

2008

How to remember thee?: problems of memorialization in english writing, 1558-1625

Sean Flory

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, sflory@jc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Flory, Sean, "How to remember thee?: problems of memorialization in english writing, 1558-1625" (2008). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 226.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/226

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

HOW TO REMEMBER THEE?
PROBLEMS OF MEMORIALIZATION IN ENGLISH WRITING, 1558-1625

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of English

by
Sean Flory
B.A., Sam Houston State University, 2000
December 2008

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Introduction. The Culture of Death in Early Modern England.....	1
Chapter One. Protestant Preachers and Protestant Saints: The Politics of Commemoration in Reformation England, 1558-1603.....	27
Chapter Two. Vernacular Elegies for Sir Philip Sidney: The Knight as Martyr and Author.....	75
Chapter Three. Spenser, Preachers, and the Commemoration of Justice: The Lords Deputy of Ireland and Book V of <i>The Faerie Queene</i>	115
Chapter Four. “Our Succeeding Charlemagne”: Funeral Sermons for Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales and the Education of Charles I.....	158
Chapter Five. David, Moses, or Solomon?: The Funeral Sermons for James I.....	196
Conclusion	231
Works Cited	235
Vita	252

Abstract

This dissertation focuses on the use of funeral commemoration in religious and political controversies in early modern England. By examining the rhetoric used in funeral sermons and elegies, I show that commemorative writers use figural interpretation of the Bible to legitimize praise by linking the deceased to characters from scripture. Figural interpretation places the dead into a framework of ecclesiastical history and creates Protestant saints used as *exempla* in political and religious debates. This dissertation examines funeral sermons, elegies, and other commemorative poems written between 1558 and 1625. Chapter one discusses the development of figural interpretation in Elizabethan funeral sermons. By reading sermons by Edmund Grindal, Thomas Sparke, Matthew Parker, and William Barlow, I show that figural interpretation allows preachers to use funeral sermons as reformed counterparts to medieval cults of political saints. Chapter two examines elegies written by George Whetstone, Thomas Churchyard, John Phillips, Edmund Spenser, and Mary Sidney after Sir Philip Sidney's death in 1586. These poets support military intervention on the continent against Roman Catholic States by using figural interpretation to represent Sidney as a martyr. Chapter three discusses commemoration as a polemical tool for militant Protestants in Elizabethan Ireland by discussing funeral sermons for three Lords Deputy of Ireland and Book V of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. Chapter four considers the commemoration of Prince Henry in 1612 and argues that poets George Wither, Joshua Sylvester, and Henry Peacham, and the preacher Daniel Price use biblical *figurae* of kings David and Josiah to represent Henry as a militant Protestant saint. I also show that John Donne uses figural interpretation in his elegy to advance an agenda of religious pacifism. Chapter five examines funeral sermons preached after James I's 1625 death. I argue that militant Protestant preachers like Daniel Price and Phineas Hodson and conformist preachers like John

Donne and James Williams used different sets of *figurae* to support their sides in the debate over ceremonies in the English church. The conclusion calls for further research on the role of commemoration in early modern England as a whole, and in Donne's work in particular.

Introduction: The Culture of Death in Early Modern England

For people in early modern England, some of the more troubling consequences of the Reformation were sudden changes in the rites and doctrines surrounding death. These changes encompassed everything from accepted views about the afterlife to the material trappings of funerals. According to historian Ralph Houlbrooke, one of the major effects of the Reformation was a radical destabilization of the relationship between the living and the dead. The dismantling of the Catholic penitential system under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth I brought “[c]hanges in the last rites and funeral ceremonies” that “left both the dying and the survivors with much-diminished ritual support” (374).¹ One of the major effects of this collapse in ritual support involved the issue of the memorialization of the dead. With the removal of the penitential system, traditional means of commemoration, including the building of funeral monuments and the endowment of penitential prayers, became legally and theologically problematic. Caught in the shifting winds of theological debate in the 16th and 17th centuries, believers both lay and clerical were left uncertain of how, or even whether, they should commemorate the dead.

The issue of commemoration was critically important given the role of funeral practices in the political life of early modern English society. Anthropological research on early modern funerals shows that “[e]laborate rituals survived the Reformation, not because they found justification in Protestant theology, but because they served deep-rooted social and familial

¹ See Houlbrooke’s *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480-1750*, as well as Clare Gittings’s *Death, Burial, and the Individual in Early Modern England*, Eamon Duffy’s *The Stripping of the Altars*, Richard L. Greaves’s *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England*, and Vanessa Harding’s *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1670* for more discussion of the Reformation’s impact on funeral services.

needs” (Cressy 99). Many of these social needs were political, as commemoration helped bind political communities in a variety of ways. Funeral rites served the needs of political authorities. According to Gittings, “the main reason for holding the ritual was to stress the continuing power of the aristocracy and to prove that it remained unaffected by the death of one of its members” (175), the funerals of aristocrats and gentry “served to illustrate order and hierarchy and to evoke respect and deference from onlookers” (Harding 214). In addition, funeral rituals helped create and maintain broader political and ecclesiastical communities, for the funeral and commemoration of the dead gave communities “moment[s] of self-definition and [...] opportunit[ies] to witness a shared belief in a social and confessional order” (Harding 234).²

Funeral monuments and commemorative writing like funeral elegies and funeral sermons played a crucial role in the creation of political and religious communities. According to Richard Greaves, funeral monuments “reinforced the social hierarchy” by providing “future generations of worshippers [...] with a sort of secularized Elizabethan saint” that provided objects for political emulation (731). Printed elegies and printed funeral sermons fulfilled a similar function

² According to Jennifer Woodbridge, the heraldic funeral procession “was thus a microcosm of the social unit of the kingdom, hierarchically organized according to status and degree. Overall the spatial organization of the funeral procession functioned as a statement of continued order and stability” (Woodward 17). Much of the discussion of the early modern funeral as a tool of social and political control focuses on the heraldic funeral, often using Sir Philip Sidney’s 1586 funeral as a prime example. See Dominic Baker-Smith’s “‘Great Expectation’: Sidney’s Death and the Poets,” Sander Bos, Marianne Lange-Meyers, and Jeanine Six’s “Sidney’s Funeral Portrayed,” John Buxton’s “The Mourning for Sidney,” Elizabeth Goldring’s “The Funeral of Sir Philip Sidney and the Politics of Elizabethan Festival,” Alan Hager’s “The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney’s Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader,” and Ronald Strickland’s “Pageantry and Poetry as Discourse: The Production of Subjectivity in Sir Philip Sidney’s Funeral.”

as funeral monuments in creating a distinct image of what an ideal political subject of England should be at this point in history.³ According to Nigel Llewellyn,

Commemorative art played a central role in combating fragmentation. At the request of the patron, the painter, sculptor or designer had to invent an image that would help the culture to survive. Religions might resist the effects of death by teaching the eternal life of the soul, but in the cultural terms of the living, the monumental body was in itself a signal of continuity [...] monumental bodies effected the replacement of the deceased by registering what we might loosely term their personal identity and by locating them as precisely as possible in social terms” (*The Art of Death* 104-105).⁴

Representations of the dead were meant “to resist the inevitable process of decay which overtakes the corpse and to deny the ephemerality of the ritual spectacle of the funeral” (Llewellyn, *The Art of Death* 47). Commemorative art extended the reach of the funeral

³ This political function operated simultaneously with the doctrinal function in which “[t]he merits of the exemplary life were a recommendation of the faith in which the life was pursued and triumphantly concluded”, as Collinson puts it (“A Magazine of Religious Patterns” 234).

⁴ Llewellyn bases his theory on the idea of the “social body,” which he defines as the way the deceased is remembered and treated by the rest of society. The social body of the deceased created by the collected commemorative practices that surround the death of a person in early modern England, and exists in opposition to the “natural body” of the deceased. He analyzes “the human body as ‘a sign’ with two aspects, the shifting relations between which determine its meaning” (*The Art of Death* 51). In other words, the corpse was used by onlookers for a variety of different purposes, depending on the practices of representation that were brought to bear. Woodward makes the same point about the heraldic funeral ceremony: “The focus of the proceedings was the public persona of the nobleman, signified by the heraldic titles and achievements. Once that public persona had been ritually transferred to the heir, attention was fixed on him and the body lost its significance” (34). Representations of the deceased focused on this transcendent social body, and determined whether it was used primarily as a *memento mori* or as the focus for familial and social continuity.

ceremony, which was “necessary to restore the breach caused by the death of a member” of society (Gittings 89). Funeral monuments were “ritual items” (Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments* 36) that “relied on ritual and the law to overcome potentially destabilizing separation” and to reassure dependents of the person represented by the monument that the social order remained secure (42).

Though Llewellyn focuses exclusively on funeral monuments erected in churches and chapels, funeral sermons and funeral elegies that found their way into print played an equally important role in commemorating the dead. The disadvantage of most funeral monuments was that they were fixed in place, which limited their effect on the culture as a whole. The printing of funeral sermons provided those who mourned the dead the opportunity to spread representations of the deceased, and through them the political, social, and religious ideologies signified by those representations, to a potentially much wider audience. Funeral sermons and funeral elegies also had the benefit of being much cheaper than the traditional funeral rites and monuments associated with the funerals of aristocrats. All of these factors probably play into the steadily increasing numbers of funeral sermons that found their way into print as the seventeenth century progressed. During Elizabeth’s reign, only around 25 funeral sermons were published, while the 1610s through the 1630s, well over 100 funeral sermons were published (Houlbrooke 386). The increasing deployment of funeral sermons as funeral monuments is also evident from the fact that many preachers extensively revised their funeral sermons for publication and explicitly described the published versions as monuments.⁵

⁵ In his 1619 funeral sermon for Elizabeth Juxon, for example, Stephen Denison titles the published version of the sermon *The Monument, or Tombstone*. On the expansion of funeral sermons for publication, Houlbrooke writes: “Many published sermons probably underwent revision and enlargement between delivery and publication” (304). Thomas Sparke’s preface to his 1585 funeral sermon for the Earl of Bedford, elaborates on this practice: “In deede because then when I preached it in diuers points I was enforced (as I thinke you might well perceiue)

In spite of the social and political utility of commemorative art, many religious reformers had serious questions about whether existing commemorative practices were theologically acceptable, or even if it were possible to praise the dead correctly. For many reformers, attacking commemorative art was a key part of the “purification of the elaborate Roman funeral rite” (Tromly 294) that eliminated Catholic practices like “prayers and acts of intercession for the dead” as well as the “cult of saints and the veneration of relics and images” (Harding 179). Though debates over purgatory and the acceptability of hagiography certainly involved other theological issues, the question of the correct use of praise was critical because it involved questions of idolatry. How were readers, spectators, and listeners to know what constituted a theologically sound example and what constituted an idol, an object that distracted attention away from God?⁶ For some reformers, hagiography and idolatry were intimately linked, as the practice of praising saints might lead worshippers to direct their devotion to objects other than God.⁷ Debates over purgatory, which all reformers attacked, also brought up the question of idolatry, as reformers saw purgatory as a non-biblical innovation of the Catholic Church that directed worshippers’ prayers towards the Catholic penitential system rather than towards God.

through the shortnes of time left & allotted mee, but summarily to touch many thinges, that more at large I had purposed to haue prosecuted, and therefore perhaps then was the obscurer, I haue heare in this according to my ful purpose and premeditation then set them downe, whereby it groweth to bee somewhat longer nowe, than it was then” (A4r). Given the fact that the printed version of the sermon is 110 pages long, Sparke is not exaggerating here.

⁶ See Llewellyn’s *Funeral Monuments in Post Reformation England* for a discussion of contemporary iconoclastic debates as they related to funerary art. Llewellyn links iconoclasm to both the explicit biblical prohibitions against image-making (the 2nd commandment, Leviticus 26.1, and Psalms 97.7) (253), as well as the early modern suspicion of sight as a medium of getting information: “A constant theme in Reformist moralizing literature is that the sense of sight makes us vulnerable to the devil’s work” (243).

⁷ For example, many martyrologists in both the late medieval period and the early modern period were reluctant to compare their subjects to Christ, the martyr’s ideal example, because of a “danger that such a comparison might seem blasphemous [...] excessive praise of a martyr’s identification with Christ [...] ran the risk of crossing the boundary separating the commendable from the condemnable” (Freeman, “The Politicisation of Martyrdom” 50).

Despite these controversies, however, works like Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* show that even the most ardent reformers retained the urge to commemorate the dead and sought to find theologically acceptable models of commemoration that could use the dead as *exempla* without turning them into icons. The search for reformed models of commemoration marks many genres of art prevalent during the early modern period. Nigel Llewellyn's *The Art of Death*, for example, investigates the ways Reformation funeral monuments replaced the Catholic purgatorial system in connecting the communities of the living and the dead. Llewellyn continues this discussion in *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England*, which investigates the ways funeral monuments were influenced by debates over idolatry and iconoclasm and places commemorative funerary art in a larger social context. Stephen Greenblatt and Richard McCoy, among others, have discussed the importance of Reformation debates about purgatory and the commemoration of the dead to early modern English drama. Much of the critical attention has, understandably enough, focused on *Hamlet*, which McCoy notes "is a play obsessed with getting a decent burial" and with the idea of properly commemorating the dead (*Alterations* 68).⁸

Aside from Greenblatt's and McCoy's studies on the influence of purgatorial debates on Shakespeare, however, there have been remarkably few studies of the funeral sermon that discuss the specifically literary qualities of the genre. Most of the scholarship on the funeral sermon is historical in nature, focusing either on the importance of funeral sermons for historical research, on the role of the funeral sermon in English funerary customs, or on the theological debates over the acceptability of the genre.⁹ Most discussions of the formal aspects of the

⁸ See Stephen Greenblatt's *Hamlet in Purgatory* and Richard McCoy's *Alterations of State* for two of the most recent treatments of Purgatory and *Hamlet*.

⁹ Richard Greaves's *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England*, Clare Gittings's *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England* and Ralph Houlbrooke's *Death, Religion, and the*

funeral sermon stop at bare descriptions of the typical themes of funeral sermons, and the major topical divisions into which sermons were divided.¹⁰ A more extensive investigation of the literary qualities of funeral sermons that focuses on the kinds of figurative language used by preachers will prove fruitful for two reasons. First, funeral sermons played a key role not just in the array of early modern English commemorative practice but also in the negotiation of the Elizabethan and Stuart religious settlements. Historians of English funeral practice note that funeral sermons were opposed by influential figures like John Knox, Thomas Cartwright, and Henry Barrow, all of whom favored the deceremonialization of the English church.¹¹ To answer the objections of these powerful disputants, proponents of commemoration were forced to transform wholly the medieval Catholic version of the funeral sermon. By using new methods of biblical interpretation, new methods of organization, and new commemorative tropes, preachers

Family in England, 1480-1750 give solid overviews of the history and formal elements of the funeral sermon. In “Death and the Social Order: the Funerary Preferences of Elizabethan Gentlemen”, David Cressy offers an overview of the numbers and social status of people who had funeral sermons preached at their funerals. Eric Josef Carlson’s “English Funeral Sermons as Sources: The Example of Female Piety in Pre-1640 Sermons” and David d’Avray’s “The Comparative Study of Memorial Preaching” explicitly discuss funeral sermons as historical sources. Patrick Collinson’s “A Magazine of Religious Patterns” discusses the ways in which the conventions of the funeral sermon influenced Puritan biographers, with a focus on the use of exemplary images. Likewise, Etta Madden’s “Resurrecting Life through Rhetorical Ritual” focuses on exemplary techniques in Puritan funeral sermons from late in the late 17th century. Though Madden does not discuss Anglican funeral sermons or funeral sermons earlier than the Civil War, her overall discussion of the funeral sermon as a kind of textual recreation in order to provide exemplary images for other people to follow is useful for the investigation of earlier funeral sermons. For the major theological concerns that faced the preachers of funeral sermons in the late 16th century, especially on the possibility of confusing funeral sermons with purgatorial prayers for the dead, see Gittings, Houlbrooke, and especially Frederick Tromly’s extensive discussion of the controversy in “‘Accordinge to sounde religion’: the Elizabethan controversy over the Funeral Sermon.”

¹⁰ According to Tromly and Houlbrooke, the typical funeral sermon consisted of a lengthy discussion of doctrine followed by a much shorter discussion of the life of the deceased.

¹¹ Gittings argues that “[t]o those [...] who were Puritanical in outlook, a funeral sermon smacked of popery and resembled praying for the dead” (Gittings 138). Aside from a brief mention in Herr, and discussions of the social context of the funeral sermon in Houlbrooke, and Gittings, Tromly’s essay is the most extensive treatment of the theological controversy that surrounded the funeral sermon during Elizabeth’s reign.

made the funeral sermon into a fully reformed genre of writing that could be used to intervene effectively in the political and religious life of the nation. Second, the funeral sermon was such an omnipresent part of English life that it forms a useful context through which to read the commemorative work of authors more traditionally read as literary. In developing reformed models of praise that could avoid charges of Roman Catholicism and idolatry, preachers of funeral sermons provided a vocabulary of praise that writers from a broad spectrum of religious opinion could use to make commemorative poems a part of their own poetic interventions into English religion and politics.¹²

The theological debate over the funeral sermon made a great deal of literary reworking necessary to make the genre acceptable to more godly members of the church. In theory, praise had three purposes in the context of the funeral sermon, providing respect to the memory of the dead, “gratitude and praise to God, and instruction of those yet living” (Houlbrooke 311).

Militant Protestants who opposed the funeral sermon denounced the genre on three interconnected theological grounds.¹³ First, reformers claimed that the funeral sermon derived from pagan models of funeral oratory. Because Greek and Roman rhetorical theory “conceived of [the funeral oration] primarily as a vehicle for praise, reformers argued that the commendatory funeral sermon was therefore indelibly tainted by paganism” (Tromly 296). According to reformers, this taint made the funeral sermon unsuitable for conveying Christian doctrine.

¹² My study will follow similar lines as those of critics who have studied the intersections between English literary writers and English reformed homiletics, including Barbara Lewalski’s *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*, Jeffery Knapp’s *Shakespeare’s Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theater in Renaissance England*, Richard McCoy’s “Thou Idol Ceremony’: Elizabeth I, *The Henriad*, and the Rites of the English Monarchy,” Deborah Shuger’s *Political Theologies in Shakespeare’s England: The Sacred and the State in Measure for Measure*, Ann E. Imbrie’s “Playing Legerdemaine with the Scripture’: Parodic Sermons in *The Faerie Queene*,” and Richard Mallette’s *Spenser and the Discourses of Reformation England*.

¹³ John Knox specifically banned sermons from the funeral service in his 1560 *Book of Discipline* (Tromly 264).

