunne:
Simple Americans that doe ingrosse
The toyes of every noble genius.⁸⁵

Similar examples of poetic engagement with the ‘Elegies’ are many, and respond particularly to Carew. George Daniel’s ‘A Vindication of Poesie’, argues that God’s own wit was ‘flamed’ in Donne’s (‘’Twas but warm vpon | His Embers; He was more; and y^t is

⁸⁵ Beedome, *Poems*, sigs. G7^v–G8^v.

Donne'), evoking Carew's image of Donne's 'crowne of Bayes' (84) and, quite possibly, the trope of the divine Donne adopted by others in manuscript.⁸⁶ Even more strikingly, Sir John Suckling's 'A Sessions of the Poets' adapts Carew's epitaph on Donne with the intention (as Roebuck notes), of claiming Lucius Cary (by then Viscount Falkland) as 'a successor to Donne as defender of the English Church against the infallibility claims of Rome':

He was of late so gone with Divinity,
That he had almost forgot his Poetry,
Though to say the truth (and *Apollo* did know it)
He might have been both his Priest and Poet.⁸⁷

Thomas Shipman's elegy for Abraham Cowley shows how, in 1667, Donne was a still-conspicuous trope in critical elegy, and again in the well-subscribed terms of Carew's epitaph:

Who justly can pretend that *Monarchy*.
Donne's Judgement, Fancy, Humour, and his Wit,
Strong, searching, happy, and before ne're hit
Gives him a fair pretence to climb the Throne.⁸⁸

Similarly, an anonymous elegy on William Davenant, written onto the flyleaves of a copy of John Denham's *Poems and Translations* (1668), also refers to Donne. This stanza reveals how Donne's inimitability – a central issue in the 'Elegies' – remained central to his reputation:

He out of breath himself did run,
When with high rapture he begun,
By emulating Doctor Dunne –
I mean the father, not the son.⁸⁹

Several later seventeenth-century manuscripts reveal how *Poems, By J. D.*, and the 'Elegies upon the Author' were read and used as sourcebooks for elegiac poetry in a more general way, and that these re-appropriations of Donne as an elegiac subject occurred for surprisingly

⁸⁶ See *Critical Heritage*, I, p. 123.

⁸⁷ Quoted in Roebuck, 'From Donne to Great Tew', pp. 43–44.

⁸⁸ *Critical Heritage*, I, pp. 147–48.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

diverse reasons. One is Princeton University Library CO 199 No. 812, in which the imprisoned puritan Robert Overton commemorates his wife through commonplacing and subtly editing numerous poems by and about Donne in order to give them ‘a more elegiac cast’ befitting his staunch Fifth Monarchist beliefs.⁹⁰ Another is BL Add. MS 78423, a commonplace book compiled by the Royalist officer Sir Thomas Tuke in the 1650s, which contains a two-page selection of ‘Doctor Dunns Poems’ almost certainly copied from printed sources.⁹¹ The excerpts are themed around afterlife and the endurance of verse: Donne’s famous ‘well-wrought urn’ couplet is followed by such lines as ‘Meete blinde philosophers in heauen whose merritt | Of strict life may bee imputed faith’, ‘Verse embalmes vertue’, and part of Mayne’s elegy for Donne exhibiting characteristically anti-puritan sentiment. The so-called ‘Hannah MS’ (Bodleian MS Eng. poet. e. 30), compiled by Manne, and containing King’s elegy on Donne, has, like Overton’s volume, a clear commemorative purpose. It closes with a funeral sermon ‘Preached at the solemne Funeralls of the Right Honorable Katherine Countess of Linstr July 3. Anno Domi: 1657’, King’s elegy on her and a further elegy, beginning ‘Sleepe Pretious Ashes, in thy sacred Urne’.⁹²

More conceptually, Donne himself was also ‘elegised’ in seventeenth-century adaptations, misattributions and appropriations of poetry not originally by or about him – in ways that owe much to the ‘Elegies upon the Author’, and frequently travel alongside them. As was noted in the previous chapter, Deborah Aldrich Larson has shown how contemporary scribes and writers of commonplace books, often in the habit of taking such liberties, would biographize manuscript materials in certain ways – in particular by juxtaposing ‘the sermon writer and the love poet’ (as in *Poems* (1633)), and by finding ways to emphasise the

⁹⁰ See David Norbrook, “‘This blushing tribute of a borrowed muse’: Robert Overton and his Overturning of the Poetic Canon”, *EMS*, 4 (1993), 220–66 (particularly pp. 234–37, 256). The manuscript contains parts of the elegies of King, Valentine, Walton, Godolphin, Chudleigh, Carew, Cary, Mayne and Wilson, transcribed and adapted from a copy of *Poems* (1635).

⁹¹ British Library Add. MS 78423, fols 43^v–44^r.

⁹² Bodleian MS Eng. poet. e. 30, fols 106^r–08^r.

importance of Donne's marriage to his writing.⁹³ Likewise, I would suggest, attributing commemorative or valedictory manuscript poetry to Donne, and writing prosopopoeical poetry as if by him, are ways through which Donnean authorship, his dying voice and spiritual presence, were sustained into the 1630s and 40s, alongside critical elegy. That these poems are also frequently combined with the other kinds of verses identified by Larson suggests that the moribund or elegised 'Donne' was, like the amorous or religious 'Donne', a recognisable literary trope in these years, and an important part of the biographical heterogeneity and complexity readers found so compelling in him. In F3, for example, the commonly misattributed 'D^r Dunn's farewell to y^e world', is followed by another misattribution, titled 'To his young Mistress'.⁹⁴ A similar sequence occurs in OC2, a Royalist compilation of Oxford-based poetry in a single, neat hand, which contains the same first poem (fols 20^r–20^v) followed by Corbett's 'Epitaph' on Donne and an unattributed pastiche of *SunRis*, here titled 'To his m.^{es}'.⁹⁵ B16, which also contains Corbett's elegy alongside a number of Donne's actual commemorative poems, includes another prosopopoeical poem attributed to Donne, 'J: D: to his paper', and, immediately preceding the correctly attributed 'Dr Dunns Litany', a re-worked version of 'Go and catch a falling star', titled '9 song'.⁹⁶ As Gavin Alexander has shown, the figure of prosopopoeia invited writers and readers to distinguish between what Marcus and Dobranski describe as the 'aura of authorial presence' in the written word and the imaginative act of 'resurrecting a dead man'.⁹⁷ In different ways, over the centuries that followed, each kind of posthumous authorship remained a central to how readers engaged with Donne.

⁹³ Deborah Aldrich Larson, 'Donne's Contemporary Reputation: Evidence from Some Commonplace Books and Manuscript Miscellanies', *JDJ*, 12 (1993), 115–130. (p. 121).

⁹⁴ F3, pp. 66–67.

⁹⁵ Fol. 94^v. Another poem evocative of *SunRis* can be found in B13, fol. 18^v, written vertically into the margin shortly before Donne's original.

⁹⁶ B16, fols 45^v, 13^v–14^r; 29^r.

⁹⁷ Gavin Alexander, 'Prosopopoeia', in *Renaissance Figures of Speech*, ed. by Sylvia Adamson, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; repr. 2011), pp. 97–112 (pp. 108–11); Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance*, p. 198; Dobranski, *Readers and Authorship*, pp. 120, 128, 139.

It is generally accepted that the eighteenth century represents a hiatus for Donne appreciation. With a few exceptions (including Tonson's 1719 edition of his *Poems*), he was little printed, absent from many private libraries, and largely omitted from the canon-forming biographical works and poetic anthologies typical of the period.⁹⁸ Alongside what was printed of his work, however, and surmised about his biography, 'The 'Elegies' – specifically that of King – continued to garner interest. The 'Admirable Conclusion' to King's elegy is reproduced, for instance, in Giles Jacob's *The poetical register: or, the lives and characters of all the English poets* (1723).⁹⁹ Likewise, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, an influential yet somewhat understudied reader of Donne, took a particular interest in King's elegy, singling out its conclusion as one of the best and most representative parts of the 'Elegies upon the Author', and noting more generally of the poems (in the context of a broader discussion of seventeenth-century elegy) that:

These on Donne are more than usually excellent, their chief, and, indeed, almost only fault, being want of smoothness, flow, and perspicuity, from too great compression of thought, too many thoughts, and, often, too much thought in each [...] There are occasions, in which a regret expresses itself, not only in the most manly but likewise in the most natural way, by intellectual effort and activity, in proof of intellectual admiration.¹⁰⁰

Such a view is at odds with most modern readers of the 'Elegies', and much more sympathetic to their competitive ostentation. From the end of the eighteenth century (or the beginning of the nineteenth), survives one more piece of evidence further witnessing to special interest in King's elegy. This is one of two manuscript miscellanies containing elegies for Donne that also contain written notices singling them out as poems of particular interest – not unlike the title page of *Poems, By J. D.* This one, written onto the opening flyleaf of Bodl.

⁹⁸ Dayton Haskin, 'Donne's Afterlife', in *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne*, ed. by Achsah Guibbory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 233–46 (p. 236); Haskin, *John Donne in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 18–19.

⁹⁹ *The poetical register: or, the lives and characters of all the English poets* (1723), II, p. 48.

¹⁰⁰ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, 'John Donne', in *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Roberta F. Brinkley (Durham: N. C., 1955), pp. 519–30 (pp. 525–26).

MS Malone 22, witnesses to how King's elegy stoked bibliographical and biographical interest in both him and Donne at this time:

This Book was wrote by D^r: H: King And the Elegie on the Death of his friend Doctor Donne. will be found printed in the Edition of his ^Donne's^ works, publish'd by Henry Herringman, at the anchor, in the lower walk of the New Exchange 1669.

A brief biography of King follows, along with a citation of a print miscellany, *The Poetical Farrago* (1794), that includes a poem by King copied, the writer claims, from this manuscript.¹⁰¹ In fact, as Peter Beal has shown, Bodl. MS Malone 22 was written by Thomas Manne's so-called 'imitator', not by King himself; but this note demonstrates an emergent interest in the life and textual remains of a writer close to Donne.

One possible explanation for this kind of interest in King is suggested in Dayton Haskin's comprehensive study of Donne's nineteenth-century reception. While, as Haskin demonstrates, this century laid the groundwork for the dramatic revival of interest in Donne that would follow in the early twentieth century (particularly in the criticism of T. S. Eliot), at its beginning (as in the latter part of the century that preceded it) Donne was known far more widely as a biographical subject than as a figure of literary interest in his own right. Specifically, he was Walton's biographical subject, whose hallowed preaching and temperate religion suited him to the sensibilities of the age, transmitted via the theological insights of writers such as Coleridge.¹⁰² King, then, and his elegy, represented a biographical access point to this kind of Donne, who had 'liv'd eminent, in a degree | Beyond our lofty'st flights' (1–2).

In a related way, the 'Elegies' are likely to have reinforced the kinds of critical acclaim that were first extended to Donne's poetry in the nineteenth century – specifically his reputation as a writer of commemorative verse. Though only Mayne refers to the

¹⁰¹ Bodl. MS Malone 22, fol. 1^r. The other manuscript I have seen with such a notice is Bodleian MS Eng. poet. e. 30, fol. 2^r, under the heading 'Elegy for Donne'.

¹⁰² See Haskin, *John Donne in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 15–17.

Anniversaries by name, the inimitability, learning and influence of those poems evidently concern Donne's elegists more than anything else in his poetic corpus, underpinning their unusually insistent and pervasive inexpressibility topoi. In a possible reference to the final lines of *SecAn* ('I ame | The Trumpet, at whose voice the people came' (527–28)), for instance, Hyde refers to Donne as fate's 'great trumpet' (17), before concluding, fairly typically, that 'Hee then must write, that would define thy parts: | *Here lyes the best Divinitie, All the Arts*' (19–20). As A. J. Smith notes, Algernon Charles Swinburne was 'bowled over' by the *Anniversaries* – poems 'overflowing with glories of thought and word'; Robert Browning (whose dramatic monologues owe much to Donne's verse) described *BoulRec* as 'a long, crabbedly fine screed'; and when commemorating his sister Jane in 1817, Henry Austen felt compelled to borrow a passage from *SecAn*. Moreover, in 1868, in a manner reminiscent of several of Donne's elegists (as seen above), J. C. M. Bellew described Donne as 'a man possessed of genuine poetic fire'. Thus, the earliest nineteenth-century appreciators of Donne's verse were far less repelled by the extremes of his commemorative hyperbole than are most modern critics – a possible consequence, as Smith also notes, of Herbert Grierson's distaste for these poems. As one reviewer of Grierson's 1912 edition of Donne's poetry puts it, 'He misses the point' and 'undervalues' *SecAn*, 'one of the greatest long poems in English'.¹⁰³

Though Haskin does not consider the 'Elegies' specifically, he incidentally notes one important instance, in the 1860s/70s, of their contribution towards Donne's nascent (re)emergence as a canonical author. This was in shaping the views of William Minto, a key but neglected Donne critic:

Having read the major interpreters of Donne before him – Jonson and Carew and the other writers of commendatory verses in the 1630s, Walton and Samuel Johnson, De Quincey and Coleridge, and Taine; having thought through, with an independence of mind unprecedented in critics before him, the issues that these writers had raised; and

¹⁰³ All quotations taken from A. J. Smith, 'Donne's Reputation', in *John Donne: Essays in Celebration*, ed. A. J. Smith (Methuen), pp. 1–27 (pp. 12–20).

having read Donne's poetry with close attention to the social contexts in which it was written – Minto began his treatment of Donne with a consideration of readers' responses to the poetry.¹⁰⁴

The result of Minto's highly original methodology was a 'groundbreaking article' in *The Nineteenth Century* that 'moved Donne into a new sphere of interest' beyond the 'ecclesiastical and literary' corners of Victorian culture to which he had hitherto been mostly restricted.¹⁰⁵ From here, as Haskin shows, Donne's emergence within the modern canon of English literature, and the modern field of English literary studies, was slow but inexorable; and Eliot's prominent reappraisal of Samuel Johnson's censure against 'metaphysical poets' could build upon a secure scholarly platform.¹⁰⁶

Anyone who takes the time to peruse the late John R. Roberts's exhaustive 'Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism' will readily appreciate how Donne's twentieth and twenty-first-century resurgence has coincided with his rebirth as an elegiac subject.¹⁰⁷ To a significant extent, as Richard S. Peterson notes, this kind of interest derives from curiosity about Donne's funerary monument, which 'languished in the crypt from 1666 to 1873', having miraculously survived the Great Fire.¹⁰⁸ As I hope to show in this chapter's final paragraphs, however, the influence of the 'Elegies' upon Donne's status as a modern elegiac subject may, in hitherto unacknowledged ways, also be demonstrated. But to begin with the monument, it is clear that its unique position in popular culture owes much to Walton's account of how it was conceived:

A Monument being resolved upon, Dr. *Donne* sent for a Carver to make for him in wood the figure of an *Vrn*, giving him directions for the compass and height of it; and, to bring with it a board of the just height of his body. These being got: then, without delay a choice Painter was got to be in a readiness to draw his Picture, which was taken as followeth. – Several Charcole-lires being first made in his large Study, he brought with him into that place his winding-sheet in his hand. And, having put off all

¹⁰⁴ Haskin, *John Donne in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 144.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 142–43. See also pp. 145–48.

