John Donne Journal
Vol. 35 (2016)

"His Great Father's Greatest Instrument": John Donne's Search for Patronage and His Elegy on Prince Henry

Marla Hoffman Lunderberg

In the spring of 1614, Donne was hard at work seeking secular employment: he accepted an appointment as Member of Parliament, sought the position of Ambassador to Venice, and may have sought a position as Clerk of the Council.[1] Donne wrote his "Elegie On the Untimely Death of the incomparable Prince, Henry" (1613) at the onset of this period of active search and just two years before he finally accepted the offer to become a clergyman in the Church of England. The elegy was long unappreciated by the critical community. A quick look through the commentary gathered in the Donne *Variorum* offers these damning assessments: the poem is "full . . . of servile adulation" (Norton, 1895); "not a successful performance, and among the least readable" of Donne's poems (Jessopp, 1897); the "most obscure, frigid, and affected" of Donne's poems (Gosse, 1899); full of "conscious sycophancy" (Chadwick, 1900); full of "tasteless extravagance" (Grierson, 1912); and "strangled in . . . ingenuity" (Coffin, 1937).[2] However, more recent appraisals assert the poem's value by assessing its historic and literary contexts. Ruth Wallerstein and Terry Sherwood examine Donne's poem within the context of other poetry commemorating Henry's

[1]R. C. Bald, "Steps to the Temple," pp. 263–301 in *John Donne: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970).

[2]Quoted from *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, vol. 6, gen. ed. Gary Stringer (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), pp. 587–88.

death. Barbara Lewalski's monumental work on Donne's *Anniversary* poems places the elegy on Prince Henry within the epideictic tradition, and Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers expand on Lewalski's work as they note the way the "new rhetoric of grief" evident in the trajectory of Donne's funereal poetry is shaped by "considerations of patronage" (207, 208). Arthur Marotti reads the elegy within the context of an ambitious coterie of writers with whom Donne associated.[3] This essay will consider multiple historic and literary contexts for Donne's elegy as it asserts the poem's value in demonstrating Donne's negotiation of the tensions inherent in the early modern search for patronage.

Donne wrote his elegy on Prince Henry when he was actively seeking the favor of Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester (soon to be Earl of Somerset), and the prince had a long history of animosity with Carr. Henry had prevented Carr from obtaining Sir Walter Raleigh's Sherborne estate in 1609,[4] and the two also had clashed on the subject of Frances Howard, Rochester's mistress and, after her infamous divorce, his wife. An apocryphal story of Henry's disdain for Howard gives witness to the antagonism between himself and Rochester, expressed in raw, sexualized terms: Henry refused to accept Howard's glove when it was offered to him at a dance, "saying publickly, He

---

[3]Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965); Sherwood, "Reason, Faith, and Just Augustinian Lamentation in Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry," *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 13.1 (Winter 1973): 53–67; Lewalski, *Donne's* Anniversaries *and the Poetry of Praise: The Creation of a Symbolic Mode* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973); Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986); Pebworth and Summers, "Contexts and Strategies: Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry," *John Donne Journal* 19 (2000): 205–22.

[4]Sherborne had reverted to the Crown upon Raleigh's conviction for treason. James wished to present the estate to Carr, but when Henry interceded on Raleigh's behalf, James rescinded his promised gift to Carr. It is significant to note that after Henry's death in 1612, James finally did bestow the estate on Carr. See Elkin Calhoun Wilson, *Prince Henry and English Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1946), p. 142; and J. W. Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror, Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of Seventeenth-Century Personation* (New York: AMS Press, 1978), pp. 59–60.

would not have it, it is stretcht by another, meaning the Viscount."[5] This rancor was repeated in other accounts. Henry was said at one time to have either struck Rochester "on the back with his racket, or very hardly forborne it."[6] To a servant who offered to kill Rochester for Henry, the prince responded, "If there were Cause, he would do it himself."[7] Finally, for those who suspected foul play in Henry's death, Rochester was a prime suspect.[8]

Donne was by no means unique in writing an elegy for the prince while simultaneously courting Rochester. Henry's death occasioned the greatest number of elegies in English history—greater than that following the deaths of Sir Philip Sidney (1586) or Queen Elizabeth (1603).[9] John Webster went so far as to dedicate his elegy for Henry to Rochester, and George Chapman was first a client of Prince Henry and later a client of Rochester. The tensions that Donne experienced were one regular feature of the conditions that writers faced as they sought patronage.[10] Seventeenth-century patronage is, as Leah Marcus notes, best understood as "heterogeneous groups of contrasting interests and affiliations."[11]

---

[5]From Arthur Wilson, 2:686; cited in Elkin Calhoun Wilson, p. 95; Williamson, p. 132; and Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1986), p. 55.

[6]Elkin Calhoun Wilson, p. 95.

[7]Ibid., p. 95, and referenced in Williamson, p. 131.

[8]Williamson, p. 167–68.

[9]On the numerous elegies written on Prince Henry's death, see Wilson, pp. 132–33; Wallerstein, pp. 59–95; and Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 124.

[10]Although much has been written in recent years about the multiple dimensions of and diverse reactions to the patronage system, Heather Dubrow's "'The Sun in Water': Donne's Somerset Epithalamium and the Poetics of Patronage" remains, for my purposes, one of the best discussions about "the relationship between patrons and their suitors and about the problems of studying those relationships" (*The Historicial Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988], p. 197).

[11]"Literature and the Court," *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 488.