Connected to this first argument was the argument that “the funeral sermon was not preached in biblical times,” which made funeral sermons unacceptable to biblical literalists (297). Establishment theologians could defend against the lack of scriptural warrant for commendatory writing by “[citing] David’s praise of Jonathan, the Holy Spirit’s acclaim of Josiah, and the extolment of the prophets and patriarchs by the author of Hebrews,” but militant reformers like Henry Barrow, for example, rejected the commemorative genres because they “found no basis for them in the New Testament” which put “them in the category with such other papist practices as saints’ days, tithes, and mortuary fees” (Greaves 705). The third, most damaging, charge leveled at the funeral sermon by its opponents was “that the custom had been, and continued to be, observed in the Roman Church” (Tromly 295). The Zurich reformer Rudolph Gualter went so far as to blame the development of the doctrine of purgatory on “[t]he degeneration of the funeral sermon” (295). As both “a symptom and an agent of the progressive corruption which was in their eyes synonymous with the pre-Reformation church,” particularly the growth of the Catholic penitential and intercessory system, the funeral sermon was a prime example for militant reformers of the dangers of liturgical innovation (297).¹⁴

¹⁴ According to Houlbrooke, hotter Protestants pushed for changes in the burial rite in the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* precisely because it “allowed for the celebration of a Holy Communion” that “might resemble a mass of requiem” (265). Even after changes were made in the burial service for the 1559 Prayer Book, more radical Protestants “took exception to the expression of ‘a sure and certain hope [of salvation]’” because it contained “a trace of intercession” that implied some salvific benefit for the soul of the deceased (265) that might lead “wrong-headed people” to “conceive of the funeral sermon as a form of prayer for souls in purgatory” (Tromly 295). That reformers’ fears about this issue were not totally unsubstantiated is evident in Gittings’s citation of “a Lincolnshire man who in 1600 ordered not one, but three funeral sermons” apparently because he “felt that three would benefit him more than one, like the Roman Catholic masses for the dead” (138). However, there is some indication that the opinions of theologians were at some odds with the practice of the laity. David Cressy argues that “[c]ommissioning a funeral sermon may have shown a commitment to clerical preaching and respect for reformed religion” (108) and associates the preaching of funeral sermons with a “Puritan association” (105). If Cressy is right, it only illustrates the extent to which theologians

These theologians worried that by perpetuating Catholic funerary rites, the funeral sermon would inevitably introduce Catholic icons into the English church. Though few of the reformers put it this bluntly, Henry Barrow's worry that "the priest made the dead man a better Christian in his grave than he had ever been in his life" clearly expresses the worry that the funeral sermon introduced an unworthy object for worship (Houlbrooke 297).¹⁵ By preaching a sermon in which a sinner was flattered as a good person, a preacher ran the risk not only of holding up an unworthy object of admiration, but also of "[subverting] divine justice" (296), all of which would distract the attention of worshippers away from their primary focus, God, onto what they saw as an invention of the human mind.

Funeral preachers shared the "role of professional spokesman for a grieving community" with writers of funeral elegies (Kay 5). In early modern England, funeral elegies performed much the same cultural work as funeral sermons by mediating "the difficulty of reordering society around the absence" of the deceased (Greenfield 81).¹⁶ Like early modern funeral sermons, which had their roots in "the thirteenth century" (Houlbrooke 296), funeral elegies participated in a tradition of commendatory poetry that emerged "at the close of the Middle Ages" (Kay 9). Late medieval funeral elegists used a variety of generic forms, including "laments for monarchs [...] considerations of the *de casibus* theme [...] warning[s] from the

underestimated the intelligence of their flocks, a tendency that informs Eamon Duffy's investigation of the early progress against the purgatorial system in *The Stripping of the Altars*.

¹⁵ As a measure of the venom of the debate, some reformers objected even to the burial service in the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer*, which states that the dead have "sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternall life," as introducing a non-biblical innovation that contradicts the doctrine of limited election. See David Cressy and Lori Anne Ferrell's *Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook* for a brief mention of this controversy.

¹⁶ Though the criticism on early modern elegy is vast, the most useful sources for an investigation of the theological and political effects of the genre are Daniel Kay's *Melodious Tears*, G.W. Pigman's *Grief and Renaissance Elegy*, Matthew Greenfield's "The Cultural Functions of Renaissance Elegy," Karen Mills-Courts's *Poetry as Epitaph: Representation and Poetic Language*, Ronald Strickland's "Not so Idle Tears: Re-Reading the Renaissance Funeral Elegy," and Peter Sacks's *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*.

dead” and dream visions like Chaucer’s *The Book of the Duchess* to provide their readers with suitable *exempla* (9-10). As the early modern period progressed, elegists increasingly used their poems to “[argue] for uniqueness both for the subject and for the elegy” (4) instead of “generalizing” like their medieval predecessors (Kay 11).

Funeral elegies faced similar theological challenges as funeral sermons. Elegists committed to the cause of the Protestant Reformation were especially hard-pressed to justify their commemoration of their subjects in religious terms as they faced issues of what constituted decorous burial, the question of excessive grief, and the possibility that excessive praise of the dead might distract readers away from the larger religious and moral aim of the elegy. According to Kay, the writers of elegies were deeply involved with the “question of what constituted ‘decent’ burial” and especially in the debate over whether funeral display was a kind of vanity related to Catholic funeral rites (3). In addition, funeral elegists were forced to respond to the theological attack on grief itself, in which excessive grief for the deceased was associated with the sins of “despair and faithlessness” (Pigman 16).¹⁷ Most importantly, if funeral elegists excessively praised their subjects, they ran the same risk as funeral preachers of turning their subjects into icons rather than *exempla* of godly behavior.

For all the theological objections to funeral commemoration, however, both funeral sermons and funeral elegies were popular genres for writers from a wide spectrum of ecclesiastical opinion. Unsurprisingly, a large number of surviving funeral sermons were preached by conservative and conforming members of the church. What is somewhat surprising, however, is that throughout the 16th century, and increasingly in the 17th century, militant

¹⁷ Pigman traces this strain of criticism of grief to Erasmus (15). As Laurence puts it, “Writers of diaries and of religious testimonies tended to shun prolonged expressions of grief as being something which intruded upon God’s workings” (75). See Anne Laurence’s “Godly Grief: Individual Responses to Death in Seventeenth-Century Britain.”

Protestants and presbyterians who might have been expected to condemn the funeral sermon as a remnant of Catholicism embraced the commemorative genres as polemical weapons in their ongoing attempts to influence English policy.¹⁸ Though I discuss both members of the established church and members of the godly branch of English religious opinion, I focus mainly on militant Protestants, as an investigation of the rhetorical methods godly authors used to create Protestant saints provides the clearest picture of the development of Protestant commemorative models. In addition, by discussing the literary methods of militant Protestant writers, I will argue that the “decisive change of attitude in the ranks of the radical reformers who had been the erstwhile opponents of the custom” (Tromly 311) that turned the funeral sermon from a Catholic “cuckoo in the Protestant nest” to an integral part of “the puritan tradition” took place mainly through a reimagining of the formal qualities of the funeral sermon (Collinson, “A Magazine of Religious Patterns” 234). I also argue that the growing acceptance of the funeral sermon by militant Protestant writers was mirrored by a similar growth in the popularity of the funeral elegy among godly poets. At the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign, the elegy had been a fairly simple genre marked by “sententious” commemoration and “[generalization]” of the exploits of the dead (Kay 11). Through the latter half of Elizabeth’s reign and into the 17th century, however, poets

¹⁸ Throughout this dissertation, the term “militant Protestant” refers broadly to those churchmen, poets, and politicians variously described by historians as puritans, Presbyterians, the godly, and the precise. Despite the historical work of scholars like Peter Lake, Patrick Collinson, David Norbrook, Lori Anne Ferrell, Peter Millward, Peter MacCullough, and others, most of these terms are vague, but I base my use of the term “militant Protestant” on Peter Lake’s broad definition of Puritanism. According to Lake, this ecclesiastical group “[encompasses] those advanced protestants who regarded themselves as ‘the godly’, a minority of genuinely true believers in an otherwise lukewarm or corrupt mass” (*Anglicans and Puritans?* 7). For the most part, militant Protestants favored the further reformation of the English church, alliances with Protestant nations in Europe, and military intervention against the Catholic powers (Norbrook 127). See Peter Lake’s *Anglicans and Puritans?*, Patrick Collinson’s *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, Lori Anne Ferrell’s *Government by Polemic*, Peter McCullough’s *Sermons at Court*, Peter Millward’s *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age* and *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age*, and David Norbrook’s *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*.

turned the funeral elegy into a formidable polemical tool able to reconcile political initiatives with theological doctrine.¹⁹

Though scholars note the increased acceptance of funeral commemoration by militant Protestants, what they have neglected is a detailed investigation of the ways that Protestant preachers and poets adapted the commemorative genres to their own uses. It is important to chart this shift in opinion in closer detail for two main reasons. First, the funeral sermon and the funeral elegy were not politically neutral genres intended solely to console the living. Instead, the funeral sermon and the funeral elegy stood at a site of rhetorical contestation in which questions of political power, religious power, and theological correctness were at stake.²⁰ Second, the acceptance of commemorative genres implied an adoption of something similar to old Catholic models of hagiography. Houlbrooke and Greaves each describe Protestant preachers as adopting funeral commemoration “for the purpose of exhorting the faithful to imitate the saints and patriarchs or their own emergent tradition” (Houlbrooke 297) and creating “secularized Elizabethan saint[s], in lieu of the traditional saints of the Old Faith” (Greaves 731).²¹ What Houlbrooke and Greaves ignore, however, is that it is precisely the question of

¹⁹ The increased use of the funeral elegy as a tool of political and religious debate is most evident in the flurries of published elegies that followed the funerals of Sir Philip Sidney in 1586 (which I discuss in Chapter 2) and of Prince Henry in 1612 (which I discuss in Chapter 4).

²⁰ See Peter McCullough’s *Sermons at Court*, McCullough’s “Out of Egypt: Richard Fletcher’s Sermon before Elizabeth I after the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots,” Lori Anne Ferrell’s *Government by Polemic*, and Margaret Christian’s “Elizabeth’s Preachers and the Government of Women: Defining and Correcting a Queen.”

²¹ Other critics do even less to explain the increased tolerance for funeral sermons among militant Protestants. Collinson cites the funeral sermon mainly as “the most fruitful and influential source for the puritan biography” (Collinson, “A Magazine of Religious Patterns” 243). Collinson, however, does not give a detailed analysis of the ways in which the radical Protestants whom he studies reconciled their desire to use commendatory genres like the sacred biography and the funeral sermon to extol “the virtues of the godly life” (240) with the “social pressure” that he sees as a cause of the “general stand against” funeral sermons on the part of Puritans (243). Madden’s essay focuses strictly on the rhetorical features of the later Puritan funeral sermon without discussing its origin in earlier funerary oratory, and Tromly does little

how to define these Protestant saints, or even if there could be such a thing, that was at stake.²²

By undertaking a literary study of the commemorative genres, I will shed light on precisely how militant Protestant writers reconciled their theological objections to medieval conceptions of sainthood with their desire to use commemorations of Protestant heroes to shape the course of English political history.

I: Protestant Theories of Exemplification

Despite the considerable difficulties in separating Protestant hagiography from Catholic models, the Protestant “elevation of faith over works” and emphasis on predestination actually made the theoretical definition of sainthood, if not its practical application, a simple one (Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature* 20). For John Foxe, the Protestant saint was “one who descends into him/herself, tests his/her own faith and, finding that faith strong, persists in it” (19). Though this general definition was relatively unproblematic, Protestant preachers, poets, and politicians were forced to develop a new system of exemplification both to justify the commemorative genres that described the new saints as well as to present the terrestrial exploits of the dead as the actions of faith. Most moderate defenders of funeral commemoration, whether in the form of funeral sermon, funeral elegy, or martyrologies, focused on the utility of the genre in conveying sound doctrine to listeners and readers.²³

but note the shift in attitude, without looking at the details of how these more radical Protestants situated their praise.

²² In an even larger context, the funeral sermon formed a key part of the array of commemorative practices that the Elizabethan and Jacobean hierarchies used to maintain their power. As such, Greaves is right when he states that any “attack on funeral sermons implicitly became an attack on the social order because they extolled the dignity of prominent persons” (704).

²³ Archbishop Whitgift, whom Greaves calls “the strongest defender of funeral sermons” (704) and his allies made doctrine the centerpiece of the funeral sermon; as Tromly puts it, “[t]he

The most influential theorist of Protestant exemplification was John Foxe, whose 1563 edition of the *Acts and Monuments* lays out arguments about the utility of commemoration and about the expected results of commemoration on readers.²⁴ In the prefatory “A Declaration Concerning the Utilitie and profite of thys historie,” Foxe compares the exemplary effects of the “monuments of so manye marters” (B6r) to the exemplary effects of secular histories. According to Foxe, it is “very expedient for a common wealth to keepe antiquite in remembraunce” to inspire loyalty to the realm. The commemoration of the “the lyues and doings, not of rough warriours, but of most mylde and constant Martyrs,” accomplishes much the same goal in the body of the church. Instead of simply “[delighting] the eare,” these commemorations “garnish the lyfe” and “frame it with examples of great profite, and to enstruct the minde in all kinde of Christian godlynes” (B6r).

Foxe sees his monuments as performing two main functions. By “enstruct[ing] the minde in all kinde of Christian godlynes”, the stories of the martyrs “can provide comfort” to believers troubled by the doctrine of predestination and the need for assurance of salvation (Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature* 21). Foxe’s martyrologies provide examples to help “readers who do not feel faith” to shape “themselves as self-assured claimants to the martyrs’ faith” (20). In addition to providing examples for the modification of the individual soul, Foxe argues that commemoration of Protestant saints plays a key role in mobilizing the faithful in times of

central Anglican position was to stress that the funeral sermon very effectively communicated sound doctrine to those who heard it” (Tromly 299). Hooker praised the funeral sermon in similar terms arguing that praise was worthy because of “its power to inspire emulation of the virtuous dead” (301). Much of the doctrine addressed in the funeral sermon directly attacked the Catholic burial service. Whitgift, for example, wanted to use the genre to combat the Catholic purgatorial system on its own ground, and called the funeral sermon “a fit vehicle to decry trentals, prayer for the dead, and purgatory” (Greaves 704). In many funeral sermons, attacks on purgatory formed a key part of the “sound doctrine concerning mortality and sin” that the sermon was supposed to contain (Tromly 301).

²⁴ For good discussions of Foxe’s commemorative aims, see Susannah Brietz Monta’s *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* and J.F. Mozley’s *John Foxe and His Book*.

religious strife.²⁵ By giving examples of martyrs who died defending the faith, commemoration of the dead will “[animate]” his readers “vnto lyke conflictes, if by Gods permission they shal happen hereafter, as men becoming wyser by their doctrine, and more stedfast by their example” (B6r). Foxe’s assumption is that if secular *exempla* make for better soldiers and politicians, then the religious *exempla* will make for better warriors of God ready to fight the threat of Roman Catholicism.

The most important part of Foxe’s discussion is the active role that he gives to the monuments he publishes. By using the verb “frame” in his description of the stories’ effects on his readers, Foxe defines monuments as active participants in drawing his readers together into a more cohesive community. In his influential 1577 preaching manual *Of framing of Diuine Sermons, or popular interpretation of the Scriptures*, Hyperius of Marburg (Andreas Gerardus) justifies praise of the dead in much the same terms as Foxe:

he that is occupied in praysing of any virtuous person ought to prefixe to himselfe a double scope or ende. The one, that by hearinge the gracious and excellent deedes of worthy and famous men the godly hearers may be prouoked to prayse and magnifie GOD, who vouched safe to elect and call them, and to bring to passe through them great and mightye thinges, whereby his name might be sanctified and celebrated upon earth. The other, that the multitude maye be stirred and enflamed to the imitation of their so noble deedes. (f. 153v)²⁶

²⁵ The encouragement of the faithful in the conflict with Roman Catholicism is one of Foxe’s major goals; as Mozley puts it, Foxe’s “book is a stout blow in the battle against” Catholicism that is designed to “warn and encourage the living” (156).

²⁶ Published in English as part of *The Practise of Preaching, otherwise called the Pathway to the Pulpit*. Trans. John Ludham. London: Thomas East, 1577. According to Barbara Lewalski, Hyperias’s manual was “[t]he most complete statement of Protestant theory of the funeral

As with Foxe, praise is commendable because it has the ability to force listeners or readers to follow the example of the deceased. What Hyperius adds to Foxe's justification of commemoration, however, is the idea that all of the virtuous dead, not simply the martyrs, are worthy subjects of praise if the praise is made judiciously.

The fact that both Foxe and Hyperius feel the need to offer defenses of exemplification, as well as the somewhat defensive tone of both Hyperius's and Foxe's discussions of the subject, illustrates the ambivalent status of exemplarity in the Protestant imagination. It was easy for militant Protestants like Knox, Barrow, and Cartwright to link funeral commemoration with Catholicism because many Catholic theologians defended praise of the dead in the same terms as Foxe and Hyperius. For example, as a direct response to Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, Thomas Stapleton offers his 1565 translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* as a series of exempla that can help English people to frame themselves in a Catholic image. A large portion of his history is a list of Catholic emperors who extended Roman Catholicism. As he puts it in his preface, he hopes that these royal *exempla* will encourage Elizabeth to return England to the Catholic fold: "[i]n this history [Elizabeth] shall see in how many and weighty points the pretended reformers of the church in your Graces dominions have departed from the pattern of that sounde and catholike faith" (3r).²⁷

The true difficulty that Foxe and other reformers faced in answering the objections of Catholic writers like Stapleton was in defining which members of the dead were worthy of praise. Though Foxe would disagree violently, Stapleton and other Catholic writers offered an

sermon and the best explanation of the Protestant model for this genre" (180). See *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise*.

²⁷ Bede. *The History of the Church of Englande*. Trans. Thomas Stapleton. Antwerp: John Laet, 1565.

ecclesiastical genealogy proclaiming Catholicism the heir of the apostolic church that seemed just as valid as Foxe's genealogical link between the apostles and the Protestant martyrs. Protestants intent on memorializing the dead as *exempla* could place little faith in simple historical facts, and instead relied on a variety of devices to subordinate the praise of the deceased to a larger theological point.²⁸ One of the major effects of these restrictions on the funeral sermon is the limiting of the kinds of topics that could be discussed by the preacher. According to Hyperius, a godly funeral preacher should "frame his talke in the Church" (f. 152v) by restricting his praise to "the word of God, the continuall reading and meditation thereof, the sundry kindes of life, the ministry of the word, verginitie, matrimony," and other moral topics (f. 154). A preacher should "dealeth very slenderly with [...] the benefites of the body and of fortune," or other political achievements (f. 153r). Any preacher who stepped over these bounds risked becoming one of those corrupt preachers "that endeouour to set foorth certaine things, and doe cunningly pretend a certaine veyle of religion, but by litell & litell they bewray themselues to tender more their owne gaine and lucre then the furtheraunce of true religion" (f. 156r).²⁹

²⁸ This suspicion of the strictly historical and the difficulty of determining what constituted a theologically valid historical example to follow, underlies much of the radical reformers' resistance to commemoration in the religious sphere. Indeed, radical reformers did not completely dismiss the use of exempla. For Knox, Cartwright and Barrow, the problem arose when praise for the dead was put into a religious context. During the Admonition Controversy, Thomas Cartwright "shifted from an absolute objection to funeral sermons as superstitious" to admitting to Whitgift "that it was desirable that notable men should have their commendation" (Collinson, "A Magazine of Religious Patterns" 243). However, Cartwright was adamant that this kind of commendation "should not be confused with the office of preaching" and should take "the form of a civil oration" (243). This separate genre of funeral oratory, the *oratio funebris*, was a less controversial secular form. According to Houlbrooke, it was a fairly common part of university funeral ceremonies and at the funerals of prominent politicians, including that of Elizabeth I (whose 1603 funeral oration by Richard Niccols survives), but it was never as common as the funeral sermon, and rarely printed (Houlbrooke 326-27).

