

Elegies on the Death of Bishop John King (d. 1621)

James Doelman

On March 30, 1621 (Good Friday), John King, Bishop of London, died after long suffering from kidney stones; his burial in St. Paul's Cathedral took place the next night with markedly little ceremony.¹ King himself had instructed his family to provide a simple service and a plain tomb with "Resurgam" [I shall rise] as the only epitaph. However, in the year following his death, many more words—both beside his tomb and beyond—were offered to commemorate him, as his legacy and reputation became the contested matter of rumors, religious tracts, a sermon by his son, the churchman and poet Henry King, and a significant number of elegies and other poems. Of special interest are the elegies, mounted in Latin beside his tomb and then circulated by manuscript in English form. The aim of this paper is twofold: to suggest that Henry King is the most plausible author of these elegies (which I will call "the St. Paul's poems"), and to consider them and his sermon in the context of the politics of religious conversion in the period. Both the Latin and English versions of these "St. Paul's" elegies on Bishop King are presented in an appendix.

¹The funeral certificate quoted by Hannah only notes that it was "immediately following" his death (*Poems and Psalms by Henry King*, ed. John Hannah (Oxford: Francis Macpherson, 1843), p. xci). The private funeral and lack of a sermon was later cited by Roman Catholic writers as evidence of the conversion (Alan Davidson, "The Conversion of Bishop King: a question of evidence," *Recusant History* 9.5 (1968): 242).

Henry King has been known as the author of a separate elegy, “Sad Relick of a Blessed Soule!,” which must have been written shortly after his father’s death and burial. In her edition of King’s poems, Margaret Crum places it among his “Undated Poems” rather than with his other funeral elegies because “there is nothing to contradict the impression given by position of the Elegy in the manuscripts (with poems from 1636–8) that it belongs to a later date.”² However, contemporary references make clear that most funeral elegies were written within a few weeks of the subject’s death, and the poem’s focus on the bareness of the tomb marked only by the single word “Resurgam” is belied by the Latin poems (discussed below) which later (probably in 1622) were mounted on a tablet next to the tomb. As I will more fully develop in the pages below, the most plausible sequence is as follows:

- Henry King’s “Sad Relick” composed in the early spring of 1621
- Through the remaining months of the year, the spreading of rumors that Bishop King converted to Roman Catholicism on his death-bed
- The refutation of these rumors by Henry King in his sermon, preached at St. Paul’s on November 25, 1621, and published in late December
- In 1622 the composition (probably by Henry King) and public inscription of the Latin St. Paul’s poems next to the bishop’s tomb as part of the same campaign to protect his Protestant reputation
- At the same time, or shortly afterwards, the translation of these St. Paul’s poems into English verse

In addition, at some point in 1621, two other poets with loose connections to the King family, Thomas Goffe and Robert Aylett, composed funeral elegies defending the bishop against Catholic claims.

²*The Poems of Henry King*, ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 236n. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from King’s poetry are from this edition.

* * * *

The simple humility of bishop King's tomb in St. Paul's Cathedral is the dominant theme of Henry's "Sad Relick of a Blessed Soule!"; this brief and elegant poem is concerned not only to celebrate his father's lack of pride and ostentation but also to defend against any suspicion that the "low Exequyes" and lack of ostentatious tomb are "the cheap Arguments of our neglect" (3–4).³ Rather, such limited commemoration was "a commaunded duty, that thy Grave / As little Pride, as Thou Thy self, should have" (5–6). Henry's poem highlights the contrast between his father's tomb and those surrounding him in St. Paul's. The paraphernalia of "Chronicle and Pedigree," "Pennons" and "flagges" are "formall braggs" (10–12), which Bishop King avoids despite his (supposed) ancient lineage:

When Thou (although from Ancestours Thou came
Old as the Heptarchy; Great as Thy Name)
Sleepst there enshrin'd in thy admired Parts,
And hast no Heraldry but thy Desarts. (13–16)

The parenthetical reminder of the claim that the family was descended from Anglo-Saxon kings constitutes an undermining irony: the poem attempts at once to affirm the bishop's humility *and* offer the very pedigree that the tomb eschewed.⁴ That the poet is the bishop's son also adds to the irony: "my father was too humble to boast of our ancestry, but I'll at least mention it in passing." In effect, the parenthetical reference attempts to claim illustrious lineage and

³See Nigel Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 272–82, on the patronage of funerary monuments in the period, most of which were commissioned by the family of the dead.

⁴Hannah also finds it in bad taste that Henry dwells upon the family's supposed origins among Saxon kings given his father's wish for a humble commemoration (p. 176). On the use of genealogy in funeral commemoration, see Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 92–95.

simultaneously limit its significance in contrast to the Bishop's personal virtue.⁵

The final verse paragraph offers a dismissive description of the laboring vanity of tomb-building that Joshua Scodel describes as typical of the period.⁶

Goe, search the world, and with your Mattocks wound
 The groaning Bosome of the patient ground:
 Digg from the hidden veines of her dark womb
 All that is rare and pretious for a Tomb:
 Yet when much Treasure, and more Time is spent,
 You must grant His the Nobler Monument,
 Whose Faith stands o're Him for a Hearse, and hath
 The Resurrection for his Epitaph. (19–26)

The power in the detraction here lies partly in the dismissive imperative of its opening, and partly in the metaphoric violence of the mining enterprise. The Earth as a mother figure assaulted by her offspring leads to a folly: the construction at the end of this exercise falls short of the spiritual memorial of the Bishop. The final couplet (25–26) manifests King's typical expertise in the judicious use of caesura and enjambment: the rhyming word "hath" takes little weight, and after the caesura the poetic energy comes to fall upon the word "Resurrection." The final line is not only memorable but accurate as it returns attention to the one-word epitaph "Resurgam."⁷

⁵Bishop King's life spanned the period of what has sometimes been called the "pedigree craze" in England; the claim to illustrious Anglo-Saxon forebears goes beyond the typical claim to descent from the Norman Conquest. See Woolf, pp. 105–14. References to lineage in tomb inscriptions were becoming increasingly common in the period (*Ibid.*, p. 75). See also Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 287, on the domination of tombs by heraldic materials in the period.

⁶*The English Poetic Epitaph: Commemoration and Conflict from Jonson to Wordsworth* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 19–20.

⁷As noted above, the spring of 1621 is the most likely composition date for this poem. Enough days must have passed for the inscribed "Resurgam" to be in place.

Bishop John King, however, was not to rest in quiet peace until the Resurrection, as Roman Catholic claims slowly emerged in the following months that this renowned Protestant bishop had converted to Rome on his deathbed, claims to which those close to King quickly responded in both a sermon and funeral elegies. The rumors about Bishop King promulgated by Roman Catholic propagandists were part of a widespread pattern much feared by Protestant apologists in the early 1620s.⁸ The conversion of a notable Protestant (whether lay or clergy) could be held forth as vindicating the Roman church.⁹ The claims of a deathbed conversion were all the more powerful for supposedly showing the true colors of religious belief at the ultimate moment of crisis, and for, of course, being much more difficult to refute, as the convertites were no longer able to speak for themselves. This controversy then became the dominant concern of a sermon by Henry King and a number of elegies that mark the bishop's death.