By publishing his elegy in Joshua Sylvester's *Lachrymae Lachrymarum* (1613),[12] Donne positioned himself with a group of courtiers who had strong personal reason to mourn the prince's death. Sylvester had been a member of the prince's household, along with two other contributors to the collection: Henry Burton was Keeper of the Closet, and Joseph Hall was one of the prince's chaplains.[13] The prince had served as an important literary patron,[14] and with his sudden death, these men and many others lost a personal source of financial stability. And yet Sylvester's collection also represents a new potential source of patronage for these writers: Princess Elizabeth, sister of the dead prince, paid Sylvester for it.[15]

Patronage, then, was a natural motif in the elegies, yet it was a thorny one. Henry had anchored militant Protestant hopes during his lifetime, a position that clashed with his father's desire to fashion himself as peacemaker.[16] The prince's clients needed to find new sources of support from those whose vision of England opposed

---

[12]The full title is *Lachrymae Lachrymarum, or The Spirit of Tears distilled from the untimely Death of the Incomparable Prince Panaretus.*

[13]In 1605 Sylvester had dedicated to Henry his translation, *Tetrastica. Or, the quadrains of Guy de Faur, Lord of Pibrac*. He was a member of the prince's household by 1608, with a pension of £20 per year. In 1611 he dedicated his *David. The fourth day of the second weeke of his Du Bartas* to the prince. Prince Henry seems to have intended to appoint Sylvester to the post of Groom of the Chamber, but never fulfilled his intention. See Wilson, pp. 37, 105; and L. Parsons, "Prince Henry as a Patron of Literature," *Modern Language Review* 47 (1952): 503–07 on Sylvester. See Kay, p. 189, on Burton; and Bald, p. 269, on Hall.

[14]As Graham Parry argues, Henry "took the responsibilities of patronage seriously, building up an entourage of writers and artists who would reflect his chosen self-image as a Renaissance prince in the Italian style: soldier, scholar, collector, connoisseur and Christian." "Literary Patronage," *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, ed. David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 131.

[15]Kay, p. 195, n. 183.

[16]See Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror*; and Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*. See also Timothy V. Wilks' unpublished dissertation for a rich trove of details on Prince Henry's life. *The Court Culture of Prince Henry and His Circle, 1603–1613* (Diss. Mansfield College, Oxford, 1987). Microfilm.

Henry's. Donne rises to the challenge by praising both king and prince, one militant and the other pacifist, one dead and the other living, while subordinating the prince's qualities to the king's with a discretion which, later in his career, served as one of his great skills as preacher.[17] Donne's elegy offers a glimpse of one way an underemployed writer and would-be courtier could portray the tensions inherent in King James's reign.

1.

A seventeenth-century funeral elegy has three functions—mourning, praise, and consolation.[18] Scholars have long concentrated their attention on the portrayal of mourning in Donne's elegy, where pain, both public and private, proves more potent than reason or faith upon Prince Henry's death.[19] Yet the poem does more than grieve: it analyzes the relationship between death, love and politics, a point Jonson missed in simply noting the obscurity of its approach.[20] With images of the prince as both warrior and lover, Donne praises Henry,

---

[17]See Jeanne Shami, "Donne on Discretion," *ELH* 47.1 (Spring 1980): 48–66; and Marla Hoffman Lunderberg, "Donne's Strategies for Discreet Preaching," *SEL* 44.1 (Winter 2004): 97–119.

[18]Pebworth and Summers, p. 205. See also G. W. Pigman III, who documents changes in the way mourning and consolation were embedded in English Renaissance poetry. *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

[19]On Donne's use of the classical conception of praise, see W. M. Lebans, "The Influence of the Classics in Donne's *Epicedes and Obsequies*," *R.E.S.* ns 23 (1972): 127. Pigman argues that praise, lament and consolation are equally important in the genre, in contrast to O. B. Hardison and Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, who classify the elegy as "poetry of praise," or part of the classical epideictic genre. Pigman, "Praise and Mourning," pp. 40–51 in *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy*; Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962).

[20]Ben Jonson was said to have responded wryly to Donne's elegy, declaring that it was written "to match Sir Ed: Herbert in obscureness." Reported by Drummond (1619 [1925, 136]); cited from *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, vol. 6, gen. ed. Gary A. Stringer (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), p. 586.

and by association, his father, King James. His praise of the dead prince also sets in motion an appeal for patronage from those who survived him. Lines 25–42 of Donne's elegy praise Henry's militant activism while subordinating that militancy to King James's pacifist principles. Lines 83–98 close the poem with a shift from war to love, softening its portrayal of the militant prince and reaching out to the mysterious, anonymous woman whose presence allows the poem to close with a plea for patronage.[21]

The motif of Prince Henry as militant warrior required a careful dance on the part of writers wishing to please the king whose motto was "Beati Pacifici." Henry believed in force rather than diplomacy and in action rather than scholarship. He once told his tutor, "I know what becomes a Prince. It is not necessary for me to be a professor, but a soldier and a man of the world."[22] Henry was a popular young prince, and many contemporary observers suspected that James envied his son his popularity. The French ambassador remarked that James "often shewed that he was not pleased to see [Henry] advance so fast." The Venetian ambassador surmised that "the King has some reasonable jealousy of the rising sun."[23]

At least one elegist simply ignores the dangers implicit in these tensions. John Davies of Hereford contrasts Henry's powerful self-presentation to the quandaries of a more fearful king:

> [Henry] aw'd the Great, and (iustly, most precise)
> Discount'nanc'd such as Greater were than good.

---

[21]Quoted from *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, vol. 6, gen. ed. Gary Stringer (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995). I have omitted italics in my quotation. Further references to the elegy will be to this text.

[22]*Relazione* of 1607 by Nicolo Molin, *Calendar of State Papers*, *Venetian*, X (1603–1607), par. 739, pp. 513–14; quoted in Williamson, p. 41; and Strong, p. 15.

[23]The French ambassador is quoted from Birch, 77; the Venetian ambassador from the *Calendar of State Papers*, *Venetian*, XI (1607–10), par. 954; both are quoted in Williamson, pp. 43–44, 119.

> For, such as wilbe Sheepe, the Wolfe deuoures.
> Then, sheepish Kings must flee all Beasts of prey.[24]

Davies had been similarly indiscreet during Henry's lifetime, hoping in the preface to his 1603 poem, *Microcosmos*, that the then nine-year-old prince might someday prove capable of achieving Arthurian greatness in a manner that apparently King James could not:

> These will we now repaire, faire as before
> That Scots, and Brittaines may mixt live therein:
> Caerleon, where king Arthure liv'd of yore,
> Shall be rebuilt, and double gilt once more. (ll. 240–43)[25]

Davies's position reflects the voice of those who judged James's diplomacy inadequate to the conditions of the religio-political tensions building on the continent.

