John Donne Journal
Vol. 23 (2004)

Consecrating Lincoln's Inn Chapel

Jeffrey Johnson

On 22 May 1623 John Donne was invited to preach the sermon for the consecration of the rebuilt chapel at Lincoln's Inn, and shortly thereafter, at the benchers' request, the sermon appeared in print, the full title of which is "*Encoenia. The Feast of Dedication Celebrated at Lincolnes Inne, in a Sermon there upon Ascension day, 1623. At the Dedication of a New Chappell There, Consecrated by the Right Reverend Father in God, the Bishop of London. Preached by John Donne, Deane of St Pauls.*" Two copies of this Encænia sermon are held at Lincoln's Inn, one among the collection of printed books in Lincoln's Inn Library, and the other among the Chapel muniments in the Inn's Archives. The noteworthy point, and the matter of central significance for this study, is that bound with the Archives copy of the printed sermon is the manuscript "Latin liturgy and English prayers" for the rite consecrating Lincoln's Inn Chapel.[1] The manuscript is a fair copy written in secretary hand, but there is no indication on the manuscript of the scribe's name, although the librarian at Lincoln's Inn, Guy Holborn, believes that one of the benchers must have served as copyist. The Library's holdings also include a

[1]Lincoln's Inn Archives J1a2. A copy of "Latin liturgy and English prayers" and an accompanying transcription of the manuscript by Ernest W. Sullivan, II is scheduled to appear in a subsequent volume of the *John Donne Journal.*

transcription of the manuscript text,[2] and it too provides no indication of its copyist.[3]

While "Latin liturgy and English prayers" has been catalogued, the manuscript has not, to my knowledge, been noted in any critical discussions.[4] This manuscript calls attention to the reformation of the rite of consecration in the Church of England during the early years of King James' reign, shedding light not only on the liturgical controversies that flared up in the Jacobean church over just this type of ecclesiastical practice, but also on the shifting influences and fluid compilation of these forms. The manuscript also demonstrates the English bishops' imposition of liturgical expression as a means for promoting ecclesiastical reform. In addition, as the most complete liturgical setting for any of Donne's extant sermons, "Latin liturgy and English prayers" provides a detailed context for evaluating Donne's knowledge of the consecratory forms and, thus, for confronting Donne's irenicist impulse as he articulates the thorny problems regarding feast day and holy day celebrations and the implications for a theological understanding of the church in relation to the appropriateness of visible signs in worship.

It should come as no surprise to scholars of Reformation England that the rite of consecration came into disuse during the sixteenth century, especially given Protestant suspicions regarding visible signs and the use of externals in worship that so many in the

---

[2]Lincoln's Inn Archives J1a2/1

[3]It should be noted, however, that the transcription dates from some time after 8 April 1883, since on the first page of the document, the transcriber indicates that the chapel was reopened on that date after repairs were made to the chapel.

[4]J. Wickham Legg indicates that Bishop Montaigne's "London Register cannot be found" and then adds that the only available source for the Lincoln's Inn consecration is the "imperfect text" he includes "from the Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Tanner 176. fo. 133" (*English Orders for Consecrating Churches in the Seventeenth Century*, Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. 41 [London: Harrison & Sons, 1911]), p. 87.

English Church aligned with Roman Catholic superstition. The rite of consecration was not only *not* common practice in the Edwardian and Elizabethan churches, but was also viewed with express contempt.[5] J. Wickham Legg lists several instances of churches being consecrated during the late sixteenth century, but these are noteworthy precisely because they are anomalies—one in 1564, in which "the Bishop of London, Dr. Grindal, issued letters commissional" for hallowing and dedicating the parish church of Woodham Walter; another in 1597, in which "Dr. Richard Bancroft professed to consecrate and dedicate the rebuilt chapel of St. Anne's, Blackfriars"; and a third in 1599, in which "the Chapel in the Hospital of the Holy Trinity at Croydon was consecrated by order of the founder, Dr. Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury."[6]

As a result, it is a rather intriguing development that the rite of consecration re-emerges with such vigor in the English Church during the seventeenth century so as to become a regular fixture of liturgical practice. As with so many aspects of ecclesiastical expression and re-form in the Church of England, it is Richard Hooker who is responsible for raising and defending the appropriateness of consecration. In Book V, chapter 12 of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1597), he argues that "we knowe no reason wherefore Churches should be the worse" for being consecrated.[7] In order to illustrate his arguments regarding the historic practice and sanctity of consecration, Hooker briefly narrates the actions and opinions of Constantine and Athanasius to establish his assertion that the dedication of churches is not a work "in it selfe either vaine, or superstitious."[8] Hooker adds that churches should be set aside as public places, "for thavoydinge of privie conventicles, which covered with pretense of religion maie

---

[5]Ibid., esp. pp. xv-xvii.

[6]Ibid., p. xviii.