While a number of Catholic works refer to the supposed conversion of King, it is likely that Henry King's sermon and the posted elegies are responding to the earliest and fullest of these, *The English Protestants Plea* (1621) by the archpriest Richard Broughton. It claimed that England's best churchmen were being

reconciled to the Romane Church, as many of them [I]atley at their deaths have bene. And now in this your Parliament time,¹⁰ to move you and London, to know the trueth, the late Protestant Bishop thereof, Doctor *King*, in his life for external cariage, a great persecutor of Priests and Catholikes, a little before his death did plainely denounce your Religion to be damnable, renounced (as wee had proved before of all such) that he was any Bishop or

⁸See Michael C. Questier, *Conversion, Politics, and Religion in England, 1580–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), and James Doelman, *King James I and the Religious Culture of England* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), pp. 102–34.

⁹Henry Mason, *New Art of Lying, Covered by Jesuites under the Vaile of Equivocation* (London: George Purslowe for John Clarke, 1624) connects the rumors about Bishop King to a tradition of such claims going back to Theodore Beza.

¹⁰As Parliament sat from January 1621 to January 1622 (apart from a brief period in April), this work may have been written at any point in that year.

Cleargieman; was penitent for his protesting heresie, & humblie at the feete of a Priest, whom he had formerly persecuted, confessed his sinnes, received Sacramentall absolution at his hands, and was reconciled to the Catholike Romane Church, of which he had in his life bene so vehement a persecutor. Zealously and openly protesting, there was no salvation to be had, out of that holy Catholike Romane Church.¹¹

A second work making the same claims, *The Bishop of London his Legacie* (1623), appeared in a number of editions in the following years. Henry Mason (who had been Bishop King's chaplain) notes that George Fisher "first divulged this Libell" in 1622.¹² Fisher, who sometimes wrote under the pseudonym "George Musket," was a well-known Catholic controversialist. Although the earliest surviving edition bears the date 1623, a letter of Richard Broughton to Thomas Rant (28 April 1624) suggests that a first edition was published in March 1622, and a second, with a revised and more cautious preface, in December 1623.¹³ This work boldly offered a supposed first-person account of the bishop's conversion (while acknowledging in the added preface that such was "a Poeticall freedome" validated by the example of Xenophon and Plutarch).¹⁴ There were considerable divisions among English Roman Catholics about these published claims of King's

¹¹p. 19. A letter of Broughton to John Bennett (October 23, 1622) goes somewhat further in claiming that Bishop King "had testified with his owne hand his reconciliation" (cited in Michael C. Questier, ed., *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics, 1621–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 171n.)

¹²*New Art of Lying, Covered by Jesuites under the Vaile of Equivocation*, p. 64. There is also evidence that points to Richard Broughton as the author of the work (see Questier, ed., *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 163n.)

¹³Cited in Questier, ed., *Stuart Dynastic Policy*, p. 163n. John Gee, *Foot out of the Snare* (1624), ed. T.H.B.M. Harmsen (Nijmegen: Cicero Press, 1992), p. 144 also refers to the second edition that "changed the Frontispiece into a more darke phrase, making it a Prosopoeia or Stage-playing patch of Rhetoricke."

¹⁴Musket, *The Bishop of London his Legacy* (1623), p. ii.

conversion, with the secular clergy generally being more supportive and the Jesuits more skeptical.¹⁵

The defense against these claims was led by the bishop's son, Henry, who along with his brother John had also been imputed to have converted to Rome.¹⁶ King James, who consistently through his reign showed an interest in the Protestant side of conversion struggles, commanded Henry to defend his father. His sermon, preached at St. Paul's on November 25, 1621, was entered in *The Stationers' Register* on December 14, and by March 25 had gone through three editions. The last two editions included "the retraction of the libeller, in 'The Examination of Thomas Preston,' dated 20 December": Preston, a Benedictine monk who had long sought to reconcile English Catholics with King James, was the priest who had reputedly converted the Bishop to the Catholic Church on his deathbed; however, late in 1621 he retracted those statements.¹⁷

Bishop King would have been a major "catch" for the Church of Rome: he was a widely respected figure in the mainstream of Jacobean Protestantism about whom no rumors of Catholic leanings had circulated. While firmly Calvinist in his theology, he was fully conformist in matters of worship and church government. He promoted a balanced ministry of preaching and prayer, and he was

¹⁵See Questier, pp. 163n and 171n.

¹⁶In the epilogue "To the Reader" of his sermon, he writes that he has chosen to print it to show "I have not yet so doted on their part, or disaffected my owne, as to leave my *Coutrey* or *Religion*"; and that John has "also had his share in this lewd imputation as well as my selfe" (Henry King, *The Sermons of Henry King (1592–1669), Bishop of Chichester*, ed. Mary Hobbs (Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1992), p. 82. All subsequent references to King's sermon are from this edition.

¹⁷That the retraction was not coerced or merely Protestant propaganda is confirmed by Oliver Almond, a Roman Catholic priest, who wrote later in 1622 that "M^r Preston never confessed unto me but denied *that* ever he reconciled or in *that* kynd dealt with the b[ishop] of London" (31 August/September 1622, Oliver Almond to John Strong [Matthew Kellison], in Questier, ed., p. 162. David Lunn, *The English Benedictines, 1540–1688* (London: Burns & Oates, 1980), pp. 51–52, describes the possibility that the rumors of Preston's conversion of Bishop King had been promulgated by the Jesuits to undermine him. Gee, p. 143, asserts that a Jesuit, Father Palmer, also denied being the priest that brought about the conversion.

noted for preaching weekly in the churches of his diocese.¹⁸ This reputation “for Calvinist orthodoxy, moral rectitude, and strident anti-Catholicism”¹⁹ rendered the supposed deathbed conversion a great scandal for the Church of England and potential triumph for the Church of Rome.

For a preacher challenging Roman Catholic claims, Henry King’s sermon begins oddly, as he devotes the opening paragraphs to speaking out against Puritans, who are too enamored with gadding about to sermons; he wishes there were more praying and good works and less preaching. This argument reflects the general anti-Puritan strain in the Church of England at the time, but Henry has a more particular objection: the practice of annual City feasts and ceremonies, which make “no difference betwixt a Sermon and a Wake.” However, he then claims he does not speak out “against the practise,” but that the celebrators neglect “those times whose memory should be precious.”²⁰ The second half of the sermon turns to the more expected anti-Catholic response: he first recounts the *persecutio oris* (persecution of the mouth), which he finds worse than that of the body. He charges that the Roman Church has made a practice of such supposed conversions, rehearsing their claims about the deaths of such Protestant notables as Calvin, Luther, and Beza (including a premature announcement of Beza’s death).²¹ Although King first asserts that brevity is the hallmark of truth, he nevertheless gives a full account of his father’s deathbed: he quotes his last testament and

¹⁸Thomas Fuller, *Church History of Britain*, ed. J.S. Brewer, (Oxford, 1895), vol. 5, p. 500.

¹⁹P.E. McCullough, “John King,” *Oxford DNB*, 23 September 2004.

²⁰King, p. 67. Given the timing, it seems likely that King is referring to the Lord Mayor’s Show, held annually on October 28. Clearly some contention over city festivals and their sermons was in the air: the week before (November 17) John Chamberlain had written “Yt seemes we grow into a superstitious opinion of sermons as the papistes do of the masse, that nothing can be don without them” (John Chamberlain, *Letters*, ed. N. E. McClure, 2 vols. [Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939], vol. 2, p. 408). A number of elegists on the death of Prince Henry (November 6, 1612) contrast the celebration of the Lord Mayor’s show with the mourning that took place the following week.