²⁹ Hyperius actually offers a whole litany of potential problems with commendatory speech, which cover everything from warnings against flattery to the problem of stirring up envy amongst the listeners instead of zeal for emulation. With all of the potential pitfalls, from

To help restrict praise to theologically acceptable subjects, moreover, funeral preachers followed a fairly strict formal outline that subordinated the “structural importance” of praise (Tromly 303) to “the universal and eternal truth to which the sermon’s scriptural text points” (302). According to Hyperius, preachers perform their duty “when they commend a funeral with their sermon, they handle not praises curiously contrived and couched together” with the doctrinal part of the sermon (f. 155r). Instead, preachers should begin with instruction on the process of dying, including everything from “preparation unto death, that death is the penalty of sinne” to the fact that “the death of the sayntes is pretious in the lordes sight” (f. 155r). The opening sections of a typical Protestant funeral sermon were thus “taken up with the explication and application of a text of Scripture” (Houlbrooke 304). The second part of the sermon contained an account of the deceased which “commonly took up about a quarter of the sermon, but sometimes a third” of the sermon (Houlbrooke 311). According to Hyperius, this praise is strictly optional: “if so be it thought good after these plases declared, that somewhat be sayde of the brother which is brought to burial, then add they briefly, and (as ye woulde say) shamefastely some thinge touching the kinde of life that be imbraced, and shewe how deuoutly he serued God therin, by diligent performinge of those thinges that were his dutye to doe” (f. 155r).³⁰

For all the attempts to subordinate or eliminate the commemorative element of funeral sermons, most preachers sought to make the life of the deceased more than “the ‘lean-to’ of the sermon” (Madden 234). Instead, even militant Protestants who might agree with Knox and Cartwright on other issues made commemoration “the foundation” of the sermon’s theological

annoyed parishioners to irritated Puritans, it is no wonder that “[a]n explicit justification of praise was often felt to be necessary” in funeral sermons (Houlbrooke 311).

³⁰ According to Tromly, there was a “high degree of uniformity in the Elizabethan funeral sermons based on this model indicates the operation of a powerful but unspoken set of rules” (Tromly 302).

discussion (234). To justify praise as a foundation for a theological discussion, however, militant Protestant preachers and poets had to develop new homiletic and poetic techniques that could insulate their works from charges of idolatry. For both elegists and preachers, the solution to this dilemma was the development of a “biblical poetics” of praise.³¹

Though preachers and poets relied on a number of different techniques of biblical citation, their most important commemorative technique was the use of biblical *figurae* to interpret contemporary history as the figural fulfillment of sacred history as seen in the Bible.³² Figural interpretation of the Bible is similar, but not identical to, typology, which, strictly speaking, involves only the fulfillment of Old Testament events in the New Testament story of Christ (Dickson 254). Figural interpretation involves a broader array of interpretative practices in which the identification and interpretation of *figurae* “establishes a connection between two events or persons, the first of which signifies not only itself but also the second while the second

³¹ I borrow the term “biblical poetics” from Carol Kaske’s study of Spenser. According to Kaske, biblical poetics can be defined in three ways; first, as “the poetic practice of biblical authors;” second, as “what biblical commentators and Judeo-Christian literary critics have perceived that poetics to be;” and third, “that poetics which a poet might have derived from these two sources” (1). I am interested in the third category, especially the ways in which preachers and poets used the “rhetorical devices and methods of presentation which are either peculiar to Scripture . . . or prevalent in expressing certain of its favorite topics” in order to reconcile non-biblical events and subjects to the outline of sacred history (1). The effect of biblical poetics for both preachers and poets was to “combat the idolatrous potential of words [. . .] by constructing a dialectical function for their readership” in which readers were forced to read commemoration in typological terms (Gregerson 5). See Carole Kaske’s *Spenser and Biblical Poetics*, Linda Gregerson’s *The Reformation of the Subject: Spenser, Milton, and the English Protestant Epic*, and Barbara K. Lewalski’s seminal work *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*.

³² One of the more common of these techniques was the use of the prophetic voice, which gave preachers and poets biblical warrant to advise politicians as well as interpret scripture. See Ester Gilman Richey’s *The Politics of Revelation in the English Renaissance*, Rupert Taylor’s *The Political Prophecy in England*, Sharon L. Jansen’s *Political Protest and Prophecy under Henry VIII*, Robert Lerner’s “Medieval Prophecy and Religious Dissent,” Keith Thomas’s *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England*, Howard Dobin’s *Merlin’s Disciples: Prophecy, Poetry, and Power in Renaissance England*, and Alexandra Walsham’s “‘Frantick Hacket’: Prophecy, Sorcery, Insanity, and the Elizabethan Puritan Movement.”

encompasses or fulfills the first” (53). The *figura* to be interpreted, according to Auerbach’s reading of the Church fathers and medieval literature, “is something real and historical which announces something else that is also real and historical” (29). In interpreting the present in terms of the reenactment of biblical events, the funeral preachers engage in the same kind of interpretation as writers of the apocalyptic tradition, most notably John Bale, whose *The Image of bothe churches* influenced John Foxe and played a key role in perpetuating apocalyptic interpretation of history in England (Firth 68).³³

Early modern funeral preachers rarely went as far as Auerbach in claiming that the dead were literal fulfillments of biblical characters in the sense that Christ, for example, was interpreted as a perfected version of David, Solomon, Moses, and other Old Testament figures. The historical basis of *figurae*, however, did provide funeral preachers with a powerful interpretive tool for presenting the lives of their subjects as reenactments of biblical events. Figural interpretation of the lives of the deceased gave commemorative writers the literary tool necessary to create the kinds of Protestant saints around whom the ecclesiastical, political, and social community of militant Protestantism could coalesce. By making figural comparisons between the life of the deceased and biblical episodes, preachers and elegists could move beyond the simple tasks of praising the virtues of the deceased or reassuring the bereaved.³⁴ Instead, figural interpretation of the lives of the deceased allowed writers to make the same kind of

³³ See Erich Auerbach’s “*Figura*,” Donald Dickson’s “The Complexities of Biblical Typology in the Seventeenth Century,” and Katherine R. Firth’s *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645*.

³⁴ Preachers operating under the assumption “that typology delineated the pattern of salvation for the individual in imitation of the pattern of Christ” (Dickson 262-263) could use the deathbed scenes of conversion and repentance to illustrate the ways in which the deceased fulfilled this figural pattern and offer listeners assurance that the deceased was in heaven, which “[performs] one of the most important psychological functions of intercessory prayer abolished at the Reformation, that of making survivors feel more confident and comfortable concerning the present state of the dead” (Houlbrooke 317).

interpretative leaps as writers who “applied figural prophecy from scripture to specific national events” (Dobin 54). Rather than being merely good men and women, the honored dead became exemplary figures fit for emulation by listeners and readers because of the historical correspondence between their lives and those of the biblical characters to whom writers compared them. Through this correspondence, writers interpreted their subjects’ lives in terms of Bale and Foxe’s eschatological timelines and showed how their subjects fit into the “endless struggle of the English Church and monarchy to resist Rome’s appropriation of regal and ecclesiastical powers” (Zakai 306).³⁵ At the same time, by portraying the deceased as reenactments of biblical *figurae*, godly writers could depend on the fact that “[t]he historicity of types” gave their praise of the dead “an evidential value” lacked by other forms of praise that helped to insulate them from charges of turning their subjects into idols (Dickson 256). By using figural interpretation as a literary technique for reconstructing the lives of the honored dead, militant Protestants were able to mobilize the powerful discourses of martyrology and hagiography and turn the commemorative genres into useful tools in advancing their religious and political agendas.

The rest of this project will trace the use of figural interpretation as a commemorative tool in the period between 1558 and 1625. This period, beginning with the accession of Elizabeth I and ending with the death of James I, stretches from the final institution of the

³⁵ The Protestant historical consciousness evolved early in the Reformation as “Protestant historiography” from the time of Luther onward “based itself upon an historical interpretation of prophecies and regarded the Apocalypse as the guide to history” (Zakai 300). This tendency became an important part of the English Reformation’s treatment of history because of the influence of continental scholarship on the Henrician and Marian exiles, particularly John Bale and John Foxe. Bale and Foxe each justified the application of scripture to history because the “text of Revelation [...] correctly glossed the chronicle of English history; national history lay at the center of providentially decreed sacred history” (Dobin 57). See Irena Backus’s *Historical Method and Confession Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* and Avihu Zakai’s “Reformation, History, and Eschatology in English Protestantism.”

Reformation in England to the beginnings of the Caroline repression of militant Protestantism that helped to lead to the English Civil War. Through the period in question, militant Protestant politicians, divines, and writers were an influential force in English political and religious life, vying for influence with adherents of a variety of religious groups. Each chapter will focus on the responses of preachers and elegists to the deaths of important members of the English political and religious community. While most of the authors discussed here are, broadly speaking, adherents of militant Protestantism, I do discuss conformist authors to reveal the differences in the commemorative models favored by members of different factions of the early modern ecclesiastical spectrum.

Chapter one traces the development of figural interpretation in the English Protestant funeral sermon during the reign of Elizabeth. I argue that Elizabethan preachers, both those who conformed wholeheartedly to the established church and those who advocated more reformist theological positions, used figural interpretation of the lives of the deceased to turn the funeral sermon into a reformed version of the late-medieval tradition of the political saint. I begin my discussion with a reading of John Fisher's 1509 Catholic funeral sermon for Henry VII, and argue that the major change from Catholic funeral preaching to that of Protestants was the introduction of figural interpretation of the deceased. Afterwards, I discuss four funeral sermons written by members of various segments of the English church: Edmund Grindal's 1564 sermon for the Emperor Ferdinand I, Thomas Sparke's 1585 sermon for the Earl of Bedford, Thomas Newton's 1587 translation of Matthew Parker's 1551 sermon for Martin Bucer, and William Barlow's 1601 sermon for the Earl of Essex. In the course of the chapter, I argue that members of all segments of the English church used figural interpretation to describe their subjects as political saints, but that by the 1580s, the restrictions on ecclesiastical speech put into place by

Archbishop Whitgift had made the funeral sermon one of the key genres for militant Protestants to intervene in the religious and political life of the nation.

Chapters two and three continue to discuss the importance of commemorative writing and the tradition of the political saint to the militant Protestant cause during Elizabeth's reign. Chapter two discusses two groups of vernacular elegies published after Sir Philip Sidney's death in 1586, those written in the immediate wake of Sidney's death by Thomas Churchyard, George Whetstone, and John Phillips, as well as two elegies written later in Elizabeth's reign, Edmund Spenser's 1595 "Astrophel" and Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke's "To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney," written about 1599. I argue that Sidney's elegists use figural interpretation of Sidney's life in the same way as Elizabethan funeral preachers to portray Sidney as a martyr and as a political saint fit for emulation by the nobility. Though the earlier elegists portray Sidney mainly as martyred knight and the later poets portray him mainly as a martyred poet, the aim of each group of elegists is to encourage a new generation of nobility to coalesce into an alternative court metaphorically separate from Elizabeth's that would allow them to pursue the extension of international Protestantism through military intervention against the continental Catholic powers.

In chapter three, I discuss the use of commemorative writing in the late-Elizabethan attempt to cement English political control over Ireland. I discuss three funeral sermons preached on Lords Deputy of Ireland, Richard Davies's 1577 sermon on Walter Devereux, first Earl of Essex, Thomas White's 1585 sermon on Sir Henry Sidney, and Thomas Sparke's 1593 sermon on Arthur, Lord Grey, in addition to Book V of Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. I argue that each of these writers uses the technique of figural interpretation to commend his subject as a paragon of the virtue of justice whose exemplarity is evident mainly from the fact that he has been persecuted politically during his life. I further argue that Spenser bases his

defense of Lord Grey's term as Lord Deputy, which constitutes a large portion of the historical allegory of Book V, on the same kinds of figural commemoration used by the funeral preachers. All four authors had the same goal as Sidney's elegists; by presenting their subjects as religious as well as political *exempla*, they hoped to create a cadre of militant Protestant nobles who would enter service in Ireland as a way of fighting against the forces of international Catholicism.

In chapters four and five, I shift my focus to the development of commemorative speech during the reign of James I. Chapter four discusses the elegies and funeral sermons preached after the death of Henry, Prince of Wales in 1612. During the first part of James's reign, Henry acted as a protector and promoter of the militant Protestant cause. His unexpected death posed a severe blow to the hopes of militant Protestants to influence national affairs. In this chapter, I argue that three of Henry's many elegists, the militant Protestant minor poets Joshua Sylvester, Henry Peacham, and George Wither, used similar figural tropes as used by Sir Philip Sidney's elegists to present Henry as a Christian knight and a Protestant martyr for England's sins. These elegists argued that Henry's reenactment of the biblical king Josiah's reformation of religion proved that James should alter his pacific stance towards the continental Catholic powers and join continental Protestants in a religious war against Spain and Rome. In addition, I discuss the series of funeral sermons for Henry preached by the prince's chaplain, Daniel Price. I argue that Price uses a similar set of commemorative images in his sermon series to convince James both to reform his own court and to create an alternative court in which Charles could be educated to become the new protector of militant Protestantism. Finally, I discuss John Donne's elegy for the prince, and argue that Donne used a different set of commemorative *figurae* to argue that James should pursue a more pacific and ecumenical vision of the English church.

The debate over the right nature of the English church that emerges in the contrast between Donne's elegy and the elegies written by militant Protestant poets is the focus of chapter

five. In this chapter, I discuss four of the commemorative sermons preached in the wake of James I's death in 1625. Two of the sermons were preached by militant Protestants, Daniel Price and Phineas Hodson, and the others were preached by ministers more willing to conform to the increasingly ceremonial nature of the English church during the last years of James's reign, James Williams and John Donne. In the chapter, I argue that the two sets of preachers use different biblical *figurae* to convince Charles to follow their own favored ecclesiastical policies, with Price and Hodson using King David to argue that Charles should pursue a militant course against Roman Catholics both in England and on the continent, and Williams and Donne using King Solomon to argue that Charles's embrace of ceremonial religion was the key to ecclesiastical peace within the English church. For both sets of preachers, as for the preachers of Elizabeth's reign, the tropes of commemoration allow them to argue for their own images of the true church of England at the outset of Charles's reign.

Chapter One: Protestant Preachers and Protestant Saints: The Politics of Commemoration in Reformation England, 1558-1603

Despite historical narratives that describe Elizabeth I's reign as the time in which the Anglican Church was born, the English church was anything but peaceful during the second half of the 16th century. Conformist divines, supporters of Presbyterianism, and militant Protestants disagreed, often violently, on religious and political issues ranging from the theological acceptability of vestments and other religious ceremonies to the rightness of supporting military intervention on the continent to combat the Roman Catholic nations. What most Protestant divines could agree on, despite the objections of influential voices like John Knox and Thomas Cartwright, was the utility of the funeral sermon in the religious and political life of the nation. For preachers of many theological camps, funeral sermons provided consolation for the bereaved, taught listeners and readers acceptable ways to deal with the inevitability of death, and provided a forum for a variety of moral topics.

At least as important as its role in the emotional and moral instruction of listeners, however, was the funeral sermon's role in the political life of early modern England. Commemorative sermons on politically prominent individuals allowed preachers to intervene in the political affairs of the kingdom as a whole. For strictly conformist preachers intent on "reinforcing the social hierarchy" (Greaves 731), the funeral sermon allowed the construction of textual monuments to the aristocracy and the established church. For militant Protestants, supporters of Presbyterian discipline, and other preachers supporting anti-establishment causes, the funeral sermon acted as a form of covert speech, as praising prominent adherents to militant Protestantism gave preachers the opportunity to provide *exempla* for their listeners with limited fear of official reprisal. In examining the development of the genre by a variety of preachers

from a number of different theological opinions, it is possible to shed light on the polemical landscape of the Elizabethan church and ascertain the extent to which older Catholic religious forms were reworked and revised to provide tools for the Reformation.

By giving preachers an outlet for advising the queen and her counselors, groups of the nobility, and meetings of the clergy, the funeral sermon played a role remarkably similar to that played by the medieval cults of political saints, one of the outlawed funerary practices of Roman Catholicism.¹ Like the medieval political saints, most of the subjects of funeral sermons were not martyrs in the traditional senses of being either a “*miles Christi*, the knight of God, who attained martyrdom through his piety, chivalrous conduct, and death” (Freeman, “The Politicisation of Martyrdom” 51), by being an “innocent victim of lethal violence” (52), or by dying in the cause of true religion (52). Instead, political saints were considered fit objects for devotion because of their actions in the political realm. Usually, political saints were identified by “their violent deaths in the course of a political conflict” (Walker 79), with the majority of political saints being oppositional “political leaders who met violent ends resisting authority” (Freeman, “Concepts of Martyrdom” 7).² Though most late medieval political cults originally contained “an element, more or less central, of political protest and defiance”, many of them

¹ The similarity between the funeral sermon and the cult of the saints was one of the major causes of the debate over funeral sermons in the first place. Much of the relevant discussion of these political saints is associated with the 14th and 15th-century cults of Thomas of Lancaster, Edward II, Henry VI, and Richard Scrope, archbishop of York, and revolves around the politicization of martyrdom at the beginning of the early modern period. See Simon Walker’s “Political Saints in Later Medieval England,” Thomas S. Freeman’s “‘*Imitatio Christi* with a Vengeance’: The Politicisation of Martyrdom in Early Modern England” and “Over their Dead Bodies: Concepts of Martyrdom in Late Medieval and Early Modern England,” and Graham Hammill and Julia Reinhard Lupton’s “Sovereigns, Citizens, and Saints: Political Theology and Renaissance Literature.”

² According to Freedman, the bulk of Protestant martyrs of the Reformation fell into this category, as they were each “the innocent victim of those in authority” (“Concepts of Martyrdom” 8).

“contributed to the simultaneous, and generally more successful, enhancement of the spiritual status and claims of the English monarchy” (Walker 86).³

Like the cults of political saints, Elizabethan funeral sermons served a wide variety of religious and political factions. According to Greaves, the Elizabethan authorities used the funeral sermon in the same way as late medieval monarchs used political cults; they “reinforced the social hierarchy” by providing worshippers “with a sort of secularized Elizabethan saint, in lieu of the traditional saints of the Old Faith” (731). At the same time, however, even militant Protestants who might attack funeral preaching as a vestige of Catholicism came to embrace the funeral sermon as a polemical tool for their own political and religious ends. As the sixteenth century progressed, militant Protestants increasingly used funeral sermons to “exhort the faithful to imitate” the “saints and patriarchs” of their own “tradition” (Tromly 309).⁴

What both establishment and militant Protestant preachers found problematic, however, was the question of what exactly constituted a Protestant saint. Answering this question was crucial for preachers using commemorative sermons to promote their own religious and political agendas, for by praising their subjects too excessively, preachers might be accused of everything from iconophilia to resurrecting the entire Catholic penitential system.⁵ For all members of the Elizabethan church, the creation of viable Protestant saints revolved around modifying both the form and theological content of Catholic commemorative models. The most obvious formal

³ The medieval idea that “[s]overeigns can also be saints” (Hammill and Lupton 4) and the “set of beliefs” that taught “that the king was a priest-like figure whose task was to bring about a state of social amity on which the peace and wholeness of the body politic ultimately depended” presaged the later Elizabethan and Jacobean theories of sacral monarchy (Walker 90).