[7]*Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, ed. W. Speed Hill (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1977), 2:50.

[8]Ibid.

serve unto daungerous practices," and that the proper intention of consecration is "to surrender up that right which otherwise theire founders might have in them, and to make God him selfe theire owner."[9] In effect, then, Hooker's defense of the rite of consecration, on the one hand, speaks to the concerns of English puritans by insisting that the essence of the church is that of the community of believers, and thus the church building is no more than a place of "publique resort."[10] On the other hand, Hooker addresses the more formal demands of Anglo-Catholics by specifying the sacrality that is signalled by means of the rite, and thus the church building is itself holy, a place severed "from common uses."[11]

Little of the conciliarism that Hooker seems so mindful to foster informs the actual rites of consecration that burgeoned during the first years of the seventeenth century.[12] In fact, the

---

[9]Ibid., 2:51.

[10]For discussions of Hooker's views on community, see Arthur Stephen McGrade, ed., *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community* (Tempe, AZ: MRTS, 1977), and especially the essays by William J. Bouwsma, Ramie Targoff, W. B. Patterson, and Debora Shuger.

[11]Hooker, 2:53. In addition, see James Cannon, "Reverent Donne: The Double Quickening of Lincoln's Inn Chapel," in *John Donne's Professional Lives*, ed. David Colclough (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003), who explains that "most seventeenth-century conformists were ultimately willing to accept that God was in some way present in churches," but "instead of explaining church sacrality by Hooker's view of consecration, it was argued that God manifested himself in churches through the presence of believers" and that "this model of sacrality was derived from Matthew 18:20, 'where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them'" (p. 211).

[12]For a basic list of church consecrations in the seventeenth century, see John Wordsworth, "On the Rite of Consecration of Churches, especially in the Church of England," *The Church Historical Society* LII

Jacobean bishops who are responsible for reintroducing the rite of consecration (especially William Barlow, John King, and Lancelot Andrewes) are intent on inscribing formal ceremonies for sanctifying the churchyard, the church building, and the furniture and altar ornaments in ways that anticipate the wide-ranging liturgical reforms instituted by Laud.[13] By drawing on the justifications articulated by Hooker and capitalizing, according to James Cannon, on "the restitution of church funds under James I [that] led to a gradual increase in new building,"[14] a number of English bishops seized the ecclesiastical opportunity presented to them. In fact, the bishops realized all too well that the solemn consecration of a church, a rite more formal than a simple dedication or benediction, must be performed by a bishop and is considered irrevocable.[15] However, because no prescribed form of consecration existed in the Church of England, not only early on, but also well into the seventeenth century, each bishop was left to his own discretion.[16]

(1899): 27; and for a more complete list, see Legg, Appendix VI, pp. 318-21.

[13]See John N. Wall, Jr., "The Reformation in England and the Typographical Revolution: 'By this printing...the doctrine of the Gospel soundeth to all nations,'" in *Print and Culture in the Renaissance*, eds. Gerald P. Tyson and Sylvia S. Wagonheim (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986). Wall argues a point complementary to my own, though he does so expressly within the context of the printing press revolution, that "the English reformers took advantage of the press's ability to achieve simultaneous use of the same document over a wide area to bring about a Reformation that was more liturgical and behavioral than it was theological and intellectual, more a matter of *praxis* than of *gnosis*" (p. 208).

[14]Cannon, p. 210.

[15]For an historical overview of this issue, see Legg, pp. xxxiv-xxxvii.

[16]See Edward Charles Harrington, *The Object, the Importance and Antiquity of the Rite of Consecration of Churches* (London: F & J Rivington, 1844), pp. 97-98.

Without question the most influential expression of the rite of consecration during the seventeenth century was that of Lancelot Andrewes, which was first celebrated at Jesus Chapel, Peartree, on Sunday, 17 September 1620, when Andrewes was Bishop of Winchester. In fact, nearly every consecration throughout the 1620s and 1630s followed Andrewes' form. One of the notable exceptions, however, is the consecratory celebration at Lincoln's Inn Chapel. George Montaigne, who was Bishop of London in 1623 and who thus consecrated the chapel at Lincoln's Inn, chose instead to rely primarily on an older liturgy introduced by William Barlow. While a thorough enumeration of the differences between Barlow's and Andrewes' forms would prove rather tedious, there are a number of prominent distinctions worth mentioning. To begin with, Andrewes' text is roughly four times the length of Barlow's.[17] Further, not only are the prayers in Andrewes' form more numerous, but when Andrewes borrows prayers from the earlier rites performed by Barlow, the prayers swell to nearly twice the length of Barlow's. In addition, Andrewes is, not surprisingly, far more meticulous than Barlow in consecrating the church furniture and ornaments, and Andrewes places even greater typological emphasis on his liturgical actions, such as in his practice of washing his hands before beginning the prayer of consecration.[18] Yet, I wish to emphasize that Andrewes' excesses are comparative; there is still plenty in Barlow's form against which separatists and even some moderate Protestants could rail.

