John Donne Journal
Vol. 14 (1995)

"The Stars in their Order Fought Against Sisera": John Donne and the Pulpit Crisis of 1622

Jeanne Shami

On 15 September 1622, John Donne, Royal Chaplain to King James I and Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, preached a sermon at Paul's Cross defending the King's recently issued *Directions to Preachers*.[1] That sermon was important not only in terms of Donne's political and homiletic career (for which it served as a pivotal performance), but also in terms of the character of the pulpit as it was to be defined in the months following this moment. In that sermon, apparently, Donne was expected to do several things. Foremost was his task of persuading the people of James's good intentions in issuing the *Directions* and of James's constancy in the reformed religion. Another, equally-important task, however, was to exemplify the kind of sermon that could be preached in the wake of the *Directions* by establishing conventions of discourse appropriate to conformist orthodoxy. A common perception among recent scholars is that this sermon is Donne's quintessential defence not only of ecclesiological orthodoxy, but of the absolutist ideology which supported it, an overtly political and careerist move which marks him forever as an apologist not only for James's unpopular Spanish foreign policy, but for the censorship which it occasioned.[2] But, the conflicts and tensions registered in this sermon lead to quite a different conclusion. Contemporary reports of the sermon, both anticipating and analyzing its performance, suggest that it was a significant moment in English pulpit history. The purpose of this paper will be to place this sermon in the context of historical circumstances

affecting homiletic discourse of the period, and, in doing so, to initiate discussion of Donne's doctrinal and political position immediately preceding and following this extraordinary performance. What is presented here does not, by any means, close the book on Donne and 1622. But it should map out a number of approaches to Donne's preaching during this period.

With the defeat, late in 1620, of Frederick V, Elector Palatine and son-in-law of James I, criticism of James's policies, particularly with regard to the Palatinate, became more overt. This, along with the abrupt dissolution of the 1621 Parliament, provoked considerable public commentary on state matters even among the more loyal of James's pulpits. Certainly, by the early months of 1622, a series of preachers had been reprimanded for speaking about Spain and the Palatinate during Sunday services, their comments prompted not simply by a desire to support the Protestant cause in the continental wars, but more immediately by a fear that James's unwillingness to go to war against Spain and his obsession with a Spanish match for his son proceeded from James's attraction to Catholicism as much as to peace.[3] These fears were exacerbated by the very real possibility that James's grandchildren and future heirs would be raised as Catholics. In addition, the open Catholicism of Buckingham's family, particularly his mother, fueled popular fears of the influence of Catholicism in high places, and of the danger of James's or Charles's relapse to that "idolatrous" religion themselves.

When James issued his *Directions* in August of 1622, then, he was responding to a crisis which had been building for several years. In fact, efforts to control public criticism of state policies had begun to heat up in earnest about two years earlier. In July 1620, Chamberlain had written that "the world is now much terrified with the Star-chamber, there beeing not so litle an offence against any proclamation but is liable and subject to the censure of that court. And for proclamations and patents they are become so ordinarie, that there is no end, every day bringing foorth some new project or other."[4] In the following year, proclamations were issued to control "lavish and licentious speaches or writings in matters of state,"[5] and in the period immediately

preceding the *Directions*, two such proclamations were issued to stem the "inordinate libertie of unreverent speech touching matters of high nature, unfit for vulgar discourse, [which] doth dayly more and more increase."[6] Whiteway recorded in his diary for 3 January 1620/1 that the intent of the proclamations was to prohibit discussion both of domestic and foreign policy.[7] Despite these warnings, however, preachers were growing increasingly intractable. Chamberlain's letters report that the clergy had been warned not to meddle with the Spanish Match or with any other matters of state in their sermons, but "for all that on Sonday following (whether by chaunce or otherwise) a younge fellow at Paules-crosse upon his text (thou shalt not plowe with an oxe or an asse,) spake very freely in generall."[8]

In addition to public prohibitions against seditious speech, the *Directions to Preachers* of August 1622 and Donne's defence of them on 15 September also need to be understood in relation to the range of pulpit discourse on some of the topics proscribed by the instructions, specifically anti-Papist invective,[9] predestination, matters of state, and personal slanders. The evidence to support such a study is necessarily limited to those sermons published at the time, some sermons which survive in manuscript, and the published works of preachers collected and edited since the 17th century.[10] Such a study confirms that James's *Directions* were responding to increasingly virulent and relentless attacks on Papists in the context of increasing dissatisfaction with government policies affecting religion.[11] Virtually every sermon preached and published in the period immediately preceding the *Directions*, of whatever doctrinal stripe, attacks the Papists, in glancing remarks, digressions, or full-blown refutations of their doctrines and activities. This point is made in the address to the readers of Thomas Bedford's 26 August 1621 Paul's Cross sermon, where he says that "now lately there haue beene more Sermons and Tractates publisht concerning this sinne of Apostasie, within these few yeeres, than were in many ages heretofore."[12]

By far the greatest number of attacks is on the Church of Rome, particularly as defined by the Council of Trent and promulgated by the Jesuits.[13] These sermons take as their theme the perils of idolatry, the

dangers of relapse, and, in particular, the political as well as moral dangers of security. The sheer weight of surviving sermon evidence demonstrates that the topic of Rome and the dangers of a possible relapse of the English church to Catholicism aroused the passions of even the most sedate ministers.[14] Many sermons survive which celebrate England's deliverance from the Catholic threat of conspiracy on the anniversaries of the Gowrie Conspiracy (August 5) and the Gunpowder Plot (November 5). Peter McCullough has recently illuminated the extent to which Court sermons on Tuesdays were devoted to this very topic, adding considerably to the potential for anti-Papist commentary, at the same time as James was striving to restrict it politically.[15]

An important objection registered by preachers across the entire spectrum of reformed theology is to the Papist exegesis of Scriptures. In particular, these preachers challenge what they take to be the licentious interpretations of Scriptures by the Jesuits, and the consequences of such practices for a word-centred spirituality. In a sermon *ad clerum*, delivered at a visitation at Boston on 24 April 1621, for example, the conformist Robert Sanderson devotes the body of the sermon to proving, through detailed examples, that no (doctrinal) end justifies (corrupt) means. His exegesis of his text (Romans 3.8) challenges Papist sophisters who separate the intention of an action from its end. Sanderson contends that "whatsoeuer the *end* be we intend, it is certaine that *intention* cannot be good, which putteth vs vpon the choice of euill *meanes*."[16] The Puritan Samuel Ward also laments the decline in preaching and the increase in superstitious deeds done by rote devotion, opposing his "countryman's logic" to the sophisticated arguments of Papists and the "carnal Protestants" who follow them.[17] In the early 1620s, even the most irenical preachers do not openly extend the plea for inclusion in the church to Papists, consistently excluding them from the unity of the church. John Prideaux, Regius Professor of Divinity and Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, provides the ground for arguments against toleration in a sermon entitled *Ephesus Backsliding*, reissued in 1621. Specifically, he cautions, using the example of Samson, that "*no marriages* must be

made betweene them and Gods people." In addition, he cites the ill effects of toleration in Polonia and reminds his hearers that it "prouideth *powder*, and poysoned *kniues*, where she is not manacled."[18] If the Church of Rome is not to overtake and suffocate the reformed church, husbands will no longer be able to suffer their children and wives to be recusants. Nor may magistrates remain luke-warm in prosecuting the penal laws.[19]

James I's own writings, which excluded only the most extreme theological beliefs, those of Papists and nonconforming Puritans, from his religious consensus, encouraged and enabled another tendency in English pulpit divinity: to define doctrine in opposition to other views rather than positively.[20] This is certainly the governing rhetoric in many sermons preached and published in the period immediately preceding the *Directions*. Such rhetoric is epitomized in a sermon by John Hughes, D. D., on the subject of conscience. Hughes includes those who are erroneous in judgment or ignorantly scrupulous in the category of those with "good" but not "quiet" consciences. This kind comprises "the Recusants in both kinds, Catholiques and Catharists, Papists and Puritans, who are no lesse offended, the one with an egge on a fasting day; the other with a Cap, Crosse, or Surplesse, then with some hainous offence."[21] Hughes's use of the term "Recusants" to apply equally to Papists and Puritans is part of the evolution of a term which only a few years later (in reference to the "recusants" of the forced loan in 1626) would take on the meaning of any political resistance, regardless of doctrinal belief.[22] Similarly, in a Paul's Cross sermon preached 8 July 1621, Samuel Buggs labels those in his audience who will not hear their sins described in sermons as having an "*impatient* and *gun-powder humour*,"[23] the consummate act of Jesuitically-inspired treachery becoming, like recusancy, a metaphor for spiritual obstinacy and political treason.

2

Although not published in his lifetime, a large number of sermons preached by John Donne in the crucial years between 1620 and August of 1622 have survived. These sermons span the time during which

Donne was Reader at Lincoln's Inn, and after November 1621, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in London. They offer an important single case of the responses of a particularly sensitive and complex pulpit voice to the political climate registered in historical studies of the period, and represented in the sermons already examined. Donne is a crucial figure for more reasons than one. It was Donne who was commissioned to defend James's *Directions* from the Paul's Cross pulpit on 15 September 1622, and Donne whose interpretive initiative in his sermons of this period provides a paradigm of the kinds of obedience which could be practiced in the pulpit by supporters of both monarchical government and the rule of law. His are also the sermons of a preacher whose politics did not stifle his conscience, but who found, even within the narrowing limits decreed by the *Directions*, the possibilities of discreet and religious commentary and counsel. His sermons provide the most complex and most fully-documented examples of such an attitude operating within the conditions of censorship prevailing in these months.[24]

Donne's activities in 1620-22 after his return from the continent with the Doncaster embassy need to be reassessed in the light of circumstances impinging on the pulpit and on political expression of any kind in the months leading up to the issue of the *Directions*.[25] It is by no means clear in these crucial years that Donne can be seen as the administration's spokesperson, whose selection to preach the sermon defending censorship in December of 1622 was inevitable. It is true that Donne's reputation as a conformable minister can not be in doubt. Both at Lincoln's Inn, and then at St. Paul's, Donne is accorded official and genuine respect from his peers. On 23 April 1621, for example, Donne is authorized to judge the conformity of one Anthony Hunt, although he is never actually called upon by Hunt to perform the assessment.[26] Later that year on 16 October 1621, Donne's chaplain, Edward Maie, was dismissed by the Benchers for a sermon on the Communion of Saints, whose front matter contained a mock dedication to an unnamed bishop and an attack on anti-episcopal separatists in the congregation. Milton notes that Daniel Featley, in his capacity as licenser, had struggled in vain to insert more categorically anti-

Papist language into Maie's discussion of the eucharist in this controversial sermon.[27] According to Featley, Maie had omitted the normal caveats against the superstitious doctrine of transubstantiation to balance his incautious reference to ministers as "makers of Christ his body."[28] Because Maie had been Donne's chaplain at Lincoln's Inn for several years, Bald concludes that Donne "must have at least acquiesced" in the dismissal, although there is no record of his having taken a part in the proceedings against Maie.[29] There is some evidence that this assessment is correct. The sermon itself, while entirely consistent with Donne's own views on salvation through the established Church, must have jarred with his views on the extent to which the communion of saints could accommodate even the decrees of the Council of Trent.[30] Donne's silence in the proceedings against Maie is also consistent with what we know of his attitude toward satiric and provocative personal attacks in sermons (which are suggested, especially in the dedication of the sermon) and toward handling religious controversy.[31]

The Puritan leaning of Lincoln's Inn, and the fact that Donne was preceded by Thomas Gataker and succeeded by John Preston in his role as Reader there, has also never been sufficiently emphasized.[32] Clearly, Donne's special relationship with that congregation and his good reputation with Gataker (who reports favourably on a sermon he heard Donne preach there) suggest that he was by no means unacceptable, either in doctrine or reputation, to the congregation there. Connections between Puritans and Parliament should not be overlooked either. Annabel Patterson has convincingly demonstrated that Donne's associations with Parliamentarians such as John Hoskyns, Robert Phelips, and his long-time friend Christopher Brooke, strong oppositionists all in the 1614 Parliament, challenge the caricature of Donne as apologist for absolutism created by Bald, and reinforced by John Carey, Debora Shuger, and others.[33] In these years, Donne is clearly concerned that Parliament succeed, and continues to voice those views on the prerogatives of absolutism noted by Patterson. Opponents of this view concentrate on Donne's letters to Buckingham in this period, particularly those related to his preferment to the

Deanery of Paul's. Bald, despite his predisposition for viewing Donne as a flatterer of authority, cannot conclude that Donne actually purchased his appointment as Dean.[34] The letters thanking Buckingham for the promotion engage in the rhetoric of status appropriate to such missives, but there is no evidence that Donne was friendly with Buckingham, or anything but peripherally associated with his patronage.