¹⁰⁶ T. S. Eliot, 'The Metaphysical Poets', in *Seventeenth Century English Poetry: Modern Essays in Criticism*, ed. by William R. Keast (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 22–30.

¹⁰⁷ Available in four volumes at *DigitalDonne*.

¹⁰⁸ Peterson, 'New Evidence on Donne's Monument', p. 14.

his cloaths, had this sheet put on him, and so tyed with knots at his head and feet, and his hands so placed, as dead bodies are usually fitted to be shrowded and put into their Coffin, or grave. Upon this *Vrn* he thus stood with his eyes shut, and with so much of the sheet turned aside as much shew his lean, pale, and death-like face, which was purposely turned toward the East, from whence he expected the second coming of his and out Saviour Jesus. In this posture he was drawn at his just height; and when the Picture was fully finished, he caused it to be set by his bed-side, where it continued, and became his hourly object till his death: and, was then given to his dearest friend and Executor Doctor *Henry King*, then chief Residentiary of *St. Pauls*, who caused him to be thus carved in one entire piece of white Marble, as it now stands in that Church¹⁰⁹

In this passage, and in relaying the apparent description of Sir Henry Wotton ('*it seems to breath faintly; and, Posterity shall look upon it as a kind of artificial Miracle*'), Walton cast a spell of mystique over this sculpture that has inspired various literary and artistic responses, from figures including Virginia Woolf and Marsden Hartley.¹¹⁰ One recent poetic example is J. P. White's 'The Effigy of John Donne', which reproduces Walton's narrative in an elegiac mood:

During his last illness, when the pulse clung
to a whisper, he ordered his shroud, posed
like the only son of this world and the next.
Eyes half opened, half closed, he would leave
his statue with a faint smile, a lover's doze.

See him there. That studied face and squint cut
into alabaster. It reaches past pulpits, dresses,
and the hands of visitors who never tire of rubbing

a smudge of ashes etched by London's great fire.¹¹¹

While it is not explicitly a reflection on the St Paul's monument, nor the work of someone likely to have known Walton's 'Life' directly, the most famous modern elegy for Donne nonetheless also appears to draw on similar themes.¹¹² This is Joseph Brodsky's Russian 'Elegy for John Donne', which constructs an elaborate dreamscape evocative of

¹⁰⁹ Walton, *Lives*, pp. 71–72.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 77. Peterson, 'New Evidence on Donne's Monument', pp. 26–27.

¹¹¹ J. P. White, *The Salt Hour* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), p. 70.

¹¹² See Igor Pomerazew, 'Gespräch mit Joseph Brodsky über John Donne', *Sinn und Form*, 63 (2011), 782–86. Pomerazew notes that Brodsky admitted in a 1981 interview that he knew little about Donne at the time of writing the elegy.

Wotton's speculation that Donne's monument is asleep, rather than dead, realised in a kind of poetic free indirect discourse. Its refrain, 'John Donne has sunk in sleep', punctuates a universalised pathetic fallacy in which this slumber is applied to a meticulous list of physical, spiritual and abstract entities, among which are 'all the cherubim, in one great host | embracing, [who] doze beneath St Paul's high dome'. At the poem's mid-point the speaker's focus shifts towards an isolated figure in the snow, Donne's soul, which describes to him the 'labors' through which it made him 'a bird' capable of fantastic insight, but weeps because 'I am condemned to live among these stones. | I cannot fly up in my body's flesh'. Within the poem's final, ambiguous lines, which resume the speaker's third person voice, this frustration is again conveyed in a vision of Donne's coming resurrection:

Like some great bird, he too will wake at dawn;
but now he lies beneath a veil of white,
while snow and sleep stitch up the throbbing void
between his soul and his own dreaming flesh.
All things have sunk in sleep. But one last verse
awaits its end, baring its fangs to snarl
that carnal love is but a poet's duty –
spiritual love the essence of a priest.¹¹³

Knowing little of Donne in 1963, Brodsky's poem responds to a generalised version of him within popular culture – which indeed utilizes that 'Donne', as Constantin V. Ponomareff suggests, as the basis for a typically elegiac self-exploration of 'the shadow of Brodsky's own anticipated death [...] the death of *poetry*'.¹¹⁴ Brodsky's depiction of Donne's two-fold complexity, in a manner evocative of the 'Elegies' (especially those of Carew and Cary), is therefore suggestive of the enduring reach of those poems, alongside Walton's 'Life'.

This legacy is carried, to a significant extent, by the discursive trends of modern literary criticism. As John Guillory has demonstrated at length, the process of literary canon

¹¹³ Joseph Brodsky, 'Elegy for John Donne', in *Selected Poems*, ed. and trans. by George L. Kline (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973), pp. 39–45.

¹¹⁴ Constantin V. Ponomareff, *One Less Hope: Essays on Twentieth Century Russian Poets* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodolphi, 2006), pp. 95–96.

formation owes much to the development of a ‘vernacular literary curriculum’ in academia, and the specific forms of ‘cultural capital’ to which it gives rise.¹¹⁵ In this sense, a clear line of transmission between the ‘Elegies’ and modern scholarship is evident in some of the sources identified above. In modern criticism, however, the enduring influence of the ‘Elegies’ is particularly striking, especially given that, until relatively recently (as I have also shown) these poems have not garnered much scholarly interest on their own account. The nature of the ‘Elegies’ influence here, I would suggest, is that they have fragmented into soundbites of epithet and argument that are frequently deployed as framing devices by critics, and in often conspicuous ways. Scholarly titles, introductions and conclusions make heavy use of the ‘Elegies’, and in a manner that quite closely resembles the interests of the seventeenth-century poets who followed Donne.

Carew is once again particularly prominent. An obvious example of what I am describing is J. B. Leishman’s *The Monarch of Wit*, which adopts Carew’s much appropriated epithet in encapsulating a broad comparative analysis of Donne’s verse.¹¹⁶ Likewise freely using Carew’s epithet in his influential biography, John Carey pursues Carew’s biographical focus on the twofold Donne in a sustained attempt to comprehend and articulate psychological strands of continuity in his life.¹¹⁷ In a more recent article, R. V. Young also reads Donne through the prism of Carew’s elegy, bookending its argument with Carew’s attribution of ‘fresh invention’ (Grierson, *Poems*, I, 28) to him.¹¹⁸ This critical tendency is perhaps best illustrated, however, in the distinctly pentametric closing sentence of R. C. Bald’s *Life of Donne*, which, in laying down its own subtle inversion of Walton’s similarly elegiac closing sentence from the ‘Life’ (‘But I shall see it re-inanimated’), traces a line of

¹¹⁵ John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (University of Chicago Press, 1993), p. x.

¹¹⁶ J. B. Leishman, *The Monarch of Wit: An Analytical and Comparative Study of the Poetry of John Donne* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1951).

¹¹⁷ John Carey, *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (Faber and Faber, 1981; new edn. 2008), p. 179 (for example).

¹¹⁸ R. V. Young, ‘The Elegy’, *Handbook*, pp. 134–48 (pp. 143, 148).

continuity that leads directly back to the ‘Elegies’ that both prompted and, to some extent, underpinned Walton’s biography: ‘But let us leave him in his quiet grave.’¹¹⁹

Such examples merely adumbrate a broader tendency that, to any scholar of Donne, is unlikely to require exhaustive demonstration. But it is worth highlighting the extent to which the ‘Elegies’, as a relatively little-examined body of early literary criticism on Donne, continue to foreshadow and shape modern efforts to describe him. Moreover, I would suggest, the acknowledgement of this neglected facet of Donne’s afterlife prompts comprehension of a further parallel: that the forms of identity seeking and self-expression manifested in those first critical texts find a ready analogue in the discourses and rituals of modern critical practice, which continues to commemorate Donne in annual conferences, sermon readings and monuments, alongside the more private forms of ‘elegiac’ engagement that modern readers continue to undertake.¹²⁰ In investigating the bibliographical, historical and literary contexts out of which the ‘Elegies’ first emerged, this chapter has shown how Donne’s earliest editors, friends, rivals, chroniclers, appropriators and fans initiated a continuum of interactions with his memory and writings in which this thesis also takes its place.

¹¹⁹ Bald, *Life*, p. 536. Walton’s sentence is present in all editions of the *Life*. John Stubbs’s more recent *Donne: The Reformed Soul* (Penguin, 2007) does not continue this tradition.

¹²⁰ Recent personal correspondence I have received includes invitations to an annual ‘Service to Commemorate John Donne’ at Lincoln’s Inn, and the consecration of a Donne-related commemorative window at Blunham Church, Bedfordshire.

Conclusion: Authorship and Afterlife

This thesis has sought to demonstrate how, in writing the afterlives of others in commemorative epideictic, John Donne and his contemporaries also pursued their own unique ends and constructed their own enduring authorial identities. Several broad findings and themes emerge from the contextually integrated case studies I have pursued. First, I have demonstrated that the forms of literary commemoration in which Donne participated, particularly in verse, were socially oriented, allusive and frequently competitive in nature, contributing both to contemporary social, political, religious and literary discourses, and to finer points of disagreement, consensus and personal connection between individuals. The occasional and traditionally conservative nature of such texts led their authors typically to marshal arguments around specific and shared points of contention, which serve as discursive frameworks within and against which such agendas are subtly (or sometimes overtly) pursued.

My work has thus shown the value of reading these texts within their fullest historical, literary and bibliographical contexts, giving attention to the hitherto neglected writers and works that accompanied better known authors, verses, sermons and prose narratives in Donne's day. Chapter one revealed the potential of such scholarship in establishing occasions for commemorative texts, suggesting what a single poem, *Sorrow*, might reveal about Donne's biography and early engagement with elegiac genre. Chapter two showed how, in developing the themes of gender and intimacy, elegists commemorating Lady Markham and Cecilia Bulstrode explore and negotiate literary identities in relation to the counter court culture of Lady Bedford's Twickenham household. Considering the *Anniversaries* within their early print contexts, chapter three suggested that in writing and printing the poems, Donne deliberately incorporates and invests their radical epideictic mode into an emergent,

politically motivated authorial persona – a suggestion borne out by the manner in which that mode itself became a point of contention in elegies written for Prince Henry and Sir John Harington. Pursuing context within Donne’s literary style and personal preoccupations as an ordained minister, chapter four offered a broader survey of commemorative (and ostensibly commemorative) texts about which little specific documentary evidence has survived. Chapter five contextualised elegies written for Donne himself in a similar manner to chapters two and three, reading them against contemporary print and manuscript sources, and establishing, to an extent not previously realised, the possible motivations and relationships that underpin them, along with their influence on Donne’s reception history.

About Donne specifically, this thesis presents various original arguments and claims, building also, in new ways, upon the previous scholarship of others. My most contentious claim is probably my suggestion that, as a critical paradigm, the ‘poet of the *Anniversaries*’ offers a way of reading Donne’s commemorative writing after 1611 – even, perhaps, including some of his sermons – in relation to an enduring literary persona designed to exemplify a public reputation as a consensus seeking Jacobean conformist. This argument ties in with this thesis’s broader portrayal of Donne, particularly prior to ordination, as a poet who sought, simultaneously, participation in literary coterie and commemorative discourses, whilst rejecting the terms and modes through which those discourses were conducted. As I have suggested, the evidence does not necessarily support the received notion that Donne was particularly embarrassed by or regretted the *Anniversaries*, even when first hearing of ‘many censures’ against them while abroad; and while an apologetic frame of mind is implied in Donne’s letters (which note also that ‘I do not pardon myself’), it remains possible to nuance these protestations in light of the poems’ broader authorial and historical context.¹ In a similar sort of way, as my fourth chapter suggests, the idea that Donne did not typically

¹ *Letters*, p. 75.

commemorate those with whom he was personally intimate may owe something to his seemingly consistent desire to frame personal loss and commemorative self-fashioning in atypical ways – with what Thomas Carew’s elegy for him describes (as numerous critics have noted) as his ‘fresh invention’ (28). Even when deploying a highly conventional commemorative mode in his *Sermon of Commemoration* for Lady Danvers, as I argue, Donne manufactures exceptionalities.

