John Donne Journal
Vol. 22 (2003)

"Loe her's a Man, worthy indeede to travell": Donne's Panegyric upon *Coryats Crudities*

Brandon S. Centerwall

In May 1608 Thomas Coryate (1577?-1617), well-known buffoon, set out on a walking tour of the Continent from London to Venice and back. It was an inconsequential five-months' journey of which nothing more would have been heard if he had not subsequently expanded his travel notes into a 654-page book, *Coryats Crudities* (1611)–for Coryate was a buffoon with ambitions. The misadventures, infelicities, and petty humiliations he endured during his trip were no different from those of any other man traveling alone through foreign countries on a tight budget; but, whereas other travel writers passed over such indignities in silence, Coryate plied his readers with every miserable detail. For example, crossing the Channel has always been an occasion for seasickness, but Coryate not only described how he "varnished the exterior parts of the ship with the excrementall ebullitions of my tumultuous stomach, as desiring to satiate the gormandizing paunches of the hungry Haddocks,"[1] but

[1]Thomas Coryate, *Coryats Crudities* (London, 1611), p. 1. The main text of the book is numbered by page whereas the preliminary matter is unnumbered. References to the main text are by page number and to the preliminary matter by signature. The copy text is taken from the Huntington Library's copy of *Coryats Crudities*. I have modernized the orthography, but the original spelling and punctuation are maintained.

also commissioned an illustrator to depict him in the frontispiece in the act of losing his lunch over the side, the "hungry Haddocks" in attendance (Figure).

Such a person invites ridicule and abuse, so when Coryate canvassed the wits of the day for "Panegyricke Verses upon the Author and his booke," ridicule and abuse were not long in coming. It quickly turned into a buffoon-fest, with every wit in

sight crowding in with his contribution. This was to be a celebrity roast, so the insults flew thick and fast. By the time *Crudities* went to press the preliminary matter contained no less than 91 sets of mock-commendatory verses sent in by 56 contributors. Most were men-about-town with no exceptional talent for versification, but a few were among the leading poets of the day, including Ben Jonson and John Donne. Determined to engage in wretched excess, 13 of the encomiasts submitted more than one piece, Donne and Jonson among them. Such was the crush to get in that 11 sets of verses had to be appended to the rest in what Coryate described as a "supplement or overplus" (sig. I1^{r}). A further five sets of verses did not make it into the *Crudities* at all, so they were inserted among the preliminary matter of the author's sequel, *Coryats Crambe* (1611). The contributors provided the verses while Coryate supplied the headings, footings, and most of the marginal notes.[2]

Among the last of Donne's poems to be brought into the canon by his seventeenth-century editors was his satire "Upon Mr. Thomas Coryats Crudities," culled from the *Crudities* (sig. D3^{r}-D4^{r}) for inclusion in the 1649 fourth edition of the *Poems*.[3] It was not until 1865 that it was pointed out that the preliminary matter of the *Crudities* contained a second poem by Donne, the macaronic quatrain "*In eundem Macaronicon*" (sig. D4^{r}).[4] The quatrain

---

[2]Coryate's marginal notes serve to enlarge upon the contributors' insults, typically in one of two ways: (1) He will pretend not to grasp that he is being insulted, or (2) he will provide absurdly obvious commentary.

[3]The 1649 edition of Donne's *Poems* omitted Coryate's heading, footing, and marginal note; added the title "Upon Mr. Thomas Coryats Crudities"; and introduced several substantive variants into the text. For an enumeration of the substantive variants, and a commentary upon the text, see Herbert J.C. Grierson's edition of *The Poems of John Donne*, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1912), 1:172-4, 2:128-30.

[4]*Notes and Queries* 7 (Jan. 28, 1865): 145. The note is anonymous.

immediately follows Donne's satire on the same page, and is labeled as composed by him.

Where there were two Donne contributions, there might well be a third. Perhaps with this in mind, E.K.Chambers went through the preliminary matter of the *Crudities* in preparation for his 1896 edition of *The Poems of John Donne.* It was there he encountered the following set of verses (sig. F5[r]) which he subsequently published in his edition of the *Poems* as authentically by Donne:[5]

Incipit Ioannes Dones.