⁴ According to Tromly, this “distinctly Puritan tradition of funeral sermon” only “[emerged] late in Elizabeth’s reign” (309). See Madden’s “Resurrecting Life through Rhetorical Ritual” for a discussion of the funeral sermon among Puritan preachers.

⁵ See Tromly’s summaries of Knox’s and Cartwright’s objections to the funeral sermon. Each argues that “the funeral sermon was a crypto-Catholic ritual” at its best, so any deviation from strict Calvinist dogma would have been met with a considerable degree of scorn (295).

revision was the subordination of praise of the deceased to a larger doctrinal point. A more important formal revision, however, was the use of figural interpretation of the Bible to interpret the lives of the dead in religious terms. Instead of making simple comparisons between the deceased and biblical characters, Elizabethan funeral preachers portray their subjects as the reenactments of biblical *figurae* to show how contemporary events point toward “the ultimate fulfillment of God’s promise in the New Jerusalem” (Dickson 265). By using figural interpretation, Protestant preachers place their subjects within the broad sweep of church history that stretches from the Old Testament, to the New Testament, to the present and on into the eschaton.⁶

I: The Catholic Past of the Funeral Sermon

The debate over the place and purpose of funeral sermons stemmed from Protestant preachers’ needs to separate themselves from the commemorative practice of Roman Catholic divines of the early 16th century. This proved easier said than done, as Catholic preachers also used funeral sermons to intervene in the political and religious life of the nation as did their Protestant successors.⁷ John Fisher illustrates these ambitions in the first funeral sermon

⁶ The variety of figural interpretation that appears in funeral sermons is related to the Reformation humanist conception of the Bible as “*specula ecclesiae* or types of church history”. It is the method of figural interpretation that allows reformers like Beza and Calvin to interpret “the biblical accounts of the elect persecuted by institutionalized power and superstition” as foreshadowings of “the struggles of the early Reformed churches” (Shuger, *Renaissance Bible* 22).

⁷ See Larissa Taylor’s “Funeral Sermons and Orations as Religious Propaganda in Sixteenth-Century France” for a lengthy discussion of contemporary practice in Catholic French funeral sermons.

published in English, his 1509 sermon for Henry VII.⁸ In this sermon, Fisher uses a series of biblical examples to portray Henry as a political saint fit for emulation by the young Henry VIII. According to Houlbrooke, Fisher's "discourse shares all the major characteristics of later funeral sermons. It is based on a biblical text, expounds doctrines suitable to the occasion, and uses the dead man's life for edification, laying particular attention on the deathbed" (Houlbrooke 296). In this case, Fisher uses the discussion of Psalm 116, the first psalm of the dirige, to portray the king's death as "the ideal of the good death which was held up before Christian people before the Reformation", in which confession and repentance of sin were followed by a willingness to die peacefully (151).

Where Houlbrooke errs, however, is in his assumption that Fisher's sermon is a firm blueprint for later Protestant funeral preachers. Though Protestants could have had few problems with these motives, his sermon illustrates all of their issues with Catholic models of commemoration. Operating in the context of late-medieval hagiography, Fisher treats Henry's life with the same level of importance as the biblical verse on which he preaches. As a result, Henry becomes a verbal icon that readers of the sermon are forced to contemplate in connection with the biblical text rather than as an example of the doctrine covered by the biblical text. Protestants concerned with the danger of iconophilia could point to this kind of descriptive pattern, in which the biblical text and the life of the deceased are given the same amount of

⁸ Fisher, John. *This sermon folowynge was compyled [and] sayd in the cathedrall chyrche of saynt Poule within ye cyte of London by the ryght reuerende fader in god Iohn bysshop of Rochester, the body beyng present of the moost famouse prynce kynge Henry the. vij. the. x. day of Maye, the yere of our lorde god. M.CCCCC.ix. whiche sermon was enprynted at the specyall request of ye ryght excellent pryncesse Margarete moder vnto the sayd noble prynce and Countesse of Rychemonde and Derby.* London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509. De Worde also printed a copy of a morning remembrance, or devotion, preached at a month after the death of Margaret, Countess of Richmond in 1509. Though this is not a sermon, *per se*, it has a similar overall pattern as Fisher's sermon for Henry VII, with the commemoration of the dead countess coming near the beginning of the piece, interspersed with readings of the biblical verse with which it begins.

weight, as running the risk of exalting Henry above his proper station. Opponents of the funeral sermon cited this kind of immoderate praise as one of their main objections to the genre (Tromly 296).

Fisher's focus, like the writers of *ars morendi* manuals published both before and after the Reformation,⁹ falls on the deathbed of the king, particularly on the ways in which Henry defeated the temptations of the deathbed through repentance. Where Fisher differs from the bulk of the *ars morendi* literature, however, is that he makes a specific connection between the king's behavior on his deathbed and his final acts in the political realm, rather than simply representing the king as a repentant sinner ready for the afterlife. Though Fisher consistently praises Henry as a good king, his textual reproduction of Henry's life makes it appear that Henry becomes a good king *only* after he fully submits himself to the authority of the Church. Fisher portrays Henry VII as a saint to argue that right rule of the state depends on the right observance of religion and service to the church, which, with some revisions, matched later Protestant treatments of the proper relationship between religious and political service.

Fisher is clear about his intent to make Henry an exemplum of both religious and political conduct from the beginning of his sermon. According to Fisher, Henry's "Polytique wysdome in gouernaunce it was synguler [...] his counseylls fortunate and taken by wyse delyberacyon" and his mighty power was "dredde euery where/not onely with in his realme but without also" (A2v). However, even though Henry possessed "as moche of [these virtues] as was possible in manner

⁹ According to Peter Morgan's "Of Worms and War: 1380-1558," these "manuals on how people ought to die" (128) were generally divided into three sections: "the first on doctrines which informed the relationship between death and salvation, the second on the condition and preparedness of the dying person's soul and the third on the practical measures for managing the deathbed" (128). The purpose of the manuals was to ensure that the dying did not expire in despair. *Ars morendi* manuals were detailed, and often contained woodcuts portraying the various stages of dying, especially "the five temptations at the hour of death – loss of faith, despair, impatience, vainglory, and avarice" as well as the overcoming of these temptations (128).

for any kynge to haue” (A2v), Henry’s possession of these political virtues was “slydyng [. . .] slippery [. . . and] faylyng” (A2r), only solidifying once he confesses his sins and begins “a true tournynge of his soule from this wretched worlde unto the loue of almyghty god” (A3v). Only at this point does Henry begin to fulfill his function as a monarch, for part of Henry’s confession is a promise to reform the realm of England before his death. According to Fisher, Henry

promised thre thynges [. . .] a true reformatycon of all them that were officers and ministers of his lawes to the entent that Justyce from hens forwarde truly and indifferently myghte be executed in all causes [. . .] that the promocyons of the chyrche that were of his dysposycyon shoulde from hens forth be dysposed to able men such as were virtuous and well lerned [. . . and] that as touchynege the Jeopardyes of his lawes for thynges done in times passed he wolde graunte a pardon generally unto all his people (A3v).

Though this does constitute a kind of turning from the world, Fisher’s description of Henry’s “reformatycon” of the country suggests three things. First, it suggests that Henry’s realm was sorely in need of political reformation. Henry’s promise implies that England is a badly ruled realm in which both secular and religious hierarchies are riddled with corruption. Secondly, Fisher’s placement of Henry’s promise allows him to outline a hierarchy of the duties of the Christian monarch; reformation of the self through religious confession leads to the reformation of the state, which then leads to the reformation of the temporal apparatus of the church under the control of the monarch. The ultimate result of Henry’s confession is the mitigation of the

flawed laws of the nation. Thirdly, this reconstruction of Henry's deathbed subordinates the political hierarchy of the kingdom to the Catholic religious hierarchy.¹⁰

Fisher supports his subordination of the political realm to the ecclesiastical hierarchy by citing the example of Manasseh immediately after describing Henry's confession. 2 Kings 21 and 2 Chronicles 33 describe Manasseh as one of the evil kings of Israel who sets up shrines to foreign gods, is punished with defeat at the hands of the Assyrians, carried into captivity in Babylon, and restored to his throne after repenting and praying to God for assistance.¹¹

Ostensibly, Fisher includes this image of Manasseh to prove the utility of praying for the dead, as Manasseh was only rescued from punishment for the "many grete abhominacyons & outrages ayenst almyghty god" (A4v) because "he prayed unto hym for mercy with true repentaunce & mercy was gyuen unto hym" (A4v). Fisher concludes his homiletic point by saying "If this soo grete a synner for his owne prayer were herde of god. How may we doubte but where so grete a nombre prayeth for one as dyd for our late kynge & souerayne but that all that nombre shall be herde" (A4v).

Concealed under this didactic point, however, is an important political lesson that Fisher intends to teach the young Henry VIII. Though Manasseh is discussed by both 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles, Fisher refers only to the version of his reign that appears in 2 Chronicles, the only version that concludes with Manasseh's defeat by the Assyrians and deportation to Babylon (A4v). It is only after this divine punishment that Manasseh repents and is returned to power in

¹⁰ Henry's promise to reform the realm constitutes a regal version of the confession expected for every believer, in which "Justice and Charity alike demanded that the dying Christian should be reconciled not only to God, but to neighbor also" (Duffy 322).

¹¹ Manasseh's main sin was the persecution of the faithful. According to 2 Kings 21.16, "Manasseh shed very much innocent blood, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another, besides the sin which he made Judah to sin so that they did what was evil in the sight of the Lord" (*New Oxford Annotated Study Bible*).

Jerusalem.¹² After repenting, Manasseh embarks on a campaign of reforming both the political and religious spheres of his realm: “Afterwards he built an outer wall for the city of David [...] And he took away the foreign gods and the idol from the house of the Lord [...] and he commanded Judah to serve the Lord the God of Israel” (2 Chron. 14.16).¹³ Manasseh’s reform movement is identical to the post-confession political campaign promised by Henry. The message that Fisher hopes to convey to Henry VIII is that proper religious conduct, and the corresponding subjection of the monarchy to the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the kingdom, precedes and makes possible right political conduct and the right rule of the realm.¹⁴ Fisher’s point is that Manasseh’s only hope for political restoration comes from his renewed religious faith, a parallel with Henry’s situation that Fisher emphasizes by providing a detailed picture of the dead king’s confession. As Fisher puts it, “[t]he cause of this hope” for resurrection “was the true beleue that he had in god in his chirche & in the sacraments therof whiche he recyued all with merueylous deuocion namely in the sacrament of penaunce the sacrament of the auter & the sacrament of anelynge” (A4v).

In addition to exhorting Henry VIII to make religious conduct the basis of his political career, Fisher uses Henry’s death scene to portray the king as a political saint in order to

¹² After his defeat, “Manasseh prayed to [God], and God received his entreaty and heard his supplication and brought him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord was God” (2 Chron. 13).

¹³ Significantly, the Manasseh of 2 Kings remains a bloodthirsty apostate until the end of his life.

¹⁴ Fisher offers an image parallel to Manasseh later in the sermon, invoking the figure of Ahab “of whome scrypture sayth that he dyde more dyspleasure unto god than all the kynges of Israell that were before his time”, a reference to 1 Kings 21.27-29 (B2r). Ostensibly, Fisher invokes Ahab’s eventual repentance in order to reassure his audience that repentance and salvation are open to all, but his audience had to keep in mind Ahab’s unfortunate end as evidence that that false repentance would be punished with political defeat.

encourage loyalty to the young Tudor dynasty.¹⁵ Fisher makes his claim for Henry's sainthood by directly comparing Henry to David, the ideal biblical monarch. Fisher does this through the entire sermon by preaching on Psalm 116 (114 in the Vulgate), "the first psalme of the dirige/ Whiche psalme was Wryten of the holy kynge and prophete kynge Dauid" (A2r). Formally, Fisher alternates between a verse from the psalm and a reference to Henry's life, which links the dead king directly to the biblical monarch. More specifically, Fisher makes two detailed references to David in the sermon, each of which implies that loyalty to the crown constitutes a kind of religious duty.

Both of these explicit links between Henry and David occur in the section of the sermon in which Fisher exhorts his listeners to have compassion for the dead king. In the first, Fisher discusses David's ability to pity the deaths of his enemies. Here, "kynge Dauyd whan it was tolde unto hym the deth of his enemyes at dyuerse tymes he wept right piteously as at the deth of Saul, Absolon and Abner" (A8r). Fisher argues that David is an example of the perfect mourner, and the people of England should follow his example because "If they so grete a noble men soo moche pyteed the deth of theyr mortall enemyes We sholde moche rather tender and pyte the deth of our own kynge and souerayne" (A8r).

Fisher follows this example from David's life with a reference to one of David's servants, which illustrates the behavior expected of good subjects. Fisher cites "a seruant of kynge Dauid whose name was Ethay. Whan his lorde & soueraiyne was in trouble he wolde not forsake him but answered hym plainly in this maner saynge [...] in what place soeuer thou shalte be my lorde

¹⁵ Though he does not institute an actual cult for Henry VII, Fisher's motivation is similar to that of the founders of the "exceptionally popular, and enduring" cults for Archbishop Richard Scrope and Henry VI in the 15th century (Freeman, "Over their dead bodies" 7). See Thomas Freeman's "Ut Verus Christi Sequestor: John Blackman and the Cult of Henry VI" and Simon Walker's *Political Saints in Later Medieval England* for more information on these medieval cults.

my kynge” (A8r-v). To this, Fisher adds a reference to “A squyer also of kynge Saul. Whan he sawe his lorde & mayster deed his sorow was so grete that he slew himselfe incontinent” (A8v). Each biblical example illustrates what Fisher calls the “true pyte & very compassion become that shold be in the hertes of men” (A8v).

While his use of biblical examples does serve as a template for later Protestant funeral preachers, it is the way that Fisher uses these examples that hotter Protestants like Knox found objectionable in the Catholic funeral sermon. First, Fisher is fairly free with mixing biblical references with references to classical authors. Instead of simply preaching a sermon on “the first psalme of the dirige [...] redde at the chyrche in the funerall obsequyes of euery crysten persone” (A2r), Fisher combines the strict preaching on scripture with “the same ordre that the seculer oratours haue in their funeral oracyons most dylygently observed” (A2r). Throughout the sermon, Fisher follows citations of scripture with classical allusions, and supports classical allusions with biblical examples, granting equal rhetorical weight to both. The example of David weeping for his enemies cited above is accompanied by a reference to Hannibal, who “pyteed the deth of hys enemyes [...] whan he sawe theyr bodyes deed before hym” (A8r). If anything, the classical reference seems to take precedence over the biblical citation, as it comes before the reference to David. It is this kind of placement of non-biblical material on the same rhetorical plane as scripture that Protestants reacted against in their revision of the funeral sermon because they saw it as leading to the sin of idolatry.

II: The Funeral Sermon and the Debate over the Established Church

In revising the genre of the funeral sermon, then, Protestant preachers used biblical *figurae* to subordinate the lives of their subjects to their larger doctrinal points. Though most

Protestant preachers use figural interpretation in their funeral sermons, the exact form of the interpretation varies depending on the part of the ecclesiastical spectrum to which a given preacher belonged. This section discusses the ways four preachers used funeral sermons preached or published between 1551 and 1601 to intervene in a series of religious and political debates throughout Elizabeth's reign. The preachers discuss a wide range of topics, from Edmund Grindal's justification of the proposed Habsburg match in the early 1560s, to militant uses of the funeral sermon by Thomas Sparke and the presbyterian translator Thomas Newton to combat Whitgift's subscription campaigns in the 1580s, to William Barlow's conformist attempt to rehabilitate the Earl of Essex after his execution in 1601. These authors differed widely in theological outlook. Grindal's status as a hero to 17th-century puritans is well known. Sparke was a classic militant Protestant preacher, convinced that English intervention on the continent was a necessary tool for reforming the English church. Newton and his printer Thomas Purfoote were radical advocates of reforming church government and favored a wholesale shift from episcopal government to a presbyterian model. Barlow, on the other hand, was a staunch supporter of bishops and of using the church to buttress the monarchy. What all four have in common, however, is the use of figural interpretation to portray their subjects as saints fit for the emulation of their listeners and readers, whether those audiences were royal, noble, or common.

Edmund Grindal's 1564 funeral sermon for the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I provides an excellent example of the use of figural interpretation to portray the deceased as a political saint.¹⁶ Grindal's sermon is particularly instructive because his sanctification of

¹⁶ Grindal, Edmund. *A Sermon, at the funeral solemnitie of the most high and mighty Prince Ferdinandus, the late Emperour of most famous memorye, holden in the Cathedrall Church of saint Paule in London, the third of October. 1564.* London: John Day, 1564. Interestingly enough, a Latin edition of this sermon, translated by John Foxe, was also published in 1564 by John Day, possibly for sale internationally. Since Ferdinand was actually buried in Austria, this funeral ceremony was held because of Elizabeth's general support for elaborate funeral

Ferdinand is so bold; instead of simply praising the Catholic emperor, Grindal uses him to defend a particularly English conception of moderate reformation of the church, while at the same time using his commemoration to support Elizabeth's proposed marriage to Ferdinand's son, the Archduke Charles. In the course of the sermon, Grindal makes figural comparisons between Ferdinand and Old Testament kings like David, Solomon, and Josiah to portray Ferdinand as a reformist king whose moderate course of religious reform is suitable for imitation in England, and whose example as a religious crusader against the enemies of the true church Elizabeth should emulate in combat against the pope.

Grindal's sermon is a rhetorically complex piece because of the conflicts threatening to fracture the English church at the time of its preaching. In the early 1560s, both the Elizabethan religious settlement and its political expression were decidedly unstable. The 1559 Prayer Book and the 1563 *Thirty-Nine Articles* "were only barely acceptable to minds schooled in continental reformed theology" (Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* 34). Moreover, English politics were dominated by the question of Elizabeth's marital status and the effects that a royal marriage might have on the English church.¹⁷ By 1563, Cecil had opened negotiations with Ferdinand I and his successor Maximilian II for "a matrimonial alliance [...] with the Habsburgs" (Doran, *Monarchy* 76) to resurrect the traditional Habsburg alliance many in England believed "essential

ceremony. Ferdinand's service was only one in a series of English funerals held for foreign monarchs; at various times during her reign, Elizabeth also ordered funeral celebrations for Henry IV of France and Mary Queen of Scots (Woodward 74).