More interesting for the light it sheds on Donne's political activities during this period is an especially detailed letter of 30 August 1621 to Donne's weekly correspondent Sir Henry Goodyer, in which Donne reveals how he has been spending his time in the intervening period since their last communication. Donne writes in that letter that he has "been some times with my L. of *Canterbury*, since [m]y accident, to give you his own words. I see him retain his former cheerfulnesse here and at *Croydon*, but I do not hear from Court, that he hath any ground for such a confidence, but that his case may need favour, and not have it. That place, and *Bedington*, and *Chelsey*, and *Highgate*, where that very good man my Lord *Hobard* is, and *Hackney*, with the M. of the Rolls, and my familiar *Peckham*, are my circumferrence."[35] The information about Donne's familiarity with Abbot is significant, as is the information of his close friendship with Hobart (Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas) and Sir Julius Caesar (Master of the Rolls). Donne's close connections with Lord and Lady Danvers (at Chelsea) and his relations with his in-laws in Peckham and Beddington are well-documented by Bald. Historians who have insisted on placing Donne in the company of avant-garde conformists such as Andrewes, and by implication with Laud, Neile, and the York House group, however, need to think more carefully about this avowed familiarity with Abbot, not in great favour at that time, and they need to read this friendship in the context of a total absence of documented connection between Donne and the anti-Calvinists discussed by Tyacke or the avant-garde conformists discussed by Lake and Ferrell.[36]

Another important, and not well-known, fact needs to be considered here as well. Dating from 1615 or 1616 is a document including an official cipher and citing Donne as one of eleven men to whom the

cipher was entrusted. Among the others were Archbishop Abbot, Secretary of State Ralph Winwood, William Trumbull, and George Hakewill, strong supporters of continental Protestantism, and challengers to anti-Calvinist and Laudian elements in the late Jacobean church. The cipher seems to have continued in use for some years, since to it has been added a number meant to designate the King of Bohemia, a title that could not have been used until at least 1617. Bald underplays the significance of this network, conjecturing that Donne was employed to correspond with agents abroad on affairs affecting the welfare of the church, but not attributing great political or religious significance to such activity. However, Donne must have been working directly under Abbot in this service. Moreover, these activities, about which we know far too little, apparently went on for many years, since in January 1623, Wotton sent from Venice to Sir Albertus Morton, "a large cipher, whereof I entreat you to consign a fair copy to the Dean of Paules."[37] Despite this weight of evidence of Donne's intimate connection with Abbot, however, Bald cites a business letter from Abbot to Donne, also dated 1622, as proof that the nature of their relationship cannot be determined.[38]

In fact, in these years immediately preceding the *Directions* we find Donne engaged with Archbishop Abbot, the Earls of Carlisle, Southampton, and Kent, and his long-time friend Sir Robert Ker, later Earl of Ancrum. Among his ecclesiastical connections we know certainly of his longtime friendship with Bishop John King, who died in this period, and with King's sons, particularly Henry, a prebendary of St. Paul's, who became Donne's executor in 1631, and to whom he bequeathed the gold medal struck to commemorate the Synod of Dort, given to Donne for his part in the Doncaster Embassy in 1619-20. We have no comparable evidence of his friendship or political involvement with William Laud, with Lancelot Andrewes, with Richard Neile, or with John Buckeridge. If anything, Donne's political and perhaps his doctrinal leanings in these years were with Abbot, with the Calvinist consensus reached at the Synod of Dort (where another of his close friends Joseph Hall was a delegate), and with Lincoln's Inn rather than with the anti-Calvinist Bishops and divines with whom Donne is more

often connected. Certainly, in the months immediately preceding Donne's appointment as Dean of St. Paul's, his letters express his ambivalence about promotion within the church at such a time. He writes to Goodyer on 11 October 1621 that "truly all things that are upon the stage of the world now, are full of such uncertanities [sic], as may justly make any man loth to passe a conjecture upon them; not only because it is hard to see how they wil end, but because it is misinter[pre]table and dangerous to conjecture otherwise, then some men would have the event to be."[39] These lines clearly position Donne outside the hermeneutic circle created by "some men" and unwilling to project his conjectures on a situation already dangerously unstable. There could be no more challenging time to take advancement in the church. Nor can it be assumed that preaching a sermon defending the *Directions* was the most obvious path to advancement, in any case.

Donne's sermons, then, provide an unusually full treatment of many of the topics which were being discussed in the months leading up to the 4 August *Directions*. In the broadest sense, the extant sermons for this period document a political and religious sensibility attuned to current events, but filtered through the medium of Biblical exegesis and commentary. In particular, they focus on the hermeneutics of interpretation, not only of Scriptures, but also of the actions of public authorities in church and state; Donne's attitudes to the rule of law in both spiritual and civil matters, including the use of the language of state government to clarify Donne's political alignments; the relative authority of both church and state; discussions of peace both within the church (religious controversies) and state (the matter of war with religious enemies); and the distinctions to be made between Catholics and post-Tridentine Papists, especially the Jesuits.

Donne's fitness for the task of defending James's *Directions* is evident in the interpretive aptitude which he brought to the pulpit in these sermons. Not narrowly partisan or factional in his views, Donne's moderation was strenuously achieved. This breadth of political and religious vision is marked in Donne's sermons by his frequent and self-conscious preoccupation with the right uses of

interpretation. In practice, this means that he regularly discusses the principles by which he interprets not only the Scriptures, but also the present application of many of his texts. In both exegesis and application, Donne demonstrates leadership by taking interpretive initiative in the interest of a broadly-conceived and tolerant spirituality. Donne's interpretive initiative is tested to the limits in his 15 September sermon defending the *Directions*, and in a Paul's Cross sermon two months later, but a better understanding of his typical approach to issues of interpretation can illuminate the textual strategies and the spiritual focus of these later sermons.

Donne's method and style of interpretation is to focus on the middle course, to make flexible discriminations sensitive to the times. The overzealous style of hasty judgments, jumping to conclusions, is rejected as spiritually and politically dangerous, for in Donne's terms the healthy conscience does not see the world in such exclusive terms. Donne's middle course, in fact, seems to strive for the greatest possible inclusiveness, for an interpretive style which analyzes both Scriptures and the political world in constructive terms.[40]

Characteristically, Donne walks a middle path between what he terms "left-handed" and "right-handed" (3: 74) interpretations of Scriptures. Though both are not equal, because not equally according to the letter, both can be useful, and Donne is careful not to discard what might prove edifying to his auditory, or what might charitably be salvaged even from an incorrect sense.[41] The significance of Donne's method is not simply in his refusal to reject anything potentially useful to salvation, but primarily in his refusal to acknowledge the absolute authority of any particular commentator. Donne finds material for salvation in the writings of the Catholic fathers and expositors of the ancient Church, as well as in the opinions of Luther, Calvin and the reformers. Consequently, trying to determine Donne's religious alignments by the sources of his quotations doesn't work. Donne's sermons are evidence that he can salvage saving doctrine from a variety of sources, however unlikely. His only caution in this regard is to avoid interpretations which are "singular."[42] In general Donne has a commonsensical regard for the accumulated wisdom of thinking men

on any given issue, on the value of "opinion," although even here, he is careful not to reject an opinion simply because it is the only one. A view frequently aired in the sermons is that "The generall opinion, the generall voyce, is for the most part, good evidence, with, or against a man. One man may deceive another, and be deceived by another; . . . no man ever deceived all the world, nor did all the world ever joyn to deceive one man" (4:155).[43]

In a sermon preached at Lincoln's Inn on Trinity Sunday, 1620, Donne extends these principles of literal interpretation to avoid the far-fetched expositions of Scriptural texts associated with Papist exegesis. Donne follows Augustine's rule that "when the Scripture may be interpreted, and Gods actions well understood, by an ordinary way, it is never necessary, seldome safe to induce an extraordinary." (3: 141) This rule is given in the context of the dispute over whether the opening words of Genesis can be used to prove the Trinity. Not surprisingly, Donne frames the debate in terms of extreme interpretations, between those who make this place a literal and distinct argument to prove the Trinity, and those who object vehemently to it. Donne cites approvingly the method of the Church of England which by appointing this Scripture on Trinity Sunday, goes "a middle and a moderate way," (3: 143) declaring that to those who have been catechized and baptized in the Trinity it is an awakening of former knowledge of the Trinity to hear that God manifested himself to Abraham in three persons.

In a sermon also preached in Trinity Term at Lincoln's Inn,[44] Donne contrasts such moderate interpretation with the way of the Roman Church, which not only admits "left-handed" or weaker interpretations, but which makes them the ground for resolving controversy. Donne's example is telling. The Papists say that St. Peter was at Rome, and all moderates agreed with that. "But when upon S. *Peters* personall being at Rome, they came to build their universall supremacy over all the Church and so to erect matter of faith upon matter of fact, then later men came to deny that it could be proved out of Scripture, that *Peter* was at Rome" (3: 316). In particular, Donne rejects the interpretations of the Council of Trent, which, he says, advanced "mischievous" doctrines upon moderate positions of "former reverent

men" (3: 315), and by corruption of these senses forced reliance on the literal and original, if men were determined to pervert other, less authoritative senses.

Donne's 1621 Christmas Day sermon elaborates further on the dangers attending interpretation: either it goes too far in "wresting in *divers* senses into a word, which needs but *one*" (3: 352); or it doesn't go far enough, in that it misses the essential point. For Donne, the literal is always the safest and most important ground of interpretation, then, although often it is lawful and useful to present interpretations that raise and exalt devotion. Balancing these extremes of interpretation is Donne's constant effort in the sermons. His Easter Day 1622 sermon,[45] for example, balances those unmerciful men who stress God's reprobation with those overmerciful men who argue that even the souls in Hell can be saved. Clearly, the extremism of either view does not accord with Donne's interpretation of the letter of his text.

Similarly, in a sermon preached on 23 June 1622, Donne argues for a moderate interpretation of John the Baptist's austere and holy life, one which counters both the Papist arguments for the merits of such works of mortification, and the Puritan denial that such mortifications of the body are ever efficacious. To explain his view, Donne employs a political analogy, suggesting that the Biblical interpretation is of the same kind as the political one with which he illustrates it. "Moderate disciplines subdue the body, as under the government of a *King*, a father of his people, that governs them by a law. But when the body comes to bee subdued, by paines, and anguish, and loathesome diseases, this becomes a *tyranny*, a *conquest*; and he that comes in by conquest, imposes what lawes hee will" (4: 153).[46]

The "middle nature" of Donne's pulpit divinity, which can find edifying matter in both the left-handed and the right, in good grammar and in bad, in the direct rather than the squint-eyed vision, is continually reflected in the interpretive model which Donne embodies in his sermons. In two sermons believed to have been published late in 1620,[47] both on the topic of scandals and offences, Donne argues for an attitude that eschews the extremes as the only way to rectify abuses and initiate further reform. As he says, it is certainly a woe to be "*too*

[my emphasis] inquisitive into the proceedings of the State, and the Church, out of jealousie and suspicion that any such alterations, or tolerations in Religion are intended or prepared." This he calls a "seditious disaffection to the government, and a disloyall aspersion upon the persons of our Superiours." But not to be sensible to offences, not to see that "the Caterpillars of the Roman Church, doe eat up our tender fruit, that the Jesuites, and other enginiers of that Church, doe seduce our forwardest and best spirits" is also an offence (3: 167). The duties of those entrusted with public responsibilities are clear. The pastor must not slacken his pulpit duty, nor the magistrate slacken in the execution of those laws left in his power. However, for private members of his auditory, Donne cautions that while it is inexcusable "Jealously, suspiciously to mis-interpret the actions of Superiours", so too is it "not to feel how the adversary gains upon us, and not to wish that it were, and not to pray that is [sic] may be otherwise" (3: 167).

The rhetorical posture which Donne adopts in this sermon on offences is amplified in a second sermon on this text, also preached at Lincoln's Inn. Crucial to the doctrinal foundation of this sermon is Donne's elaboration of the "passive scandal" which Donne applies specifically to those who are faithful in good times, but are scandalized as soon as persecution comes. The weakness of interpretation characterized by this scandal is one that most engages Donne, and measures the impatience and frustration of many of Donne's auditors, as well as their uncertainty about James's policy of peace, his refusal to commit wholeheartedly to the defence of his daughter and son-in-law in Bohemia, and his apparent indifference to the success of the Catholic forces on the continent. Such a person, Donne says, "stays not to give God his leasure, whether God will succour his cause to morrow, though not to day. Hee stays not to give men their Law, to give Princes, and States time to consider, whether it may not be fit for them to come to leagues, and alliances, and declarations for the assistance of the Cause of Religion next year, though not this" (3: 179). Clearly, Donne is advocating patience, not only because the good of the nation depends on people giving the benefit of the doubt to those

who have the legal means to decide these causes, but because, he suggests, the reports of Catholic victories may very well be Jesuit propaganda. As he says, "as soon as a *Catholique army* hath given a blow, and got a victory of any of our forces, or friends, or as soon as a *crafty Jesuit* hath forged a Relation, that that Army hath given such a blow, or that such an Army there is, (for many times they intimidate weake men, when they shoote nothing but Paper, when they are onely *Paper-Armies*, and *Pamphlet-Victories*, and no such in truth)" (3: 179). These forged rumours lead to dangerous conclusions: that God is not powerful, that God does not take wise courses, that there is no God. Consequently, Donne offers a trinity of rules for the interpretation of the actions of Kings, counseling faith in divine matters, hope in state matters, and charity in civil matters.

Donne's comments regarding the relations between priest and king, church and state in sermons from this period also show that he was well-suited to the interpretive task of defending James's *Directions*. A sermon preached in Trinity Term in the early 1620s makes a very clear distinction between the church and the state, clarifying what for Donne must have been the crucial issue of conscience regarding his vocation at this time: "There is a power above the Priest, the regall power; not above the function of the Priest, but above the person of the Priest" (3: 298).[48] This kind of logical, but rhetorically ambiguous, distinction is crucial to Donne's sense of the balance of power between civil and spiritual authorities. Kings have civil power over the "person" of the priest, but no spiritual power over the "function" of the priest.[49] In the same sermon, Donne also specifies the legal and orderly means of redress appropriate to Church officials dissatisfied with state actions affecting religious worship, and traces them to "the practise of the Primitive Church" (3: 310). Impugners of the Supremacy are excommunicated and not restored but by the Archbishop; impugners of the prayer book are excommunicated but may be restored by the Bishop; impugners of the articles of religion are reserved to the Archbishop; impugners of ceremonies are restored when they repent and no Bishop named; authors of schisms are reserved to the Archbishop; maintainers of schismatics referred but to repentance; maintainers of conventicles

to the Archbishop; maintainers of constitutions made at conventicles to their repentance. Clearly, even within ecclesiastical jurisdiction, "There was ever, there is yet a reserving of certaine cases, and a relaxation or aggravating of Ecclesiasticall censures, for their waight, and for their time" (3: 310.) All of these cases are covered by ecclesiastical law, interpreted at the discretion of church officials. But from idolaters, a separation is enjoined till the Lord comes in judgment, and are not to be influenced by any means.