Finally, in tracing the reception of commemorative writing by and about Donne, this thesis has also shown the profound efficacy of literary commemoration, both in immortalising subjects and in promoting the legacies of commemorators. Presenting hitherto unacknowledged contemporary references to the *Anniversaries*, for instance, I have demonstrated how profoundly and widely the poetic reputation Donne forged through those poems became an accepted part of his literary identity in the years, decades and centuries that followed their publication. A further consequence to this, illuminated particularly in my considerations of the *Anniversaries* and Francis Beaumont’s ‘Elegy on the Lady Markham’, is that I have been able to challenge and complicate received views about commemorative decorum and taste, moving past proscriptive modern attitudes towards death and commemoration, and reading such works as earlier readers might have read them.

These findings might prove useful in various scholarly fields, in which they could prompt various future studies and approaches. To begin with Donne studies specifically, I would suggest that the biographical insight available from a more comprehensive analysis of literary and documentary responses to individual deaths and notable events relevant to Donne is potentially considerable. The occasion of *Sorrow* and the death of Sir Henry Goodere discussed in chapters one and four provide obvious examples of where such work might fruitfully focus; but it has surprised me, given the extent and nature of Donne’s modern canonical status, how little general interest there has been in the kinds of materials I have

pursued in these sections, and how biographically significant those materials might turn out to be. One likely reason for this, as chapter one in particular demonstrates, is that establishing the contexts and generic orientation of specific and problematic texts such as *Sorrow* can be complex; and on reflection, my attempt to situate that poem within the various contextual fields that proved fruitful elsewhere in this thesis met with significant challenges. Of course, fresh insight may yet materialise in the exhaustive textual and contextual work undertaken in forthcoming editions of Donne's verse (*Variorum*), sermons (*OESJD*) and letters. Yet it is predominantly in angling focus *away* from Donne, I would submit, that fresh and contextually illuminating evidence can often be found. Either way, the historical, generic and biographical properties of *Sorrow* remain, on the basis of the evidence set out in this thesis, problems with which future scholarship can engage, as are the potential effects on Donne of the deaths of figures such as Lady Drury, Goodere, Lady Bedford and Christopher Brooke.

Further consideration of contemporary print and manuscript sources and culture could shed further light on the historical contexts I have pursued. As mentioned at various points above, long-influential scholarly paradigms related to early modern print and manuscript media – the 'stigma of print' and 'coterie poetry' most conspicuously – have, in recent years, been called increasingly into question, as critics have sought rightly to nuance and revise them in various ways. One relevant insight offered by this thesis, I would suggest, is the potential importance of genre and occasion to any such revision. It seems likely, for instance, that scholarly mistrust of these concepts might hitherto have served to preclude investigation of 'commemorative' texts and their perhaps inherently competitive and metapoetical tendencies. Whether or not this is the case, there has undoubtedly been a lack of connection between scholarly accounts of commemorative genre and the more biographically and bibliographically focused work that has recently dominated the study of writers such as Donne. Further such work could certainly build upon many of the contextual arguments

presented in this thesis. Textual collation of manuscript and printed works not by Donne, for instance – a methodological avenue I have not pursued – would be a valuable supplement to my arguments about the circulation and intertextual characteristics of commemorative works. Given the intensity of scholarly focus on Donne in early modern manuscript studies, such techniques remain to be applied to a great many contemporary authors within his literary and professional circles – work that may yet uncover fresh insights relevant to him.

This, however, prompts a further observation. Several of the peripheral literary figures considered in this thesis – Edward Herbert, Joseph Hall, Lady Drury, William Alabaster and Francis Kynaston, for example – are ripe for further dedicated study in the light of the new scholarly resources (*CELM* and *UFLI* most obviously) that have lit up the study of Donne, rather than as mere supporting characters in his ongoing literary story. This is, of course, a challenge for early modern literary studies more generally. Andy Kesson captures it well in describing a recent Shakespeare Association of America Conference panel in which delegates considered how to move beyond their canonical protagonist:

The discussion was great, and repeatedly made challenges to Shakespeare as focal point to our collective research, but I was struck by the fact that it was even more focussed on Shakespeare than an average SAA session. If I had brought my Shakespeare klaxon to my presumed Shakespeare safe space, I'd have been traumatically tooting it at least once every twenty seconds. What I understood as an invitation to forget Shakespeare had resulted in a discussion of Shakespeare. That discussion was full of transformative ideas, but it still seemed embedded in a Shakespearean viewpoint. Perhaps I was wrong to expect otherwise; as contributors themselves kept helpfully noting, early modern literary scholarship has got stuck in a self-perpetuating loop.²

When I was first developing the proposal on which this thesis is based, this was an issue about which I was somewhat apprehensive. In justifying (to myself) my focus on Donne, my intention has always been to utilise well-travelled scholarly paths as a means to discovering those less travelled by, in order to reconsider why and how (and whether) he first

² Andy Kesson, 'Shakespeare, attribution and attrition: at tribute zone', <<https://beforeshakespeare.com/2017/04/12/shakespeare-attribution-and-attrition-at-tribute-zone/>> [accessed 15 September 2019].

came to acquire such prestige. In doing so, however, I have undoubtedly contributed towards just such a ‘self-perpetuating loop’, an ongoing cult of personality that scholars of Donne, like his contemporary readers, colleagues and commemorators, continue to generate. But I hope that, in illuminating the simultaneously self-effacing and self-making nature of contemporary commemorative works within their earliest bibliographical, historical and literary contexts, my research has suggested some new paths that might enable future studies of other authors in their own right, along with new ways of seeing how authorial identities are contingent upon contested and contestable ideological factors and individual interventions. As I note in chapter five, Kynaston is one such neglected figure to whom I intend to turn in future work of my own.

The manner in which this thesis has nuanced readings of texts frequently considered unedifying by modern scholars and readers prompts further, broader observations also relevant to the issue of literary canonicity. Whilst I have been able to demonstrate, through forms of reception study, that Donne’s contemporaries typically engaged with commemorative works in more multifaceted ways than modern critics have tended to appreciate, the historical distance from which critics necessarily view the ethics of grief and commemoration manifested in early modern commemorative texts continues to hinder our efforts to interpret those texts on their own terms. This is, in large part, a consequence of the fact that in the modern West, death and commemoration are taboo subjects, inflected by political and cultural realities that are hard to make out, and prescribing an ethics of grief in which consolation is compromised. As Diana Fuss notes, ‘a common critical tendency to idealise and fetishize resistance’ has led to the widespread notion ‘that only acts of melancholic refusal are ethical, while acts of hopeful reparation are not’.³

³ Diana Fuss, *Dying Modern: a meditation on elegy* (Duke University Press, 2013), p. 108.

In such a world, it is perhaps not surprising that critics have been put off by the ostensible sycophancy, artifice and opportunism of commemorative writing by Donne and his contemporaries. What might seem strange, however, is the extent to which modern attitudes towards the commemoration of canonical literary figures – exemplified, perhaps, in the quatercentenary festivities held on the occasion of Shakespeare's death – acquiesce in similarly opportunistic activities, capitalising and monetising upon the exclusionary feedback loops of authorial afterlives. Anniversary commemorations may now be the primary means through which authorial identities are announced, manufactured and sold in popular culture. Memory has an agenda. Further developing a critical framework for understanding and distinguishing between the commemorative ethics of the modern world and its early modern counterpart, then, would provide keys to unlocking a wealth of approaches to the kinds of texts considered in this study.

Appendices

Appendix I

Letter from Sir Thomas Egerton to the Lord Keeper (HEH EL 77)

[On exterior face]

To the right honorable my
deare father S^r Tho: Egerton

[Page break]

The Casualty & vncertaynty of mans life oughte to perswade every honest Christian to be ever prepared to make an honest end both wth god & the world, & not vnwisely to Differ every thinge to that momente, w^{ch} God of his mercy doth geue vs moast sensibly to seek our owne weaknes, & ^to^ call for his mercy; This consideracion makes me nowe in perfecte memory, & good vnderstandinge, to leave this testimony behinde me, that I firste Acknoweledge my selfe A most greevous & heinous sinner towards God, & that wthout his Infinite mercy I ^am^ vtterly condemned, & finde, no hope or comforte of salvacion, but my mercifull god to redeeme my errors, & strengthen my weaknes, hath send his son, my Saviour Jesus Christe to vndergoe & satisfy that w^{ch} my fraylty could not, who hath wth his righteousnes perfected all my faultes, & made me cleane partaker of All those Benefites, w^{ch} belonge to his children; This I knowe & Assure my selfe, for my God hath promised it & he will not breake, & ^my^ fayth in Jesus (w^{ch} good god increase) doth assure

me heaven, for to all ~~stedf~~ stedfast beleevors it doth
 Appertayne, so that what soever become of my vile
 polluted body, heaven hath my ~~selfe~~^{^soule^}, ~~so that~~[^] And thus[^] wth my gi<xxx>
 & heavenly father I have made (through his mercy) a
 happy End. Nowe to you my deare ^Erthly^ father who next
 to God I ~~m~~ ever most feared, I Doe wth ~~as much~~^{^much^} confidence ^of obtayninge^
 aske pardon for all my faultes ~~or~~ towards you, w^{ch} to my
 Griefe I must Acknowledge to have bene many; for my
 younge Vnbriedled youth hath bene ever naturally
 geven to all wanton licsitiones, & to neglecte those
 good things w^{ch} I have bene ever by you directed to followe
 yet I have wthstoode ^them^ as much as I could, & endeavored
 to beate downe, that sturringe mocion of sinne, w^{ch} I
 could not so mortify ~~it~~ but it hath carried mee to many
 Contemperate Disorders, that have made me breake
 that comandemente that wth greatest charge from you
 I receyved, w^{ch} was never to runne in debte to Any
 This I protest, nexte to those greate sinnes I have ofended
 my heavenly ~~father~~^{^god^} in, doth most touch me, that should

[Page Break]

be Drawen for any vayne worldly ~~respects be Drawen~~^{^<xxx>^} to
 offend so good a father. This I protest doth much trouble me
 & would much more tormente ^me^ but I Am Assured you will
 satisfy the world, & not suffer it to laye on my soule.
 The note ^of my debtes^ you shall finde here inclosed wherein they are all
 very truly sett Downe;/ I knowe you will thinke them
 very many./ & thinke I have bene very prodigall;/ I meane
 not at this tyme to comend my good husbandry, nor I would

not willingly leave a memory of more prodigality behind
 me, then I Am gyilty of, tho I Acknowledge my selfe gyilty of
 that & many greate & faultes, for the greatest & vaynest of
 my expence have bene long agoe at lest 4 or 5 yeares
 when I wanted vnderstandinge to knowe my selfe, what
 I have since spent, tho I will ~~te~~ not perticuler it, yet it
 hath bene ever to good pourpose, to effecte & put thinges
 into y^r handes, to drawe you laye, but y^r money, for I
 thoughte if it should be in y^r hands it was very casuall
 whether any share should come to y^r children, when as if you
 boughte land that would be better knowen, & more ~~te~~ means
 to recover. This concayte hath bene to me very chargeable
 w^{ch} I Beseech you pardon, for I knowe ~~& god~~ it an offence
 both to god & you; Pardon it good father, & see all these
 thinges satisfied, that my soule be not charged, it is my
 porcion & much it is not; I charge my brother as he
 will Answere ^it^ at the last Iudgemente that he will ~~Answere~~
 Disburthen me. I thinke it not much, when I desier my
 poore Daughters should be no more troublesome, who I refer
 to y^r care, & as Deepely as a Deade sonne maye charge his
 father, I charge you be carefull of there educacion, &
 fortune; I must commend my poore wife to you, who I
 beseech you respecte as a gentellwoman of her quality
 ought to be, & as my wife; L Vppon my Brother the hope
 & fortune of y^r house standes, w^{ch} I ~~hope~~ praye you be care=
 full to Advance, for y^r memory that lives after you, be care=
 full the world ~~have~~ note ^not^ so litell forsighte as to saye strangers
 goe awaye wth the sweete of y^r labour & toyle, I praye you

be carefull of my sister, shee is y^r only ~~childe~~^{daughter}; & ~~yet~~ it would

[Page Break]

be a wronge to you in the opinion of the world not to
vphold her fortune; therefore I praye you thinke of some
Course to repayre S^r William Leigh & assure & the landes vppon
her son. I must commend my poore servantes to you
where of I have 4 have served me [^]longe & [^]honestly & [^]or[^] thinke
it [^]will[^] laye on my soule if you doe [^]not[^] some thinge for them
The Troubles of this world ~~is~~^{are} [^]longe [^]& many[^] drawes me far, yet
sweete father of heaven call me back to remember
thee; good father let me be layde by [^]my[^] mother, wth som
memory we are together,: I Desier some small remem
brances maye be bestowed amongst my frendes, that
the[y] maye knowe if he had lived longer he would ~~have~~
ever have loved his frend honestly. & I Did ever praye
for y^r health, w^{ch} god longe continue,: I have nowe change[d]
you for a heavenly father, yet I did ever honor & love
you as truly as ever son did father, I praye god blesse
you & geve you much comforte & happiness, & god
graunt me a happy speedy & joyfull resurrection

from y^r Deade son

Tho: Egerton.