¹⁷ That Grindal's funeral sermon has not been more widely discussed is somewhat surprising since, as Collinson notes in his brief discussion of the sermon in *Archbishop Grindal 1518-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church*, it is Grindal's only surviving sermon (162). Collinson offers a summary of the sermon, and Tromly, in his article on the Elizabethan funeral sermon, mentions Grindal's sermon only in passing. Norman L. Jones mentions the sermon in the context of early Elizabethan debates over conformity in "Elizabeth, Edification, and the Latin Prayer Book of 1560."

for England's commercial interests and political security" (95).¹⁸ Despite the potential advantages of the marriage and the fact that the match attracted supporters from "a wide spectrum of religious opinion ("Religion" 913),¹⁹ the negotiations still "contributed to religious, as well as political, tension." Militant Protestants feared Elizabeth would either "return to Catholicism" or adopt "the Augsburg Confession" ("Religion" 910).²⁰ Grindal's sermon attempts to quiet these religious and political tensions by portraying Ferdinand as a proto-Reformer in his own realm, making him a proper object for monarchical emulation and making his son Charles a fit spouse for Elizabeth.²¹

Formally, Grindal's sermon diverges markedly from Fisher's sermon and follows the basic outline of the bulk of English funeral sermons. Instead of mixing doctrinal matters with his discussion of the deceased's life, Grindal divides his sermon into discrete sections with the first section preaching doctrine and the second commemorating Ferdinand. The second section has a further subdivision in which Grindal specifically defends the funeral rite against the attacks of both Catholic and radical Protestant disputants. Grindal preaches on Matthew 24: "Therefore be ye redy, for the Lord wyl come at the houre which ye thinke not on" (A2r), an appropriate text

¹⁸ This was not Elizabeth's first consideration of a Habsburg match. According to Susan Doran, Ferdinand contacted Elizabeth about a possible marriage to one of his sons soon after her accession (*Monarchy* 26), but this opening effort collapsed in 1560 after Elizabeth's decision to remain single ("Religion" 911). For a full discussion of the Habsburg match, see Susan Doran's "Religion and Politics at the Court of Elizabeth I: The Hapsburg Marriage Negotiations of 1559-1567," "Juno versus Diana: The Treatment of Elizabeth I's Marriage in Plays and Entertainments, 1561-1581," and *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I*.

¹⁹ Supporters of the match include "godly Protestants" like Sir Nicholas Bacon and the Earl of Huntington as well as conservatives like the Earl of Norfolk, in addition to moderates like Cecil. Leicester, who hoped for his own marriage with Elizabeth, was the main opponent to the match (Doran "Religion" 913).

²⁰ Negotiations eventually broke down because Archduke Charles was a committed Catholic who demanded toleration of private masses "in the royal household" as a condition of marrying Elizabeth (*Monarchy* 97).

²¹ Grindal's sermon plays a similar role as the "[m]any masques and plays in the 1560s" that were used "as part of the general pressure on the queen to marry" (Doran, "Juno" 265).

for a funeral sermon as it concerns the suddenness of Christ's second coming and the inevitability of death. After the doctrinal discussion, Grindal praises Ferdinand's position as Emperor and provides proof that the Pope is "an usurper" who "by challenging to be aboute the Emperour" pursues a "pretensed supereminencie" (B3r).

By portraying Ferdinand as an enemy of the Pope, Grindal is able to describe him as a monarch concerned with a moderate course of reform whom Elizabeth would do well to emulate. Grindal uses Ferdinand's role in the Peace of Augsburg, in which he "gaue license to al his own countreis, to haue the use of the Sacrament in both kyndes" (C4r), as evidence that Ferdinand was moving towards reformed theology and was not "addicted to the Romishe religion" (C3r). Grindal praises Ferdinand as an ideal monarch in terms of his use of his royal power in the apocalyptic battle against false prophets. Through this, and the reformation that Grindal argues Ferdinand was engaged in promoting in his realm, Ferdinand is an *exemplum* for the reforming work that Elizabeth should be carrying out in the English church.

To portray Ferdinand as a reformer, Grindal makes a series of figural comparisons between the emperor and the Old Testament kings David, Solomon, and Josiah, each of whom corresponds to a different part of Ferdinand's career. In discussing Ferdinand's military career, for example, Grindal describes his wars against the Turks as a reenactment of David's "valeancie against the Philistines & other infidels" (B3v). By fighting the Turks, Ferdinand fulfills the "principal office required of a Christian Prince [...] the right use of the sword, put by God into his hand, for the defense of the godly" against "infidels" (B3v).

At the same time, however, Grindal uses the figural comparison to David to condemn the forces of religious faction in the Empire, especially those parties guilty of "contemning and persecuting the doctrine of the Gospell, then offered unto them" (B4r). It is because the princes of the Empire have ignored the teachings of the Gospel, here a clear reference to Protestantism,

that Ferdinand has lost “the better part of the kingdome of Hungarie” (B3v) in spite of his status as a divine ruler. Military defeat is divine punishment “for the sinnes of the Christian princes, & people” (B4r) like God’s decision “to plague [...] the Jewes by Nabuchodnosor [...] for the sinnes of Manasseh” (B4r).²² Based on the reference to Manasseh, the idolatrous king of Israel whose sins God punished with invasion by the Babylonians, Grindal emphasizes the fact that religious disunion, and the continued domination of continental Europe by the papacy, was the main cause of the wars with the Turkish infidels.

However, Grindal attributes Ferdinand’s successful defense of Vienna to a miraculous reward for Ferdinand’s domestic policies on religion. According to Grindal, the defense of Vienna is of supreme importance in the history of Christendom, because “if the Turke had then surprized Vienna, not onely al Germanie, but al Italy, Fraunce, yea and England also would haue before this time trembled & quaked” (B4v). Grindal attributes this instance of “Gods good protection” (B4v) to Ferdinand’s “peaceable gouernment, after he attained the Imperiall crowne” (C1r). To support this interpretation, Grindal makes a figural comparison between Ferdinand and “Salomon, who is termed by the interpretation of his name, pacificus, peaceable, or a Prince of peace” (C1r-v). Tellingly, Grindal discusses Ferdinand’s pursuit of peace solely in terms of his religious policies. As Grindal puts it, Ferdinand’s “warres were against Gods enemies, his peace was with gods people [...] he hath not stirred up any ciuil warres, under colour and pretence of religion, or for any other titles: but rather peaceably gouerned, nourishing concord and amitie among al the states of the Empire” (C1r). Here, Grindal’s praise of Ferdinand’s treatment of “gods people” is a clear reference to Ferdinand’s policies of toleration of Protestants within Imperial territory, and the section as a whole refers obliquely to Ferdinand’s role in the

²² 1 Kings 24.3. Throughout my discussion of Grindal’s sermon, I cite the Geneva translation, as the theological bias of the Geneva translators most closely matches Grindal’s own theological views.

creation of the 1555 Peace of Augsburg, which constituted, in Diarmaid MacCulloch's opinion, a "middle way" (297) that went "some way to meeting the symbolic issues of public worship that concerned Lutherans and Utraquist Hussites" (296).²³

Grindal portrays Ferdinand's religious "middle way" as an example of the way the English church should work, as a vehicle for his subjects' salvation rather than as a tool for political manipulation. Grindal makes a figural comparison between Ferdinand and Josiah to contrast Ferdinand's policies to those of the papacy. While the papacy according to Grindal introduces "schismaticall mater" into religious debate to increase its political power (C3v), Ferdinand uses the power of his office to reform religion for the spiritual good of his subjects by appealing to the Pope that "libertie may be graunted to haue the Communion ministered in both kyndes" in the Empire (C3v). For Grindal, this appeal reveals that Ferdinand was a kind of proto-Protestant who "was not ignoraunt of the sacrilege of the Romish Churche in depriuing the people of God of the one halfe of the Sacramente where Christe him selfe instituted both" (C3v). More importantly, however, the fact that Ferdinand attempts to institute this religious ceremony emphasizes the fact that the royal government should be the body deciding matters of religious practice, including all ceremonies of the church.

Grindal further uses the *figura* of Josiah to support the established church. Here, he uses Josiah's status as a righteous monarch who instituted new royal and religious feasts without veering into doctrinally suspect areas to defend Elizabeth's funeral ceremony for Ferdinand. By

²³ See Diarmaid MacCulloch's *The Reformation*. Grindal's interpretation of this, of course, differs from that of modern historians. According to MacCullough, Ferdinand's managing of religious minorities constituted a "pragmatic strategy" in which his support of clerical marriage and other issues of interest to Protestants was carefully modulated to suit the specific circumstances of his various territories despite his private "bias in favour of the old Church" (296). According to Paula Sutter Fichner in her essay "The Disobedience of the Obedient: Ferdinand I and the Papacy 1555-1564," Ferdinand combined realpolitic motives with an impulse towards reforming the Catholic church that found its fruition in the later Counter-Reformation.

extension, Grindal uses his defense of Ferdinand's funeral to justify religious ceremonies as a whole. According to Grindal:

Josias did not onely eate and drinke for necessitte, but also upon iust occasions, made great & royal feasts, & was sumptuous in other matters meete for hys estate, but he ioyned withal iudgement & iustice, he destroyed the monuments of idolatry, he ministered iudgement to the idolatrous priests, he ministered iustice to the oppressed, to the widow and fatherles & God was well pleased with him, saith the prophet. (D3r)

Grindal's direct source here is Jeremiah 22.15, in which the prophet's attack on Joachim is based primarily on his inability to follow his father's political and religious reforms.²⁴ According to Jeremiah, Joachim is guilty of following the teachings of false prophets, and his punishment for this political and religious sin is to be defeated and taken into exile by the Babylonians.

By using this figural connection in conjunction with his comparison of the Turks to the Babylonians, Grindal argues that Ferdinand is an Austrian Josiah. According to Grindal's textual reproduction of Ferdinand, the emperor's ability to save Vienna and the rest of

²⁴ According to the account of Josiah in 2 Kings 23, Josiah's main accomplishment is to be a reforming king who corrects the religious infractions of his predecessor, the idolatrous king Manasseh. Josiah's main accomplishments are that "he sacrificed all the priests of the hie places, that were there vpon the altars" (2 Kings 23.20) and "also toke away them that had familiar spirits, & the sothesayers, and the images, and the idoles, & all the abominacions that were espied in the land of Iudah and Ierusalem, to performe the wordes of the Lawe" (2 Kings 23.24), as well as ordering a Passover feast so sumptuous that "there was no Passouer holden like that from the daies of the Iudges that iudged Israel, nor in all the dayes of the Kings of Israel, and of the Kings of Iudah" (2 Kings 23.22 – all citations from the Geneva edition). 2 Chronicles expands on this account, saying that Josiah "appointed the Priests to their charges, and encouraged them to the seruice of the house of the Lord" (2 Chronicles 35.2). Thus, Josiah is seen as the last of the righteous kings who attempts to rule according to the laws of the covenant.

Christendom from Turkish invasion rests solely on his attempts to control the ecclesiastical structure of the Empire. His part in devising the Peace of Augsburg and his attempt to introduce communion in both kinds are a reenactment of Josiah's similar elimination of idolatry from Israel. Both kings prosper because they use their temporal powers in order to rectify problems within the ecclesiastical structure of their respective realms.²⁵

Consequently, Elizabeth's order for Ferdinand's funeral ceremonies fulfills the same biblical *figura*, as well as completes Ferdinand's own religious policies in Europe. By making a distinction between the funeral ceremony and Catholic practices like prayers for the dead, Grindal portrays Elizabeth as an English Ferdinand and an English Josiah, who restores the funeral ceremony to its uncorrupted form. The prayers for the dead introduced under the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, according to Grindal, are products of false prophets like those whom Josiah's son Joachim follows, as purgatory has been "maintained principally by fayned apparitions, visions of spirits, and other like fables, contrary to the Scriptures" (D1r). The elimination of these false rites from the funeral ceremony without eliminating the funeral ceremony altogether forms the core of Grindal's defense of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* against attack from his religious enemies.

Though Grindal's support of the established church seems uncharacteristically conservative for a prelate so closely associated with the proto-Puritan cause, he also uses his praise for Ferdinand to exhort Elizabeth into taking more decisive action against the Catholic powers on the continent. Grindal's logic is that if Ferdinand is a royal *exemplum* who reenacts the biblical *figurae* of David, Solomon, and Josiah through his protestantizing policies in the Empire, then he is also a forerunner of Elizabeth herself, who must follow his example to fulfill

²⁵ In order to sustain this connection, however, Grindal must omit the troublesome fact that Josiah, despite his righteousness, is killed in battle by the Egyptians.

her own role as a Christian monarch. According to Grindal, the best way of emulating Ferdinand is for Elizabeth to marry the Archduke Charles, which will create “unitie, concord, and amity” between the two countries as a prelude to an international Protestant crusade against Roman Catholicism (C3v).²⁶

Grindal’s treatment of marriage revolves around his praise of Ferdinand’s “chastitie” in his marriage which is the only attribute of the dead emperor that he says he “commend[s] specially” (C1v) as Ferdinand’s marriage is another example of Ferdinand imitating David’s example.²⁷ Ferdinand’s children offer him the same kind of political certainty that David had “when Salomon his sonne was proclaimed king before his death,” a peaceful succession that promises the ability to carry on his religious and political policies without disruption (C2r-v). Ferdinand imitates this *figura* through the “honourable marriages of hys daughters in sundrie places of Christendom” (C2r), and the role of Solomon is reenacted by the Emperor Maximilian, whose succession to the throne is “A great blessing to a Prince, and a great blessing to a country” by giving the Empire a ruler who could be expected to continue his father’s reforming policies (C2v). The political implications of Grindal’s stance here are bold. By portraying Ferdinand as a reenactment of Solomon’s fertility, he presumes to advise Elizabeth on her marital prospects, a topic on which she was reluctant to take advice from anyone. More boldly,

²⁶ This also appears to be the reason for the inclusion at the end of the sermon of a list of the mourners who participated in the funeral ceremonies. Ferdinand’s mourners included such noted protectors of the Protestant settlement in England as Archbishop of Canterbury Matthew Parker, William Cecil, Lord Henry Herbert, and Sir Francis Knollys, a fact that seems to support the idea that one of the main purposes of the funeral ceremony was to portray Ferdinand as a kind of proto-Protestant.

²⁷ Here, Grindal seems to be using the word chastity to mean the same thing that Spenser later does in Book 3 of *The Faerie Queene*, as he never mentions a matrimonial option aside from Ferdinand’s example of “preciselye [keeping] his wedlocke” (C1v) or the loose behavior of “Princes liuing heretofore incontinently” (C2r).

he also suggests that Elizabeth, by remaining a royal virgin, may be committing a grievous sin against both God and her divinely granted station as queen.²⁸

Marriage to the Archduke Charles, then, would allow Elizabeth to fulfill her role as a reformer of the universal church. Not only would the succession be assured, but also the temporal power of the Empire would allow her to become a crusading Protestant monarch able to intervene militarily on behalf of continental Protestants under threat of Catholic persecution. Since England's safety has depended entirely on "the good meanes of this noble Emperour Ferdinandus" in his defense of Vienna (B4v), a marriage to Ferdinand's son would solidify England's security and allow her to practice "the right use of the sword, put by God into [her] hand, for the defense of the godly and innocent, and for the repressing and punishing of the wicked" (B3v), most of whom would presumably be the more aggressively Catholic regimes that were engaged in the persecution of Protestants on the continent. The English church, with its militantly Protestant queen, would then serve as an example to other kings in Europe to follow in the path of religious reform, as "[t]hese kindes of actions [...] tend to thincrase of charitie, to the continuance and confirmation of unitie, concord, and amity, with a most noble and mighty prince our neighbor, and therefore cannot but be commended of al those that be louers of peace and unitie" (D3v).²⁹

In using figural interpretation in his commemoration of Ferdinand, Grindal accomplishes two important goals. First, the figural references throughout his sermon play the same role as

²⁸ That royal virginity is a sin is evident from the fact that the sterility that faces Elizabeth is the identical punishment for royal adultery, which is "sterilitie and want of roial issue of their bodies, and so the direct line of succession hath bene cut of after them" (C2r).

²⁹ I suspect that this is the purpose of Foxe's Latin translation of the sermon. By implying to foreign rulers that Elizabeth was not that different in her motives from Ferdinand, and arguing that her settlement of religion was motivated more by peace than by a desire to harshly persecute Catholics, he may have hoped to derail criticism of the English church from foreign agitation, including that of English Catholics in exile on the continent.

other kinds of allegorical language in the period. By making his argument through biblical *figurae*, Grindal is able to veil his speech and give himself some plausible deniability about his actual argument, which renders his direct intervention into the snakepit of Elizabeth's marital negotiations less hazardous for himself. Second, the figural interpretations that Grindal uses allow him to plausibly argue that Ferdinand, a Catholic monarch *par excellence*, is a kind of Protestant saint. By creating this saint through figural interpretation, Grindal argues that Ferdinand's conduct is as much a part of God's plan for the world as scripture and is, in fact, a kind of reflection of biblical doctrines of monarchy that Elizabeth must follow if she wants to be treated as a divine monarch in her own right. For the rest of Elizabeth's reign, as well as during James's reign, preachers would use commemorative sermons in the same way as Grindal, as polemical weapons that cast certain models of worldly conduct as earthly manifestations of divine law.

III: Militant Protestantism and the Funeral Sermon

If Grindal's sermon is an example of the way funeral preachers could use figural interpretation to support the established church, his conviction that the clergy has the right to advise the queen provides an example for more militant Protestant preachers who used the funeral sermon to argue for further reformation. As the climate for religious debate became increasingly hostile in the 1580s after John Whitgift's ascendance as Archbishop of Canterbury, the funeral sermon became a particularly important polemical tool for militant Protestants and supporters of presbyterian government of the church. The two sermons that I discuss here, Thomas Sparke's 1585 funeral sermon for the Earl of Bedford and a 1587 edition of Matthew Parker's 1551 funeral sermon for Martin Bucer, were published near the end of what Peter Lake

has called “a relatively moderate middle period” in the history of reformist agitation, “during which spokesmen for the movement made a self-conscious attempt to challenge conformists for the middle ground of respectable and evangelically concerned protestantism” while facing increasing pressure from the conformist archbishop (71).³⁰ Between Whitgift’s accession in 1583, with the accompanying subscription crisis that marked Whitgift’s attempt to “reinstate uniformity of liturgical observance in the Church” (Millward, *Elizabethan Age* 77), and the publication of the Marprelate tracts in 1587-1588, militant Protestants needed to find alternate methods of promulgating their ideas. The preaching and publishing of funeral sermons allowed militant Protestants to “[expand] the audience for religious polemic” in much the same way as the Marprelate tracts later did, with the added benefit that the publication of funeral sermons was actually legal (Black 209).³¹

Sparke’s sermon for the Earl of Bedford illustrates the use of commemoration to cement specific social circles for the purpose of religious and political unity. The sermon’s publication history suggests that Sparke intended it to reach a militant Protestant audience. Instead of being published in London, it was published by Joseph Barnes, the printer at Oxford, whose press was

³⁰ See Peter Lake’s *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. Much of my discussion of this period will be based on Lake, as well as Collinson’s *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, and Peter Millward’s *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*.