²¹*Ibid.*, pp. 74–75.

describes his peacefulness and his blessing of those around him. This description is partly meant to prove that Bishop King was never alone in a way where a Catholic confessor could come to him.

* * * *

Despite Bishop King's request for no word other than "Resurgam" on his tomb, at some point in 1622 or shortly after, a tablet was erected upon which were engraved five further Latin poems.²² Although destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666, they were recorded in the 1633 edition of John Stow and John Strype's *Survey of London* (the first to appear after the Bishop's death).²³ There they were introduced in this way:

John King Bishop of London, descended from the Ancient Kings of Devonshire by his Father, and from the Conquests of Haughton Conquest, in Bedfordshire, by his Mother, lyes buried in the South Ile of Saint Pauls, behind the Bishops Seat, having onely a plaine Marble over him, and RESURGAM written on it for his Epitaph; as himselfe directed in his Will.²⁴

²²That they were engraved on the tablet hung *next* to his tomb may have been a way of technically respecting the bishop's wish that only the word "Resurgam" appear on his tomb.

²³Coincidentally, Bishop King had been the dedicatee of the 1618 edition of Stow. Tracey Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 176, notes that the 1633 edition of Stow/Munday, *Survey*, had a section on improvements to London churches, "which he claims to have been specifically requested to put together for the 1618 edition by the Bishop of London, John King, via an unnamed 'Gentleman of much learning and respect.'"

²⁴Stow, *The survey of London* (1633), pp. 775–76. They were also printed in William Dugdale's *History of St. Paul's Cathedral* (London: Thomas Warren, 1658), p. 73, and Payne Fisher's *The tombes, monuments and sepulchral inscriptions lately visible in St. Paul's Cathedral* (London, 1684), pp. 129–33. Fisher's text of the poems seems to be independent of Stow and Dugdale as it includes four lines not found in either Stow or Dugdale and a number of other distinct readings.

It then notes that “These Verses [the Latin poems] hang by in a Table.”²⁵ The opening two poems are the most substantial: the first, entitled “Johannis King Episcopi Londinensis, quicquid mortale est in hoc pulvere componitur,” is, like the sermon, a rebuttal of the Catholic claims of conversion. The second, “In Diem Obitus,” reflects upon the coincidence of his death with Good Friday. They are followed on the tablet by an anagram and a chronogram, and then a concluding epitaph, beginning “Non hic Pyramides.” (While I will refer to the first two poems as “elegies” to distinguish them from the concluding poem entitled “Epitaphium,” they too have epitaphic elements in their deictic gesturing towards the tomb). Margaret Crum notes that a copy of “Non hic Pyramides,” in Henry King’s hand, is preserved in Bodl. MS. Rawl. D. 398, fol. 195, and concludes, “he may have composed it, but this can hardly be taken as evidence that he did.”²⁶ The Latin version of the epitaph is also found in Folger V.a.170, p. 168, along with an eight-line passage from the middle of “In Diem Obitus.”

In addition, English versions of the three longer St. Paul’s poems (not the anagram or chronogram) survive in BL MS Harl. 6918 and BL MS Add. 58215. It seems most likely that the Latin versions were composed first, possibly intentionally for the tomb, and the English versions followed—and of course it is possible that the English ones were by a different author (or authors) than the Latin. There are a few details in the Latin that do not appear in the English. Margaret Crum, seemingly unaware of the Latin versions, writes that “the authorship of all these unasccribed poems is uncertain.”²⁷ *CELM* KiH 803 suggests that the Latin epitaph itself may be by Henry King; however, no one seems to have gone on to ask whether all the original Latin poems might be by him. As poems inscribed as part of the monumental commemoration of the bishop, they are the most “authorized” of the surviving elegies, and this makes it all the more likely that they were composed by one of the Bishop’s sons or someone close to them. (It is

²⁵Stow, *The survey of London* (1633), p. 776.

²⁶p. 242.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 251. The only other scholar who seems to have noted the poems is Peter Sherlock, but he erroneously suggests that they “gave an extended account of his life and salvation” (*Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 213.

also possible that a number of authors were responsible for the five poems.) At the very least, it cannot be imagined that such would have been posted in St. Paul's without the active involvement of Henry and John King.

If we surmise that one of the brothers is the likely poet, the evidence leans towards Henry. John certainly was a poet: a number of his Latin poems were published in Oxford anthologies of the 1610s, and the death of Henry's wife, Anne, in 1624, prompted him again. However, he was generally less active and accomplished as a poet than his elder brother. In addition, John King spent most of his time in Oxford, not London; Henry, as the elder brother and the one present in London, seems most likely to have overseen the mounting of the poems in St. Paul's and thus the more likely composer of them. In addition, throughout his life he wrote both Latin and English funeral elegies (the Latin ones have never been collected or translated). Crum presumably eliminated Henry as a potential author because of his earlier elegy on the death ("Sad Relick of a blessed soule.") However, the details of the "St. Paul's poems" suggest that they were written later (probably in early 1622) as part of the refutation of the Catholic claims of conversion. (That the English version of the first one refers explicitly to the *Bishop of London his Legacy* means that it at least must have been composed after March 1622, when the first edition of that work is believed to have been published.) Furthermore, that Henry might compose multiple poems on the same death is confirmed by general practice in the period, where a single poet often wrote a number of poems on the same death,²⁸ and by his own work: he wrote the famous "Exequy" on his wife's death, which was followed six years later by "The Anniverse: An Elegy." Most significantly, and as will be more fully demonstrated below, the first poem's close echoing of his sermon also tilts the body of evidence in Henry's direction.

* * * *

I turn now to consider how the mounted St. Paul's poems refigure the Bishop's death in response to the Catholic claims of conversion. I

²⁸Consider, for example, Donne's "Elegy" and two "Anniversaries" on the death of Elizabeth Drury.

will primarily discuss the English versions, but turn to the Latin where they offer further details or clarification. The first poem opens quite simply in the Latin version: “Hic iacet, nisi quis calumniatur”; however, this direct response to Catholic claims is rendered much more richly in the English, as it playfully engages with the formulaic “Here lies . . .” of the epitaph tradition:

Here lyes (unles some dare belye
His Ashes wth Apostacy
As they have done his Faith, and Rome
His changling Mind and Corpse entoombe.)
A praelate rightly Catholike
Who factious siding did dislike; (1–6)²⁹

“Belye” functions in a variety of ways here: the bishop’s “lying” in repose may be troubled by being “belied,” that is misrepresented (“calumniatur”) by Roman Catholic propaganda.³⁰ However, “belie” can also mean “to lie next to”—his opponents have set apostasy in his tomb alongside his body. Finally, the verb can also mean “to besiege,” a fit metaphor for how the defamers have attacked the helpless dead bishop. The poet avers that these propagandists, not content in claiming his deathbed experience, will extend their meddling to disturb his “ashes” and tomb. Rome has snatched his “changling Mind,” which does not mean that *he* has changed his mind but that Rome has made a “changling” of it. The struggle over the dead individual will continue, one which Henry King in his sermon compares to the devil claiming the body of Moses and the battle over Patroclus’ body in *The Iliad*.³¹ Bishop King had been safely buried in St.

