John Donne Journal
Vol. 14 (1995)

Donne and the Prince D'Amour

Tom Cain

Despite his involvement with such figures as Essex and Egerton, and his membership of two parliaments, Donne remains politically enigmatic. For those many readers who still see his poetry as characterized by the very fact that it transcends its time and its roots in history this has never been a problem. Until recently, however, almost all those who have refused to cut Donne off from his times and his first audience have seen him as a conservative monarchist. Whether presented as ideologically committed, as a timeserver, or as the helpless voice of the dominant discourse of power, he sounds much the same in his absolutist attitudes when read by an old-fashioned humanist like Gosse or a New Historicist like Goldberg. This tradition goes back to Walton, whose account of the young Jack is partly the product of the Doctor's self-editing memory, partly of Walton's own hagiographic program. It is reinforced by the recent tendency to emphasize his apostasy, and by readings of the love poetry which trace the discourse of power in the privacy of the lyric, the lover an absolutist mimic of the prince he affects to reject. This near-consensus does not square, however, with the anti-monarchical, subversive elements in Donne's satires, to which as he wrote "there belongs some fear,"[1] nor with the detached, skeptical observations on the court and politics in his letters, *Problems*, and, at times, in his sermons.[2] Nor, as will be seen, does it square with the views of many of his closest friends. Over the last few years, a number of critics have sought to qualify this agreement over Donne's supposed absolutism. In particular, Annabel Patterson has drawn attention to the relevance to Donne of the political activities of his circle in the early 1600's, and David Norbrook, revising his earlier reading of Donne as a high-church monarchist, has argued cogently that "an analysis which

paid closer attention to the contexts of his writings would . . . qualify the view of his unequivocal absolutism."[3] The most important single aspect of the "contexts" of a coterie poet like Donne is his coterie. If Donne, more than most poets, challenged his audience with new ideas and strategies, it is also true that his élite audience were active, in a sense creative recipients of his poetry, the holders of shared values and expectations which conditioned its form and function. This paper tries to add something to our understanding of his political values by examining his relationship with one of the leading figures in the Donne coterie, the lawyer, MP, and wit Richard Martyn.

The royal court, in which power, absolute or not, was still located, was viewed by Donne and by many of his earliest readers from the perspective of the Inns of Court.[4] The Inns, and especially Martyn's Middle Temple, were increasingly linked to another court, the High Court of Parliament, in particular the House of Commons, in the growth of whose power lawyers played a disproportionately important role. Commons committees regularly met in the Inns, and the lawyers' commitment to the Common Law, and knowledge (or selective memory) of precedent were major factors in the development of opposition to the Crown.[5] Several of Donne's circle who were members of an Inn played a prominent part in the growth of parliamentary opposition to absolutist policies: notable among them were Martyn himself, Sir Edwyn Sandys, Christopher Brooke, John Hoskyns, Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, William Hakewill, Sir Robert Phellips and John Selden. Indeed, though revisionists might dispute it, it is reasonable to argue that these men, most of them friends from Oxford days, formed the nucleus of early opposition to any extension or (as they saw it) abuse of the royal prerogative. Donne's career made him (like Wotton) cautious about political statement. He was hampered successively by his Catholicism, by his employment with Egerton, by his search for another patron, and finally by his receipt of royal and courtly patronage.[6] He was also attached to discretion, "the mother of all vertues," in most forms of discourse in a way that Martyn was certainly not:[7] but while Donne's private views cannot simply be equated with those of his friends, it is most unlikely that he was markedly out of step, before or

after his ordination, with men who were and remained close to him, and who were so much involved in the genesis of his work. Their explicit, sometimes courageous anti-absolutist attitudes must color our reading of Donne, in particular the Donne of the Satyres, who employs the apparently gratuitous simile to illuminate the corrupt lawyer who can "lye in evry thing, / Like a Kings favourite, yea like a King" ("Satyre II," ll.69-70), or the Donne who can write that

> men do not stand
> In so'ill case here that God hath with his hand
> Sign'd Kings blanck-charters to kill whom they hate,
> Nor are they Vicars, but hangmen to Fate.
> ("Satyre III," ll. 81-92)

This could serve, were we not predisposed to see Donne as an absolutist, as a summary of what men like Martyn, Sandys, Brooke, Hoskyns, and Hakewill stood for in the years leading up to the Civil War. Even more so could the unequivocal statement from "Satyre IV," made in the context of the court, that he is "none's slave":

> Low feare
> Becomes the guiltie, not th' accuser; Then,
> Shall I, none's slave, of high borne, or rais'd men
> Feare frownes? (ll. 160-3)

Richard Martyn demands attention as more than an adjunct to Donne. His influence as an intellectual, cultural, and political figure has never been recognized. It certainly reached Ben Jonson, who dedicated *Poetaster* to him, and probably caricatured him affectionately as Pol Martin, the handsome and sharp-witted "huisher" to Lady Tub in *A Tale of A Tub*, and as Martino in *The Case is Altered.* In the latter play, Martino plays a bout at cudgels with Onion and "breaks his head" (Act II, Scene vii). Martyn was "bastinadoed" in just this way in 1598 by Sir John Davies, who alternated between excessive adulation of him as "that singing Swallow... To whom I owe my service and my love," and this violent assault.[8] Christopher Brooke, John Hoskyns, Hugh

Holland, and John Davies of Hereford were other poets who were close to him. His influence probably touched Shakespeare, Marston, and Chapman, and extended beyond literature to Lionel Cranfield, to the Virginia and Levant Companies, and to the House of Commons. His contemporaries underline the impact he made on them personally, emphasizing his eloquence, his physical grace, and, most of all, his wit. Aubrey summarizes, "He was a very handsome man, a graceful speaker, facetious and well-beloved," and Wood adds there was "none more admired by Selden, Serjeant Hoskyns, Ben Jonson &c than he," and that he left "various poems," to which Fuller adds the tantalizing information that his poetry was "suppressed."[9] Whether this suppression was political or merely accidental, it was efficient enough to leave only one undistinguished sonnet addressed to Thomas Coryate surviving as the undisputed corpus of the "Swallow whose swift Muse," according to Davies,

> doth range
> Through rare *Idæas*, and inventions strange
> And ever doth enjoy her joyfull spring,
> And sweeter then the Nightingale doth sing.
> ("Orchestra," stanza 130)

