John Donne Journal
Vol. 20 (2001)

Donne's Most Daring *Satyre*: "richly For service paid, authoriz'd"

Dennis Flynn

As one of Donne's first official acts, after becoming late in 1597 a secretary to Lord Keeper of the Great Seal Thomas Egerton, he composed and dedicated to Egerton his most daring *Satyre*, a poem analyzing the injustice and corruption of Queen Elizabeth's Court and the legal courts it supervised. In M. Thomas Hester's words, *Satyre V* is distinguished from Donne's first four *Satyres* as the utterance of "an insider who has the means, the opportunity, and the place to activate reform," whereas the earlier poems "could be dismissed as the jealous ravings of a malcontent."[1] Indicative are lines 28 to 34 in the poem, "a curious apotheosis of Elizabeth and encomium of Egerton," aligning the Queen, the Lord Keeper, and the satirist in a common purpose to reform corruption and injustice:

> Greatest and fairest Empresse, know you this?
> Alas, no more then Thames calme head doth know
> Whose meades her armes drowne, or whose corne o'rflow:
> You Sir, whose righteousnes she loves, whom I
> By having leave to serve, am most richly
> For service paid, authoriz'd, now beginne
> To know and weed out this enormous sinne.

Assimilating his own service for Egerton to Egerton's for the Queen, the satirist incorporates three persons in one shared, satiric enterprise.

---

[1]M. Thomas Hester, *Kinde Pitty and Brave Scorn: John Donne's* Satyres (Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press, 1982), pp. 98 and 103-104. The text of the poem used here is that of John Shawcross, *The Complete Poetry of John Donne* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1967).

Consequently, the poem's analysis of injustice and corruption presumes the Lord Keeper's "righteousnes ... authoriz'd" by Elizabeth. Egerton, Hester remarks, "can deny the satirist's explication of the current legal predicament and of his own duty as Lord Keeper only by denying that he is indeed righteous" (104). *Satyre V* is a junior staff member's whistleblowing attack from within on the involvement of Court officers and their suitors in a corrupt system of justice.

In accord with Hester's reading of the poem, the present essay will highlight the daring quality of *Satyre V*, its challenge to authority, by reviewing circumstances surrounding Egerton's own appointment and his appointment of Donne to his secretariat. Following the death of Lord Keeper Sir John Puckering at the end of April 1596, Egerton's record of steady and impartial service had helped make him the acceptable choice to head the court of Chancery. Egerton's appointment avoided a disastrous log-jam such as had occurred five years earlier at the death of the last head of Chancery, Lord Chancellor Christopher Hatton. The post had stood vacant for over six months while two great men, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, and his godson Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex, deployed factions in a contest for dominance. Eventually a man beneath faction had been found for the job: an undistinguished judge, Puckering seemed inoffensive to either side. A more serious crisis had ensued when a second chancery official died, Master of the Rolls Sir Gilbert Gerard. Factional strife again caused a delay of over a year before Egerton as a compromise was appointed to the Mastership. The solution found this time was a man who seemed to be above faction.[2]

---

[2]W. J. Jones, *The Elizabethan Court of Chancery* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 44-47. Louis A. Knafla conjectures that the delay in naming Egerton to replace Gerard may have been a result of Egerton's reluctance to accept the position; *Law and Politics in Jacobean England: the Tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1977), p. 28. This seems less likely to have been the main cause than the tension at this time between the factions of Essex and Burghley. The problem of factional strife was a problem between two groups both of whom "felt themselves personally bound to one particular great man *and* who also saw themselves as necessarily opposed to other men who had a similar bond to a different leader"; Paul E. J.

At the death of Puckering, thirty-eight years of Cecilian management had rendered the central issue of Tudor government—explosive religious reform—a fringe concern in Elizabethan politics. Religious dissent was no longer a danger to the survival or stability of the government. Domestic tranquility appeared on the surface of things, presenting no further need of crucial parliamentary initiatives, although economic and legal reforms required attention. Wartime relations with France and Spain were still dangerous, but had been put on a more guarded footing through the military zeal of Essex. The only areas of political tension lay where two factions contending for power worked with spite and guile to prepare for the inevitable succession of the Scottish King to the throne of England, something Queen Elizabeth as ever refused to discuss or even hear about. This unmentionable problem of the succession, and (almost more important) who was going to control it, was the political imperative of the day, determining the answer to every political question, including the choice of a new Lord Keeper.

