

Preaching to a Court Papist? Donne's Sermon Before Queen Anne, December 1617

Peter McCullough

King James's legendary determination to make a churchman of Donne has perhaps given the impression that upon taking orders in January 1615 the failed courtier instantly became a favourite courtier-cleric. Donne's admission to the number of James's chaplains in ordinary did indeed follow within a few months, and this was no small perquisite. With it came the lucrative right to hold multiple benefices, and, as recent historical work has shown, the only foundation for any hopes to preferment to the episcopal bench under either James or Charles.¹ But with a sermon consumer like James on the throne, the size of his preaching chaplaincy made the field a very crowded one. Elizabeth had been ushered to her grave by a modest fifteen chaplains in ordinary, the traditional complement of two for each month of the year plus the odd spare. But James's procession was to include the outrageous number of seventy.² The King's enthusiastic enlistment of Donne to serve in his household looks rather less impressive when we understand that James made chaplains as quickly as he made knights, often quite impulsively on the basis of one good sermon.³ Surviving manuscript and textual evidence suggests that it actually took two to three years for Donne to earn a publicly visible place among James's most-favored chaplains.

Donne's first surviving court sermon suggests that he took up routine chaplain's duties in the household in April 1616.⁴ Not until 1617-18 did Donne perform more prominent special preaching ser-

vice. On Accession Day, 24 March 1617 Donne preached his first Paul's Cross sermon to wide acclaim (1: 183-222); then on 2 November (out of his routine month of attendance) Donne preached at Whitehall in the middle of the peculiarly Stuart court festival season formed by the coincidence of All Saints-tide and the commemoration of the Gunpowder Plot deliverance (1: 223-35); on the third Sunday in Advent, 14 December, Donne preached before Queen Anne at her town establishment, Denmark House (1: 236-51); and the following Lent saw Donne listed for the first time among the king's premier preaching bishops and chaplains in the court Lent sermon series (1: 252-67).⁵ Careful examination of one of those privileged auditories to which Donne was called—the court of Queen Anne of Denmark—will not only cast some new light on the perennial question of Anne's rumoured Roman Catholicism and demonstrate again the crucial importance of reading Donne's sermons with their specific occasions in mind, but may also suggest the possible significance for Donne's career of realignments in court politics after 1616.

1

In his sermon on the day of King James's death, royal chaplain Daniel Price laments the "*fatality of this bloody Moneth*" by recalling the "*ancient Triumph of Funerall Solemnities in March,*" which had included the deaths of both James's royal predecessor and his wife. Price eulogizes Elizabeth conventionally as that "*Paragon of mortall Princes,*" likening her to the Virgin Mary. About Queen Anne, however, Price asserts rather strongly that she was "not *superstitious*, not *factious*, not *tyrannous*, but *religious* to her God."⁶ The defensiveness of Price's allusion suggests that some, perhaps even Price himself, *did* believe that Anne of Denmark was superstitious, factious, tyrannous, and irreligious, or, at the least, that her reputation needed defending against charges of false religion. Anne's confessional allegiance had been a point of some concern in England at least since June 1603 when she very publicly did not receive communion at her and her husband's coronation in Westminster Abbey.

A. J. Loomie has documented how Anne was rumoured to have Roman Catholic sympathies as early as 1593, and that Jesuit missionaries reported her formal conversion at “about the year 1600.” After her arrival in England she repeatedly made overtures to Rome and insinuated to Catholic ambassadors that she was of their religion. Yet, eager to secure a reliable Catholic influence on her husband, these men found Anne’s frequent attendance at protestant preaching and prayers, and her unwillingness to become the anchor of a Catholic interest at court, dubious confirmation of her Catholicism. Like Loomie, they found her religious beliefs “elusive” at best.⁷ But, joined to our knowledge of Anne’s “elusive” Catholicism, her attendance at establishment services and her overt patronage of protestant preachers in her own household may lend supportive detail to the thesis that there were in early modern England an underestimated number of Catholics for whom routine compliance with the Church of England and committed Catholicism were not mutually exclusive.⁸ Queen Anne may not have been a religious enigma after all, but rather one of Jacobean England’s consummate “church papists.”

As early as 1601 Anne personally petitioned Pope Clement VIII for his “absolution and a blessing” for her to attend “the rites of heretics” not out of belief, but out of political expediency. This practice was in keeping with the official policy of the Scottish Jesuit mission and its superior, Robert Abercrombie (reportedly Anne’s *quondam* confessor), who required his priests to allow Catholics in their charge to attend protestant sermons when necessary for a show of conformity.⁹ As Walsham has shown, the practice of such conformity or “church papistry” was indeed an option practiced by the laity and tacitly allowed by the Catholic mission on a scale much greater than official Roman Catholic propaganda for a strictly separatist recusancy might suggest.¹⁰ What was observed by contemporary ambassadors and cited by modern historians as Anne’s puzzling appearances at her husband’s protestant services and sermons was in fact a form of religious dissimulation widely practiced in both Scotland and England. If anything, the frequency with which Anne publicly played the protestant has been underestimated.

