John Donne Journal
Vol. 22 (2003)

Donne and Andrewes

Peter McCullough

As exciting as it might be to prove points of biographical contact, indeed of literary or theological influence, between the two greatest preachers in early modern England, it must be stated at the outset that the surviving evidence shows that a rather large, if respectful, distance separated Lancelot Andrewes (1555 - 1626) and John Donne (1572 - 1631) in the fifty-four years that their lives overlapped. Yet the two men, or rather their works, have been involved ever since the mid-seventeenth-century in a complex relationship of mutual posthumous influence. The common instinct to compare, if only to contrast, the two preachers is the product of political, religious, and literary-critical programs that have used the two men's works and reputations for ends that they themselves might barely recognize, much less perhaps approve of. Andrewes and Donne are in so many crucial ways–generation, churchmanship, prose style–so different as to be compared perhaps only insofar as the proverbial apple and orange. Certainly much more productive work on similarities should be carried out by comparing not Donne and Andrewes, but Donne and Hugh Latimer, Donne and Hooker, Donne and Hall, or Donne and the Kings (the father and son bishops, John and Henry). But, the habit of linking Donne and Andrewes has such a long pedigree, that the phenomenon in itself deserves fresh scrutiny here: first a survey of the factual biographical grounds for considering the two together, then the bibliographical politics of the 1620's and '30's that began to force them into an unnatural proximity, and finally, the perhaps

much more productive use of the two in the recent, but long overdue, work of assessing Donne's churchmanship, with particular reference to the relative places in it of preaching and the eucharist as conduits of divine grace.

Exercising one's historical imagination on the prospect of Donne and Andrewes simultaneously inhabiting early modern London is rather like the tantalizing prospect that confronts music historians imagining the careers of Palestrina and Victoria in early seventeenth-century Rome. Working only a few churches away from one another, it seems impossible that each was not aware of the brilliance of the other's triumphs in Renaissance choral composing. But maddeningly, there is not a shred of evidence to prove that they ever even laid eyes on one another. The same is almost true of Donne and Andrewes. Taking the historian's mantra of "chronology, chronology, chronology" is of some use as a starting point for understanding this almost unbelievable near-miss, for there is to begin with an easily forgotten generation gap between the two men. In 1572, the year of Donne's birth in Bread Street, the academic prodigy Lancelot Andrewes was already in his second year of university, having left his home at the opposite end of the City (on Tower Hill) the year before, when he matriculated at Pembroke Hall Cambridge with his classmate from Merchant Taylors' School, Edmund Spenser.[1] Donne's and Andrewes's youths, at least educationally, could hardly have been more different. Andrewes was trained-up under the humanist pedagogue

[1]Unless otherwise noted, basic biographical information on Donne is taken from the summary chronology in R. C. Bald, *John Donne, A Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 537-46. For Andrewes, the most reliable outline is still *The Dictionary of National Biography*, used here unless otherwise noted. Factually reliable, but interpretatively less so, is Paul A. Welsby, *Lancelot Andrewes: 1555-1626* (London: SPCK, 1958). These will soon be replaced or supplemented by Peter McCullough in the new entry for Andrewes in *The New Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, forthcoming 2004), and *Lancelot Andrewes, A Life* (Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

Richard Mulcaster at his pace-setting new grammar school through the munificence of the family's neighbour and Lancelot's patron, Sir Francis Walsingham, that scourge of Elizabethan papists.[2] Donne however, was educated privately by the same seminary priests hounded so relentlessly by Walsingham. Andrewes proceeded through the honours conventionally afforded academic brilliance at Cambridge, including in 1576 a fellowship at age 21 and a succession of College offices culminating in the mastership in 1589, with time out for ordination in Chester and service to the Lord President of the North in the early 1580's in preaching campaigns against recusancy.[3] Meanwhile, as a recusant himself, Donne dodged loyalty oaths by studying on the institutional margins of both Oxford and Cambridge. It is to Donne's presumed two or three years in Cambridge, *ca.* 1588-90, that we should date the first likely contact, however distant, between Andrewes and Donne, who were then, respectively, a 33 year-old leading academic theologian poised on the verge of a dazzling career in the church, and a sixteen-year old rakish wit of dubious religious affiliation, wide but extracurricular reading, and deeply uncertain career prospects. It is from this distance that Donne probably formed his mental image of Andrewes as one of the "two reverend men / Of our two Academies" nominated by the speaker of Satire IV as the "best linguist[s]" in Europe, and identified as Andrewes and John Rainolds in a marginal

[2]Sir John Harington, *A Supplie or Addicion to the Catalogue of Bishops*, ed. R. H. Miller (Potomac, Maryland: José Porrúú Turanzas S.A., 1979), p. 138.

[3]Andrewes was ordained by bishop of Chester William Chaderton 11 June, 1580 (Chester Record Office MS EDA 1/3 fo. 25v). I am grateful to Ken Fincham for this reference.

annotation in the Dobell Manuscript.[4] This is the only known reference by John Donne to Lancelot Andrewes, and is precisely one more than exists by Andrewes to Donne.

Donne and Andrewes both removed from Cambridge to London at roughly the same time, Andrewes to take his first benefices, as Vicar of St Giles Cripplegate and residentiary canon of St Paul's in 1589, and Donne to join Lincoln's Inn in 1592, and it is in this period that I want to draw speculative attention to the likely further awareness of Andrewes by Donne. Obscured by Andrewes's more well-known episcopal career after 1605 is the fact that he was a legendary pastor at St Giles' and St Paul's in the 1590s. Resident in his prebend's house in Creed Lane adjoining St Paul's during term-time, he preached assiduously at both church and cathedral, was admired for reviving the practice of auricular confession in St Paul's during Lent, became well-known for his ministry to the poor, and composed a manual of prayers for use during his routine rounds of visiting the sick and dying in his sprawling, economically mixed extramural parish, which included in its bounds the theatre district of the northern liberties.[5] Committed to preaching, he nonetheless did so in a startlingly new way: he denounced the cult of the sermon itself, lamented the

---

[4]John Donne, *Satyre IV*, ll. 56-7, in *Complete English Poems*, ed. C.A. Patrides, 2nd ed. (London: J. M. Dent, 1994). (Subsequent references to Donne's poetry will be from this edition.) The manuscript annotation was first noted by Evelyn Simpson, "Notes on Donne," *Review of English Studies* 20 (1944):224-27. The identification of Andrewes and Rainolds (President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford) has been accepted by subsequent editors, including W. Milgate, *The Satires, Epigrams and Verse Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 153.

[5]Henry Isaacson, *The Life and Death of...Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1650), repr. in J. P. Wilson and James Bliss, eds., *The Works of Lancelot Andrewes*, 11 vols., The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1840-54), XI, viii; Harington, *Supplie or Addicion*, p. 140; R[ichard]. D[rake]., ed., *A Manual of Directions for the Sick..of...Lancelot Andrews* (London, 1648), sig. A4v-A5r.

decay of ancient charities, stridently insisted on the necessity, even hinting at the efficacy, of good works as part of a sustained rear-guard critique of predestinarianism, instituted the parochially unheard of practice of monthly communions, and, as I will discuss later, preached a eucharistic theology at odds with the 39 Articles.[6] Even more important from a literary point of view, he did this all in a dazzling, arch, pointed prose style for which there was no precedent in English pulpit prose.[7] And this combination of both avant-garde style and content made him the darling of the bohemian literati of the early to mid-1590's, that group of retro-conservative, puritan-hating, over-educated, unemployed but aspirant men who had been employed by Andrewes's bosom friend Richard Bancroft as hack-writers in the Marprelate Controversy. In 1596, the demotic Thomas Nashe, no less, in his character-assassination of Andrewes's pedantic colleague at Pembroke, Gabriel Harvey, professed that by virtue of his playwright friend John Lyly's "immoderate commending him, by little and little I was drawne on to bee an Auditor of his: since when, whensoever I heard him, I thought it was but hard and scant allowance that was giu'n him, in comparison of the incomparable gifts that were in

---

[6]Representative examples of Andrewes's early anti-puritanism and avant-garde emphasis on good works are his 1588 Spital sermon, and the 1592 St Giles's lecture known subsequently as "Of the Worshipping of Imaginations," *XCVI Sermons*, Part II, pp. 1-38. For his communion practice and an outstanding overview of his St Giles's ministry, see Nicholas Tyacke, "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism," in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 200), pp. 5-33.