Obedient to a hidden logic of this undeclared conflict, Egerton was swiftly appointed in May 1596 in the absence of the Earl of Essex, who had left the Court for Plymouth as Lord General of the Cadiz expedition. The Queen was instead attended in the privy chamber at Greenwich by Burghley and his son, Sir Robert Cecil, with two other Councilors: William Brooke, Lord Cobham, and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst. These four men were the Earl's four most powerful and dedicated enemies in the Privy Council. In the absence of Essex, they took repeated advantage, beginning with this opportunistic move ushering Egerton into higher office. Before the Earl could return from Cadiz, Burghley would further supervise the promotions of his son and Cobham, and Buckhurst would block and drain Essex's political power at Oxford.[3] While Essex dissipated his own and the Queen's substance

---

Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), p. 357.

[3]Sir Robert Cecil and Lord Cobham were appointed Principal Secretary and Lord Chamberlain respectively on 5 July and 8 August, while before the end of July Buckhurst (as Chancellor of Oxford University) had effectively countered Essex's challenging influence by appointing his own man, Dr. Thomas Ravis, Dean of Christ Church and Vice-chancellor: Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 368-70.

making military moves abroad, the factional conflict now without obstruction turned under Burghley's hand decisively against the Earl, although this turn had long been a foregone conclusion.

A member of Essex's secretariat, Edward Reynolds, disinformed about what had happened at Greenwich, wrote to the Earl that the new Lord Keeper had gained his post only by the Queen's "own choice, without competitor or mediator." Anthony Bacon, embroidering on the same report Reynolds had heard, wrote that Egerton had "come to the place freely without competitor or mediator, yea against the desire and endeavour, as it is thought, of the *omnipotent couple*."[4] Frozen out of power by the glacial shouldering of their Cecil cousins, Bacon and his older brother Francis had sought power in the next reign by serving Essex. Historians have tended to accept the opinion expressed by Bacon that Burghley and his son were suspicious of Egerton and reluctant to see him appointed.[5] However, a close reading of the ceremony in the privy chamber at Greenwich argues otherwise.

In unaccustomed wonderment, and yet with that purblind assurance widespread among the Essex faction, Reynolds and Bacon saw their fortunes rising with Egerton's in the political balance. They believed what Burghley would have wanted them to believe. The Queen, feeling a desperate loss of control imposed on her reign by obdurate factions, appointed Egerton in appreciation for Burghley's masterful politics that could misdirect the obstructive and intractable Essex faction into being pleased, largely because they thought the Cecils opposed the appointment. Given the pretense to balancing of factions that at this delicate term had become the main preoccupation

---

[4]Edward Reynolds to the Earl of Essex, 6 May 1596, and Anthony Bacon to Dr. Henry Hawkins, 9 May 1596; Thomas Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols. (New York: AMS Press, 1970), 1: 479 and 481 (italics in Birch).

[5]Conyers Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth* (New York: Knopf, 1960), pp. 522 and 588, n. 47; Knafla, *Law and Politics in Jacobean England*, 29; and especially Jones, *Elizabethan Court of Chancery*, pp. 80-81. But not Hammer (*Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, p. 364) who elsewhere shrewdly classifies Egerton as one of those courtiers "well disposed towards [Essex] but whose willingness to assist him was compromised by competing ties with his enemies" (ibid., p. 290).

of government policy, the Queen would never have agreed to Egerton's appointment unless Burghley had recommended it. Egerton could serve both the Queen's and Burghley's purposes in this way because he had avoided commitment to faction in his conduct of office.

The new Lord Keeper was immediately tested by political pressure when Essex wrote from Plymouth, requesting Egerton's support for Francis Bacon to succeed as Master of the Rolls. A few days later Egerton received another letter, from Anthony Bacon, anticipating the support for Francis that Essex had requested, and offering to supply the Lord Keeper with copies of intelligence reports from all over Europe. Despite these commanding expectations Egerton had no intention of relinquishing the Mastership to Bacon. He continued inflexibly to hold both offices throughout Queen Elizabeth's reign. In Egerton's own words, referring to another matter of patronage, "I am unwilling to contend with competitors." Egerton has been described as a man "who fawned on many but was inflexible to all."[6] This inflexibility was one of his main traits of character.