According to the precedent book of the Chapel Royal, she was churched according to the form of the *Book of Common Prayer* after the births of both English-born princesses, Mary (1605) and Sophia (1606), and on Good Friday 1611 she attended Princess Elizabeth's confirmation and the sermon following in the chapel at Whitehall.¹¹ The accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber indicate that she routinely joined the King and Prince of Wales in the Council Chamber window to hear the Lent sermons preached from the outdoor pulpit at Whitehall.¹² The Scots minister James Melville, during his enforced visit to Hampton Court in September 1606, noted that the Queen was present with the King at the sermons preached in chapel on Sunday and Tuesday, 21 and 23 September; and on St. Michael's Day, the 29th, he "saw the King and Quein offer at the altar" at the service of ante-communion.¹³ When James was absent on his 1617 progress to Scotland, Anne, attended by the Lords of the Council, dutifully presided at the court Lent and Easter sermons.¹⁴

Furthermore, the conventional titles used for printed sermons preached *coram rege* have erased from historical memory some of the Queen's participation in conformist court religious life: even if other members of the royal family were present at sermons that were printed, only the King's presence goes noticed on the title page. For example, the printed editions of the two September 1606 Hampton Court sermons that she attended, those preached by William Barlow and John Buckeridge, are titled, respectively, "ONE OF the foure Sermons PREACHED BEFORE THE KINGS Maiestie, at Hampton Court in September last. . . ." and "A SERMON PREACHED AT Hampton Court before the Kings Maiestie. . . ." Similarly, the titles of Lancelot Andrewes' many holiday court sermons, both those printed in his own lifetime and those gathered into the posthumous folio of 1629, make no mention of the Queen. But, as the Treasurer's accounts show, Anne sat in her chapel closet next to the King on all of the principal feast days for which Andrewes preached.¹⁵ The Queen not only joined her husband at services and sermons, but made a point to attend them on her own. During her western progress in late summer 1613, she heard service three times in Salisbury Cathedral, five times in Bath Abbey,

and a sermon in the cathedral at Wells. And in May of the same year, she had attended a cathedral sermon as part of her public welcome to Bristol.¹⁶

Moreover, the Queen did not limit her attendance at reformed preachings to quasi-public events like outdoor Lent sermons and progresses, but also sponsored protestant preaching in her own household. As we have seen, Donne preached before her at Denmark House in 1617; and shortly before her death one year later John Chamberlain dismissed rumours of her “desperat” health on the evidence that “she was able to attend a whole sermon on Christmas day preached by the bishop of London in her inner chamber.”¹⁷ But even more significantly, the list of mourners for her funeral confirms that the Queen, like the King and Princes of Wales, was served by a group of sworn chaplains. Of the men among the eighteen listed who can be positively identified, the majority had solid conformist credentials.¹⁸ Two of these were even pillars of a notable evangelical revival in the West Country: Edward Chetwynd, lecturer at Bristol, who (through the patronage of James Montagu, Dean of the Chapel Royal) became Dean of Bristol in 1617; and Samuel Croke, who died a near-legendary puritan patriarch after forty years of godly preaching at Wrington, Somerset.¹⁹ During Elizabeth’s reign Croke, educated at Merchant Taylor’s School and Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, was barred from a fellowship by Pembroke’s then master, Lancelot Andrewes, and instead took up one at the puritan seminary of Emmanuel College; at Cambridge he was a disciple of William Perkins. After his appointment as rector of Wrington in 1602, and therefore throughout whatever years he was associated with Anne’s court, he preached godly puritanism “for the space of forty seven years. . . wherein he could give an account of above seven thousand elaborate Sermons preached”; and in 1648 he oversaw the introduction of presbyterian government in the former diocese of Bath and Wells.²⁰

True, one of the other ordinary chaplains, Roger Mainwaring, was to become a zealous advocate of Charles’s royal prerogative and of Laud’s ceremonialism; but Mainwaring never held Arminian views on grace.²¹ Among Anne’s chaplains only Godfrey Goodman, later

bishop of Gloucester, ever made overtures to Rome; his Catholicism was rumoured as early as 1635 and asserted in his will in 1656.²² Moreover, beyond her chaplaincy Anne seems to have cultivated associations with two notable episcopal scourges of popery. Archbishop of York Tobie Matthew, a preaching prelate scandalized by his own son's conversion to Rome, often graced the Queen's pulpit during his parliament-time visits to London—an association that dated from Matthew's escorting the Queen and her two eldest children south from Scotland in 1603.²³ And the Christmas sermon Anne heard from her sickbed in 1617 was preached by John King, Bishop of London, one of England's leading evangelical Calvinists and a vehement critic of popery. King's son later reminded King Charles I "how great an interest your Princely Mother, our late Gracious Queene, vouchsafed to challenge in my deceased Father," adding that Anne accounted Bishop King "as one of Hers. . . by all the tyes a Royall Mistris might engage a Servant."²⁴

The churchmanship of Anne's preachers corresponds to the religious sympathies of her favored inner circle, summarily described as "the Essex group." This group was centered on Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford, the Queen's fast favorite, and Sir Robert Sidney, brother of the late Sir Philip, Anne's Lord High Chamberlain, later Viscount de Lisle and Earl of Leicester. Around Bedford and Sidney orbited those allied families like the Haringtons, Devereux, and Herberts who were closely linked by association or blood to the ill-fated second Earl of Essex. In addition to being generous Jacobean patrons of the literary arts, these families continued a tradition of militant, anti-Catholic protestantism that stretched back to Sir Philip Sidney and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Anne would not find, indeed probably did not look for, kindred religious spirits in this group; their predominance in her household establishment stemmed from what has been termed the "lightning strike" of amity between Anne and the Countess Lucy, as well as from the general revival of Essexian fortunes under King James.²⁵ But it is apparent that the "Essex group" played a role in determining the religious temper of Anne's preaching chaplaincy, perhaps most directly through Sidney, who (as Lord

Chamberlain) would have overseen personnel above-stairs, including chaplains.