Because it is apparent, as will be discussed below, that Montaigne was familiar with Andrewes' form, his reason for relying on Barlow more so than on Andrewes may indicate Montaigne's sensitivity to the Calvinist leanings of the Lincoln's Inn benchers. Wilfrid Prest contends that none of the other Inns

---

[17]That is, as the two are printed in Legg's edition, pp. 1-8 (Barlow) and 47-80 (Andrewes).

[18]Ibid., p. 340 (note for p. 71, line 30). For a further listing of differences between Andrewes' and Barlow's forms, see Legg, pp. xl-xli.

of Court "rivalled the puritanism of Lincoln's Inn, either in reputation or reality," and he adds, "the tone of zealous piety which pervades the Black Books is conspicously [sic] absent from the records of the other houses."[19] However, it is entirely possible that Montaigne may not have had the Calvinism of the benchers foremost in his mind, for although he was an Arminian sympathizer, Montaigne's churchmanship during his years as Bishop of London was, according to Kenneth Fincham, marked by what little impression he made on the dioceses.[20]

The reasons for Montaigne's choices may instead be the result of historical accidents related to situation and timing. Just prior to becoming Bishop of London, Montaigne served, from 1617-1621, as Bishop of Lincoln, where William Barlow himself served as bishop just four year before Montaigne's term, from 1608-1613.[21] In addition, Montaigne's decision to model the rite after Barlow's form for a private chapel may also show a consideration for the more limited ecclesiastical function of Lincoln's Inn Chapel. Thus, considering the coincidences related to the bishopric of Lincoln, as well as the chapel's use as a specialized parish church, it is understandable, if not almost predictable, that Montaigne would draw heavily on William Barlow's form for the private chapel at Langley, the manor house of Edmund Style in Beckenham, Kent, celebrated on 26 July 1607, when Barlow was Bishop of Rochester.

The rite of consecration for Lincoln's Inn Chapel begins, as with the Langley consecration, at the entrance of the chapel. In fact, no one other than a bishop was permitted to enter a chapel until it had been consecrated. The manuscript indicates that Montaigne first delineated the particulars of the date and feast day

---

[19]Prest, *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640* (London: Longman, 1972), pp. 206, 207.

[20]Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), see esp. pp. 292-93.

[21]It is Richard Neile who served as Bishop of Lincoln between the terms of Barlow and Montaigne, from 1613-1617.

(Thursday, the feast of the Ascension, AD 1623) and the specific time and location (between 8am and 11am, at the inn commonly called Lincoln's Inn near the lane commonly called Chancery Lane in the suburbs of the city of London).[22] The document then names Thomas Spencer, Richard Digges, Giles Tooker, and William Ravenscroft as the owners (or trustees, "*domini*"[23]) of the new chapel who, as representatives of the benchers, willingly relinquished their own interests in the building. The manuscript specifies that the structure was named the Chapel of the Holy and Undivided Trinity in Lincoln's Inn and that these owners of the chapel petitioned the Bishop to separate the chapel from all of its former profane uses in order for it to be dedicated and consecrated to holy and divine uses. As a token of their free gift, the four named benchers presented Montaigne with the key to the chapel.[24]

Next, the Latin liturgy indicates that Bishop Montaigne entered the empty chapel alone and that the first, seventh, and ninth verses of Psalm 122 were sung. At this point, the document recounts that the Bishop faced toward the east, kneeled, and raised his hands in preparation for the consecratory prayer.[25] This somewhat lengthy prayer acknowledges that while God, "mightie in power and of incomprehensible Majesty," cannot be contained "within anie the largest circuite," yet God takes pleasure in having particular places consecrated "for hearing thy word, celebrating the Sacrament of the Lords supper, and offering up the sacrifices both of prayer and thankesgivinge."[26] The prayer concludes by promising God that those who use the chapel will approach the altar to present both their "soules and bodies as holy Temples of thy spirit, within this

---

[22]J1a2, f. 1v.

[23]Ibid.

[24]J1a2, f. 1r.

[25]Ibid., f. 2v.

[26]Ibid., f. 2v-2r. Legg notes that the question of whether Barlow composed these prayers himself or drew upon some source is currently unknown (see p. xlii).

little Temple."[27] The potentially contentious words "altar" and "temple" are quoted directly from the Langley form. In fact, up to this point in the service, Montaigne follows Barlow's Langley form quite closely, except of course for the inclusion of those details related specifically to Lincoln's Inn.