²⁹BL Add. 58215, fol. 97v.

³⁰Such punning on “lie” was already well-worn in English poetry; one noteworthy example that Henry or the young John King surely knew is John Donne’s epigram on “The Lame Beggar.” See Theresa M. DiPasquale, “Donne’s Epigrams: A Sequential Reading,” *Modern Philology* 104.3 (2007): 339–45.

³¹The same comparisons are made in the elegy on Thomas Washington. See James Doelman, “Claimed by two religions: The Elegy on Thomas Washington, 1623, and Middleton’s *A Game at Chess*,” *Studies in Philology* 110.2 (2013): 318–49.

Paul's using "The Burial of the Dead" from *The Book of Common Prayer*, and no second Spanish Armada was threatening to sail up the Thames and make off with it, but by claiming a deathbed conversion, Roman Catholic writers were abducting his whole continuing being—both soul and body, which his epitaph promised would be resurrected. They have not just claimed him *dying*, but claimed him *dead*.

The poet is at pains to stress that King was "rightly *Catholic*"—not of the Roman sort, but of the Church Universal that looked back to primitive times. On the other side, the poem, like Henry King's sermon, seeks to distinguish the bishop from more radical Protestants. While Bishop King was of a decidedly Calvinist theology, he was a moderate in his ecclesiology, disinclined to what the poet calls "factious siding." The lines that follow distinguish him from Protestant sectaries and those inclined to follow new ideas:

Nor trode he wild Opinions Maze;
 Nor any newe sects did he rayse
 Or if some long wing'd Rabbis sor'd,
 Made by the Many, and ador'd;
 He rose not lightly at their sight,
 But flewe their Faiths not persons height:
 Deeming them great (no doubt) but lesse
 Then Truth which did him more possesse. (7–14)

This situating of the Bishop's theology is akin to the first few pages of Henry's sermon, which, rather than refuting conversion to Rome, denied any inclination to radical Protestantism on the Bishop's part. While the reference to "long wing'd Rabbis" is rather cryptic, from its context we can gather that the poet is using the term to denigrate preachers (especially Puritan ones) popular for their lofty oratory.³²

In the lines that follow the poet most directly denies any connection between Bishop King and Rome:

Onely he was not of the swarme
 Of shaveling Locusts, that doe harme
 Cloak't wth Religion; whose troopes loade
 The seven hill'd Roome; who making bode

³²(*OED*, *rabbi*, 3.a). The Latin text has "notae prioris" [familiar priors].

Like Geese about the Capitoll
 Dare swanlike songs harshly controll
 By gagling and unpleasant notes,
 (Sent from their rough, uneven throtes)
 And for a dying Swan[n]s sweet breath
 Their Gander tunes and quills bequeath. (15–24)

The representation of Catholic priests as plague-like devouring “locusts” was widespread in early seventeenth-century Protestant polemic, perhaps best known in Phineas Fletcher’s *Locustae* (1627).³³ The latter part of this satirizing of the Roman church is more intriguing, as it specifically addresses writers who had claimed the bishop’s conversion. The poet associates their “song” with the geese of the Capitol in ancient Rome, whose cackling warned Marcus Manlius of the Gauls’ attack. Such “gagling and unpleasant notes” might be appropriate as defensive warning, but are a mocked replacement of the “swanlike songs” of “a dying Swan” like Bishop King.

Likewise the poet derides the “thousand perjurd Doway throngues” who misrepresented the Bishop. As typical of such works, both *The English Protestants Plea* and *The Bishop of Londons Legacie* were printed without a place of publication on their title pages. While scholars now know that they were printed at Saint-Omer, the poet assumes they came from the Roman Catholic College at Douai, a similar college dedicated to the training of young English Catholics.³⁴ A few lines further on, the poem refers to claims that Bishop King had been “Caught by some Fisher,” a reference to Fisher [Musket], the author of *Bishop of Londons Legacie*. This allusion to “Fisher” and his “Legend Legacie” affirms that this elegy was written after at least the first edition of *The Bishop of Londons Legacie* in 1622. This verse paragraph concludes with a statement asserting that the Bishop died committed to the Church of England: “Yf but one God, one Faith

³³See *Phineas Fletcher: Locustae vel Pietas Iesuitica*, ed. Estelle Haan (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), pp. xlix and 54.

³⁴The first two editions of *The Uncasing of Heresie* (1623), another Catholic work that includes brief reference to Bishop King’s supposed conversion, were printed in Douai. However, it is unlikely that the elegy was written as late as that year.

there bee, / In this one Englands Faith dyed hee” (31–32). However, this statement is not as clear as it could be, and in fact seems to engage in some of the equivocation with which Protestant polemicists charged Catholics at the time. The first line posits, conditionally, a single God and faith. If there is only a single faith (despite seeming differences), then as a logical consequence the Church of England is part of it, and even if King died adhering to the Roman church, the broader unity of the church would mean he had also died in the Church of England—because after all there is just *one* church. The opening “if” complicates the whole sentence because, seemingly, if it is denied, if one were to argue that no, there are different faiths, Catholicism and Protestantism are distinct, then the second line is no longer true. One wonders if the ambiguity is unintentional, but the equivalent lines in the Latin version manifest the same ambiguity: “Unus si Deus est, Fides & una / Huic uni immoriens, & Anglicana.”

While the poem’s first purpose is to defend Bishop King’s death-bed commitment to the Church of England, the poet embraces the opportunity to offer more general satire of the Roman church and its beliefs. Thus, he suggests that the “forger of false Fames” has attempted a “transubstantiation” of Bishop King akin to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the mass, which is derided as “Christ swimming on the plate” or “wine Christo-fer ith’plate,” which is in turn pejoratively associated with the Pythagorean idea of transmigration of the soul (Pythagoras is explicitly named in the Latin text).

The poet, picking up on the title of *The Bishop of Londons Legacie*, challenges the Roman Catholic claims directly, calling upon them to “racke the poet grave,” to discover

Whither hee ere more creditt gave
 To his fein’d Legend Legacie,
 Then hee that wonn credulitie
 [98v]
 Whom the besotted world admire,
 The Golden Legends leaden fire.
 Or let him ne’r so stoutly swear
 And wth great Oathe truth overbear
 His tongue may do’t, but in his Mind
 Some Reservation sure hee’l find. (53–62)

Thus, he associates Fisher/Musket's *Bishop of Londons Legacie* with *The Golden Legend*, the medieval compendium of saints' tales.³⁵ In his sermon defending his father, Henry King also points to *The Golden Legend* as evidence of the fictionality of Catholic claims. Even oath-based Catholic claims are rejected, as the poem connects these with Catholic dependence on casuistry.