To Sidney, and to his “MVCH honoured and worthy *friends*” in the Queen’s “family,” was dedicated the only surviving text of a sermon for Anne’s court by one of her ordinary chaplains, Samuel Crooke. The Essex thread can be traced also through others of the Queen’s preachers. The first printed sermon preached before Anne was by John Hopkins, a chaplain to James who had served as one of Essex’s chaplains on the Cadiz expedition; the Queen’s chaplain Edward Topsell credited Essex’s successor in Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy with his early preferment; and Donne of course not only served under Essex at Cadiz but famously cultivated the patronage of Lady Bedford.²⁶

Should we conclude not so much Anne’s church papistry as the likelihood that she was in fact a good protestant, albeit a Lutheran one, with scruples about the Calvinist English communion? To assume so requires discrediting Anne’s own professions of a Roman faith. It seems rather that affinity, kinship, and patronage ties often transcended religious differences between Anne and her preachers, just as they did between herself and her inner circle. More importantly, the Queen, like so many conforming Catholics, opted for conformity to the routine non-eucharistic services of the church instead of the staunch recusancy urged by Catholic missionary propaganda. If avoiding the weekly parochial services “whose very seating arrangements visibly embodied and reinforced the social hierarchy,” was “a grave dereliction” of a country gentleman’s “duty to bolster parochial discipline and stability,” how much more unthinkable would it have been for the Queen consort not to show herself reigning from her closet window next to the King’s in the Chapel Royal? And if a Catholic matriarch “circumspectly recruited conformist tutors after she was required to notify the Privy Council regarding the private education of her son,” is it really surprising to see Anne, so much more in the public’s eye than Elizabeth Vaux, compensating for rumours of her Catholicism by packing her chaplains’ rota with unobjectionable, indeed godly, ministers?²⁷

Queen Anne chose, however, as her one public conscientious objection to the Church of England, to abstain from its communion, a tack popular among conformists as an “appealing alternative to insolent refusal to attend weekly services.” For the ordinary layman, avoiding a service required only three times a year was not a difficult business.²⁸ For a prince living in a Tudor palace with the tradition of more or less private services for the prince in a private closet or oratory fitted for the celebration of the Eucharist, Anne’s not descending to the body of the Chapel Royal for communion on Christmas, Whitsun or Easter was no proof that she had not received a lawful communion in the seclusion of her private closet; and, of course, the privy closet would also have provided the perfect place for clandestine celebration of mass. Anne’s Catholicism, whether devout or dabbling, was a matter of private faith, and she seems to have decided early in her marriage that she would not make it a factional issue. Therefore it is not remarkable that her patronage and involvement in court intrigue, both religious and secular, did not observe neat confessional boundaries.

Anne clearly did not let any confessional loyalties dictate her politicking at her husband’s court. In matters of preaching she was apparently glad to offer shelter to one anti-Catholic preacher who taunted from the King’s pulpit one of her inveterate enemies, himself a crypto-Catholic. In 1616 Thomas Scott dedicated to Anne the printing of two sermons preached before King James (one on Easter Tuesday 1613, the other undated).²⁹ In a dedicatory epistle, he mentioned that the first of these sermons was “one for which I was calld in question, and in defence whereof whilst you stood, a great affront was giuen you by an vnequall opposite; so that I seemed not to suffer for it alone, but your Maiestie with me. I haue now sent it to your Highnes, that you may see wherein it deserued so many great exceptions, or I for it so strict a censure.”³⁰

Chamberlain’s account of Scott’s troubles supplies the name of Anne’s “vnequall opposite.” Scott, he said, “glaunct at matters somewhat suspiciously, wherupon he was called before the counsaile, and the Lord Privie-seale insisted much to know yf he had any

particular meaning to him.”³¹ Given the wave of public sentiment cresting in 1613 against Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, Lord of the Privy Seal (and given Northampton’s apparent distaste for Scott’s sermon), it seems likely that the Earl was the target of the preacher’s criticism.³²

Scott’s sermon in fact belongs to a rash of anti-Northampton libels in 1612 and 1613, both in verse and in sermons, decrying not only the Earl’s crypto-Catholicism but his favor and influence at court. These libels in turn inspired “a programme of sustained suppression by the Earl.”³³ Chamberlain’s account of Northampton’s rough dealing with Scott immediately follows his bemused notice of a severe and illogical Star Chamber sentence meted out by the Lord Privy Seal against two “seelie men”—the “straunge medley” of a 5,000 mark fine and whipping—for allegedly retailing rumours that Northampton was an “arch-papist” who had petitioned the king for favors to Catholics after the death of Prince Henry.³⁴

There was plenty in Scott’s sermon to anger an already defensive Henry Howard. For not only did Scott rant against conniving flatterers, a commonplace in the court pulpit, he specifically warned the king to “aboue all other beware of them, that do acknowledge *England* to be their country, but will haue *Rome* to be the randeuoue and rule of their religion”—a sure glance at Northampton’s ambidextrous ability to defend protestant royal supremacy while practicing Roman Catholicism.³⁵ Scott then went on to caution against traitorous Catholics who sat at the king’s own board. In a thinly-veiled biblical allegory that made a daring twist on the common alignment of the King with Christ, Scott told James to beware when *Iudas* sitteth with Christ at his owne table, and in his owne messe, and is one of the next men to him, yea when he embraceth him in his armes and kisseth him with his lippes, he betraieth him into the handes of his enemies, and hath an armie of *Romane* souldiers in a readinesse to rescue him from his Apostles.³⁶

Why then was Anne willing to be Scott’s “protection against the torrent of violent greatnes” unleashed by his sermon?