Donne proves more circumspect than Davies, tempering his praise of the prince by simultaneously praising his sovereign's ideals and by subordinating the dead prince's militancy to the live king's pacifism. In various fashions, most other elegists also subordinated Henry's activism to James's pacifist politics. Henry Burton acknowledges Prince Henry's militant Christianity but diffuses the tension inherent in that militancy by describing the prince's energies as aimed at "heathen" Saracens and Indians, rather than toward the Catholic Continental nations with whom James wished to maintain peaceful relations. Thomas Heywood neutralizes the differences between father and son by describing Henry as an activist, but also as heir "to all his Fathers vertues." Sir William Cornwallis subordinates the prince to the king as he paints Henry as a military commander who paid James "A Sonn's and subject's dew obedience." John Webster pairs

---

[24]John Davies of Hereford, *The Muses-Teares for the Losse of their Hope; Heroick and Nere-Too-Much praised, Henry, Prince of Wales* (1613), sig. A4^{v}, ll. 155–58. Davies' elegy was also surprising in another line of criticism of royalty: "Some Kings are more than Men in their beliefe; / But, in their lives such Beasts as never liv'd" (sig. A3^{r}, ll. 85–86).

[25]Quoted in Richard Badenhausen, "Disarming the Infant Warrior: Prince Henry, King James, and the Chivalric Revival," *Papers on Language and Literature* 31.1 (Winter 1995): 3.

Mars and Minerva in his characterization of Henry: Henry's militancy thus is teamed with James's love of scholarship. Cyril Tourneur pairs Peace and War as competitors for Henry's affection. [26]

Donne subordinates Henry's bellicose ambitions to James's peacemaking as the poem adapts the classical commonplace that war's goal is peace (ll. 32–34). In *De Officiis*, a staple of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century education, Cicero argues, "the only excuse . . . for going to war is that we may live in peace unharmed."[27] Cicero acknowledges that some might wish to go to battle in order to achieve "mere ambition for fame," but declares that such achievements are of lesser value than those of peace: "For arms are of little value in the field unless there is wise counsel at home" (I.xxii, pp. 75, 77). In writing that Henry's "activ'st spirit" had been expected to "conuey and tye / This soule of Peace" (ll. 33–34), Donne engages Ciceronean ideology in order to subordinate the prince to the king.

Donne further subordinates son to father with a simple metaphor: Henry is "his great Father's greatest Instrument" (l. 32). Arthur Marotti writes that "such language glosses over the contrast between James's pacific policies and the Prince's militant Protestantism."[28] I

---

[26]Burton, "A Pilgrim's sad Observation upon a disastrous Accident, in his Travaile towards the Holy-Land," in *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, 3rd ed. (1613), sig. G1^{r}; Heywood, "A funeral elegie upon the death of Henry, prince of Wales," in *Three elegies on the most lamented death of prince Henrie, by C. Tourneur, J. Webster and T. Heywood* (1613), sig. C1^{v}; Cornwallis, "Elegie On the untimely Death of the incomparable Prince, Henry," in *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, 3rd ed. (1613), sig. E3^{v}; Webster, "A monumental columne, erected to the memory of Henry, later prince of Wales," sig. B1^{r}, in *Three elegies on the most lamented death of prince Henrie, by C. Tourneur, J. Webster and T. Heywood* (1613); Tourneur, "A griefe on the death of prince Henrie," sig. C3^{r}, in *Three elegies on the most lamented death of prince Henrie, by C. Tourneur, J. Webster and T. Heywood* (1613). Tourneur problematizes the pairing more than Webster does: Peace wins the competition by taking Henry with her to heaven; but she may have won by default—out of fear that Henry, alive, might have preferred War to Peace.

[27]Cicero, *De Officiis*, translated by Walter Miller, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961), I. xi, p. 37. On the ways *De Officiis* became part of a cultural vernacular, see Cicero, *On Obligations*, translated and introduction by P. G. Walsh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. xliv–xlv.

[28]Marotti, p. 271.

argue instead that such "glossing" is actually a rhetorical *tour de force*. The difficulty of sustaining the metaphor of Henry's instrumentality can be best seen in the contrast between Donne's and George Chapman's elegies. Chapman, like Donne, had much at stake in the careful management of his praise: Henry was Chapman's patron, and the prince's death left Chapman financially and socially stranded.[29] Chapman's elegy initially positions the son as his father's "chiefe Limme," couching his praise in the manner we see in Donne. However, later in his poem, Chapman does not mask the prince's desire for war, nor does he attempt to reconcile it to James's desire for peace, as he writes of the prince's militarism, "Peace being but a pause to breathe fierce warre; / No warrant dormant, to neglect his Starre."[30]

Where Chapman praises Henry's warlike nature, Donne instead shifts his poem's focus to the king's peacemaking and in the context of peacemaking introduces the language of Christianity. This language does not appear in Donne's initial description of Henry's activism (ll. 25–30), and this absence is meaningful in the context of Henry's militant Protestantism. Only in service to James does Donne declare that Henry will "tye / This soule of Peace through Christianitie" (ll. 33–34) and "make / This general Peace th'eternall ouertake" (ll. 35–36). Only within the context of James's peacemaking does Henry's activism acquire Christian significance.

The elegy's Christian vocabulary paints an apocalyptic vision which Donne employs to further subordinate prince to king. The eternal peace (l. 36), the end time for which James's peaceful reign is so far only an emblem (l. 38), and the "last Dayes" (l. 40) signal an apocalyptic eschatology which, in Donne's vision, maintains a different

[29]John A. Buchtel argues persuasively that the publication history of Chapman's *The Whole Works of Homer, Prince of Poetts, in his Iliads, and Odysses* demonstrates Chapman's struggle in riding the tide of power shifts between Henry and James. See "Book Dedications and the Death of a Patron: The Memorial Engraving in Chapman's *Homer*," *Book History* (John Hopkins University Press) 7 (2004): 1–29.