The first major alteration occurs at this point in the liturgy, and for this next extended section ("*In Dei Nomine*"[28]), Montaigne draws on Andrewes' rite. If Montaigne had remained faithful to Barlow's form, then following the consecratory prayer, he would have called the congregation into the chapel. Instead, however, the manuscript indicates that Montaigne came out through the doors of the chapel and addressed the congregation, which was still gathered outside.[29] Imitating the basic structure established by Andrewes for this portion of the service,[30] Montaigne repeated the location of the chapel with respect to its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and he described the inside measurements of the structure (about 68 feet from east to west, and about 41 feet from north to south).[31] In addition, the Bishop detailed the particular pieces of furniture and ornaments for worship that were being consecrated along with the building itself, including a holy table, a pulpit, convenient seats, a bell, and other necessaries for divine service.[32] Finally, Montaigne reiterated the various liturgical uses to which the chapel would be put.[33]

Again, Montaigne follows Andrewes' form within this section rather faithfully; the significant departure, however, occurs in the placement of this section within the overall liturgy. For Andrewes,

---

[27]Ibid., f. 3v.

[28]Ibid., ff. 3r-5r.

[29]Ibid., f. 3v-3r.

[30]See Legg's edition, pp. 66-70.

[31]J1a2, f. 3r.

[32]Ibid., ff. 3r-4v.

[33]It is at this point that the "imperfect text" of the liturgy, Bodleian Library MS Tanner 176. f. 133, ends.

this section appears well into the service, and thus well after the consecratory prayer.[34] In particular, the congregation has already entered the church, the bishop has offered a second consecratory prayer, the sermon has been preached, the Eucharist has been celebrated, and the bishop has recited Solomon's prayer dedicating the Temple.[35] Thus, Andrewes' form expresses as consequential both to the formal moment of consecration and to the initial religious service for which the building was constructed that which Montaigne's form establishes as preparatory to the liturgical participation of the congregation. In other words, this portion of the liturgy serves Andrewes' ecclesiastical agenda of articulating the sacrality of the furniture and ornaments through a physical showing forth of these elements. In contrast, Montaigne defines the space, iterating the sacrality of that space, while the congregation remains outside of the building so that the very act of entering binds the individuals as a community and secures their consensual participation in the consecratory rite.

Returning then to the Langley form (and from this point on, there are no substantive departures from Langley for the chapel consecration), Montaigne called the congregation into the chapel and began the divine service. The manuscript indicates that Psalms 24,[36] 27, and 84 were sung, that the first lesson was 2 Chronicles 6 (Solomon's dedication of the Temple), that the second lesson was John 10:22 (the feast of the Dedication), and that the Litany was recited.[37] Montaigne then offered a brief prayer, again emphasizing that while God "dwellest not in Temples made with hands," yet

---

[34]Pages 66-70 of Andrewes' form as printed in Legg's edition.

[35]The scriptural basis for the prayer is I Kings 8:27-30, 33-43, 45-53 / 2 Chronicles 6:18-42 and 7:12-16.

[36]Legg states that "the twenty-fourth psalm is one of the proper psalms as said by the followers of Barlow, while it is dropped by those of Andrewes, even where there is no evidence that it was said by the bishop as he entered the building" (p. xliii).

[37]See *The Book of Common Prayer, 1559*, ed. John E. Booty (Charlottlesville: University of Virginia Press, 1976), pp. 68-76.

God allots "speciall places for divine offices promisinge even there to heare and graunt their requests."[38] The manuscript then specifies that Psalm 23 was sung, after which Donne preached, using John 10:22, 23 as his scripture text. Following the sermon, Montaigne celebrated the Eucharist, and the Bishop concluded the chapel consecration with a prayer of blessing ("Blessed be thy name"[39]) and a rather lengthy benediction ("It was your most earnest"[40]).

There are two significant points to be noted here, namely, the central importance of celebrating the Eucharist during rites of consecration, and the placement of the sermon in the consecratory liturgy. Regarding the former, Legg expressly emphasizes that the early seventeenth century bishops, as evidenced by their practices, widely accepted the pre-Reformation tradition that "the solemn celebration of the Eucharist by the bishop is of the essence or substance of the rite of consecration," and he conjectures about the source of influence, stating, "It is quite possible that the seventeenth century bishops remembered the dictum of the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*: 'Omnes basilicae cum missa debent semper consecrari.'" [41] With respect to the placement of the sermon, Legg notes that "beginning with Barlow's first order at Langley it will be noticed many times that the sermon was preached, not after the Nicene Creed where the Jacobean books clearly expect the sermon, homily, or exhortation to be, but between the Litany and the Communion Service."[42] The seventeenth century bishops, and Barlow and Montaigne in these particular instances, draw heavily

---

[38]J1a2, f. 6v.

[39]Ibid., f. 7v-7r.

[40]Ibid., ff. 7r-8r.

[41]Legg, pp. ix and xxvii.