Though there is no unequivocal proof, the presumption must be that Donne and Martyn knew each other at least from the early 1590's. They may well have met still earlier, when Martyn entered Broadgates Hall, Oxford, in Michaelmas 1585, aged 15. Donne had matriculated at Hart Hall in the previous year, aged 12. Other mutual friends were at Oxford during the later 1580's, Henry Wotton, John Hoskyns, Hugh Holland, Benjamin Rudyerd, and the two John Davies amongst them.[10] Martyn, who came from a wealthy Exeter merchant family, only stayed about a year at Oxford, (though Prince says he was a "noted disputant" there).[11] He went to New Inn, an inn of Chancery linked to the Middle Temple, in 1586, and was admitted to the Middle Temple itself in November 1587, three months before Robert Cotton, another friend he shared with Donne.[12] Dennis Flynn has recently thrown doubt on the length of Donne's stay at Oxford, and shown that he may have gone

abroad in 1585 to avoid the Oath of Supremacy. What is certain is that he did not go on to Thavies Inn until 1591 and thence to Lincoln's Inn in 1592, five years later than Martyn.[13] He may already have been in touch with members of the Middle Temple before that date, however, through Martyn or Cotton, or perhaps through Henry Goodyer, who had moved from Cambridge to the Middle Temple in 1589 (not to Gray's Inn, as Bald states).[14] When Donne arrived at Lincoln's Inn he quickly became, like Martyn, involved with the Christmas festivities of his Inn; since Lincoln's Inn and the Middle Temple traditionally had a close relationship, especially with regard to revels, the two young law students are likely to have come into contact. Donne was elected Master of Revels in February 1593, perhaps with a view to the following Christmas, since plague had already prevented communal celebration of Christmas in 1592-3. There was, as it turned out, not to be any in 1593-4 either, and Donne declined the appointment when chosen Steward of Christmas in 1594-5. This refusal need not be taken as anticipating the rather sombre attitude to Christmas which his Christmas sermons were to counsel from 1621 on, but it is certainly true that Martyn's career as a Lord of Misrule was altogether longer and more successful than Donne's.[15] Records of the Middle Temple Christmas revels were not kept, unless some disturbance demanded disciplinary action. The Middle Temple set up an unnamed "Chrismas Lord" in 1588-9, the year following Martyn's arrival, a fact known only because, *ultra vires*, he tried to sack the Steward for "ill provision of victual and other abuses." The following year "Divers gentlemen [were] put out of commons for misorder on Candlemas night," when they apparently set up a "Lord of Misrule." Again, nobody is named, but the next year, 1590-91, despite an explicit warning, Martyn, William Fleetwood, and John Davies are amongst eight named who "broke the ordinance by making outcries, forcibly breaking open chambers in the night and levying money as the Lord of Misrule's rent." The next year the same group were at it again. This time they "broke open chamber doors and abused many gentlemen of the House, as appears by the examination of townsmen who were with them, and some of this Fellowship knew them notwithstanding their disguised

attire." Instead of being fined, Martyn and Fleetwood were expelled for "their misdemeanours and abuses to the Masters and Benchers," while Davies was suspended. Martyn was readmitted the following June.[16] He clearly continued as a Lord of Misrule, however, and a few years later Donne's first surviving reference to him is significantly by his title as the ruler of a festive court that is ironically compared with Elizabeth's. He wishes, he tells Wotton (another Middle Templar), that he had: "some news to ease this itch of writing which travayles me for in our owne or in the d'amours Court I know nothing worth your reporting. . . ."[17] The "D'Amour's Court" was that ruled over by the Prince Martino, whose Christmas revels of 1597-8 were described in detail by Benjamin Rudyerd. Rudyerd closes his account with a description of Signior Martino, in which the facetious tone he has hitherto adopted modulates into one altogether more serious and affectionate:

> The Prince was of face thin and leane, of a cheerful and gracious countenance, black hair, tall bodyed, and well proportioned; of a sweete and fair conversation to every man that kept his distance. Fortune never taught him to temper his owne wit or manhood. His company, commonly weaker than himself, put him into a just opinion of himselfe of his own strength. Of a noble and high spirit, as farre from base and infamous strains as ever he was from want; soe wise that he knew how to make use of his owne subjects, and that to theyr own contentment; soe eloquent in ordinary speech, by extraordinary practise, and los of to much tyme, that his judgment, which was good, studdy could not mend it. He was very fortunate, and discreet in the love of women; a great lover and complainer of company, having more judgment to mislike than power to forbear.[18]

Martyn was associated with this Princely role for many years, so much so that Hugh Holland's eulogy published in 1620, two years after his death, opened with his title: "Princeps Amorum, Principum nec non Amor."[19] He carried the role over to his social relationships, and more importantly, into the House of Commons, which he and Donne entered together in 1601. There Martyn's defense of political liberty was

conducted with something of the licensed liberty of the Lord of Misrule. Such a person would have been the ideal reader in 1601 of Donne's "Metempsychosis," written that summer, a poem whose facetious, often subversive satire has puzzled critics, but which, like the Satyres, the Paradoxes, and the satirical booklist, *Catalogus Librorum Aulicorum*, would have been highly congenial to Martyn.

Martyn was probably responsible for organizing Middle Temple festivities during several succeeding Christmases, including that of 1601-2, at which, as Manningham recorded, "wee had a play called Twelve night or what you will," a play which famously opens with a Prince d'Amour called not Martino but Orsino.[20] Donne, who wrote to Sir George More telling him of his marriage on the very day of this performance, may well have been too ill or preoccupied to attend: if he did, he too might have initially identified with Orsino, but would soon have found he had more in common with Malvolio, likewise imprisoned for aspiring to marry above himself. Whether or not he attended these particular revels, it is certainly a mistake to assume that Donne's employment with Egerton from 1598 meant the severing of his contacts with the Inns: Egerton retained close connections with Lincoln's Inn, of which his surviving son John was still a member, and Donne's own attachment is suggested by his continued close relations with Christopher Brooke, and by his subsequent appointment as Divinity Reader. He thus probably witnessed or participated in such events as the 1613 masque staged by the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn for the marriage of Princess Elizabeth, the more so since he had written an epithalamium for the event. Martyn, and his and Donne's friend and patron Sir Edward Phellips, were "the chief doers and undertakers" of the masque, while Christopher Brooke was a main organizer for Lincoln's Inn, as was another friend of Donne, Sir Henry Hobart. The King enjoyed the performance, and "strokes the Master of the Rolls [Phellips] and Dick Martin."[21] This is just one of those "occasions of delight and content" as he called them, which Martyn continued to organise up to his death. At Christmas 1615-1616, for example, he entertained four ambassadors at the Middle Temple, and a few months later was one of those charged "to take care concerning

the barriers at the creation of the Prince [of Wales]."[22] In the same year he wrote to Buckingham, defending himself (not altogether convincingly) against accusations of political hostility towards the King. Not only have his political activities been misinterpreted, but his role as an entertainer must be considered:

> not only our fellowshipps (where still I have been, & now am emploied) but others also will testifie for mee wth both there hands. wch may well argue wth many other of like kinds, that I had no ... untractable humour to his Majesty's desires.[23]

Here, the applause of the auditors is a testimonial not only to Martyn's political loyalty, but to his suitability to be appointed to an unspecified post, probably Recorder of London. That dancing should qualify one as a senior judge might not have surprised those who had read Davies' "Orchestra" (or who remembered Hatton's rise to power). It may also seem less surprising to us now, in the wake of work on the masque by Stephen Orgel and others, than it would have done to Bald, for whom Martyn was merely a "frivolous character" (p.190). There is, however, another more elusive aspect to the link between Martyn's political career and his masqueing one, and that is the way in which he seems to extend the role of Lord of Misrule into the House of Commons as well as into his social relationships. This is not to say that he was not a serious and effective politician. Wit and daring could minister to an efficient directness, as Cecil acknowledged when, meeting Martyn as leader of a deputation from the Commons to confer with the Lords in 1610, he said "I am glad to encounter with you, Mr. Martin, for I assure myself I shall have short and apt answers."[24] Earlier, as will be seen, Cecil had taken a less polite view of Martyn's directness. Martyn's wit was certainly not always under full control. In 1614, it was to lead him into serious trouble with the Commons, whilst outside it sometimes led to physical violence: thus, Donne's letter to Wotton was presumably written just before, or well after, the extraordinary news that surely was worth reporting from Martyn's Court, that he had been savagely attacked by his former acolyte, John Davies, in

the hall of the Middle Temple, an event which almost destroyed Davies' career, and which led to the intervention of Cecil and the Lord Chief Justice to bring about a reconciliation. The most plausible explanation for Davies' attack is that he had been goaded beyond breaking point by Martyn's satire at his expense during the revels that had just finished. Much later, in 1616, Thomas Coryate was to ask to be commended to Martyn "though at a mans house in *woodstreet*, he used mee one night verie perversly." The man may have been Cranfield, who lived in Wood Street, and the perverse usage was probably not sexual (if it was, even Coryate would surely not mention it in quite this public way), but of a kind that recalls Martyn's behavior at the Middle Temple Christmas celebrations in the early 1590's. Whatever the injury, it suggests that Martyn's role as Lord of Misrule carried over to contexts in which we would not expect to find it.[25]