Loe her's a Man, worthy indeede to travell;
Fat Libian plaines, strangest Chinas gravell.
For Europe well hath seene him stirre his stumpes:
Turning his double shoes to simple pumpes.
And for relation, looke he doth afford
Almost for every step he tooke a word;
What had he done had he ere hug'd th'Ocean
With swimming *Drake* or famous *Magelan*?
**Terra incognita.* And kis'd that *unturn'd* cheeke* of our old mother,
Since so our Europes world he can discover?
a *Rablais.* It's not that [a]*French* which made his [b]*Gyant* see
b *Pantagruel.* Those uncouth Ilands where wordes frozen bee,
Till by the thaw next yeare they'r voic't againe;
Whose *Papagauts, Andoüilets*, and that traine
Should be such matter for a Pope to curse

[5]Chambers modernized the poem's spelling and punctuation for his edition of *The Poems of John Donne*, 2 vols. (London: Lawrence & Bullen, 1896), 2:289.

As he would make; make! makes ten time worse,
And yet so pleasing as shall laughter move:
And be his vaine, his gaine, his praise, his love.
Sit not still then, keeping fames trump unblowne:
But get thee *Coryate* to some land unknowne.
From whence proclaime thy wisdom with those wonders,
Rarer then sommers snowes, or winters thunders.
And take this praise of that th'ast done alreadie:
T'is pitty ere thy *flow* should have an *eddie*.

Explicit Ioannes Dones.

Despite its ironic tone–this was a roast, after all–"Loe her's a Man" is among the most laudatory of the poems prefixed to the *Crudities*. In comparing Coryate to Rabelais, the poet affects a disdain for the French satirist and his outlandish tales:[6] Rabelais is bad enough, but Coryate is ten times worse (11-16). If, however, the author of these verses was known to be an admirer of Rabelais, the tongue-in-cheek insult neatly inverts into high praise–a true panegyric.

In the present essay I will argue that Chambers was right, "Loe her's a Man" is indeed by Donne. In the first section I will trace the curious circumstances under which this poem was lost to the Donne canon–mislaid, in effect. In the second section I will address those arguments that have been made against its authenticity. (And, yes, Donne was an admirer of Rabelais.)

---

[6]In Rabelais' *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, the giant Pantagruel and his seafaring companions encounter frozen words in the Arctic Sea (Book Four, Chs. 55-56). Elsewhere they do battle with an island of living sausages (*andoüilets*; Book Four, Chs. 35-42) and later stop at the Island of Ringing Bells to gape at the one and only 'popehawk' (*papagaut*; Book Five, Chs. 2-8). The popehawk is a stinging satire directed at the Office of the Holy See; it can be imagined that a pope might curse upon reading it (l. 15 in "Loe her's a Man"). Coryate himself was a stalwart Protestant.

I

Although Chambers accepted the poem as Donne's, he recognized that whereas Donne's satire and its appended quatrain pose no problem of attribution for the editor, "Loe her's a Man" does present some anomalies: "The third set [of verses] comes at a different place in the book, and the name is differently spelt, but I do not doubt that this also is by Donne."[7] To be more specific, "Loe her's a Man" is attributed to one '*Ioannes Dones*' in both its *incipit* and *explicit* and is separated from the other two poems by 35 pages of verses by various and sundry other contributors.

Herbert Grierson was more tentative. He included the text of "Loe her's a Man" in his monumental *Poems of John Donne* (1912), accompanied by the brief note, "It may be by Donne, but was not printed in any edition of his poems."[8] Citing its inclusion in Chambers' and Grierson's editions of the *Poems*, Geoffrey Keynes identified "Loe her's a Man" in his *Bibliography of the Works of Dr John Donne* (1914) as "certainly by Donne."[9] In her 1924 *Study of*

---

[7]Chambers, 2:297.

[8]Herbert J.C. Grierson, ed., *The Poems of John Donne*, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1912), 2:129-30. Grierson is alluding to the seventeenth-century editions of Donne's poems. He was well aware of Chambers' edition of the *Poems* (1896), which had printed both "*In eundem Macaronicon*" and "Loe her's a Man." Unlike Chambers' modernized edition, Grierson's provides the original text from *Coryats Crudities*, with the original spelling, punctuation, and orthography. Unfortunately, there are two typographical errors (14 *Andoüelets*] *Andoüilets*; 24 they] thy).