Appendix II

1609 Elegies in Manuscript Sources

	<i>BedfShe</i>	<i>Mark</i>	'A maid'	Goodere	Beaumont	<i>BoulRec</i>	Bedford	<i>BoulNar</i>	Herbert	Jonson	Hare
B7 (BL Add. MS 18647 - Denbigh MS)		*				*		*			
B8 (BL Add. MS 19268)		*				*		*			
B11 (BL Add. MS 23229 - Conway MS)				*	*						
B13 (BL Add. MS 25707 - Skipwith MS)		*			*	*					
B16 (BL Add. MS 30982 - Leare MS)	*	*			*	*					
B23 (BL Egerton MS 2230 - Glover MS)					*					*	
B27 (BL Harl. MS 3910)	*										
B30 (BL Harl. MS 4064 - Harley Noel MS)	*	*	*			*	*	*	*	*	
B32 (BL Harl. MS 4955 - Newcastle MS)		*				*					
B35 (BL Harl. MS 6057)										*	
B40 (BL Lansdowne MS 740)	*	*				*		*			
B46 (BL Stowe MS 961)		*			*	*		*			
B47 (BL Stowe MS 962)		*				*	*	*		*	
B51 (BL Evelyn MS)						*					
BL Add. MS 33998										*	
BL Sloan MS 1446					*						
Bradford Archives 32D86/34					*						
Digby MSS (Untraced Bright MSS)					*						
C1 (CUL Add. MS 29 - Edward Smyth MS)		*			*	*					
C2 (CUL Add. MS 5778(c) - Cambridge Balam MS)		*			*	*					
C8 (CUL Add. MS 8467 - Leconfield MS)		*				*					

C9 (CUL Add. MS 8468 - Narcissus Luttrell MS)	*	*				*	*	*		*	*
CT1 (Cambridge Uni, Trin. Coll. Lib., MS R. 3. 12 - James 592; Puckering MS)	*	*				*		*			*
DT1 (Trinity College, Dublin, MS D258/28/5i)		*				*		*			
DT2 (Trinity College, Dublin, MS D258/31/16)		*									
EU3 (Edinburgh University Library, MS Laing III. 493)		*			*	*				*	*
EU4 (Edinburgh University Library, MS H.-P. Coll. 401 - Halliwell-Phillips Collection)		*									
F2 (Folger MS V.a.96)										*	
F6 (Folger MS V.a.125)					*						
F7 (Folger MS V.a.162 - Welden MS)								*			
Folger V.a.160					*						
H3 (Houghton MS Eng. 966.1 - Norton MS 4502, Carnaby MS)	*	*			*	*		*			
H4 (Houghton MS Eng. 966.3 - Norton MS 4503)	*	*				*		*			
H5 (Houghton MS Eng. 966.4 - Norton MS 4506, Dobell MS)		*				*					
H6 (Houghton MS Eng. 966.5 - Norton MS 4504, O' Flahertie MS)	*	*				*		*		*	*
H7 (Houghton MS Eng. 966.6 - Norton MS 4500, Stephens MS)	*				*	*		*			
H8 (Houghton MS Eng. 966.7 - Norton MS 4620, Utterson MS)	*	*									
HH1 (HEH EL 6893 - Bridgewater MS)		*				*	*	*		*	*
HH4 (HEH HM 198, Part 1 - Haslewood-Kingsborough MS)	*				*			*			
HH5 (HEH HM 198, Part 2 - Haslewood-Kingsborough MS)			*						*	*	*
Houghton JnB 102										*	
Houghton MS Eng 966.2											*

IU2 (University of Illinois Lib., MS 821.08/c737/17 - Joseph Butler Commonplace Book)		*				*					
Leeds Archives WYL156/237					*						
Leeds University MS Lt. q. 11, No. 50					*						
LR2 (Leicester RO, MS DG. 9/2796)					*						
MC1 (Chetham's Library, Manchester, Farmer-Chetham MS 8012, A.4.15)										*	
NP1 (Nottingham Univesity Library, Pw V 37 - Welbeck MS)		*			*	*					
NY1 (New York Public Library Arents Collection, Cat. No. S191 - John Cave MS)		*									
NY2 (New York Public Library Arents Collection, Cat. No. S288 - Hugh Barrow MS)		*									
O3 (Bodl. MS Ashmole 38)					*					*	*
O8 (Bodl. MS Eng. poet. c. 9)	*										*
O20 (Bodl. MS Eng. poet. e. 99)		*				*					
O21 (Bodl. MS Eng. poet. f. 9 - Phillipps MS)	*	*			*	*	*	*	*		
O30 (Bodl. MS Rawlinson poet. 31)	*		*				*	*	*	*	
O33 (Bodl. MS Rawlinson poet. 116)										*	
O34 (Bodl. MS Rawlinson poet. 117)					*						
O36 (Bodl. MS Rawlinson poet. 160)					*					*	
OJ1 (Oxford University, St John's College Lib., Nathaniel Crynes Vol.)		*				*		*			
P1 (MS Bedford 26 - Woburn MS)		*									
PM1 (Pierpont Morgan Library, MA 1057 - Holgate MS)		*			*					*	
R9 (Rosenbach Museum and Library, MS 1083/16 - Bishop MS)					*					*	
SA1 (South African Public Library, MS Grey 7 a 29)		*						*			

SN2 (NLS MS 2060 - Hawthornden MS VIII)		*				*		*		*	
SN3 (NLS MS 2067 - Hawthornden MS XV)						*		*			
SN4 (NLS MS 6504 - Wedderburn MS)		*				*		*			
SP1 (St Paul's Cathedral Library, MS 49. B. 43)		*				*					
TT1 (Texas Tech University Library, MS PR 1171 D14 - Dalhousie 1)	*	*				*		*			
VA2 (Victoria and Albert Museum, Cat. No. 18, MS 25.F.17 - Nedham MS)		*									
WN1 (National Library of Wales, Dolau Cothi MS 6748)		*				*					
Y2 (Yale University Library, MS b. 114 - Raphael King MS)		*				*		*			
Y3 (Yale University Library, MS b. 148 - Osborn MS)	*	*			*	*	*		*		
Y5 (Yale University Library, MS b. 197)					*						
Yale University Library, MS b. 356					*					*	

Appendix III

James Barry's Elegy for King James (Trinity College MS 652)

[Fol. 362^v]

To the reuerend, and Learned Doctor Donne: Deane
Of S^t Paules.

S^r

It is not out of an opinion of any worth in this poore trifle of mine,
that I presume to make choise of you for my Patrone. It is because

[Fol. 363^r]

I assure my selfe, that any thinge that lookes like perfume, or spice,
bestowed upon the imbalminge of the memory of your gracious Mast:
cannot but be most welcome, and acceptable to you. It might haue
been enough that my owne priuat deuotions, could beare wittnesse
wth me of my true sorrowe for the losse of his sacred Ma^{tie}, but the exam=
ple of God himselfe, is more then a commaundment, and he when a
good Kinge of Judah dyed, vouchafed to descend so lowe, as to be the
author of his epitaph, for if we may belieue s^t Jerome, the lamen=
tations of Jeremy were a funerall elegy, upon the death of the Kinge
Josias: Hauinge such a cobby to write after, I could not hold my
handes till I had finished this, w^{ch} (as it is) I lay at your feete, wth
his hand, and hart whoe honors, and admires you.

J: B.

A funerall Elegy on Kinge James. J: B.

Whoe cannot write an Elegy, or not singe

A funeral Anthem, when so good a Kinge
Remoues his Court, shall euery common hearse
Be honor'd onely, by heroike verse,
While euen the best made for our soueraigne looke
Like some longe Ballade, swolne into a booke.
Shall it be his as 'twas great Henerys fate,
That none but poet Skelton should relate
His worth, whose worke may well deserue that doome
Th'epitaph is more brazen then the tombe.
Rather awake deade Muse, thy masters prayse
May grace thy accents, and enriche thy Layes,
A thought of him, had made that Skelton write
More wittily then Chaucer, but a sight
Of him, had forct an obstinate saducee
To sweare that there were Angells, and yet hee
He our blest Angells dead, <xxx> why should we then
Expect eternity, whoe are but men:

[Fol. 363^v]

Let his death teach us what a sea of glasse
This whole worlde is, since he our ioye, who was
The soule of it is fled, and could not be
ffreed from that common fate mortality.
Could knolledge, vertue, greatness or the rest
Of those poore thinges w^{ch} we doe count the best,
Had beene preseruations 'gainst death, he then,
Whom we lament, had ouerliu'd all men,
ffor we do celebrat his funeral
Whoe was more learn'd, great, good then all,

His very name was learninge, and his breast
As is a well furnisht library was possest
Wth Artes, and langages, soe as whoe looks
Into those ragges in print, w^{ch} we call bookes,
Shall see, that he was the originall,
And they but coppeys, he inform'd them all,
And vs, be'inge ablere to improue a man
Then Bodeleys booke case, or the Vatican:
What volumes did he write to vindicate
ffrom imputations both the church, and state;
What volumes did he speake, when euery line
He uttered, was so strange, and soe deuine,
That had he heard him speake, whoe wisht to heare
Diuine s^t Paule, and so conclude, that all
His writings should be held canonicall.
yet he that was all this is deade, his artes,
Nor all the thinges he spake, wth those good partes
W^{ch} did adorne him, all these could not adde
A minute to those blessed dayes he had,
Nor could his greatnes priueledge him, his descent
ffrom a most royall line, could not preuent
His unexpected fate, such casuall thinges
Are euen the best of men, whom we call Kinges;
Then let us learne from hence, not to bestowe,
Our confidence upon these thinges belowe,
All of them ioyn'd together, cannot blesse
Theyr master wth a reall happyness,

No man needes doubt of that, when he may reade
 The truth of it in this, Kinge James is deade.
 He of whom Xenophon seem'd to prophesy
 In his good Cyrus, whom Integrity,
 Justice, Religion, vallor, Temperance;
 Joyn'd wth a constant purpose to aduance
 The common profitt, made one miracle,
 ffor all heroicke vertues w^{ch} did dwell
 Singly in seuerall worthys, were combin'd
 In him, whoe was the Phænixe of his kinde;
 yet is this Phænixe dead; was this the end
 ffor w^{ch} thy hand my God, did still defend
 My soueraigne, what was it but to showe
 Thy prouidence, that thou preserued'st him soe:
 But I doe not expostulate, I giue
 Thy name all prayse, whose goodness made him liue
 In spite of all his enemies, who did thinke,
 His shippewreake would haue made the true church sinke.
 Had a man searcht all the recordes of Hell,
 He would not finde an act to parallel
 That powder tragedy; yet I will pause
 A while, and see, if I can finde the cause.
 Was it to put Ignatius by that throne,
 ffor w^{ch} he now may pleade prescription.
 Perhaps as Germans, to aduance the arte
 Of printing, w^{ch} they challendge as a parte
 Of theyr discoueries, make the greatest noyse
 In ffrankefurt Mart, although they write but toyse:

So theise inhumane powder traitors thought,
Because they first that strange Artillery brought
Into the worlde, they by such plotts alone
Might propagate theyr owne invention.
Or may't not be, as he whoe sometimes fir'd
Dianas Temple, but to be admir'd
In after ages; soe theise men in hope
To be commended for it by the Pope,
As was that ffrench Assassion, or to be
Befainted too, and gaine a deitie,

[Fol. 364^v]

Hauing a proiect to obscure his fame,
Would burne the church that had Appollos name;
But they did loose theyr endes, and all the glory
Renowned Prince, whose art, and care did free
This kingdome from that strange conspiracy,
ffor this for euer shall out Nephewes singe,
Great James is was both our Sauour, and our Kinge.
Nor was that all he did, his royall hand
Hath beene victorious in a foraigne land,
ffor though his predecessors did possesse
Some parte of Ireland, t'was his happynesse
To gaine it all, soe that it may be sayd,
He was the first, ~~that~~^{that^all^} Ireland conquered,
And when he did doe that, had he but knowne,
What a riche country he had made his owne,
If not to settle there, yet well he might
At least haue beene perswaded to a sight;

But sure my courtery 'twas thy Masters happe
To see thee in a most deceiuing mappe;
yet he improu'd thee well, for what increase
Of all good things, hath his establisht peace
Produc'd in twenty yeares, I may say more
Then many hundered yeares had done before,
What new schooles rais'd, wherein thy sonns may striue
Those many famous titles to reuiue
W^{ch} whileome thou enioyed'st, when men did come
Vnto thee, from all parts of christendome
To learne diuinity, when euery knolledge
Had proper to it selfe a seuerall Colledge;
What churches haue bene built, what townes, if I
Should but remember halfe his piety,
And zeale to Justice, the least action well
Would merit an eternall chronicle.
But I can better weepe, then write, myne eyes
By this haue learn'd to shed true Elegyes,