[7]The best study of Andrewes's style in historical context is still George Williamson, *The Senecan Amble: Prose Form from Bacon to Collier* (Chicago: U. of Chicago P., 1951), ch. 8. See also the lapidary essay in Brian Vickers, ed., *Seventeenth Century Prose* (London: Longman, 1969), pp. 70-75.

him."[8] It seems inconceivable that a literary magpie as energetic as Donne was while at Lincoln's Inn at this time did not make the effort to sample Andrewes's fare. And there are glimpses in Andrewes's lectures that he knew that he had in his auditories literary libertines like the Inns-men who spent their time seeing who could outdo one another in things like versified misogyny, as when in a 1591 sermon on Eve at St Paul's he warned,

> God knew that many speeches and reproaches would arise among men against this work which God had in hand, of making Woman. Some by way of juest and merriment to disgrace that sex, and others in contempt to dispraise them, calling them necessarie evills; therefore God saw it needfull to expresse the absolute good which cometh to Man by Woman...for seeing we cannot deny, but that God that doth best know what we want and what is good, doth affirm that it is good for us to have *Eve* made, and that it were evill for us to be alone without her, therefore that we presume not foolishly in jest nor earnest to contradict and crosse Gods will."[9]

He obviously saw coming lines like "For if it be a shee / Nature beforehand hath out-cursed me."[10]

Later Donne's path must have crossed Andrewes's, again in Cambridge, and again probably at some distance, at a crucial stage in Donne's clerical advancement. Having been ordained in January 1615, Donne attended, probably as a newly-sworn royal chaplain,

---

[8]Thomas Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, in R. B. McKerrow, ed., *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, rev. ed. F. P. Wilson, 5 vols. (London: Blackwell's, 1958), III, 105, 107.

[9]Lancelot Andrewes, *A••••AMATIA SACRA: OR A Collection of posthumous and orphan LECTURES: Delivered at St. PAULS and St. GILES his Church* (London, 1657), p. 198.

[10]Donne, 'The Curse', ll. 31-2.

the king's progress to Cambridge in March and was in keen expectation of an honorary D.D. As we know from Chamberlain, the University resented the royal arm-twisting in favour of Donne, and initially refused. Donne lingered after the royal entourage had departed and did leave a few days later with the degree in hand, albeit forced out of the Vice-Chancellor by royal mandate. Senior among the clerics in that royal entourage was Andrewes, who as a former head of house, and now as bishop of Ely and therefore visitor of three Cambridge colleges, must have at least been in on the gossip about the DD for the latest pet royal chaplain, if not involved more directly in the debate about his degree. But whether he sided with his university colleagues, or pressed the king's case for Donne is entirely unknown.[11]

It should be pointed out that, although there is no clear record of Andrewes ever making reference to Donne in print or pulpit, there may be an oblique allusion by Andrewes to Donne's contribution to the Oath of Allegiance controversy, *Pseudo-Martyr*, published in January 1610. In his Gowry Anniversary sermon for the same year–essentially a witty vernacular precis of his on-going print battle with Cardinal Bellarmine–Andrewes, glossing the Old Testament injunction "Touch not mine anointed" (1 Chron. 16.22), laments that "[it is] to our shame, that heathen men, and Idolaters were kept from it [regicide] by this charge, and now (I will not say) Christians, but holy religious men, Friers, and Priests, yea, and martyrs forsooth, will not be held in by it, but they will be *touching*." Andrewes certainly steeped himself in all of the major contributions to the Controversy, of which Donne's was recognized as a leading vernacular example, so Andrewes's "martyrs forsooth" may be a polite acknowledgement of *Pseudo-martyr*, although the lines of influence are further clouded by James having deployed the pseudo-martyrological argument (possibly from Donne?) in his speech to Parliament in March: "the wilfulnesse of their humors...makes them to take a pride boldly to endure any

[11]Bald, *Donne*, pp. 306-8.

torments, or death it selfe, to gaine thereby the reputation of Martyrdome, though but in a false shadow."[12]

Proof of the wishful literary historical instinct that there should have been contact between these two at least after Donne's ordination is found in Edmund Gosse's delightful red herring that made Andrewes Donne's "friend" by assuming that the latter's Latin verse epistle to "Dr Andrews" was addressed to the bishop in apology for one of the Donne sproglets having trashed a book borrowed from the episcopal library. Although this Andrews was shown years ago to have been an Oxford medical doctor, the misidentification has persisted as late as Keynes' bibliography.[13] But if Donne and Andrewes were not on book-borrowing terms, there must have at least been mutual awareness of one another. As a royal chaplain, Donne must have taken the court pulpit at least on occasion in the presence of Andrewes who was Lord Almoner (1606 - 20) and later Dean of the Chapel Royal (1618 - 25); Donne's regular month of attendance, April, would also almost guarantee his attendance at Andrewes's Easter day sermons, and probably explains why it was Donne who, on very short notice, took Andrewes's place in the pulpit at Whitehall on Easter Day 1619 when Andrewes had been hastily summoned on Good Friday to travel to Newmarket to deliver his Easter sermon to the dangerously ill king there. But since royal chaplains were answerable administratively to the Lord Chamberlain, even after Andrewes's appointment as Dean of the Chapel Royal in 1618,

---

[12]Andrewes, *A Sermon...the fifth of August last, at Holdenbie* (1610), sig. G2r; King James VI & I, *The Kings Maiesties Speech...the xxj. of March* (1610), sig. G4r. For this sermon, see the text and commentary in Peter McCullough, ed., *Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Sermons* (Oxford, forthcoming 2004).

[13]Edmund Gosse, *The Life and Letters of John Donne*, 2 vols. (London, 1899), I, 187; Herbert H J C Grierson, "A Spirit of Conflict," *Spectator* 170 (1943), p. 293; G. Keynes, *A Bibliography of John Donne*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 200.

there would have been little institutional reason for contact between the two men even at court.[14] Only with Donne's promotion to the deanery of St Paul's in 1621 did he even begin to approach the circles in which Andrewes had been moving for almost forty years; both now sat *ex officio* on the Court of High Commission, and the two men adjudicated at least two cases together in the Court of Delegates.[15] But just as Donne's star began to rise, Andrewes's began to set. The bishop's health began to fail from early in 1625. There was to be no cadaverous delivery of his own funeral sermon by Andrewes; he preached for what would be the last time at court on Christmas Day 1624. The following March he was too ill to heed James's call for him to attend at his deathbed, and Andrewes himself died at his episcopal palace in Southwark on 26 September 1626.

Donne scholars hardly need be told that posthumous reputation and hagiography can obscure the life of a biographical subject. But due to the unusually large number of Donne's surviving letters that made Gosse's two volumes possible, Donne's biography has always been on a much surer footing that Andrewes's. And, even against the weight of Walton's sentimentalizing piety, Donne has had the benefit of being known for a body of secular poetry which has trained on him less sectarian literary-biographical attention. Andrewes, however, has been known since his death almost exclusively through religious works in religious genres that have stood metonymically for the man. Those were a collection of

---

[14]For court preaching and chaplains' rotas see Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Religion and Politics in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), and "Donne as Preacher at Court: Precarious 'Inthronization'" in David Colclough, ed., *John Donne's Professional Lives* (Woodbridge: Brewe, 2003), pp. 179-206. For the Andrewes-Donne switch on Easter Day 1619, see entry for 28 March 1619 in "A Calendar of Sermons Preached at Court," in McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, appendix on diskette.