³¹ The use of figural interpretation and the republication of older sermons also allowed preachers to negotiate the waters of Elizabethan censorship and preaching regulations. Though scholars like Cynthia Clegg have revised and modified the paradigm of Elizabethan censorship developed by Annabel Patterson, the conditions of ecclesiastical debate in the mid-1580s meant that preachers and printers as much as poets needed to take advantage of rhetorical tools that would “allow their authors to keep faith with themselves, while creating a medium of expression that may [...] break through the political restraints and cultural assumptions” (Patterson 51). In 1585, for example, Whitgift denied Thomas Cartwright a preaching license (Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* 295) and the Puritan printer Robert Waldegrave “spent almost three months in prison” (274) for their opposition to the established church. See Patterson’s *Censorship and Interpretation* and Clegg’s *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* for extensive discussion of Elizabethan censorship.

set up under Leicester's protection in 1584, and who did not have to abide by the London's censorship regime.³² Bedford himself had been a staunch protector of militant Protestantism since the reign of Edward VI, and his death in 1585 was the first in a series of deaths of godly nobles that left the movement with few protectors at court (Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* 387).³³ Since Sparke was a militant controversialist who attended both the Lambeth Court meeting with Whitgift in 1584 and the 1604 Hampton Court Conference with James I and was an ecclesiastical client of the staunchly Protestant Arthur, Lord Grey, he was a logical choice to preach a sermon meant to recruit new noble protectors for militant Protestantism. Sparke's sermon both commemorates a noble who had been a reliable political defender of Protestantism, argues that the nobility have a religious duty to use their political positions to act as watchmen for the church, and also argues that the ceremonies of the established church have been irredeemably corrupted by the practices of Catholicism.³⁴

³² In an introduction to a library of Barnes's Latin publications, Dana Sutton argues that Barnes published "propagandistic literature designed to orchestrate educated public opinion". Carter agrees with this interpretation, arguing that Barnes's "press was used chiefly for tracts and sermons on the Protestant, at first Calvinist, side of religious controversy" (Carter 23). Given this fact, as well as Leicester's protection of the militant Protestant cause during the 1580s, it seems that Barnes's press was used to produce tracts and sermons that might have been found too offensive to be published in London under Whitgift's watchful eyes. See Harry Carter's *A History of the Oxford University Press* and Sutton, Dana. "Introduction" to Charles Fizegeoffrey's *Sir Francis Drake, His Honourable Lifes Commendation, and Tragicall Deathes Lamentation*.

³³ According to the *DNB*, Bedford attempted to forestall Mary's accession to the throne first by supporting the reign of Jane Grey, and then by supporting Wyatt's rebellion; he later fled to Geneva for the duration of the reign (vol. 49 431-433). Other Presbyterian protectors who died during the late 1580s and early 1590s included Leicester, Walsingham, and Sir Walter Mildmay, leaving little support for radical Protestants at court until Essex's rise to favor in the 1590s.

³⁴ See Sparke's entry in the *DNB* (vol. 53 312-313). Significantly, Sparke dedicates his massive expansion of the sermon to Grey, who he suggests should take over Bedford's role as leading Protestant defender, a somewhat ironic suggestion given Grey's own political problems in the mid-1580s, all of which makes it somewhat ironic that Sparke later wrote a pamphlet encouraging Puritans to conform to the church in 1607. Sparke also preached Grey's funeral sermon in 1593.

Sparke begins his figural interpretation of Bedford's life and his role in the protection of militant Protestantism by invoking an eschatological context. Sparke preaches on *Revelation* 14.13: "I heard a voice from heauen saying vnto me, write: Blessed are they that die in the Lorde thenceforth: euen so saith the spirit that they rest from their labours, and their workes accompany them" (1).³⁵ Sparke spends most of the sermon defining what it means to be one of the people who die in the Lord, or who die in a state of grace. In pursuit of this end, Sparke organizes his sermon around the shift from the prophecy of Antichrist and the mark of the beast in *Revelation* 13 to the coming of the Lamb in *Revelation* 14. Unsurprisingly, Sparke interprets Antichrist as a biblical prophecy of the Roman Catholic church, and he provides a great deal of historical justification for this interpretation.³⁶ This anti-Catholic diatribe takes up the bulk of the sermon, at the end of which Sparke turns to a brief commemoration of the life of Bedford, whom he praises as a nobleman whose political support of the militant Protestant cause reveals him to be a Protestant saint who can be expected to die in a state of grace.

As far as this goes, Sparke's sermon can be read as a typical piece of anti-Catholic polemic, but Sparke's figural interpretation of contemporary events makes it clear that Sparke's definition of Antichrist includes the established church as well, making his sermon an argument that his noble readers emulate Bedford's position as a protector of militant Protestantism. Sparke uses the eschatological context of his chosen text to connect the mark of the Beast with any church that relies heavily on ceremonies at the perceived expense of preaching. Sparke makes his connection between the English church and Antichrist through a pattern of imagery emphasizing infection and disease. Sparke further makes this connection through using a

³⁵ Sparke preaches from the Geneva edition, not surprising for an aggressive Protestant like Sparke.

³⁶ Most of this section of the sermon consists of paraphrases of the relevant Geneva Bible glosses.

rhetoric of separation that implies that only those who separate themselves from the ceremonial church can consider themselves in a state of grace and “die in the Lord.”

The controlling image of the sermon is the contrast between those who die in the Lord and those who align themselves with Antichrist, and Sparke therefore begins his sermon with a discussion of different interpretations of who these people are. Specifically, Sparke refutes the Catholic interpretation of this verse “that only hereby martyres are ment” by arguing that *Revelation* 14:13 refers to all of those who die in a state of grace (9).³⁷ The people who die in the Lord, according to Sparke, are all of those believers who withstand not only Antichrist’s “cruel persecutions”, but also the “faire means, or subtile perswasions” used by the Roman church “to heale up the wound of the beast” wrought by the Reformation (10).³⁸

Sparke directs his attack at Catholics’ “sweete and subtile” persuasive techniques (5). Foremost in Sparke’s mind is the elaborate ceremonial practice of Catholicism, which is not surprising given that the gloss of the Rheims New Testament says that Revelation 14.13 supports “Praying for the dead, and vnto the Saints, at the altar” (726). According to Sparke, all Catholic ceremonies, especially the purgatorial system, constitute “an Idole of their owne heades” (69) that “sprung [...] from earthly and not heauenly groundes, from the wit and will of foolish man and uncertaine traditions of earthly men” (71). Ceremonies are idolatrous because they both distract attention away from true worship of God and because they suggest “that Christ by his

³⁷ Here, Sparke refutes the annotations of the 1582 Rhiems New Testament, translated by Gregory Martin. The Rhiems gloss to Revelation 14.13 is a defense of purgatory and argues that the term “die in the Lord” is “specially spoken of Martyrs” rather than all of those who die in a state of grace (726). According to the Geneva gloss, which Sparke follows, those who die in the Lord are “are ingrafted in Christ by faith, which rest and stay onely on him and reioyce to be with him: for immediatly after their death they are recieved into ioye” (119).

³⁸ That this wound is the Reformation can be deduced from Sparke’s long-winded figural comparison between the Roman Catholic church and “Babylon the great Citie, that hath made all nations drunke with the wine of the wrath of her fornication, that is, that hath infected all nations with a false faith and religion” (61).

sufferings hath not so satisfied the iustice of his heavenly father as that hee will not require further satisfaction at the hands of him, that beleueeth in him” (35).

As bad as this would be, the elaborate ceremonies of Catholicism are most damning because they are present-day reenactments of the mark of the beast described in *Revelation* 13 and condemned in *Revelation* 14.9.³⁹ The reenactment of this mark is the panoply of Catholic ritual equipment: the “holie water, holie oyle, holie salt, holie creame, holie breade, holie palms, holie crosse, yea and to what toy soeuer, if it be but a graine, or a beade hallowed of the Pope” (36). Use of any of these is a sign that the worshipper has been marked by the beast, and therefore “whosoeuer dyeth in this popish fayth, dyeth bearing the mark of the beast in the forehead or hand” (59).

Sparke’s point is that these Roman ceremonies have infected the practices of all other countries. As he puts it, “the Babylonish harlotte is described to hould out unto others her abominations and filthie fornications in a golden cuppe” in order to seduce members of other societies through “as glorious shewes of Catholique and Christian religion as he could devise” (67). These false religious practices “hath infected all nations with a false faith and religion” that accompanies the spread of Antichrist’s kingdom (61). The worst infection, according to Sparke, is the infection of the English church through the medium of “seruice bookes.” Sparke claims that the service book is one of the many “toy[s]” used by Catholics, and classes it with the other Catholic corruptions of correct worship. Though Sparke never states it explicitly, it is clear that he sees the *Book of Common Prayer* as one of the practices that Catholics “haue taught us [...]”

³⁹ Here, Sparke follows the Geneva glosses of Revelation 13.16 in describing the ceremonies of Catholicism as the mark of the beast. The gloss reads: “Whereby he renounceth Christ: for as faith, the worde, and the Sacraments are the Christians markes: so this Antichrist wil accept none but suche as wil approue his doctrine: so yet it is not ynough to confesse Christ, & to belieue the Scriptures, but a man must subscribe to the Popes doctrine: moreouer their chrismatories, graisings, voves, othes & shauings are signes of this marke in so muche as no nation was excepted that had not manie of these marked beasts” (GGG3r).

too grosse experience” (36).⁴⁰ Thus the prayer book is evidence that the established church has been marked by Antichrist, making the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the English church just as guilty as Catholics of “[altering God’s] lawes and orders, [adding] and [detracting] at their pleasure too and from his reuealed and written worde, as the face and practice of their Church teacheth, in deed & truth they denie that he is come in the flesh” (66).

That Sparke’s main target is the English church rather than Catholics can be seen through his discussion of the Rheims seminary in the sermon. Throughout the text, Sparke conflates the Rheims seminary with the ecclesiastical hierarchy by describing the “Rhemists” (36) as a native source of bad interpretation that corrupts the English church from within by infecting England with Catholic ceremony and Catholic doctrine. At every mention of a specific Catholic doctrine, Sparke is careful to tell his audience that it is “our learned Rhemistes” that promulgate and develop the doctrine (36). For example, Sparke attacks the Catholic gloss to Revelation 14.13 as a doctrine meant to seduce the English to “trayterouslie and treacherouslie to murder their naturall Prince for that hee or shee fauoreth not the Popish faith.” Because of the Rheimists, assassination “is become nowe a meanes to merite and to obtaine plenary remission of all sinne to the partie that will hazarde his life to doe it” (37), a doctrine that is all the more dire since it comes “out of our owne countrimens writings “ (39).⁴¹ The possessive pronoun here strengthens the suggestion that the corruption of the established church is as much an internal matter as a matter of external subversion by Catholics from Rome.

⁴⁰ The ecclesiastical environment of 1584, during which Whitgift was beginning reprisals against nonconforming preachers, would have made it too dangerous for Sparke to be as direct as he might have liked, despite his political connections to high-ranking militant Protestants, like Bedford and his patron, Lord Grey, and the publication of his sermon at Oxford.

⁴¹ Sparke expresses a perverse kind of nationalistic pride about Robert Parsons, whom he refers to here as being “counted not the meanest of the Jesuites” (39). If Sparke had any other hint of a sense of humor, this might count as a joke.

Sparke presents presbyterian discipline as the antidote through which worshipers can fulfill the biblical injunction to die in the Lord. Sparke does this by using a rhetoric of separation; those who are “desirous to escape eternall damnation should in any case so separate themselves from Antichrist & his religion, that neither in forehead nor hand they bear his mark, that is neither openly nor secretly they be any longer fauorers of him and his abhominations” (5). Sparke describes the true church as a remnant of those who “perseuere in the zealous profession” of the Gospel (14) despite the attempts of Antichrist to “dazel [their] eyes” and seduce them into the “garish synagogue” of popish worship (74).

Sparke’s rhetoric is connected to the larger body of sermons in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries that portrayed the search for the true church as a “remnant which might for a time redeem and preserve the nation, but which would also survive the temporal ruin of the nation” (Collinson, “Biblical Rhetoric” 20).⁴² His conception of this separation, however, relies on the contemporary legal status of militant Protestantism. Here, Sparke uses the doctrine that “a man is not iustified by the workes of the Lawe, but by the faith of Jesus Christ” to prove that the literal legal system of the realm has been corrupted by the Beast (52). As Sparke puts it, “Christ was not sent to comfort any by the Gospell, that were not first discomforted by the lawe,” a phrasing that suggests that the elect are precisely those preachers and worshippers who had been deprived of their churches by Whitgift’s drive for conformity (75).

Though Sparke’s language invokes the Pauline interpretation of Christ as superseding the law of the Old Testament, his use of Bedford as an *exemplum* shows that he sees the remnant as being dispossessed by state law as well. Bedford is an *exemplum* and a Protestant saint because he is a noble who exerts his power on behalf of the persecuted ministry even at the risk of his

⁴² See Patrick Collinson’s “Biblical Rhetoric: the English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode” for a discussion of the rhetoric of the remnant in early modern conceptions of nationhood.

own martyrdom. In Sparke's words, Bedford "hath shewed himselfe in his life a zealous and constant professor & confessour of this faith, using all good meanes both priuately and publicly to nourish it" even during the realm of Mary I, "when to shew himselfe of this faith was dangerous to his lyuing and honour" (79). Rather than being a "vaine and prophane politike, that faouered and countenanced religion for his owne turne" (82), Bedford attempted to separate the English church from Catholic infection because he "hated the least ragge, relicke, and clout of the Romish harlote euery day more and more unto his death" (81). It is to follow Bedford in not being a "timeseruer, or dissemppler" that Sparke wants to encourage his audience (81). Though Sparke's direct reference to Bedford's life is somewhat brief, he turns the deceased into a Protestant saint through a process of contrast. Since he is not a time-server, Bedford is therefore a worthy model for emulation by other members of the ruling class.

The brevity of Sparke's treatment of Bedford's life makes its application to the problem of Catholic practices in the church somewhat obscure, but much of this brevity can be explained by the fact that the militant Protestant funeral sermon was still a genre in flux.⁴³ In his 1587 translation of Matthew Parker's 1551 funeral sermon for Martin Bucer, Thomas Newton makes far more use of the radical potential of Grindal's political funeral sermon to craft a masterpiece of indirect polemic against Whitgift's policies. Instead of a simple translation, Newton's republication completely transforms the sermon to portray Bucer and Parker as a pair of militant Protestant saints who both helped reform the English church. Newton represents Bucer, who was posthumously burned at the stake during Mary's reign, as a Protestant saint whose prophetic evangelism should be imitated by all members of the ministry. By focusing on Parker's

⁴³ See my discussion of Sparke's sermon for Arthur Grey, Baron de Wilton in chapter three. By 1593, when he preached Grey's funeral sermon, Sparke had perfected his method for connecting the life of the deceased and the doctrinal section, as his discussion of Grey's life is extensive and specific.

commemoration of Bucer, Newton is also able to redefine Matthew Parker, an ecclesiastical moderate who conformed during the Marian return to Catholicism, helped to write the *Thirty-Nine Articles* (Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* 34) and advocated the legitimacy of church vestments (69), as a militant Protestant prelate who followed the Bucerian ideal of a bishop who did not “rule as an aristocrat” (160) and who dealt with fellow preachers “fraternally rather than judicially” (159). Through this rather creative representation of Parker’s religious views, Newton is able to argue for an increased role for the clergy in the reorganization of the church.

It is clear from the publication history of the sermon that Newton and his printer, Thomas Purfoote, had some other use for the sermon than simply bringing an old sermon into print. Both Purfoote and Newton were sympathizers with militant Protestant causes, with Purfoote printing a number of anti-episcopal works and Newton translating works by Luther and Andreas Hyperius, a 1569 elegy for Lady Knollys, wife of the godly Sir Francis Knollys, and two translations of Parker’s sermon for Bucer, in 1570 and 1587.

Parker’s sermon focuses on the question of when and to what extent it is appropriate to mourn for the dead. The sermon is based on the Wisdom of Solomon 4 verses 7, 10, and 14-19.⁴⁴ Interestingly, the translation comes from the Geneva version, and must have been added to the sermon by Newton, given the fact that the Geneva Bible was not published until nine years

⁴⁴ The translation reads “Vers. 7 Althoughe the righteous bee preuented by death, yet shall he bee in reste. 10. He pleased God and was beloued of him, so that whereas hee liued among sinners, he translated him. 14. For his soule pleased God: therefore hasted hee to take him awaye from wickednesse. 15. Yet the people see, & understand not, & consider no such things in their hearts, how that grace & mercy is vpon his Sainctes, and his prouidence ouer the Elect. 16. Thus the righteous that is deade, condemneth the vngodly which are liuing: and the youthe that is soone broughte to an end, the longe life of the vnrighteous. 17. For they see the ende of the wise, but they vnderstande not what God hath deuised for him, & wherefore the Lord hath preserued him in safety. 18. They see him & despise him, but the Lord will laugh them to scorne. 19. So that they shall fall hereafter without honour & shall haue a shame among the deade for euermore.”

after the initial preaching and publication of Parker's sermon.⁴⁵ Newton used the Geneva edition to make Parker seem more like a presbyterian sympathizer than he actually was, as the Geneva translation of these verses gives a predictably Calvinist slant to the biblical verse by using the word "Election" in Wisdom 4.15, where the Great Bible and Coverdale's Bible use the word "chosen."

Newton's reinterpretation of Parker works because the sermon makes a general argument against mourning the dead, using Bucer as an example of the type of man whom listeners do not need to mourn because they can be sure of his salvation. As Parker puts it in his explication of doctrine, "To mourne and weepe for the death of a good and godly man, so far fourth as concerneth him, we are flatly forbidden both by reason and also by nature" (Parker A3r). Parker argues that mourning for a distinguished reformer like Bucer would go against the laws of charity, as to mourn for him would be to deny Bucer's salvation. Instead, listeners should be "undoubtedly perswaded of such sure and manifest promises of most blessed state after this life by the benefite of our Redeemer" (A3v). Moreover, Parker stresses the stoic acceptance of death as one of the main markers of Protestant Christianity. According to Parker, it is only "Heathen people rather then true Christians" who mourn excessively for the dead because they are "enuious caitiues" instead of "wel meaning friends" who are "void of hope & faith [...] & persons doubtful & uncertain of their saluation rather then constant beleeuers" (A7r). The distinction that Parker draws is a clear one, with the most important word being his attack on the "Heathen" people who do not have faith in their salvation and engage in the "howling or blubbering" that Parker links with Catholic prayers for the dead.

⁴⁵ Since Parker's sermon was originally in Latin, he most likely used either the Vulgate or possibly the Great Bible. Newton almost certainly used the Geneva version in his translation from the Latin edition published abroad.

That this would be Parker's argument is not surprising, as Protestants under Edward VI embraced a rigoristic approach to grief as a way of differentiating themselves from Catholics. Grief could be seen as a sign that the bereaved "either is guilty of the sin of despair or is admitting that the deceased is in hell" (Pigman 27).⁴⁶ However, Parker argues that even though his audience should not grieve for Bucer, they should grieve for themselves, and for the fate of the community that has to exist without Bucer. According to Parker,

in respect of our selues, that are bereft the company, sight and comfort of his virtuous manners, godly life and excellent learning, we haue most iust and urgent cause not onely to lament and bee sorie, but euen for a long space to continue the same our grieffe and moane, as hauing recieued some great losse & hinderance unrecoverable. (A8r).