The concluding lines of the poem address the naïve Roman Catholic reader, here put in the typical epitaphic situation of the "*viator*" (passer-by or passenger):

Thou passenger,³⁶ who ere thou art,
 Yf otherwise thou thinkst in heart
 Yf thy Implicite Faith needs must
 Take up each Fable upon trust
 Sucking wth spongie greedynes
 All those seraphlike Guides expresse;
 Shake off thy Lethargie, and skan
 By thine owne Reason, like a man
 Mature to use both tongue and braines
 Without the borrow'd easie paines
 Of undertakers. Bee thou wise
 On thine owne stocke. A friends advise
 Knockes to awake thee. But if Thou
 Hoodwinke thy sence, and wilt not know,
 Thy state is desperate, Bee gone,
 And henceforth cheerly foole it on. (63–78)

The term "Implicite faith" used here is a specific theological one, *fides implicita*, meaning unquestioning acceptance of what the Roman Catholic Church teaches. The poet's charge is that such unquestioned allegiance has led to widespread acceptance of "fables," among which are the accounts of Bishop King's conversion. This becomes a stern rallying of the reader to "be a man / Mature to use both tongue and braines" in independent rational thought. Overall, this is an uncommonly extended address to the *viator* figure, here for the purpose of a very Protestant and rationalist exhortation, which

³⁵Gee, p. 144, concludes with a comparison of *The Bishop of London his Legacie* to *The Golden Legend*.

³⁶These two words are highlighted by a slightly larger, finer script.

concludes with dismissive ridicule. Thus, from beginning to end this opening poem is concerned with the ecclesiastical struggle over the reputation and commitment of the dead Bishop: religious controversy has largely displaced other elegiac commemoration.

The second long poem next to King's monument (beginning, "Quem Πασχα Domini fecerat Sacrii Diem") appears in the manuscripts in the English version as "That sacred Friday by his Paines (our Peace)." This is a more straightforward conventional elegy that proceeds by exploring the appropriateness of Good Friday for Bishop King's death and highlighting the parallels between Christ and the bishop. (Henry King's sermon had also concluded by remarking on the parallels between Bishop King and Christ: "Let it satisfie all the world and his owne fame that this (now dead) *Disciple hath had but the same fate and usage his Master had.*")³⁷ In the poem's first few lines, it is difficult to discern which of the two deaths is meant:

That sacred Friday by his Paines (our Peace)
Whose Death crown'd all his conflict wth release,
That Day, that Lord did this his servant lend,
Who rests heerby, an yrkesome life to end.
[99r]
Each may a Man of Sorrowes, well be stil'd,
His Crosse of stone, Christs was of wood compild.
Within him his Crosse grew, wthout Christs stooide,
To each one Day sett their paines period. (1-8)

The "Paines" in line 1 are Christ's, but such only becomes clear in line 3 where they are identified as of "that Lord." Christ's sacrificial death brought peace and the end of "an yrksome life" to his "servant" (Bishop King). The differences between the two figures are presented as mere details: thus, the specific Christological term "Man of Sorrowes" is applied to King as well, and their "Crosses" only differ in their material and placement (King's inner "stone" cross was his kidney stone that led to his death, remarked on by a number of the elegies.) However, this is the limit of the poem's boldness. Even its emphasis upon the simplicity of his tomb, with the sole word "Resurgam [I shall rise]" upon it, is not explicitly used to question the

³⁷p. 81.

more ornate tombs surrounding it in St. Paul's, as do some of the other elegies.³⁸ It is poetically successful in its refiguring of the "light" tomb that will "grone wth pain / To bring it [the body] forth, when it in sleepe hath lay'n / Three dayes" (17–19). The tomb thus becomes not a place of death, but of new life, as the tombs of Christ and King are collapsed into one, and the difference between three days and a thousand years dismissed in the immensity of God's time: "So long Christ lingered in the grave / (And 1000 yeares three daies short reck'ning have / In Gods account.)" (19–21). The concluding lines anticipate the Final Resurrection, and in so doing redirect readers' attention to the original one-word epitaph, "Resurgam": "Which here Thou readst in Characters engraven, / 'Twas stamp't upon his Heart, confirm'd in Heaven" (27–28).

The sequence on the memorial tablet next to King's tomb concludes with three short Latin poems: an anagram, chronogram and epitaph.

Anagr. Nominis, & Chronogr. Aetatis
62. currentis.
Joannes Kingus Praelatus.
En apertus Jonas Anglikus.

Chronogramma Anno Domini
1621.
ECCe CVpio DISSoLVI aC
ChrIsto aDgIVit Inar I
Philip. 1.2,3.

Pauli hoc dissolvi, repeti non desuit, ante
Quam, quae protulerat, Lingua soluta fuit.

The anagram involves a play on letters that makes translation unlikely, and none survive in the manuscripts. The poetic part of the anagram (*En apertus Jonas Anglikus*) can be translated "Behold, the English Jonah is revealed." The chronogram takes the Roman form of the year 1621

³⁸See Peter Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 213, on this as an example of an effective one-word epitaph.

and finds within it a text based upon Philippians 1:23: “Ecce dissolvi ac Christo adglutinari” [“having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ”]. The “cupio dissolvi” was a well-known text that figured prominently in medieval and renaissance debates about suicide.³⁹ At the heart of the issue was how to distinguish between a justifiable desire for the presence of Christ through death and the unlawful will to self-destruction. This leads into the epigram part of the chronogram, “Pauli hoc dissolvi, repeti non desiit, ante / Quam, quae protulerat, Lingua soluta fuit.” Payne Fisher provides a translation of the epitaph in his account of St. Paul’s monuments: “He ceas’d not with St. *Paul* death to invoke, / And be dissolv’d, until he no more spoke.”⁴⁰

The sequence concludes with a short epitaph (beginning “Non hic Pyramides” in the Latin inscription) that returns the focus to the simple, but spiritually significant, tomb. This translation of it occurs in manuscript with the other St. Paul’s poems:

No Pyramis nor gilded Elogie,
 Nor lofty Pile rayes these Ashes high
 More thrift it is to leave Thee to Thy selfe,
 Thy corpse were poorer, laden with more pelf.
 [99v]
 For hee that lives and dyes soe, leaves his Name
 To outlive Tomb, or costly marble frame./⁴¹ (1–7)

³⁹David Colclough notes that “The compressed phrasing ‘cupio dissolvi’ was widespread in citing this scriptural text in both patristic and early modern theology” (*The Oxford Edition of the Sermons of John Donne: Volume III, Sermons Preached at the Court of Charles I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 305. The “cupio dissolvi” comes up frequently in Donne’s sermons, and in *Biathanatos*, Distinction 4, Section 8, he concludes that Paul’s desire to be with Christ through death was not wrong, but that the virtue of charity called him to remain active in his earthly mission. (Donne does not actually use the phrase “cupio dissolvi” in the section itself, but it appears in the description of this section in his Table of Contents at the beginning of the work.)

⁴⁰p. 132.

⁴¹BL Add. 58215 offers *two* versions of the final line, that reproduced above, and “A living/lasting Toomb, and costly Marble Frame.” (“Living” and “lasting” are offered within { } as competing possibilities.)

While this partakes of the oft-used trope that the worthy need no monument, it gains an extra layer of irony given how Bishop King's original desire for an unadorned tomb had been at least partly undermined by the erection of the tablet including these verses.⁴²

* * * *

Apart from these Latin poems erected beside Bishop King's tomb, two other funeral elegies on him, by Thomas Goffe and Robert Aylett, confront the Catholic claims of conversion. Thomas Goffe, playwright and priest, was closely connected to the King family: like Bishop King, Goffe attended Westminster School and then Christ Church, Oxford, where he matriculated in the same year (1609) as both Henry King and John King (the younger). He was ordained as deacon by Bishop King in 1618. Thus, his elegy ("I know how witty grief is to invent") emerges from the close circles of the King family and Christ Church, and predictably it also mounts a direct challenge to the conversion rumors.⁴³ However, more than the inscribed poems discussed above, it goes further in developing an extended satiric attack on the Church of Rome in general.