Donne was returned to the last of Elizabeth's parliaments in October 1601 as MP for Brackley (a seat in the gift of his employer, Lord Keeper Egerton), and Martyn as MP for Barnstaple (nominated by his fellow-Devonian, Robert Chichester). Edward Phellips, Edwyn Sandys, Francis Bacon, William Hakewill, Sir Maurice Berkeley, John Davies, John Bond, and Tobie Matthew, all mutual friends or associates of Donne and Martyn, were members of the same parliament. Donne and Martyn are next linked in 1607, along with other members of this group, when Tobie Matthew writes that his particular visitors in prison were "Sir Maurice Barkley, Sir Edwyn Sands, Sir Henry Goodyer, Mr. Richard Martin, and Mr. John Donne." Matthew places Donne and Martyn firmly together as friends with similar views:

> Both Dunne and Martin were very full of kindness to me at that time, though it continued not to be hearty afterward. By their discourses with me, when I was in prison [for his politically embarrassing conversion to Catholicism], I found that they were mere libertines in themselves; and that the thing for which they could not long endure me was because they thought me too saucy, for presuming to show them the right way, in which they liked not then to go, and wherein they would disdain to follow any other.[26]

"Libertines" probably means free-thinkers in religion rather than sexual adventurers. Matthew presents them as joint leaders of their coterie, resenting his presumption, and taking up much the same position over religious affiliation that Donne had expressed a decade earlier in "Satyre III": doubting wisely would have looked to Matthew like libertinism. A year or so later a letter of Donne's to Goodyer (March 1608) mentions Martyn:

> I came this evening from M. *Jones* his house in *Essex*, where M. *Martin* hath been, and left a relation of Captain *Whitcocks* [Whitelock's] death, ... without doubt want broke him; for when M. *Hollands* company by reason of the plague broke, the Captaine sought to be at Mris. *Jones* house, who in her husbands absence declining it, he went in the night, his boy carrying his cloakbag, on foot to the Lord of *Sussex*. . . .[27]

"Mr. Jones" was not Inigo, but probably Ned Jones, the alleged co-author of the satirical poem *The Parliament Fart*, said (in British Library, Add. MS. 23339) to be by "Ned Jones, Dick Martyn, Hoskins, & Brooke / the fower compilers of this booke. / Fower of like witte, fower of like arte. / And all fower not worth a farte." "Mr. Holland" was almost certainly Hugh, while "Captain Whitcock" points to further links between Martyn and Donne: he was elder brother of James Whitelock, another Middle Templar, a friend of Martyn (who stood as godfather to his daughter) with similar political views. Captain Whitelock, suspect of complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, was a follower of the Earl of Northumberland, yet another Middle Templar whom Donne knew well enough to ask him to act as intermediary between himself and Sir George More: it was Northumberland, himself viewed, like his father and uncle, as a distinctly subversive figure,[28] who undertook in February 1602 to deliver to Sir George the letter in which Donne informed him that he had married his daughter secretly "about three weeks before Christmas." Sir George in his turn was to be one of the MPs who came to Martyn's defence when he was censured in the Parliament of 1614.

In 1612 Donne addressed his sole surviving holograph poem from Amiens to Martyn's reputed mistress, Lettice Carey, and her sister, Essex Rich.[29] This may or may not be significant. Much more so is the presence of both men two or three years earlier at the "Convivium Philosophicum" at the Mitre Tavern. Other members present that day were Christopher Brooke, Lionel Cranfield, Arthur Ingram, Sir Robert Phellips, Sir Henry Neville, John Hoskyns, Richard Connock, Sir Henry Goodyer, John West,[30] Inigo Jones, and, apparently a half-serious guest of honour, Thomas Coryate.[31] They are very much the same group as that which Coryate describes in a letter, written from India in 1615, as "the right Worshipfull Fraternitie of Sirenaical gentlemen, that meet the first Fridaie of every moneth, at the signe of the Meremaide in Bread streete."[32] In this letter Coryate asks to be remembered to, among others, "M. John Donne, the author of two most elegant Latine Bookes, *Pseudo martyr*, and *Ignatii Conclaue*" (a salutary reminder of the basis of Donne's wider reputation at this time) and "M. Richard Martin, Counsellor, at his chamber in the middle Temple, but in the Terme time, scarce else." Other friends named by Coryate in this way include Brooke, Hoskyns, George Garrard, William Hakewill, Ben Jonson, Inigo Jones, Hugh Holland, John Bond, and William Stansby, Jonson's and Coryate's printer. Other letters add the names of the Master of the Rolls, Sir Edward Phellips, whose "Honourable Table" these "worthy gentlemen" frequent, and his secretary Lawrence Whitaker, while Coryate's earlier published *Crudities* (1611) acknowledges Lionel Cranfield as "the original and principal animator of me," and contains, notoriously, a huge number of introductory tributes, those by Martyn (his only known published poem) and Donne significantly placed together. In the body of the text there is also a half-serious epistle from Martyn to Wotton, then Ambassador to Venice, introducing Coryate.

The significance of Martyn and Donne's membership of the Mitre and Mermaid clubs, which had probably existed in some form for several years,[33] is that most members were active MPs with anti-absolutist views similar to Martyn's. Christopher Brooke, one of both Donne's and Martyn's closest friends, was almost as outspoken

as Martyn in opposition to absolutist tendencies in the Parliament then in progress.[34] When he died Brooke had, amongst a substantial collection of paintings, portraits of the Earl of Southampton and Richard Martyn.[35] Hoskyns, another very close friend of Martyn, witness of his will and author of the epitaph on his tomb in the Temple Church, was in 1610 one of the leaders, with Martyn, of the attack on Cowell's *Interpreter*, which argued for the absolute power of the king. Hoskyns became more famous for his speech against Scottish favorites in 1614, an attack which resulted in a year's close imprisonment in the Tower. William Hakewill, like Martyn an Exeter man, was also to be arrested, after the parliament of 1621; he played a large part in drafting the Petition of Right of 1628, and made a famous and influential speech, published in 1641, but made originally in the Commons in 1610, on *The Liberty of the Subject*. Sir Robert Phellips, son of Sir Edward, was arrested along with Hakewill in 1621. Phellips had been one of the leading speakers against Stuart prerogative government both in that parliament and in 1614, and by 1625 had become the leading spokesman for the Commons. (Also arrested in 1621 was John Pym, probably never a member of the Mermaid Club, but related to Martyn by marriage; he followed Martyn to Broadgates Hall in 1599 and the Middle Temple in 1602).[36] Lawrence Whitaker, from 1615 a follower of the Earl of Somerset (whose patronage Donne was also courting during these years), and then Clerk of the Privy Council during the 1620's, necessarily took a more cautious view during those years, but moved towards Parliament in later years until, in 1648, he served on the committee which ordered the trial of Charles I. John Bond, editor of the satirists Horace and Persius, was another outspoken MP in this group, while Sir Henry Neville was probably the Henry Neville of Berkshire who was implicated in Essex's rebellion (it is probable that most of this circle sympathized with Essex),[37] and who was active in the parliaments of 1604 and 1614. Connock and Goodyer seem, like Donne, to have had much quieter careers as MPs, though Connock was to speak out in defense of Martyn in the 1614 parliament. His attachment as Auditor to Prince Henry is a reminder that most of this group had official or unofficial links with the latter's household.[38]