Mourning for the community is acceptable in a way that mourning for the dead is not because Bucer's death has damaged the community of the church that he "notable seasoned [...] reuiued and resorted to her right ancienty & former strength and authoritie" (B1r).⁴⁷

Parker elaborates this idea in his discussion of Bucer's life by using a figural comparison between Bucer and Moses to link the English church and a rebellious Israel. The church's crime in ignoring Bucer's attempts to reform it is the persecution of a prophet, a crime symbolized by a rigid adherence to old ceremonies. Both the idea that the unfaithful were guilty of killing the

⁴⁶ See G.W. Pigman's *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* for a discussion of the rigoristic treatment of grief during the period. According to Pigman, this treatment of grief differs from an earlier Patristic acceptance of grief and mourning (28). Pigman briefly discusses Parker's sermon in the context of this debate, and uses it as a key document in his argument that the 1550s marked the high point of rigor, before a slow acceptance of mourning and grief began.

⁴⁷ This is no surprise, given the fact that early modern funeral rites were specifically designed to repair this kind of social damage. See Introduction.

prophets and therefore of religious rebellion and the idea that a too-rigid adherence to ceremonialism was a key part of this prophetic mirror godly criticisms of the established church under Whitgift. In particular, Newton's translation responds to the subscription crisis of 1583/84, in which many presbyterian-leaning clergy were deprived of their churches, the failure of Cope's Bill and Book in the 1586 Parliament, and the subsequent jailing of the leaders of the movement to make the Presbyterian *Book of Discipline* the basis of the Elizabethan church.

Moreover, the figural comparisons between Bucer and Moses and the English church and Israel are what make Parker's sermon so useful to Newton as an argument for the further reform of the church, as this figural connection reinforces Parker's conception of a prophetic ministry in which preachers take a leadership role in the direction of the church. According to Parker, Israel's religious relationship with Moses is political as well as religious in nature, as Moses is as much a civil governor as a prophet; he is the "Captain & Gouverneur" (B3r) of the Israelites, "their leader and Gouverneur" (B3v), a "worthy & so noble a Prince" (B3v), and "their Prince and Gouverneur" (B4r). Likewise, Parker describes the religious crimes of the Israelites in political terms; the Israelites' refusal to listen to Moses's dictums "touchinge their Sacrifices, Rytes and Ceremonies, which hee eyther by worde of mouthe, or by traditions written, had left amonge them" (B5r) is a "mutinous reuolt and undutifll contumacie" (B4r). Moses's death is punishment for a series of religious and political rebellions by the Israelites.

Just as God appointed Moses the leader of the Israelites, God has appointed Bucer the religious leader of Cambridge, and by extension leader of the English church as a whole. Parker states that God "ordeyned this worthy instrument in his Church, to sojourne and dwell now in the ripenesse both of his lyfe and doctrine herre among" the English at Cambridge (B1v) to carry out a religious reformation by [reviving] and [restoring] to her right ancienty & former strength and

authoritie” the English church (B1r).⁴⁸ Parker describes Bucer as being the architect of the Reformation, as “he shewed himselfe a most diligent and paynefull builder, and a most wise and cunning maister workman” (B7r). If the English church is a kind of religious polity, then Bucer is its divinely appointed governor. Bucer’s death is the same kind of punishment for religious error and rebellion that Moses’s death is to the Israelites. The English church is “herein in like sort punished by the hand of God as the Israelites” (B5v) because, like the Old Testament rebels, the people of the English church have been disloyal to Bucer and, by extension, to God. According to Parker, despite the fact that Bucer helped to raise Cambridge from “being greatly decayed and almost utterlye fallen downe to the grounde” (B1v), some members of this same community are guilty of a religious rebellion: “[i]t is sayde, that he liued heere amonge thanklesse, crabbed, and frowarde sinners” (B6r) who

deuise all the waies they can, and seeke all meanes possible, to the uttermost of their ability to deface the beautye & glory of this building, to undermine the walles and ouerthrow the foundation therof, that all the wilde beastes of the woode, may freely enter, to deuour, spoyle, robbe and most cruellye to make hauocke of all. (B7v)

Parker uses the revolt of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram in Numbers 16.3 to lend figural support to his contention that ceremonialists within the church were guilty of attacking the prophets. Though the three rebels base their uprising on the presumption that Moses and Aaron have arrogated too much religious power to themselves, Parker makes it clear that their crime

⁴⁸ Parker here uses the common Reformation assumption that the reformed churches were the true inheritors of the apostolic succession.

stems from “their malicious & manifest contempt of God” (B2r).⁴⁹ Parker emphasizes this idea by quoting Isaiah 30.10, in which the Israelites tell the prophets to “prophecie not and to the seers, see not, neither speak vnto vs right thinges: but speake flattering things vnto vs: prophecie errours. Departe out of the way: goe aside out of the path: cause the holy one of Israell to cease from us” (B2v). Parker then argues that this repeated denial of the prophets is the reason for Israel’s repeated punishments at the hands of God in the Old and New Testaments. Similarly, the English church has been guilty of denying the prophets through their rebellion against Bucer’s reforms. By sending Bucer to Cambridge, “God hath sent his Prophets, Wisemen & Scribes from the far distant places of the world” (B8v). Any attacks on Bucer constitute a kind of rhetorical killing of one of God’s prophets, which leads to Parker’s culminating call that his audience “Repent, repent, thou that killest the Prophets, & with slaunderous words stonest them that are sent unto thee” (B8v).⁵⁰

In the 1550s, Parker’s exhortation referred to recalcitrant Catholics and to those who opposed Bucer’s efforts to create the *Book of Common Prayer*, but what makes the sermon particularly useful to Newton as an argument for a more presbyterian government of the church is the amount of power that Parker’s figural comparisons give to preachers in the church. Most important is Parker’s characterization of Bucer as a ruler of the church, which Parker bases on the comparison between the dead reformer and Moses. Both Bucer and Moses are governors because they were prophets; “the singuler benefite of the flocke” (B3r) of both biblical Israel and

⁴⁹ According to the Geneva edition that Newton uses in this edition, the verse reads “Who gathered them selues together against Moses, and against Aaron, and said unto them, Ye take to muchee vpon you, seing all the Congregacion is holy, euerie one of them, and the Lord is among them: wherefore then lift ye your selues aboue the Congregacion of the Lord?”

⁵⁰ Describing notable reformers as latter-day prophets was a fairly common occurrence. For example, see Max Engammare’s “Calvin: A Prophet without a Prophecy” for a discussion of the ways in which Calvin was represented as a prophet during his life and after his death.

England depends on the prophets sent by God using their divine inspiration to “notable season religion” that has become “pitifully many wayes mangled and deformed” (B1r).

Parker emphasizes the role of prophets in the church in his final figural comparison of the members of the English church to the fig tree that Jesus curses in Matthew 21.19 and Mark 11.13. As opposed to Bucer, whom Parker describes as a “greene Tree which yelded plentiful store of fruite in due season” (B7v), the English community that gave him envy during his life is made up of “deade, drye and withered Figge trees, without eyther blossome or fruite” that “bring foorth in our lyfe nothing but brambles and thistles” (B8r).⁵¹ This figural connection is more significant when the gloss from the Geneva Bible is considered, and illustrates the way that Newton uses Parker and Bucer as exempla for the proper government of the church. According to the Geneva gloss to Mark 11.13, Jesus’s curse “was to declare how muche they displease God which haue but an outwarde shew & appearance without fruit.” This interpretation of the curse provides Newton with a clear case against excess ceremonialism in religion. Those who reject Bucer, or reject the reforming prophets of the English church are guilty of rejecting God and giving only the outward appearance of piety.

Newton’s translation of Parker’s sermon is a response to the crisis facing presbyterianism and militant Protestantism in the late 1580s. By presenting Bucer and Parker as twin *exempla* for the clergy, he makes an argument for an altered form of church government. By describing Bucer as a reenactment of Moses, he makes his case that it is the prophetic authority of ministers and preachers that makes them the rightful governors of the church instead of the bishops. He presents Parker as a divine counterexample to the behavior of Archbishop Whitgift, a prelate

⁵¹ From the Geneva edition that Newman uses, Matthew 21.19 reads “And seing a figge tre in the way, he camee to it, and founde nothing thereon, but leaues onely, and said to it, Neuer frute grow on thee hence forwardes. And anone the figge tre withered!” Mark 11.13 reads “Then Jesus answered, & said to it, Neuer man eate frute of thee hereafter while the worlde standeth: and his disciples heard it.”

who understands the prophetic source of a preacher's authority. In each case, the Protestant model of commemoration, in which the figural interpretation of the life of the deceased is the basis of praise, is a necessary part of Newton's polemical campaign. By turning Parker and Bucer into Protestant saints, he can deploy them as symbolic arguments for the further reformation of the English church in a presbyterian direction, and can convince his audience of godly clergy and godly nobility that they should use their power to effect religious change from within the church.

IV: William Barlow, the Earl of Essex, and Making a Rebel a Saint

It was not only presbyterians like Newton and militant Protestants like Sparke who used funeral commemoration to advance their views. As Elizabeth's reign progressed, conformist divines came to use the funeral sermon as a polemical tool to create a specifically conformist vision of the interdependence of religion and obedience. William Barlow's 1601 funeral sermon on the Earl of Essex provides an excellent example of the ways conformist divines could mold the discourse of political sainthood to their own ends.

Barlow's sermon on the Earl of Essex is atypical of the other sermons I have discussed here. For one, it was preached at Paul's Cross on the Sunday after Essex's execution rather than at his actual funeral, but more importantly, because the sermon "[contains] in it more matter rather of state then diuinitie" (Barlow A3r), its discussion of its subject's life is more detailed and extensive than in a standard Elizabethan funeral sermon. Barlow here was following the

orders of William Cecil to explain to the people Essex's "acknowledgment of his guilt and his profession of repentance for his treasonable designs" (*DNB* vol 3: 232).⁵²

Arnold Hunt argues that Barlow's sermon constituted the regime's final effort to manipulate public opinion about Essex (100). This manipulation was necessary because varying interpretations of Essex's religious self-presentation "rapidly came to be seen as a key to the meaning of the revolt" (97).⁵³ Barlow intends to stamp out the image of Essex as "a Protestant hero" (97) and to neutralize the clerical patronage circle that Essex had used to "[attract] a religious following which could then be mobilized in the service of political faction" (106).⁵⁴ The initial response of Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, to Essex's arrest was to issue preaching orders that "alleged that Essex was guilty of treasonable correspondence with the Pope and other Catholic powers," a rhetorical strategy that "backfired badly" when members of the London clergy unconvinced of Essex's guilt refused to follow Bancroft's instructions (98). Barlow responds to this predicament by focusing on native Catholic subversives instead of hazy connections with foreign powers (101). This more moderate strategy allowed Essex's followers

⁵² Ironically, the only other extant Elizabethan funeral sermon that spends a similar amount of time on the life of the deceased is Richard Davies's sermon 1577 sermon on Essex's father.

⁵³ See Hunt's "Tuning the Pulpits: the Religious Context of the Essex Revolt." See also Patrick Collinson's *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* for a detailed look at the ways in which Essex interacted with the Presbyterian underground in London during the 1590s.

⁵⁴ Hunt endorses Francis Bacon's hostile interpretation of Essex's rebellion. Though historians generally agree that "after a brief flirtation with radical Puritanism, Essex gradually disengaged himself from his puritan supporters" (89), Essex still maintained a clerical patronage circle of militant Protestants and "maintained close personal links with a number of prominent Puritan ministers in London" (89). Collinson agrees with this view of Essex's clerical circle. By maintaining links with both Archbishop Whitgift as well as with Puritans like Cartwright, Essex could gain support from both sides. His success at playing different religious factions against one another is evident from the fact that "Whitgift was faithful to the earl in his disgrace and fall" despite Essex's support of militant Protestants (*Elizabethan Puritan Movement* 445).

“to believe that their leader had died an exemplary Christian death, but at the same time they would also be forced to accept that he had confessed to treason” (102).⁵⁵

What Hunt does not discuss directly is that Barlow’s rehabilitation of Essex describes Essex’s fall into rebellion and subsequent repentance as a progression from faulty to correct methods of biblical interpretation. Essex falls not because he is power-hungry, but rather because he is a dupe of Catholic theologians who use a flawed interpretative framework to lead Essex astray. Barlow responds with a sermon on the proper interpretation of Christ’s answer to the Pharisees in Matthew 22.21, “Give unto Caesar the things of Caesar,” a biblical verse that immediately invites a discussion of the relative weights of religious vs. political duty. Barlow interprets the Pharisees as attempting to “intrap [Jesus] in matters both of Religion, and policie” (B2r) and Christ’s answer as a perfect understanding of the sacral nature of the monarchy.⁵⁶ The bulk of the sermon is taken up with a description of how Essex moves from a faulty understanding of this doctrine to a confession of his guilt.⁵⁷ Barlow centers the sermon on the scene of Essex’s confession in the Tower, in which Essex undergoes a dramatic transformation from an unrepentant rebel to a confessed sinner who accepts his execution as a sacrifice made in service to the state.⁵⁸ Barlow portrays Essex’s shift from rebellion to repentance as a shift from

⁵⁵ In its goal of neutralizing militant Protestant supporters, Barlow’s sermon was apparently successful, though mainly because members of Essex’s clerical circle began blaming each other for the collapse of the movement rather than because Barlow’s sermon actually convinced any of them (Hunt 104-105).

⁵⁶ See Shuger’s *Habits of Thought* and McCoy’s *Alterations of State* for more in-depth discussion of sacral monarchy.

⁵⁷ The vita is notable not only because of its length, but also because it includes extensive quotations from Essex’s private confession. The sermon also includes an appendix that describes Essex’s behavior at his execution, which gives evidentiary witness to Barlow’s interpretation of Essex as a fully reformed Christian.

⁵⁸ Barlow’s description benefits from “the privileged aura attaching to words delivered in the face of death” and conforms to the ideal shift from rebellion to repentance advised in the *ars morendi* manuals (Lake and Questier 241). Moreover, Essex’s death matches the only way that a convicted criminal could die a good death: “Many of the convicted held themselves up as terrible

faulty to correct methods of biblical interpretation. The unrepentant Essex is a negative exemplum, whose fall is entirely the fault of his *inability* to imitate Christ's actions in the episode of the Pharisees. This connection of rebellion to deviation from the interpretative framework of the established church, while aimed at Catholics, marginalizes members of all religious factions who supported Essex's rebellion, while Essex is reintegrated into the body politic as a model citizen fit to be imitated by all loyal members of English society.

Barlow relies on a network of figural imagery that presents Essex's Catholic conspirators as reenactments of the Philistines and the redeemed Essex as a saintly imitation of Christ's ability to give a correct interpretation of religious and political doctrine.⁵⁹ Through this figural reading of Essex's life, Barlow deemphasizes Essex's role in the revolt and presents him as an exemplary Christian who understands that what is due to Caesar and what is due to God are ultimately identical. In the structure of the sermon, the Pharisees are a figural pivot between Old Testament figures of religious entrapment and the reenactment of these figures in Essex's own entrapment. Thus, Barlow begins his sermon by connecting the Pharisees to the figure of Nimrod, "that mighty hunter before the Lord" in Genesis 10 (B1r), who is the first in a series of

examples to be avoided. Such a ritual allowed the condemned man to seize a last opportunity of doing good and to be reintegrated into earthly society before being finally despatched from it" (Houlbrooke 214), and Lucinda Beier uses Essex as an example of the way "a good death could dim public recollection of crimes committed in life" (60). Indeed, it is this exemplary death itself that allows Barlow to portray Essex as a saint of the established church, as the ability of a felon to face death with confidence "was considered to be an acid test of the personal religious profession of the condemned and of the truth of the religious system within which that profession was framed" (Lake and Questier 241). See Peter Lake and Michael Questier's *Antichrist's Lewd Hat* and Lucinda Beier's "The Good Death in Seventeenth-Century England."

⁵⁹ Barlow focuses on the Catholic participants of Essex's rebellion to the exclusion of all else, urging his readers to "looke to the commanders" of Essex's rebellion, who present "danger to her person to religion, to the Realme" because "two of the principall [are] stiffe and open Papists, and the fourth, by report, affected that way" (D2r).

satanic hunters who occur throughout the Bible, and who use a variety of “toyles and nets” in 2 Timothy 2 to entrap the righteous (B1r).⁶⁰

The danger of these rhetorical nets, in Barlow’s view, is that “the snares of questions” asked by the Pharisees, which Barlow interprets as religious controversy, are meant to lead Jesus into treason (B1v). According to Barlow, who here almost directly quotes the Geneva gloss, the Pharisees’ question “hath a downfall on both sides, for if hee had answered negatively, they wold haue accused him of treason against the Emperour [...] If his answer had bin affirmatiue, they had accused him of blasphemie against God and their state” (B2v). Notably, Barlow describes the possible treason against the Jews as “blasphemie,” which emphasizes the religious basis of political loyalty. Most important to Barlow, however, is the fact that the Pharisees’ question depends on a linguistic game in which the stakes are differing interpretations of the word “lawful” (Matt. 22.13). Christ’s answer illustrates his perfect understanding that the monarch and God “haue interchangeably borrowed names: it pleaseth God to bee called a King in heauen, Psa. 20. And the King is called a God on earth, Psa. 82. Therefore hee which denieth his dutie to the visible God, his prince and Soueraign, cannot performe his dutie to the God inuisible,” the doctrine that underlies sacral monarchy (Barlow B3r).

The chief English Pharisee is the Jesuit Robert Parsons, who is also guilty of playing religious word games in order to provoke unorthodox religious interpretations that lead readers into treason. Parsons, according to Barlow, pursues theological questions not as a true inquiry

⁶⁰ Barlow further further connects the Pharisees to Old Testament figures of political entrapment by stating that the “Herodians with the Pharisees, & the Saduces after the Herodians, and the lawyers after the Sadducees” are all predicted by David in Psalm 22.16, in which David says “Many Dogs are come about me” (B1v) and Psalm 140 “The proud haue laide their snares for me” (B1v). According to the Geneva Bible’s gloss to the story, Christ’s accusers “were certeine flatterers of the court, which maintained that religion, which King Herode best approued: and thogh they were enemies to the Pharises: yet in this thing thei consented, thinking to intangle Christ, and so ether to accuse him, or to bring him into the hatred of all his people” (DDir).

into the truth of scripture. Instead, Parsons proves “by stories of scripture, that it is lawfull for the subject to rise against his soueraigne” to create a political snare like that the Pharisees use against Jesus, intended to provoke Essex into rebellion (B5v). In this way, Parsons “makes the crowne of England a tennis bal, and tosseth it from Papist to Puritan, and from Puritan to Protestant” (B5v). The image suggests that instead of approaching the crown as a symbol of God’s deputy on earth, Parsons’s interpretation of the crown is as semantically empty as the Pharisees’ understanding of the word “lawful” in the biblical story. Since “Papists lay these grounds, and make these proofes” (C5v), the main threat of Catholicism is verbal juggling with the scripture that disrupts stable political and religious hierarchy.⁶¹

The result of this linguistic game is that would-be political actors like Essex are led into erroneous hermeneutic strategies encouraging them to use any biblical text as support for their plans on the basis of outward similarity rather than on an investigation of the true meaning of the figure. Barlow compares this interpretative fallacy to leprosy, as it is “loathsome and infectious to others,” with the result being the degeneration of the body politic (C2r). What is interesting, however, is that Barlow describes the commemoration of Essex as the medicine that can cure the injured body politic. Even though Essex, the political leper is dead, “he leaueth behind him both the house, and ayre daungerously contagious” with the seeds of further rebellion, in the form of his still-faithful followers. Barlow hopes that by showing how Essex revises his interpretation of his own actions in his shift from rebellion to repentance, the “double commiseration both of his fall, and of his soule” will heal the realm of “the remainder and contagion of his offence” (C2v).