[15]Bald, *Donne*, p. 415.

English sermons and miscellaneous Latin controversial works edited by William Laud and his associate John Buckeridge and two devotional manuals edited by strident keepers of the Laudian flame during the Interregnum.[16] The conclusion of the poem that graces the engraved portrait of Andrewes that prefaces Laud's edition of Andrewes' sermons, a poem specially commissioned in 1631 from a young Laudian acolyte at Cambridge named Richard Crashaw, was prophetic in its insistence that Andrewes would live in the Laudian editions of him: "*If you think / 'Tis but a* dead face *Art doth heer bequeath / Look on the following leaues & see him* breath."[17] This was the beginning of four hundred years of holding Andrewes hostage, bibliographically, to a succession of sectarianisms: first Laudianism, then the Tractarianism of the Oxford Movement, which reincarnated the Laudian texts in The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, and finally T. S. Eliot's anglo-catholic royalism, as he himself defined it when he made Andrewes the eponymous poster-boy for his collection of essays, *For Lancelot Andrewes* in 1928.[18] It has taken the refreshingly brusque historiographical visitation of historians like Peter Lake and Nicholas Tyacke, and the incisive literary criticism of Deborah Shuger finally to show the way behind a very limiting and ahistorical anglo-catholic hagiography to a no doubt pious man, but one who was an avant-garde political and religious animal and

---

[16]Andrewes, ed. Laud and Buckeridge, *XCVI Sermons*; and *Opuscula Posthuma* (both 1629); Andrewes, ed. Richard Drake, *A Manual of Directions for the Sick*; and *A Manual of Private Devotions* (both 1648). These are reprinted in *Works*, ed. Bliss, vols. I - V and XI, respectively.

[17]The poem is unattributed in the engraving, but appears in several early manuscript collections of Crashaw's verse as well as the *editio princeps* (1648) with the title "Upon Bishop Andrewes' Picture." See *The Poems...of Richard Crashaw*, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), pp. 163-64.

[18]"The general point of view may be described as classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion." T. S. Eliot, preface to *For Lancelot Andrewes* (London, Faber & Gwyer [1928]), p. ix.

anything but the epitome of conformity and orthodoxy in the pre-Civil War Church of England.[19]

The parlous state of most Andrewes scholarship before 1990, especially the lack of a scholarly biography, has resulted in the unfortunate survival of some old-fashioned sentiments, if not downright errors, about Andrewes in recent scholarship on Donne. The most recent exercise in the Andrewes-Donne set-piece genre is in David L. Edwards' 2001 literary biography, *John Donne: Man of Flesh and Spirit*. Although sometimes less than satisfying on the poetry, this book contains some of the best treatments of Donne as a preacher to emerge recently, and it is a particularly salutary antidote for the misunderstandings and misrepresentations of religion in John Carey's *John Donne: Life Mind and Art* (1981, new ed. 1990). Andrewes is obviously not Edwards' subject, so it is perhaps unfair to expect fresh research to inform his comparison of Donne to Andrewes. And given that Edwards is the former Provost of Southwark (Anglican) Cathedral, where Andrewes' tomb is a place of anglo-catholic pilgrimage, it is perhaps not surprising to find Andrewes invoked by him as "a personality...unified and beautiful in its holiness," epitomized by the tear-stained copy of the *Preces Privatae*, "a treasure of Anglican spirituality," that was bequeathed, relic-like to William Laud. For some the *Preces* are a treasure, but the terms used here shroud Andrewes in a cloud of incense. Edwards also misleadingly characterizes Andrewes as an ineffective diocesan, which suggests the lingering influence of the late Trevor-Roper's 1955 essay on the Jacobean episcopate, a piece thoroughly overturned by Ken

[19]Peter Lake, "Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-garde Conformity at the Court of James I," in Linda Levy Peck, ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 113-33; Tyacke, "Lancelot Andrewes"; Debora Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, & the Dominant Culture* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), ch. 1.

Fincham's magisterial *Prelate as Pastor* (1990), where Andrewes emerges as the *consummatum est* of episcopal efficiency. Much more regrettable when comparing Donne and Andrewes, though, is Edwards's inference that Andrewes disregarded preaching, especially the kind of practical divinity that was the staple of most early modern preaching.[20] Andrewes cannot be understood as a non-preaching cleric, or as not pastorally minded. To be blunt, his parochial and prebendal ministries at St Giles's and St Paul's in the 1590's put Donne's efforts in the same arenas in a long, dark shadow. The picture of Andrewes as an aloof, court-centred disciplinarian is the distorted legacy of Laud's edition of *XCVI Sermons* which, for ideological reasons, showcased only Andrewes the bishop and court preacher for great ceremonial feast days.[21] On the evidence only of *XCVI Sermons*, 92 of which are solemn court sermons, it might be understandable to conclude with Daniel Doerksen that Andrewes is less concerned than Donne with sermons that "[bear] on the experience of living."[22] But for this sort of pastoral preaching by Andrewes, one needs to go to the huge body of lectures and sermons preached in Cambridge, St Giles's, and St Paul's that Laud both ignored and actively tried to suppress, and which only saw the light of day after the collapse of Laudian print controls in 1641: a folio of catechetical lectures on the Ten Commandments, a folio of two and three-year long lecture cycles on Genesis and the epistles of Peter, and octavo editions of lecture series on the Lord's Prayer, and on the Temptation of Christ in the

---

[20]David L. Edwards, *John Donne: Man of Flesh and Spirit* (London: Continuum, 2001), pp. 113-14.

[21]For a much fuller treatment of the ideology and influence of the Laudian editions of Andrewes, see Peter McCullough, "Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626 - 1642," *Historical Journal* 41.2 (1998): 401-24.

[22]Daniel Doerkson, *Conforming to the Word: Herbert, Donne, and the English Church before Laud* (London: Associated University Presses, 1997), p. 112.

Wilderness, works which triple the size of the Andrewes bibliography and prove him not just an assiduous pastoral preacher, but the practitioner of a genre, the lecture series, far more associated with evangelical practical divinity than anything Donne ever produced.[23]

Comparison of Donne's and Andrewes's preaching patterns prompts some further reflection about the two men as pastors. Just as Donne was unmistakably a coterie poet, comparing him to Andrewes suggests that he might also be called a coterie pastor.[24] Acknowledging his commitment to evangelical preaching in principle, Donne can still be seen as a minister who channelled that commitment most energetically toward a closed circle of friends and institutions, a minister far more enmeshed in a network of cliquish patronage and clientage than Andrewes. Donne was of course nudged into ordination itself by great patrons, King James obviously, as well as Lord Hay; the deed itself was done at the hands of his Egerton House associate John King; he was a royal chaplain almost a year before beginning service as a parish priest (something almost entirely without precedent); his first parochial benefices, when they came, were country sinecures

[23]Andrewes's Elizabethan sermons have a very complex bibliography; for an overview, see McCullough, "Making Dead Men Speak," esp. pp. 403-4, 419-22. An inferior edition of the Cambridge lectures on the Commandments, *A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine*, was reproduced as the sixth volume of Wilson and Bliss, eds., *Works* (1846). The lectures on Genesis and the epistles are in *A••••AMATIA SACRA* and have never been reprinted. *Scala Coeli, Nineteene Sermons Concerning Prayer* (London, 1611; anr. ed. 1641) and *The Wonderfvll Combate...Sermons, vpon the Temptations of* CHRIST (London, 1592; anr. ed. 1627) are included in Wilson and Bliss, eds., *Works*, vol. V.