A sermon preached at Whitehall 8 March 1621/2 continues the discussion of church-state relations in an enigmatic context that invests the entire sermon with a political resonance it would not otherwise have. In his exegesis of the enmity of death, Donne says that the enemy who reserves himself unto the last, and attends our weak estate, is more dangerous than the enemy who appears at first. In his application, however, he cautions his audience to "Keepe it, where I intend it, in that which is my spheare, the Conscience" (4: 55). The appeal to intention suggests that other meanings apart from the intended meaning could be derived from Donne's application, and the warning serves to highlight rather than to obscure the other applications. Again, in a sermon preached on Ascension Day 1622, Donne distinguishes between the spheres of state and church, and indicates, as he does so, just how he uses analogy to offer political commentary when he considers it indiscreet, even unprofessional, to do so openly. Donne says that the warning in his text to "Come not after them" would afford a good note for the public and the magistrate "*if* [my emphasis] we were to reflect at all, which we always avoid, on publick things" (4: 139). Donne's topic in this section is the health of a state which is in a condition of continual physic and defensive war. The analogy to a body is explicit. "That which is proverbially said of particular Bodies, will hold in a Body Politick, in any State" (4: 140). The section concludes, in fact, with a cryptic warning that that state which has been a physician to all her neighbour states, letting and stanching blood in them for the sake of their own health, may be required to repair and cure herself, if she is not alert to her own idolatrous enemies. The passage seems to be suggesting that state officials should be more concerned with fighting

idolatry at home, than with involving England in the continental bloodbath over religion. Following this suggestion, Donne reiterates that "this is not our sphear, the Publick, the State; but yet States consist of Families, and Families of private persons, and they are in our sphear, in our charge" (4: 140). Masters of families, then, as well as individual consciences are warned to be beforehand with their sins, and not to presume upon mercy. All of these are part of the sense of the phrase as Donne interprets it. "With Idolaters in the State, with Underminers in thy House, with Sins in thy Soul, be still beforehand, watch their dangerous accesses" (4: 141).[50]

In this context, it is appropriate to consider Donne's comments on authority in order to answer the current fashion in Donne scholarship depicting Donne as one fascinated by power and in awe of the way in which kings in their prerogative imitate the power of God as he is Lord of Hosts. As evidence of Donne's absolutism, Carey, Shuger, and others focus on the passion with which Donne describes the power of the Lord of Hosts to subdue his enemies.[51] Even leaving aside the obvious point that this attitude is at least as common among Puritans awaiting God's vindication of the godly as it is among conforming Calvinists in the Church of England, examination of Donne's comments about the power of God does not support such a caricature.[52] In a sermon preached on Trinity Sunday, for example, Donne comments on the power of God's mercies, his comforts, his "power to erect and settle a tottering, a dejected soul, an overthrowne, a bruised, a broken, a troden, a ground, a battered, an evaporated, an annihilated spirit" (3: 270). This is an act of might that requires the assurance and presence of God. Similarly, in another sermon preached in Trinity Term, Donne comments on the power of gentleness: "There is not so violent a thing as gentlenesse, so forcible, so powerfull upon man, or upon God" (3: 326). This gentleness is what conforms us to our pattern, Christ. Donne continues this line by pointing out that, for the preacher too, "there is no such Bullet, as a Pillow, no such Action, as Passion, no such revenge as suffering an injury" (3: 327). "This is the warre of the righteous man," he says, "to conquer by yeelding" (3: 327). Finally, in a Trinity Sunday sermon, Donne observes that it is a

sin against God's power to misconstrue the power of the Magistrate: "A King is not a King, because he is a good King, nor leaves being a King, as soon as he leaves being good" (3: 290). By the same token, however, civil magistrates are warned that if they abuse their power to the point of oppression they can not call it sedition when the people say they ought to obey God rather than man.

In the months preceding the *Directions*, questions of authority often involved discussions of peace, a subject which became more topical as tensions over war on the continent and internal, domestic wranglings in church and state increased. Although Donne seldom comments on the continental wars in his sermons, peace within the church is a subject that, for Donne, falls legitimately within the purview of his authorized ministry, and several of his sermons comment on the question of the limits of controversy and criticism. A Lent sermon preached before the King at Whitehall on 16 February 1621 finds Donne voicing one of his fundamental beliefs about the place of controversial preaching in the late Jacobean church. Donne distinguishes between Christ's plain doctrine, which exercises faith, and the "curiously disputed" doctrines of men which exercise the understanding. "It is the Text that saves us," Donne insists; "the interlineary glosses, and the marginal notes, and the *variae lectiones*, controversies and perplexities, undo us" (3: 208). The evidence for salvation, Donne insists, is "matter without controversie" (3: 210).

This belief leads Donne, in another Lincoln's Inn sermon, to preach against those men overactive in doctrinal things and contemptuous of others who stay within positive divinity and articles confessed by all churches, who are content with salvation and want to edify an auditory rather than amaze them. According to Donne, such zealots in matters of predestination transgress the wisdom of the Son, abjuring "Gods revealed Will, his Acts of Parliament, publique proclamations," in favour of "his Cabinet Counsailes, his bosome, his pocket dispatches" (3: 330). The point is made even more clearly by way of several effective analogies in Donne's Christmas sermon for 1621. The true searching of the Scriptures, he says, is "to finde all the *histories* to be *examples* to me, all the *prophecies* to induce a Saviour for *me,* all the

Gospell to apply Christ Jesus to *me*" (3: 367). This is to search the Scriptures, "not as though thou wouldest make a *concordance*, but an *application*, as thou wouldest search a *wardrobe*, not to make an *Inventory* of it, but to finde in it something fit for thy wearing" (3: 367). Donne is clear in his observation that interpretation of Scriptures depends very much on the intention of the interpreter, and Donne urges his hearers and other preachers to be clear that they are looking for salvation rather than controversy in God's word.

To a great extent, Donne places much of the responsibility for avoiding controversy in church matters on his auditory, thereby stressing that hearing, as well as preaching, has its obligations. This emphasis is evident in a sermon preached on Easter Monday 1622 in which Donne comments that one of God's greatest blessings to him was to give him an audience of "spiritual and circumcised Ears," rather than an audience with ears itching with the desire "to hear popular and seditious Calumnies and scandals, and Reproaches, cast upon the present State and Government." This, Donne says, is to make a sermon a satire, a prayer a libel, "if upon colour of preaching, or praying, against toleration of Religion, or persecution for Religion, he would insinuate, that any such tolerations are prepared for us, or such persecutions threatned against us" (4: 91). Donne's audience, he says, have been mostly born since the Reformation, not naturalized by conversion, or transplanted from one religion to another, but born the natural children of this church, and to these, he argues, he does not need to consider points of controverted doctrine.

In the crucial months of late spring and early summer 1622, Donne's sermons, like many of those published in these months, register popular fears of the doctrinal and political dangers posed by Papists, but do so in a manner which, characteristically, points out deceptions of post-Tridentine Catholicism while allowing for a reformed version of Catholic doctrine. In his sermon for Easter Monday 1622, for example, Donne compares Papists to Syrians, who are constantly thinking of ways by which to gain the advantage over God. When he frustrates their rebellions, they try excommunications, then invasion, then supplantations, then fire, etc. They think they can fool

him because he is not the God of equivocations, but he sees all of their actions and imaginations. For Donne, the object is to preach to them who are "at *Rome*" (4: 110) in their hearts, because God can transmute even a Papist into a Protestant, as he can make a moral man a Christian. The differences, he suggests, are of degree rather than of kind.

Donne's Ascension day sermon for 1622 is entirely devoted to the danger of relapse into pre-Reformation idolatry. "God hath given us such a deliverance heretofore in the reformation of Religion; so far we are ascended, and so the Inhibition lies upon us, that we slide not back again" (4: 133). For Donne, there is no security though the enemy be destroyed. Though idolatry has been destroyed in pulpit and in law, still there are weeds and seeds. Much of the sermon is devoted to cautions against the snares of Papists: the incitements to send sons to foreign universities, not to bring servants to church, not to let the wife's religion hinder the husband's preferment. More insidiously, Papists lay snares for one's fame; they will have the world believe you died a Papist.[53] Donne's position is clear: "we had received the Reformation before the Council of *Trent*, and before the growth of the Jesuits: And if we should turn to them now, we should be worse then we were before we receiv'd the Reformation; and the Council of *Trent* and the Jesuits have made that Religion worse then it was" (4: 139).

This point is made most clearly in a sermon tentatively dated Whitsunday 1622[54] in which Donne challenges the usurped authority of the Council of Trent, and in particular, the way in which Papists reject the testimony of the marks of "spirituall filiation" in Scripture, while they insist on "an assurance of faith, That a Councell cannot err" (5: 71-72). In particular, Donne challenges the faith that Papists have in their worldly councils, specifically the Council of Trent, and counters it with the faith of St. Paul and St. John recorded in Scriptures. Are not these, he asks, "as good a ground for our faith, as the servile and mercenary voices of a herd of new pensionary Bishops, shovelled together at Trent for that purpose, are for the contrary?" (5: 72).

Donne's clearest indictment of the Jesuit mission occurs in his sermon of 24 June 1622 in which he says that "such a Mission cannot satisfie a rectified conscience" (5: 157). The Jesuits are sent to defend

the immunities of the Church and take away the supremacy of the King. They are assured in this by the tenet that "into what place soever the Pope may send *Priests*, he may send *Armies* for the security of those Priests" (5: 157). Further, Donne points out that those who run after priests to masses, or send a wife, child, or servant, justify their "unjust Mission, and make them thinke their sending and coming lawfull" (5: 157). The congregation has the responsibility of demonstrating the good effects of preaching on their lives by being witnesses against the Jesuits.

3

The middle nature of Donne's divinity, the inclusiveness of his spirituality, and his respect for orderly processes and judicial means made Donne particularly well-suited to defend James's *Directions*. So, too, did his sustained criticism from the pulpit of Jesuit Scriptural interpretations and other practices, and his fundamental belief that those things necessary for salvation were "matter without controversie" (3: 210). It is clear that in August and September of 1622 people anticipated some momentous change in policy which would likely have a powerful impact on pulpit messages, particularly those delivered from the important Paul's Cross pulpit. Speaking vaguely only a month before the *Directions*, on 5 July, for example, George Abbot writes to William Trumbull, the King's resident agent in Brussels, that there is reason of "forbearance of letters, till things bee settled whereunto I pray God to give a good ende, to the strengthening of the Gospel, and comfort of those who truly love religion and their countrey."[55] The reason for these heartfelt wishes becomes clear in correspondence after the *Directions* in which Abbot expresses embarrassment at his involvement but sends Trumbull, and others, copies of the *Directions* as well as letters explaining the King's reasons and instructing Bishops to enforce these *Directions* in their dioceses. John Howson's letter accompanying the *Directions to Preachers* in the Oxford diocese specifically requires ministers to publish the *Directions* at morning services the Sunday after they are received. Churchwardens are charged to observe carefully whether any form of preaching,

lecturing, or catechizing is used or practised other than what the *Directions* prescribe, and to inform the Bishop immediately. Parishioners are also entreated to inform on transgressors so that "a more religious and peaceable forme of preaching and catechising be setled amongst you." Churchwardens' presentments are required quarterly from Michaelmas term onwards, to better render account on these matters.[56]

Abbot's 4 September letter urges his auditors not to put an "ill construction to that, which may receave a faire interpretation."[57] The issue seems to be the popular perception that the *Directions* tend to the restraint of preaching and an abatement in the number of sermons preached. Abbot offers James's reasons for issuing the *Directions*, noting first the King's perception that every day there are more defections from religion, either to Popery or Anabaptism. The King has determined that these defections have been caused by the lightness and unprofitableness of preaching, especially of those preachers who consider points of divinity too deep for the people, who preach to show off their own wits, who meddle in state matters, and who rail against the persons, rather than the doctrines, of Papists and Protestants. In addition, Abbot notes that the placing of these matters in the care of civil magistrates is evidence that the King wishes to prevent the least discouragement to "solid preaching, or discreet or religious preachers."[58]

As Cogswell has noted, the impact of the *Directions* must also be seen in context of the order, two days earlier (2 August) that all Jesuits, priests, and refusers of the Oath of Allegiance were to be liberated from prison.[59] This point is clearly made in a letter from John Beaulieu to his brother-in-law William Trumbull in which he summarizes the main points of the *Directions* and links them to a second order for enlarging of Papists imprisoned on religious grounds (he lists refusing the Oath of Supremacy, hearing Masses, discussing books), and orders that they not be troubled for matters of conscience.[60] Despite instructions from Bishop Williams, recently Lord Keeper, explaining that only those who were recusants in religion, and not those whose recusancy appeared to be "meerly & totally Ciuill & Politicall"[61] were to be liberated, such a

move fuelled popular fears that the *Directions* were part of a broader plan towards greater toleration of Papists, and a general slackening in religion. Chamberlain writes to Dudley Carleton that priests, Jesuits, and other Papists are to be set at liberty even if they had refused "the oath of allegeance or supremacie,"[62] and his report makes clear that the distinction between civil and religious recusancy was not easily made. Walter Yonge, for example, easily made the connection between relaxation of the penal laws against recusants and the *Directions*, noting in his diary on 19 August 1622 that "There is a report that Papists shall have a toleration here in England, and that the Protestant ministers shall preach but once a Sabbath."[63] The Venetian ambassador, Valaresso, writes to the Venetian Doge and Senate on 26 August informing them of the orders for the release of Catholics, and mentioning a not-yet-executed order from the Archbishop of Canterbury forbidding preachers to attack the Roman faith or enlarge on disputes with the Roman Church. He also reports the rumour that preaching,"which is now so frequent through the week," will be confined to Sundays.[64]

An ill-timed sermon by John Everard, reader at St. Martin's-in-the-Field, on Hosea 12.1 ("Ephraim is fed wth the wynde") illustrates the kind of exegetical excesses which the *Directions* were designed to curb. A letter from John Castle to William Trumbull reports that Everard "tooke occasion to distinguishe the wynde into a spirituall, and into a pollitiq wynde." He applied the first to the doctrine of the Church of Rome and reserved the latter to their policy, which he said he would treat on the following sabbath, fearing no man's anger while he should handle the discourse of it. He was commanded by the King to forbear the pulpit the next day, his notes were seized, and he was sent for, by the King himself, to Court. James apparently used this example to threaten Bishops to hold their preachers "more naturally to their texts, [or] he will returne them to their old readinge of the Homilyes again."[65]

In fact the *Directions* were also timed to coincide with moves by James later in the year to break up centres of secular dissent in London by issuing a proclamation ordering all gentry to retire to the country-

side. Records of the Old Archdeaconry of St. Albans provide information regarding the sequence of events by which the *Directions* would be implemented.[66] The setting of a date of 12 September for the instruction of the clergy about the details of the *Directions* seems to be timed to coincide with Donne's official defence of them at Paul's Cross only three days later. One can conclude from these documents that the *Directions* were not immediately implemented, but that after an official engagement with them, preachers as well as clerical administrators would have been on the watch for offending sermons. From 15 September onwards, at least within the diocese of London, offenders would be made examples of if they spoke in breach of these *Directions*.