[30]Chapman, *An Epicede or Funerall Song: On the most disastrous Death, of the High-borne Prince of Men, Henry Prince of Wales* (London: Printed by T. S. for John Budge, 1612), sig. B3^{r} and sig. C3^{r}.

focus from typical early seventeenth-century militant usage.[31] In Donne's poem, war appears only as rumor (l. 42),[32] in contrast to militant writers' focus on apocalyptic wars against the Biblical Antichrist, and that rumor is a tool in the hands of a peace-seeking king. In this construction, father and son work toward the same end: Henry's activism, or rumors of it, will extend the peace of James's reign toward an eternal and universal peace.

Donne further appeals to James's ideals when he presents Henry's militancy as an enigma, declaring that Henry's "Reputation was an Extasie / On Neighbor States; which knew not Why to wake / Till Hee discouerd what wayes Hee would take" (ll. 26–28). J. W. Williamson has argued convincingly regarding the warrior mythos that shaped Henry's life, and Williamson's *Myth of the Conqueror* documents multiple historic occasions of the international paralysis which Donne praises Henry for creating. In 1607, when Henry was only thirteen, he sent to France a personal ambassador, Prince de Joinville, who was, in fact, an engineer and spy, and who embarrassed the French by reporting to Henry on the fortifications of Calais. When Henry was sixteen, Protestant princes throughout Germany awaited his decision to join France's Henri IV in fighting against Spain. At the time of

---

[31]See Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978). During Elizabeth's reign, apocalyptic imagery had been used both by Elizabeth's churchmen and radical separatists (Christianson, pp. 45–46). In 1588, James VI of Scotland himself applied his interpretation of Revelations to current events in England (in *A fruitfull meditation*; see Christianson, pp. 94–95). But by 1613, most apocalyptic imagery in English writing was used by radical puritans and separatists to condemn alleged abuses in the Church of England (Christianson, pp. 89–92).

[32]Donne's vocabulary alludes to the "rumors of wars" mentioned in Mark 13.7 and Matthew 24.6. The focus on war was true both of the apocalyptic writers for whom Rome was the Antichrist and of the puritans and separatists who criticized the English church. John Bale's *The image of bothe churches* (1541–47), in which the primary thrust was the identification and eradication of the Biblical Antichrist, set the standard for this focus. Some writers, like Thomas Brightman, incorporated a millennial vision into their reading of the apocalypse, but their goal remained to incite the holy war which must precede the final peaceful days. On Bale and his successors, see Christianson, pp. 14–26; on Brightman, see Christianson, pp. 100–06.

Henry's death, Europeans were assessing his exploits with care, fearing that he at any time might lead an invasion against the Spanish in Holland.[33] But Donne does not mention any such events. Instead, he emphasizes the enigmatic quality of Henry's activism by pointing to Henry's effect on others rather than to any of Henry's known activities. Donne observes that others go into an ecstasy out of fear of actions Henry might undertake, or are stupefied by their own attempts to angle for his favor. Donne never specifies what Henry does to create this furor, providing only a vague description of Henry's "aspect and Excercise" (l. 41).

By imaging Henry's activism as enigmatic, Donne praises both father and son: with his actions vague and his intentions unclear, Henry can be seen to have served as James's best instrument for peace, and by shrouding the dead prince in mystery, Donne honors the policies of the living sovereign, King James. James believed in surrounding royal activities with secrecy. In 1616 he warned the Star Chamber,

> Incroach not upon the Prerogatiue of the Crowne: If there fall out a question that concernes my Prerogatiue or mystery of State, deale not with it, till you consult with the King or his Councell, or both: for they are transcendent matters. That which concernes the mysterie of the Kings power, is not lawfull to be disputed; for that is to wade into the weaknesse of Princes, and to take away the mysticall reuerence, that belongs vnto them that sit in the Throne of God.[34]

The rhetoric of royal mystery—*arcana imperii* in its Roman precedent—was often used to keep James's subjects at arms' length from his public policies as well as from his private life.[35] Donne

---

[33]Williamson, pp. 43, 112, 141.

[34]*The Political Works of James I*, ed. Charles Howard McIlwain, 1918 (New York: Russell and Russell, 1965), pp. 332–33.

[35]See Jonathon Goldberg, "State Secrets," pp. 55–112 in *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and Their Contemporaries* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983). See especially page 68 on the Roman precedent, "arcana imperii," and page 83 for various contemporary accounts of some of the pleasures behind the royal mysteries.

appeals to this rhetoric in his descriptions of the prince: Henry embodies the mystery that James demanded for royalty. Others "knew not" how to respond to Henry; they had to study his actions in order to interpret them. Rumors of possible military action took the place of any complete knowledge of Henry's military plans.

In writing this elegy, Donne constructs a prince whom he can safely praise. Henry's militancy is presented as a weapon firmly secured in the hands of the king. His activism is not a source of political tension in this construction, and therefore, the prince thus imagined is not exactly the one who lived. Donne's careful adaptation of the facts of Henry's life resembles his mode of praise offered in another elegy, the "Obsequies to the Lord Harington": both poems finesse their praise of a militant young man whose politics differed from the king's. In the Harington poem, as Ted-Larry Pebworth argues, "the point is not that Donne's poem is insincere or dishonest, but that, on the contrary, it truthfully (yet tactfully) reveals the author's ambivalences."[36] In the Henry elegy, it is not ambivalence but political savvy and careful rhetoric that guides Donne's weaving of truth and tact.

Donne's elegy for Henry operates on an advisory level as well, suggesting that any king who hopes to command respect from neighboring countries must wield military power—or at least the threat of such power. In this understanding of Donne, I part company with Pebworth, who believes "Donne shared the king's reluctance to make war."[37] Donne was, as Pebworth points out, "in religious matters, extraordinarily tolerant for his day" (38), yet this tolerance is different from a pacifist politics. For Donne, a military experience—his Cadiz expedition in the service of Essex—played a significant role in the development of his own identity as a Protestant Englishman.[38] In the elegy, military force—the threat of Prince Henry's attack on other

---

[36]Pebworth, "'Let Me Here Use That Freedome': Subversive Representation in John Donne's 'Obsequies to the Lord Harington,'" *JEGP* 91.1 (January 1992): 17–42, 31.