[9]Geoffrey Keynes, *Bibliography of the Works of Dr John Donne, Dean of St Paul's* (Cambridge: The Baskerville Club, 1914), pp. 91-2. Keynes incorrectly described "Loe her's a Man" as headed "*Incipit Ioannes Donne.*" The entry was repeated verbatim in the second edition of the *Bibliography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), pp. 102-3, including the error.

the Prose Works of John Donne, Evelyn Simpson noted a textual parallel between "Loe her's a Man" and one of Donne's letters.[10]

Then a strange thing happened: "Loe her's a Man" did not appear in Grierson's revised edition of the *Poems* (1929), an absence without explanation, without even an acknowledgment that there was such a poem. To understand this requires a closer inquiry into the organization and editing of Grierson's 1912 *Poems of John Donne.*

Grierson had set himself the herculean task, never previously attempted, of examining and collating all known major manuscripts of Donne's poetry, and all prior printed editions, to arrive at a critical determination of the canon. Since new texts continued to be discovered and brought to light, there was no logical endpoint at which Grierson could say, "It is complete." As a consequence, Grierson's *magnum opus* was very much a work-in-progress, undergoing continual revision up until the point of going to press. The 1912 edition was published in two volumes, the first volume providing the texts of Donne's poems as well as appendices for the dubia. The second volume provided 276 pages' worth of introduction, commentary and notes. As will be seen, under the pressure of continual revision it was Grierson's somewhat peculiar editorial practice that if a poem by Donne remained under consideration too long, or arrived too late, for its text to be inserted into its proper place within the canon, rather than omit it entirely he would insert the text elsewhere in the edition as a holding place until such time as he could come out with a revised edition.

This was certainly the case with Donne's verse letter "To the Countesse of Huntington," previously regarded as canonical but placed by Grierson in his Appendix B, "Poems attributed to John Donne" (1:417-21). As Grierson explains the matter, rather defensively, in his Introduction (contained, as noted, in Volume II),

---

[10]Evelyn M. Simpson, *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), p. 291*n*.

> There is no more difficult poem to understand or to assign to or from Donne than the long letter headed *To the Countesse of Huntington* ...which, *for the time being*, I have placed in the Appendix B. (2:cxxxviii; emphasis added)

There follow four pages of "reasons which led me to doubt Donne's authorship" (2:cxxxviii). Despite these reasons, he concludes,

> The question is an open one, but had I realized in time the weakness of the positive external evidence [against Donne's authorship] I should not have moved the poem [out of the canon](2:cxliii).

It should be carefully noted, for its subsequent significance, that this last comment documents that Volume I of the *Poems*–containing the texts of the proposed canon and its dubia–was closed to further revision at a time when Volume II–containing the introduction, commentary and notes–was still being written.

As it turned out, the question was not nearly as open, or the difficulty of assigning the poem to Donne nearly as great, as Grierson would have his readers believe: He was roundly castigated by fellow scholars for removing "To the Countesse of Huntington" from the canon. In his revised edition of the *Poems* (1929), Grierson transferred the poem back into the canon and issued a *mea culpa* in his prefatory "Note on the Text and Canon of this Edition":[11]

> I agree ... that I made a mistake in even tentatively removing the Letter headed *To the Countesse of Huntingdon* [*sic*] ... from the canon of Donne's poems. I felt that before [I] had sent off my last proofs, but had

[11]Herbert J.C. Grierson, ed., *The Poems of John Donne*, Revised Edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. xlix-liv.

