John Donne Journal
Vol. 18 (1999)

Menippean Satire and Competing Prose Styles in *Ignatius His Conclave*

Reuben Sanchez

In the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, King James issued the Oath of Allegiance (May 1606), which was intended to ensure the loyalty of English Catholics to the crown. While some English Catholics did take the Oath, others, at the direction of Pope Paul V, refused. Of the various responses for and against the Oath, Donne weighs in with *Pseudo Martyr* (1609), in which he argues that taking the Oath would not violate the faith of English Catholics, that refusal to take the Oath could be considered treasonous and could result in execution, and that death under those circumstances would not be martyrdom, but suicide. T.S. Healy locates Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* (written in late 1610 and published in 1611) specifically in the context of the controversy surrounding the Oath of Allegiance.[1] Healy is right about Donne's tract being a satire on the Jesuits and on Ignatius Loyola in particular, but any anti-Catholic sentiment Donne expresses at this time might be considered a defense of the Oath; after all, he has already converted to Anglicanism, and it is during this period that he has taken steps to gain royal favor, as is evidenced by *Pseudo-Martyr*. While one can locate *Ignatius His Conclave* in the general political-theological context of the Oath of Allegiance, then, one can also locate it in a specific context, this one stylistic, involving the competing prose styles of the time.

Indeed, the *type* of satire Donne chooses to write reveals much about his reasons for writing *Ignatius His Conclave* in the first place. Eugene Korkowski has argued persuasively that Donne's tract is a Menippean satire.[2] According to M.H. Abrams, Menippean satires

> are written in prose—though often with interpolated passages of verse—and constitute a miscellaneous form often held together by a loosely constructed narrative. Their major feature, however, is a series of extended dialogues and debates (often conducted at a banquet or party) in which a group of loquacious eccentrics, pedants, literary people, and representatives of various professions or philosophical points of view serve to make ludicrous the attitudes and viewpoints they typify by the arguments they argue in their support.[3]

Although dialogue is the defining characteristic of this type, characterization itself is usually weak, which Northrop Frye attributes to the satirist's subordination of characterization to intellectuality: "The Menippean satire deals less with people as such than with mental attitudes.... The Menippean satire thus resembles the confession in its ability to handle abstract ideas and theories, and differs from the novel in its characterization, which is stylized rather than naturalistic, and presents people as mouthpieces of the ideas they represent."[4] Dialogue is important in this type of satire, but the speakers tend to sound alike; one distinguishes between the speakers by the positions they represent, that is, by their "mental attitudes."

The characteristics of Menippean satire outlined above are found in *Ignatius His Conclave,* where there is much dialogue but little characterization. While several speakers are of minor importance, serving only to further the anti-Jesuit satire, the major characters—Ignatius, Machiavelli, and Lucifer—are cut from the same linguistic mold in that when they speak, they often sound like each other. However, there is another major character to consider in this satire: the narrator, who witnesses the action he describes although he does not participate in it, and whose voice is distinguishable from the other three major characters. Since Ignatius is the character given the most attention, his voice serves as a clear contrast with that of the narrator. Those two voices—or prose styles, as I will describe them—are the Senecan, or anti-Ciceronian, style of the narrator, and the Ciceronian style of Ignatius. By analyzing the voice of the narrator and the voice of Ignatius, we can see that Donne is highlighting the two competing prose styles prevalent

in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century England. But because those two voices are part of a Menippean satire, it becomes difficult, perhaps impossible, to tell which style is to be preferred.