[42]Ibid., p. xxxviii. For additional commments regarding the significance of the Eucharist for the rite of consecration, see Wordsworth, pp. 8-9, and R. W. Muncey, *A History of the Consecration of Churches and Churchyards* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1930), pp. 10-11, 57.

upon Roman Catholic tradition and practice in creating their consecratory forms and seem, as a result, to be expressing liturgically the preeminence of the sacraments to preaching.[43]

"Latin liturgy and English prayers" offers further possibilities that Bishop Montaigne may have been pursuing ecclesiastical reforms by affecting liturgical practices. Those who are familiar with the unusual architecture of Lincoln's Inn Chapel recall that the chapel proper is built upon and supported by columns and vaults forming an open-air undercroft. The manuscript of "Latin liturgy and English prayers" does not end with the consecration of the chapel, but immediately continues with a separate rite of consecration for the undercroft, which Montaigne treats as a churchyard. While not a typical churchyard in that it is positioned beneath rather than adjacent to the chapel, the Lincoln's Inn undercroft was always used for burials, and the gravestones are there to this day.[44] In fact, the formal resolution of the Council that the undercroft should be used as a burial ground came on 13 May 1623, just nine days before the consecration.[45]

The rite for the undercroft falls into three basic parts, each of which is influenced by or based on a different form. The first part ("*Tunc dictus Reverendus*"[46]) includes a brief section of introductory

---

[43]For an overview of sacraments and sacramentals in the consecratory rite, see Legg, pp. lxv-lxvii.

[44]I am grateful to Guy Holborn for the following information: "The register of burials is only extant from 1695, and the earliest gravestone still visible is from 1669. Burials continued there until 1852 (from 1791 Benchers only), and a report of 1857 (doubtless prompted by the Burial Act of that year, a sanitary and public health measure) seems to have put paid to any thought of anymore, though by that time it was in any case pretty full" (Guy Holborn, "Re: John Donne and Lincoln's Inn [Scanned]," e-mail to the author, 29 July 2005).

[45]Black Books, vol. 2, p. 242. The next record in the printed Black Books is on 22 April 1630 (vol. 2, p. 293) when orders for burial were to be drawn up and a Register Book obtained (vol. 2, p. 297).

[46]J1a2, f. 9v-9r.

matters, such as the notations that Bishop Montaigne led the congregation out of the chapel and around the perimeter of the undercroft, and that there was a reading of Genesis 23 (the burial of Sarah).[47] Both the perambulation of the site and the Old Testament reading repeat Roman Catholic tradition and practice, and these liturgical features appear in the earliest known seventeenth century consecration of a churchyard, that by Bishop Barlow at the churchyard of Fulmer,[48] which was consecrated on All Saints' Day 1610, when Barlow was Bishop of Lincoln.[49] One significant point of departure is that the Fulmer churchyard is consecrated prior to the church being consecrated, whereas the consecration of the Lincoln's Inn undercroft occurs after the chapel's. It should be noted, however, that in Andrewes' Peartree form, the churchyard consecration also follows that of the chapel.[50]

---

[47]Legg notes that

> there seems to be but one feature that is common to all [churchyard consecrations]; and that is, prayer for the hallowing of the new ground. This prayer may be preceded by the reading of the twenty-third chapter of Genesis, the reading of a psalm like the ninetieth, and the whole may be intercalated into a shortened form of evening prayer; or begun by a procession round the new burial ground singing the hundredth psalm. (p. xliv)

[48]Legg describes Fulmer as "a retired, out-of-the-way village, in the hundred of Stoke and the deanery of Burnham, lying about six miles south-east of Beaconsfield and about four miles west of Uxbridge" (p. 333).

[49]For English and Latin versions of the rite, see Legg's edition, pp. 9-20. A draft manuscript of the Latin liturgy is held at Lambeth Palace Library, MS 929 item 83.

[50]Cf. the rite as printed in Legg's edition, pp. 74ff.

The second, and longest, section of the undercroft rite ("*In Dei Nomine*"[51]) essentially repeats the portion from Andrewes' form discussed above that Montaigne includes in the chapel consecration,[52] which reiterates the location and ecclesiastical jurisdiction and describes the measurements of the undercroft (about 76 feet from east to west, and about 67 feet from north to south).[53] Within this second part, Montaigne emphasizes the function of the undercroft using the word "*Cœmiterium*,"[54] which Barlow defines early in the Fulmer churchyard consecration as

> a dormitory, or place for Christians to sleepe in, for soe the death of those which die in the faith of Christ, is called, both by himself and his Apostles, because they lyinge in their Graues, expect to be raised againe at the last day, by the voice, of the Archangle, as those which lye in their beddes are raysed in the dawninge of the day, by the Cockes Crowinge.[55]

Andrewes' Peartree form also includes the word "*Cœmeterie*," which he defines as a "place of Christian buriall," in which "bodies may be laid vp vntill the day of the generall resurrection."[56]

In the final part of the undercroft consecration ("Most mercifull Father"[57]), the manuscript includes a benediction that Montaigne borrowed directly from the consecration of the churchyard of St. Olave, Silver Street, celebrated on Thursday, 9 July 1612, by John King, when he was Bishop of London.[58] Regarding this prayer,

---

[51]J1a2, ff. 9r-11r.