> not the heart to ask my long-suffering publishers to permit a last reconstruction ... (p. li)

Even more striking is the case of "A Letter written by S^r^ H: G: and J: D: *alternis vicibus*," a verse letter of twelve stanzas, with Sir Henry Goodyere and John Donne composing the odd and even stanzas respectively. The piece was originally gleaned by Chambers from Additional MS 25707 in the British Library and published in his 1896 edition of the *Poems* (2:287-8). Grierson wrote in his 1912 edition that "it has quite the appearance of being genuine" (2:clii-cliii):

> There is not much reason to doubt that ["A Letter"] is what it professes to be. The order of the names in the heading, and the character of the verses both suggest that the second and corresponding verses are Donne's contribution. There is a characteristic touch in each one. (2:267)

Nevertheless, the text of "A Letter" appears in one of the Volume I appendices reserved for dubious attributions (1:433-4). It can be inferred that Grierson initially doubted the poem's attribution to Goodyere and Donne, for which reason he placed it among the dubia. By the time he changed his mind (as indicated by his comments in Volume II) Volume I was unfortunately closed to any further "reconstruction." Therefore, like the verse letter "To the Countesse of Huntington," Goodyere and Donne's "Letter" would have to languish among the dubia "for the time being."

Presumably, "for the time being" was intended to be a relatively brief period of time. However, World War I intervened and, between one thing and another, Grierson's revised edition did not come out until seventeen years later, in 1929. As noted, he moved "To the Countesse of Huntington" back into the canon at that time, but, oddly, "A Letter" remained where it was in the appendix (pp. 392-3). The most plausible explanation is that Grierson quite simply forgot it was there. Seventeen years is a long time–and

Goodyer and Donne's piece is not a major work such as would stick in the mind. As a result, "A Letter" was not to appear at all in the editions of the *Poems* edited by John Hayward (1929, 1930), Hugh I'Anson Fausset (1931), or the editions based upon Hayward's (Hillyer, 1941; Coffin, 1952).[12] Finally, and without further argument, Roger Bennett moved "A Letter" into the canon in his 1942 edition of the *Poems*[13]–where it has since remained.

Which brings us to "Loe her's a Man." It would seem that the text arrived under Grierson's consideration very late indeed, for it does not appear in Volume I at all, not even in the appendices. Instead, it is inserted among the notes in Volume II (2:129-30), presumably because, as with the previous instances, Volume I was no longer open to further changes. The accompanying note is strictly nominal, a place-holding statement:

> The following poem is also found among the poems prefixed to Coryat's *Crudities*. It may be by Donne, but was not printed in any edition of his poems.(2:129)[14]

With "A Letter" lost due to oversight, what hope was there for "Loe her's a Man" when Grierson came to prepare his revised edition? The most fundamental change made in the new edition

---

[12]John Hayward, ed., *John Donne Dean of St. Paul's Complete Poetry and Selected Prose* (Bloomsbury: The Nonesuch Press, 1929); John Hayward, ed., *John Donne Dean of St. Paul's Complete Poetry and Selected Prose*, Revised Edition (New York: Random House, 1930); Hugh I'Anson Fausset, ed., *The Poems of John Donne* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1931); *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne & The Complete Poetry of William Blake*, Introduction by Robert Silliman Hillyer (New York: Random House, 1941); *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne*, Introduction by Charles M. Coffin (New York: The Modern Library, 1952).

[13]Roger E. Bennett, ed., *The Complete Poems of John Donne* (New York: Hendricks House, 1942), pp. 168-9.

[14]See note 8.

was to drop Volume II entirely, with all its notes and commentary, a change probably insisted upon by the publishers for the purpose of marketing Donne's poetry to a wider audience. What was being discarded *in toto* need not be considered in its specifics, so out it all went, taking with it "Loe her's a Man." As a consequence, the text of "Loe her's a Man" has not appeared in any edition of the Poems, not even among the dubia, subsequent to Grierson's 1912 edition. Sheer oversight is the simplest explanation. Grierson added forty-three pages of fresh commentary to the 1929 edition, so it can be presumed there was no financial barrier blocking the addition of a one-page poem. And even if Grierson had had any doubts regarding the poem's attribution to Donne, there would still have been a place for it among the appendices of the new edition–so we return to oversight as the most plausible explanation for the omission.

Following the non-appearance of "Loe her's a Man" in Grierson's 1929 revised edition of the *Poems*, I.A. Shapiro came out against Donne's authorship in a 1936 letter to the *Times Literary Supplement*,[15] whereas Simpson, returning to the matter in her revised edition of *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* (1948), came out in favor of Donne.[16] Thereafter, the poem faded from view. In the third edition of his *Bibliography* (1958), Keynes downgraded it from "certainly by Donne" to "probably not by Donne."[17] In R.C. Bald's 1970 biography of Donne, the matter is relegated to a footnote: "Another set of verses signed 'John Dones'

[15]I.A. Shapiro, "A Donne Poem?," *Times Literary Supplement*, February 1, 1936, p. 96.