Significantly, many of those whose reports survive focus on the sermon Donne preached by royal command on 15 September justifying the *Directions* from the official Paul's Cross pulpit. The appropriateness of Donne's selection for this politically-sensitive task has never been questioned; nor has it been adequately explained. David Norbrook has suggested that Donne was selected because his wide range of connections was not limited to any one court party or faction, and therefore he was not identified as an enemy to either of the aggrieved parties, the Papists, and in particular, the Puritans. This is a plausible suggestion, particularly since it was the Puritans and the more zealous among the godly who needed to be persuaded of the necessity of such royal intervention in the affairs of the pulpit.[67] Equally an aspect of Donne's fitness for the sensitive task was the fact that Donne's mother, an elderly woman and a devout Catholic, was living with her son, and remained in his care until her death in the deanery of St. Paul's in 1630. Both in terms of family, education, and connections Donne's catholicity of belief would have inspired trust among those who feared Papists but feared persecution more. Clearly, too, Donne's status as Dean would have made him more acceptable to the popular auditories, untainted as yet by the prelatical ambitions which rendered the words of James's bishops suspect among the more zealous reformers. Add to that Donne's reputation as a powerful and persuasive pulpit orator, and as a frequent and impressive preacher and defender of sermons,

and it is a testament to James's political acuity that he chose Donne for this difficult task.

But what exactly was Donne supposed to do on 15 September, and to what extent did he accomplish what was intended? Several contemporary accounts exist which cast light on this important public moment from both before and after the event. There is no doubt that the event was much-anticipated. Simonds D'Ewes records in his diary that he went to bed "timelye" on the 14th "because I would heere Doctor Dunn, whoe was to preach at Paules Crosse toomorrow and upon whom was great expectation."[68] Joseph Mead writing to Sir Martin Stuteville on the same day also reported that Donne was to preach on the next day at Paul's "either to that purpose, to give satisfaction, or, as the Londoners talk, to teach men how to preach hereafter."[69] The reason for this, Mead goes on to say, is that previous preachers at Paul's Cross, Sheldon and Clayton, "went beyond the usual limits" and were imprisoned for their efforts.

Given this state of anticipation, those who attended the sermon were quick to "read" the performance. Simonds D'Ewes "hasted thither" in the morning "and by great good fortune and little cost, stood close by him [Donne] within the Crosse, and ther wrote as much as I desired.... The most parte of the afternoone and a prettye [while] after supper I spent in noting it out, soe that I did not partake of our whole Temple sermon, heere at night."[70] Writing to William Trumbull on 19 September, John Beaulieu reported that "there was a Declaration made at Powles Church by D^r^ Donne the Deane of Powles, of H.M.s mynde & intention aboue the late order made by him concerning Preachers, for the jealousie w^ch^ H.M. perceiued was apprehended thereof amongst the People as though he had an intent whiles he was enlarging the libertie of the Papists to abridge that of the Protestants in th'exercise of their Religion. Wherein the D. Deane did fully cleare H.M.s mynde, & further added a solemn protestation in His name, whereof he said he had a good & speciall warrant from him, that if he had a thousand liues he would liue & dye in no other Religion then that wherein he was borne, & brought up & w^ch^ he had hitherto confessed and defended both by his tongue & writings."[71] John Chamberlain's

report is more equivocal. Donne, he says, preached at the Cross, "to certifie the Kings goode intention in the late orders concerning preachers and preaching, and of his constancie in the true reformed religion, which the people (as shold seeme) began to suspect; his text was the 20th verse of the 5th chapter of the booke of Judges, somwhat a straunge text for such a busines, and how he made yt hold together I know not, but he gave no great satisfaction, or as some say spake as yf himself were not so well satisfied."[72]

Apparently, then, Donne was expected to do several things. Foremost was his task of persuading the people of James's good intentions in issuing the *Directions* and of James's constancy in the reformed religion. It is this task which Chamberlain felt had not been adequately fulfilled (although Beaulieu's letter offers a much less tentative appraisal). However, the other, equally important task, it appears, was that of modelling the kind of sermon which could be preached from the Paul's Cross pulpit in the wake of the *Directions* and of the sermons of Sheldon and Clayton which Mead said had gone "beyond the usual limits."[73] Donne was in fact being asked to establish the limits within which discreet and religious preachers would be allowed to operate, particularly from the influential Paul's Cross pulpit. In this regard, the verdict is more equivocal. Chamberlain found Donne's choice of text "straunge for such a busines" and could not say for certain how Donne made it hang together.[74] His final comment on the performance is the most intriguing. Donne apparently "gave no great satisfaction," a statement which contradicts the clear explanation of James's good intentions and the exhortation to obedient compliance with the *Directions* (which should have satisfied James), as well as the clear and passionate assertion that James was not slackening in religion (which should have satisfied the auditors). The key to the dissatisfaction appears to be in the impression created by Donne and obviously conveyed to at least one of his hearers, that "himself were not so well satisfied." How Donne created this impression it is difficult to imagine, although we know that he had a reputation as a powerful and persuasive preacher well able to use gestures to convey his messages.[75] Then, too, there is the matter of the choice of text, which was strange

enough for Chamberlain, not a great follower of sermons, to comment upon, but which passed unremarked by a much more experienced sermon-gadder, Simonds D'Ewes. Even after the sermon, however, popular opinion was uncertain how to interpret the significance and intent of the *Directions*, or more generally, the state of true religion in England. Lord Keeper Williams writing on 17 September to the Earl of Arran notes that the common people are not able to penetrate the actions of the King, regarding the release of recusants. Williams explains that the King is not a favourer of Popery, but that he could not mediate successfully for Protestants in France and Germany while remaining rigorous to Papists. Williams also points out to Arran that his 2 August letter to the judges was merely explanatory, delineating the classes of recusants to be spared, but excluding priests, seducers from religion and those who cast aspersions on government.[76]

Chamberlain's letter of 25 September also notes the Countess of Buckingham's relapse into popery, a fact which would have exacerbated fears of a general Catholic infiltration of court circles, dominated by the Duke of Buckingham. The same letter notes the reconciliation of Toby Matthew (whose recusancy had seriously embarrassed his father, the Bishop of York) to the King, who would now receive him into favour. It also reports the return of Mr. Gage from Rome with a copy of the dispensation for the match between Prince Charles and the Spanish Infanta, viewed with horror by most Englishmen, including a faction of powerful courtiers headed by Pembroke. The people were clearly justified in fearing that Papist influence was now in the ascendant and might eventually overcome the status of reformed religion in England.[77]

Donne's sermon was truly a test of the very discretion on which he had commented in an earlier sermon preached on 25 August at Hanworth before Lord Doncaster, the Earl of Northumberland, and Buckingham.[78] Many things about this sermon appear to be finely-balanced, beginning with its printed dedication to the Duke of Buckingham. Donne says that he transfers the sermon to the world through Buckingham's means, hoping that by acquiring Buckingham's approval, he can also claim to have spoken as the King intended. A

potential conflict between the intentions of the Holy Ghost and those of James is "resolved" by Donne, by separating exegesis from application, conscience from the authority of Buckingham.[79] The tactic requires his readers, as it must have done his hearers, to think of these intentions as distinct and not easily reconciled, despite Donne's claims to be in the service of uniting the Church both in itself and with the godly designs of James. Perhaps it is the uneasy dichotomy between these dual intentions that helped produce the vague feelings of dissatisfaction recorded by Chamberlain.

The text itself is strange, according to Chamberlain, and a signal (to those who attended to these things) of the kind of exegetical position inhabited by the preacher. Perhaps the strangeness resided in the choice of an equivocal text, one in which the application was not clear and preordained. Gosse, for one, assumed that Donne was aligning James with Sisera,[80] and, although the sermon proves that he was not, that suggestion would have been available to his expectant audience. The text is a text of resistance, albeit an orderly one, the very stars of heaven being enlisted in the fight against Sisera, clearly placing the heavens against the earth in the battle of good and evil which is here recorded. Edward Gee had given Sisera a specifically Papist interpretation in a sermon preached a few months before Donne's performance. There he had argued against the sinfulness of "security" occasioned by the refusal of ministers, "politique Neuters," to reprove sin in great men of the world.[81] Gee is offended by the leniency with which laws against recusants are enforced, and urges that "it is high time to take the nayle of the Lawes into your left, and the hammer of execution into your right, and to pierce the head of Popish Siseraes."[82] By 1624, the text has become an emblematic accompaniment to the assembled spiritual order of the kingdom depicted on the frontispiece of the Puritan Thomas Scott's *Vox Regis*, perhaps as a consequence of Donne's selection and exegesis of the text in that Paul's Cross sermon, and its subsequent publication and reissue.[83]

The modern perception of this sermon as an exercise in bland and unconscientious conformity lacks historical support. Patterson, for one, objects to this oversimplified reading, noting that Donne qualifies

his praise of James's pacifism, calls attention to the unpopular forced loan which he had been asked to pay in 1622, and dwells on the domestic political ideal of moderation in the sermon, no doubt aware of the contradiction involved in explaining "from the pulpit the pulpit's repression."[84] Wright comes even closer to the mark when she observes that Donne's "ambiguous" prooftext could be interpreted as a statement of obedience to God, but whether that obedience were primarily to God's Scriptural word or to a divinely appointed King remains unresolved.[85] Wright observes that Donne ends the first part of his exegesis by affirming his divine commission rather than his civic obligation, and the examples he cites as his standard of interpretation are those of Christ and the Apostles rather than secular laws. In the second part of the sermon, Donne relies on unusually limited testimony to justify the *Directions*, citing only emperors and Kings as James's precedents, and abandoning the witness of biblical *figurae* as well as Scriptural and patristic texts.

The early part of the sermon confronts immediately popular conceptions of James's pacifist foreign policy. Donne's avowed purpose is to assuage those who suspect "Gods power, or Gods purpose, to succour those, who in forraine parts, grone under heavie pressures in matter of Religion" (4: 183). Donne explains that God's pattern of action is to work through means, preaching specifically to remove suspicions of God's neglecting his business "because he does it not by our appointment." God does "much with little," and his subordinate means encompass the entire social spectrum, from Kings and governors to the poor and idle, all of whom can contribute to God's cause.

The second part of the text, that which supposedly satisfied James's intentions, is the occasional application of this text to preachers who, as stars, must fight orderly and decently against God's enemies. Donne is clear that the spiritual war must still be fought, that there is no reconciling Christ and Belial, Sincerity and Idolatry. "It is an opposition against God, . . . to reconcile opinions diametrally contrary to one another, in fundamentall things" (4: 193). So while day and night may join, light and darkness cannot. Donne's statements

about the importance of preaching are also unequivocal and trenchant: "That warre *God* hath kindled, and that warre must bee maintained, and maintained by this way; and his way, and his *Ordinance* in this warre, is Preaching" (4: 194). Even the example of Chrysostom, who kept his lamp burning by him at all times, is interpreted by Donne as evidence that he preached in the afternoon (something which was expressly forbidden by the *Directions*), and that the *Directions* do not intend an abatement of preaching. The section ends with a firm statement of the value and authority of preaching: "Preaching then being Gods *Ordinance*, to beget Faith, to take away preaching, were to disarme *God*, and to quench the spirit; for by that *Ordinance, he fights from heaven*" (4: 195).

The duty to preach ordained by heaven is Donne's next theme, and he is careful to note that preachers who silence themselves out of laziness, ignorance, or indiscretion invoke a heavy penalty. Donne is careful to interpret the *Directions* as specifically against personal revilings, rather than against contrary opinions, and the contemporary evidence cited indicates that this is how James intended the *Directions* to be interpreted. Immediately following this point, Donne places the "order" of preachers in the context of the political order of the commonwealth determined in Parliaments, courts, and pulpits.[86] In fact, his example of disorderly proceeding is the Roman Church which acts outside the rule of any temporal law. Similarly, the Head of this "order" is determined to be first God and then King James. Donne spends most of this section considering whether James is innovative in his *Directions*, and concluding that he is not. In particular, the methods by which the *Directions* were issued and publicized indicate to Donne that James was openly and fairly laying down the rules, which may be seen and copied in the registers' offices. In fact, Donne urges his hearers to look at the *Directions* and judge for themselves what their intent was. The practice of catechizing, the foundation of the Thirty-nine Articles, and the *Book of Homilies* are explained, and in each case, Donne finds that there is room for both positive and controverted divinity. Donne notes in particular those articles and homilies against idolatry and for doctrines of predestination, thus pointing specifically

to texts which would enable disciplined discussion of proscribed or controversial topics.

Chamberlain's puzzlement as to how the sermon hung together should alert readers to the complexity of Donne's exegesis and should encourage more balanced judgments of Donne's success in satisfying both his conscience and the King. The sermon was ordered published and there is evidence that it was popular, going soon into three editions. But in many ways the sermon is really two sermons. It is as much a clarion call to active and zealous preaching, within the terms of the *Directions*, as it is an assertion of monarchical power to censor sermons and to restrict controversial preaching. It afforded both an explanation and a model for preaching in the months to come.

Donne's own comments on the sermon, in a letter written only four days later to Sir Henry Goodyer, follow his extensive and detailed commentary on the affairs of the Palatinate. Donne's views on the continental situation seem clear, his statement that "The Palatinate is absolutely lost" ringing with the frustration of the losses which he goes on to enumerate.[87] In fact, the personal tone with which he discusses the political fate of the Palatinate contrasts markedly with the indirect and detached perspective which he takes on the matter of his sermon and the King's *Directions* which they defended. As Annabel Patterson has noted,[88] Donne's use of the passive voice and impersonal, conditional constructions serves to distance him from the event (e.g., "they received comfortable assurance of his Majesty's constancy in religion"), an effect which is at odds with Doncaster's report of the King's judgment that the sermon "was a piece of such perfection, as could admit neither addition nor diminution. . . concerning highly his service."[89] Another letter to Goodyer, dated 25 September, reports the "extreme cruelties" with which Heidelberg has been taken and entered. In this context, we hear Donne's further frustration that these momentous events are no longer having their effect on a people demoralized by their leadership and numb to further bad news. Donne says that while the King thinks the Spanish ambassador needs a guard, following the loss of Heidelberg, Donne's own reading of the situation is different, as is that of the Spanish ambassador, who obviously goes

about without fear despite these events. Donne says, "but I do not see, that he seems to need it, in his own opinion, neither in truth does he; the people are flat: or trust in God, and the Kings ways."[90] However else one interprets this passage, it is clear that Donne disapproves of the Spanish ambassador's confidence and is frustrated by the reasons for it. The comment on the flatness of the people, in apposition to their trust in God or the King's ways, and the detachment of Donne's observations, suggest that Donne does not include himself in any of the views expressed. He does not celebrate the flatness, nor the confidence it lends to Gondomar, whom Donne seems able to read more clearly than can James. Only four days before this letter, on 21 September, Donne was dining at Croydon with Abbot, whose support for the *Directions* was not unequivocal. If Donne was apologizing for James's *Directions* in his 15 September sermon, he does not seem to have been entirely sympathetic with their implementation and popular impact.