R. V. Young and M. Thomas Hester trace the beginnings of the anti-Ceronian movement to Plato's *Gorgias,* where Plato calls into question "the moral and intellectual integrity of verbal skill—the ability to manipulate an audience with words, which so often seem divorced from concrete knowledge or moral aims. What in the sixteenth century is called anti-Ciceronianism is, in the final analysis, a rhetorical response to a philosophical dilemma."[5] There was a perceived separation, then, between rhetoric and philosophy, which Cicero himself tried to reconcile while defending his own oratorical style from criticism by proponents of the Attic, or plain, style. The reaction against Cicero in the sixteenth century was marked by Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* (1528), in which the criticism of Ciceronianism was based on two points: first, although religion is not Erasmus' main concern, it does become important since Ciceronianism was thought to represent paganism; second, Erasmus believed that Ciceronianism led to a violation of decorum in that people simply should not speak the way they did in Cicero's time.[6] Young and Hester point out that the very nature of public language changes dramatically during the Renaissance: "Important decisions were no longer made in the open forum under the sway of eloquent speakers, but rather in the private chambers of rulers and their ministers. The result was a diminution of oratory with a concomitant revaluation of the significance of the letter. ."[7] Anti-Ciceronianism seemed apropos to the "crucial developments in the social and intellectual history of the later Renaissance."[8] A text like Lipsius' *Epistolica Institutio* therefore became a significant manifesto for proponents of the anti-Ciceronian style in the seventeenth-century.

In her book on Donne's prose style, *Contrary Music,* Joan Webber explains how the competing styles would be viewed in Donne's time:

> Of the two main classic styles, Attic and Asiatic (called in the Renaissance, Senecan and Ciceronian), the one is theoretically concerned with the working out of ideas and feelings and the

> other with a beautiful rendition of them; the one is perhaps primarily concerned to record the movement of thought and emotion and the other to express thoughts fully formed, or even, especially when influenced by Platonism, to symbolize the eternal Ideas. The Renaissance Senecans abandoned the highly wrought, logical, periodic Ciceronian sentence—the vehicle of one who knows what he is going to say before he begins—and adopted the loose and curt styles in which persuasion was less important than meditation. They abandoned decorative figures of speech, which they considered useless, and adopted the thought figure.[9]

Webber acknowledges that "if we define Ciceronianism as its Renaissance opponents did, as a style which prohibits thought and proliferates frivolous adornment, then Donne is not in the least Ciceronian."[10] She adds, however, that Donne did not completely abandon the Ciceronian style, but recognized and appreciated its usefulness (especially, I might add, in a tract strongly dependent on dialogue). "Donne has a great appreciation of the thunderous force that a Ciceronian period could achieve," states Webber. "In an age when rhetorical battlelines seemed to be sharply drawn, any good writer . . . could get the best of both worlds."[11] Indeed, in *Ignatius His Conclave* Donne uses both competing styles of the day, the Ciceronian and the Senecan, in an effort to broaden the satire ostensibly directed at the Jesuits.[12]

****

Donne's narrator presents himself as special, somehow singled out by destiny: "But my destiny favoured mee so much, that I was present then, and saw all the pretenders."[13] Such status apparently allows him to claim special knowledge, to claim omniscience in terms of knowing the thoughts of others: "But when he [Machiavelli] thought better upon it . . . he determined to direct his speech to Ignatius . . . as to make *Lucifer* suspect, that by these honors & specious titles offered to Ignatius, and entertained by him, his owne dignity might bee eclipsed, or clouded" (p. 25). Not only is the narrator privy to Machiavelli's scheming, but

he can also read Lucifer's mind: "Therefore *Lucifer* thought it time for him to enter into the businesse, least at last Ignatius should prescribe therein" (p. 71). Indeed, the narrator later declares that he can know the thoughts of all those whom he observes: "All this discourse, I, beeing growne cunninger than that Doctor . . . that by onely motion of their lippes, without any utterance, understood all men, perceived and read in every mans countenance there" (p. 93). Yet at other times the narrator seems naive and uninformed, as though he were just another character in the story. For example, while he can read the thoughts of others, he does not seem to know the outcome of the story he is describing, and he worries that, his soul having left his body and venturing into hell to witness this scene, something might befall his body. But his curiosity gets the best of him because he chooses to remain in Hell to find out how the scene he is witnessing will turn out: "yet I was loath to leave the stage, till I saw the play ended"(p. 63). Of course, Donne does not characterize the narrator in a naturalistic manner. Nor can we consider the narrator a reliable source of authority because at times he sounds like a third-person narrator, at other times like a first-person narrator.