The political careers of a significant number of the Mitre/ Mermaid group, then, give a suggestive context not just to Donne's Satyres and early prose, but to his later work also. It is clear that a surprising number of his coterie were strong opponents of absolutism not just in the 1590's, when biographers have conventionally allowed Donne to be critical of the establishment, but up to and beyond his ordination in 1615. This is especially true of Martyn: while Donne is never recorded as having spoken in parliament, Martyn took to the Commons in 1601 like "a duck to water."[39] He had already spoken several times before he launched a powerful attack on monopolies, hyperbolically blasting the target that Donne is aiming at in "Satyre IV," written 3 or 4 years earlier,[40] where the satirist's interlocutor

> knowes who'hath sold his land, and now doth beg
> A licence, old iron, bootes, shooes, and egge-
> shels to transport; Shortly boyes shall not play
> At span-counter, or blow-point, but they pay
> Toll to some Courtier. (ll. 103-7)

Martyn may have recalled Donne's list when he stood up to speak

> for a town that grieves and pines, and for a country that groans under the burden of monstrous and unconscionable substitutes, to the monopolitans of starch, tin, fish, cloth, oil, vinegar, salt, and I know not what. Nay, what not? The principal commodities both of my town and country are engrossed into the hands of these blood-suckers of the commonwealth.[41]

He saw monopolies as a serious threat to liberty "by. . . supreme authority." Even Cecil conceded that in some forms "it taketh from the subject his birth right:" again, one is reminded of Donne's assertion that he is "none's slave." These themes of the rejection of "servility," the safeguarding of traditional liberties, and the curbing of prerogative powers, were to run through Martyn's career in Parliament. When, a week later, he single-handedly forced a cowed or apathetic House into a successful division in opposition to Cecil and Raleigh, Cecil, furious

at his humiliation, and presumably mindful of Martyn's reputation as a Lord of Misrule, accused him of creating "disorder": "The reputation of this House hath ever been religiously maintained by Order and Government, but now error hath so crept in amongst us that we know not what is Order and what is disorder...[Mr. Martyn] first brake Order."[42] It may have been such considerations that made Donne ascribe a book on *The Privileges of Parliament* in his mock library catalogue to Tarlton, the most famous Lord of Misrule.

Martyn's next significant political statement was made without the parliamentary privilege Cecil accused him of hiding behind.[43] Chosen by the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex to welcome the new King, Martyn's speech threatened to violate the expected codes of flattery and complacency. Flattery was in fact a target: James is warned that in England "flattery will essay to undermine, or force your Majesties strongest constancie and integrity."[44] The kingdom's ills are described in terms reminiscent of Donne's Satyres, with the same cast of corrupt lawyers, flattering courtiers, and simoniac clergy:

> Oppression shall not be here the badge of authoritie, nor insolence the mark of greatnesse. The people shall every one sit under his own Olive tree, and anoynt himself with the fat thereof, his face not grinded with extorted sutes, nor his marrow suckt with most odious and unjust Monopolies. Unconscionable Lawyers, and greedie officers, shall no longer spinne out the poore man's cause in length to his undoing, and the delay of justice. No more shall bribes blinde the eyes of the wise, nor gold be reputed the common measure of men's worthinesse: Adulterate gold, which can guild a rotten post, make *Balam* a Byshoppe, and *Isachar* as worthy of a judiciall chair as *Solomon*, where he may wickedly sell that justice which he corruptly bought. . . no more shall Church livings be pared to the quicke, forcing ambicious Church-men . . . to enter in at the window by simonie and corruption, which they must afterwards repaire with usurie, and make upp with pluralities.[45]

The catalogue of corruption and oppression goes on, through restriction of trade, the neglected nobility, the condemned clergy, the

wearied commons, as Martyn, speaking as one who has "a heart free from fear or hope" shows James "the agues which keep low this great body" of England. This was an ominous welcome. What the assembled aldermen and lawyers thought of Martyn's analysis of Elizabeth's legacy is not recorded, but Hugh Holland confirms that it was regarded as unusually forthright: writing later in 1603 to Cotton, he says that Martyn "with like liberty as eloquence was not afraid to tell the king the truth." Annabel Patterson describes the speech as "remarkably challenging," but nobody else since the seventeenth century has recognized how daring it was. It was reprinted without alteration in 1643.[46]

In the next parliament, that of 1604-11, Martyn sat as MP for Christchurch in Hampshire. A letter to Donne, no longer in parliament, and exiled for much of this period to the damp house in Mitcham, says that he is one of the "best speakers" of the parliament, along with Bacon, Yelverton, and Sir Edwyn Sandys (Bald, p. 144). Records confirm that he emerges here, with Sandys, as a leader of the anti-absolutist group in the Commons, speaking forcibly in the Goodwin-Fortescue case which threatened to undermine the initially conciliatory, optimistic mood of King and Parliament in the new reign.[47] He consistently opposed any absolutist claims to levy impositions, and took a leading part in the debates over Cowell's *Interpreter*, chairing the sub-committee which condemned that book. For Martyn the King was "the most absolute King in Parliament, but of himself, his power is limited by law." He was one of a group of six leading members selected "to maintain Argument" at a conference with the Lords on Union with Scotland. Later in the same session he chaired the debates over Cecil's proposed Great Contract. He seems to have worked closely with Sandys, the leading figure in the organization of opposition during this period. Thus, on 9 July 1610 Martyn reports from the Great Committee, usually Sandys' role, and wins for the Committee a free hand to "treat of any proposition touching composition or Bargain with the King." The Lord of Misrule seems to be developing into a serious and effective, if not sober political leader: but on 14 November, frustrated by the breakdown of negotiations over

> it may, I hope, somewhat secure us; if it do not, yet we shall do well to leave a monument behind us that may show to posterity that we do unwillingly endure servitude."[48]

This speech has been wrongly called flippant: while not seriously aimed at becoming law itself, the bill was a political gesture, seeking to preserve freedoms that Martyn regarded as a fundamental part of Common Law. It is closely allied to satire in its ironic venom: wit and eloquence are deployed with the deeply serious aim of either securing liberty, or, in that final phrase, leaving a marker to show that it was not given up easily. Political liberty and the liberty of speech exercised by the Lord of Misrule here coincide. Wotton was to write later: "I have noticed in our House, that. . . irreverent discourse was called honest liberty." He was thinking of Hoskyns, whose own version of the role of wit in politics is probably closer to Martyn's: "no man ever suffered for mere witt: but yf he lived not to requitt it hymselfe, yet the witt of all posterity took penaunce on his name that oppressed hym. . . and for my part I had rather dy with witt then live without it."[49] Before we dismiss either of these men as flippant political lightweights, or (in Finkelpearl's phrase) as "disciplinary problems," we should recollect the issues they embraced, the values they defended, and the dangers they faced.