On the same day as Donne was justifying the King's *Directions* at Paul's Cross, his friend, fellow satirist, and self-proclaimed moderate, Joseph Hall, had the equally difficult task of preaching before the King at Theobald's.[91] Hall took as his text James 7.24 ("Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment"), and his performance must be seen in the context of Donne's Paul's Cross sermon for that day. If Donne's qualifications for the task of preaching at Paul's Cross on this occasion included his acceptability to a wide range of persons of varying doctrinal persuasions, Hall, too, was an effective choice for that day, but for different reasons. In his long career, his rhetoric of moderation ensured that he was distrusted by both Puritans and anti-Calivinists alike, denounced by the former as a "flashy, proud, self-dramatizer,"[92] and suspected by Laud, who sent spies to report on his conformity.[93]

Hall's sermon deals entirely with standards of judgment, applied first to the negative imperative (judge not according to the appearance) and then to the positive standard (but judge righteous judgment). The greater part of Hall's sermon preached on this day applies directly to the faulty judgments which are made according to appearance. This

emphasis is made necessary, Hall explains, because "it is needful to unteach error ere we can learn truth."[94] The negative part of this text, the "judge not," follows upon Hall's exposition that "There is nothing more uncertain than appearance."[95] The results of this exposition lead directly to the *Directions*. "Every man makes himself a justice itinerant, and passeth sentence of all that comes before him; yea, beyond all commission of all above him; and that many times not without gross misconstruction, as in the case of our late directions."[96] In fact, like Donne, Hall deflects his criticism of this method of judgment by attributing it to the Papists, arguing that the "holy frauds" of the Papists, the "weepings and motions of images, the noise of miraculous cures and dispossessions. . . could not gull men if they did not judge according to appearance."[97] "Should we judge according to appearance, all would be gold that glistereth," Hall explains, and we would confuse hypocrites and saints.[98] Among the deceptions which might pass for truth, Hall displays the catalogue of fair hypocrites and foul saints whose actions would most certainly be misinterpreted if we judged by appearance. Balaam prophesies Christ, Judas preaches him, Satan confesses him: when even an Abraham dissembles: a David cloaks adultery with murder, a Solomon gives at least a toleration to idolatry."[99] The "false appearance" of a "toleration of idolatry" intended by Great Britain's Solomon leads Hall to declaim against "false religion" with its "hierarchy mounted above kings," its "pompous ostentation of magnificence," its "garish processions," its "canonizations." And for all his claim that Solomon's toleration of idolatry is a "false appearance," Hall can only "blush and weep and bleed, to see that Christian souls should, after such beams of knowledge, suffer themselves to be thus palpably cozened with the gilded slips of error!"[100]

As if to justify his criticisms, Hall exhorts his hearers to the standards of "righteous judgment," cautioning them against the flattery of applauding the actions of the great no matter how they sin. Such flatterers, he argues, are the true traitors, and in time show their colours, as Judas did against Christ, Delilah against Samson, and Jael against Sisera. Hall's grouping of these examples, however, is

confusing; Jael's flattery might be construed as politic and holy against the tyrannical Sisera (the very "error" against which Donne was preaching at that moment at Paul's Cross), whereas Judas and Delilah clearly betrayed their lords, and could not be construed as popular heroes in any sense. The examples are cautionary, and deliberately ambiguous. Hall's point is that the godly must not fear to judge the powerful, and that sometimes deception is demanded for the greater good. To his audience of courtiers, Hall states clearly that while appearances are not to be trusted completely, appearances cannot be neglected by godly judges either. The ambiguity of Hall's examples is appropriate to the multiple audiences for this sermon, which enjoins righteous judgments to penetrate surface appearances at the same time as it warns evil courtiers that they can and will be seen.

Hall's sermon, like Donne's, interprets the *Directions* generously, but in a fashion that cannot be construed as flattering or unequivocal in its application. The very theme of his text allows for, even demands, double-edged advice, and his comments on appearance and judgment cut both ways. Yes, the people are to judge generously, but at the same time they are to judge. And sometimes, they are to judge by what they see, for their senses are safeguards to the understanding. Equally, flattery may be treacherous, but it may also be necessary against God's enemies. Both Hall and Donne seem to be walking a careful line, asserting the claims of conscience, at the same time as they promote discernment and judgment in the audience. In particular, Hall seems to be addressing his audience of courtiers to remind them that they are being judged, and that such interpretation of public figures is inevitable.

4

Donne's 5 November sermon on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot marks his return to the Paul's Cross pulpit, and extends the public interpretation of the *Directions for Preachers* begun in his 15 September sermon.[101] The occasion of the sermon, and Donne's attitude towards it, are revealed in a letter to Sir Thomas Roe, then Ambassador to Constantinople.[102] In this letter, Donne explains what

he could do in a sermon when left "more to mine own liberty." It is important that the comments about Donne's sermons follow a lengthy discussion of the thorns of calumny which make up our crown. He notes in words that apply as much to his own case as to Roe's in his new ambassadorship that "Outward thorns of Calumny, and mis-interpretation do us least harme; Innocency despises them; or friends and iust examiners of the case blunt or breake them." Donne's introduction of the matter of this sermon comes after an intriguing metaphor to describe the circumstances leading up to the events of the past few months. He comments that "the Astronomers of y^{e} world" are most exercised when there arises "a new, and irregular meteor in the skies." Donne goes on to say that many such meteors have been produced "in o^{r} firmament, in o^{r} diuinity" by this treaty of marriage of the Prince. His own view of the furor caused by this projected match is that the "Astronomers" are "measuringe publique actions, w^{t} private affections." The problem, as Donne sees it, is in the over-dangerous misapplication of these events and of the illogical leap from the "maior proposition" (the Spanish Match and some civil acts in favour of Papists) to the conclusion ("tepidnes in very high places") without a minor premise to support such a conclusion. Donne laments the necessity of the moves, arguing that "to conclude y^{e} worst, ys y^{e} first degree of yll, ys a distilling w^{t} too hot a fire."

Since Donne does acknowledge that things have come to "y^{e} first degree of yll," it is significant that he chooses to preach on a text from the Book of Lamentations, a book which was not recognized as a distinct book in the canon of the Council of Trent, although according to Donne it is "certainly a *distinct booke*" (4:237). Another aspect of this liberty is that the text can be interpreted either historically, of the death of the good King Josiah, or prophetically, of the bad King Zedekiah. And since Donne chooses to dwell on the conflict of interpretation, the sermon becomes a flexible medium for interpretation which does not fix upon either of these alternatives but plays between them. On the surface at least this sermon should have been acceptable to James. Its underlying premise and overt political message is that all Kings, even bad Kings, must be preserved—a

doctrine which James had expounded with an admirable instinct for self-preservation in his writings. Donne's argument is that, good or ill, Kings are "to be lamented, when they fall into dangers, and... reserved by all means, by Prayer from them who are private persons, by counsell from them, who have that great honour and that great charge, to be near them in that kinde, and by support and supply, from all, of all sorts, from falling into such dangers" (4: 239).

What is particularly challenging in this sermon, though, is Donne's parallel application of the text to both good and bad Kings, an application which he presents in the sermon as a problem of interpretation for his audience. Although he insists that present application can be made only to the good King, Josiah, he notes parenthetically that the text is more ordinarily and more probably held by the expositors to apply to the bad King. And although he assures his audience, and the King, that the case of the bad King Zedekiah is merely hypothetical, and that it reinforces the case for preserving the good King, the comparison and its obvious application to the present dissatisfaction in the kingdom would have been only too apparent to the audience at Paul's Cross. In voicing the people's fears, Donne continues to take the sermon beyond conventional "defences" or apologies.

Donne's approach to the subject of the sermon is twofold. He has much to say about the duties of a people to a bad king, but does so in the context of a direct attack on the political theology of the Papists who have made treason an article of religion. In addition, Donne's application of the text complicates the discourse of absolutism noted by readers in this sermon not only by calling attention to the conventions of interpretation by which Kings are to be judged, but by his advice to his hearers as to their own religious responsibilities. With the *Directions* only three months old, Donne confronts openly the political threat posed by Roman Catholicism (a topic expressly limited by the *Directions*, although expressly enjoined by the conventions of Gunpowder Plot rhetoric) at the same time as he directly engages popular dissatisfaction with the King. Donne's conclusions may seem absolutist, but in the process of reaching them, he reveals the ambivalence and complexity of his attitudes.

Donne's final paragraph addresses his hearers directly, advising them what they *can* do even if they are dissatisfied with James's religion. Just as the hypothetical consideration of good and bad Kings ended finally with an exhortation to interpret according to their consciences, so his hypothetical allowance of James's coolness in religion leads ultimately to practical advice grounded on good sense and self-preservation. He says "Let not a mis-grounded, and disloyall imagination of coolness in him, cool you, in your own families" (4: 263). And in a clear allusion to recent relaxation of the penal laws, Donne warns family leaders not to be indifferent to Papists, as if Papist and Protestant were but several callings. And though Donne allows the Prince the liberty to open and close the doors of the Kingdom "as God shall put to his minde," he does not think that this means a relaxing of religious vigilance in the households of the nation. Their responsibility remains despite the new lenience towards Papists. "A Theif that is let out of New-gate is not therefore let into thy house; A Preist that is let out of prison, is not therefore let into thy house neither: still it may be felony, to harbour him, though there were mercy in letting him out" (4: 263).

As others have noted, a conjunction of circumstances made this occasion particularly difficult for Donne. John Wall and Terry Burgin, for example, place this sermon at the convergence of several cultural realities: Paul's Cross and its public function as an official pulpit, the annual anti-Catholic invective unleashed on 5 November, the popular opposition to the Spanish Match, and the official church policy on the subject of royal authority, as defined in the *Book of Homilies*, reprinted in 1623 at the express command of King James. Donne in fact was handed an anti-Catholic occasion and asked to defend the policies of a monarch who seemed to many all too pro-Catholic. Donne's strategy in this sermon, they argue, is to shift the emphasis from religious to political dimensions, by emphasizing the plot as an assault on the person and authority of the King, rather than an assault on religion or the nation.

Wall and Burgin are persuasive in their argument that Donne was paraphrasing the *Book of Homilies* on the subject of prayers for Kings,

although less convincing in their assumption that only things supportive of the King saw print, or in their ignoring the fact that James, in fact, did not order this sermon published. It is also difficult to concur with the argument that Donne is undercutting the arguments of James's protestant opposition in this sermon by associating them with the disobedience to royal authority manifested by the Gunpowder Plotters. While it is true that Donne stresses the importance of order and stability to a nation's foreign policy (a united front at home, as it were), Donne still offers ways of dealing with internal grievances, by focusing on the role of family leaders in guarding their homes, while leaving the ports and doors to the kingdom in the hands of the monarch.

A sermon by Robert Willan, D. D., preached at Westminster Abbey before the judges on the same day as Donne was preaching at Paul's Cross, and dedicated to Lord Keeper Williams, provides an important basis of comparison with Donne's sermon. It is clear from the beginning that Willan's purpose in the sermon is to defend James's *Directions* and to connect those disgruntled by this new test of obedience with the Gunpowder plotters, who were willing to destroy the entire foundation of government to assert their liberty. Judson discusses Willan's sermon as an example of a sermon by a royalist, notable for the extent to which he proclaimed the King to be above the law.[103] Willan chooses as his text Psalm 2.1-4, a text which provided encouragement to the Apostles when they were forbidden to preach and which comforted Luther when all the world was opposed to him. It is a Janus-like text, Willan argues, one which looks back to revive the memory of the Gunpowder conspiracy, but one which looks forward to the present "tumultuarie" times when other parts of Christendom are being persecuted.[104] When Willan turns his attention from "the Propheticall conspiracy against CHRIST our King" to his text as history ("the Historicall faction against King *Dauid*"), he seizes the opportunity to observe that "[f]or people in any estate to grumble against the gouernours is not nouelty,"[105] adding that a King might as safely be a keeper of bears and tigers. Willan's specific target appears to be "pettie greatnesse"[106] rather than the "vulgar man,"[107] those who expostulate with kings if others are raised up, and sow dissension and

mischief among the nobles. The prevention of conspiracy requires the twin pillars of government: "Direction, in the Superior; Obedience, in the Inferior.... When these meet, the State is successfull."[108] Good laws are the "bands" of this text, and the "yoke" is religion. Religion, he says, tames the stubborn nature of man and makes him "yeelde due obedience. . . . It is the cyment of societie, and strongest Pillar of Gouernment."[109] Laws in this commonwealth are like the cords that hold up the tent, humbling the wild and underpropping the weak. In all of this Princes are the only exception: "Lawes were not written for them; Lawes do not, like death, equall the Scepter with the spade,"[110] although the humility of Princes should respect the law.

Given the audience for whom Willan's sermon was preached—those very judges whose function, at least nominally, was to uphold the laws of the state, without exception—the contrast with Donne could not be more complete, despite a superficial similarity in doctrine. The rhetoric of obedience, of superiors and inferiors, of Princely prerogative, conveys a message much different from Donne's extended application of his text to the bad King Zedekiah, and his stripping away of the grounds of interpretation of royal actions. In this context, Willan's overt recommendation of the royal directions, a subject Donne does not even mention in his sermon, takes on a repressive tone. As Willan argues, "By his last heauenly directions, which followed well, may place Religion where it is not, and settle it where it is already entertain'd," conspiracy will be foiled.[111] The point could not be clearer: "He who is not moued by his [James's] example, nor instructed by his works, nor wonne by his clemency [in the relaxation of the penal laws], nor obseruant and pliable to his direction, I doe not say resists, but argues and makes doubts, fearing where no feare is." This man is a "plaine rebell to CHRIST in heauen, to *Dauid* on earth. For when Gods precept thunders, and that is when the voyce of his Deputie speakes, we must submit and not dispute or els the yoke is cast off."[112] Where Donne had chosen to emphasize the political and earthly nature of the *Directions*, as well as their temporary application to present circumstances, Willan apotheosizes them into heavenly and universal instructions, part of the larger pattern of unthinking obedi-

ence which alone can prevent the tumults of history from being reenacted. The differences from Donne are a matter of degree rather than of kind. But the differences need to be registered if we are to comprehend both the conscientious independence of Donne's point of view as well as the unequivocal obedience demanded by Willan who concludes that "we must submit and not dispute." Furthermore, Willan equates conspiracy and sedition with a general dislike of government, and a rejection of both law and religion. In the end, unlike Donne, Willan does not extenuate James's popular reputation; he does not even acknowledge it. Nor does he instruct his hearers in the ways of interpretation or in the private means by which the King's mysterious lenience to Catholics for the sake of a far-reaching foreign policy can be offset at home by religious diligence. Superficially, the messages of the two sermons are similar, but rhetorically, they demand quite different responses from their hearers.