The narrator's manner of speaking is not smooth and polished, like Ignatius' Ciceronian style. Rather, the narrator speaks in the Senecan, or anti-Ciceronian, style, an important characteristic of which is the use of the curt period. Morris Croll defines the curt period as a series of brief and abrupt clauses.[14] Though the curt period avoids coordinating conjunctions, when they are used they tend to lack a "logical *plus* force," instead merely connecting "two efforts of the imagination to realize the same idea; two as-it-were synchronous statements of it."[15] Generally, semicolons and colons are found in curt periods. The length of each clause varies, with each clause containing a different subject to show how the mind shifts as it conceives and elaborates an idea. We may see an example of the curt period in the following observation by the narrator, in which he reveals that he believes the Jesuits can perform miracles:

> Truely I thought this Oration *of Ignatius* very long: and I began to thinke of my body which I had so long abandoned, least it

> should putrifie, or grow mouldy, or bee buried; yet I was loath to leave the stage, till I saw the play ended: And I was in hope, that if any such thing should befall my body, the Jesuits, who work *Miracles* so familiarly & whose reputation I was so careful of in this matter, would take compassion upon me, and restore me againe. (p. 63)

Donne uses two colons and one semicolon to divide the period into four main sections, the concerns of which are the following: 1) I thought this oration very long; 2) I began to worry about my body; 3) I did not yet want to leave; 4) I hoped the Jesuits would perform a miracle if something happened to my body. The period has four different, though related, subjects—the subject of the fourth clause an expansion of the second, as if the speaker's mind returns to and expands upon an earlier idea. The coordinating conjunction "and" lacks a "logical *plus* force" in this period: "and I began to thinke . . . And I was in hope." The "and" does not coordinate with, add to, or expand upon the clause that precedes it, but rather functions as a device with which the narrator gets himself, excitedly it seems, into the next clause and subject; it serves, that is, merely to tack on a thought.

As noted earlier, Webber argues that while Donne's prose style is often Senecan—in the Sermons, for example—the Ciceronian characteristic of circularity could prove especially useful at times.'[16] Although the narrator's style in *Ignatius His Conclave* is predominantly Senecan, certain of his observations possess the circularity of the Ciceronian period:

> By this I knew it was *Copernicus:* For though I had never heard ill of his life, and therefore might wonder to find him there; yet when I remembered, that the *Papists* have extended the name, & punishment of Heresie, almost to every thing, and that as yet I used *Gregories* and *Bedes* spectacles, by which one saw *Origen,* who deserved so well of the *Christian Church, burning in Hell,* I doubted no longer, but assured my selfe that it was *Copernicus* which I saw. (p. 13)

The first, second, and third clauses are concerned with Copernicus, but the clause beginning "yet when I remembered" moves away from the subject. Beginning with the fourth clause a series of spontaneous thoughts results in shifting emphases on different subjects, far removed from Copernicus. Yet the end of the period returns to the subject with which it began: "it was *Copernicus* which I saw." The beginning and end of the period suggest Ciceronian circularity and predictability, but the shifting emphases within the period suggests Senecan spontaneity and unpredictability.

There are other instances where the narrator's spontaneity is conveyed, not specifically through the circular period, but through periods that seem more loose than curt. The terms "loose" and "curt" denote particular *types* of the Senecan style. According to Croll, the loose style, unlike the curt, uses conjunctions for longer sentences, and always contains at least one clause with an absolute participle construction that helps reveal how the mind works, how it moves, sometimes roughly, from thought to thought. We may see an example of the loose style in this observation by the narrator:

> Casting therefore his [Lucifer's] eyes into every corner, at last a great way off, hee spied *Philip Nerius:* who acknowledging in his owne particular no especiall merit towardes his kingdome, forebore to presse neere the gate; But *Lucifer* called to his remembrance, that *Nerius* and all that *Order,* of which hee was the Author, which is called *congregatio Oratorii,* were erected, advaunced, and dignifyed by the *Pope,* principally to this end, that, by their incessant Sermons to the people, of the lives of *Saints* and other *Ecclesiastique Antiquities,* they might get a new reputation, and so the torrent, and generall supersitition towards the Jesuits, might grow a little remisser, and lukewarme: for at that time the Pope himselfe beganne to bee afraid of the Jesuites, for they begunne to publish their *Paradox of Confession and absolution to bee given by letters, and Messengers,* and by that meanes to draw the secrets of all Princes onely to themselves; And they had tried and sollicited a great *Mon-*