Perhaps disillusioned, perhaps because of those dangers, Martyn did not stand for the Addled Parliament of 1614. Donne was a member, but again is not recorded as speaking. He cannot have watched dispassionately, however, as his friends Hoskyns and Sir Walter Chute, and Sir Charles Cornwallis, father of another close friend, talked themselves into the Tower. Martyn, who had clearly been disappointed by the failure of his hopes of the last parliament, may well have felt like Sir John Holles, who took his seat unwillingly in 1614, coming "as a bear to a stake. . . conjecturing this would begin where the other parliament left. Neither was I deceived."[50] Chamberlain supports the view that disillusionment of a similar kind made Martyn fear that if he did continue as a leader of opposition in the 1614 Parliament he would be carried away by anger or frustration. Chamberlain reports that his

the Great Contract, the Lord of Misrule returned as Martyn made one of the most extraordinary -- and prescient -- speeches of this parliament. The royal prerogative, politicized clergy, and the threat to liberty were again his main targets. He feared that "now the contract is like to break. . . . The King's wants may drive him to extremities." Privy Councillors were not a threat, since "it cannot be imagined they will ever advise that which will make their posterity servile." But a political clergy were:

> Another sort there are more to be feared, which preach in pulpits and write in corners the prerogative of a king, and dare put into the King (who hath as much natural goodness in him as a man can have) that which hath made him do things here which he never did in Scotland, nor his predecessors in England. What would these men do if they had a king would hearken to them? When the highway to get into a double benefice or a higher dignity is to tread upon the neck of the common law. Have we not sermons made every day to rail upon the fundamental laws of the kingdom? Who will not be afraid when he shall hear a man in high place say, if the King take anything without parliament 'tis his right, if in parliament 'tis his grace? . . . Did I not hear a hedge-priest say in a sermon that the trial by common law was by 10 fools and 2 knaves?

He introduces a bill to punish them and "to preserve our liberties and to keep them from the means to rise by our danger":

> I had at first made it somewhat sharp; but 'twas short: I would but have hanged them, and so I think we might have been well rid of them; but I was advised by some of my friends to spare that. I then thought of a course that it would be fit to make such slaves (who by such base means as the selling the liberty of the people and the laws would seek to prefer themselves) villeins so that they and their posterity might feel that bondage which they would lay upon others; but this I was dissuaded from too. I have now taken another course, which makes the bill somewhat longer than I meant it, but not much. The first offense to be loss of all their dignities, and make them uncapable of others, and the second a praemunire. If this may pass,

reason for not standing was "fear of being transported and doing himself harme." He was "Loth to venter his rising fortune upon his slipperie tongue." Subsequent events make this ring much more true than Bacon's advice to the King that he need not fear Martyn in a new parliament since he has "money in his purse."[51] If wrong about motivation, however, Bacon's memorandum is significant in its confirmation that there was perceived to be an "opposite party," with at least three close associates of Donne -- Martyn, Sandys and Brooke -- among its leaders:

> The opposite party heretofore is now dissolved and broken. Yelverton is won: Sans [Sandys] is fallen off; Crew and Hide stand to be serjeants; Nevell hath his hopes; Martin hath money in his purse; Brock [Brooke] is dead [in fact he died in 1628]. Besides they find the vanity of that popular course, the King having kept a princely temper towards them, not to persecute or disgrace them, nor yet to use or advance them.

Bacon may have been right about money, however, not in the sense that Martyn had been bought by the Court party (as some MPs from the previous parliament had been), but that he was developing business and legal interests outside of a House of Commons which he no longer saw as a likely agent of reform. In particular, he, along with Sandys, Brooke, Berkeley and Hakewill, was deeply involved in the Virginia Company, seeing the new colony as a place where the secular and religious liberties that were under threat in the Commons could be preserved. At least twenty of Donne's friends were investors in the Company, and Donne, who had earlier sought the secretaryship of the Company (Bald, p. 162) which had subsequently gone to Martyn, became an honorary member of the Council in 1622, and later that year preached a special sermon to the Company. A facetious letter from Donne to Goodyer (?1610-12) characterizes Martyn amongst his friends by his involvement with the colony. Hugh Holland later called him the "herald and benefactor of Virginia."[52]

It was in his role as counsel for the Company that Martyn still ended up addressing the House in May 1614 by special favor. There is no

record of Donne's response as Martyn was indeed "transported" by "his slipperie tongue." He strayed spectacularly from his brief in a speech which was now protected neither by the license of misrule nor by membership of the House. Having spoken for some time on Virginia, he told members "that we were the representative body of the commonwealth; that this was the great school to teach all men the wisdom of the land; and made it appear that we were not all king nor all people." He then "fell to advising of us how to proceed in making of laws, that our law-making consisted of three points: how to consult, conclude, and demonstrate, and also showed what had been agitated among us and what our success should be in conclusion." He then attacked "some particular men, [supporters of the prerogative such as Sir Thomas Lake] iterating their own speeches which formerly they had made." In particular, Secretary Lake's earlier speech on impositions was "alluded unto very grossly and not to be endured." Martyn's speech can only have reinforced Donne's views on discretion: coming from a non-member, admitted as a special favor to plead a specific case, it caused outrage. It was called "the most unfitting [speech] that ever was spoken in this House." A formidable group of friends set out, with real or feigned bewilderment, to mount a defense: among them were Robert Phellips, Hoskyns, Brooke, Connock, Sandys, and a less predictable ally, Donne's father in law, Sir George More. Both sides stressed Martyn's contribution in previous parliaments, and in the end the House "respecting his Person, good Affections and former Service" and swayed by his eloquent apology (made the next day) merely warned him not to repeat the offense.[53]

This satisfyingly typical episode marked the end of Martyn's career in the Commons, and the end of his documented contact with Donne. The next year, Donne was ordained, and Martyn became Lent Reader in the Middle Temple. Annabel Patterson raises the interesting question as to whether, in the light of what he had witnessed in the 1614 Parliament, Donne's decision to give way to James' pressure to take orders "may have been less out of naked ambition than out of despair for any secular change."[54] Certainly despair and frustration may well explain both Hoskyns' and Martyn's apparent recklessness in the

House: Christopher Brooke had said a month earlier (18 April) that there was a danger the Commons would "leave our posterity in worse case than our ancestors have left us," a sentiment which tellingly echoes Martyn's concern with the threat to the liberties handed on to posterity in his speech of 1610. There was a consciousness of major battles being lost, and posterity betrayed. Another lawyer gave a revealing glimpse of Martyn's state of mind on the morning he was to address the House. In the debate that followed his speech

> Sir Robert Hitcham said that this morning Mr. Martin came to his lodging and told him that he was in the greatest perplexity that ever he was [in] in his life about a speech that he was to go to make to the House; and desired him to send for some wine for him he found such a deadness over all his parts; and therefore in this perplexity he might be carried to say he knew not what.[55]

This is exactly in line with Chamberlain's "fear of being transported," but it also confirms that the digression was in a sense premeditated, something he was driven to do by a deep-seated frustration with political developments: a man as experienced as Martyn could not have felt such perplexity over his Virginia brief alone.