[16]Evelyn M. Simpson, *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne*, Second Edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), pp. 47, 149.

[17]Geoffrey Keynes, *A Bibliography of Dr John Donne, Dean of Saint Paul's*, Third Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 129.

[*sic*] has sometimes been attributed to Donne, but the orthography [i.e., the spelling of the name] is against such an ascription."[18]

II

Shapiro's has been the only considered argument against Donne's authorship. His critique is, in effect, an extension of Chambers' original observation in 1896 that the poem "comes at a different place in the book, and the name is differently spelt...."[19] Shapiro's argument is given at length:

> The prefatory matter in the "Crudities" bears signs of having been seen through the press very carefully by Coryate, and possibly by some of the contributors also. Every contribution is distinguished by an "incipit" and "explicit"; and although several contributors sent a number of poems, the work of each is always gathered into a single group. One poem by Glareanus Vadianus, who has a group of seven in the main collection, is added in the "supplement," but this hardly constitutes an exception. It seems clear that we are meant to take the contributions of Ioannes Donne and Ioannes Dones as the work of different authors.
>
> Moreover, it is very unlikely that Coryate, who was well acquainted with Donne, and elsewhere spells his name correctly, should here mispronounce it (for that is what we should have to believe) as "Dones." There are two very similar but actually quite distinct surnames found in sixteenth and seventeenth century records: "Dun" (spelt also Dun(n)e, Don(ne), Doun, Doon, &c.) and "Dunch" (variously spelt Dunsh(e), Dun(ne)s, Don(n)es, &c.; some examples may be found in Clark, "Registers of Univ. of Oxford," Index X, *s.v.* Dunche).

---

[18]R.C. Bald, *John Donne, A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 193*n*.

[19]Chambers, 2:297.

> Elizabethans and Jacobeans occasionally confused these two surnames, though less frequently than some modern scholars have done, but never (as far as I have been able to discover) when the person concerned was at all well known to the writer. (*op. cit.*, p. 96)

Before proceeding further with Shapiro's objections, it should be noted that they do not in any case constitute grounds for rejecting the poem in question from the Donne canon. The headings (and footings) of poems in this period were not infrequently captious, designed to mislead the unwary, and Thomas Coryate was as captious as they came. The whole business of the preliminary matter was an exercise in buffoonery, with some of the poems being submitted under humorous *noms de plume*. The placement of "Loe her's a Man" and the spelling of the name are indeed enigmas–perhaps accidental, perhaps intentional–but they are not counter-arguments to Donne's authorship. Chambers, Grierson[20] and Simpson did not see these as constituting valid objections. Neither do I.

However, even if Shapiro's arguments were to be regarded as pertinent to the authorship issue, the factual bases of his objections are demonstrably erroneous in key respects. Having stated that "the work of each [contributor] is always gathered into a single group," Shapiro contradicts that assertion by noting that one of the eight encomia submitted by "Glareanus Vadianus" (sig. L1^{v}-L2^{v}) appears separated from the other seven (sig. G6^{v}-H3^{r}), in Coryate's "supplement or overplus" of panegyrics, "but this hardly constitutes an exception." *Pace* Shapiro, an exception is an exception, and there are others as well. Laurence Whitaker's distichs explicating the frontispiece (sig. A1^{r}-A3^{r}) are separated from the rest of his contributions (sig. D4^{v}-D6^{v}), and one of Jonson's poems arrived so late it was remanded to appear in the *Crambe* (sig. A2^{r}-A3^{r}). If we accept "Loe her's a Man" as Donne's, four of the thirteen

[20]See Grierson's discussion in his 1912 edition of the *Poems* (2:cxxxix).

encomiasts who submitted more than one piece had one of their contributions printed separately from the rest–not so exceptional a practice, after all.