The poem begins by comparing the universality of death with the defaming of the dead: "As Nature makes it common for to die / Soe common tis' one dead mens fames to lie" (5–6); this moves him to engage in the equally common role of elegists defending the reputation of the dead. However, the explicit defense against the

⁴²Other translations of the "Epitaphium" also survive. One, from the Phillipps manuscript, is printed in Crum's edition of Henry King (p. 186); it begins, "No Pyramids, nor Panegyrick Verse." Also printed by Crum (p. 242) is a second, beginning "No Pyramis, nor carv'd toomb-complement" (Bodl. MS Rawl. D.317, fol. 171) in a hand identified as John King's. This manuscript preserves a number of poems by John King in surrounding pages. Payne Fisher provides what is presumably his own translation, beginning "No Pyramid, no Panegyrick here," on p. 133.

⁴³All quotations are from Morgan Library MA 1057, published as *The Holgate Miscellany: An Edition of Pierpont Morgan Library Manuscript, MA 1057*, ed. Michael Denbo (Tempe: ACMRS, 2012), p. 176. The first six lines of the poem also appear in Rosenbach MS 1083/16, p. 298.

claims of apostasy only comes near the end of the poem. Instead he begins by reflecting on the Bishop's one-word epitaph and his heavenly life after death, which will include being used by the angels to inspire other preachers. His role as a preacher then dominates much of the poem, and as part of this, Goffe celebrates Bishop King's role as spiritual advisor to the king, enjoining him to the rebuilding of St. Paul's: now "who shall tell Kings the roomes / which Kings should build, are Temples, and not Tombes" (86–87). Bishop King was well known for his March 26, 1620 sermon encouraging King James to support the rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral, whose spire had been destroyed by lightning in 1561 and never replaced. It is this "temple" to which the poem refers. The reference to kings "not building tombs" potentially gestures in a number of directions. In one way it affirms James's practice of *not* building lavish tombs for his family members, as other European monarchs were wont to do. For example, neither Prince Henry (d. 1612) nor Queen Anna (d. 1619) had a permanent stone monument erected in Westminster Abbey to mark their graves.⁴⁴ Secondly the reference to not building ornate tombs also points to Bishop King's own simple tomb, only graced with "Resurgam" as an epitaph (to which Goffe alludes in line 13). Rather than a tomb monument that attracts attention to itself (as some more ornate tombs in St. Paul's, like that of Sir Christopher Hatton, were accused of doing), Bishop King becomes *a very part* of the house of God, supporting it in death as he did in life. He is a "Marble pillar" and "a foundation stone" (97) of the cathedral. In figuring Bishop King as one who became "stone," Goffe's elegy is (like a number of works marking King's death) playing on the cause of his death—"the stone": as he became "In some parts Marble, breeding his owne Tombe / with in his bowells" (95–96)—a rather baroque and unsettling figure.⁴⁵

In the final section of the poem Goffe, like Henry King's sermon and "Here lyes (unles some dare belye," confronts those who have spread rumors about the bishops's supposed death-bed conversion:

⁴⁴That monuments were built for the royal princesses, Sophia (d. 1606) and Mary (d. 1607), may reflect the less constricted financial situation of that time and the more modest tombs appropriate for infant princesses.

⁴⁵An epitaph beginning "though here thou lyeest in little Roome," whose title does not identify its subject, may also be about Bishop King: it plays upon the small tomb and death caused by the stone (BL Harl. 6038, fol. 12r).

And let no noise from Babel er'e molest
 Thine urne with slauder; Though some undertake
 with clamors of confusion to awake
 Thee from thy peace. No blessed soule can hearke
 Unto such dog'gs that stand without & barke.
 Boast not proud Jezebel, such a victory
 That thou, or thine adulterate vanity
 could ere entice his eyes to bee or'e tane
 with such a painted beauty (99–107)

Goffe derisively presents the Church of Rome in terms common to Protestant polemic: it is “Babel” (Babylon), a “proud Jezebel” and “a painted beauty,” and those individuals spreading rumors are not to be heeded. His refutation continues, not by recounting the history of the bishop’s death (as his son Henry’s sermon had done), but through an act of the imagination in which his soul in heaven does “scorne those foule reports” (112). If he were to visit earth again, “with what a power / Of Indignation would hee to’th world declare / His stedfast innocence?” (119–21). The final lines extend this derisive indignation to God himself, who “doth from heav’n deride / Their folly, where with good men are belide” (128–29); the final word echoes “Here lyes (unles some dare belye.” In the midst of this final section, there is one further intriguing line, where Goffe writes that Rome by “His name shall never add one relique more” (113). Thus he metaphorically applies the competition waged by medieval churches for the remains, however partial, of the saints to establish themselves as sites of pilgrimage. Bishop King’s reputation and ecclesiastical commitment, here figured as his “reliques” (which Henry King had begun his first elegy by addressing), are safe from Roman plunder.

While less sophisticated than the other poems on Bishop King’s death, one by Robert Aylett joins them in defending him against the claims of conversion. This poem was appended to Aylett’s verse paraphrase *The Song of Songs* (1621), his first published poetic work.⁴⁶ Aylett had largely completed this volume before Bishop King’s death, and he then added a short epistle to Henry King thanking him for

⁴⁶Hannah, following Anthony à Wood, mistakenly ascribes this work to Richard Argall rather than Aylett (*Poems and Psalms by Henry King*, ed. John Hannah [Oxford: Francis Macpherson, 1843]).

having passed along the manuscript to his father and noting how death has prevented his dedication of the work to the bishop. Instead he has appended to it a funeral elegy. Written in Aylett's usual rather pedestrian style, the poem proceeds by paralleling Bishop King with various biblical worthies: Elijah, David, Solomon, Jonah and Christ himself. Early in the poem he responds explicitly to those who "wrong thy fame / And die them, like their whoare, scarlet in shame" (27–28), emphasizing King's steadfast Protestantism right up until his death:

Yet had I but his Spirit here to tell,
How stoutly he opposed *Iezabel*,
And all her *Baalling* superstitious crew
Of Prophets, and their Idols overthrew,
How firmly he in his *Religion* stood,
Readie till *Death* to *seale* it with his *blood*,
Without least *Bastard thought* to change that Truth,
Which was in him firme, rooted from his youth;⁴⁷ (17–24)

King is an Elijah figure (which renders Aylett an unworthy Elisha), one steadfastly adhering to his God in the face of the jeering prophets of Baal. Yet, such slander is to be expected, he suggests, as even Christ suffered the same after his death.

* * * *

Beyond the elegies discussed here, the controversy surrounding King's death continued to reverberate. Elena Levy-Navarro argues that it prompted John Donne some three years later to record his steadfast commitment to the Church of England in his *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, written during what he feared was a deadly illness.⁴⁸ The controversy certainly had not died down at that time: John Gee's *Foot out of the Snare* devotes a chapter to it, attacking *The Bishop of London his Legacie*, and congratulating Henry King for his sermon response.⁴⁹ A

⁴⁷sig. O8v.