At the same time, the king's policy as outlined by Bacon, of neither persecuting nor advancing the "opposite party," meant that they each had to arrive at some accommodation with the sources of advancement in the court, the same Scottish favorites, in particular Somerset, whom Hoskyns had threatened in his "Sicilian Vespers" speech (the allusion was to a Sicilian uprising in which the occupying French were butchered in 1282). Further light is shed on Martyn's and Donne's attitudes at this time by a letter from Martyn to their mutual friend Lionel Cranfield, written in December 1614, six months after Parliament was prorogued amidst allegations that men like Hoskyns and Martyn were seeking the death of James and his favorites.[56] Martyn is typically frank, and cynical, about the need to pay court to such favorites. He asks Cranfield to:

> send to Mr. Hooker the Goldsmith in Cheapside, where amongst other plate of mine yu shall find a little fine trencher salt, wch when

> it was sent thither was fairly ennameld, & a fitt present for any man, this if it bee in good plight, I would entreat yu on that day when yu send yr owne plate to present to my L. of Sommersett in my name (wth thenclosed directed to him) & to give it what grace yu can afford yr frind. I will not neglect that precept to make frinds wth th'unrighteous Mammon (wherby ar meant the great Ones of ye world) & my fortune, wch I must fortify by prudence (knowing what a beare I have to muzzle) hath no assurance in any vertue that I can bragg of, all wch, if it were more, weigh little in this coster monger time being all owt of fashion.[57]

Martyn's belatedly-chosen prudence is akin to Donne's discretion, both necessary virtues in a costermonger time, when all places, high and low, were bought through the favor of the powerful. It is perhaps no coincidence that Donne's efforts to acquire a post through Somerset's favor are at their most strenuous in 1614: there is a cynical ambiguity in his flattering remark that "it hath pleased your Lordship to make an other Title to me, by buying me,"[58] while it is probable that his epithalamion for the marriage of Somerset and Frances Howard, which took place on 26 December, 1613, was not actually written until during or even after the Parliament of 1614.[59] The events and aftermath of that Parliament made it more clear than ever that the unrighteous Mammon had to be befriended, and Hoskyns, Phellips and Sandys, like Martyn, Donne, and, no doubt, Brooke, all paid court to Somerset and then to Buckingham. Martyn's letter of 1616 to Buckingham, in which he tries to repair some of the damage done to his chances by his behavior in the Commons, has already been quoted; Donne's letters to Goodyer late in 1614 show that he, too, was watching the rise of Somerset's new rival with care,[60] but "when he first began to pay court to him is not known" (Bald, p. 314). Whether he had to bribe Buckingham for his Deanship in 1621 is also unknown, but his letters to Buckingham that year make it quite clear that he saw Buckingham as the main agent in his promotion (Bald, pp. 371-80). Such use of royal favorites to further one's career, however, does not confirm Donne's absolutist allegiances any more than it confirms those of Martyn, Hoskyns, or Sandys.

Just before his death, Martyn succeeded in his search for preferment: he was appointed Recorder of London through the mediation and financing of his own private Mammon, Cranfield, but he died before his new court, as distinct from the D'Amours Court, could sit. So transparent was the system of bribery that Cranfield, angry at the loss of any return on the £1,500 he had laid out, demanded his money back.[61] Goodyer suggested that Donne should write an elegy for Martyn; Donne replied in March 1619:

> For your commandment in memory of Mr. Martin, I should not have sat so many processes, if I could incline my thoughts that way. It is not laziness, it is not gravity, nor coldness towards his memory or your service; for I have thought of it oftener and longer than I was wont to do in such things, and nothing is done.[62]

Five years before, Donne had written that the "Obsequies to the Lord Harrington" was the place where his Muse had "spoke her last" (ll. 256-8). If this was not literally true, it is the case that less and less verse came from his pen in the years after 1614, and the failure to write for Martyn may well be just as he describes it. In the end, it was left to Hoskyns and Holland to write: Hoskyns' epitaph can still be seen on Martyn's tomb in the Temple Church. Holland's Latin eulogy has already been mentioned; a later poem in English is in its way a more moving tribute. Writing in 1625, on the death of James I, Holland recalls the deaths of those closest to him:

> now breathes not any.
> Nor Ursula my dear, nor Phil my daughter:
> Amongst us death hath made so dire a slaughter.
> Them and my Martyn have I wretch survived.[63]

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Notes

[1] Donne to Wotton, ca.1600; Burley MS. ff.308v-309, transcription in Evelyn M. Simpson, *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd. ed., revised, 1948), p. 316. For a discussion of these letters in the Burley MS., see Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, "Donne's Correspondence with Wotton," *JDJ* 10 (1991): 1-36.

[2] For reassessment of the political dimensions of the sermons, see *JDJ* 11 (1992), especially Jeanne Shami, "Introduction: Reading Donne's Sermons," 1-20; Paul W. Harland, "Donne's Political Intervention in the Parliament of 1629," 21-37; Gale H. Carrithers, Jr. and James D. Hardy, Jr., "Love, Power, Dust Royall, Gavelkinde: Donne's Politics," 39-58; and Meg Lota Brown, "'Though it be not according to the law': Donne's Politics and the Sermon on Esther," 71-84.

[3] 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 Harvey and Katherine Maus (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 3-36; Annabel Patterson, "All Donne," ibid., pp. 37-67. See also Annabel Patterson, "John Donne, Kingsman?" in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 251-72; Dennis Flynn, "Donne the Survivor," in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), pp.15-24; and (though he presents Donne as more clearly in line with "official court policy") Ted-Larry Pebworth, "'Let Me Here Use That Freedome': Subversive Representation in John Donne's 'Obsequies to the Lord Harrington,'" *JEGP* 91 (1992): 17-42.

[4] See Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), pp. 25-95, for a survey of the Inns' ambiance, and the poetry written there by Donne.

[5] For a recent survey, see Charles M. Gray, "Liberty and the Law," in *Parliament and Liberty From the Reign of Elizabeth to the English Civil War*, ed. J.H. Hexter (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1992), pp. 155-200.

[6] For an illuminating discussion of the ways in which the conflicting pressures of patronage bear on a single poem, see Pebworth, "'Let Me Here Use That Freedome.'"

[7] *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. G. R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson, 10 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953-61), 5: 199; cf. *John Donne: The Satires, Epigrams and Verse Letters*, ed. W. Milgate (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. xxxv-xxxix; and Jeanne M. Shami, "Donne on Discretion," *ELH* 47 (1980): 48-56.

[8] "Orchestra Or a Poeme of Dauncing," stanza 131, in Robert Krueger (ed.), *Poems of Sir John Davies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p. 125; the poem was

dedicated to Martyn as "mine-owne-selves better halfe, my dearest friend." For the assault, see *Middle Temple Records,* ed. Charles Henry Hopwood, K.C., 4 vols. (London: Butterworth & Co., 1904), 1: 379-80, 381.

[9] John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. Andrew Clark, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), 2: 48; Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis, An Exact History*, ed. P. Bliss, 4 vols. (London: F.C. & J. Rivington, 1813-20), 2: 250-1; and *The History of the Worthies of England, endeavoured by Thomas Fuller, DD*, ed. John Nichols, 2 vols. (London: F.C. & J. Rivington et al., 1811), 1: 306.