[37]Ibid, p. 38.

[38]See Bald, "Military Service," pp. 80–92 in *John Donne: A Life*. See also Dennis Flynn for a different view on Donne's military experience and his identity as Englishman, in *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995).

nations—is a significant component of the identity of a successful king.

Yet the poem's complicated intersection of Henry's militancy and James's pacifism demonstrates Donne's caution in the model he constructs. Rhetoricians had long recognized in praise a relatively safe method of giving advice to the powerful. As Erasmus wrote,

> No other way of correcting a prince is so efficacious as presenting, in the guise of flattery, the pattern of a really good prince. Thus do you instil virtues and remove faults in such a manner that you seem to urge the prince to the former and restrain him from the latter.[39]

Donne himself at times recommends such Erasmean praise as a valuable method of giving counsel, as in his verse letter to the Countess of Huntingdon: "flatteries work as far, / As counsels, and as far th'endeavour raise" ("Man to God's image," ll. 51–52). Yet Donne remains wary of flattery's appeal. In a sermon preached for the Countess of Bridgewater (probably in the early 1620s), he criticizes Roman orators, who, he explains, "had no way to make the Prince wise, and just, and temperate, but by a *false* praising him."[40]

In the Henry elegy, Donne advises James by praising Henry rather than by falsely praising James himself. However, such a defense of

---

[39]Cited in Lester K. Born, in "The Perfect Prince According to the Latin Panegyrists," *American Journal of Philology* 55 (1934): 35. Francis Bacon and Ben Jonson also promote advice through praise; see Bacon, "Of Praise," in *Essays* (London: Everyman's Library, Dent, 1972), pp. 156–57; and Jonson, "Discoveries," in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925–52), 8: 566. I owe the references to Bacon and Jonson to Michael C. Schoenfeldt, "'Subject to Ev'ry Mounters Bended Knee': Herbert and Authority," in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 249, n. 25.

[40]Quoted from *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson, 10 vols. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1953–62), vol. V, p. 200. Italics mine. See the introduction to Volume V, pages 14–15, for Simpson's dating of the sermon. For further discussion of Donne's critique of flattery in this sermon passage, see Lunderberg, "Donne's Strategies for Discreet Preaching."

Donne the elegist against the accusations of Donne the preacher depends, in the end, upon splitting hairs. The tension evident in the contrasting voices of preacher and elegist demonstrates that articulating praise could prove crushing. The dangers of failure were real: John Buchtel notes that of three poets that Richard Helgerson designates as holding "failed laureate ambitions"—George Chapman, Samuel Daniel and Michael Drayton—all three had made a "common investment of their poetic stock in the praise of Prince Henry."[41] As Donne writes praise for the prince, the line upon which he dances is a thin one, a moving target, a dangerous one indeed.

2.

As Donne's elegy turns from praise for the dead to consolation for the living, its final lines build an image of Henry as lover, one which departs from the poem's earlier portrayal of the warrior prince. In a notoriously obscure passage, Donne claims he can comprehend his prince by imagining him through this alternative personification—that is, "as Hee embrac't the Fires of Loue" (l. 88)—better than by thinking about him "as he really was." Ruth Wallerstein declares that this turn to love answers the philosophical question structuring Donne's elegy: "It is through love, [Donne] says, that the problems of limited reason and failing faith are solved."[42] While this is true, the turn to love also responds to the practical challenge Donne faced in writing about Henry: how to modulate his praise of the militantly Protestant prince with a proudly pacifist father. The prince who might have lived to love would have pleased the pacifist, alliance-seeking king, and the praise Donne pens for Henry's imagined love also responds to criticism Donne received for his earlier venture in writing poetry for praise, *The Anniversaries*. Yet because history records no love interest on Henry's part, critics have been left to surmise about

[41]Buchtel, "Book Dedications," p. 17, acknowledges that this common thread (seeking the patronage of Prince Henry) is not the only factor in these poets' failed search for esteem, but that it is one interesting factor not noted by Helgerson. See Richard Helgerson, *Self-crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), p. 53.

[42]Wallerstein, p. 71.

Donne's intent in these lines, and the possibility that the lines might refer to Henry's sister Elizabeth raises all manner of critical discomfort.

Donne is not alone in his use of a love trope as the basis of consolation in an elegy for Henry: love structures the consolation in Henry Goodyer's and Edward Herbert's elegies as well.[43] Goodyer's poem turns from mourning for Henry to the poet's love for the remaining royal heirs, Charles and Elizabeth, not a surprising turn for someone seeking patronage from a living heir. Herbert imagines that those who cared for Henry during his lifetime continue to live only through their love for and memory of Henry.[44] However, in comparison to Goodyer's and Herbert's poems, Donne's application of the love *topos* is extraordinary: in Donne's poem, it is Henry, and not the poem's narrator, who experiences love. Henry's other elegists do not refer to any specific love interest for the prince. Two other contributors to *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, Sir William Cornwallis and Hugh Holland, describe women's desire for Henry, but indicate no reciprocation, or for that matter, any kind of sexual desire on Henry's part.[45] But in Donne's poem, the warrior prince who dominates the early lines of the poem is transformed into the loving prince of the poem's close.

Court entertainments from Henry's lifetime demonstrate the tradition of balancing any portrayal of the warrior prince. Jonson's *Prince Henry's Barrier's* (1610) presented Henry as Meliades, who, according to Arthurian tradition, had a mysterious love relationship with the mythical Lady of the Lake. Jonson's *Barriers*, though, omits

---

[43]Herbert and Goodyer's elegies also share with Donne's a philosophical speculation on death and an examination of the power of poetry to increase fame and console a grieving person. See Terry Sherwood on the common subject matter in Donne's, Herbert's, and Goodyer's elegies on Prince Henry. See also Lewalski, *Donne's* Anniversaries, pp. 322–26, on the likelihood that Donne's *Anniversaries* influenced these two elegies on Prince Henry.