There was no love lost between Anne and Northampton in the spring of 1613. First, the Queen was no doubt still nursing the insult she had received by Northampton's late December 1612 victory in a battle over rights to Greenwich Park.³⁷ Moreover, combining allegiance to the Essex group, enmity for Northampton, and bitter resentment of Robert Carr's confidante Sir Thomas Overbury, Queen Anne stood squarely opposed to Northampton's engineering the annulment of the marriage of the Earl of Essex and Northampton's niece, Frances Howard Devereux.³⁸

But why did Scott wait until 1616 to print these sermons? Northampton's influence in 1613 is the most obvious answer. As Scott mused in his dedicatory epistle to the Queen, there was a time "for all things," and even if James did rebuke his Lord Privy Seal for harassing Scott, to have printed the sermons in 1613 would have been foolishly "out of season." After June 1614, Northampton was out of the picture, but why did Scott wait another full year and a half before printing the sermons? They were made suddenly and sensationally topical in the autumn of 1615, when the revelation of Frances Howard's successful plot to murder Sir Thomas Overbury, followed by the trials and executions of her alleged accomplices, mesmerized the public. Rumours of foul play circulating in September led in rapid succession to house arrest for the Somersets in early October, the trial of the accomplices Richard Weston and Anne Turner beginning late that same month, and their subsequent executions on 25 October and 14 November.³⁹

Meanwhile, rumours began to fly that Somerset's presumed involvement in the Overbury murder was part of a larger, pro-Spanish, pro-Catholic plot that included not only Somerset but the deceased Howard patriarch, Northampton, now rumoured by some not to lie mouldering in a tomb at Dover Castle, but to walk the streets of Rome orchestrating an international popish plot.⁴⁰ So the old charges from 1613 of Northampton's traitorous popish conniving suddenly had a newfound currency in the rather sordid heat of scares, trials, and executions during November 1615.

On 19 November, Thomas Scott's two sermons with their dedication to the Queen were entered in the Stationer's Register.⁴¹ Scott's—

or possibly the Queen's—time had finally come to advertise (what he no doubt wanted to suggest was) his prophetic 1613 indictment of Northampton as a crypto-Catholic traitor. By publishing at the height of the Overbury murder scandal what in 1613 had been an attack on Northampton, Scott could use his early “glance” at Howard treachery to parrot in his dedicatory epistle providentialist assurances, first invoked during the murder trials, that time and God would always avenge evil.⁴² “God hath his time neuer limited,” Scott moralized, “and yet in respect of the execution of his will, he hath his time too, as we see lately by wonderfull example. What this age hath seene were enough to make a heathenish Atheist a Christian, and a licentious Christian, a Saint.”⁴³ The 1615-16 fall of the Somersets, and the further posthumous fall of Northampton on their Howard coattails, gave Anne a convenient vindication of her past enmity with Northampton. And the conflation of all these things in Scott's dedication to her and in his sermons gave the Queen an even more convenient means of advertising not only her distance from the crumbling Howard axis at her husband's court, but, by implication, her alignment with the ascendant Essexians who stood ready to fill the gap left by Somerset's fall.⁴⁴

2

John Donne, who had fixed his last hopes for secular preferment on Somerset, could hardly have rested easily during this turn of Fortune's wheel.⁴⁵ But his long-standing connexions with the Essex circle and other progressive protestants may have placed him on the winning side of this major realignment in courtly factional interests. If such connexions do not explain his greater prominence as a preacher after 1616, then they may at least suggest an explanation for his appointment to preach before Queen Anne in December 1617.

The new order at court, anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic, had as its leaders Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex; William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke; George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury; and (ironically, from a confessional perspective) the Queen.⁴⁶ Donne's reputation for

anti-Catholic controversial writings certainly would have recommended him to Herbert, Somerset's successor as Lord Chamberlain, who by right of office had oversight of the royal chaplains and drew up the court Lent sermon lists with Abbot. At this very time Donne was recruited to participate in the anti-Catholic intelligence network organized by Abbot, and he preached an extended series of sermons on Romish abuses to the members of Lincoln's Inn. Moreover, one of Abbot's closest ecclesiastical allies, John King, Bishop of London (a preacher favored by Queen Anne), had ordained his friend John Donne almost two decades after their friendship was struck in the household of Lord Chancellor Egerton.⁴⁷ Lori Anne Ferrell has rightly argued that Donne's churchmanship, though anti-predestinarian, was deeply sympathetic to the anti-Catholic, sermon-centered piety of mainstream Jacobean Calvinism, a position that separated him from Andrewes and nascent Laudianism.⁴⁸ It needs to be added that in terms of factional interests at court, both lay and ecclesiastical, Donne was also much more firmly tied to the anti-Catholic, broadly Calvinist tradition that would find itself at loggerheads with King Charles soon after his accession.

But if Anne was a "church papist" would not her progressive protestant allies and preachers have known or at least suspected as much and left some trace of admonition in their sermons? Texts of only three sermons preached before her survive. Two—those by John Hopkins, and the post-mortem sermon by Samuel Crooke—contain nothing that is not conventional.⁴⁹ But I would argue that the third—the sermon by Donne (1: 236-51)—is an extended condemnation of church papistry addressed directly to Anne herself.⁵⁰ As we have seen in the case of Thomas Scott, couching criticism of the monarch or another prominent courtier in a court sermon was delicate business. Preachers honed their skills of veiled speech to such a degree that, especially as across centuries many allusions lose their sharp edge, it is difficult to prove who the intended subject of any given "glance" or "touch" might have been. The whole valence of a sermon can depend, as it does in the case of Donne's sermon before Anne, on who the "you" addressed by the preacher actually was.