[10] R.C. Bald, *John Donne: A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp.42-3 (hereafter cited in the text as 'Bald'); see also J. Foster, ed., *Alumni Oxoniensis 1500-1714*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Parker & Co., 1891-2). Hoskyns and Holland remained especially close to Martyn throughout his life. Edwyn Sandys, a slightly older contemporary, may also have met Martyn at Oxford: he became a fellow of Corpus Christi in 1580.

[11] John Prince, *Danmonii Orientales Illustres: or The Worthies of Devon* (London, 1810), p.576.

[12] *Middle Temple Records*, 1: 293. For Martin's friendship with Cotton, see Holland, *Pancharis* (London, 1603), sig.D6v.

[13] See Flynn, *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), pp. 131-4, for the argument that Donne left Oxford after only one term.

[14] Bald, pp. 163-4; and *Middle Temple Records*, 1: 305.

[15] For Donne's later attitude to Christmas as "a type of the Day of Judgment," rather than an occasion for celebration, see Dayton Haskin, "John Donne and the Cultural Contradictions of Christmas," *JDJ* 11 (1992): 133-57.

[16] *Middle Temple Records*, 1: 303-4, 311, 318, 326-7, 328, 329.

[17] Burley MS. ff.298, transcription in Simpson, *Prose Works of John Donne*, pp.312-3.

[18] *Le Prince d'Amour, Or the Prince of Love* (London, 1660), pp. 89-90.

[19] "Prince of Loves, and also the Love of Princes"; from Holland's poem attached to the engraved portrait in John Nichols, *Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First,* 4 vols. (London: J.B. Nichols, 1828), 1: facing p. 128. Dated 1620, the portrait is dedicated to Cranfield, from "Chr Brocus Io Hoskinni et Hugo (heu iterum) Holland." Holland's first line is also quoted by Leslie Hotson, who claims for Martyn the authorship of the commendatory poem signed in *Sejanus,* and the "curious address to the Reader which appeared in some copies of the 1609 quarto of *Troilus and Cressida.*" See *Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and Other Essays* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1949), pp. 50-2. Holland dedicated *Pancharis* to Martyn in 1603, accompanied him on a trip to Devon in 1614-15, and mourned his death in 1618. He too was close to Cranfield, as well as to Shakespeare and Jonson.

[20] *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple*, ed. Robert P. Sorlien

(Hanover, N.H: University Press of New England, 1976), p. 48; for the suggestion that Orsino is intended to remind the audience of the Prince D'Amour, see Henk Gras, "*Twelfth Night, Every Man Out of His Humour,* and the Middle Temple Revels of 1597-8," *MLR*, 84 (1989): 545-64.

[21] Chamberlain to Carleton, quoted in E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 3: 261-2.

[22] For the ambassadors (French, Venetian, Savoyard and the States' Ambassador), see Nichols, *Progresses,* 3: 131-2, quoting Sir John Finett, *Finetti Philoxenis*, (London, 1656), p.31; for the Prince of Wales, see *Middle Temple Records*, 2: 610, and Nichols, *Progresses*, 3: 213-4.

[23] Martyn to Buckingham, 28 August 1616; British Library, Harleian MS. 1581, f.226.

[24] *Proceedings in Parliament 1610*, ed. Elizabeth Read Foster, 2 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1966) 1: 117. It was probably this remark which led Wallace Notestein to mistakenly characterise Martyn as "a careful man who usually acted with discretion;" see *The House of Commons, 1604-1610* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1971), p. 566.

[25] Letter to Lawrence Whitaker, in *Thomas Coriate Traueller for the English Wits: Greeting. From the Court of the Great MOGUL* (London, 1616), p.30. A rumour in circulation just before Martyn's death claimed that misrule had extended as far as killing a fellow Middle Templar: "Mr. Richard Martin being made Recorder of London and haveing bine suspected heretofore of the murder of one Mr. Ferrers (the fame went) that one of Mr. Ferrer's sisters ... should saye -- God forbid that ever hee should sit upon blood before he hath paid the price of bloud himselfe; but it seems the Recorder going to the recett [of the] Venetian Ambassador dranke somewhat deepe with him in theyr strange kinde of drinke, and there of surfetting presently after dyed, never keeping any sessions, which are every three weeke." Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Tenth Report, Appendix, Part VI* (London: HMSO, 1887), p. 84. I have found no further evidence of this event. For this group's propensity to be "troublemakers, more or less serious disciplinary problems," see Philip J. Finkelpearl, *John Marston of the Middle Temple* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969).

[26] *A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew*, ed. A. H. Mathew (London: Burns & Oates, 1904), p. 86; cf. Bald, p. 188.

[27] *Letters to Several Persons of Honour* (London, 1651), p. 140. For Whitelock's death, cf. Carleton to Chamberlain, 20 Sept 1608 in *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, James I 1603-10*, ed. M. A. E. Green (London: Longman, Benn, Green, Longmans and Roberts, 1857), p. 457; and Sir James Whitelock, *Liber Famelicus*, ed. John Bruce, (London: Camden Society, 1858), pp. 7-11. Matthew had been committed to Jones' house for two months when let out of the Fleet; *Conversion*, p. 121.

[28] For the Percys and Donne, see Flynn, *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic*

Nobility, pp.83-97.

[29] Chamberlain tells Carleton that Lady Carey's daughter is "Dick Martin's, or rather a greater mans." See *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Maclure 2 vols. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939), 2: 247. Martyn denies the relationship in a letter to Cranfield of March, 1617: "yet must I crave a respitt for a time to stay heere, & yt in favour of the dead, not for love of the living as you ymagine. Jesu, yt you also must neede be besmerd wth the mire of common error. I had thought I had long er this satisfied you, or you had been satisfied of me, that at least (as you glance) I would not have sought good speed in a desperate affaire. but I see well that as ye finest constitutions, & strongest bodies, ar likewise maintaind with common humours, so ar the most refined witts, & strongest apprehensions much nourisht wth vulgar coinceits & rumours. as much hath that pourpose fallen wthin th' intention of her or mee (though in both alike) as in you to hope for good speed (in that nature) wth the Countess of Dorsett the bedlam." (Kent Archive Office, Cranfield Papers U269/1 CB 148).

[30] Perhaps the "John West of Tiverton, Devon, Gent." found in *Middle Temple Records*, 1: 619.

[31] For the poem, attributed to Hoskyns, see Louise Brown Osborn, *The Life, Letters and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638*, Yale Studies in English, 87 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937) pp. 196-9; the poem exists in several versions, and in an English translation by John Reynolds (printed in Osborn, *Hoskyns*, pp. 288-91).

[32] *Traveller for the English Wits*, pp. 37-47, dated 8 November 1615. Coryate had been abroad since 1612, so is probably referring to a club which existed in or before that year.

[33] If Helen Gardner is correct in identifying the L. C. of the "Elegy on the L. C." as Lionel Cranfield, then it is possible that from as early as 1595 much the same group, centering on Donne, Martyn, Cranfield and Hoskyns, had been meeting in some form or other. The Mermaid group has recently been examined by Annabel Patterson ("All Donne," esp. pp. 37-44). Though the research for this paper was largely completed before I read her article, it will be seen that I am indebted to it, and that our conclusions are broadly similar. See also I.A. Shapiro, "The Mermaid Club," *MLR* 45 (1950): 6-17.