[44]Goodyer, "Elegie On the untimely Death of the incomparable Prince, Henry," and Herbert, "Elegie On the untimely Death of the incomparable Prince, Henry," in *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, 3rd ed. (1613).

[45]Cornwallis, sig. E4^{r} and E4^{v}; and Holland, "Elegie On the untimely Death of the incomparable Prince, Henry," in *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, sig. D2^{r} and D2^{v}.

the complicated (and messy) history of Meliades as lover, and according to Stephen Orgel, this omission may have been problematic for Jonson. Meliades's primary role in *Barriers* is to provide Henry a venue for demonstrating his skill in "feats of arms."[46] It is possible that this chivalric presentation of Meliades did not please King James: Orgel notes that *Oberon*, the masque Jonson wrote for Henry just a year later (1611), has a much less martial tone than that maintained in the *Barriers*.[47] Donne's closing his elegy with an emphasis on the prince as lover, and more particularly, as a very mysterious kind of lover, makes sense in this context. Donne's poem avoids the martial tone of the *Barriers*, building instead a prince as mysterious in his private life as in his public persona.

In proclaiming Henry to be "Our Soules's best Bayting and Mid-period / In her long Iourney of Considering God" (ll. 85-86), Donne adopts the conceit that earthly love can serve as education in and preparation for loving the divine. Donne's straightforward adoption of this trope was unusual for elegies in this era: Barbara Lewalski notes that elegies for Queen Elizabeth typically adapted the convention for secular use. While in Dante and Petrarch, the deceased became a "manifestation of God to the lover and a way to that highest love," in elegies to Elizabeth, "the Petrarchist conceits are constantly employed without this romantic basis and with only very general Christian significance."[48] Donne's phrasing applies, rather than avoids, the conceit's Christian origins.

Yet even as he pens the trope, Donne contradictorily rejects the tradition. The narrator declares himself "too narrow" to think of Henry as he really was and too humanly limited to glean consolation from the literary and spiritual convention. Rather than drawing strength from thinking of Henry "as Hee is Hee" (l. 84) the narrator

---

[46]"The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers," pp. 523–39 in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, Vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1975), p. 66.

[47]Orgel, *Illusion of Power*, p. 67.

[48]Lewalski, pp. 25–26. See also Donald L. Guss, *John Donne, Petrarchist: Italianate Conceits and Love Theory in the "Songs and Sonets"* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1966).

finds comfort in imagining love in the prince's life. With an extraordinary shift that both rejects the actual history of Henry's life and recalls the closing stanza of "The Canonization," Donne praises the education in love that the prince can offer his bereaved subjects: "I can reach Him thus; / As Hee embrac't the Fires of Loue with vs" (ll. 87-88). Donne is self-conscious in constructing a prince different from the prince as he lived.

It should be no surprise, then, that the poem's professed longing to "see or hear / That Shee-Intelligence which mov'd This Sphear" (ll. 89-90) has frustrated scholarly attempts to locate any historic lover that Donne might be gesturing towards.[49] Nothing we know about Henry's life suggests that any real-life love affair played a significant role in his history. On the contrary, his biographers were careful to assert the opposite. Sir Charles Cornwallis, treasurer of Henry's household, wrote that he,

> having beene present at great fests made in his [Henry's] house, whereunto hee invited the most beautifull and specious Ladies of the Court and City, could neither then discover by his behaviour, his eies or his countenance, any shew of singular or especiall fancy to any.[50]

Likewise, Sir Francis Bacon:

> His passions were not over vehement, and rather equable than great. For of love matters there was wonderfully little talk, considering his age: insomuch that he passed that extremely slippery time of his early manhood, in so great a fortune and in very good health, without being particularly noted for any affairs of that kind.[51]

Henry was unenthusiastic about the various matches proposed for him over the years: the Infanta of Spain, considered at various times

---

[49]See *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, vol. 6, p. 609.

[50]*A discourse of the most illustrious prince, Henry, late prince of Wales. Written anno 1626* (1641); quoted in Wilson, p. 96.

[51]*The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. James Spedding, R. L. Ellis, and D. D. Heath, VI (1858), p. 328; quoted in Wilson, p. 96.

between 1603 and 1610; a princess of Savoy, for whom negotiations were undertaken between 1610 and 1612; the sister of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, proposed for him in 1612; and Princess Christine of France, proposed in 1612.[52] In 1612, James asked Henry to evaluate the merits of the French and Savoyard matches, but Henry merely acknowledged his indifference:

> If I have incurred the same error that I did last, by the indifference of my opinion, I hereby crave pardon of your Majesty, holding it better for your Majesty to resolve what course is most convenient to be taken by the rules of State, than for me, who am so little acquainted with subjects of that nature. And besides, your Majesty may think that my part to play, which is to be in love with any of them, is not yet to hand.[53]

Henry, less than pleased with the various Catholic matches proposed for him, finally determined that he would accompany his sister Elizabeth to Germany after her marriage to Prince Frederick and find in Germany a Protestant bride.[54]

Yet a Continental love affair is not the only option for interpreting the love demanded at the closing of this elegy. Barbara Lewalski is

---

[52]See Williamson, pp. 133–40, and Strong, pp. 80–83, on the several matches proposed for the prince. Badenhausen understands these repeated Catholic matches proposed by King James as one way that James attempted to temper Henry's militant Protestantism (p. 3).

[53]From a letter from Henry to James, dated October 5, 1612. Qtd. in Mary Bradford Whiting, "Henry, Prince of Wales: 'A Scarce Blown Rose,'" *Contemporary Review* 137 (1930): 497–98.