We might begin with the heading given the sermon when it was first printed in the 1661 folio *XXVI Sermons*—"A Sermon Preached to Queen Anne, at Denmarke-house. December. 14. 1617."—which seems direct enough about who the addressee was, especially by virtue of its subtle but significant use of the preposition "to" instead of the conventional "before."⁵¹ In the sermon text itself Anne is never directly addressed by name or title in the way used on some occasions by preachers before her husband. But Donne also shuns the other extreme, which is to preach in a first-person plural voice that includes the preacher as well as the auditory in his admonitions, and thereby gives the sermon a less confrontational tone.

In the first part of the sermon there are brief, witty allusions to things feminine that suggest Donne playing to the female household, as when he explains somewhat wryly that "*Salomon*, whose disposition was amorous, and excessive in the love of women" naturally "conveyes all his loving approaches and applications to God. . . into songs, and Epithalamions" (1: 237). But who is the preacher's intended "thou" in the sermon's passages of sharp exhortation? To picture the preacher literally eye-to-eye with the Queen must force us to entertain the possibility that she was the intended "thou." If she was, Donne's sermon contains criticisms, both oblique and direct, of institutional and covert Catholicism that provide rare evidence of a contemporary critique of Anne's church papistry.

The puzzle of just how specifically we should read Donne's address to his Queen is perhaps solved by a brief but important allusion in the sermon's conclusion to an event in the Queen's own life. In his urgent call to turn to Christ from the follies of a sinful youth—based on his text's latter portion, "they that seek me early shall find me"—Donne invites those present to "seek Christ early. . . now as soon as you begin your day of Regeneration, seek him the first minute of this day" (1: 250). Does "your day of Regeneration" simply refer to the entire auditory's new life of commitment to Christ as inspired by God's word preached by Donne? The date of the sermon, 14 December, suggests otherwise.

Anne was born on 12 December, and Donne's description of the day two days thereafter as her "day of Regeneration" suggests that it was the day of her baptism, the day on which, in the words of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the baptized was made "regenerate and born anew."⁵² Immediately before his reference to the "day of Regeneration" Donne dwells on themes appropriate to the anniversary of the Queen's birth, namely the passing of mortal years and the folly of delaying one's return to Christ until the end of one's life. "For thus," Donne warns, "we shall by this habit carry on this early to our late and last houre, and say we will repent early, that is, as soone as the bell begins to toll for us" (1: 250). From this allusion to the passing of mortal years, Donne then recalls the Queen to the new life initiated so many years before at her baptism, but now neglected. Hence, Donne's sermon could be read as a commemorative sermon marking the anniversary of the Queen's "day of Regeneration," or her new life sealed by the sacrament of baptism, and therefore as a sermon intended quite specifically and personally for her.

In the first part of his sermon, treating the phrase "I love them that love me," Donne offers meditations on the nature of sacred and profane love. But in the second part, preaching on the need to seek Christ and his love early, Donne abandons abstract definitions and applies his text with some vigor to the wrongs of Roman Catholicism, a profession (he says) that discards rather than seeks Christ. He begins by applying Mary Magdalen's cry at the tomb, "They have taken away my Lord," as a cry against Catholics who "have taken away Christ, by a dark and corrupt education, which was the state of our Fathers to the Roman captivity." But immediately on the heels of this quibble over papist use and abuse of patristic authors, Donne applies his text to the present; and, in the presence of the Queen, Donne's words must have electrified the entire chapel: "the *abjecerunt Dominum*, which is so often complained of by God in the Prophets, is pronounced against thee, when thou hast had Christ offered to thee, by the motions of his grace, and seal'd to thee by his Sacraments, and yet wilt cast him so far from thee, that thou knowest not where to find him." The complaint

of the “Prophets” is the complaint here “pronounced against” the Queen by Donne himself.

Anne, Donne seems to suggest, had been sealed as Christ’s own in the sacrament of baptism some forty-two years before, and although Christ had continued to be “offered” to her in the Church of England’s holy communion, she had spurned him by refusing to receive. But Donne goes on to chastise Anne for things done as well as things left undone. The tears that should have been “thy souls rebaptization for thy sins” have instead been poured out in “prophane and counterfeit tears,” and sighs of reconciliation with God have been but “corrupt and ill intended sighs,” and “execrable and blasphemous oathes.” So far has Christ been pushed aside that, Donne summarizes, “thou knowest not when thou didst lose him, no nor dost not remember that ever thou hadst him” (1: 244-45).

Where has Anne “lost” Christ? Just as Mary and Joseph had lost Christ “in the holy City, at *Jerusalem*,” Donne tells the Queen, “we may lose him at *Jerusalem*, even in his own house,” and more pointedly, “even at this present, whilst we pretend to doe him service.” This last remark is a stock criticism of the conforming Catholic who, in the eyes of faithful Protestants, of course offered no true worship or “service” by sitting through the established church’s liturgies and sermons for mere conformity’s sake.⁵³ And, Donne continues, if Christ could be lost in the practice of a *faux* godliness within the “Jerusalem” of the Church of England, how much more could he be lost “if our dwelling be a *Rome* of Superstition and Idolatry.” Donne’s subsequent advice on where to find Christ continues his criticism of popery, but both palliates it with an indictment of the opposite extreme—Genevan Calvinism—and holds up the Church of England as a desired golden mean.