Egerton's discreet abstinence from faction was the "righteousnes" Donne speaks of in *Satyre V*, the basis on which the Queen "authoriz'd" Egerton to assume office. In his turn the Lord Keeper had "authoriz'd" Donne to serve him as a secretary. As Donne later

---

[6]Jones, *Elizabethan Court of Chancery*, p. 46. Egerton's unwillingness to contend was expressed in his letter to Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York, 22 June 1596; *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York*, ed. J. Raines (London: Surtees Society, 1843), p. 110—quoted in Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, p. 290. Egerton had requested from the Archbishop the lease of York House, his property near Charing Cross. Hutton predictably began to cite his obligations to other suitors, hinting that Egerton might overcome these obstacles if only he would extend patronage to certain friends and relatives of Hutton. (See Hutton to Egerton, 13 and 20 June 1596; *The Egerton Papers*, ed. John Payne-Collier [London: Camden Society, 1840], pp. 221-23). The matter was quickly resolved in favor of Egerton by pressure from the Privy Council in the Queen's name. Hammer concludes about Egerton that, "unwilling and unable to choose sides, he declined to do so," a judgment that seems to underestimate the man. Rather he was quite capable of choosing sides but did so with inflexible discretion, without becoming involved in patronage contests, giving no such hostages to fortune.

recalled in a letter to Egerton, "I had a desire to be your Lordships servant, by the favor which your good sonn's love to me obtein'd."[7] Donne's desire to work for Egerton was in part stimulated through the opportunity offered by the staffing needs of a new Lord Keeper. But Donne had not used his years at Lincoln's Inn to become the kind of lawyer Egerton was, or the kind of lawyer Egerton would bring along and promote in the administrative structure of Chancery. In fact, for most young Inns of Court men or university graduates, Egerton's offices did not present much that would promise to gratify ambition. Most of them were drawn instead to one or both of the factional centers of power, with the idea that from the Cecils or from Essex they could best prepare their futures toward the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign. Such seems to have been the thinking of Henry Wotton, with whom Donne had become friends shortly after joining Egerton's secretariat.[8] Considering other sources of patronage available and chosen by some of Donne's acquaintances, his particular interest in Egerton seems to reflect a characteristic political discretion. Discretion was a value the two men shared.

By the fall of 1597 Donne's Epigrams, Elegies and *Satyres*, brilliantly adapting the work of Roman poets, were still his main achievements. He had no conspicuous record at either university or law school. His reputation was of uncertain extent, initially including family members and friends who, having read his astonishing manuscripts, copied them and showed them to others who in their turn widened the circle of readers. Among these readers, Ben Jonson later expressed what must have been a common assessment: that

---

[7]Donne to Sir Thomas Egerton, 1 March 1602; Alfred J. Kempe, ed., *The Loseley Manuscripts* (London: John Murray, 1836), 341. According to Izaak Walton, Donne became the Lord Keeper's "chief Secretary" (*Lives*, p. 27) although as Bald comments "this is hardly likely" (*John Donne: a Life*, p. 97).

[8]Walton reported that the friendship of Donne and Wotton began at Oxford in the 1580s; but no corroborative evidence of this has yet been found. Their correspondence of 1597 suggests that they first formed a friendship after Donne read Wotton's manuscript book, *The State of Christendom* (written in 1594 and 1595). A copy of this book remains among Egerton's papers (Huntington Library, Ellesmere manuscripts, EL8378).

Donne was "the first poet in the World in some things."[9] Egerton's son probably had read at least some of Donne's poems, although it is difficult to imagine how he or Donne himself could have shown many of them to the Lord Keeper. Yet little but Donne's poetry could be offered to adorn a resume. He could write a fair italic hand (and may also have written in other hands). He had nothing else to show other than his lineage, his experience as a traveler on the continent, and his undistinguished military service. The mere writing of poetry, especially satiric poetry such as Donne's, while an indicator of valuable skills, would not by itself have assured success for any candidate to become a member of an Elizabethan Court officer's secretariat. But Donne's poems were extraordinary, as was obvious to anyone with some knowledge of Roman elegiac and satiric verse. And the savoir faire of selected poems may in part have appealed to Egerton's professional concerns, even if somewhat uncomfortably.