⁴⁸Elena Levy-Navarro, "John Donne's Fear of Rumours in the *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* and the Death of John King," *Notes & Queries* 47.4 (2000): 481–83.

⁴⁹pp. 142–44.

similar controversy arose over the death of James, Marquis Hamilton in March 1625, which is treated by Margaret Maurer as analogous to that of Bishop King (and King James, who died a few weeks after Hamilton).⁵⁰

Conclusion

While funeral elegies of the early Stuart period were written first of all to grieve and commemorate the dead, they frequently include material of a broader social, political and religious nature. Most often, however, such matters are contained within a section of an individual elegy: the poems on Bishop King discussed above are exceptional in how thoroughly Catholic-Protestant conflict dominates them. The furor prompted by claims of his conversion also overrode Bishop King's specific instruction for a simple tomb marked by the single word "Resurgam." If, as I have proposed, "the St. Paul's poems" were written by Henry King himself, his role as grieving son was also largely displaced by the role of defender of the Church of England and his father's commitment to that church.

Brescia University College

⁵⁰"Poetry and Scandal: John Donne's 'A Hymne to the Saynts and to the Marquesse Hamilton,'" *John Donne Journal* 26 (2007): 7–11. See also Thomas Roper to Thomas More, March 4, 1625, in Questier, p. 356; *CSPV, 1623–5*, p. 621; and *HMC Mar and Kellie*, p. 222. On rumors that Hamilton had been poisoned, see Alastair Bellany and Thomas Cogswell, *The Murder of King James I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2015), pp. 68–74.

Appendix

The Latin texts of the poems mounted on the tablet beside Bishop King's tomb are primarily based on John Stow, *Survey of London* (1633), p. 775. I have recorded major variants from William Dugdale's *History of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1658), p. 73 and Payne Fisher's *The tombes, monuments and sepulchral inscriptions lately visible in St. Paul's Cathedral* (1684), pp. 129–33. However, there are four lines in the first poem that appear in Fisher but not in Stow or Dugdale (these have been included in the present text in square brackets). That they are reflected in the English versions of the poem suggest that either: a) they were part of the original Latin verses inscribed at St. Paul's and Fisher's version was taken directly from that (rather than from Stow or Dugdale) or b) Fisher and the English versions reflect a separately circulating manuscript copy of the Latin poem.

IOANNIS KING Episcopi Lon-
dinensis, quicquid mortale est in
hoc pulvere componitur.

HIC IACET, nisi quis calumniatur,
Mendax Transtiberinus Ambulator,
Transferri Cineres, Fidemque Romam.
Et migrâsse semel, simulque utrumque
Praesul Catholicus, sed Orthodoxus.
Non partis studiosus, evagari
Per divertia multa opinionum,
Aut Sectas didicit novas creare:
Quod si qui fuerint notae prioris,
Quos vulgus facit & colit Magistros,
Hic tantâ levitate non adhaesit,
Ut persona fide magis placeret:
Magna nomina, sed minora semper
Isthaec omnia, Veritate duxit.
Tantum non fuit Ille de Locustis,
Aut rasis Monachis, piisque nequam,
Urbem qui gravidâre Septicollem:

Qui circum Capitolium strepentes
 Romanum, velut Anseres sonori,
 Cygnaeas temerare cantilenas
 Audent, per modulamen inficetum:
 Et pro vocibus ultimis Oloris,
 Commendare suas, & Anserinas.
 Sed, quod nec Calami, nec Ora centum:
 Nec Perjuria mille de Duaco;
 Nec Satan Decumanus ille mendax;
 Nec tandem Legio Diabolorum,
 Extorquere suis strophis valebunt:⁵¹
 Unus si Deus est, Fides & una
 Huic uni⁵² immoriens, & Anglicanae.
 Quod si quis Logodaedalus profanus,
 Aut Famae Plagiarius Scelestus,
 Quicquam Sacrilego reponat ore:
 Si vafer⁵³ Fidei Μελοσίαιης,⁵⁴
 Qui vult de similâ Deum creare,
 Et Christum iubet innatare vino:
 Et sic Hereticos & Orthodoxos
 Confandit, facit utque symbolizent
 Plus quam Pythagorae Μετεμψυχώζει,⁵⁵
 Seductum crepat hunc Apostatâsse:
 Tam ventosa Fides videtur illis;
 Tam ventosus & Ille Christianus;
 Ut, post tot, docilis Senex, aristas,
 Accessisse putetur imparatus,⁵⁶
 Infansque, ad Documenta Lessiana.
 Non plures libet, Arbitros citare,⁵⁷

⁵¹Dugdale] valebant

⁵²Fisher] unus

⁵³Fisher] vafera

⁵⁴Fisher] Metempsychosis

⁵⁵The five lines from "Qui vult" to the end of this line are missing in Fisher.

⁵⁶Fisher] imperitus

⁵⁷These four lines, which do not appear in Stow or Dugdale, have been supplied from Fisher. They are reflected in the translation.

[Quàm *Conscire suum*; quod apprecarer
 Testem, Carnificemque Judicemque
 Illi quisquis erat sacer Poeta
 An plus crediderit suae *Legendae*]
 Quam vulgi pius ille fascinator,
 Autor plumbens Aureae *Legendae*.
 Quin si jurat idem sat impudenter,
 Lingua peierat; at quid inde? Mentem
 Injuratus habet; Scioque habebit.
 Tu si credideris secus VIATOR,
 Nugis, Impliciti necessitate
 Assensus, bibulam fidem recludens,
 Si quis Seraphicus propinet Autor;
 Veternum excutias: & absque tandem
 Susceptore, tuum pares Adultus
 Examen, tibi teque cognitorem
 Ponas, & sapias mente Amico.
 Sin sis Credulitatis obstinatae,
 Conclamatus es: ILICET. Deinceps
 Te stultum jubeo libenter esse.

In Diem Obitus

Quem Πάσχα Domini fecerat Sacrii Diem,
 Et Mors coronis integri Certaminis:
 Hunc aequae Amicum Numen indulsit idem.
 Desiderando, quod prope hic, Capiti, Iacet,
 Quo solveretur Vita vitalis parum.
 Dolorum utrumque dixeris recte Virum;
 Hic Saxeam, Ille Ligneam sensit Crucem;
 Hic intus, Ille baiulans Extra suam:
 Dolorum, utrique; Lux posuit una & modii.
 Quin ipsa Lux haec masculum rebur dedit,
 Ut nil tremendum Mortis, incuteret metus;
 Sed Pascha verum, Transitus potius foret,
 Aeternitati Prodromus. Marmor loquax

Spirat RESURGAM,⁵⁸ Mysticis candens Notis:
 Nec ipse Sadducæus apparet lapis.
 Conditque tantum, non Premit Corpus grave
 Spes ista superat pondus,& Summum petit;
 Nec detinebit mole Depositum suâ;
 Sed sponte ruptus Exitum tandem dabit.
 Cum Triduanum dormierit. Ipus tulit
 Hanc, Christus Olim, Tertiae Lucis moram.
 (Nec mille Sæcla Triduum excedant Dei.)
 Sic tota domum, juncta Primitiis, Seges
 Egerminabit. Haec Via ad Patriam, Mori.
 Calcata Mors est, Surges ad Patriam vigil.
 Hanc spem fovebat Ille: quod sculptii hic legis,
 Sed Corde fixum fuerat, & Coelo ratum.