[52]As repeated in the Peartree churchyard consecration, as printed in Legg's edition, pp. 76ff.

[53]J1a2, f. 10v.

[54]Ibid., f. 10r.

[55]As printed in Legg's edition, p. 10.

[56]Ibid., p. 74.

[57]J1a2, ff. 11r-12r.

[58]See Legg's edition, pp. 27-28.

Legg notes that "until the time of Andrewes the consecratory prayers are nearly all different," though he adds that prior to Andrewes, "the one most often used was the form of St. Olave, Silver Street."[59]

Precisely because of the unusual architecture of the Lincoln's Inn undercroft, Bishop Montaigne may have found it prudent not only to position the undercroft consecration after that of the chapel, but also to create a unique, though ecclesiastically substantive, churchyard rite by drawing upon those of the earliest forms and authored by three of the most prominent bishops of his day—Barlow, Andrewes, and King. What seems most apparent, however, is that Bishop Montaigne availed himself of an opportunity for reform, which he seized by creating a composite rite that as a consequence validates the reforms of his fellow bishops and the wide array of their consecratory liturgies. In addition, because the Lincoln's Inn graveyard rests directly below the chapel, the separate consecration of the undercroft has the residual effect on the auditory of a second, though in this instance exterior, consecration of the chapel itself.

Beyond its relevance for enlightening scholars about the re-emergence of the rite of consecration during the Jacobean era, "Latin liturgy and English prayers" is the crucial document for setting Donne's Encænia sermon, as well as for re-evaluating his 1619[?] sermon at Lincoln's Inn, "preparing them to build their Chappell."[60] Discovering the liturgical context for Donne's Encænia sermon, in particular, is all the more significant in the light of Peter McCullough's findings that precious few early modern sermons were "preached as an integral part of a prayerbook service," and that "allusions within sermons themselves make it abundantly clear that the reformation sermon, like its medieval

[59]Ibid., p. xliv.

[60]Volume 4:362-79 and Volume 2:213-34, respectively, in the Potter and Simpson edition of the *Sermons*. All references to these sermons are from this edition and are cited in the text by volume and page numbers.

predecessor, was most usually either a free-standing set-piece in the mid-afternoon, or a supplementary extra tack-on after morning prayer."[61] McCullough's further comment draws out the particular importance of "Latin liturgy and English prayers" for Donne's Encænia sermon: "few seem to have thought of the sermon as part of the liturgy in the way we do, which is the reason for the repeated Laudian attempts to inscribe preaching unambiguously within the liturgy, and for the depth of popular resentment at the attempted change."[62] The occurrence of Donne's consecration sermon within a precise liturgical setting and its positioning between the Litany and the Eucharist expose the unique circumstances of this sermon and further highlight Montaigne's attempts at ecclesiastical reform by means of his alterations to more typical liturgical practices.

It is apparent in his Encænia sermon that Donne is familiar with the long history of church consecration and its typological underpinnings and meaning (4:372-75). In particular, Donne compares the consecration of a church to the baptism of the children of Christian parents (4:372), and in repeating later that consecration is "a kind of *Christning* of the *Church*" (4:373), he seems to reinforce the sacramental import of the action. Using a variety of biblical figures and examples, Donne argues further that consecration is sanctified in Nature, in the Law, and in the Gospels, concluding, "that as sure as wee are that the people of *God* had *materiall Churches* in the *Apostles* first times, so sure we are, that those places had a Sanctitie in them" (4:372). Donne also recounts the ruling by Pope Hyginus, "the eighth after *Saint Peter*," who instituted "*That no Church bee consecrated without a Masse*," which, Donne argues, "surely intends nothing, to this purpose, but the Service, the Common Prayer of the *Church*, then in use, there" (4:375).

---

[61]McCullough, "Donne and Andrewes," *John Donne Journal* 22 (2003): 194.

[62]Ibid.