> *arch,* who hath manie designes upon *Italy,* against the *Pope,* & delivered to that prince diverse articles, for the reforming of him. (pp. 71- 73; even numbered pages show the Latin text in Healy's bilingual edition)

Although the clauses beginning "Casting therefore" and "who acknowledging in his owne" are conditional participle constructions rather than absolute participle constructions, they nonetheless disrupt—in this instance, delay—the development of the period. The several conjunctions have a logical plus force in that they link clauses together, although the clauses have their own emphases. The opening clause, "But *Lucifer* called to his remembrance," shifts emphasis to Lucifer's thoughts on the activities of Nerius and his Order. The clause beginning "for at that time" shifts emphasis to the Pope's fear of the Jesuits, while the clause beginning "And they had tried" shifts to the Jesuits' attempt to solicit "a great *Monarch.*"

While the narrator's speech is spontaneous rather than oratorical, Ignatius' speech is Ciceronian, and therefore oratorical. George Williamson describes "The circular or cumlative period" as attaining "the height of artistic coherence by employing all of the formal supports of prose—rounded form, balance, cadence Thus the circular pattern, accumulating both rhythm and sense, gives us the cumulative Ciceronian period."[17] Ignatius uses this Ciceronian balance in different ways, with different effects. Most often, his tendency to repeat a single word or phrase simply emphasizes a point: "'there have bene some few of them . . . have troubled the peace of some states, and beene injurious to some princes, and have beene admitted to some place in this kingdome . . .'" (p. 77). At other times, the repetition results in humor, which reflects both on Ignatius and the Ciceronian style: "'Let your *Greatnesse* write; let the *Pope* execute your counsell; let the *Moone* approach when you two think fit. In the meane time let me use this Chamber, as a resting place . . .'" (p. 89). Still at other times, repetition results, not in the disruption of syntax, but in a smoothly presented, dramatic delay of the main thought, as when Ignatius addresses Columbus:

> 'Except we when wee toke away their old Idolatrie, had recompenced them with a new one of ours; except we had obtruded to those ignorant and barbarous people sometimes natural things, sometimes artificiall, and counterfeit, in steed of *Miracles;* & except we had ben alwaies ready to convey, & to apply this *medicine* made of this pretious *American* dung, unto the Princes of *Europe,* & their Lords, & *Counsellours,* the profite by the onely discovery of these places (which must of necessity bee referred to fortune) would have beene very little; yet I praise your perseverance, and your patience; which (since that seemes to be your principall vertue) you shall have good occasion to exercise heere, when you remaine in a lower and remoter place, then you thinke belongs to your merits.' (p. 69)

The repetition "Except we" sets up a pattern, a rhythm, that leads to the main thought—"the profite . . . would have beene very little." The repetition in sound—your perseverance / your patience / your principall—sets up a rhythm in sound. Since the first clause ends with the idea that the Jesuits are responsible for "the profite," Ignatius can, in the clause beginning "yet I praise your perseverance," establish a cadence that builds to a grand, oratorical dismissal of Columbus.[18]

The reason Machiavelli poses a special problem for Ignatius is because he, too, is capable of oratorical speech deemed successful in that Lucifer seems persuaded by it. As noted earlier, because characterization is weak in Menippean satire, speakers tend to sound alike; one distinguishes speakers from each other, therefore, by the positions, or "mental attitudes," they hold. Machiavelli does sound like Ignatius: "'Dread Emperour, and you, his watchful and diligent *Genius,* father *Ignatius, Arch-chancellor* of this *Court,* and highest *Priest* of this highest *Synagoge* . . . let me before I descend to my selfe, a little consider, speake, and admire your stupendious wisedom, and the government of this state'" (p. 25). In a parenthetical phrase, he goes so far as to refer to Lucifer and Ignatius as a "'noble paire of Emperours'" (p. 27). Machiavelli's praise of Ignatius seems boundless as he refers to him, again in a parenthetical phrase, as "'most Reverend *Bishop* of

this *Dioces, Ignatius*'" (p. 29). Having thus heaped praise upon praise, he ends with an extended period declaring why he should be invited to enter the "secret place," and by therefore distinguishing his position from Ignatius':