*Anagram: Nominis, & Chronogr:
 AEtatis 62. currentis.*

IOANNES KINGUS PRAELATUS.
 EN APERTVS IONAS ANGLIKVS.

*Chronogramma Anni Domini
 1621.
 ECCE CVPIO DISSOLVI, AC
 CHRISTO ADGLVTINARI*

Philip. I.23.

*Pauli hoc dissolvi, repeti non desiit, ante
 Quam, quae protulerat, Lingua soluta fuit.*

⁵⁸Echoing the single word on Bishop King's tomb.

EPITAPHIUM.

*Non hic⁵⁹ Pyramides; non sculpta⁶⁰ Panegyris ambit
 Hos Cineres; lapidum nec preciosa strues.
 Quod frugale magis, Tibi Te committimus unum:
 Si jaceas aliter, vilior Umbra fores.
 Nam Tibi qui similis vivit,⁶¹ meriturque⁶² Sepulcrum
 Ille sibi vivax,⁶³ & sibi Marmor erit.*

SEQVENTVR QVI NON DVM PRAECSSERE.

The English translations of “the St. Paul’s poems.”

This transcription from BL. Add. MS 58215 preserves original punctuation and spelling, except for “u/v” and “i/j,” which have been regularized. Expansion of scribal contractions has been indicated in italics. The copies of the poems in BL Harl. 6918, fols. 7–8 are largely similar; a small number of significant variants are recorded in the footnotes.

BL Add. MS 58215

[fol. 97v]

Here lyes (unles some dare belye
 His Ashes wth Apostacy
 As they have done his Faith, and Rome
 His changling Mind and Corpse entoombe.)
 A praelate rightly Catholike
 Who factious siding did dislike;
 Nor trode he wild Opinions Maze;

⁵⁹Fisher] Hic non

⁶⁰Fisher] scripta

⁶¹Fisher] vixit

⁶²Fisher] moriturque

⁶³Fisher] vivens

Nor any newe sects did he rayse
 Or if some long wing'd Rabbis sor'd,
 Made by the Many, and ador'd; 10
 He rose not lightly at their sight,
 But flewe their Faiths not persons height:
 Deeming them great (no doubt) but lesse
 Then Truth which did him more possesse.

Onely he was not of the swarme
 Of shaveling Locusts, that doe harme
 Cloak't wth Religion; whose troopes loade
 The seven hill'd Roome; who making bode
 Like Geese about the Capitoll
 Dare swanlike songs harshly controll 20
 By gagling and unpleasant notes,
 (Sent from their rough, uneven throtes)
 And for a dying Swan's sweet breath
 Their Gander tunes and quills bequeath.⁶⁴
 But which nor hundred pens nor tongues,
 Nor thousand perjur'd Doway throngues⁶⁵
 Nor the Grand Maister of that Art,⁶⁶
 Nor lying Legeons, on his part

[fol. 98r]

Shall by their juggling Sophistrie
 Evict, how ere they lowdly Lye: 30
 Yf but one God, one Faith there bee,

⁶⁴The various Roman Catholic works that claimed Bishop King's conversion. The "dying Swan" would be King himself, and his "song" his deathbed utterances.

⁶⁵The Roman Catholic College at Douai was dedicated to the training of young English Catholics; the first two editions of *The Uncasing of Heresie* (1623) were printed there; however, the poet may have in mind *The English Protestants Plea* and *Bishop of Londons Legacie*, two of the Catholic publications that claimed Bishop King's conversion. They were printed at Saint-Omer, a similar college also in the north of France. No place of publication appears on the Title Pages of any of these works.

⁶⁶Satan, as clear from the Latin version.

[fol. 98v]

Whom the besotted world admire,
 The Golden Legends leaden fire.
 Or let him ne'r so stoutly swear
 And wth great Oathe truth overbear 60
 His tongue may do't, but in his Mind
 Some Reservation sure hee'l find.
 Thou passenger,⁷⁰ who ere thou art,
 Yf otherwise thou thinkst in heart
 Yf thy Implicite Faith⁷¹ needs must
 Take up each Fable upon trust
 Sucking wth spongie greedynes
 All those seraphlike Guides expresse;
 Shake off thy Lethargie, and skan
 By thine owne Reason, like a man 70
 Mature to use both tongue and braines
 Without the borrow'd easie paines
 Of undertakers.⁷² Bee thou wise
 On thine owne stocke. A friends advise
 Knockes to awake thee. But if Thou
 Hoodwinke thy sence, and wilt not know,
 Thy state is desperate, Bee gone,
 And henceforth cheerly foole it on./

Upon the Day of his [Bishop King's] Death

That sacred Friday by his Paines (our Peace)
 Whose Death crown'd all his conflict wth release,
 That Day, that Lord did this his servant lend,
 Who rests heerby, an yrkesome life to end.

⁷⁰These two words are highlighted in slightly larger, finer script.

⁷¹*fides implicita*, unquestioning acceptance of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.

⁷²undertakers] helpers

[fol. 99r]

Each may a Man of Sorrowes, well be stil'd,
 His Crosse of stone, Christs was of wood compild.
 Within him his Crosse grew, wthout Christs stoode,
 To each one Day sett their paines period.
 Nay and that Day such manly courage brought,
 That the grim bug-bear Death, no terror wrought, 10
 But was a Pascha,⁷³ (Passage it imports)
 Forerunner to true Life. The stone reports
Resurgam, pourtray'd in mysterious white.
 (No sadducean stones this language write.)⁷⁴
 The Corpse it shelters, not sinkes downe. This Hope
 Lightens the weight, and climbs the Marbles top.
 Which shall not clogg this Pawne;⁷⁵ but grone wth pain
 To bring it forth, when it in sleepe hath lay'n
 Three dayes. So long Christ lingered in the grave 20
 (And 1000 yeares three daies short reck'ning have
 In Gods account.) Then shall the Harvest bee
 Like the First fruites; both springing wee shall see.
 The way to Heavens safe Harbour is by Death:
 Deaths way thus trodd, hee shall resume his breath
 When he awakes, and rise his Countries hight⁷⁶
 This Hope⁷⁷ he cherish't (and was cherish't by it)
 Which here Thou readst in Characters engraven,
 'Twas stamp't upon his Heart, confirm'd in Heaven.

⁷³Pascha] the Passover, subsequently identified as the Christian Easter.

⁷⁴Sadduceans, who rejected the Resurrection, would not write such on a tombstone.

⁷⁵Pawne] pledge or loan. Compare Henry King's "Exequy," lines 61–78, where he presents his wife's body as a mere loan made to the earth, of which "grain and atom of this dust" must be fully paid back.

⁷⁶BL Harl. 6918] sight.

⁷⁷BL Harl. 6918] home (i.e. St. Paul's Cathedral).

Epitaph

No Pyramis nor gilded Elogie,
Nor lofty Pile rayses these Ashes high
More thrift it is to leave Thee to Thy selfe,
Thy corpse were poorer, laden with more pelf.

[fol. 99v]

For hee that lives and dyes soe, leaves his Name
To outlive Tomb, or costly marble frame./
A living/lasting Toomb, and costly Marble Frame.⁷⁸

⁷⁸“Living” and “lasting” are offered within { } as competing possibilities.