Donne's Encænia and "preparing" sermons also reveal his familiarity with the contemporary forms of consecration. So, for example, although James Cannon describes Donne's choice of sermon text as "unusual,"[63] the twenty-second verse from John 10 is used as the gospel reading in virtually every seventeenth-century form, including Montaigne's.[64] Further, in the "preparing" sermon, Donne possibly alludes to the consecratory ritual of the owners handing over the chapel key to the bishop (2:215). Donne also insists that of the seven names usually given to the church (*Ecclesia*, *Dominicum*, *Domus Dei*, *Basilica*, *Martyrium*, *Oratorium*, and *Tueri*), "the name of *Temple* seems to be most large, and significant," for the word "*Tueri*" "signifies both our beholding, and comtemplating *God* in the Church: and it signifies Gods protecting, and defending those that are his, in his Church" (2:221). Donne also aligns the building of the new chapel with the sacramental renewal of receiving the Eucharist, stating, "But principally, let all of all sorts, who present themselves at *this table*, consider, that in that receiving his body, and his bloud, every one doth as it were conceive a *new incarnation*, by uniting himselfe to them in these visible signes" (2:223). In addition, Donne concludes the "preparing" sermon by quoting 1 Kings 8:27-30, which is the prayer of Solomon for the newly erected Temple and which anticipates the use of these verses among the consecratory prayers in Andrewes' form.[65]

While Donne essentially upholds and confirms the consecratory rites, he does not do so blindly nor without modification; he seems acutely aware of the controversies related to the reforms being instituted through these consecratory rites. Both the "preparing" sermon and the Encænia sermon address the contentious issue of kneeling for prayer. In the former, Donne indicates that proper

---

[63]Cannon, p. 208.

[64]Donne's knowledge of this fact is reinforced by his allusion to these verses in his earlier "preparing" sermon (*Sermons* 2:217).

[65]See Legg's edition, p. 64.

worship includes "a reverent disposition of the body, if thy knees be bent to the earth, thy hands and eyes lifted up to heaven" (2:216); he compares the head of every household to a bishop, who "when he comes to kneele at the *side of his table*, to pray, he comes to build a Church there" (2:222-23); and he asks his auditory to consider the spiritual condition in which Christ will find them "when thou art upon thy knees" (2:224) as a preparation for receiving the Eucharist. In the Encænia sermon, Donne makes a pointed allusion to the efficacy of the bishop's consecratory action when he comments that the ceremonies that have their foundation in Nature include "bowing of the knee, lifting up the eyes, and hands" (4:374).

Donne even calls attention to physical features of the chapel that are emblems of its extravagance, namely, the bell (4:370) and the new stained glass windows (4:363). As Prest recounts, Lincoln's Inn Chapel, with its ornamental undercroft, "its stained glass windows by Bernard van Linge of Old Testament figures and the apostles, and its bell supposedly taken at Essex's siege of Cadiz in 1596" rose to a cost of "about £3,500, an almost 'insupportable chardge.'"[66] Donne himself refers to the escalated expenses of the chapel when he states in the sermon, "but strangers shall know to *Gods* glory, that you have perfected a work of full three times as much charge, as you proposed for it at beginning" (4:372). Beyond the cost, however, the stained glass windows remained a source of contention. While Paul Raffield provides a convincing argument that the windows are "of conscipuous importance as a symbol of the autonomy of common law,"[67] it is these very windows that were

[66]Prest, pp. 190, 205.

[67]Raffield, *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England: Justice and Political Power, 1558-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 183. His contention that "the theme of the four windows in the chapel reflects the spiritual unity of the English constitution and the Biblical principles that the legal profession sought to embody and

cited during the trial of Laud to illustrate the Archbishop's idolatrous and popish inclinations.[68]

Donne's awareness of the controversies related to consecration in general and to the Lincoln's Inn Chapel in particular provide him with an opportunity in his Encænia sermon to temper the conflicting reactions of his auditory. Donne opens the sermon by stating his hope that each person has come not only to witness a building being consecrated, but also to have "consecrated himselfe, who is a *Temple* of the *Holy Ghost*," and to have done so "before hee came to assist, or to testifie the consecration of this place of the Service of God" (4:364). Thus, Donne responds to the contentions regarding whether the church is to be understood as a gathering of persons or as a physical location by insisting, through the use of chiasmus, "as the Congregation sanctifies the place, the place may sanctifie the Congregation too," for "they must accompany one another; holy persons and holy places" (4:364). Further, Donne defines, and even redefines, the benchers' voluntary surrendering of the chapel to the bishop as a lay dedication of the chapel, one distinct from, though congruent with and complementary to, what he refers to as the ecclesiastical dedication (4:370-72). In this way, Donne espouses "an equall care in *Clergie*, and *Layetie*, of doing the duties of their severall callings," which he nicely encapsulates, again using chiamus, stating, "The *Layetie* no farther remoov'd then the *Clergie*, The *Clergie* no farther entitled then the *Layetie*" (4:371).

And, finally, Donne seeks to mediate the debate regarding the preeminence of the Word versus that of the Sacraments. First, he compares his role as "a poore assistant" in previously laying the cornerstone of the chapel to that of being "a poore assistant again in this laying of this first formall Stone, the Word and Sacrament" (4:371). Later in the sermon he states, "the name that *God* gave to

---

represent" is developed in his informed reading of the windows (pp. 184-89).