[24]Compare, of course, Arthur Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986).

that held little attraction for him other than their income.[25] Donne's pastoral enthusiasm seems first to have been satisfied by appointment as Reader to his old society of Lincoln's Inn (October 1616); and the large number of sermons preached by invitation to Donne's friends and patrons among the upper gentry and nobility–Doncaster, Dorset, Bridgwater, Montgomery, Herbert-Danvers, Nethersole–suggests not only amity and clientage, but also the sort of elite lay-patronage of godly preachers that was characteristic of fashionable evangelicalism, or even nonconformity (Stephen Egerton at Blackfriars and Donne's successor at Lincoln's Inn, John Preston, come immediately to mind).[26] This is not to discount the obvious affinity for the people of London that Donne showed as dean of their cathedral, nor to ignore his dutiful administrative and preaching commitment to St Dunstan's-in-the-West, but there remains a sense of selectivity and exclusivity to Donne's career and ministry, especially when compared to Andrewes's, which was far more independent and promiscuous, if that word can be used in a positive sense. Andrewes owed his first preferments to Walsingham, but those were gifts given in recognition of Andrewes's learning and proven skills as a preacher, even after the two men had agreed to disagree over what Sir John Harington called the "Statepoints of Puritanisme" which

[25]Of the over one-hundred royal chaplains appointed by James I, only James Montagu had never held a parochial benefice, having been plucked from the mastership of Sidney-Sussex College to fill the revived office of Dean of the Chapel Royal by Whitgift and Bancroft. See McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, pp. 107-8.

[26]Also suggestive of Donne as the author of sermons as well as of poetry which circulated among a private coterie is the unusually large number of contemporary manuscripts of his sermons that survive, several of which were used explicitly as tokens or gifts in coterie manuscript transactions. See Bald, *Donne*, pp. 373-74; and George Potter and Evelyn Simpson, eds., *The Sermons of John Donne*, 10 vols. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1953 - 62), 2: 25, n.54, and 179.

Walsingham had mistakenly assumed that Andrewes would promulgate for him.[27] Similarly, Andrewes refused two bishoprics from Elizabeth, making no secret of his disgust that they were offered only on condition of the alienation of church lands. There is no evidence to contradict Buckeridge's funeral sermon judgement that Andrewes received his preferments "without all ambition or suite of his owne: GOD turning the hearts of his friends to promote him for his great worth."[28]

But perhaps few things epitomize better the difference in the two men's pastoral characteristics than their wills.[29] Immediately after his preamble, Donne's first priority is to dispose of his remarkable collection of paintings, the recipients of which constitute a roll-call of the same elite coterie to whom he had privately preached; next come bequests to his household servants and cathedral staff and instructions for certain of his furnishings to remain in the deanery; and then the careful arrangements for maintenance of his mother and children, which included selling-off his books for investment capital. By the standards of elite wills for the period this is an incredibly close, or closed, circle of benevolence. Most striking, especially for a Londoner, is the total absence of legacies to charitable foundations. Donne does make small *pro forma* bequests to the poor of the parishes of which he was incumbent, but it is a far cry from the more outward-looking charity even of his father's 1575 will which left the comparatively huge sum of £300 pounds for poor relief, and specific named

---

[27]Harington, *Supplie or Addicion*, p. 139.

[28]Isaacson, *Life and Death*, in Bliss, ed., *Works*, XI, p. xxvii; John Buckeridge, *A Sermon Preached at the Funerall of...Lancelot Late Lord Bishop of Winchester* (hereafter, *Funeral Sermon*), appended to *XCVI Sermons*, p. 19.

[29]Donne's will is reproduced in Bald, *Donne*, pp. 563-67; Andrewes's is in Bliss, ed., *Works*, vol. XI, pp. c - cxix (however, I quote from the original probate copy, Public Record Office PROB 11/150, ff. 1r - 4v; and PROB 11/151 ff. 184r-v, 193v - 195v.)

bequests to all of the "prisons in london and the suburbes thereof," and to "the poore people harboured in the hospitalls of Christe Churche, St bartholomews Bridwell and Saint Thomas in Southwark."[30] In their wills, Donne, father and son, confirm the most recent work by Ian Archer on charitable giving in early modern London, which saw an increase in testamentary bequests to charities in the early reformation period peaking in the 1570s that then declined steadily through to the eighteenth-century.[31] Is this further evidence that Donne had become a good middle-class London protestant, comfortably off and looking after his own, and increasingly content to let government rates and City institutions provide for the needy? But of less interest than the political economics of Donne's will is what it implies about his conception of ministerial vocation. His will, like his deathbed, seems troublingly self-regarding. Contrast Andrewes, whose benefactions drawn-up four years before John Donne's more closely resemble Donne's father's of 1575: after allowing six hundred pounds to be in a "solemn manner buried," he charged that the remainder "bee bestowed in workes of charitie & noe otherwise." First remembered were poor men to attend his funeral in number equal to his age at death selected from the five London parishes in which he had resided since birth. They were to receive a full suit of cassock, breeches, stockings, shoes, and hat, "not as the manner is each a gown." Next Andrewes left to Pembroke Hall endowment for two fellowships, and a set of silver duplicating that given by its foundress. A codicil set out an elaborate endowment for poor relief: two thousand pounds were to be invested for the support of men unable to work, for orphans "such as goe vp and downe in the

---

[30]The will of Donne's father, also John, is reproduced in Bald, *Life*, pp. 560-62.

[31]Ian Archer, "The Charity of Early Modern Londoners," paper presented at the University of Sunderland, 19 October 2001; forthcoming in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (2003). I am very grateful to Dr Archer for sharing this working progress.

Streets...to binde and place them forth apprentices," for widows who had had only one husband, and for prisoners in Southwark (instead of London, he specified, "where there are a great number of more wealthy persons hable to relieve"). Then bequests to every known member of his extended family, to the son of his teacher Mulcaster, his godsons, his household servants, every London hospital and prison, and the poor of his former parochial and cathedral churches. His entire library was left to Pembroke, where the bulk remains. There is here almost no trace of a coterie of patrons, clients, or friends, the anonymous poor and future scholars receiving the lion's share of the bequests.[32]

I have already alluded to the influence upon Andrewes' reputation exercised by his posthumous editors Laud and Buckeridge in their production of the folio *XCVI Sermons*, and need to sketch briefly some further characteristics of that edition to carry the argument forward into the perhaps less speculative territory of Andrewes's posthumous influence on Donne. As I have shown elsewhere, *XCVI Sermons* was a revolutionary way of presenting the collected sermons of an English preacher in print.[33] In the first instance, it was the first such collection published in

[32]The are also no pictures. What might seem a purely coincidental contrast with Donne is made more intriguing by Buckeridge's observation that "as if [Andrewes] had made *Master Mulcaster* his Tutor or superviser, he placed his picture over the doore of his Studie: whereas in all the rest of the house, you could scantly see a picture" (*Funeral Sermon*, p. 18). The singular pride of place of his schoolmaster from Merchant Taylors' not only epitomizes Andrewes's academic asceticism, just as Donne's collection of religious oils suggests Continental sensuousness, but also reveals crucial differences in the two mens'attitudes to word and image which deserve further study. For Andrewes's library, see D. D. C. Chambers, "A Catalogue of the Library of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 5 (1969-71): 99-121.

[33]For a much fuller discussion, see McCullough, "Making Dead Men Speak."

folio, and for the sermon should carry the same significance that we attach to the Jonson and Shakespeare folios. Even more significantly, Laud and Buckeridge took the unprecedented step of arranging the sermons of a contemporary preacher not chronologically or by place of preaching, as was conventional, but liturgically, grouped in sections with their own half-title pages for Christmas, Ash Wednesday, Lent, Easter, Whitsun, Gowry, and Gunpowder (that peculiarly Stuart liturgical year). This, as well as the sum total in roman numerals used as the title, was an innovation that deliberately imitated the canons of collected sermons by the greatest patristic authors–the argument was thus being made bibliographically by Laud and Buckeridge that Andrewes was a latter-day father of a refurbished, liturgically-orientated Church of England. It also served as a witty Laudian appropriation of the priority given to preaching over the liturgy by the mainstream early Stuart church: *XCVI Sermons* says boldly, "You want sermons? Then here you have them, as good as they get, but inscribed and proscribed in their proper place within the liturgy." This liturgical arrangement and numerical titling was imitated thereafter so regularly as to become the norm for establishment sermon bibliography.