> 'But yet although the entrance into this place may be decreed to none, but to Innovators, and to onely such of them as have dealt in *Christian* businesse; and of them also, to those only which have had the fortune to doe much harme, I cannot see but that next to the Jesuites, I must bee invited to enter, since I did not onely teach those wayes, by which thorough *perfidiousness* and *dissembling of Religion,* a man might possesse, and usurpe upon the liberty of free *Commonwealths;* but also did arme and furnish the people with my instructions, how when they were under this oppression, they might safeliest conspire, and remove a *tyrant,* or revenge themselves of their *Prince,* and redeeme their former losses; so that from both sides, both from *Prince* and *People,* I brought an aboundant harvest, and a noble encrease to this kingdome.' (pp. 29-31)

Machiavelli's speech is an example of what Webber, in a passage quoted earlier, describes as "the highly wrought, logical, periodic Ciceronian sentence—the vehicle of one who knows what he is going to say before he begins." The first three clauses give the prerequisites for entering: "'But yet . . . and to onely such . . . and of them also.'" The fourth clause offers a conclusion as to his own fitness to enter, given those prerequisites: "'I cannot see but that next to the Jesuits, I must be invited to enter.'" The fifth and sixth clauses show how he has fulfilled the prerequisites: "since I did not onely teach those ways, by which thorough *perfidiousnesse* and *dissembling of Religion,* a man might possesse, and usurpe upon the liberty of free Commonwealths." The seventh clause shows how he exceeds the basic prerequisites: "'but also did arme and furnish the people with my instructions . . . their former losses.'" The eighth clause declares that he has shown the Prince how to hurt the people, and the people how to hurt the Prince: "'so that from both sides, both from *Princes* and *People,* I brought an aboundant

harvest, and a noble encrease to this kingdome."' The period is centered in that the main idea is delayed to the clause, "I must bee invited to enter"; but it is also circular in that the ending emphasizes why he must have entrance to this place. Machiavelli's period is carefully structured, and seems to persuade Lucifer, who is "much moved with this Oration" (p. 31). Indeed, the narrator intrudes at this point to let us know that Lucifer considers Machiavelli a counter-balance to Ignatius: "[H]e thoght *Machiavel* a fit and necessarie instrument to oppose against him . . ." (p. 31).

Aware of this successful oratory, Ignatius will not be outdone, and attempts to turn Machiavelli's flattery against him, while at the same time flattering Lucifer: "'Durst any man before him, thinke upon this kinde of injurie, and calumnie, as to hope that he should be able to flatter, to catch, to entrap *Lucifer* himselfe?'" (p. 33). If one is going to praise, one must do it supremely, contends Ignatius: "'Weake praising, is a kind of Accusing, and wee detract from a mans honour, if when wee praise him for small things, and would seeme to have said all, we conceale greater"' (p. 37). In his criticism of Machiavelli's oratory, Ignatius' oratory is characterized by assonance and alliteration: "'I know what his excuse and escape will be: that things must not be extended infinitely; that wee must consist and arrest somewhere, and that more meanes & instruments ought not to be admitted, where the matter may be dispatched by fewer"' (p. 47). The oratory is also characterized by balance within the period: "'that things must not be extended infinitely"' balances against "'that wee must consist and arrest somewhere."' The third "that" clause contains two parts that balance against one another: "'that more meanes & instruments ought not to be admitted, where the matter may be dispatched by fewer"'— "more" balancing against "fewer," "ought not" against "may be," "admitted" against "dispatched." This reliance on balance may be found elsewhere in Ignatius' speeches. But the careful structure of the Ciceronian period is characteristic of the speeches of the other "innovators" as well. Although it is difficult for us to distinguish linguistically between the oratory of Ignatius and that of Machiavelli— and Paracelsus, for that matter—it is telling that Lucifer determines that Ignatius poses the

greatest threat and must therefore be disposed of by being sent to the moon.