5

The last months of 1622 were certainly important in Donne's career as a preacher. From one perspective, they mark his ascendancy as a model of pulpit leadership; in another sense they might mark his subordination as a religious leader. Two sermons, the one defending James's *Directions to Preachers* on 15 September 1622, and one preached to the Virginia Company on 13 October 1622, were subsequently published. A third sermon, preached at Paul's Cross on 5 November 1622 was commanded by the King. In that same time period, two of the three sermons dedicated to Donne in his lifetime were preached and published.[113] Of the seven sermons preached at Paul's Cross from 4 August to 5 November 1622, in fact, four were directly connected to Donne.

Donne's increasing political visibility and his selection to preach on the sensitive issue of the regulation of sermons attest to his fitness for the task. And yet, despite this, 1622 did not mark a decisive upward turn in Donne's career. From another point of view, these months might be viewed as a turning point for Donne in a different direction.

Contemporary reports, and Donne's comments, suggest that the 15 September performance was as much of a political test as a public honour. Donne himself felt constrained by the occasion, and preached sermons which were more equivocal when left more to his "liberty." Especially if we measure Donne's 15 September and 5 November sermons against the more conventional conformist sermons of Robert Willan and others, we begin to understand that Donne's 5 November sermon (which, significantly, was not recommended for publication) might mark a turning point in Donne's career. Certainly, after this point we find no more special commissions for Donne in the pulpit. Nor is Donne promoted either by James or by Charles to the bishopric which the "absolutist" reading of his politics predicts.

By selecting Donne to defend his *Directions*, James as some have suggested, may have shown political astuteness in offering the people a preacher both doctrinally and rhetorically satisfying. It is also possible that James was trying to colonize Donne, reining him into public service rather than allowing him to maintain independent views, or, more dangerously, a powerful silence. James was always aware of the importance of coopting powerful preachers to serve his own ends. By making John Preston the Prince's chaplain, James had already shown his acuity, depriving the Puritans of Preston while ensuring that he did not function as a Court preacher. A similar case might be made for James's selection of Donne. It seems clear, however, that following the November 1622 sermon, Donne was less sought after, less eager, perhaps, to engage in pulpit controversy. Whatever the reasons, the last months of 1622 mark the limits of Donne's ambitions, and call into question the modern image of Donne as royal spokesman.

Donne's sermons in the last years of King James's reign (1623-1625), culminating in his important first sermon preached to Charles in 1626 on the subject of "foundations," demand greater attention from his readers. These sermons need to be interpreted in the light of recent scholarship on the religious politics of the transition from James I to Charles I in 1625, and in the context of what we know about Donne's own activities (as Dean of St. Paul's, vicar of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, Justice of the Peace for Bedford, and judge in the Court of

Delegates, for example) during these crucial years. If Donne was not promoted for his efforts in 1622, we need to consider what this tells us about his political status in the last years of James's reign. The last months of 1622, I would argue, mark the limits rather than the beginnings of Donne's ambitions, and direct us to further examination of available biographical and historical evidence, particularly Donne's sermons and letters, which develop a language of public and private conscience.

University of Regina

Notes

[1] The entire text of the *Directions* as well as accompanying letters from George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, are available in Kenneth Fincham, ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Church of England Record Society, vol. 1 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1994), pp. 211-14.

[2] This is the view offered by several influential critics: see Millar Maclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1958), p. 105; R. C. Bald, *John Donne: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 434-35; John Carey, *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (London: Faber and Faber, 1981), p. 116.

[3] Thomas Cogswell provides the most comprehensive list of offenders in *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989), p. 27, and establishes a detailed context for conditions affecting the pulpit in this period (pp. 27-35). See also the details concerning Dr. Andrew Willet in *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman E. McClure, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), 2: 140, and Dr. John Preston in Thomas Ball, *The Life of the Renowned Doctor Preston* (Oxford, 1885), pp. 62-65. Anthony Milton discusses Willet's moderate puritanism in the context of the changing religious and political climate in England in the early Stuart period, particularly as his writings help to gauge the changing nature of anti-Papist controversial writing in the early 1600s. See his *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995). The importance of a sermon preached by John Knight at Oxford in late April 1622 has been noted by Cogswell (*Blessed Revolution*, p. 27) and Milton (pp. 58, 292, 519). Although the following list of four sermons is not exhaustive, these sermons provide a doctrinal and political context within which to read the reports of Knight's sermon which preached the "extravagant" doctrine (Chamberlain, p. 434) of resistance to tyrannical monarchs: William Laud, *A Sermon preached at White-Hall, on the 24. of March, 1621* (London, 1622) [preached 24 March 1621/2] STC 15300; Walter Curll, *A sermon preached at White-Hall* (London, 1622) [preached 28 April 1622] STC 6132; Christopher White, *A Sermon Preached in Christ-Church, Oxford* (London, 1622) [preached 12 May 1622] STC 25378; Richard Gardiner, *A Sermon Preached at St. Maries Oxford* (Oxford, 1622) [preached 8 July 1622] STC 11568. Nicholas Tyacke has discussed some of the political and theological aspects of Laud's sermon in "Archbishop Laud," *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (London: The Macmillan Press, 1993), pp. 59-62.

[4] Chamberlain, 2: 310.

[5] Chamberlain, 2: 394.

[6] These proclamations, issued 4 December 1620 and 26 July 1621, are printed in *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, ed. James Larkin and Paul Hughes, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 1: 495-96, 519-21.

[7] William Whiteway, *William Whiteway of Dorchester: his diary, 1618-1635* (Dorchester: Dorchester Record Society, 1991), p. 33.

[8] Chamberlain, 2: 331.

[9] These "bitter invectives and undecent raylinge speeches against the persones of eyther papists or puritans" are distinguished in the *Directions* from modest and grave defences of the Church of England "occasioned thereunto by the texts of Scripture" (*Directions*, p. 213).

[10] Some of the problems arising from the use of sermons as evidence are discussed in my "Introduction: Reading Donne's Sermons," *JDJ* 11.1-2 (1992), 1-20.

[11] Although some anti-Papist polemics were purely doctrinal, the popular conviction that "political loyalty and Roman Catholicism were incompatible" (Milton, p. 257) dominated conformist rhetoric in this period. Milton stresses, however, that avant-garde conformists had a more flexible anti-Papist ideology, which was not so absolute in its condemnation of all Papists.

[12] Thomas Bedford, *The sinne unto death. Or an ample discovery of the sinne against the Holy Ghost* (London, 1621), p. 3b. STC 1788.

[13] Anthony Milton's richly-detailed account of anti-Papist rhetoric in the period examines the full range of responses to the Jesuits and the Council of Trent and their impact on the early Stuart church. Many Protestants believed that the Council of Trent had changed things irreversibly for the worse by formally establishing heretical new doctrines and imposing them as articles of faith (p. 245). King James's official policies attempted to separate loyal from treasonous Papists, and, in fact, anti-Papist attacks on the Jesuits during this period increasingly focus on the political threats posed by their "extreme" doctrines. See also Peter Lake, "Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), pp. 72-106.

[14] The following is only a sample of the variety of published anti-Papist commentary in the period preceding the *Directions*: John Prideaux, *Ephesus Backsliding: considered and applied to these times* (London, 1621) STC 20352 ; Robert Sanderson, *Two Sermons* (London, 1622) STC 21708; Samuel Ward, *The happinesse of practice* (London, 1621) STC 25044; Samuel Buggs, *Davids strait. A sermon preached at Pauls-Crosse* (London, 1622) STC 4022; James Ussher, *The substance of that which was deliuered in a sermon before the Commons House the 18. of February, 1620* [1621] (London, 1621) STC 24553.5; Edward Gee, *Two sermons. One, the curse and crime of Meroz. The other, of patience* (London, 1620 [1621]) STC 11700; Thomas Sutton, *Jethroes counsell to Moses: or, a direction for magistrates* (London, 1631) STC 23505; Robert Bolton, *Two sermons preached at Northampton* (London, 1635) STC 3256; Edward Chaloner, *Sixe Sermons* (London, 1623) STC 4936; Roger Ley, *The Bruising of the Serpents Head. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse* (London, 1622) STC 15568.

[15] I am grateful to Peter McCullough for showing me the relevant portions of his forthcoming book on Elizabethan and Jacobean court sermons. See *The Sermon at the Elizabethan and Jacobean Courts, 1558-1625: Preaching, Religion, and Politics*.

[16] Sanderson, p. 76. The following article discusses the religious and political character of Sanderson's conformity: Peter Lake, "Serving God and the Times: The Calvinist Conformity of Robert Sanderson," *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), 81-116.

[17] Ward, p. 27.

[18] Prideaux, pp. 22, 25.

[19] Despite the apparent topicality in 1621 of Prideaux's comments on marriage and the political threat posed by the Church of Rome, it is important to remember that this sermon was first preached in Oxford in 1614, well before the crisis over Spanish Match negotiations had reached its peak, and before the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618. Cogswell finds Prideaux's comments on the Pope as Antichrist notable "as late as 1621" when James was intensifying negotiations with Spanish Catholics and the Pope himself for a bride for Charles (*Blessed Revolution*, pp. 29-30). Cogswell says that in this sermon Prideaux could "confidently boast" that his university audience would scarcely doubt that the Pope was Antichrist, implying that this attitude was common in 1621. In fact, Prideaux in 1614 is exhorting his listeners against such doubt: "Fathers and brethren, is this a time to make a doubt, whether the Pope be Antichrist or no, seeing his hornes and markes are so apparently discouered?" (p. 36). On the question of changing attitudes to the Pope as Antichrist in the 1620s and 1630s see Milton, pp. 93-127 and *passim*.

[20] See Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I," *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), 169-207. This article offers a detailed and persuasive account of James's policy of incorporating a wide range of theological opinion in his church, and of excluding only those holding the most extreme positions, specifically Papists who would not take the Oath of Allegiance and nonconforming Puritans. In a letter to the Scottish bishops, James had written that "Papistry was a disease of the Mind, and Puritanism of the Brain; and the Antidote to both a grave, setled and well-ordered Church in the obedience of God and their King." See John Spottiswood, *The History of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1668), p. 542.

[21] John Hughes, *St. Pauls exercise, or, a sermon of conscience* (London, 1622), p. 10. STC 13914.

[22] Richard Cust relates Puritan resistance to the forced loan to "the worry that Catholics had won their way into royal favour through their forwardness in promoting prerogative taxation." See *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626-1628* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 304. Roger Manwaring had made the analogy clear by contrasting godly Puritan "recusancy in temporalls" with the

loyalty to the King of many Catholics. See Roger Maynwaring [sic], *Religion and Allegiance* (London, 1627), p. 31. STC 17751.

[23] Buggs, p. 36.

[24] The phrase "discreet or religious" is used by Abbot in his letter accompanying the *Directions* (p. 214) to clarify that James does not intend to discourage "obedient" and orderly preaching. Donne quotes the phrase to stress that "heere is no abating of Sermons, but a direction of the Preacher to preach usefully, and to edification." See *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson, 10 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959-62), 4: 209. All subsequent quotations from the sermons are taken from this edition and indicated by volume and page number in the text of this essay. The nature and extent of censorship in this period is debated by historians. See, in particular, the following works: Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Reading and Writing in Early Modern England* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1984); A. B. Worden, "Literature and Political Censorship in Early Modern England," in *Too Mighty to be Free: Censorship and the Press in Britain and the Netherlands*, ed. A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse (Zutphen: De Walburg Press, 1987), pp. 45-62; Sheila Lambert, "The Printers and the Government, 1604-1637," in *Aspects of Printing from 1600*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Oxford: Oxford Polytechnical Press, 1987), pp. 1-29.

[25] Donne's participation in the Doncaster embassy is the subject of Paul Sellin's *"So Doth, So Is Religion": John Donne and the Diplomatic Contexts in the Reformed Netherlands, 1619-20* (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1989).

[26] The details of this episode are in Bald, p. 368.

[27] Milton, p. 197. Milton (p. 70) also cites this sermon as an example of burgeoning "negative popery" in the 1620s, referring to doctrines asserted without the normal caveats against superstitious and popish abuses of such doctrines.

[28] See Milton, p. 199. The quotation is from Edward Maie, *A Sermon on the Communion of Saints* (London, 1621), p. 7. STC 17196.

[29] Bald, p. 370.

[30] In a sermon preached 16 June 1619, Donne had said that "the knowledge which is to salvation, is by being in Gods house, in the Houshold of the Faithfull, in the Communion of Saints" (2: 353). On the Church as the means to salvation in this period, see also 1: 29 and 4: 106. Donne's rejection of the decrees of the Council of Trent, however, appears to remain consistent throughout his career. In his Christmas 1621 sermon, for example, Donne argues that the Christian doctrine necessary to salvation was delivered but once, in the Scriptures, and calls the new creed of the Council of Trent, which contains more articles than the Apostles' Creed, a "monstrous birth" (3: 369).

[31] Donne's standard regarding satire in sermons is "nearnesse" (3: 142) rather than direct, personal attacks, which are uncharitable, ineffective, and possibly dangerous. The difficulties of achieving "nearnesse" in sermons are discussed in

my "Donne on Discretion," *ELH* 47 (1980), 48-66, and "Donne's Sermons and the Absolutist Politics of Quotation," in *John Donne's Religious Imagination: Essays in Honor of John T. Shawcross*, ed. Raymond-Jean Frontain and Frances Malpezzi (Conway, AK: Univ. of Central Arkansas Press, 1995), pp. 391-92. Donne probably agreed with Maie on the "itch" to hear schismatical doctrine currently infecting congregations. In his sermon for Easter Monday 1622, for example, Donne comments that one of God's greatest blessings to him was to give him an audience with spiritual and circumcised ears, rather than an audience with ears itching to hear popular and seditious calumnies upon state and church (4: 91). Even Donne, however, was tempted to be satirical in his comments on audiences itching for zealous sermons on predestination. In what is arguably the most satiric passage in his sermons, Donne says of those who are dissatisfied with his pulpit style: "You are not all here neither; you are here now, hearing me, and yet you are thinking that you have heard a better Sermon somewhere else, of this text before; you are here, and yet you think you could have heard some other doctrine of downright *Predestination* and *Reprobation* roundly delivered somewhere else with more edification to you" (3: 110). Maie, however, is firm in rejecting heretics, schismatics, and apostates as not of the communion of saints, whereas Donne's dislike of controversy causes him to distinguish fundamental doctrine from uncharitable wrangling over less important issues. It also causes him to remember that Saint Paul urged Christians not to scandalize "the false and infirme church, by refusing to communicate with them." In addition, he urges his hearers not to shake the foundations of religion, recalling the days in the beginning of the reformation when the injunctions of Princes forbade these "odious names" (3: 176).