And the first to replicate the Laudian Andrewes prototype, was John Donne, Jr., with publication of his father's *LXXX Sermons* in 1640. Like the Andrewes edition, the project had royal backing, and both volumes were dedicated to King Charles. But Laud had a hand in the Donne folio as well. The public face put on the matter by Donne, Jr., was all sweetness and light, where in the preface he acknowledged Laud as the source of "*the encouragement I have had to give it this light.*"[34] But from a statement by Donne written in the early 1640's we know that the light shone by Laud on the project was a rather harsh glare, afforced by the stare of his licensing chaplains: "I had in my proceedings with the Bysshop of

[34]John Donne, *LXXX Sermons,* ed. John Donne, Jr. (London, 1640), sig. A3v.

Canterburies Chaplaines, (who were to license them), manie disputes, thay offeringe to expunge manie things, which hee openly preached, and, in the Bysshops hearinge, withoute anie dispute, all his lyfetime: by which meanes I soe farr incurred the Bysshops displeasure, that hee thrice put mee by the Cannonry, which was my promissed rewarde, both by the Kinge and himselfe."[35] Kenneth Fincham has discovered further evidence that Donne, Jr., may have tried to avoid Laud's censorship by publishing his father's sermons in Oxford. In a statement dated 26 September 1638, he claimed that upon presentation of some of the sermons to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, Accepted Frewen, the latter (Laud's appointee) demanded to know whether they had been vetted by the licensing chaplains of either Laud or Bishop of London William Juxon. Donne, Jr., said that they had not been, and they were then read by William Strode, chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, Richard Corbett, who judged them as being faithful to the "catholic faith according to the Church of England" ("fidei catholicae vel ecclesiae Anglicanae").[36] What Laud might have tried to keep out of an edition of Donne should be the topic of another study, so here I want only to suggest that one sop that Donne, Jr., clearly offered to the antagonistic Laud (perhaps, of course, under pressure) was the compliment of packaging his father's sermons in exactly the same format that Laud had chosen for Andrewes. For in *LXXX Sermons* we have the engraved frontispiece, the dedication to the king, the first appearance of Walton's "Life" (as the cognate for Buckeridge's eulogistic funeral

[35]Folger Shakespeare Library MS. V. b.201, printed in Bald, *Donne*, pp. 575-77.

[36]Magdalen College Oxford, MS 281 no. 25. I am very grateful to Dr Fincham for this reference. Frewen was Vice-Chancellor for the academic year 1638-39, which fixes very tightly the date of Donne, Jr's, presumed first presentation of the sermons for publication. Corbett contributed an elegy on Donne for the 1633 *Poems*, and Donne, Jr, was later to edit Corbett's poems (Bald, *Donne*, p. 550).

sermon for Andrewes that concludes *XCVI Sermons*), and, crucially, the same liturgical arrangement of the sermons.[37]

LXXX Sermons is *Son of XCVI Sermons*, we might say, but the family resemblance is only skin-deep. The relationship between the presentation and contents of these two folios deserves much fuller study; but here touching only the beginnings of them–liturgically, of course, meaning Christmas–will have to suffice. Dayton Haskin has already made some fascinating observations and indeed complaints about the attention afforded Donne's Christmas sermons after Potter and Simpson's reordering of the texts from all three folios into a chronological sequence. But we are on the wrong track to think, with Haskin, that these are given "pride of place" in the first folio because of any particular literary or thematic merit judged by the editor, Donne Jr, or any relative importance attached to them by the preacher.[38] They are in fact simply the sermons for the first major festival in the liturgical year, and are therefore first in the folio. But Haskin is certainly right to point to how ill-suited the sermons' contents are for the liturgical packaging of *LXXX Sermons*. The folio arrangement and half-title page heralds the major festival of the Nativity, while the contents of the sermons push in exactly the opposite direction, away from conventional Christmas texts, themes, and sentiments, pointedly avoiding the "politics of mirth" and joy. In Haskin's astute judgement, Donne "never talked about any ways of celebrating Christmas besides those that involved prayer and meditation." He even ventures that "in this sense he gave no solace to the vigorous supporters of the *Book of Sports*" (p. 142). In sharp contrast, both Andrewes's

---

[37]*LXXX Sermons* is also a case of an exception proving the rule: the subsequent editions published by Donne, Jr. after Laud's demise, *Fifty Sermons* (1649) and *XXVI Sermons* (1661), return to conventional non-liturgical orderings such as occasion and place of preaching.

[38]Dayton Haskin, "John Donne and the Cultural Contradictions of Christmas," *John Donne Journal* 11.1-2 (1992), pp. 133-57. Subsequent references will appear in the text.

sermons and the first folio of them are the most strident manifestos for the politics and religion of mirth before Herrick.[39] But Donne simply was not a liturgical preacher, and his sermons sit uncomfortably in kalendrical groupings because of that.[40]

Haskin chastises the California editors for judging the Christmas sermons over-severely and by anachronistic standards of what a "Christmas" sermon should be, as in their representative judgement of one of them as "by no means a characteristic Christmas sermon" because Donne "regards Christ, not as the Babe of Bethlehem."[41] Such standards are, I would agree, the inheritance of the Victorian construction of a sentimentalized Christmas, but that inheritance is more from high Victorian anglo-catholicism than from Dickensian family holiday values, or the importation from Germany of customs like "decorating a

---

[39]Haskin aptly quotes (p. 142) Andrewes's call to Christmas sport and pastime in his 1609 Nativity sermon (*XCVI Sermons*, p. 31). Such quotations could be easily multiplied, but compare in particular his sermon for Gunpowder Day 1618 (*XCVI Sermons*, pp. 997-1008), a sustained defense of the church's power over "the making of a new *Holyday* (over and above those of GOD's in the *Law*)" (p. 997). Informing both my remarks and Haskin's here is, of course, Leah Marcus's seminal study, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Marvell, Milton and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago, 1986).

[40]Haskin wisely cautions that "not too much should be made...of the fact that Donne preached on Christmas Day: it was a requirement of his office as Dean of the Cathedral" (p. 142). I would refine the point by suggesting that some of Donne's *ex officio* feast day sermons appealed to him more than others. Whereas Donne seems to go out of his way to avoid preaching on liturgically appropriate texts for Christmas, he unfailingly does so on Whitsunday. I would venture that Pentecost's opportunity to extol divine inspiration and the gift of mighty tongues to preachers appealed infinitely more to Donne's sensibilities–and his preacherly ego–than the feast of the Incarnation.

[41]Haskin, "Christmas," p. 151, quoting Potter and Simpson, eds., *Sermons*, 8: 27.

tree...sending cards...and awaiting Father Christmas" (Haskin, p. 147). To anyone, like Potter and Simpson, who read early modern English Christmas sermons at the turn of the century, and especially after 1926, the fashionable standard for the "characteristic Christmas sermon" was undeniably set by Lancelot Andrewes in Victorian drag. Donne's first folio contained seven sermons on the Nativity; Andrewes's seventeen, and the topics and texts chosen by the latter would make any Christmas-card designer happy: the great Old Testament prophecies–"Unto us a child is born" (Is. 9.6); "Behold a Virgin shall conceive" (Is. 8.4); "And thou Bethlehem Ephrata" (Mic. 5.2)–the angels' annunciation to the shepherds (Luke 2.10), the Johannine *Verbum caro factum est* (Jo. 1.14), the Christmas Psalm "Mercy and Truth shall meet together" (Ps. 85.10), and, of course, the now famous two-sermon treatment of the "cold-coming" the Magi had of it (Matt. 2.1-2). The Victorians certainly approved. The nativity sermons occupied, by liturgical default, the first volume of the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology edition (1840), and were therefore the first to be promulgated in the Tractarian appropriation of Andrewes. In 1887, the heyday of late Victorian anglo-catholicism, they were published separately in a wholly new edition "in handy *Shilling Volumes*" for the pious laity's edification and as examplars for parish priests preparing their own Christmas sermons. The new volume appealed not only to the Victorian "Babe in Bethlehem" sentimentality so well reconstructed by Haskin, but were more specifically recommended by the obviously Tractarian editor because in them "the apprehension of [the Doctrine of the Incarnation], and the place in worship of the Blessed Eucharist, is particularly illustrated."[42] And lo and behold, this is the volume which T S Eliot had to hand and recommends to readers in the 1926 *TLS* article that would reappear as his influential essay

[42][ed. anon.], *Seventeen Sermons on the Nativity...by Lancelot Andrewes...A New Edition* (London: Griffith, Farrar, Okeden & Welsh, [1887]), p. vii.