****

P.M. Oliver suggests that the voice of Ignatius remains distinct from the voice of the narrator, and that the two voices are consistent in Donne's satire, which makes *this* satire successful:

> The sharing of assumptions . . . is essential for the proper functioning of satire, and this is one of the reasons *Ignatius His Conclave* is successful as satire while Satire III is not. The ebb and flow of the poem generates too much uncertainty, while the prose work's more fixed viewpoint allows readers to laugh in the knowledge that their laughter will not rebound on them. They will not suddenly find themselves undermined by any moment of the textual sympathy with Loyola. Naturally the satire has distinct peaks . . . . But the narrative voice and the voice of Loyola (which is heard extensively) both remain recognisably stable.'[19]

The different prose styles Donne uses in *Ignatius His Conclave* do seem distinct enough to allow us to conclude that the narrator speaks primarily in the Senecan style while Ignatius speaks primarily in the Ciceronian style. As I have suggested, however, there is at least one instance when the narrator uses a Ciceronian characteristic within a Senecan structure. There is also another significant moment when these two styles do not seem stable. The two styles overlap when Ignatius hears Lucifer's proposal to establish a *"Lunatique Church"* on the moon. Judging from the narrator's description, Ignatius loses his Ciceronian calm, and begins speaking in Senecan fashion, which can be seen in an awkward transition from the narrator's discourse to his description of Ignatius' discourse:

> Ignatius had not the patience to stay till *Lucifer* had made an end; but as soone as hee saw him pause, and take breath, and looke, first upon his face, to observe what changes were there, and after

> to cast his eye to an other place in *Hell* where a great noyse was suddenly raysed: he apprehended this intermission, and as though *Lucifer* had ended, he said: 'That of *Luczfers* affection to the *Romane Church,* and to their *Order,* every day produced new Testimonies: and that this last was to be accounted as one of the greatest. That he knew well with how great devotion the Bishop of *Rome* did ever embrace and exectue all counsels proceeding from him: And that therefore . . . .' (pp. 81-83)

This pattern of speech continues for several more sentences. The proliferation of "that" clauses sounds more like the narrator than Ignatius, and the pronouns used suggest that the narrator, not Ignatius, speaks. There is no doubt, however, that a few sentences later (beginning with "'Why may not woemen instructed by us"' [p. 83]) Ignatius himself speaks. The "that" clauses are no longer tacked on, and from this point on the dialogue becomes contrived in the Ciceronian fashion. There is a point, then, where the narrator's voice and Ignatius' voice overlap as Donne makes the transition from one speaker (the narrator) to another (Ignatius). It will not do to suggest that Donne merely made the transition awkwardly. The transition is awkward, of course, and the narrator and Ignatius, for a moment, sound alike, but perhaps that is Donne's point.

It is difficult to distinguish characters from one another in Menippean satire, but it is even more difficult when we focus on the grammatical structure of individual English sentences that were probably translated from the Latin by Donne himself Webber suggests that in the Sermons, Donne often wants us to disregard, or at least not dwell upon, individual sentence structure. Rather, we are advised to concentrate on the distinction between the "period" and the "sentence," and on the overall conceptual unity of the paragraph and the sermon:

> Donne makes no consistent grammatical distinction between semicolon and comma, or among colon, semicolon, and period. But beyond this he does not even seem to think in terms of sentences; his units of organization are sermon division and paragraph. Croll's distinction between the sentence, which is defined by punctuation and syntax, and the rhetorical period,

> which is defined by completion of thought or satisfaction of emotion, must therefore be kept in mind during the course of this analysis, for when a choice must be made, it is the period, not the sentence, to which attention ought to be given; only in this way can we see the rhythm and architecture of Donne's style as he conceived it. Paragraph and period are apt to coincide even when several sentences occur within the paragraph; therefore, a single sentence may seem incomplete or disproportioned, when it is really part of a larger harmony.[20]

The overall structure takes precedence over the specific, syntactical components. Perhaps so, yet one can not ignore sentence structure since voice is conveyed through structure. In the case of *Ignatius His Conclave,* focusing on sentence structure makes it difficult to distinguish the voices from one another.