[32] Until recently, historians have been reluctant to label Donne politically. Wilfred Prest, for example, identifies the avowedly Puritan preachers at Lincoln's Inn from 1600 to 1640, but says simply that Donne could not be so described. See Wilfred R. Prest, *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972), p. 197. More recently, Tyacke has labelled Donne an "Arminian," Ferrell an "avant-garde conformist," and Sellin a conforming "Calvinist." See Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 182; Lori Anne Ferrell, "Donne and His Master's Voice, 1615-1625," *JDJ* 11.1-2 (1992), 59; Paul Sellin, *John Donne and "Calvinist" Views of Grace* (Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel, 1983). Doerksen discusses Donne's "Puritan" imagination. He argues that although not a Puritan himself, Donne could get along well with conforming Puritans, and finds elements of "emotional" Puritanism in Donne's sermons. See Daniel W. Doerksen, "'Saint Paul's Puritan': John Donne's 'Puritan' Imagination in the Sermons," in *John Donne's Religious Imagination: Essays in Honor of John T. Shawcross*, ed. Raymond-Jean Frontain and Frances Malpezzi (Conway, AK: Univ. of Central Arkansas Press, 1995), pp. 350-65. In *Catholic and Reformed*, Milton demonstrates that the terminology used to describe religious

opinion in the early Stuart church needs to take into account the "many shifting and transitional colours" which made up the spectrum of religious belief in this period (p. 8). The "enthusiasm and zeal" for the cause of "true religion" which he describes cannot be separated from Puritan notions of a "godly elite" beset by hostile enemies. While Donne can certainly be described as passionate, even zealous, in certain respects, he does not seem to have thought of the communion of saints as reserved for a godly elite. In almost all respects, the notion of a "Puritan" Donne is untenable; however, a "Calvinist" and "conformist" Donne, as posited by Sellin, is arguably more useful a label.

[33] Essays by David Norbrook, Annabel Patterson, and others offer detailed, alternative readings of biographical information from Donne's pre-ordination period and, consequently, more nuanced interpretations of Donne's politics than those urged by John Carey, *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (London: Faber and Faber, 1981); and, especially, Debora Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics and the Dominant Culture* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1990). For this alternative view see 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 E. Maus (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 3-36; Annabel Patterson, "All Donne," in the same collection, pp. 37-67; Annabel Patterson, "John Donne, Kingsman?", in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991), pp. 251-72; and also Tom Cain's "Donne and the Prince d'Amour," a paper delivered at the eleventh conference of the John Donne Society (February 1996), printed below in the present number of *JDJ*. The issue of Donne's politics is a complex one and also informs many of the essays published in *JDJ* 11.1-2 (1992), a special issue of the *Journal* devoted entirely to Donne's sermons. Donne's post-ordination politics are also the subject of my essays already cited, as well as the following: Jeanne Shami, "Kings and Desperate Men: John Donne preaches at Court," *JDJ* 6.1 (1987), 9-23; Dave Gray and Jeanne Shami, "Political Advice in Donne's *Devotions*: No Man Is An Island," *MLQ* 50.4 (1989), 337-56; and David Nicholls, "Divine Analogy: The Theological Politics of John Donne," *Political Studies* 32 (1984), 570-80, and "The Political Theology of John Donne," *Theological Studies* 49 (1988), 45-66. In a broader sense, beginning with an earlier period in Donne's life, the nature of his later politics has been put in perspective by the biographical work of Dennis Flynn (especially in *John Donne & the Ancient Catholic Nobility* [Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995]; "Donne the Survivor," pp. 15-24 in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. Claude Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth [Columbia, MO: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1986]; and "Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* and Other Libels on Robert Cecil, *JDJ* 6 [1987]: 163-83); and the criticism of M. Thomas Hester (especially *Kinde Pitty and Brave Scorn: Donne's Satyres* [Durham: Duke Univ.

Press, 1982]; "Donne's [Re]Annunciation of the Virgin[ia Colony] in Elegy XIX," *South Central Review* 4 [1987]: 49-64; and "'This Cannot Be Said': A Preface to the Reader of Donne's Lyrics," *Christianity and Literature* 39 [1990]: 365-85).

Richard Strier has recently tried to argue that critics claiming Donne was "not unambiguously absolutist" (Norbrook and Patterson), or that he took his role as royal counselor seriously enough to offer unpalatable advice to Prince Charles (Gray and Shami), have embarked on an unsuccessful quest to find an "oppositional" dimension in Donne's post-ordination writings. See "Donne and the Politics of Devotion," in *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*, ed. Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), pp. 93-114. I will let Annabel Patterson and David Norbrook speak for themselves as to whether "not unambiguously absolutist" is the same as "oppositional." However, to say that "Donne remained politically 'obedient' while still offering advice to the Court" or that "If Donne's politics are 'absolutist' it is important for critics to explain how they are and to find evidence not only in the sermons but in their contexts" (Shami, "Politics of Quotation," pp. 381 and 403) is hardly grounds for creating such a false critical dichotomy. Strier divides commentators on Donne's politics into those who "see" the absolutism of Donne's politics (which Strier accepts, without reservation, on the say-so of Debora Shuger) and those who are "searching [unsuccessfully] for oppositionality" (Strier, "Politics of Devotion," pp. 93-94). Ironically, Strier argues that the latter critics are "falling prey to a false dichotomy. . . assuming that the only alternative to careerism and toadying is criticism or opposition" (p. 94). The dichotomy, however, is all of Strier's own making. It is true that a growing number of critics have been concerned to challenge the "absolutist" model of Donne's politics, but this is largely because no one has mounted a case that Donne was "oppositional," and because of the flawed methodology which has produced the "absolutist" conclusions. I have argued at length that the "absolutist" view of Donne's politics is a recent development, deriving mainly from Carey and Bald, and is promulgated by critics who read the sermons in a fragmentary, uncontextualized way with the aid of the Index, and who come to the sermons with a preconceived notion of Donne's politics. Here, at least, I am encouraged to find that Strier, too, objects to critics who "pick out bits and pieces" from Donne's writings, or who "fit texts into predetermined views of the author's political orientation" (p. 93). Strier's suggestion that critics ought to consider "the possibility of principled loyalty to the established church and state" (p. 94) is particularly apt, and echoes my own statement that "In the broadest sense, Donne's politics ask the question of how Donne could be a royalist supporter without, by definition, supporting the absolutist politics of that monarchy" ("Reading Donne's Sermons," p. 12). The essays on Donne's politics cited in this note are all concerned with ways in which Donne understood and articulated his obedience after his ordination, what "obedience" meant, and how Donne managed "to offer advice that is both

principled and yet acceptable to James and Charles" (Shami, "Politics of Quotation," p. 404). Strier himself, in discussing questions of obedience and resistance in another context, has made the important point that there is "a strand within the Protestant tradition that. . . intensified nonobedience into resistance rather than diminishing it into endurance." See Strier's "Faithful Servants: Shakespeare's Praise of Disobedience," in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 108. But, Strier's characterization of the alternatives, especially the implication that "endurance" is the diminished form of obedience while resistance is its more heroic manifestation, needs to be challenged. Just as Strier has suggested that it is a mistake to assume that only oppositional figures had principles ("Politics of Devotion," p. 94), so too is it a mistake to assume that obedience cannot be principled, and perhaps even heroic. The polemical uses of quotation which I discuss in "Politics of Quotation" were well-known to Donne's contemporaries. See the discussion of Henry Burton's quarrel with Joseph Hall in Rudolf Kirk, "A Seventeenth-Century Controversy: Extremism vs. Moderation," *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 9 (1967): 1-35.

[34] Bald, pp. 377-78.

[35] John Donne, *Letters to Severall Persons of Honour (1651)*, ed. M. Thomas Hester (Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977), p. 158.

[36] See the works by Tyacke and Ferrell already cited. The concept of avant-garde conformity was first introduced by Peter Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I," in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991), pp. 112-34. Joshua Scodel makes the connection between Donne and Abbot in reference to Donne's 1627 sermon on the text "Take heed what you hear." See Josuah Scodel, "John Donne and the Religious Politics of the Mean," in *John Donne's Religious Imagination: Essays in Honour of John T. Shawcross*," ed. Raymond-Jean Frontain and Frances Malpezzi (Conway, AK: Univ. of Central Arkansas Press, 1995), p. 64. Scodel uses the discussion to argue for Donne's anti-Arminianism, and he makes a strong case that the "middle way" of the Arminians was a travesty of Donne's middle way between extremes of Papism and non-conforming Puritanism (pp. 63-70). He also argues that Donne distinguished in his sermons between these two middle ways. See my discussion of this sermon in "Kings and Desperate Men," pp. 19-21 and Strier's in "Politics of Devotion," pp. 96-97. Donne's objections to the extrajudicial (i.e. unauthorized) criticisms of the "bed of whisperers" are discussed in my "Politics of Quotation," pp. 403-04.

[37] Bald, pp. 314-15 and 569-70, where the document is printed.

[38] Bald, p. 440.

[39] *Letters*, p. 199.

[40] Various readers have discussed the "middle nature" of Donne's rhetoric, epistemology, and religious views. See Thomas O. Sloane, *Donne, Milton, and the*

end of Humanist Rhetoric (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1985); Terry G. Sherwood, *Fulfilling the Circle: A Study of John Donne's Thought* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1984); Scodel, "Politics of the Mean"; and my "Donne on Discretion." In addition, discussions of Donne's casuistry have demonstrated how the habits of thought and language characteristic of casuistry contributed to and enabled Donne's politics. See Camille Wells Slights, *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert, and Milton* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1981); Meg Lota Brown, *Donne and the Politics of Conscience in Early Modern England* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995); and my "Donne's Protestant Casuistry: Cases of Conscience in the Sermons," *Studies in Philology* 80.1 (1983), 53-66 and "Politics of Quotation."

[41] Brown adduces the inadequacy of literal application of laws to define the tradition of reformed casuistry in which she situates Donne (pp. 5, 80). In both places, she cites Hall's warnings about interpreting according to the letter. Donne's respect for the Scriptural letter, however, is consistent throughout the sermons, and seems to derive from his belief that the letter of God's word (and therefore of his law) is flexible and can be broadly construed, and from his observation of the doctrinal and political excesses that result from "singular" interpretations. See my "Donne's Protestant Casuistry," pp. 57-60; "Donne on Discretion," pp. 57-58; and "Politics of Quotation," pp. 391-92.

[42] Even this caution, however, is qualified by comments on Calvin's exposition of Scriptures in Donne's Easter 1629 sermon. Although Calvin is singular in interpreting his text, Job 4.18, of good angels, Donne explains, "this singularity of his, may be a just reason of suspending our assent, but not a just reason presently to condemne his exposition. The Church must be as just to him, as it was to S. *Augustine*, that is to examine his grounds" (8: 359). Donne goes on to examine these grounds and, when he is done, to accept that Calvin's interpretation "may very well be received."

[43] Donne's equivocal comments on the value of opinion are discussed in my "Politics of Quotation," pp. 382-83. Donne often contrasts opinion with faith, but while he positions opinion between ignorance and knowledge, he does not discount it entirely. See *Sermons* 6: 317: "S. *Bernard* proposes three wayes for our apprehending Divine things; first, understanding, which relies upon reason; faith, which relies upon supreme Authority; and opinion, which relies upon probability, and verisimilitude." See also a comment in a sermon preached on 24 June 1622: "*Vox Populi, vox Dei*, the generall voyce is seldome false" (5: 155).

[44] Potter and Simpson argue plausibly for dating this sermon during Donne's tenure as Reader at Lincoln's Inn. The latest possible date for the sermon would thus be 1621. However, their arguments for dating it in 1620 or 1621 rather than earlier are not convincing. Potter and Simpson do not believe that this sermon (or three others also preached in Trinity Term) could be earlier than 1620, "for they have a maturity of thought and a richness of tone which we do not find in the earlier

Lincoln's Inn sermons" (3: 28). Such judgments, based on assumptions about intellectual "maturity" or stylistic "richness," are untenable and must be challenged on methodological grounds.

[45] Potter and Simpson date this sermon in 1622 because it is the only undated Easter sermon for Donne's tenure as Dean of St. Paul's, and we know that Donne was required by statute to preach on Easter Sunday (4: 29).

[46] Strier raises the interesting question of "how one determines what the political context of a text is" ("Politics of Devotion," p. 93). He specifically rejects the use of "remarks about government and state power (hence bits and pieces)," probably because unskillful readers "equate" these with the politics of the text. However, it is at least arguable that analogies, including analogies to government and state power, can register something of the political valences of a work, and that it is not only legitimate, but even necessary, to pay attention to these "bits and pieces" as well as to many others. See the comments on Donne's politics of the Trinity in the two articles by David Nicholls already cited.

[47] Potter and Simpson date these sermons in late November 1620, when the first news of the defeat of the Elector Palatine had reached London. Specific comments in the sermons, however, rather than their "general tone" (3: 10) support the view that they could have been preached in Lincoln's Inn at any time between Donne's return from the Doncaster embassy in 1620 and his appointment as Dean of St. Paul's in 1621.

[48] Donne goes on to say that "in extraordinary cases, God raysed Prophets above Kings" (3: 298), but, generally, Donne does not equate Ministers with Prophets (2: 303-04). See my "Kings and Desperate Men" pp. 18-19, for a discussion of the importance of this distinction for Donne's understanding of his vocation.

[49] This point is discussed fully by Donne in his Gunpowder Plot anniversary sermon, 5 November 1622. See the sermon, especially Donne's discussion of obedience to the King "in those things, which are, in their nature but circumstantiall, and may therefore, according to times, and places, and persons, admit alterations" (4: 255-56).