"Lancelot Andrewes." In fact, his only quotations in it are from the Christmas sermons, and most of those from the 1620 Magi sermon from which he would also snip the opening lines of the 1929 poem "Journey of the Magi."[43] This, I think, would be the body of material that formed Potter and Simpson's views of what a Christmas sermon should be, and no wonder they found Donne's lacking by such standards. So with the help of William Laud, John Donne, Jr., and T.S. Eliot, it was Lancelot Andrewes, albeit posthumously, who cast the mould into which most of Donne's sermons were poured in 1640, and who has set standards for comparison and judgment of at least some of those sermons right through to a major twentieth-century university press edition.

But to mention Eliot is also to invoke the only begetter of the modern academic study of Andrewes, and, perhaps a less-obvious claim, it is to invoke if not the only begetter, then one of the early popularizers, of a particular strain of Donne sermon criticism. For Eliot in fact devotes half of his famous essay on Andrewes to Donne. It is in form akin to Dr Johnson's peroration to the *Life of Pope*, with its antithetical weighing-up of Pope and Dryden, although Eliot is far less charitable to one of his paired subjects than Johnson was. It appeared first as an unsigned article in the *TLS* on 23 September 1926; filling in that date above the essay's opening line–"The Right Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Bishop of Winchester, died on September 25, 1626" – reveals what has not before been noted, that the piece must have been run as a

[43]T S Eliot, "Lancelot Andrewes," in *Selected Essays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1932; New Ed. 1960), p. 304. Subsequent references will appear in the text. Eliot does here acknowledge the five volumes of sermons in *The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, but commends *Seventeen Sermons on the Nativity* as a "more easy" introduction. "Journey of the Magi," in Eliot, *Complete Poems and Plays 1909 - 1950* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1980), pp. 68-9, ll. 1-5 are a direct quotation from Andrewes's sermon for Christmas 1622 (*XCVI Sermons*, p. 143-44).

memorial for the tercentenary of Andrewes's death, which also accounts for the oddly funerary conclusion to its first paragraph: "Before attempting to remove the remains of his reputation to a last resting-place in the dreary cemetery of literature, it is desirable to remind the reader of Andrewes's position in history" (p. 299). But as Donne scholars will remember, the essay does more to put Donne on the ash heap than Andrewes. For therein we have one of the earliest examples in modern criticism of Donne as the untrustworthy egomaniac, insidiously presented with diction that contemptuously laces slurs against evangelical religious enthusiasm with insinuations of dirty sex and intellectual deficiency: "About Donne there hangs the shadow of the impure motive; and impure motives lend their aid to a facile success. He is a little of the religious spellbinder, the Reverend Billy Sunday of his time, the flesh-creeper, the sorcerer of emotional orgy." Few passages in Eliot capture better not the spirit of Donne, but Eliot's own fastidious, repressed anxieties about religion and sex camped-up as lofty critical judgment: "Donne had a trained mind; but without belittling the intensity or the profundity of his experience, we can suggest that this experience was not perfectly controlled, and that he lacked spiritual discipline." And immediately after that withering picture of religious and hinted sexual perversion, enter, not a knight in shining armour, but a bishop in shining mitre: "But Bishop Andrewes is one of the community of the born spiritual, one *che in questo mondo, / contemplando, gusto di quella pace.* Intellect and sensibility were in harmony; and hence arise the particular qualities of his style" (pp. 302-3). It remains an open question whether these views on Donne as preacher influenced later criticism. A reasonable untested assumption could be that he we have here the roots of the line of criticism that reaches its apogee in Carey's monster of apostasy and ambition, or even Deborah Shuger's similarly shaded view of the Donneian mix of power, devotion, and desire. But perhaps not surprisingly, the greater landmarks of Donne sermon scholarship ignore the piece entirely: neither Evelyn Simpson, Joan Webber, Shuger, nor Carey give it a

and image through which Donne combines positions and evades being pigeonholed. And we do ourselves a misservice if in trying to do historically-informed work on Donne we trade those skills at the door for the cruder confessional grids or taxonomies offered by historians: as Jeanne Shami and Joshua Scodel have shown, Donne himself spurned the mudslinging labels–like "Calvinist" and "Arminian"–that flew about in the church, and we should not lapse into using them either.[47] Donne constructed an almost unique brand of churchmanship for himself that sits uncomfortably within them, although constructed out of them.

Having promulgated a manifesto of historiographically and literarily nuanced close reading, space will allow neither here in turning to the question of the relative importance attached by Donne to preaching and the eucharist as a means of grace, the topic that seems most under scrutiny at the moment in the study of Donne's religion, and the one that makes the most use of Andrewes as a foil. Edwards, Shuger, and Doerkson, for example, have judged Donne less eucharistically focussed than Andrewes, and far more committed to the mainstream evangelical tradition of a sermon-centered piety.[48] In response, Jeffrey Johnson, in his welcome and long-needed overview of Donne's theology, argues that "Doerksen...overstates the case....the *Sermons* testify that the

---

[47]Jeanne Shami, "Donne on Discretion," *ELH* 47 (1980): 48-66; Joshua Scodel, "John Donne and the Religious Politics of the Mean," in Raymond-Jean Frontain and Frances M. Malpezzi, eds., *John Donne's Religious Imagination: Essays in Honor of John T. Shawcross* (Conway, Arkansas: University of Central Arkansas Press, 1995), pp. 45-80. Historians continue, of course, to offer salutary cautions to literary-critical enthusiams; cf. Johann P. Somerville's wrist-slapping of Annabel Patterson and David Norbrook for their forced attempts at making Donne into a republican *avant-la-lettre* in his "John Donne the Controversialist: the Poet as Political Thinker," in Colclough, ed., *Donne's Professional Lives*, pp. 73-96.

[48]Doerkson, *Conforming to the Word*, pp. 84-5, 94-5; Edwards, *John Donne*, pp. 113-14; Shuger, *Habits of Thought*, p. 208.

sacraments are for Donne equally essential. It is for him neither the one over the other, nor the one more than the other, but both together through which the visible Church receives the invisible grace of God." In support Johnson then quotes several assertions by Donne of the efficacy of both preaching and sacraments independently, and the Christian's need for both cooperatively.[49] But the question certainly is not whether Donne held that sacraments or sermons were efficacious. Andrewes, like Donne, periodically complained about the increasing habit of divines to pit the two against each another.[50] But, elsewhere in their sermons and in practice both men betray an instinctive as well as an articulated greater trust in one over the other. And here we must also attend to what preachers like this did not say, as much as to what they did. From that irenic middle ground of pleading for rapprochement between sermons and sacraments, Andrewes also emphatically and repeatedly lambasts spiritual reliance on over-frequent preaching, and calls explicitly for more frequent resort to communion; Donne on the other hand never offers extended satires against sermon-going, and does not commend the benefits of communion attendance beyond the statutory minimum of two major feast days. But this is not to say that Donne disregarded the efficacy of communion. A case in point is the *locus classicus* for most discussions of Donne's eucharistic theology, that is, Donne's cathedral sermon for Christmas 1626.[51] Donne's position there is, as Johnson and Theresa DiPasquale have shown, extremely high; it

[49]Jeffrey Johnson, *The Theology of John Donne* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1999), pp. 131-32.