[54]Williamson, pp. 139–40. Roy Strong refers to vague "hints" that late in the Prince's life "there are allusions to courtly dalliance" (p. 221), but concedes that we lack substantial details regarding these matters (pp. 42, 55, 80). The single piece of evidence of such dalliance Strong offers is of the Prince's refusing to accept Frances Howard's glove at a dance. Others have taken note of the prince's refusal of the glove while drawing different conclusions. Margaret Maurer has noted her suspicion that court rumors were behind the suggestions made in Donne's elegy. "John Donne: Occasional Poet," Presidential Address, John Donne Society Conference, February 27, 2010.

among the critics who find the poem's centering "Shee-Intelligence" to be not a lover, but Henry's beloved sister Elizabeth.[55] This identification of Henry's love addresses the elegy's historical context: Henry's funeral and the national mourning for him were intimately tied to Elizabeth's wedding preparations. Henry's death on November 6 occurred soon after Elizabeth's groom's arrival in England, and Elizabeth's wedding was postponed for Henry's funeral ceremonies. The link between the two occasions appears most dramatically in an elegy by William Basse which, after seeming to close, continues with two final stanzas titled "Morning after Mourning," a dedication to Elizabeth and her upcoming nuptials.[56]

It is appealing to imagine the Princess Elizabeth presiding over the close of Donne's elegy, in a manner similar to her role in Samuel Daniel's masque, *Tethys*. Performed in June 1610 at Henry's "creation" as Prince of Wales, *Tethys* starred Henry's mother, Queen Anne, in the title role, and his sister Elizabeth as the River Thames. In these roles, David Bergeron argues, the royal women "control the masque, presiding and participating" while Henry and James are mere spectators.[57] The close of Donne's elegy positions Elizabeth similarly, as an active, formative presence in Henry's life.

As Donne's elegy gestures, however opaquely, toward Elizabeth, it becomes a plea for patronage. Elizabeth paid for *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, the collection of poems that included Donne's elegy, and the patronage connection between Elizabeth and Donne is well-attested in other ways as well. Elizabeth was raised in the home of

---

[55]Lewalski (p. 66) and Kay (p. 195) believe the woman here is probably the princess Elizabeth, although Lewalski calls the reference "deliberately vague." Sherwood finds the difficulty of identifying a woman evocative of the uncertainties of all human relationships (p. 66). Leonard Tourney finds current critical speculation on the woman's identity irrelevant to the poem's affirmation of human love. See "Convention and Wit in Donne's *Elegie* on Prince Henry," *Studies in Philology* 71 (1974): 480–81. On Henry's relationship with Elizabeth, see Wilson, p. 56; and David M. Bergeron, *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), pp. 111–12.

[56]*Great Brittaines sunnes-set bewailed* (1613); described in Kay, p. 168.

[57]Bergeron, "Creating Entertainments for Prince Henry's Creation (1610)," *Comparative Drama* 42.4 (Winter 2008): 444.

Lord and Lady Harrington, the parents of Lucy, Countess of Bedford,[58] and Donne could have met one patron through the other. In later years Donne sent Elizabeth copies of two of his publications: *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624) and *The First Sermon Preached to King Charles* (1625).[59]

Still, if the love in the poem is between Henry and his sister, the poem's erotically suggestive vocabulary—"embrac't the Fires of Loue" (l. 88), "Charmes Hee spoke" (l. 93), "Oathes . . . [you] neuer broke" (l. 94) and "the Souls you sigh't" (l. 95)—is disturbing. Multiple scenes from Donne's love poems are suggested in the imagery of the elegy. The secrecy of the love between Henry and the unidentified woman resembles the fiercely defended privacy of "Break of Day," "The Canonization" or "The Sun Rising." "That Shee-Intelligence which mov'd This Sphear" (l. 90) repeats a recurrent image from "Air and Angels." The final two lines, where Donne poses as an angel singing the history of the royal lovers, resemble the close of "The Canonization," where future lovers sing hymns in praise of the narrator and his love. The images that build the sensuality of the love poetry seem oddly misplaced—or worse—in a portrayal of sibling affection.

The use of the love *topos* elsewhere in English elegies can provide one answer to the oddly conceived tone of these lines. Critics have also questioned Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey's, use of the love *topos* in his "So crewell prison," though for reasons different from those in Donne's poem. In a fine analysis of Surrey's expression of grief in this poem, G. W. Pigman argues that "the diction is that of love-lament" and that this lament "has parallels in Surrey's own love poetry."[60] Surrey's expression of grief, then, parallels Donne's use of the love *topos* to deal with the pain of loss in his elegy for Prince Henry. Pigman cites Puttenham regarding the way the early modern period established a rhetoric of lament that applied to many different kinds of loss—"laments for death, war, and disappointments in love."[61] In Surrey's poem, Pigman argues, "the hyperbole of love poetry proves to

[58]Bald, *John Donne,* p. 171.

[59]Ibid., pp. 455, 483.

[60]Pigman, *Grief,* p. 70.

[61]George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Doidge Willock and Alice Walker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939); cited in Pigman, *Grief,* p. 70.

be no exaggeration of Surrey's grief."[62] Like Surrey, Donne uses erotic vocabulary to express a pain that is beyond the reach of ordinary expression.

The closing lines of the poem offer Donne's response to criticism of his most famous poems for patronage, the *Anniversaries*, as the lines echo and alter vocabulary and imagery from the earlier poems. Donne's defense of the *Anniversaries*' hyperbolic praise of Elizabeth Drury is well-known: in his 1612 letter to George Garrard, Donne addresses those who thought his praise of an unknown twelve-year-old was too extravagant. He urges all readers to accept his praise for themselves, but first to make themselves worthy of that praise. Famously, he responds to his critics,

> I would not be thought to have gone about to praise her, or any other in rime; except I took such a person, as might be capable of all that I could say. If any of those Ladies think that Mistris Drewry was not so, let that Lady make her self fit for all those praises in the book, and they shall be hers.[63]

In the Prince Henry elegy, Donne repeats a similar invitation: "Whoe'er thou bee / Which hast the noble Conscience, Thou art Shee" (ll. 91-92). As the poem's love relationship itself remains mysterious, the potential for consolation turns toward the reader who might see herself in Donne's poem, or, as W. Milgate glosses the line, "whoever you are who have the noble inner knowledge that you are she I speak of."[64] Such a reader can choose to make herself worthy of Donne's praise by positioning herself as the distributor of consolation—consolation which could, of course, include patronage of Henry's poet-mourners.