As for the assertion that Donne's name was never spelled with an *s*, or at least not deliberately, an example to the contrary has recently come to light. By way of preface, we should recollect that Donne was not universally admired in his own day. His first publication, *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610), was a prose essay devoted to the argument that English Catholics who chose martyrdom rather than swear their allegiance to James were in reality pseudo-martyrs. As summarized by Simpson:[21]

> His argument is that the sufferings which the Catholic recusants have brought upon themselves are the just punishment of rebellion against their lawful sovereign. The recusants are therefore 'pseudo-martyrs', and have no right to the honour which is ascribed to those who suffer in the cause of religion.

The authorities were favorably impressed,[22] but *Pseudo-Martyr* was bound to anger others, especially Catholics. For example, in 1613 an English Jesuit in exile, Thomas Fitzherbert, published the following as part of his rebuttal to *Pseudo-Martyr*:[23]

---

[21]Simpson (1948), pp. 180-1.

[22]*Ibid.*, p. 181.

[23]Thomas Fitzherbert, *A supplement to the discussion of M.D. Barlowes answere To the Judgment of a Catholike Englishman etc. interrupted by the death of the Author F. Robert Persons of the Society of Jesus ... And By the way is briefly censured M. John Dunnes Booke, intituled Pseudo-martyr ... By F.T. ... Permissu Superiorum* (Saint Omer, 1613), p. 107. Quoted in Geoffrey Keynes, *A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne, Dean of Saint Paul's*, Fourth Edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 5-6. I have modernized the orthography. Fitzherbert being in exile, his book was published outside of England.

> I hope some others will, ere it be long, display *M. Dunns* ignorance to the world, yea & make him understand, that it had byn much more for his reputation to have kept himselfe within his compasse, and not to have passed *ultra crepidam*, that is to say, beyond his old occupation of making Satyres (wherein he hath some talent, and may play the foole without controle) then to presume to write bookes of matters in controversy, which are to be scanned and sifted by learned men, and require much more substance, then his scambling studies, and superficiall knowledg can affoard.

Which brings us to the point: In 1610, shortly after *Pseudo-Martyr* was published, one Henry Stanford wrote of it in a letter to one Elizabeth Berkeley:[24]

> M*aster* Dun his booke *whom you in your letter call Duns* hath here no opinion being full of words & froth rather then substance ... (emphasis added)

Elizabeth Berkeley demonstrates that Donne's name could indeed be spelled with an *s*–if one wished to characterize him as a "Duns," i.e., a "Dunce." Her wordplay is not only witty but etymologically correct as well: Our modern *dunce* derives from the eponymous medieval theologian John *Duns* Scotus (1265?-1308?), a scholar renowned for the subtlety of his reasoning (*OED*). His followers came to be known as *Duns men*, and *Duns* eventually evolved into a term of abuse for individuals who indulged in excessive hair-splitting. Thus, Richard Stanyhurst (1587): "... Duns, which tearme is so triviall and common in all schools, that whoso surpasseth others either in cavilling sophistrie, or subtill

[24]Katherine Duncan-Jones, "'They say a made a good end': Ben Jonson's Epitaph on Thomas Nashe," *Ben Jonson Journal*, 3(1996): 10.

philosophie, is forthwith nickenamed a Duns."[25] At about the same time as Stanyhurst was writing, *Duns/dunce* was beginning to take on its modern signification of outright stupidity (*OED*), but, for our purposes, it appears that Elizabeth Berkeley was playing upon the older, but still current, meaning of *Duns* as signifying one who engages in "cavilling sophistrie" as a form of misplaced cleverness. It was certainly a wordplay available to Coryate when "Loe her's a Man" was ascribed to John Dones, and, indeed, perhaps it was Donne himself who chose, in a whimsical mood, to sign himself Dones–a dunce writing in praise of a clown, Donne "playing the fool."[26]

Throughout the conversation, all have tacitly agreed that the verses in question are consistent in style, language, and general merit with Donne's authorship. Even Shapiro, who argues against Donne's authorship, concedes this in a backhanded manner in his preliminary remarks:[27]

---

[25]Richard Stanyhurst, *The description and historie of Ireland*, in Raphael Holinshed, ed., *Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (London, 1587), 2, 9.