Throughout the 1590s Donne had written increasingly dangerous poetry about injustice. His fifth Elegy, while it dealt with a love affair and was addressed to a mistress, expressed deep repugnance for the whole system of patronage that debased the royal Court and administration of the law:

> Oh let not me serve so, as those men serve
> Whom honors smokes at once fatten and sterue;
> Poorely enrich't with great mens words or looks
> Nor so write my name in thy loving books
> As those idolatrous flatterers; which still
> Their Princes Stiles, with many Realmes fullfill
> Whence they no tribute haue, and where no sway:
> Such Seruices I offer, as shall pay
> Themselues. . . .

---

[9]Jonson evidently repeated a settled opinion, years after he had first read Donne's poems, in his 1619 conversations with William Drummond; "Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden," in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, 11 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52), 1: 135. On transmission of literary manuscripts see Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1986), 3-15, although the subsequent application of general principles to Donne's particular case is not reliable.

The code of honor at Court is a hollow rigmarole: service in name only is rewarded with empty pay and inflated status.[10] Scorn of payment for service is important to Donne and recurs as a theme in his writing. Such poetry may have had some appeal for Egerton.

In *Satyres* of the earlier 1590s Donne had returned to the subject of judicial abuse, ridiculing in *Satyre I* a foolish suitor wooing "a velvet Justice with a long / Great traine of blew coats, twelve, or fourteen strong." This Horatian gibe was directed at Elizabethan types but came short of suggesting that the entire administration of the law and the judicial system were corrupt. In *Satyre II* Donne again took aim at the patronage system, in particular at suitors' degrading use of poems as a means to advancement:

> And they who write to Lords, rewards to get,
> Are they not like singers at doores for meat?

(Nevertheless, Donne himself did apply for work, most likely using his writings and/or his reputation for them as credentials; and Egerton accepted the application.) In *Satyre II* Donne also raised the intensity of his attack by presenting, as typical of the legal profession, "men which chuse / Law practise for meere gaine, / . . . Worse than imbrothel'd strumpets prostitute." He went on to describe one such lawyer's acquisitiveness operating so efficiently that "Shortly' (as the sea) hee'will compasse all our land." Moreover, in *Satyre II* and again in *Satyre IV* Donne traced encompassing greed and corruption to their cause in the Tudor statutes stamping out Catholicism. And in the latter poem he took dangerous aim at the royal Court, the center of administration, a site he compared quite candidly to Dante's *Inferno*.[11]

---

[10]"Elegy 5: Oh let not me serve so," *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, ed. Gary A. Stringer et al., vol. 2, *The Elegies* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 2000), p. 110. Citing John Carey, Marotti conjectures (with more probability than verisimilitude) that Donne's exposures of injustice say the opposite of what they mean in the Elegies and in general; see *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, pp. 45ff.

[11]*Satyre I*, *Satyre II*, and *Satyre IV*, Shawcross, *Complete Poetry of John Donne*, 15, 19-20, 21 and 31 respectively. Marotti argues again that these expressions say the opposite of what they mean; *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, pp. 40, 56, and especially 102, referring to *Satyre IV*, for example, as "a poem whose intensity

Although Egerton might well have suspected himself a target of such writing, he was equipped to sympathize by his own experience and inclination, as can be seen in his habitual penchant for keeping certain Court entanglements at arm's length.

Satyre IV had told the moral perils of a courtier satirist's mere reluctant visit to Court. *Satyre V* presents the courtier satirist as a servant of the Lord Keeper and, with disarming frankness, addresses analysis of the moral problem directly to Egerton and to Queen Elizabeth. Donne's analysis describes a systemic and pervasive corruption, highlighting in the course of his description the embarrassing facts that the Queen presided over this evil and that the Lord Keeper, the nation's chief legal officer, was functioning amidst overwhelming defilement. The poem describes Egerton's "righteousnes" as having been appointed to "weed out this enormous sinne" but implausibly characterizes Egerton (a Court officer for more than a quarter of a century) as one who did not know about the sin before accepting his position from Queen Elizabeth. Similarly the Queen herself is said to know "no more then / Thames calme head doth know / Whose meades her armes drowne, or whose corne o'rflow." Finessing what his superiors knew and when they knew it may have enabled Donne at least temporarily to get away with expressing his contempt for the regime in which they were principal figures, something he had already expressed less fully in earlier work. *Satyre V* with audacity exposes to the Queen and her Lord Keeper the iniquitous organization and rationale of their own government, a government Donne himself had joined as a member of Egerton's secretariat.