[34] See, e.g., his speeches of 23 March and 2 Nov. 1610 in *Proceedings in Parliament 1610*, ed. Foster, 2: 64 and 394.

[35] Will quoted in Bald, p. 501. These two portraits were left to his cousin, Sir John Brooke. Both Brookes were, like Martyn, active council members of the Virginia Company.

[36] Martyn's aunt, Elizabeth Rous, third wife of his uncle Nicholas, was Pym's step-sister.

[37] For Donne's generally sympathetic, if increasingly critical, attitude, see the Epigram "E of Nottingham," attributed to Donne by Gary A. Stringer, "Donne's

Epigram on the Earl of Nottingham," *JDJ* 10 (1991): 71-4; and Donne's letter to Wotton of ca. 1600: "he [Essex] understood not his age: for it is a naturall weaknes of innocency. That such men want lockes for themselues & keyse for others." (Burley MS. f. 296v, transcription in Simpson, *Prose Works of John Donne*, p.310). As Annabel Patterson points out ("All Donne," p. 62) there are two Sir Henry Nevilles, cousins: the other Henry Neville of Birling, Kent, succeeded as Lord Bergavenny in 1621. He contributed a poem to Coryate's *Crudities*, but the Henry Neville of Berkshire, whose political position was closer to the others mentioned, is marginally more likely to have been a member of the Mermaid club.

[38] Lionel Cranfield and Arthur Ingram were also MPs, but their interests were mercantile and in Cranfield's case administrative. Both made loans to the King which were secured by impositions; and both speculated in customs "farming," but Cranfield had the confidence of the Commons in these years as an efficient and, by contemporary standards, unusually honest reformer of the royal finances. Martyn and he were close friends: four letters from Martyn to Cranfield survive, as do letters from Hoskyns and Brooke and one from Donne written in 1628, well after Cranfield's impeachment (Kent Archive Office, Cranfield Papers U269/1 CB 148 and CP 69).

[39] P. W. Hasler, *The House of Commons 1558-1603*, 3 vols. (London: HMSO, 1981), 3: 22-3.

[40] The reference to the "loss of Amiens" (to the Spanish, March 1597) in l. 114 dates the poem to later that year; monopolies were a serious issue in the Commons in 1597: see Sir Simonds D'Ewes, *A Compleat Journal of the Votes, Speeches and Debates, both of the House of Lords and House of Commons throughout the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth, of glorious memory*, 2nd ed. (London, 1693), pp. 554-5, 558, 570, and 573. The year 1597 marked the beginning of the real expansion of monopolies: more than thirty were granted between 1597 and 1601.

[41] D'Ewes, *Journal*, p. 646.

[42] D'Ewes, *Journal*, p.675. Cecil went on: "But I see that men which have desired to be popular without the House for speaking against Monopolies do also desire to be private within." Raleigh was also attacked by Martyn in this episode, as previously over his monopolies.

[43] Later, Wotton was to argue that such men as Hoskyns were unwise to speak out in the Commons as if they were in the Venetian Senate "where the Treaters are perpetual Princes, then where those that speak so irreverently, are so soon to return (which they should remember) to the natural capacity of Subjects." Letter to Sir Edmund Bacon, *Reliquiae Wottonianae* (London, 1672), p. 432. In 1610, Hoskyns reminded the House of "a Statute in H.VII that no man should be impeached for speaking in Parliament freely. Proclamation:-- [the *Journal* adds enigmatically] The Freehold, the Conscience, the Life of Men." See *Journals of the House of Commons*, I, 1547-1628 (London, 1803), p. 425.

[44] *A Speach Delivered to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty . . . By Maister*

Richard Martin of the Middle Temple, sig A4v. See also British Library, Add. MSS. 15903, f.10 and 25707, f.142 (the "Skipwith" MS.), and Stowe MS. 145, f.41; Inner Temple, Petyt MS. 538.36.xiii, f.207; and *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1603-10*, p. 7.

[45] *A Speach Delivered*, sig. B1.

[46] Holland, *Pancharis* (1603), sig. D5v; Patterson, "All Donne," p. 38. The King responded well; at least, Martyn thought so: writing to Buckingham thirteen years later, he recalls that "his Majesty gave me a most favourable acceptance, and (behind my back) many great testimonies of my ability and discreet demeanour" (Martyn to Buckingham, 28 August 1616; British Library, Harleian MS. 1581, f.226).

[47] His position does not seem to have been threatened by his arrest for debt: "Informed, that Mr *Rich. Martin*, a Member of the House, stood outlawed, at the Suit of one... *Palmer*, dwelling in *Wood-street*, in an Action of Debt; and that one *Nicholas Allen*, *Palmer's* Attorney in the Suit, did threaten to proceed to Trial.

Direction given that both *Palmer*, at whose Suit, and *Allen*, the Attorney, should be brought to the Bar by the Serjeant"; *Journals of the House of Commons*, 1: 373.

[48] British Library, Add. MS. 48119, ff.203v-204v; transcribed in Foster, *Proceedings in Parliament 1610*, 2: 327-9.

[49] *Reliquiae Wottonianae*, p. 432; and Hoskyns, letter to his wife from the Tower, 2 March 1614, in Osborne, *John Hoskyns*, p. 71.

[50] Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Portland, K. G., Preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, 10 vols. (London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1891-1931), 9: 27.

[51] Chamberlain, *Letters*, 1: 531; and James Spedding, *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, 8 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1868), 4: 365.

[52] Donne to Goodyer, n. d.; Edmund Gosse, *Life and Letters of John Donne*, 2 vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1899), 1: 239-41. For Holland's "Anglorum alumnus, praeco Virginiae ac parens" see the engraved portrait in Nichols, *Progresses*, 1: facing p.128.

[53] *Commons Journal*, I, 487-9; and Maija Jansson, ed., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: 1988), pp. 275-9.

[54] "All Donne," p. 60.

[55] Jansson, ed., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614*, p. 268.

[56] Winwood conveys this prophetic news to Carleton, 16 June 1614: "The break-neck was some seditious speeches, which made the King impatient, and it was whispered to him that they would have his life and that of his favourites before they had done, on which he dissolved them"; *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1611-18*, p. 237.

[57] Martyn to Cranfield, 19 December ?1614; Kent Archive Office, Cranfield

Papers, U269/1, CB 148.

[58] Donne to Robert Ker, Earl of Somerset, ?1614; Gosse, 2: 23.

[59] See Robert S. Jackson, *John Donne's Christian Vocation* (Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1970), pp. 130-41; Patterson, "All Donne," pp. 52, 59; and letters in Gosse, 2: 24-5, 27.

[60] Gosse, 2: 65, 66, and 69.

[61] Chamberlain to Carleton, 14 November 1618; SP 14/103/93: "the greatest difficultie was how to content Sr Lionell Cranfield for £1500 he laide downe for Dick Martin, who enioyeng the place so small a time it seemed reasonable he should be remboursed by his successor, but this man [Heath] disclaimes all such contracts, wherfore he must find some other way to be restored."

[62] Donne to Sir Henry Goodyer, 9 March 1619; Gosse, 2: 122.

[63] *A Cypres Garland* (London, 1625), sigB2r.