First, Donne speaks against the doctrine of saintly and priestly intercession to Christ: “thou must not so think him in heaven, as that thou canst not have immediate accesse to him without intercession of others.” So too, Christ is not “so beyond Sea” as to be found only in “a forrein Church, either where the Church is but an Antiquaries

Cabinet, full of rags and fragments of antiquity . . . or where it is so new a built house with bare walls, that it is yet unfurnished of such Ceremonies as should make it comly and reverend." Anne is to find Christ domestically, as it were, both in her own household and heart, and in her adopted land: "Christ is at home with thee, he is at home within thee, and there is the neere way to find him" (1: 245-46). But since Christ "may easily be found," Donne argues, the practice of his religion is by definition and necessity a public, proclaimed one, not a religion observed covertly or in hiding. Again, Donne glances first at institutional Catholicism, saying that true religion, unlike that of Rome, "is not confined to Cloysters and Monasteries, and speculative men only, but is also evidently and eminently to be found in the Courts of religious Princes." He then proceeds to the case of crypto-Catholicism, the dissimulating practice of religion in "private Conventicles and clandestine worshipping of God in a forbidden manner, in corners." (Perhaps Donne had heard the report retailed by the Spanish ambassador less than two months before this sermon was preached that the Queen maintained two Roman priests at Oatlands where mass was said secretly every day.⁵⁴) No amount of sermon-hearing could redeem such forbidden worship of God "in corners." True religion does not hide. It hears the voice of Christ, not the whispers of priests, and inspires the true worshipper to "confidently doe whatsoever he commands thee, in the eye of all the world" (1: 247).

"To make haste" to his conclusion, and thereby to the end of a sensitive, if not dangerous sermon, Donne recalls the Queen again to her membership in Christ's church by virtue of having been sealed by "his word and sacraments." Anne, Donne reminds her, had not been born into false religion, but born and baptized into a resolutely Protestant family: God "hath sought thee amongst the infinite numbers of false and fashionall Christians, that he might bring thee out from the hypocrite, to serve him in earnest, and in holyness, and in righteousness." To revoke this heritage, to regress to Rome, is indeed to reject Christ, to reject a birthright that has been sealed in baptism. God has picked her out from "the Herd of the nations and Gentiles, who had no Church" at all, from creatures without souls, indeed from primal

nothing at the general Creation. “Yea,” the preacher concludes, “millions of millions of generations before all this he sought thee in his own eternal Decree. . . not only from the beginning of this world, but from the writing of that eternal Decree of thy Salvation” (1: 249).

Then Donne gathers up the themes of his sermon’s two parts—affirmation of God’s love and exhortation to turn from idolatry and seek that love—in a remarkable collect composed for the occasion. Opening with an Augustinian invocation, “O glorious beauty, infinitely reverend, infinitely fresh and young,” he holds out the hope of receiving, in spite of past sins, God’s regeneration: “we come late to thy love, if we consider the past daies of our lives.” And he alludes once more to the significance of this day as an anniversary of baptismal regeneration by asking God to “reckon with us from this houre of the shining of thy grace upon us.” Then Donne modulates into an embellished version of the Collect for Grace, the second collect read daily at the close of Morning Prayer. This not only conflates the Biblical text’s theme of seeking Christ “early” with the actual time of day, but also inscribes upon the sermon—and its royal audience—a participation in the rites of the Church of England (1: 250-51).⁵⁵

Donne clearly hoped that his sermon would inspire Anne to move from outward conformity to full communion. And as a convert from Roman Catholicism himself he must have spoken with a special authority on the subject that made him, more than any other preacher, able to deal so frankly with the Queen’s covert Catholicism. The Queen’s chaplains in ordinary, and visiting preachers like Bishop John King could, and no doubt did, serve up healthy doses of vitriol about the international threat of the papist conspiracy. But Donne approached the topic in a much more personal way, with Catholicism treated as a threat to a soul, not the state. In his sermon, the covert practice of Catholicism estranges a prince from the faith of her birth and baptism. Donne, of course, had travelled the opposite path, born into Catholicism but converted to the Church of England. And indeed, there is a hint of knowing sympathy between Donne the former Catholic, and the royal mistress he perceived as having slipped into the clutches of Rome. In addition to Christ’s being found “in the Courts

of religious Princes,” Donne says, he is to be found “in the Courts of Justice (in the gates of the City). . . . Both these kinds of Courts may have more diversions from him then other places; but yet in these places hee is also gloriously and conspicuously to be found” (1: 247). So Donne, the Reader of Divinity at Lincoln’s Inn, draws himself into society with the Queen, both of them members of reformed “courts,” and seems to say, I have found and do preach Christ in an Inn of Court, you too can find him in your royal one.

Trinity College, Oxford University

Notes

¹ R.C. Bald, *John Donne: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 302 and 307; Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 24 and 305-306; and Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 39-42.

² Funeral lists for Elizabeth I and James I: Public Record Office, LC 2/4/4/54v-55v; LC 2/6/40v-42v.

³ This is not, of course, to detract from Donne's qualifications or James's religio-political savvy; the chaplaincy was crowded, but also reflected James's own broad-based conception of the ecclesiastical polity. See Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court, 1558-1625: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, forthcoming in 1997).

⁴ *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson, 10 vols. (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1953-62), 1: 168-82 (noted hereinafter by volume and page number parenthetically in the text); and Bald, *John Donne: a Life*, pp. 307 and 312-13.

⁵ Cf. also Bald, *John Donne: a Life*, pp. 322-23 and 329. The 1618 Lent sermon can be confirmed as Donne's first from the annual *rotæ* that survive in Westminster Abbey Muniment Book 15/41 (1616, Donne not listed) and 42 (1618, "Feb:20. Do^r Dunn"); and from P.R.O., SP 14/90/101 (1617, Donne not listed)—documents not used by Potter and Simpson or Bald.