Donne's analysis of the Tudor Court and courts in *Satyre V* adapts Juvenal's thirteenth satire, a poem that rebuked the Roman grandee Calvinus for initiating a breach-of-trust lawsuit after a friend defrauded him. Juvenal tells Calvinus that the sum contested is rather petty, and that in any case he ought to have known better than to risk it given the state of public morals in their time (*saecula ferri*—an age of iron). Pursuing vengeance through the law, Calvinus has made himself

---

of criticism of the courtly world is probably a function of the frustrations of [Donne's] ambition." Little if any factual content specific to Donne's biography can be integrated with Marotti's intuition.

ridiculous by mouthing sanctimonious pieties no one believes any more. Juvenal advises him to chill out, drop his suit, and leave the criminal to stew in his own perversion.[12]

Like Juvenal addressing Calvinus, Donne directs most of his poem to pretentiously aggrieved suitors in the royal Court and courts of law. The foremost of Court suitors was of course Essex, pitted against the holders of higher office, the Cecils and their faction. Constructing this opposition as one of suitors versus officers, Donne tells the Essexians, as Juvenal told Calvinus, that they should drop their protestations of wronged honor, which seek to replace one unjust regime with another. One-upping Juvenal, Donne explains that Tudor England is (worse than imperial Rome) an "Age of rusty iron!": "Th'iron age *that* was, when justice was sold; now / Injustice is sold dearer farre." The fundamental injustice being sold is "controverted lands," former Church properties first put on the market by Tudor confiscations, for control of which suitors and officers engage in legal actions contesting wills, the intricacies or absence of proper deeds, etc. Embattled suitors pay "demands, fees, and duties" that amount to bribes, in effect gambling in a futile quest to secure ownership. The suitors' payment of these fees to officers ratifies and consents to the original injustice that precipitated traffic in land and associated Church property.

Playing out this ever growing volume of litigation once stimulated and now controlled by the royal Court, English courts and legal administration are all in the business of selling injustice. In this pitiless system, hypocritical, grasping, and unjust claims by suitors are thwarted by corrupt officers of the law in the service of the Crown.

> If Law be in the Judges heart, and hee
> Have no heart to resist letter, or fee,
> Where wilt thou'appeale? powre of the Courts below
> Flow from the first maine head. . . .

Pursuing this dangerous course, Donne's satirist drives home an unsparing judgment of the power structure and legal administration

---

[12]*Juvenal and Persius*, trans. G. G. Ramsay (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1979), 246-65. Discussion here of *Satyre V* in relation to Juvenal depends entirely on the poem's explication by Hester in *Kinde Pitty and Brave Scorn*, pp. 100-103.

that have themselves caused the factional imbroglio of Tudor government in the 1590s:

> Judges are Gods; he who made and said them so,
> Meant not that men should be'forc'd to them to goe,
> By meanes of Angels; When supplications
> We send to God, to Dominations,
> Powers, Cherubins, and all heavens Courts, if wee
> Should pay fees as here, Daily bread would be
> Scarce to Kings; so 'tis.

The cost of doing business in Tudor England, whether acquiring more or keeping pace, grows ever higher for every level of English society, including the Crown. The amazing paradox is that the Tudor monarchy, despite having enriched itself by despoiling the Church, is unable to support itself. The economy of spoliation is a feedback loop: spiraling legal expenses and political repercussions threaten to bankrupt even Queen Elizabeth.

This grotesque system is ever fuelled by its origin: the depredations set in motion by Tudor religious reform. Suitors who have somehow managed to gain control of former abbeys and made chapels into dining halls—"eating out of vessels formerly used at mass and off sometime altar cloths—"[13] are bedeviled by an inexorable engine of injustice:

> Would it not anger
> A Stoicke, a coward, yea a Martyr,
> To see a Pursivant come in, and call
> All his cloathes, Copes; Bookes, Primers; and all
> His Plate, Challices; and mistake them away,
> And aske a fee for coming?