[Fol. 365^r]

And let them doe soe still, they cannot haue
A nobler obiect then Kinge James his graue:
Whom had those Greeke, or Latine Poets seene,
As they dreamt of him, infinite had beene
Aneas, and vlysses stories, since
Thy were but tipes to represent our Prince;
Whoe as executor to Christ, did see
The true performance of that Legacy,
W^{ch} he bequeath'd unto the world; upon

His sadd, and finall transmigration,
And that was peace, w^{ch} he pursud so farre
That he had banish'd euen the name of warre,
And settled a longe saboath, till the pride
Of that ambitious Monarche did diuide
The Christian world, whoe labors for a throne
As Catholique as his religion
Is thought in Rome, this made our Lyon roare,
And our blest peacemaker, whoe before
Becalm'd all Europe, then began to trye
What fier, and sworde could doe; if I might pry
Into the arke of state, I should diuine
That my deare souraigne, had some high designe
On foraigne partes, did not our sinnes preuent
Our Moses in the full accomplishment
Of his desiers, God brought him to the hill,
And there he dyed; 'tis Joshua must fullfill
Our prophesies of him, his gracious sonne
Must doe that, w^{ch} the father might haue done:
May he doe that, and more, and euer bee
Blest in his counsell, may felicity
Crowne all his actions, and religion
Establishe him in a prepetuall throne.
And now thou blessed saint, o're whose sad vrne
I thy poore prophet, haue presum'd to burne
This litle Incence of a loyall hart,
Pardon my weakenes, and let this be parte
Of his iust tribute, whoe could wishe to bee

A Chapman, or a Siluester to thee,

[Fol. 365^v]

While others penne the Annalls of thy time,
To sett the common peoples teares in rime,
And whoe can doe that here, where euery face
Doth labor by a strange, and seuerall grace
T'expresse it Masters sorrowe, where all eyes
Are drown'd in teares, where the disconsolate cryes
Of orphane subiects doe proclaime thy fall
To be an vniversall ffunerall;
yet since it was decree'd, we could not choose
A more conuenient time, wherein to loose
So rare a Jewell, then in March, t'was then
Great Ceasar dy'd, that miracle of men:
In Marche the worlde was borne, and now it dyes
In Marche againe, in thy sad obsequies:
In March was Adam made, and mankinde than,
In March Christ dyed, so it demolish'd man;
Thus we are all March dust; why may not wee
Be turn'd to dust againe to ransome thee;
But heauen forbid that wishe, since thou art gone
To an immediat possession
Of euerlastinge happynes, and wee
Haue but life lent us to remember thee.
ffor as in natural bodyes, when the head
Receiues a mortall wound, all partes are deade,
The hand hath last his feelinge, and the eye
Can hardly giue intelligence to discrye

Approaching dangers, soe in states the death
Of Princes, steales the subiectes breath
Out of theyr nostrills, hence that generall rott
W^{ch} ouerrunne us, we euen then had gott
When we lost thee, when thou our sunne did'st sett
Thy absence from our hemispheare did begett
A night of sicknes, and that might hath slayne
As many, as haue made a noble to ayne
Of followers, whoe ar gone from hence the faster
Because they might attend so Just a master.

[Fol. 366^r]

ffor as the provident Tartars would not send
Theyr dead Kinge to his Tombe, wthout a frend
To beare him company, soe are they gone
Onely as courtiers to waite upon
Theyr Prince in his last Progresse, and to see
Thee reinvested in thy maiesty.
Death hath but chang'd thy crowne, and this translation
Doth leade thee to a second coronation,
While in thy passage thither thou shalt bee
Still intertayn'd wth riche varietie
Of reall Pageants till thy chariot shall
Be drawne by Angells, unto heauens White Hall,
The Ayre shall welcome thee wth a sweete quier
Of winged queristers, when thou mount'st higher,
The Plannets to this greate solemnity
Shall adde for state, her starre=wrought Canopie,
Then some Pythagoras shall tune the spheares

To rarer musick, and to blesse thyne eares
The saynts themselues shall singe, whil'st thou aboue
Them all art plac'd, to be inthron'd wth Joue,
Wher God thy Lo: of Canterbury shall bestowe
A crowne on thee, and end thy triumph soe,
Heauens shall wth ioy full acclamations ringe
Not of God saue, but God hath sau'd our Kinge.
And least by our neglect the memory
Of soe admir'd a Prince, might chance to dye.
In future times, ffame shall inscribe this on
His statuary representation.

Wolsey could not devise a Monument
Worthy thy greatnes, had the Cardonall spent
More then all Ægipts ~~ghalth~~ glory upon one,
It would not finishe thy Sepulchrall stone:
The worlde is thy Tombe, all Poetry shall be
Thine epitaph, all Prose thy History.

Works Cited

Manuscript Sources

Variorum sigla given in left hand column, where applicable. This list does not include manuscript sources cited only in Appendix II.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

O3	MS Ashmole 38	Burgh MS
	MS Eng. poet. e. 30	Hannah MS
O17	MS Eng. poet. e. 37	
O20	MS Eng. poet. e. 99	Dowden MS
O21	MS Eng. poet. f. 9	Phillipps MS
	MS Malone 22	
O29	Rawl. poet. 26	
O31	Rawl. poet. 31	
O36	Rawl. poet. 160	Michell MS
	MS Rawl. D. 317	

British Library, London

B7	Add. MS 18647	Denbigh MS
B8	Add. MS 19268	
	Add. MS 24191	
B11	Add. MS 23229	Conway MS
B12	Add. MS 25303	
B13	Add. MS 25707	Skipwith MS
B16	Add. MS 30982	Leare MS
	Add. MS 58215	Thomas Manne MS
	Add. MS 78423	
B23	Egerton MS 2230	Glover MS
	Egerton MS 3165	
B27	Harley MS 3910	
	Harley MS 2129	
B30	Harley MS 4064	Harley Noel MS
B31	Harley MS 4888	
	Harley MS 7007	
B32	Harley MS 4955	Newcastle MS
	Harley MS 6917	
B38	Harley MS 6918	
B40	Lansdowne MS 740	
B41	Lansdowne MS 878	
B42	Lansdowne MS 984	
	Sloane MS 1394	
B46	Stowe MS 961	
B47	Stowe MS 962	

Cambridge University Library

C1	Add. MS 29	Edward Smyth MS
C2	Add. MS 5778	Cambridge Balam MS

C8	Add. MS 8466	Leconfield MS
C9	Add. MS 8468	Narcissus Luttrell MS
C4	Add. MS 8470	Edward Hyde MS

Christ Church College Library, Oxford

OX2a MS Music 350
 OX2b MSS 736–38
 OX2c/B51 Evelyn 252

Corpus Christi College Library, Oxford

MS 318
 OC2 MS 328

Edinburgh University Library

EU3 Laing III. 493

Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC

F1	L.b.541	
F3	V.a.97	
F4	V.a.103	Thomas Smyth MS
	V.a.219	

Houghton Library, Cambridge, MA

	JnB 102	
H4	MS Eng. 966.3	
H5	MS Eng. 966.4	Dobell MS
H6	MS Eng. 966.5	O’Flahertie MS
H7	MS Eng. 966.6	Stephens MS
H8	MS Eng. 966.7	Utterson MS

Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California

	EL 71	
	EL 72	
	EL 74	
	EL 1002	
	EL 1007	
	EL 1008	
	EL 1018	
	EL 1130	
HH1	EL 6893	Bridgewater MS
HH4	HM 198, Part 1	Haslewood-Kingsborough MS, Part 1
HH5	HM 198, Part 2	Haslewood-Kingsborough MS, Part 2
	HM 904	

Lancashire Archives, Preston

Pr 2886/1

Lambeth Palace Library, London

MS 3203

Leicestershire Record Office, Leicester

LR1 DG7/Lit.2

Burley MS

LR2 DG9/2796

London Metropolitan Archives

ACC/1360/528

DRO/174/A/01/003

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh

SN2 MS 2060

Hawthornden MS VIII

SN3 MS 2067

Hawthornden MS XV

SN4 MS 6504

Wedderburn MS

National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth

WN1 Dolaucothi MS 6748

National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh

GD406/1/62

GD406/1/10442

New York Public Library

NY1 Arents Collection Cat. No. S 191

John Cave MS

NY3 Berg Collection

Westmoreland MS

Princeton University Library

CO 199 No. 812

St John's College Library, Cambridge University

MS S. 23 (James 416)

Nutting MS

St Paul's Cathedral Library, London

SP1 49.B.43

Texas Tech University Library, Lubbock

TT1 PR 1171 D14

Dalhousie I

The National Archives, Kew

E 407/57/2

PROB 11/123/378

PROB 11/98/227

SP 14/71

SP 14/77

Trinity College Library, Cambridge

CT1 R.3.12

Puckering MS

Trinity College Library, Dublin

DT1 MS 877, Part 1

MS 652

University of Nottingham

NP1 Pw V 37

Welbeck MS

Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut

MS b. 356

Y2 MS b. 114

Raphael King MS

Y3 MS b. 141

Osborn MS

Copies of Printed Books**Bodleian Library, Oxford**Tanner 876 *STC* 7024J–J Sidney 135 *STC* 23576J–J Sidney 136 *STC* 23578**Cambridge University Library**Keynes B.5.6. *STC* 23578Kaynes B.4.8. *STC* 7047SSS 32. 2. *STC* 23576**Edinburgh University Library**De.3.21. *STC* 7040**Primary Sources***The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated*

Anon. *Great Brittans Mourning Garment. Given To all faithfull sorrowfull Subiects at the Funerall of Prince Henry* (Arthur Jonson, 1612).

Anon, ed., *The Poetical Farrago: Being A Miscellaneous Assemblage of Epigrams and Other Jeux D’Espirits, Selected from the Most Approved Writers* (J. Deighton, 1794).

Beaumont, Francis, and Fletcher, John, *Comedies and Tragedies written by Francis Beaumont and Iohn Fletcher* (Humphrey Moseley, 1647).

_____ *Poems* (Laurence Blakelock, 1653).

Beedome, Thomas, *Poems Divine, and Humane. By Thomas Beedome.* (John Sweeting, 1641).

Campion, Thomas, *Obseruations in the art of English poesie* (Richard Field, 1602).

_____ *Thomæ Campiani Poemata. Ad Thamesin. Fragmentum Vmbra. Liber Elegiarum. Liber Epigrammatum.* (Richard Field, 1595).

- Cartwright, William, *Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With other Poems. By M^r William Cartwright late Student of Christ-Church in Oxford, and Proctor of the University* (Humphrey Moseley, 1651).
- Cleland, James, *Hero-paideia, or The institution of a yovng noble man* (Joseph Barnes, 1607).
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 'John Donne', in *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Roberta F. Brinkley (Durham: N. C., 1955), pp. 519–30.
- *Specimens of the Table Talk of the Late Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, II (John Murray, 1835).
- Coryat, Thomas, *Coryats crudities hastily gobled vp in five moneths trauell in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia comonly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the traueilling members of this kingdome.* (William Stansby, 1611).
- Donne, John, *A Collection of Letters made by Sr Tobie Mathews Kt*, ed. by John Donne Jr (Henry Herringman, 1660).
- *A Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danuers, late Wife of S^r. Iohn Danuers* (Philemon Stephens and Christopher Meredith, 1627).
- *A Sermon of Commemoration of the Lady Danvers, Late Wife of Sr. John Danvers (1627)*, ed. by Bettie Anne Doebler and Retha M. Warnicke (Ann Arbor: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 2006).
- *Collected Poetry*, ed. by Ilona Bell (Penguin Classics, 2012).
- *Deaths Duell, or, A consolation to the soule, against the dying life, and liuing death of the body Deliuered in a sermon at White Hall, before the Kings Maiesty, in the beginning of Lent, 1630* (Richard Redmer and Benjamin Fisher, 1632).
- *Devotions Vpon Emergent Occasions, and the several steps in my Sicknes* (Thomas Jones, 1624).
- *Donne's Poetical Works*, ed by Herbert J. C. Grierson, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912).
- *The Epithalamions, Anniversaries and Epicedes*, ed. by Wesley Milgate (Oxford: Clarendon Press,
- *The Life and Letters of John Donne*, ed by Edmund Gosse, 2 vols (William Heinemann, 1899).
- *Fifty sermons. preached by that learned and reverend divine, John Donne* (John Marriot and Richard Royston, 1649).