[50]Doerkson, *Conforming to the Word*, p. 90, assembles a small florilegium of Andrewes's remarks on the subject.

[51]Potter and Simpson, eds., *Sermons*, 7: 279-99 (subsequent references will appear in the text).

approaches Andrewes's public assertions of the real presence.[52] What keeps Donne from being remotely like Andrewes, however, is not his theory as expounded in one sermon, but his cumulative practice, and this is what makes him eucharistically so atypical in the period. His high view of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist does not translate, as it does in avant-garde conformists like Andrewes, into a call for more frequent recourse to it, much less the attendant call for a curtailing of sermon-going. The witness of Donne's collected sermons overwhelmingly emphasizes the minister as preacher over the minister of sacraments. Moreover, Donne's verse epitome of priesthood in the Church of England, "*To Mr* Tilman *after he had taken orders*," equates ordination exclusively with the power and privilege of preaching: "*Maries* prerogative was to beare Christ, so / 'Tis preachers to convey him, for they doe / As Angels out of clouds, from Pulpits speake" (41-3). The absence of any allusion to the priest's duty to administer sacraments as well as the word is thrown into even sharper relief here with Donne's arresting choice of the Incarnation as an analogy for preaching–preachers like Andrewes repeatedly insisted that nothing, especially sermons, came as close to the incarnation of the word than the celebration of holy communion.

The occasion of Donne's 1626 Christmas sermon at St Paul's itself is further suggestive on this point. It is clear from several remarks in it that although preached on Christmas Day, the sermon was not delivered as part of a liturgical service, but as was the case for far more early modern sermons than scholars seem to realize, it was a free-standing lecture preached in the afternoon. Critics of Donne's sermons must be much more cautious when asserting that Donne's preaching "occurred within the liturgical context of the Prayer Book"[53]–very, very little early modern

[52]Johnson, *Theology*, pp. 140-42; Theresa Dipasquale, *Literature and Sacrament: the Sacred and the Secular in John Donne* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1999), pp. 12-13. 256-57.

[53]Johnson, *Theology*, p. 138.

preaching did, if by that we mean a sermon being preached as an integral part of a prayerbook service. Allusions within sermons themselves make it abundantly clear that the reformation sermon, like its medieval predecessor, was most usually either a free-standing set-piece in the mid-afternoon, or a supplementary extra tacked-on after morning prayer; few seem to have thought of the sermon as part of the liturgy in the way we do, which is the reason for the repeated Laudian attempts to inscribe preaching unambiguously within the liturgy, and for the depth of popular resentment at the attempted change.[54]

With this in mind we might also cast an eye back to Haskin's fine work on how un-Christmassy Donne's Christmas sermons are in comparison to Andrewes's. Although preached on a communion day that commemorates the Incarnation, Donne's were not preached at, but hours after, communion. Andrewes's sermons at court, however, were preached squarely in the middle of the communion service at that liminal point between the ministry of the word and the creed, offertory, consecration, and administration of the elements.[55] Where Donne reflectively and retrospectively thematizes Christmas, moving away from the birth narratives (if he even mentions them) to confirm and foster the more general participation of Christ in the life and faith of the post-communicant believer, Andrewes zeroes-in on the infant Christ at Bethlehem in order to bring the believer, through his sermon, to the Bethlehem that is the altar, a process that moves in the opposite direction from Donne, in a clear prioritizing of sacrament

[54]The antiquarian case for patterns of service and sacrament is too complex to make here. Emblematic of how preemptive sermon could be to liturgical service, even at court, is James I's practice in the chapel royal; see McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, pp. 155, 166-67.

[55]Andrewes had the luxury of preaching at the only three occasions in the year on which James received communion publicly in the chapel royal (Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday), hence the only occasions at which the monarch and court was a captive audience for both sermon and full liturgical service.

over word. His technique is uniform across the seventeen nativity sermons; one example, from 1605 typifies the move from acknowledging the usefulness of the word preached to a crucial insistence of the superiority of the eucharist:

> be united to Him, this day, as He was to us, this day...Wee may so...and we doe so, so oft, as we doe..lay hold of, *apprehend*, or receive...the *word which is daily grafted into us*. For the *Word* He is, and, in the *Word*, Hee is received by us. But, that is not the proper of this day, unlesse there be another joyned unto it. This day, *verbum caro factum est*; and so must be *apprehended* in both. But specially, in His *flesh*, as this day giveth it, as this day would have us. NOW, *the bread which we breake, is it not the partaking of the body, of the flesh of IESVS CHRIST*? It is surely; and by it, (and by nothing more,) are we made partakers of this blessed union.[56]

This difference in emphasis is not only due to the timing of the two men's sermons *vis-a-vis* the Christmas liturgy (one after, one during). Rather, it is an historical coincidence that happens to affirm a crucial fine distinction between their eucharistic theology and their views of preaching. Consider from DiPasquale's work two points about Donne's position that, when compared to Andrewes's, suggest that the goalposts of early Stuart eucharistic theology were much farther apart than we might think, and that Donne was much closer to the center than the fringe occupied by Andrewes. First, Donne's classical protestant emphasis on "reception, portraying the sacraments as human works made effectual through the 'cooperation' of divine power," which carries with it the strong endorsement of Luther's ideal of the priesthood of the believer and concern over the worthiness of the receiver. Second, the opposed Catholic notion of a sacrament that functions exclusively in and out of the bare performance of that sacrament

[56] *XCVI Sermons*, p. 9.

itself, without the need for cooperation of faith in the receiver, which view of sacramental grace Donne rejects explicitly: "not *ex opere operator* [sic], not because that action is performed, not because that sacrament is administered."[57] One of the thrills of rediscovering the large body of neglected parochial sermons by Andrewes from the 1590s is to read sermons in which he, away from the doctrinal hothouse of university pulpits, or the hypersensitivity of court auditories, lets his hair down and speaks much more directly and practically as a parish priest on matters like communion.[58] Among these, one jumps off the page, a sermon dated 1 October 1598 on Isaiah 6.6-7, "Then flew one of the Seraphims unto mee, having a live-cole in his hand, which hee had taken with the tongs from off the altar. And he laide it upon my mouth, and sayd, Loe this hath touched thy lippes, and thine iniquitie is taken away, and thy sinne purged."[59] In it, Andrewes unambiguously reads the prophet's vision as an allegory of the priestly administration of the eucharist and concludes that "wee are here taught, That our sinnes are no lesse taken away by the element of the bread and wine, in the Sacrament, then the Prophets sinne was by being touched with a Cole" (p. 516). The whole sermon is a strident essay in *ex opere operato* sacramentalism that credits the bare action of receiving not with the 39 Articles' gloss on the sacraments as confirming the remission of sins purchased on the cross, but with actually exercising that power again and again, as in the doctrine of propitiatory sacrifice

---

[57]DiPasquale, *Literature and Sacrament*, pp. 253-54, 13 (the latter quoting Donne, *Sermons* 2: 258).

[58]To date, only Nicholas Tyacke, "Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism," pp. 12-16, has addressed this material.

[59]*A••••AMATIA SACRA*, pp. 515-28 subsequent references will appear in the text). This sermon is included, and the textual status of *A••••AMATIA SACRA* fully considered, in Peter McCullough, ed., *Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming, 2003).

promulgated by Trent, which specifies its "salutary effects applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit."[60] Not Trent in 1562, but Andrewes in 1598 argues first (in itself rather outrageously for a protestant) that the acts of prayer and almsgiving themselves work the remission of sins, and then concludes with his signature combination of sarcasm and punning (here on "tong" and "tongue") in a withering dismissal of the cult of the sermon:

> in the Sacrament...both the word and prayer and the works of mercy doe concure, to the cleansing of sinners from their sinnes: Whereas the Seraphim did not take the coale in his mouth, but with tongs; and applied it not to the Prophets eare, but to his tonge. We learn, that it is not the hearing of a sermon that can cleanse us from sinne; but we must taste of the bodily element...nothing is so availeable to take away sinne, as the touching of bread and wine, with our lips (p. 520).