The elegy's reference to the "Shee-intelligence" who held the prince's attention resembles the sustained metaphor in the *First Anniversary*, where Elizabeth Drury is the intelligence that animates the world. In the Prince Henry elegy, Donne resituates the metaphor.

---

[62]Pigman, *Grief*, p. 70.

[63]Donne, *Letters to Severall Persons of Honour*, ed. M. Thomas Hester (Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1977), p. 239.

[64]*Epithalamions, Anniversaries and Epicedes*, edited with introduction and commentary by W. Milgate (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 195.

It is the sphere itself, Prince Henry, and not the animating female, who has died, and the poem focuses on the loss, not of a relatively unknown young girl, but of a public figure whose life might have altered the course of European history. The world's animating female presence, then, becomes not the cause of immeasurable grief but a source of potential consolation, to the world, and also to Donne himself. The Henry elegy simply is not as hyperbolic as the *Anniversaries*.

The final lines of the Henry elegy point toward the tenuous nature of Donne's situation as a writer in 1613. In these lines, Donne positions himself in much the same way he did at the close of the *Second Anniversary*: as a voice to proclaim another's worth. In the *Second Anniversary*, he calls himself God's trumpet, whose purpose is to proclaim Elizabeth Drury's life and death to all the world. In this role, the poet claims that his voice is not simply his own: he fulfills God's will and purpose (ll. 523, 526) and acts on God's authority (l. 526). Yet different applications of the prophetic voice respond to the context behind each poem's search for patronage. When Donne wrote the *Second Anniversary*, he was writing for Sir Robert Drury, a proven patron whose appreciation of the *First Anniversary* was known. The unhesitating image of the divine trumpet speaks to the poet's confidence in this patronage relationship. By contrast, the prophetic voice at the close of the Henry elegy, an angel singing the history of the prince and the woman he loved, is much less certain. The angel's position is tenuous, dependent upon the character of the imagined reader, the success of the "conjuring" of line 93, and the conditional "if" of line 95:

> I coniure Thee by all the Charmes Hee spoke,
> By th'Oathes which only you Two neuer broke,
> By all the Soules you sigh't, that if you see (95)
> These Lines, you wish I knew Your Historie

If the woman Henry loved were to see these lines, she might wish to teach the poet more of her history. The consolation of the entire poem depends upon Donne's ambiguous creation of an *imagined* history, and the conditional nature of these lines suggests uncertainty. When Donne wrote the Henry elegy, the possibility of earning patronage for

his poem was uncertain, and therefore, the prophetic role he claims is likewise uncertain.

The love imagined at the poem's close softens the earlier portrait of the prince as warrior. In his love, Henry is decorously self-consistent, a mystery in his private as well as his public life. His life and his love come to resemble the ideal imagined in Donne's love poetry: "We die and rise the same, and prove / Mysterious by this love" ("The Canonization," ll. 26-27). As the identity of the woman Henry loved remains vague, the nature of Henry's love remains in keeping with James's policy of *arcana imperii*. The love which renders Henry more accessible to his subjects ("I can reach Him thus," l. 87) simultaneously and contradictorily reinforces the distance between him and his subjects. The love expressed in this way navigates the challenge of a king who needs his son to be honored in death—but not to be over-honored, over-loved.

* * * *

Seventeenth-century poets and courtiers proclaimed Donne as master of the funeral elegy, with Sylvester opening his own elegy with a tribute to Donne:

> How-euer, short of Others Art and Wit,
> I know my powers for such a Part vnfit;
> And shall but light my Candle in the Sunn,
> To do a work shall be so better Donne.[65]

In our own era, Donne studies were for some time dominated by demeaning critical portraits of the poet-courtier who became a late-in-life preacher: "ambition" and "apostasy" were the key terms used to represent a desperate careerist, evaluations that relied on a particular reading of Donne's commitment to the Church of England.[66] While

[65]Sylvester, *Lachrymae Lachrymarum*, sig. A2^{r}. On Donne as the acknowledged master of the genre, see Lewalski, pp. 307–70; and Kay, p. 115.

[66]For varying critical assessments of Donne's life, see John Carey, *John Donne, Life, Mind and Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981) and Arthur Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet*. The portrait of a singlemindedly desperate careerist suggested by Carey and Marotti has long been refuted by

many more recent writers have undertaken new and more nuanced readings of Donne's life and work, the last years before Donne took holy orders continue to serve as an important nexus for interpreting the career-shaping choices Donne made, and consideration of the subtleties of a complex court system remains critical to this enterprise.[67] As Robert Evans states in view of Ben Jonson's very different career path, "No matter how he earned his living, every individual was still implicated in countless ways, in a society permeated by patronage relations and shaped by assumptions conducive to them."[68] John Donne's pre-ordination poetic activity demonstrates one man's experience of operating, with discretion, within the exigencies of multiple court demands.

Hope College

---

works as varied as those by Heather Dubrow, *A Happier Eden: The Politics of Marriage in the Stuart Epithalamium* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990); Annabel Patterson, "John Donne, Kingsman?" in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 251–72; David Norbrook, "The Monarchy of Wit and the Republic of Letters: Donne's Politics," in *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*, ed. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katherine Eisaman Maus (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 3–36; and Lunderberg, "Donne's Strategies for Discreet Preaching." Margaret Maurer has presented an important reassessment of our reading of Donne with her Presidential Address, "John Donne: Occasional Poet," given at the John Donne Society Conference on February 27, 2010.

[67]Work on court masques and on Shakespeare's plays already makes use of this understanding of patronage. See, for example, David Bevington, "Introduction," *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. David Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); and Mark Rankin, "Henry VIII, Shakespeare, and the Jacobean Royal Court," *SEL* 51.2 (Spring 2011): 349–66. Bevington notes the challenges Jonson faced in writing *Neptune's Triumph* (1624), due to the need to "pick his way among the radically contradictory preferences" of his audience (p. 3). Rankin analyzes "competing narratives of the Henrician Reformation that could legitimate differing ideological commitments concerning history and English Protestant orthodoxy" and the ways these different narratives were shaped to please and/or advise King James (p. 362).

[68]*Ben Jonson and the Poetics of Patronage* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1989), p. 26.