- _____ *John Donne's Marriage Letters in The Folger Shakespeare Library*, ed. by M. Thomas Hester, Robert Parker Sorlein and Dennis Flynn (Washington, DC: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 2005).
- _____ *Letters to Severall Persons of Honour*, ed. by John Donne Jr (London, 1651).
- _____ *LXXX sermons preached by that learned and reverend divine, Iohn Donne, Dr in Divinity, late Deane of the cathedrall church of S. Pauls (Richard Marriot and Richard Royston, 1640).*
- _____ *Poems, by J. D. with elegies on the authors death* (John Marriot, 1633).
- _____ *Poems, by J. D. with elegies on the authors death* (John Marriot, 1635).
- _____ *Poems on Several Occasions. Written by the Reverend John Donne, D. D. Late Dean of St. Paul's. With Elegies on the Author's Death* (Jacob Tonson, 1719).
- _____ *The Complete English Poems*, ed. by C. A. Patrides (Everyman's Library, 1991).
- _____ *The Complete Poems of John Donne*, ed. by Robin Robbins, 2nd ed. (Routledge, 2010)
- _____ *The Divine Poems*, ed. by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952).
- _____ *The Elegies and the Songs and Sonnets*, ed. by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965).
- _____ *The Oxford Edition of the Sermons of John Donne*, gen. ed. Peter McCullough, 16 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013-).
- _____ *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. by George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson, 10 vols (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1953–62).
- _____ *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, gen. eds. Gary Stringer and Jeffrey Johnson, 8 vols (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995-).
- Denham, John, *Poems and Translations, With the Sophy* (Henry Herringman, 1668).
- Draxe, Thomas, *Calliepeia or a rich store-house of proper, choise, and elegant Latine words and phrases, collected for the most part out of all Tullies works* (John Norton and John Bill, 1607).
- Fitzherbert, Thomas, *A supplement to the discussion of M. D. Barlowes Answere* (St Omer, 1613).
- Fowler, Constance Aston, *The Verse Miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler: A Diplomatic Edition*, ed. by Deborah Aldrich-Watson (Tempe, Ariz.: Renaissance English Text Society, 2000).
- Fvnerall Elegies, Vpon the Most Vntimely Death of the Honourable and most hopefull M^r. Iohn Stanhope, Sonne and Heire to the Right Honourable Philip Lord Stanhope,*

- Baron of Shelford: Who Deceased in Christ-church at Oxford, the 18. Iuly, 1623* (Ralph Mab, 1624).
- Gorges, Arthur, *The Poems of Sir Arthur Gorges*, ed. Helen Estabrook Sandison (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952).
- Gibson, Thomas, *The Blessing of a Good King. Deliuered in Eight Sermons vpon the storie of the Queene of the South* (Arthur Johnson, 1614).
- Hall, Joseph, *Epistles The first volume: Containing II. Decads* (Samuel Macham, 1608).
- *Salomons Divine Arts, drawne out of his Proverbs and Ecclesiastes* (Samuel Macham, 1608).
- *Virgidemiarvm, Sixe Bookes. First three Bookes, Of Tooth-lesse Satyrs* (Robert Dexter, 1597).
- Hamilton, Francis, *King Iames His Encomium. Or A poeme, in Memorie and Commendation of the High and Mightie Monarch Iames* (Edinburgh: John Wreightoun, 1626).
- Herbert, Edward, *Occasional verses of Edward Lord Herbert, Baron of Cherbery and Castle-Island deceased in August, 1648* (Thomas Dring, 1665).
- *The English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- *The Poems, English & Latin, of Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923).
- Herbert, George, *The Latin Poetry of George Herbert: A Bilingual Edition*, trans. by Mark McCloskey and Paul R. Murphy (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1965).
- Jackson, Abraham, *Sorrovves Lenitive. Written Vpon occasion of the Death of that hopefull and Noble young Gentleman, John Lord Harrington, Barron of Exton* (Roger Jackson, 1614).
- Jacob, Giles, *The poetical register: or, the lives and characters of all the English poets* (A. Bettesworth, W. Taylor, and J. Batley, 1723).
- Florio, John, *A Worlde of wordes, or Most copious, and exact dictionarie in Italian and English* (Edward Blount, 1598).
- Jonson, Ben, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, 7 vols, gen. eds David Bevington, Martin Butler and Ian Donaldson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (Richard Meighen, 1616).
- Jonsonvs Virbivs: or The Memorie of Ben: Johnson Revived By the Friends of the Mvses* (Henry Seile, 1638).

King, Henry, *The Poems of Henry King*, ed. by Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

——— *The Sermons of Henry King (1592–1669), Bishop of Chichester*, ed. by Mary Hobbs (Rutherford: Scolar Press, 1992).

Kynaston, Francis, *Amorvm Troili et Creseidæ: Libri duo priores Anglico-Latini* (Oxford: John Lichfield, 1635).

Le prince d'amour; or the prince of love. With a Collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs By the Wits of the Age (William Leake, 1660).

Lithgow, William, *The Pilgrimes Farewell, to His Natiue Countrey of Scotland VVherein is Contained, in Way of Dialogue, the Ioyes and Miseries of Peregrination* (Edinburgh: Andre Hart, 1618).

Lovelace, Richard, *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, ed. by C. H. Wilkinson, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953).

Maxwell, James, *The Laudable Life, And Deplorable Death, of our late peerlesse Prince HENRY. Briefly represented. Together, with some other Poemes* (1613).

Overbury, Thomas, *The 'Conceited Newes' of Sir Thomas Overbury and His Friends*, ed. by James E. Savage (Gainsville Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968).

——— *Sir Thomas Ouerburie His Wife with New Elegies vpon his (now knowne) vntimely death: Whereunto are annexed, new Newes and Characters, written by himselfe and other learned Gentlemen. Editio Septima.* (Lawrence Liste, 1616).

Primrose, Gilbert, *The Righteous Mans Euils, and the Lords Deliuerances* (Nathaniel Newbery, 1625).

Puttenham, George, *The Arte of English Poesy* (Richard Field, 1589).

Quarles, Francis, *Sions Sonets. Sung by Solomon the King, and Periphras'd by Fra. Quarles* (Thomas Dewe, 1625).

Raleigh, Walter, *The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh: Letters*, II, ed by Edward Edwards (Macmillan, 1868).

Randolph, Thomas, *Poems with the Myses Looking-Glasse: and Amyntas.* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1638).

——— *The Jealous Lovers. A Comedie presented to their gracious Majesties at Cambridge, by the students of Trinity-College* (Cambridge, 1632).

Sandys, George, *A Paraphrase vpon the Divine Poems* (1638).

Shakespeare, William, *Comedies, Histories & Tragedies. Published according to the True Originall Copies* (Edward Blount, 1623).

- _____ *Comedies, Histories & Tragedies. Published according to the True Originall Copies* (Robert Allot, 1623).
- Spenser, Edmund, *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (William Ponsonby, 1595).
- _____ *The Shepheardes Calendar Conteyning twelue Æglogues proportionable to the twelve monethes* (Hugh Singleton, 1579).
- Stock, Richard, *The Chvrches Lamentation for the losse of the Godly: Deliuered in a Sermon, at the funerals of that truly noble, and most hopefully young Gentleman, Iohn Lord Harington, Baron of Exton* (John Beale, 1614).
- Stow, John, *The Annales of England, Faithfully collected out of the most autenticall Authors, Records, and other Monuments of Antiquitie* (Ralph Newbery, 1600).
- _____ *The Survey of London: Containing The Original, Increase, Modern Estate, and Government of that City, Methodically set down.* (Nicholas Bourne, 1633).
- Stubbes, Philip, *A Christall Glasse for Christian Women. Containing, A most excellent Discourse, of the godlie life and Christian death of Mistresse Katherine Stubbes* (Richard Jhones, 1592).
- Sylvester, Joshua, *Lachrymae Lachrymarum or The Spirit of Teares Distilled for the vntymely Deth of The incomparable Prince, Panaretvs. By Ioshua Syluester. The third Edition, with Addition of His Owne* (Humphrey Lownes, 1613).
- Taylor, John, *Great Brittain, all in Blacke. For The incomparable loss of Henry, our late worthy Prince.* (James White, 1612).
- Thompson, George, *Vindex Veritatis Aduersus Ivstvm Lipsivm Libri duo. Prior insanam eius religionem politicam, fatuam nefariamq; de Fato sceleratissimam de Fraude doctrinam refellit* (1606).
- Walton, Izaak, *The Life of John Donne, Dr. in Divinity, and Late Dean of Saint Pauls Church* (Richard Marriot, 1658).
- _____ *The lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert* (Richard Marriot, 1670).
- _____ *The Lives of Dr John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr Richard Hooker, Mr George Herbert .* (Richard Marriot, 1675).
- Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops Who have had Their Education in The Most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford*, ed. by Philip Bliss, 4 vols (Rivington et al., 1813–20).
- Wordsworth, William, 'Preface to Lyrical Ballads', in *Romanticism: An Anthology*, third edn., ed. by Duncan Wu (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), pp. 495–507.

Secondary Sources

The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated

Adlington, Hugh, et al., 'A Corpus Stylistics Approach to the Sermons of John Donne and his Contemporaries', *Scientific Studies of Literature* (forthcoming).

_____ 'John Donne and the Thirty Years' War: Religion, Diplomacy, and Law' (Unpublished doctoral thesis, King's College London, 2006).

_____ 'Seven More Books from the Library of John Donne', *The Book Collector*, 67 (2018), 528–33.

Adolph, Anthony R. J. S., 'Segar, Sir William (1554–1633)', *ODNB* (2016).

Albrecht, Roberta, 'Alchemical Augmentation and Primordial Fire in Donne's "The Dissolution"', *SEL*, 45 (2005), 95–115.

Alexander, Gavin, 'Prosopopoeia', in *Renaissance Figures of Speech*, ed. by Sylvia Adamson, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; repr. 2011), pp. 97–112.

_____ *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney 1586-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Alvaro, Ribeiro, 'Sir John Roe: Ben Jonson's Friend', *RES* 24 (1973), 153–64.

Arber, Edward, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A. D.*, 5 vols (Privately printed, 1875–94).

Baker, J. H., 'Egerton, Thomas, first Viscount Brackley (1540–1617)', *ODNB* (2015).

Bald, R. C., *Donne and the Drurys* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959).

_____ *John Donne: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970).

Barnes, Andrew William, *Post-closet Masculinities in Early Modern England* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2009).

Beal, Peter, ed., *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols (Mansell Publishing, 1980).

_____ *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

_____ 'John Donne and the circulation of manuscripts', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume 4*, ed. by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 122–26.

- Bell, Ilona, “‘if it be a shee’: The Riddle of Donne’s “Curse””, in *John Donne’s “desire of more”: The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry*, ed. by M. Thomas Hester (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 106–39.
- , “‘Under Ye Rage of a Hott Sonn & Yr Eyes’: John Donne’s Love Letters to Ann More”, in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 25–52.
- Bellany, Alistair, ‘Writing the King’s Death: The Case of James I’, in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 37–59.
- Bennett, Alan, *The History Boys* (New York: Faber and Faber; repr. 2006).
- Bevan, Jonquil, ‘*Hebdomada Mortium*: The Structure of Donne’s Last Sermon’, *RES*, 45 (1994), 185–203.
- , ‘Henry Valentine, John Donne and Izaak Walton’, *RES*, 40 (1989), 179–201.
- Bland, Mark, ‘Francis Beaumont’s Verse Letters to Ben Jonson and “The Mermaid Club”’, *EMS*, 12 (2005), 139–79.
- Bloom, Harold, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).
- Bowers, Will, and Crummé, Hannah Leah, ‘Introduction’, in *Re-evaluating the Literary Coterie, 1580–1830: From Sidney to Blackwood’s*, ed. by Will Bowers and Hannah Leah Crummé (Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), pp. 1–14.
- Brady, Andrew, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century: Laws in Mourning* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).
- Bremer, Francis J., ‘Alabaster, William (1568–1640)’, *ODNB* (2007).
- Brodsky, Joseph, ‘Elegy for John Donne’, in *Selected Poems*, ed. and trans. by George L. Kline (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), pp. 39–45.
- Brown, Cedric C., ‘Presence, Obligation and Memory in John Donne’s Texts for the Countess of Bedford’, *Renaissance Studies*, 22 (2008), 63–85.
- Burlinson, Christopher, ‘Richard Corbett and William Strode: chaplaincy and verse in early seventeenth-century Oxford’, in *Chaplains in early modern England: patronage, literature and religion*, ed. by Hugh Adlington, Tom Lockwood and Gillian Wright (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 141–158.
- Cain, Tom, ‘Elegy and Autobiography: ‘The Bracelet’ and the Death of Henry Donne’, *JDJ*, 23 (2004), 25–57.
- Carey, John, *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (Faber and Faber, 1981; new edn. 2008).

- Carey, John, 'The Poems of Nicholas Hare', *RES*, 11 (1960), 365–83.
- Carlson, Peter, 'The Art and Craft of Dying', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern English Literature and Religion*, ed. by Andrew Hiscock and Helen Wilcox (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 634–49.
- Centerwall, Brendon C., 'Who Wrote William Basse's "Elegy on Shakespeare"?: Rediscovering a Poem Lost from the Donne Canon', in *Shakespeare Survey*, ed. by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 267–84.
- Colclough, David, 'Donne, John (1572–1631)', *ODNB* (2011).
- _____ ed., *John Donne's Professional Lives* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003).
- Coldiron, A. E. B., "'Poets be silent': Self-Silencing Conventions and Rhetorical Context in the 1633 Critical Elegies on Donne", *JDJ*, 12 (1993), 101–113.
- Colie, Rosalie, "'all in peeces": Problems of Interpretation in Donne's *Anniversary Poems*', in *Just So Much Honor: Essays Commemorating the Four-Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of John Donne*, ed. By Peter A. Fiore (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1972), pp. 189–218.
- _____ *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance* (University of California Press, 1973).
- Collier, J. P. ed., *The Egerton Papers* (The Camden Society, 1840).
- Collinson, Patrick, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983).
- Considine, John, 'Bulstrode, Cecily (1584–1609)', *ODNB* (2004).
- _____ 'The Invention of the Literary Circle of Sir Thomas Overbury', in *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000), pp. 59–74.
- Corney, Bolton, 'Sir Thomas Roe: On the Death of Lord Harington, 1614', *N&Q*, 105 (1870), 9–10.
- Coward, Barry, *The Stanleys, Lords Stanley, and Earls of Derby, 1385–1672: The Origins, Wealth, and Power of a Landowning Family* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983).
- Craik, Katherine A., 'Reading "Coryats Crudities" (1611)', *SEL*, 44 (2004), 77–96.
- Crawford, Julie, *Mediatrice: Women, Politics and Literary Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014).