⁶ Daniel Price, *A Heartie Prayer, In a needeful time of trouble. The Sermon Preached at Theobalds, before his Maiestie, and the Lords of the Priuie Councell, an houre before the Death of our late Soueraigne King Iames* (London: M. Flesher, for John Grismand, 1625), pp. 31 and 32.

⁷ Albert J. Loomie, S. J., "King James's Catholic Consort", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 34 (1971): 303-316.

⁸ A thesis most recently and thoroughly advanced by Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, for the Royal Historical Society, 1993), p. 77.

⁹ Vatican Library, MSS Barberini Latini 8618/15-16; quoted in Loomie, "Catholic Consort", p. 305.

¹⁰ Walsham, *Church Papists*, ch. 3.

¹¹ Edward F. Rimbault, ed., *The Old Cheque-Book, or Book of Remembrance, of the Chapel Royal, St. James Palace* (Westminster: Camden Society, 1872), pp. 169-172.

¹² Anne is specifically mentioned in preparations for the outdoor Lent sermons in 1606, 1608, 1609, 1611, and 1612 (P.R.O., E351/543/153^v, 189^r, 211^r, 247^r, and 260^v).

¹³ *The Autobiography and Diary of Mr. James Melville*, ed. Robert Pitcairn

(Edinburgh: The Wodrow Society, 1842), pp. 653, 657, and 664. Ante-communion, the routine service on the three Sundays out of four when the eucharist was not celebrated, followed the prayer-book communion service through the appointed lessons, prayers and creed, stopping short of the eucharistic portion of the service. See McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, Chap.II, section 2; and John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 180.

¹⁴ Oxford University, Bodleian Library, MS 74/371.

¹⁵ Payments for preparing the Queen's chapel closets are myriad and routine, e.g. "for makeing ready the Chappell and Clozett at Whitehall on both the kinge and Queenes side against Allhallowtide," October 1607 (P.R.O., E351/543/188^v).

¹⁶ P.R.O., E351/544/8^v-9^r; and John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*, 4 vols. (London: J. B. Nichols, 1828), 2: 645-6.

¹⁷ *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols., ed. Norman McClure (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), 2: 196-197.

¹⁸ Listed as "Chaplaines to y^e Queene" are: "D^r [Edward] Chettwind deane of Bristow, D^r [George] Goldman, D^r [William] Swadden, D^r [Godfrey] Goodman, William Tunstall, M^r [John?] Shawe, M^r Samuell Prockter, M^r William Ashfield, Edward Tapsall, M^r [John?] Bretton, M^r Smith, M^r Samuell Crooke, [Ro?]ger Mainwaringe, M^r Hilliard, M^r George Needham, M^r Lamplugh, M^r Serrein dutch chaplaine, M^r [John?] Day" (P.R.O., LC 2/5/36^v-37^r). I am indebted to Dr. John Considine for transcribing this list for me.

¹⁹ Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, pp. 193-94.

²⁰ W[illiam] G[arret], *Anthologia. The Life & Death of M^r Samuel Crook* (1651), pp. 4 and 44. Garret very carefully disguised evidence of Crooke's court associations: he mentioned Crooke's 1618 funeral sermon for Anne only by the title "*Death subdued*," tacitly suppressing its occasion and date (pp. 16 and 60-61).

²¹ Mainwaring (1590-1653) was Chaplain in Ordinary to King Charles and Caroline Bishop of St. David's. See Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: the Rise of English Arminianism, circa 1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 159 and 216.

²² Geoffrey Soden, *Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, 1583-1656* (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), pp. 224-35 and 246-66. Goodman dedicated to Anne his 1616 treatise *The Fall of Man*.

²³ York Minster Library, Add. MS 18, pp. 70-1, 82, and 108.

²⁴ *The Sermons of Henry King (1592-1669), Bishop of Chichester*, ed. Mary Hobbs (Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press and London: Scholar Press, 1992), p. 63.

²⁵ Leeds Barroll, "The Court of the First Stuart Queen," in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), pp. 200-205.

²⁶ Samuel Crooke, *Death Subdued, or, the Death of Death. Begvn in a Sermon at Denmarke house on Ascension day, May 6, 1619. Now pvblished and enlarged.*

. . . (London: W. I. For Edmund Weaver, 1619), sig. A4^r; and John Hopkins, *A Sermon preached Before the Queenes Maiestie at Hampton Court*. . . (London: F. K. for Thomas Man, 1609). Hopkins attended Essex during the first months of his house arrest in August 1599; see Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury . . . Preserved at Hatfield House*, 24 vols. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1883-), 9: 410.

²⁷ The conformist Catholic *exempla* are Walsham's: *Church Papists*, pp. 82 and 84.

²⁸ Walsham, *Church Papists*, p. 85.

²⁹ Thomas Scott, *Christs Politician, and Salomons Pvritan* (London: F. Constable, 1616). The sermons are undated in the published text; I date the first sermon following Chamberlain, *Letters*, 1: 453-54. The biographical tangle of anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish Thomas Scott(s) in Jacobean England is bewildering. The royal chaplain and author of *Christs Politician* could be any of three Thomas Scotts who graduated from Cambridge and have been confused with one another. *STC* and *DNB* conflate all into one; see John Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 10 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1927-54), 4: 33. It seems unlikely, though, that our author was the radical of the anti-Spanish tracts *Vox Populi* (London, 1620) and *The Belgicke Pismire* (London, 1622), for the court sermons do not appear in this man's posthumous *Workes* (Utrecht, 1624), moreover, and he did not proceed B. D. at Cambridge until 1620 (whereas the court sermons' author was, according to the 1616 title page, already B. D.). More likely, the royal chaplain was the Thomas Scott from Trinity College, Cambridge, B. D. 1611 and Rector of St. Clement's, Ipswich, from 1612 to 1638.