If Webber were right, we could shift our attention away from the confused voices of this Menippean satire to the "larger harmony," which would enable us to define that larger harmony as the distinction—the balance, therefore—between the mental attitudes, and between the prose styles through which those attitudes are expressed. Positions and battle lines would be rendered clear as regards mental attitudes and competing prose styles. Yet, the confusion of voices (and therefore the confusion of sentence structure) occurs by design; Donne wants two characters not only to clash but to seem indistinguishable from one another. In this reading, the narrator—both as character and as narrator—is unreliable, forcing the reader to turn to the author for guidance, which is what one must at times do when reading satire, Menippean or otherwise. After all, one does not rely on Gulliver, but on Swift, who helps the reader understand what the hapless narrator cannot. So too with *Ignatius His Conclave,* the very form the narration takes becomes suspect in the hands of Donne's hapless narrator. Seen in this way, the objects of satire can of course include the Jesuits and Ignatius Loyola, as well as the competing prose styles of the day and those who employ them.

California State University—Fresno

Notes

1. T.S. Healy, S.J. ed., *John Donne: Ignatius His Conclave* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. xvii-xxix.

2. Eugene Korkowski, "Donne's *Ignatius* and Menippean Satire," *Studies in Philology* 72(1975): 419-438. Korkowski cites several Menippean satires of the Renaissance as examples of "visions of the next world or imaginary eavesdroppings on clandestine theological meetings, containing some reference to a previous Menippean model, and set in a mixture of prose and verse" (431). However, in their edition of Donne's prose, Evelyn M. Simpson, Helen Gardner, and Timothy Healy contend that *Ignatius His Conclave* is incorrectly categorized as Menippean *(John Donne: Selected Prose* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967], p. 59). Instead, they categorize it as "a debate much in the manner of Seneca's *Pumpkinification of Claudius* or Erasmus' *Julius Exclusus"* (p. 59).

3. M.H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., [5th ed.] 1985), p. 167.

4. Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957,) p. 309. According to Frye, there are two forms of Menippean satire: the short form and the long form. The short form comprises the dialogue or colloquy of the type practiced by Erasmus and Voltaire. The long form comprises more than two speakers usually in a symposium setting; Petronius is a practitioner of this second form.

5. Young and Hester, *Justus Lipsius. Principles of Letter-Writing: A Bilingual Text of "Justi Lipsi Epistolica Institutio"* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1996), p. xxvii.

6. Young and Hester xxx-xxxi.

7. Young and Hester xxxii.

8. Young and Hester xxxii.

9. Joan Webber, *Contrary Music: The Prose Style of John Donne* (Madison: Univ. of Wis. Press, 1963), pp. 21-22.

10. Webber 23.

11. Webber 24.

12. The objects of satire in *Ignatius His Conclave* are several. For example, Korkowski suggests the satire is "aimed at the Jesuits" as well as at "philosophers and theologians" ("Donne's *Ignatius* and Menippean Satire," 431). Healy argues that Donne wrote "a satirical mockery of Bellarmine's two works against King James, and one which would employ, as far as possible, exactly those arguments in its mockery which the King had used in all seriousness" *(John Donne: Ignatius His Conclave,* p. xxvi). It should be noted, however, that Donne's satire is perhaps aimed more at Bellarmine's argument than at Bellarmine himself for as Healy points out, of the two works being satirized, *Responsio* (1608) and *Apologia pro Responsione Sua* (1609), Bellarmine's name was not affixed to the former, which was published

under the name of Matthaeus Tortus, Bellarmine's chaplain; of King James' two defenses of the Oath of Allegiance, *Triplici Nodo Triplex Cuneus* (1608, and reprinted in 1609 as *An Apology for the Oath of Allegiance)* and *Premonition* (1609, published with *An Apology),* the former was published anonymously (pp. xxi-xxiii).

Dennis Flynn suggests that Donne's satire is aimed at Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, and that the satire, or "libel," is not direct but a result of the ambiguity, or "indeterminacy," of the text ("Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* and Other Libels on Robert Cecil," *John Donne Journal* 6. 2 [1987]: 163-183). Flynn points out that while Donne does side with King James, "the focus of ridicule is not simply on Ignatius Loyola, not simply on the Jesuits, but also on a relationship between Ignatius and Lucifer which is materially the same as the relationship of Cecil and James in the eyes of Cecil's political opponents" (177). In Flynn's reading, the indeterminacy of the tract is intentional, therefore allowing a double-reading: ostensibly, a satire on Loyola and the Jesuits; subtly, a satire on Cecil.