- Cressy, David, 'Death and the social order: the funerary preferences of Elizabethan gentlemen', *Continuity and Change*, 5 (1989), 99–119.
- Creswell, Catherine J., 'Giving a Face to an Author: Reading Donne's Portraits and the 1635 Edition', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 37 (1995), 1–15.
- Crowley, Lara M., *Manuscript Matters: Reading John Donne's Poetry and Prose in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- Daniels, Edgar, 'Browne's TO THE DECEASED AUTHOR', *The Explicator*, 45 (1988), 19–20.
- Davidson, Peter, and Stevenson, Jane, 'Elizabeth I's Reception at Bisham (1592): Elite Women as Writers and Devisers', in *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, ed. by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 207–26.
- DiPasquale, Teresa M., 'Ambivalent Mourning in "Since she whom I lov'd"', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 183–95.
- DiTraglia, W. E., 'Out of this transitory life': death, commemoration and the heraldic funeral in Tudor and Stuart Cheshire and Lancashire' (Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 2005).
- Dobranski, Stephen B., *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Doebler, Bettie Anne, *The Quickening Seed: Death in the Sermons of John Donne* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1974).
- Duggan, Mona, *Ormskirk: A History* (Stroud: The History Press, 2007).
- Eckhardt, Joshua, *Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Eckhardt, Joshua, and Smith, Daniel Starza eds., *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).
- Edwards, Francis, *Plots and Plotters in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002).
- Elimimian, Isaac Irabor, *A Study of Rhetorical Patterns in John Donne's Epicedes and Obsequies* (New York: Vantage Press, 1987).
- _____, 'The Dedicatory Letter as a Rhetorical Device: The Example of Donne', *Classical and Modern Literature*, 6 (1986), 127–36.

- Eliot, T. S. 'The Metaphysical Poets', in *Seventeenth Century English Poetry: Modern Essays in Criticism*, ed. by William R. Keast (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 22–30.
- Erne, Lukas, 'Newly Discovered Adaptations of Poems by John Donne, Printed in 1662', *RES*, 67 (2015), 679–712.
- Ezell, Margaret J. M., *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).
- Faith, Melanie, 'Correcting the Date of the Conceited Newes', *N&Q*, 53 (2006), 505–08.
- Fallon, Robert Thomas, 'Donne's "Strange Fire" and the "Elegies on the Authors Death"', *JDJ*, 7 (1988), 197–212.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne, and McCullough, Peter eds., 'Revisiting the study of the English sermon', in *The English sermon revised: Religion, literature and history 1600–1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 2–21.
- Fincham, Kenneth, 'The roles and influence of household chaplains, c.1600–c.1660', in *Chaplains in early modern England: Patronage, literature and religion*, ed. By Hugh Adlington, Tom Lockwood and Gillian Wright (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 11–35.
- Finkelpearl, Philip J., *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).
- Flynn, Dennis, 'Donne's Wedding and the Pyrford Years', *Handbook*, pp. 471–81.
- *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).
- 'John Donne in the Ellesmere Manuscripts', *HLQ*, 46 (1983), 333–36.
- Flynn, Dennis, Hester, M. Thomas, and Maurer, Margaret, 'Goodere at Court, 1603–1610: The Early Jacobean Decline of a Catholic Sympathiser and its Bearing on Donne's Letters', *JDJ*, 31 (2012), 61–98.
- "'Only in Obedience" to Whom? – The Identity of a Donne Correspondent', *LC*, 6 (2009), 424–32.
- Fox, R. A. (1971). "Donne's Anniversaries and the Art of Living." *ELH* 38: 528-541.
- Frost, Kate Gartner, "'Preparing towards her": Contexts of *A Nocturnall upon S. Lucies Day*', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 149–71.
- Fuss, Diana, *Dying Modern: a meditation on elegy* (Duke University Press, 2013).

- Gardner, Helen, 'Dean Donne's Monument in St Paul's', in *Evidence in Literary Scholarship: Essays in Memory of James Marshall Osborn*, ed. by R. Wellek and A. Riberio (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 29–44.
- Gelpke, Karl A., *ESTEYS of England And America* (1970).
- Gibbons, Zoe, 'Vicissitude of Years: Temporal Experience in Donne's Anniversaries', *Studies in Philology*, 116 (2019), 101–123.
- Gilman, Ernest B., *The Curious Perspective: Literary and Pictorial Wit in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1978).
- Gittings, Clare, *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England* (Croom Helm, 1984).
- Goodwin, Gordon, and Larminie, Vivienne, 'Jackson, Abraham (1588/9–1646?)', *ODNB* (2004).
- Gottlieb, Sidney, 'Elegies Upon the Author: Defining, Defending, and Surviving Donne', *JDJ*, 2 (1983), 22–38.
- Gray, Dave, and Shami, Jeanne, 'Political Advice in Donne's *Devotions*: No Man is an Island', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 50 (1989), 337–56.
- Green, Charles, "'Now the Lord hath made me a spectacle": Deathbed Narratives and Devotional Identities in the Early Seventeenth Century', in *People and Piety: Devotional Identities and Religious Writing in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Elizabeth Clarke and Robert W. Daniel (Manchester: Manchester University Press, forthcoming).
- Goldring, Elizabeth, "'So iust a sorrowe so well expressed": Henry, Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration', in *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, ed. by Timothy Wilks (Southampton Solent University in association with Paul Holberton publishing, 2007), pp. 280–95.
- Guibbory, Achsah, 'Donne's Religion: Montagu, Arminianism and Donne's Sermons, 1624–1630', *ELR*, 31 (2001), 412–39.
- 'Fear of "loving more": Death and the Loss of Sacramental Love', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 204–27.
- Guillory, John, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (University of Chicago Press, 1993).
- Guss, Donald L., *John Donne, Petrarchist: Italianate Conceits and Love Theory in The Songs and Sonets* (Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1966).
- Halli, Robert W. Jr, 'Cecilia Bulstrode, "The Court Pucell"', in *Subjects on the World's Stage: Essays on British Literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. by

- David G. Allen and Robert J. White (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1995), pp. 295–312.
- Hamilton, George, *A History of the House of Hamilton* (Edinburgh: J. Skinner & Co., Ltd., 1933).
- Hammer, Paul, *Elizabeth's Wars: War, Government and Society in Tudor England, 1544–1604* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 2003).
- Hardison, O. B., *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1962).
- Healy, Simon, 'Harington, John, Second Baron Harington of Exton (1592–1614)', *ODNB* (2004).
- Haskin, Dayton, 'Donne's Afterlife', in *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne*, ed. by Achsah Guibbory (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 233–46.
- _____, *John Donne in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Healy, Simon, 'Donne, the Patriot Cause, and War, 1620–1629', *Handbook*, pp. 616–31.
- Heijting, Willem, and Sellin, Paul R., 'John Donne's "Conclave Ignati": The Continental Quarto and Its Printing', *HLQ*, 62 (1999).
- Herz, Judith, 'Under the Sign of Donne', *Criticism*, 43 (2001), 29–58.
- Hester, M. Thomas, 'Donne's Epigrams: A Little World Made Cunningly', in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 80–91.
- _____, '"Fæminæ lectissimæ": Reading Anne Donne', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 17–34.
- _____, *Kinde Pitty and Brave Scorn: John Donne's "Satyres"* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1982).
- _____, '"miserrimum dictu": Donne's Epitaph for His Wife', *JEGP*, 94 (1995), 513–29.
- Hobbs, Mary, *Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992).
- _____, ed., *The Stoughton Manuscript: A Manuscript Miscellany of Poems by Henry King and his Circle, circa 1636* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990).
- Houlbrooke, Ralph, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480–1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

- Hunt, Arnold, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- _____ ‘The English Nation in 1631’, *Handbook*, pp. 632–45.
- Hunter, William B., ‘An Occasion for John Donne’s “The Lamentations of Jeremy”’, *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes and Reviews* 12 (1999), 18–23.
- Hurley, Ann, ‘Colliding Discourses: John Donne’s “Obsequies to the Lord Harington” and the New Historicism’, *Renaissance and Reformation*, 18 (1994), 57–76.
- Kelliher, Hilton, ‘Donne, Jonson, Richard Andrews and the Newcastle Manuscript’, in *EMS*, 4 (1993), 134–173.
- Kathman, David, ‘Stanley, Ferdinando, fifth earl of Derby (1559?–1594)’, *ODNB* (2013).
- Kay, Dennis, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
- Kennedy, David, *Elegy* (London: Routledge, 2007).
- Keynes, Geoffrey, *A Bibliography of Dr John Donne, Dean of Saint Paul’s*, 3rd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958).
- _____ ‘A Footnote on Donne’, *The Book Collector*, xxii (1973), Summer, pp. 165–168.
- Klaus, John, ‘The Two Occasions of Donne’s “Lamentations of Jeremy”’, *SP* 90 (1993), 337–59.
- Knafla, Louis A., ‘Mr Secretary Donne: The Years with Sir Thomas Egerton’, *Professional Lives*, pp. 37–71.
- _____ ‘Spencer [married names Stanley, Egerton], Alice, countess of Derby (1559–1637)’, *ODNB* (2008).
- Kneidel, Gregory, ‘Ars Prædicandi: Theories and Practice’, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 3–18.
- Kuin, Roger, ‘Hieroglyphics of Nobility: The Banners in Sir Philip Sidney’s Funeral Procession’, *Sidney Journal*, 33 (2015), 1–25.
- Lander, Jesse, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print, and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- La Torre, Lauren, ‘Dar La Luz: Illuminating John Donne’s “A nocturnall upon S. Lucies day, Being the shortest day.”’, *JDJ*, 27 (2008) 103–120.
- Larson, Deborah Aldrich, ‘Donne’s Contemporary Reputation: Evidence from Some Commonplace Books and Manuscript Miscellanies’, *JDJ*, 12 (1993), 115–130.

- Lawson, Lesley, *Out of the Shadows: The Life of Lucy, Countess of Bedford* (Hambledon Continuum, 2007).
- Lebans, W. M., 'The Influence of the Classics in Donne's Epicedes and Obsequies', *RES*, 23 (1972), 127–37.
- Lee, Jongsook, 'Who Is Cecilia, What Was She? Cecilia Bulstrode and Jonson's Epideictics', *JEGP*, 85 (1986), 20–34.
- Lee, Sidney, and McGinley, J. K., 'Quin, Walter (c1575–1641)', *ODNB* (2004).
- Lein, Clayton D., Donne: The Final Period', *Handbook*, pp. 601–15.
- _____, 'Revisiting the Records: Donne at St. Dunstan's', *JDJ*, 31 (2012), 1–60.
- Leishman, J. B., *The Monarch of Wit: An Analytical and Comparative Study of the Poetry of John Donne* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1951).
- Levine, Jay, "'The Dissolution': Donne's Twofold Elegy", *ELH*, 28 (1961), 301–15.
- Lewalski, Barbara K., *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: the Creation of a Symbolic Mode* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).
- _____, 'Lucy, Countess of Bedford: Images of a Jacobean Courtier and Patroness', in *The Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 52–77.
- Love, Harold, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- _____, 'The Argument of Donne's *First Anniversary*', *MP*, 64 (1966).
- Lutz, Tom, *Crying: A Natural and Cultural History of Tears* (W. W. Norton, 1999).
- Lyon, John, 'Jonson and Carew on Donne: Censure into Praise', *The English Renaissance*, 37 (1997), 97–118.
- MacColl, Alan, 'The Circulation of Donne's Poems in Manuscript', in *John Donne: Essays in Celebration*, ed. A. J. Smith (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1972), pp. 28–46.
- Mahony, Patrick, "'The Anniversaries': Donne's Rhetorical Approach to Evil", *JEGP*, 68 (1969), 407–13.
- Malpezzi, Frances M., 'Love's Liquidity in "Since she whom I lov'd"', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry*, ed. by M. Thomas Hester (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 197–203.

- Manley, Lawrence, and Maclean, Sally-Beth, *Lord Strange's Men and Their Plays* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).
- Mann, Lindsay, 'The Typology of Woman in Donne's "Anniversaries"', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 11 (1987), 337–50.
- Marcus, Leah, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (Routledge, 1996).
- Marotti, Arthur F., "'Rolling Archetypes': Christ Church, Oxford Poetry Collections, and the Proliferation of Manuscript Verse Anthologies in Caroline England", *ELR*, 44 (2014), 486–523.
- _____, 'John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility (Book Review)', *JEGP*, 96 (1997), 610–12.
- _____, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, repr. ed. (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1986).
- _____, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Cornell University Press, 1995).
- Martin, Jessica, *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the Rise of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Martz, Louis, *The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954).
- Maurer, Margaret, 'Poetry and Scandal: John Donne's "Hymne to the Saynts and to the Marquesse Hamilton"', *John Donne Journal*, 26 (2007), 1–33.
- _____, Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford, and the Terms of John Donne's "Honour is So Sublime Perfection", *ELH*, 47 (1980), 205–234.
- May, Steven W., 'Donne and Egerton: the court and courtship', *Handbook*, pp. 447–59.
- May, Steven, 'Spenser's "Amyntas": Three Poems by Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, Fifth Earl of Derby', *MP*, 70 (1972), 49–52.
- McCarthy, Erin A., 'Poems, by J. D. (1635) and the Creation of John Donne's Literary Biography', *JDJ*, 32 (2013), 57–85.
- _____, 'Reading Women Reading Donne in Manuscript and Printed Miscellanies: A Quantitative Approach', *RES*, 69 (2018), 661–85.
- McCullough, Peter, 'Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626–1642', *Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), 401–24.
- _____, 'Preaching and Context: John Donne's Sermon and the Funerals of Sir William Cokayne', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 213–64.