³⁰ Scott, *Christs Politician and Salomons Pvritan.*, sig. A2^v.

³¹ Chamberlain, *Letters*, 1: 453-4. Chamberlain's account of a sermon "upon this text in one of the Gospells, beware of men" by "one Scot" on "Easter Tewsdays," 1613, fixes the date of "Christs Politician" (although Chamberlain's editor mistakenly assigns the sermon to "John Scott").

³² Margot Heinemann has suggested that Scott's sermon alludes to the 1615-16 fall of Somerset; but Heinemann does not notice Chamberlain's positive dating of the sermon in 1613. See *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1980), pp. 275-76.

³³ Alastair Bellany, "The Poisoning of Legitimacy? Court Scandal, Public Opinion and Politics in England, 1603-1660" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1995), Chap. I, section 4. I am very grateful to Dr. Bellany for sharing drafts of his work in progress.

³⁴ Chamberlain, *Letters*, 1: 453.

³⁵ Scott, *Christs Politician and Salomons Pvritan*, part 1, p. 24. A libellous animal fable of 1616 by yet another Thomas Scot cast Northampton as the griffin,

a hybrid beast who “halts to either side” and “Who hath two faiths, doth true to neither stand”; Thomas Scot, Gent., *Philomythie or Philomythologie...* (2nd edition, “much enlarged” (London: F. Constable, 1616), sigs. C2’ and C3’. I am indebted to Alastair Bellany for this reference.

³⁶ Scott, *Christs Politician and Salomons Pvritan*, part 1, pp. 25-26.

³⁷ Linda Levy Peck, *Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982), pp. 40 and 74.

³⁸ David Lindley, *The Trials of Frances Howard: Fact and Fiction at the Court of King James* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), p. 84. For Northampton’s involvement, and his Catholicism, see Peck, *Northampton*, pp. 38-40.

³⁹ Lindley, *Trials of Frances Howard*, pp. 146-48.

⁴⁰ Bodleian Library, MS Eng. Hist.c.477; cited in Bellany, “Poisoning of Legitimacy?”

⁴¹ Edward Arber, *A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640*, 5 vols. (1875-94), 3: 266. The sermons were licensed by Dr. William Pierce, then chaplain to Bishop King of London. He was one of four chaplains of King James chosen to walk in Queen Anne’s funeral procession; P.R.O., LC 2/5/37’.

⁴² For the topos of *Veritas filia Temporis* (“Truth the daughter of Time”) see Lindley, *Trials of Frances Howard*, pp. 188-89. Dr. Bellany has examined the providentialism that animated the murder trials themselves in “Poisoning of Legitimacy?”

⁴³ Scott, *Christs Politician, and Salomons Pvritan*, sig. A2’.

⁴⁴ Lindley, *Trials of Frances Howard*, pp. 25 and 83-84. William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and a leader of the Essex faction, succeeded Somerset as Lord Chamberlain; and there is evidence to suggest that our Thomas Scott was his chaplain; see Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre*, pp. 275-76.

⁴⁵ Bald, *John Donne: a Life*, p. 314.

⁴⁶ For a case study of how this realignment literally played itself out in the masque for Christmastide 1616, see Martin Butler, “Ben Jonson and the Limits of Courtly Panegyric”, in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1993), pp. 104-108.

⁴⁷ Bald documents Donne’s affiliations with Abbot (pp. 314-15), Herbert (p. 351), and John King (pp. 93, 97, 227 and 282-83). For the Abbot-King factional interest at court, which also included Donne’s earliest mentor Thomas Morton, see Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, “The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I,” *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985): 192-97; and Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor*, pp. 267-70.

⁴⁸ Lori Anne Ferrell, “Donne and His Master’s Voice, 1615-1625,” *John Donne Journal* 11 (1992): 59-70.

⁴⁹ Samuel Croke, *Death Subdued* (1619); John Hopkins, *A Sermon Preached Before The Queenes Maiestie* (1609).

⁵⁰ Donne's text was Proverbs 8.17 ("I love them that love me, and they that seek me early shall find me."). This sermon, although a favorite of anthologists as one of Donne's earliest stylistic successes, has not attracted any significant critical attention. Though Potter and Simpson judge the oration "obviously adapted" for a female auditory, they claim that Donne "does not direct his remarks to them specifically or personally" (1: 117 and 134).

⁵¹ The two surviving manuscript copies of this sermon have no title or heading and specify only the Scriptural text of the sermon. These are the "Merton" manuscript (Bodleian Library, MS Eng. the. c. 17, fols. 116-22), and the "Ellesmere" manuscript (collection of Geoffrey Keynes) both of which date from the 1620s or 1630s. See Donne, *Sermons*, 1: 33-45 and 2: 365-67; also Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts, Volume I 1450-1625, Part I, Andrewes-Donne* (London: Mansell; New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1980), p. 555.

⁵² John Booty, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer 1559* (Washington: Folger Books, 1976), p. 270 (from the opening collect for Public Baptism). I have met no success finding documentary evidence for Anne's christening. A contemporary chronicle written for Anne's father, King Frederick of Denmark and Norway, records only Anne's birth: Peder Hanson Resen, *Kong Frederichs Den Anden Kronicke* (Copenhagen, 1680), p. 278.

⁵³ Walsham, *Church Papists*, pp. 104-106.

⁵⁴ Ambassador Sarmiento to King Philip II, Oct. 22, 1617; quoted in Loomie, "Catholic Consort", p. 312.

⁵⁵ Cf. Booty, ed., *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 60.