Whereas Donne specifically insists that grace is available "not because that action is performed, not because that sacrament is administred," Andrewes insists that it need only touch one's lips to be propitiatory and efficacious. And even though Donne fleetingly on one or two occasions does come close to the language of propitiatory sacrifice, also absent from his treatments is the intense clericalism that is part and parcel of Andrewes's eucharistic views. In his allegorical reading just as the bread and wine is a coal from the altar, so the priest is an angel, an unambiguously exalted mediator and conveyor of divine grace, which Andrewes uses to insist on his view of the absolute necessity of a hierarchical clergy

---

[60] *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, Trans. J. J. Schroeder (London: B. Herder, 1941; Rockford: Tan Books and Publishers, 1978); quoted in DiPasquale, *Literature and Sacrament*, p. 253. Andrewes's direct source here, as he asserts in his opening sentence, is the ancient Byzantine liturgy of St Basil (*A••••AMATIA SACRA*, p. 515).

that distributes the body of Christ not in sermons, but in sacraments, and in whom alone rests the power of absolution. Although endorsed by the *Book of Common Prayer*, the godly were sorely exercised by the notion of priestly absolution, but as on other occasions in the 1590's Andrewes strenuously and cleverly insists upon it here by arguing that because the "cole," the consecrated eucharistic elements, are literally "Christs body" which takes away sins, the priestly administration of communion is a form of priestly absolution: "for the same office that is here executed by an Angell is committed to the sonnes of men, to whom, as the Apostle speaks, *Hee hath committed the ministery of reconciliation, 2 Cor.* the fift chapter and the eighteenth verse, to whom hee hath given this power, *that whose sinnes soever they remit on earth shall bee remitted in heaven*, the twentith chapter to Saint *John* and the twenty fift verse."[61] There is here very little room indeed for the priesthood of the believer, against the exaggerated place of which in protestant culture Andrewes waged a bitter guerilla war from at least the late 1580s until his death. Andrewes's priesthood was a sacerdotal, levitical one, set-apart by ordination from the laity to which it ministered Christ's body directly in the eucharist which, in turn, contained within it the sacramental practice of priestly absolution–all without the protestant emphasis upon cooperation by faith in the hearts of the laity. Sermons too were not to be, as they were for Donne, emotionally heightened, meditative orations designed to empower the layperson through acts of mutual interpretation, but were to be explicitly one-way acts of sophisticated pedagogical instruction through the priest's unequivocally superior learning.

And as the self-appointed guardian of Andrewes's views, it is small wonder that William Laud wanted some things cut from the Donne first folio. For to Donne, the priesthood of the believer

---

[61] *A••••AMATIA SACRA*, p. 519. *Cf.* Andrewes's sermon on absolution preached at Whitehall 30 March 1600 (*XCVI Sermons*, pt. II, pp. 49-65), which caused a scandal at court (see McCullough, "Calendar of Sermons" for this date).

remained at the heart of his sermons just as it did his being as a protestant minister of the sacraments, preacher, and even poet: his is a Christian populism that encouraged lay participation, both in the cooperation by faith he saw necessary at the eucharist, and in the mutual acts of interpretation that are his sermons. Passages like some from Donne's sermon at St Paul's on Christmas Day 1626 must have had Lancelot Andrewes spinning in his freshly-dug grave, and might have laid the groundwork for Laud's deep suspicion of Donne that would flare-out into open confrontation only a year later.[62] At one point Donne cannily chastises Calvin–a good thing to do in 1626–for wishing that Simeon, the old man privileged with the sight of the infant Jesus presented in the Temple (Luke 2.25-26), had just been an average layman, and not (as assumed by tradition) a priest of great dignity. Donne counters that it is a good thing to assume that Simeon was a priest. So far, so elitist? So far so proto-Laudian? Not so. Donne wants Simeon to be a priest because as such he stands for the belief that all can see and hold the salvation that is Christ because all are priests. Proto-Laudian sacerdotalism here gets re-appropriated by Donne to achieve a radical protestant populism–and that at the very altar, the symbolic heart of avant-garde sacramentalism and of Laud's future reforms–for, as Donne claims, "at the Sacrament every man is a Priest." As if that was not daring enough, he continues by lacing that sacerdotalism with a levelling elevation of every layperson not only to priesthood but also to royalty:

> Therefore hath the Apostle, not knighted, nor ennobled, but crowned every good soule, with that style, *Regale Sacerdotium, That they are a Royall priesthood*; To be Royall without Priesthood, seemed not to him Dignity

[62]I will consider in work-in-progress the possibility that Donne may in fact respond in this Christmas sermon to John Buckeridge's funeral sermon for Andrewes preached only six weeks earlier (11 November), the bulk of which is an extended statement of emergent Laudian eucharistic theology.

> enough. Consider then, that to come to the Communion Table, is to take Orders; Every man should come to that Altar, as a holy Priest, for there he is a Priest,

and more breathtakingly,

> There thou are a Priest, though thou beest but a lay-man at home....Live in remembrance, that thou wast a Priest to day; (for no man hath received Christ, that hath not sacrificed himself.) And live, as though thou wert a Priest still. (*Sermons*, 7.285-87)

And Donne's laity are preaching priests as well. In a willing bequest of interpretative authority that Andrewes would never surrender, Donne invites the man and woman in the stall or pew to flesh-out the branches of his sermon outline for themselves:

> [Simeon] is our example, and the characters that are upon him, are our Alphabet. I shall onely have time to name the rest of those characters; you must spell them, and put them into their syllables; you must forme them, and put them into their words; you must compose them, and put them into their Syntaxis, and sentences; that is, you must pursue the imitation, that when I have told you what he was, you may present your selves to God, such as he was (7.289).

Little wonder, then, that Andrewes's and Donne's prose styles are so different. As Eliot so famously put it, Andrewes "takes a word and derives the world from it; squeezing and squeezing the word until it yields a full juice of meaning which we should never have supposed any word to possess" (*Essays*, p. 305). But that is because he does not expect, indeed, does not trust his auditory to do that work for themselves. And the incipient imagery of the winepress that Eliot perhaps only subconsciously deploys here is entirely apt, for whether it be administering chalice or sermon,

Andrewes keeps each firmly in the hands of the clergy, while Donne promiscuously gives both to a participating laity. To Eliot this was one of the "impure motives" that he, with an elitism wholly akin to Andrewes's, found vulgar, populist, and threatening in Donne the preacher.

It seems precipitous, then, to make Donne an absolutist in either religious or secular politics, much less anything approaching a proto-Laudian. To do so betrays the Donne who in both prose and poem, despite an omnipresent ego, offers up his thoughts not prescriptively to, but in cooperation with, his hearers, in classically protestant fashion. To do so also sets aside too much exemplary work showing Donne's discretion, his striving for the mean, his refusal to be a "king's man."[63] But is this at odds with my earlier judgment that Donne was a coterie preacher? Can the evident social elitism of his ministry be reconciled with the view latterly expressed here or protestant populism? I think that the answer lies in understanding the mind of an early modern evangelical: Donne's brand of Christian populism is, paradoxically, only on show in the narrow, egotistically-charged space of the pulpit. To support this view, I think we need not enlist yet again Carey's monster of apostasy and ambition, nor even Eliot's Billy Sunday, but perhaps find new ways of profitably comparing Donne and Lancelot Andrewes.

Lincoln College, Oxford

---

[63]Shami, "Donne on Discretion"; Scodel, "Politics of the Mean"; Annabel Patterson, "John Donne, Kingsman?," in Peck, ed., *Mental World*, pp. 251-72; David Norbrook, "The Monarchy of Wit and the Republic of Letters: Donne's Politics," in Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus, eds., *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), pp. 3-36.