- McGann, Jerome J., *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
- McKenzie, D. F., *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, repr. 1999).
- McMullan, Gordon, *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Meakin, H. L., *John Donne's Articulations of the Feminine* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- *The Painted Closet of Lady Ann Bacon Drury* (Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 2016; first publ. by Ashgate Publishing, 2013).
- Milgate, Wesley, 'The Early References to John Donne', *N&Q*, 195 (1950), 229–31, 246–47, 290–92, 381–83.
- Miller, Andrew H., 'Implicative Criticism, or the Display of Thinking', *New Literary History*, 44 (2013), 345–60.
- Milton, Anthony, 'New Horizons in the Early Jacobean Period', *Handbook*, pp. 483–94.
- Mitchell, Maria, 'Gender, Genre, and the Idea of John Donne in the *Anniversaries*', in *Donne and the Resources of Kind*, ed. by A. D. Cousins and Damian Grace (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2002), pp. 106–19.
- Morrissey, Mary, 'John Donne as Conventional Paul's Cross Preacher', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. by Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) pp. 159–78.
- Mueller, Janel, *John Donne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- Murphy, Avon Jack, 'The Critical Elegy of Earlier Seventeenth-Century England', *Genre* 5, (1972), 75–105.
- Nichols, Jennifer L. 'Dionysian Negative Theology in Donne's "A Nocturnall upon S. Lucies Day."', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 53 (2011) 352–67.
- Nichols, John, *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources*, III, eds. Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elizabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
- *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I: A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources*, IV, eds. Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elizabeth Archer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

- Nixon, Scott, Carew's Response to Jonson and Donne', *SEL*, 39 (1999), 89–109.
- Norbrook, David, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984).
- _____. "“This blushing tribute of a borrowed muse”: Robert Overton and his Overturning of the Poetic Canon', *EMS*, 4 (1993), 220–66.
- Novarr, David, *The Making of Walton's Lives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958).
- _____. *The Disinterred Muse: Donne's Texts and Contexts* (London: Cornell University Press, 1980).
- O'Callaghan, Michelle, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Ockenden, Michael, *Tower and Steeple: The Story of Ormskirk Parish Church* (Ashby: Ashby-de-la-Zouch Museum, 2002).
- Osborough, W. N., 'Barry, James, first Baron Barry of Santry (1603–73)', *ODNB* (2004).
- Parker, Michael P., 'Diamond's Dust: Carew, King, and the Legacy of Donne', in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 191–200.
- Pask, Kevin, *The emergence of the English author: Scripting the life of the poet in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Pebworth, Ted-Larry, 'John Donne's 'Lamentations' and Christopher Fetherstone's *Lamentations* (1587)', in *Wrestling with God: Literature and Theology in the English Renaissance*, ed. by Mary Ellen Henley and W. Speed Hill (Vancouver, B. C.: n.p., 2001), 85–98.
- _____. "“Let Me Here Use That Freedom”: Subversive Representation in John Donne's "Obsequies to the Lord Harington"', *JEGP*, 91 (1992), 17–42.
- Pebworth, Ted-Larry, and Summers, Claude J., 'Contexts and Strategies: Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry', *JDJ*, 19 (2000), 205–22.
- Peterson, Richard S., 'New Evidence on Donne's Monument: I', *JDJ*, 20 (2001), 1–51.
- Phillippy, Patricia, *Shaping Remembrance from Shakespeare to Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- Pigman, G. W., *Grief and Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- _____. 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance', *RQ*, 33 (1980), 1–32.

- Pilarz, Scott, R., *Robert Southwell and the Mission of Literature, 1561–1595: Writing Reconciliation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
- Pollnitz, Aysha, 'Humanism and Education', in *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England*, ed. by Timothy Wilks (Southampton Solent University in association with Paul Holberton publishing, 2007), pp. 22–64.
- Pollock, John L., 'A Note on Donne's 'Elegie on the L. C.', *Notes and Queries*, 21 (1974), 92–93.
- Pomerazew, Igor, 'Gespräch mit Joseph Brodsky über John Donne', *Sinn und Form*, 63 (2011), 782–86.
- Ponomareff, Constantin V., *One Less Hope: Essays on Twentieth Century Russian Poets* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodolphi, 2006).
- Post, Jonathan F. S., 'Reading Donne: A Sentimental Journey', in *John Donne and Contemporary Poetry*, ed. by Judith Scherer Herz (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 61–73.
- Preston, Claire, *Thomas Browne and the Writing of Early Modern Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Prestwich, Menna, *Cranfield: Politics and Profits Under the Early Stuarts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).
- Pritchard, Allan, 'Donne's Mr. Tilman', *RES*, 24 (1973), 38–42.
- Reed, John Curtis, 'Humphrey Moseley, Publisher', *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings & Papers*, 2 (1927–30), 57–142.
- Rhatigan, Emma, 'Donne's readership at Lincoln's Inn and the Doncaster embassy', *Handbook*, pp. 576–88.
- '“The sinful history of mine own youth”: John Donne preaches at Lincoln's Inn', in *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, ed. by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), pp. 90–106.
- Riggs, David, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989).
- Rivers, Bryan, '“Faeminae Lectissimae Dilectissimaeque”: John Donne's Epitaph on his Wife, and the Elizabethan *Homily of the State of Matrimony*', *N&Q*, 59 (2012), 94–96.
- Roebuck, Graham, 'Elegies for Donne: Great Tew and the Poets', *JDJ*, 9 (1990), 125–35.
- 'The anniversary poem', *Handbook*, pp. 273–84.
- 'From Donne to Great Tew', *JDJ*, 32 (2013), 25–54.

- Roston, Murray, 'Donne and the Meditative Tradition', *Religion & Literature*, 37 (2005), 45–68.
- Royan, Nicola, 'Barclay, John (1582–1621)', *ODNB* (2008).
- Rundell, Katherine, "'And I am re-begot': The textual afterlives of John Donne' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2016).
- Sacks, Peter, *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985).
- Salzman, Paul, *Literary Culture in Jacobean England: Reading 1621* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
- Sampson, John, 'A Contemporary Light upon John Donne' in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, vol. 7 (1921), pp. 82–107.
- Sánchez, Reuben, *Typology and Iconography in Donne, Herbert, and Milton: Fashioning the Self After Jeremiah* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
- Saunders, Benjamin, *Desiring Donne: Poetry, Sexuality, Interpretation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Saunders, J. W., 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', *Essays in Criticism* 1 (1951), 139–164.
- Scodel, Joshua, *The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1991).
- Shami, Jeanne, 'Donne's Decision to Take Orders', *Handbook*, pp. 523–36.
- _____, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2003).
- _____, 'The Cultural Significance of Donne's Sermons', *LC*, 4 (2007), 433–42.
- Shami, Jeanne, Dennis Flynn and M. Thomas Hester eds., *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Shapiro, I. A., 'The Date of a Donne Elegy, and its Implications', in *English Renaissance Studies: Presented to Dame Helen Gardner in honour of her Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John Carey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 141–50.
- Sherwood, Terry G., 'Reason, Faith, and Just Augustinian Lamentation in Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry', *SEL*, 13 (1973), 53 – 67.
- Slater, Victor, 'Herbert, William, third earl of Pembroke, (1580–1630)', *ODNB* (2004).

- Smith, A. J., 'Donne's Reputation', in *John Donne: Essays in Celebration*, ed. A. J. Smith (Methuen), pp. 1–27.
- _____, ed., *John Donne: The Critical Heritage*, 2 vols, (London: Routledge, 1983).
- Smith, Daniel Starza, 'Busy Young Fool, Unruly Son? New Light on John Donne Junior', *RES*, 62 (2010), 538–561.
- _____, *John Donne and the Conway Papers: Patronage and Manuscript Circulation in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
- Smith, Daniel Starza, Payne, Matthew and Marshall, Melanie, 'Rediscovering John Donne's *Catalogus librorum satyricus*', *RES*, 69 (2018), 455–487.
- _____, 'The Poems of Sir Henry Goodere: A Diplomatic Edition', *JDJ*, 31 (2012), 99–164.
- Smuts, R. Malcolm, 'Kynaston, Sir Francis (1586/6–1642)', *ODNB* (2004).
- Snyder, Susan, 'Sylvester, Joshua (1562/3–1618)', *ODNB* (2004).
- Sommerville, Johann P., 'John Donne the Controversialist: The Poet as Political Thinker', *Professional Lives*, pp. 73–95.
- Sparrow, John, 'Two Epitaphs by John Donne', *TLS*, 208 (1949).
- Stein, Arnold, 'Handling Death: John Donne in Public Meditation', *ELH*, 48 (1981), 496–515.
- Stevenson, David, 'Hamilton, James, second marquess of Hamilton (1589–1625)', *ODNB* (2015).
- Stirling, Kirsten, 'Liturgical Poetry', *Handbook*, pp. 233–41.
- Stringer, Gary, 'Editing Donne's Poetry: From John Marriot to the Donne Variorum', *Handbook*, pp. 43–55.
- Strong, Roy, *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (Pimlico, 1986).
- Stubbs, John, *Donne: The Reformed Soul* (Penguin, 2007).
- Sugg, Richard, 'Donne and the Uses of Anatomy', *LC*, 1 (2004), 1–13.
- Sullivan, Erin, *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).
- Sullivan, Ernest W., 'Donne's Epithalamium for Anne', in *John Donne's "desire of more": The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry*, ed. by M. Thomas Hester (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1996), pp. 35–38.
- _____, *The Influence of John Donne: His Uncollected Seventeenth-Century Printed Verse* (University of Missouri Press, 1993).

- Summers, Claude J., 'Donne's 1609 Sequence of Grief and Comfort', *SP*, 89 (1992), 211–231.
- _____, 'W[illiam] S[hakespeare]'s A Funeral Elegy and the Donnean Moment', *EMLS*, 7 (2001), 1–22.
- _____, 'The epicede and obsequy', *Handbook*, pp. 286–97.
- Targoff, Ramie, 'Poets in Print: The Case of Herbert's *Temple*', *Word & Image*, 17 (2001), 140–52.
- Taylor, Craig, *Joan of Arc: La Pucelle* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
- Taylor, Edward, *Donne's Idea of a Woman: Structure and Meaning in "The Anniversaries"* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991).
- Venn, John, and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A bibliographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900*, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922).
- Vickers, Brian, *Counterfeiting Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's Funerall Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Wallerstein, Ruth, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950).
- Walls, Kathryn, 'Elizabeth Drury as "druery" in John Donne's "A Funeral Elegy"', *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes, and Reviews*, 31 (2018), 73–75.
- Webber, Joan, *Contrary Music: The Prose Style of John Donne* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963).
- Weitzmann, Francis White, 'Notes on the Elizabethan Elegie', *PMLA*, 50 (1939), 435–43.
- White, J. P., *The Salt Hour* (Urbana and Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 2001).
- Whitlock, Baird W., 'Donne at St. Dunstan's—I', *The Times Literary Supplement*, 16 September 1955, p. 548.
- _____, 'Donne at St. Dunstan's—II', *The Times Literary Supplement*, 23 September 1955, p. 564.
- Wilcox, Helen, *1611: Authority, Gender and the Word in Early Modern England* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2014).
- Williamson, J. W., *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, A Study of 17th Century Personation* (New York: AMS Press, 1978).

- Willson, Anthony Beckles, *The Church of St Mary the Virgin Twickenham, The Memorials and Ledgerstones* (St Mary's Church, Twickenham, 2015).
- Wilson, E. C., *Prince Henry and English Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1946).
- Wilson, F. P., *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).
- Winner, Jack D., 'Ben Jonson's *Epigrammes* and the Conventions of Formal Verse Satire', *SEL*, 23 (1983), 61-76.
- Winny, James, *A Preface to Donne* (Routledge, 2014).
- Woodward, Jennifer, *The Theatre of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England 1570–1625* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997).
- Woudhuysen, H. R., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1559–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
- Wright, Gillian, 'A commentary on and edition of the shorter poems of William Browne of Tavistock in British Library MS Lansdowne 777' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow, 1998).
- Wright, Stephen, 'Draxe, Thomas (d.1618/19)', *ODNB* (2004).
- _____ 'Estye, George (1560/61–1601)', *ODNB* (2008).
- Yoklavich, John, 'Donne and the Countess of Huntington', *Philological Quarterly*, 43 (1964), 282–88.
- Young, R. V., 'The Elegy', *Handbook*, pp. 134–48.
- _____ 'The religious sonnet', *Handbook*, pp. 218–32.