These properties came unjustly into possession and are in turn unjustly confiscated by officers who charge each victim a fee to cover their costs of operation.

The syndrome is replicated in the relations between the dominant political factions of the 1590s. In this framework, the Cecilians are

---

[13]J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984), p. 106.

officers, controlling the Court and the courts; the Essexians (whom the satirist addresses throughout most of the poem) are suitors, struggling to keep their share of spoils with which the Tudor Crown has created new nobility like the Devereux Earls:

> They are the mills which grinde you, yet you are
> The winde which drives them; and a wastfull warre
> Is fought against you, and you fight it; they
> Adulterate lawe, and you prepare their way
> Like wittals, th'issue your owne ruine is. . . .

In order to maintain his suit for favor from the Queen, Essex and his faction are forced by the superior political maneuvers of the Cecils to fight wars overseas. These consume Essex's own substance as well as the Queen's. Her losses require her officers, through abuse of the law, to regain the same substance suitors are trying to secure, though it "Scape, like Angelica, the strivers hands."

Egerton himself had been involved with this shell game for most of his professional life, as a judge, as a lawyer, and as himself a suitor in quest of "controverted lands." He had decided cases involving these lands; he had represented clients suing for them; and he had himself sought and acquired considerable land holdings in Cheshire and the Welsh counties, for example. Moreover, as a legal theorist, one of his distinctive personal beliefs (in explicit departure from prevailing European thinking about the "king's two bodies"—natural and political) was that in English law, "all the rights and privileges of the English people, had evolved from the natural bodies of their monarchs."[14] Donne's poem expresses awareness of Egerton's theory, presenting Queen Elizabeth in her flesh as the embodiment of the law and her officers as fleshly extensions of the Queen:

> Shee is all faire, but yet hath foule long nailes,
> With which she scracheth Suiters; In bodies
> Of men, so in law, nailes are th'extremities,

---

[14]Knafla, *Law and Politics in Jacobean England*, p. 67. Egerton's theories, known to the Inns of Court community, were later published in his "discourse concerning the Royall Prerogative" (1604) and his *Speech touching the Post-Nati* (1608); ibid., pp. 197-253.

> So'Officers stretch to more then Law can doe,
> As our nailes reach what no else part comes to.

Here officers of the Court such as the Cecils and Egerton himself are defined as the Queen's excremental tools in their rapacious scraping to maintain the heartless momentum of royal policy. On the other hand,

> officers
> Are the devouring stomacke, and Suiters
> The excrements, which they voyd.

All is excrement, because "all things be in all."

Yet despite his involvement in this grinding machine, Egerton's "righteousnes," along with the Queen's innocence *ex officio*, provide a somewhat disingenuous but still respectable front that somehow insulates them from factional culpability and strife. The participle "authoriz'd" seems most grammatically to apply to Egerton. However, Hester observes that "the ambiguous antecedent" suggests also that the satirist's service for Egerton itself both pays him and authorizes him to engage in Egerton's work. Both the satirist and the Lord Keeper then will, with the Queen's love, "now beginne / To know and weed out this enormous sinne."[15] The satirist seems to regard himself as one joined with the Queen and the Lord Keeper apart from faction, partly because he had sought to serve Egerton for no pay other than "having leave to serve." In this place of separation, behind a respectable front, Donne writes with both "Charity and liberty" in a manner suggesting that, unlike Juvenal, his primary audience was not a suitor or suitors. Instead, he addresses the audience specified in the *Satyre*'s climactic apostrophe to his "Greatest and fairest Empresse" and to "You Sir, whose righteousnes she loves." Egerton, if he was ever shown this daring poem, cannot have escaped awareness of his

---

[15]Hester, *Kinde Pitty and Brave Scorn*, pp. 106 and 111. Marotti agrees that "a curious use of pronouns in this satire" suggests Donne may have found "a way of establishing the speaker's (and author's) own position of authority and security, a gesture, on Donne's part, of separating himself from the abject misery of both courtly and judicial suitorship": *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, p. 117.

targeting in it, Donne's last and most daring of *Satyres*. One doubts that Egerton ever showed it to the Queen.

Bentley College