[26]One of the reviewers of the present essay points out that Donne's signature characteristically ends with a flourish that resembles an *s*, with the implication that Dones may simply have been a misreading by a scribe of Donne's signature on the manuscript supplied by Donne to Coryate. (For examples of Donne's signature, see Bald (*op. cit.*), facing p. 213.) This is certainly an alternative explanation which cannot be ruled out. It should be noted, however, that while the final flourish does indeed closely resemble an *s*, the s is outsize to the rest of the lettering and, furthermore, is clearly separated from the rest of the lettering by a space, both of which features militate against the final flourish being mistaken for an *s*. To put it another way, one can hardly imagine Donne employing such a final flourish if it were actually mistaken for an *s* with any frequency. And, finally, while a misreading of Donne's signature would explain the *s* in Dones, it does not explain how an *n* was lost in the process. Still, it's a possibility.

[27]Shapiro, *op. cit.*

> While there is nothing specifically characteristic of Donne in the style or language of "Ioannes Dones's" lines to Coryate, I would not deny that, if they are read by themselves, there is nothing to suggest that they cannot be his ... [I]t is not on grounds of style that I would reject this poem as Donne's.

—as though writing a poem that could pass in style, language and merit for Donne's were an easy thing. Others may beg to differ.

As for there being "nothing specifically characteristic of Donne" in the panegyric, I, for one, note that Dones' description of distant lands–"that unturn'd cheeke of our old mother" (l. 9)–employs the same unusual imagery that Donne uses in the opening of his verse letter "To the Countesse of Huntington" to describe those same distant lands–"That unripe side of earth" (l. 1). When the mood was upon him, Donne would torture syntax to within an inch of its life: Lines 11-18 of "Loe her's a Man" form a single sentence and are as tortured as anything in the Donne canon. Having tweaked Coryate repeatedly for his inordinate prolixity, Dones' final couplet rounds out the panegyric with that unexpected twist which is almost a trademark of our poet. I move on.

As noted by Simpson, Dones knew his Rabelais–and so did Donne.[28] Indeed, Donne admired Rabelais so much that his Latin *Catalogus Librorum Aulicorum* (written *c.* 1603-11) was written in imitation of the mock library catalog in *Gargantua and Pantagruel* (Book Two, Ch. 7).[29] Other allusions to *Gargantua and Pantagruel* occur in Donne's "Satyre IV" (l. 59) where he refers to Panurge the omniglot (Book Two, Ch. 9) and in a letter to Sir Henry Wotton (1604) where he mentions "Rabelais his land of tapistry" (Book Five, Chs. 30-31).[30] Of greatest interest, however, is another letter of Donne's, probably to Wotton (1600), where he writes that "words seald up in letters be like words spoken in those frosty

[28]See notes 6 and 16.

[29]Simpson (1948), pp. 149-58.

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 319.

places where they are not heard till y^e^ next thaw...." (Book Four, Chs. 55-56, cf. ll. 11-13 in the present poem).[31]

In summary, the enigma presented by the spelling of the name offers two possible solutions. Either there was a poet named John Dones of whom there is no other record; who could write a poem with such style and language, of such merit, as to be taken for Donne's by leading Donne scholars; who uses rhetorical devices characteristic of Donne; who was a knowledgeable admirer of Rabelais, as was Donne; and who was an associate of Thomas Coryate, as was Donne. Or "Loe her's a Man" was written by Donne.

Accepting that the poem is by Donne nonetheless leaves open questions regarding the spelling of the name and the placement of the poem relative to the other pieces Donne contributed to *Coryats Crudities*. It appears that "Loe her's a Man" was lost to the canon by accident, slipping through the cracks (as it were) when Grierson prepared his revised edition of the *Poems* in 1929. Perhaps the spelling of the name and the placement of the poem are likewise the result of accident–a smudged manuscript, a misread text, a compositor's error. Perhaps it was intentional, a play upon 'Dunce' by either Coryate or Donne himself, the wittiness of the wordplay now dimmed by the passage of time and the loss of context. What is clear, however, is that a secure attribution of "Loe her's a Man" to Donne does not require an antecedent resolution of these riddles. The honor of discovering "Loe her's a Man" goes to E.K. Chambers. The present essay has undertaken the lesser task of rediscovering this pleasant occasional verse and restoring it to the Donne canon.

St. Thomas University

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 310.