Anthony Raspa agrees that Donne's satire can be seen as an attack on individuals such as Ignatius Loyola, but that what Donne is more concerned with is Ignatius' method of writing and meditation: Donne's is "a satire on the composition of the fictional image in the mind of the exercitant in the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius, and of the aesthetic counterpart of this image in the profane poetry" ("Theology and Poetry in Donne's *Conclave," ELH* 32 [1965]: 478). Since Donne believes the power of "sacred poetry" is derived from God, the poet who writes sacred poetry does so in the line of Moses and the other prophets. Sacred poetry is therefore an art that leads man back to the Bible, and the "unified theological system" to be found there. As Raspa points out: "The three books, the Bible in which a man found the prototypes to judge who were the Elect, the Register of the Elect in which he learned the revealed abstract law, and the Book of Creatures in which he discovered the will of God, formed a unified theological system . . . "(487). Donne held that the theological system to be derived from the Bible was threatened by "innovators": "In the structure of the *Conclave* Donne satirized the invention of material to represent Christian ideas by either a Jesuit exercitant in meditation or a Jesuit poet in the composition of a poem..." (488). For example, Donne opposes the use of pagan or classical images to convey Christian truths; rather, he felt that the appropriate symbols for conveying such truths must be found in the Bible itself: "He [Donne] attacked the use of fictional designs representing Christian mysteries and experiences for aesthetic and ascetic ends" (488). Donne is not satirizing Ignatius only, but "innovators" as well as creators of "new matter" in general; if the "new matter" is not based on biblical prototype, it therefore threatens the theological system derived from the Bible (478).

13. Healy, *John Donne: Ignatius His Conclave,* p. 13. All subsequent quotations from *Ignatius His Conclave* will be from this edition, and page numbers will be referred to parenthetically in my text.

14. Morris W. Croll, *"Attic" and Baroque Prose Style,* edited by J. Max Patrick

and Robert 0. Evans, with John M. Wallace (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1966).

15. Croll 215.

16. As Webber points out, "[T]he rhetorical period completes a circle; it ends with its beginning. The imaginative progress made during its course enables it to meet its beginning again with a far richer and more forceful emphasis than that with which the point was at first suggested. And although the period is, in this sense, circular, it does not move with flowing roundness from beginning to end" (p. 60).

17. George Williamson, *The Senecan Amble: A Study in Prose Form from Bacon to Collier* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1951), p. 46.

18. Ignatius deals with Paracelsus in a similar manner. He at first seems to praise Paracelsus (pp. 21-23). But the real purpose in acknowledging certain of Paracelsus' accomplishments is to show that the Jesuits have not only achieved the same accomplishments but have surpasssed Paracelsus. Having indirectly shown how Paracelsus does not deserve praise, Ignatius quickly changes the subject by directly attacking him for trying to prolong life, an odd plan of attack since one of Paracelsus' claims was that he used Lucifer's precious metals to destroy life. Better that the precious metals should go to the Pope, Ignatius contends:

> 'To him belonges all the Gold, to him all the pretious stones, conceal'd in your entrailes, wherby hee might baite and ensnare the *Princes* of the earth, through their Lords, and counsellours meanes to his obedience, and to receive his commandments, especially in these times, when almost everywhere his auncient rights & tributes are denied unto him. To him belongs your Iron, and the ignobler mettals, to make engines; To him belong your Minerals apt for poyson; To him, the Saltpeter, and all the Elements of Gunpowder, by which he may demolish and overthrow Kings and Kingdomes, and Courts, and seates of Justice.' (pp. 23-25)

Ignatius does not directly attack Paracelus here, but rather uses the Ciceronian period to undermine Paracelsus' claim to the place of honor next to Lucifer and to ingratiate himself to Lucifer by praising the Pope, the refrain "To him" emphasizing both the balance and the cadence of the declaration.

19. P. M. Oliver, *Donne's Religious Writings: A Discourse on Feigned Devotion* (London: Longman, 1997), pp. 183-184.

20. Webber 31.