[50] The point is reiterated in the 5 November 1622 sermon where Donne urges his hearers to "look thou seriously to thine own dores, to thine own family, and keep all right there," no matter how the King handles his own doors (i.e. the ports and the prisons) (4: 263).

[51] See Carey, pp. 122-25; Shuger, p. 169; and my "Politics of Quotation," pp. 386-90 for the evolution of this claim.

[52] This point is discussed more fully in my "Politics of Quotation," p. 387.

[53] Donne is likely referring to the recent Papist attempt to claim that Bishop John King had converted to Catholicism on his deathbed, a claim which his son Henry King refuted in a sermon. See Henry King, A *Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, touching the supposed apostasie of J. King, late bishop of London*

(London, 1621).

[54] Potter and Simpson date this sermon 9 June 1622, citing "what seems to be a reference to the Thirty Years War" (5: 5). It is impossible, at this point, to be any more certain about the date, but references to the Council of Trent and the Jesuits in this sermon are consistent with a 1622 dating. One might add that after the *Directions*, issued 4 August 1622, Donne speaks less freely of election, predestination, and other proscribed topics of controversy.

[55] British Library, Trumbull MSS. 1 [Abbot Correspondence]/45. (The Trumbull MSS., formerly in the Berkshire Record Office, are now the property of the British Library. They have not yet been catalogued for public access. I am grateful to Dr. Hilton Kelliher of the British Library for his assistance in using these materials.)

[56] *Directions*, p. 215.

[57] *Directions*, p. 213.

[58] *Directions*, p. 214.

[59] Cogswell, *Blessed Revolution*, p. 33.

[60] BL, Trumbull MSS. VII [Beaulieu Correspondence]/70.

[61] BL, Trumbull MSS. XIV [Miscellaneous Correspondence 1622].

[62] Chamberlain, 2: 449.

[63] Walter Yonge, *The Diary of Walter Yonge, Esq.*, ed. George Roberts (London: Camden Society, 1848), p. 64.

[64] *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian* [1621-1623], 17: 397.

[65] BL, Trumbull MSS. XVIII [Castle Correspondence]/79.

[66] These records are discussed briefly in Robert Peters, *Oculis Episcopi: Administration in the Archdeaconry of St. Albans 1580-1625* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1963). The actual documents are located in the Hertfordshire Record Office, among four volumes of miscellaneous papers catalogued as "Records of the Old Archdeaconry of St. Albans," specifically 4: 241-47. See H. R. Wilton Hall, *Records of the Old Archdeaconry of St. Albans, A Calendar of Papers* (London: St. Albans and Herfordshire Architectural and Archaeological Society, 1908).

[67] Strier ("Politics of Devotion," p. 94) dismisses Norbrook's suggestion as "doublethink," and paraphrases Norbrook's view as follows: "James chose Donne to expound his policies in the most visible London pulpit because James knew that Donne was not wholly committed to these policies" (p. 94). There is a note of desperation in Strier's attempt to caricature Norbrook's argument, no doubt because Strier himself does not have any evidence to contradict Norbrook's suggestion. He takes on faith Cogswell's assertion that Donne "regularly stressed the importance of obedience" in sermons of this period without examining what such obedience might entail or what Donne had to say about it. See Thomas Cogswell, "England and the Spanish Match," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes

(London: Longman, 1989), p. 119. But Cogswell's own flair for the dramatic causes him occasionally to misrepresent his sources. For example, Cogswell notes that in a September 1622 letter Donne remarked that "the people are flat." Cogswell glosses that statement with the phrase "they had at last learned to 'trust in God and the King's way'" (*Blessed Revolution*, p. 34). Donne's letter, however, expresses none of the satisfaction of Cogswell's "at last." In fact, it follows upon an account of the "extreme cruelties" with which Heidelberg had been taken, and describes the demoralizing effect of that defeat.

[68] Simonds D'Ewes. *The Diary of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, 1622-1624,* ed. E. Bourchier (Paris: Didier, 1974), p. 96.

[69] Thomas Birch, ed. *The Court and Times of James I*, 2 vols. (London, 1849), 2: 329.

[70] D'Ewes, p. 97.

[71] BL, Trumbull MSS. VII [Beaulieu Correspondence]/76.

[72] Chamberlain, 2: 451.

[73] Richard Sheldon, a convert from Catholicism, preached this notorious sermon at Paul's Cross on 1 September 1622; it was published in 1625. The sermon was on the Biblical text Apocalypse 14.9-11, and sets out to elaborate on the image of the beast and the marks by which it is known. It is a vitriolic, anti-Papist polemic which attracted considerable attention. Cogswell discusses the sermon, but in the context of 1623 (*Blessed Revolution*, p. 40). It would repay closer attention in light of its delivery less than a month after the *Directions* were issued. Simonds D'Ewes reports in his diary that in this sermon Sheldon "shewed (verye comfortablye for the doubting times) that poperye could not in any possibilitye, morall, divine, or royall, settle in this kingdome anymoore. . . . And lastlye, hee shewed the Kings profession, writing and opinion and therfore royallye impossible; and concluded (which use all soe our minister here made of it alsoe, soe charitable and obedient are the grounds and professors of our religion) that the late articles the King had sett foorth, especiallye that of preaching in the afternoone upon the points of the catechisme would bee of great force and good use for the beating down of poperye" (pp. 94-95) Clearly, D'Ewes found the anti-Papist rhetoric appropriate to the occasion and conducive to pulpit obedience in the spirit of the *Directions*. James, however, disagreed, and Sheldon fell completely from favour. Clayton's sermon has not survived. He was minister of Hackney and, though imprisoned, was released through the efforts of his patron, Sir John Ramsey.

[74] In an unpublished essay, Donna Achtzehner suggests that part of the strangeness of the text might lie in the fact that Donne had chosen a text from the period in the Old Testament when God ruled through Judges rather than through Kings. "Such a choice undermines Donne's own application of the text to his contemporary situation, in which the accepted 'order' was that the king was God's representative" (See "'that I have spoken as his Majestie intended': Ambiguity and Communication in Two Sermons of John Donne," unpublished paper, 1993, p. 8).

Achtzehner also takes up Chamberlain's observation about the difficulty in seeing how the sermon hung together. She notes that the coherence of the two "hemispheres" of the sermon "relies on a tenuous connection from Aquinas, and on Donne's 'reading into' biblical passages more than is there" (p. 9). She concludes (pp. 9-12) that some of Donne's hearers, at least, would have been aware of the tenuous equations he was making (i.e. between stars and preachers). Achtzehner's essay invites us to pay much closer attention to Donne's use of his biblical and patristic sources. The following article provides a model for this kind of careful reading of Donne's sources: Mark Vessey, "Consulting the Fathers: Invention and Meditation in Donne's Sermon on Psalm 51:7 ('Purge me with hyssope')," *JDJ* 11.1-2 (1992), 99-110.

[75] A remark by a Mr. Hinton, recorded 1 June 1630, attests to Donne's "powerfull kinde of preaching by his gestur & Rhetoriquall expression." See Thomas Crosfield, *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, ed. F. S. Boas (Oxford: Royal Society of Literature, 1935), p. 43.

[76] Public Record Office, SP14/153/20.

[77] Chamberlain, 2: 450-53.

[78] In that sermon, Donne had preached on Job 36.35: "Every man may see it, man may behold it afar off." One subject of the sermon is the medicinal use to be made of God's corrections. Donne argues that most men have "affliction and crosses enough" and that one need not "thrust himselfe into unnecessary dangers, or persecutions, and call his indiscretion *Martyrdome*" (4: 173). He urges his listeners to see Christ in their personal calamities, and in words that must have struck the Earl of Northumberland (recently released from the Tower for his alleged role in the Gunpowder Plot) with their nearness, he preaches that the man who "in his own imprisonment, can see Christ in the grave, and in his owne enlargement, Christ in his resurrection, this man. . . beholds God, and he beholds him. . . *afar off*" (4: 175).

[79] Cogswell observes that "some ministers opposed to royal policy made their point by simply drawing attention to the fact that they were being muzzled (*Blessed Revolution*, p. 33). He cites John Everard's practice of adopting "two stage sermons" which divided discussion of the text into spiritual and political halves (only the first of which Everard handled, promising to discuss the political part on the following Sunday). Mead writes to Stuteville (28 September 1622) of another minister who ended his sermon abruptly after the exegesis, before application could be made, saying "he was not ambitious of lying in prison" (Birch, 2: 334-35). While Donne does not avoid applying his text, it is important to take seriously his efforts to separate spiritual and civil duties in this sermon.

[80] Edmund Gosse, *The Life and Letters of John Donne, D. D.*, 2 vols. (London, 1899), 2: 161.

[81] Gee, p. 16.

[82] Gee, p. 22.

[83] The frontispiece of *Vox Regis* is reproduced on the dust jacket of Cogswell's *The Blessed Revolution.*

[84] Patterson, *Censorship*, p. 99. Strier ("Politics of Devotion," p. 95) says that this contradiction "is conjured by the critic," pointing out that the *Directions* did not "forbid" preaching, though they did attempt to prohibit preaching on "incendiary political topics." But Patterson says nothing about "forbidding" preaching. As for "repression" of preaching, there is a wealth of contemporary evidence that many people interpreted the *Directions* as restricting both the number of sermons and their content. To cite just three examples: John Beaulieu writes to Trumbull on 23 August 1622, lamenting "the generall & overflowing calamities ouer the whole Bodie of or Profession throughout all Christendome." Accompanying his lamentation for the state of the reformed religion was a copy of the *Directions* which Beaulieu says extend as far as has been reported. The excess of Beaulieu's lamentations apparently elicited a "friendly warning" from Trumbull. See BL, Trumbull MSS. VII [Beaulieu Correspondence]/74. Peter Heylyn reports in his biography of William Laud how "much they [the *Directions*] were misreported amongst the People, and misinterpreted in themselves." See Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicanus* (London, 1668), p. 99. According to Collier, "These Directions were look'd on as a Reflection on the Discretion, and an unusual Restraint of the Clergy." Williams' letter, already cited, was to "take off this imputation of Rigour, and explain the King to a more inoffensive Sense." See Jeremy Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (London, 1714), 2: 723-24.

[85] Nancy Wright, "The *Figura* of the Martyr in John Donne's Sermons," *ELH* 56.2 (1989), p. 302.

[86] In view of my argument that Donne's sermon balances law with discretion and that "the foundation of his defense is the principle of Order and God's ordinary means of establishing it" ("Kings and Desperate Men," p. 16), and in view of my discussion of the orderliness of Donne's preaching in contrast to the "disorderly men" of the Roman Church ("Politics of Quotation," pp. 394-95), it is rather disingenuous of Strier to suggest that he is the first to note that Donne was serious, passionate, and sincere in his defence of orderly preaching ("Politics of Devotion," pp. 95-96). Strier is surely right, however, to emphasize Donne's statement in this sermon that he was "not willing onely, but glad to have my part" in defending orderly preaching. This attitude is consistent with my focus in those two earlier essays on Donne's sermon as an interpretation of the *Directions* that establishes, explains, and models the kind of spiritual warfare not only permitted but enjoined by his text. Donne makes it very clear that "none are Silenc'd. . . if. . . they fight within the discipline and limits of this Text" (4: 196).

[87] *Letters*, p. 230.

[88] Patterson, *Censorship*, p. 99.

[89] Bald, p. 435.

[90] *Letters*, p. 211.

[91] In an article reviewing more recent Hall scholarship, Ronald Corthell reminds readers that Hall had his Puritan as well as his episcopal opponents. See Ronald J. Corthell, "Joseph Hall and Seventeenth-Century Literature," *JDJ* 3.2 (1984), 249-68. The point is made in the article by Kirk on the 1628 controversy between Hall and Henry Burton: "In consequence of this moderate stand, Hall was never fully accepted by Archbishop William Laud and his followers, who insisted on greater observance of the ancient Catholic forms in liturgy and in Church discipline generally, and, of course, he was heartily disliked by the Puritans, who were not slow in launching a pamphlet war against the Bishop" (p. 8). I am particularly indebted to an essay by Peter Lake for its exposition of the polemical and political uses to which Hall put his moderate and irenic rhetoric in the 1620s. See Peter Lake, "The Moderate and Irenic Case for Religious War: Joseph Hall's *Via Media* in Context," in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 55-83.

[92] Corthell, p. 251.

[93] Kirk, p. 34.

[94] Joseph Hall, "The Deceit of Appearance," in *The Works of the Right Reverend Joseph Hall, D. D.*, ed. Philip Wynter (New York: AMS Press, 1969), 5: 147.

[95] Hall, 5: 148.

[96] Hall, 5: 149.

[97] Hall, 5: 150-51.

[98] Hall, 5: 154.

[99] Hall, 5: 155.

[100] Hall, 5: 155.

[101] The 5 November sermon is discussed briefly, in the context of Donne's politics, in my "Politics of Quotation," pp. 395-400. Discovery in the British Library of a manuscript copy of this sermon, corrected in Donne's hand, is the subject of my "Donne's 1622 Sermon on the Gunpowder Plot: His Original Presentation Manuscript Discovered," *English Manuscript Studies* 5 (1994), 63-86. My edition of the manuscript is forthcoming in *John Donne's 1622 Gunpowder Plot Sermon: A Parallel-Text Edition* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne Univ. Press, 1996).

[102] PRO, SP14/134/59.

[103] Margaret Judson, *The Crisis of the Constitution* (New York: Octagon Books, 1964 [1949]), p. 200.

[104] Robert Willan, *Conspiracie Against Kings, Heavens Scorne* (London, 1622), p. 2. STC 25669.

[105] Willan, p. 17.

[106] Willan, p. 20.

[107] Willan, p. 21.

[108] Willan, p. 24.

[109] Willan, p. 25.

[110] Willan, p. 26.

[111] Willan, pp. 31-32.

[112] Willan, p. 32.

[113] The two sermons are Daniel Donne, *A Sub-poena from the Star-Chamber of Heaven* [preached 4 August 1622] (London, 1623), and Elias Petley, *The Royall Receipt: or, Hezekiahs Physicke* [preached 29 September 1622] (London, 1623). Strier ("Politics of Devotion," p. 102) claims that Donne's appeal to the example of Hezekiah in the *Devotions* is "oddly inconsequent"; however, a comparison between Petley's use of the comparison and Donne's suggests some worthwhile avenues for exploration of the religious and political significance of this Biblical example.