[68]For a discussion of Donne's views on iconoclasm, see my *The Theology of John Donne* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1999), pp. 61-88.

his house, is not *Concionatorium*, nor *Sacramentarium*, but *Oratorium*, the House of Prayer," noting,

> And therefore without prejudice to the other functions too, (for as there is a *væ* vpon me, *Si non Euangelizavero*, If I preach not my selfe, so may that *væ* be multiplied upon any, who would draw that holy ordinance of *God* into a dis-estimation, or into a slacknesse,) let us never intermit that dutie, to present our selves to *God* in these places, though in these places there bee then, no other Service, but Common prayer. (4:374)

In this sermon of Donne's that follows the Litany and precedes the Eucharist, he urges his auditory to remember that both Word and Sacrament are joined in the divinely ordained order of common prayer.[69]

As it turns out, Donne's words reached a significant number of people on the day of the chapel's consecration, and more than the Lincoln's Inn benchers witnessed Montaigne's consecratory liturgy. According to John Chamberlain, "there was great concourse of noblemen and gentlemen" who attended the event, forming so large a crowd that "two or three were indaungered and taken up dead for the time with the extreme presse and thronging."[70] The new chapel also had additional effects upon the benchers. James Cannon notes that "in 1623 the Masters of the Bench were keen to protect the dignity of their new communion table, forbidding those who sat near it during divine service to 'sit, leane or rest their hattes or arms upon or any other part of their bodies upon or against the Communion Table, or lay their hats or books upon the same.'"[71] The throng that gathered for the chapel's consecration

---

[69]For a discussion of Donne's views on prayer, see my *The Theology of John Donne*, pp. 37-60.

[70]*The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman E. McClure, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), 2:500.

[71]Cannon, p. 214.

and the ruling by the Masters of the Bench are emblematic of the appeal and influence of spectacle in determining religious practice and identity. The benchers and other Londoners viewed the new chapel as a showpiece, and because there was certainly no consensus regarding the propriety of such exhibition for the English Church, the building sparked a great deal of debate.

"Latin liturgy and English prayers," as a unique compilation of the forms introduced by Barlow, Andrewes and King, is an important manuscript for documenting the English re-formation of church consecration. The composition of the manuscript illustrates the influence of the earliest seventeenth century forms, as well as the theological nuances that emerge from a piecemeal borrowing of forms. In effect, then, Montaigne's liturgy participates in the ecclesiastical reform of the Jacobean Church and the varied ways in which liturgical rites were being used to shape and determine the church's identity. In this regard, the manuscript raises further questions for scholars about the spectrum of nuanced meanings that are possible when using such generalized sectarian labels as "moderate Calvinist" and such phrases as "puritan anti-ceremonialism." As a result, to what extent then does our use of such language account for the participation of the Lincoln's Inn congregation in a liturgical form in which the bishop kneels and raises his hands to the heavens, in a rite that positions the sermon between the Litany and the Eucharist, and in a building in which the benchers themselves establish rules that reinforce the sacrality of the chapel furniture?

Donne asserts in the Dedicatory Epistle to the printed edition of the Encænia sermon that he "had no occasion to handle any matter of Controversie between us, and those of the *Romane Perswasion*," yet he adds, "the whole body of the *Sermon*, is opposed against one pestilent calumny of theirs, that wee have cast off all distinction of places, and of dayes, and all outward meanes of assisting the devotion of the Congregation" (4:362). This passage calls attention to the morass of religious and political pressures exerted on Donne's sermon and the consecratory service

in which it was preached. On the one hand, Cannon urges that in this passage Donne's arguments "should be treated with a pinch of salt" since what he aims at is "not so much to create 'clear blue water' between the Church of England and Rome, but to distance the former as much from puritan ideas and practices."[72] On the other hand, as Jeanne Shami asserts, "the first half of 1623 was dominated by one event: the departure of Prince Charles and Buckingham for Spain...and the prolonged negotiations for a match with the Spanish Infanta."[73] The divides and distinctions here are not easily extracted from one another, nor should they be. While Donne may certainly wish to use such a statement in the Dedicatory Epistle of the sermon's printed version to comment on the political situation, or even to deflect the effects of his positions in the sermon away from conflicts within the Church of England, the prefatory comment complicates, rather than simplifies, both the text and its varied contexts. Donne's Encænia sermon shows him responding to the polemics raised by the historic moment and the religious temperaments of his Lincoln's Inn auditory as situated within the very act of consecration and the unique features of Bishop Montaigne's form in dedicating a building in which Donne himself was deeply invested from its inception.[74]

Northern Illinois University

---

[72]Ibid., pp. 207, 208.

[73]Shami, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2003), p. 166.

[74]I wish to thank Peter McCullough and Joshua Eckhardt for their advice and encouragement, and Emma Rhatigan for generously sharing her own scholarship. I offer special thanks to Guy Holborn, Librarian at Lincoln's Inn, for his gracious and learned assistance.