⁶¹ Interestingly, Shakespeare uses the same image in *Henry V*, in which the French ambassador offers Henry a case of tennis balls as a coronation gift. As with Barlow’s comparison, the gift is meant to accuse Henry of being essentially unserious, with a corresponding suggestion that Henry’s claim to the French throne is based little more than clever wordplay.

In the first part of his confession, Essex does the opposite of Christ in the story of the Pharisees, and is therefore snared by Parsons. In each of his justifications, Essex follows the Catholics in “[wresting] the scripture from the true sence, [bringing] foorth either a heresie or a phrensie” (C6r). Essex’s reason for denying wrongdoing is that “the sinceritie of [his] conscience, and the goodness of [his] cause dooth comfort [him]” (C5r). Barlow emphasizes the religious implications of this damaging statement by connecting Essex’s excuse to a supposedly Catholic reliance on “justifying [...] an ill execution upon a good purpose and meaning”, which follows the doctrine of Catholic “Canon Lawyers” that “God loues Aduerbs better then Adiectiues” (C5r). This reliance on good intentions, according to Barlow, “is the utter subuersion of all religion and policie: an opinion forged at the fire of hell, and hammered at the Anvile of the Popes faculties” (C5r).

More particularly, Barlow shows how Essex has misread particular biblical verses to justify his uprising. When Barlow asks Essex why he refused to report to Elizabeth when she summoned him before a court of lords, Essex uses a biblical example that “reasoneth, *David* refuseth to come to *Saul* when he sent for him: *Ergo* I might lawfully refuse to come to Queene Elizabeth” (C5v). According to Barlow, this is a clear misreading of the text, as “there is no semblance of this example” that “makes for his refusal” (C6r). Unlike Saul, who “was reiected by God,” Elizabeth “is the chosen and the beloued of God” who reenacts David’s role; thus Essex has no justification to refuse her summons (C6r).⁶²

Essex is also guilty of misreading scripture in discussing the legal rights and responsibilities of his office of Earl Marshal of England. Essex explains his uprising as a

⁶² However, in order to avoid agitating Essex’s still-loyal followers, Barlow makes the tactful choice of ignoring the more obvious interpretation of Essex’s statement. By comparing himself to David and Elizabeth to Saul, Essex could be accused of using this biblical example to claim himself as the legitimate, divinely elected monarch in place of Elizabeth.

fulfillment of his duty to “remooue euils from the land” and to pursue “some things to be reformed” (C6v), which Barlow interprets as an attempt to enact the dictum of Proverbs 25.5, “Remooue the wicked from the King, and his throne shall be established in iudgement” (C6v-C7r). However, Barlow argues that Essex’s attempt to exert his earthly authority constitutes an unlawful and ultimately self-interested attack on the religious and political structure of the realm. According to Barlow, the biblical text does not make the removal of the wicked the business of the king’s subjects. Instead, he quotes Proverbs 25.4, “the drosse must be taken from the siluer” which is the job of the “Gold-finer”, a common biblical “similitude” for God. Here, Essex oversteps his bounds, as the “iust authority and lawfull meanes” for reforming the king “is Gods alone” (C7r).⁶³

Barlow further compares Essex’s misreading to the reasoning of “Clement the Frier who killed Henry the third the French king” (C5v). Here, the Catholic assassin uses Ehud’s killing of Eglon from Judges 3 to justify his assassination: “Ehud killed kinge Eglon, therefore I may kill Henry. Eglon was a king, so is Henry. What then Eglon signifieth a Calue and Henry is a Caluinist, Ergo I may kill him by authoritie of Scripture” (C5v). According to Barlow, Clement draws a false similitude between himself and a biblical figure, and falls into the same trap as Essex of rebelling against his monarch.

In the second half of his description of the earl’s confession, Barlow emphasizes the fact that Essex’s repentance marks a return to orthodox Protestant methods of interpretation, which marks him as a reenactment of Christ. This theological conversion allows Essex to undergo a political conversion in which he accepts his execution as the best way of healing the breach in the body politic caused by his rebellion. It is important to Barlow’s reconstruction of the event

⁶³ Barlow’s interpretation agrees with the Geneva gloss, which “sheweth that it is hard for a man to atteine to the reason of all the secret doings of the King” (ZZ3r).

that none of the attending clerics has much to do with Essex's conversion. During the second meeting, they are amazed to find him more willing to admit his own wrongdoing. According to Essex, this new "detestation and remorse" (C7v) for his rebellion comes because, as Barlow quotes Essex, "God of his mercie hath opened mine eyes, and made me see my sinne, my offence, and so touched my hart as I hate it both in my selfe and others" (D1r). Essex states that his new understanding is the result of "the worke of Gods spirite within him," which "hath plowed up my hart" (C8r).

The result of the sudden action of grace and newfound religious obedience to the English church is that Essex comes to full political conformity by making a voluntary confession to the Council and identifying his co-conspirators (C8r).⁶⁴ More importantly, however, Essex interprets his own actions in terms of predestinarian theology. God has "made him this example to be spewed out of the land" (D4r). Instead of reading himself as a justified rebel, he now sees his rebellion in politically orthodox terms. He is "both a burthen and a danger" to the state and the queen (D4r).

Essex thus willingly sacrifices himself to the state, rendering what is due to Caesar in this case, and the description makes Essex into a kind of a martyr. He is an example for people to be wary of, but Barlow certainly intends his readers to understand that this repentant Essex, who understands political doctrine well enough to sacrifice himself willingly because "he knew that the Queene could not be in saftie so long as he liued vpon the earth" (D4r), is the one they should emulate. Just as Barlow and Essex hope that Essex's execution will purge the body politic of the illness of rebellion, Barlow hopes that any readers in his audience who still supported Essex's rebellion would become orthodox political subjects like Essex.

⁶⁴ The fact that Essex identifies some of his conspirators as people who have already been arrested seems significant, as they act as physical proof that he is acting in good faith.

This newly repentant Essex in the third stage of Barlow's reconstruction becomes the symbolic Essex "upon the Scaffold," whose final words become the opportunity for more explication that links Essex's rebelliousness to Barlow's own audience. The emphasis shifts from the native Catholics who infected Essex to the larger circle of his supporters, who become a stand-in for any religious sectarians who deviated from the royal supremacy.⁶⁵ In the example of Clement, Henry III's assassin, Barlow says that he is "sory that any, who carries the name of a Protestant, should argue" that the Bible gives warrant for rebellion against the monarch (C5v). On one level, this simply refers to his grief that Essex has fallen prey to this kind of faulty biblical interpretation, but when combined with his earlier accusation that Parsons bounces the crown between Puritan and Catholic, Barlow implies that the hotter Protestants who followed Essex were guilty of the same theological crime as Essex by supporting him.

Most importantly, in his reading of Essex's final plea that God "forgiue him his great sinne, his bloody sinne, his crying sinne, his infectious sinne," Barlow is far more concerned with describing how the people of London are guilty of misreading Essex's now-orthodox reading of his own revolt (D4v). For example, when Barlow begins this denunciation, he describes Essex's "great sinne" as "the compound of all the famous rebellions eyther in Gods booke, or our owne land," which includes everything from the biblical rebellions of Abner, Corah, Sheba, Abimelechs, and Haman to the native English Peasant's Revolt and Henry IV's rebellion against Richard II (D5r-v). All of these rebellions, significantly, had a popular element, and Barlow uses Essex's position as a reenactment of these biblical and native revolts to indict the populace of London who supported Essex in his bid for power. Barlow suggests that the

⁶⁵ Barlow's prefatory letter divides his audience into two camps – the faithful and the unfaithful both politically and religiously. Significantly, Barlow's sermon responds to a 1599 Paul's Cross sermon by John Richardson that uses the same verse, but a different interpretation, in support of Essex, that compares Elizabeth to Nero, a suggestion that got Richardson barred from preaching and placed under house arrest (Hunt 91).

Earl's supporters, who included a large number of Protestant preachers, have succumbed to the same faulty methods of interpretation that misled Essex's Catholic co-conspirators. Essex, his Catholic co-conspirators, and the people of London are thus grouped together as religiously-disloyal rebels whose religious sectarianism leads directly to their political rebellion.

As the examples of Grindal, Sparke, Newton, and Barlow show, the development of new commemorative techniques provided members of all segments of the English church with a powerful polemical tool with which to influence English policy makers. Because it links the lives and actions of the deceased definitively to major episodes from biblical narratives, figural interpretation gave these representations of the dead the appearance of scriptural truth. Rather than praising the acts of mortals or the products of the corrupt human imagination, preachers and controversialists were praising the reflections of Christian doctrine represented by their subjects, and could argue that their subjects were fit *exempla* for their listeners and readers to follow. The usefulness of figural interpretation as the method for creating Protestant political saints explains the growing acceptance of commemorative speech through the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign, so that by the late 1580s and 1590s, funeral sermons and the funeral elegies that borrowed the figural rhetoric of the funeral preachers became an even more important part of the polemical climate of the English church and state.

Chapter Two: Vernacular Elegies for Sir Philip Sidney: The Knight as Martyr and Author

When Richard Greaves defined the goal of funeral commemoration as the creation of “secularized [...] saint[s],” he might have used the funeral procession and funeral elegies that followed Sir Philip Sidney’s 1586 death at the battle of Zutphen as his example (Greaves 731).¹ Few of the aristocratic funerals of Elizabeth’s reign were as grand, provoked as many laudatory publications, or inspired so enduring a public cult as Sidney’s. As a number of historians have made clear, Sidney’s funeral was unusual in its grandiosity; despite being a commoner, Sidney was granted a funeral that was not only “of great political importance” (Bos et al 50), but was “essentially a royal one in all but name” (Goldring 199).² The mourning for Sidney extended far beyond his funeral procession, however. Between 1586 and the end of the century, Sidney’s death was remembered in a large number of commemorative publications, which included “an unprecedented amount of elegy” devoted to shaping Sidney’s memory and public reaction to his death (Pigman 57).³

¹ For more detailed discussion of Sidney’s biography and his conduct at Zutphen, see John Buxton’s *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance*, Duncan-Jones’s *Philip Sidney, Courtier Poet*, Alan Stewart’s *Philip Sidney: A Double Life*, and Arthur F. Kinney’s “Intimations of Mortality: Sidney’s Journey to Flushing and Zutphen.”

² Though Bos, Lange, and Six argue that Sidney’s funeral was not an actual “state funeral” because most of the costs were paid by Francis Walsingham rather than Elizabeth (49), the fact is that Sidney’s funeral was as close to being an official funeral as any aristocrat was likely to get. For discussions of Sidney’s elaborate funeral procession, see Dominic Baker-Smith’s “‘Great Expectation’: Sidney’s Death and the Poets,” Sander Bos, Marianne Lange-Meyers, and Jeanine Six’s “Sidney’s Funeral Portrayed,” John Buxton’s “The Mourning for Sidney,” Elizabeth Goldring’s “The Funeral of Sir Philip Sidney and the Politics of Elizabethan Festival,” Alan Hager’s “The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney’s Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader,” and Ronald Strickland’s “Pageantry and Poetry as Discourse: The Production of Subjectivity in Sir Philip Sidney’s Funeral.”

³ The publications about Sidney include engravings and descriptions of the funeral procession, including Thomas Lant’s *The Funeral Procession of Sir Philip Sidney*, “[f]our collections of University verse (one from Cambridge, two from Oxford, and one from Leiden) containing

The posthumous shaping of Sidney's legacy, however, was not a simple matter of portraying him as a "perfect pattern of heroic virtue" (Ringler 3). Instead, these elegies were part of a "deliberate propaganda campaign" (Hammer 53) that contributed to a "lengthy and complex" process of defining the meaning of the deceased Sidney to the Elizabethan public (Kay 67). According to critics like Kay, Falco, and Strickland, the elegies can be divided into two major groups, each with its own concerns. The elegies printed immediately after Sidney's funeral in 1587 tend to praise Sidney strictly as "a national hero, a Christian soldier and patron" with little mention of his poetry (Kay 67). On the other hand, those printed in the 1590s, and particularly those elegies that are included in the *Astrophel* volume, overwhelmingly "focus on Sidney as a poet" and especially Sidney's role as a progenitor of an English poetic genealogy (Falco 1).⁴

The critical emphasis on the use of the later elegies as an articulation of a literary genealogy obscures a number of similarities between the two groups of elegies that illuminate

hundreds of poems; three lengthy ballads, and perhaps others now lost; a write-up in Holinshed a long *Epitaph* by Churchyard, and two funeral songs by Byrd" (Alexander 57), as well as a number of vernacular elegies published both immediately after Sidney's funeral and in the 1590s, the most notable of which were published in conjunction with Spenser's 1595 *Astrophel*. According to Pigman, this explosion of print marked the first full-fledged use of elegies in public mourning. Prior to 1587, only three collections of elegies had been published (one for Bucer and one for Henry and Charles Brandon, each published in 1551, and one for Sir William Butts, published in 1583/4) (53). For a discussion of the collections of Latin elegies, see Pigman and C.A. Upton's "'Speaking Sorrow': the English University Anthologies of 1587 of the Death of Philip Sidney in the Low Countries"; for discussions of the vernacular elegies, see Alexander's *Writing After Sidney*, Buxton's "The Mourning for Sidney," Raphael Falco's "Instant Artifacts: Vernacular Elegies for Philip Sidney," Daniel Kay's *Melodious Tears*, Strickland's "Pageantry and Poetry as Discourse: The Production of Subjectivity in Sir Philip Sidney's Funeral," and Dominic Baker-Smith's "'Great Expectation': Sidney's Death and the Poets." Strangely enough, Sidney's funeral sermon has not survived.

⁴ This posthumous praise for Sidney is somewhat ironic given that "[d]espite his image as the ideal courtier, Sidney was not on particularly good terms with Elizabeth, who was reluctant to entrust him with important diplomatic or military duties" (Norbrook 98). Norbrook ascribes some of Elizabeth's suspicion of Sidney to "Sidney's close contacts with radical political thinkers" espousing quasi-republican ideas (98).

the evolution of Protestant hagiography. Though there were a number of writers, including Nashe and Samuel Daniel, who “put Sidney at the centre of the new map of English literature that emerged in the 1590s” (Alexander 64), and viewed Sidney as a poetic progenitor (Falco 19), many of the poets who wrote elegies on Sidney in the 1590s, including Spenser and Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, used their praise of Sidney’s poetry to advance the same militant Protestant agenda as the earlier elegists advanced by praising Sidney’s military abilities. Close attention to the elegies shows that all of the elegists, whatever their focus in their poems, portray Sidney as a political martyr “to bolster the religio-political agenda of the militant Protestant wing at Elizabeth’s court” (Goldring 200).⁵ The shift from a focus on military accomplishments to literary production was determined by the shifting political fortunes of the militant Protestant cause, in which the deaths of prominent Protestant noblemen and military failure on the continent left the godly with little support at court. If the earlier elegists used their elegies to encourage noblemen to take up arms in the Netherlands, then the task that later elegists like Spenser and Mary Sidney found themselves faced with was to use their commemoration of Sidney to recreate the political leadership of the militant protestant cause. In large part, the later elegists focus on Sidney’s poetry and Sidney’s role as a poet because of their belief that poetry could be used to create citizens to support the militant Protestant cause.⁶

⁵ Alternative interpretations view the Sidney funeral as a propaganda tool used by Elizabeth either to “distract attention away from the death of the Catholic Mary Queen of Scots” (Woodward 76) or “to capitalize upon the anti-Catholic sentiment generated by that event” (Goldring 210). Though the timing of the funeral was fortuitous vis a vis Mary’s execution, Goldring’s interpretation of the funeral as an opportunity for militant Protestants to extend their popular power through public commemoration is more convincing given the fact that it was Francis Walsingham who financed the funeral ceremonies and the fact that “staunch supporters of the militant Protestant cause” like Leicester, Huntington, Pembroke, and Essex were prominent members of the funeral procession (209).

⁶ In essence, these elegies formed an extension of Spenser’s stated intention of *The Faerie Queene* “to fashion a gentleman” (“Letter to Raleigh” 714). Sidney’s own *Defense of Poesy* provides one of the major articulations of the idea of poetry as a form of political activism.

If these two groups of elegists had similar goals in praising Sidney, they also faced some of the same rhetorical challenges as the preachers of funeral sermons. Though insulated to some extent from the theological debates that cast funeral sermons as illegitimate holdovers from the Catholic past, poets in the late sixteenth century were vulnerable to rhetorical attacks from militant Protestants who regarded poetry itself as a form of idolatry.⁷ The association between poetry and idolatry arose from an influential strain of Reformation theology that condemned any product of the imagination as corrupt. Beginning with Tyndale and extending through to antipoetic and anti-theatrical writers like Stephen Gosson, some Reformers condemned Catholic practices like purgatory and the liturgy as products of the fallen human imagination (Herman 38), and began “using the terms ‘poetry’ and ‘poet’ to epitomize their objections to Catholicism” (41).

For religious poets like Spenser and the rest of the elegists who wrote on Sidney, these charges carried a significant theological threat, and like the preachers of funeral sermons who could also be accused of everything from flattery to idolatry, the elegists adopted the same techniques of biblical citation and figural interpretation of their subject to preempt these accusations. By making figural comparisons between Sidney and figures from the Bible, the

⁷ While iconoclasm proper was limited to a “critique of formalistic religion that identified the ‘holy’ with material places and objects” (King, *Spenser’s Poetry* 48), Aston makes it clear that the impulse behind the destruction of religious objects could be extended to other imaginative pursuits: “[w]hen the iconoclasts went to work they were concerned with attitudes as well as objects. They wanted to erase not simply the idols defiling God’s churches, but also the idols infecting people’s thoughts” (2). For an excellent study of iconoclasm in England, see Margaret Aston’s *England’s Iconoclasts*. The critical discussion of anti-poetic and anti-theatrical discourse is extensive, but for good discussions of the religious and iconoclastic elements of the debate, see Ernest Gilman’s *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation*, Peter C. Herman’s *Squitter-wits and Muse-Haters*, which discusses Reformation attacks on the imagination in connection with anti-poetic sentiment, John N. King’s *Spenser’s Poetry and the Reformation of the Subject*, Stephen Greenblatt’s *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, and Kenneth Gross’s *Spenserian Poetics: Idolatry, Iconoclasm, and Magic*, each of which places Spenser in particular against the backdrop of early modern debates over images.

elegists can construct Sidney as an English version of biblical figures like Christ or David, either sacrificing himself for his nation or writing divinely inspired poetry.⁸ This chapter will compare the use of these biblical *figurae* in elegies written in 1587 by George Whetstone, Thomas Churchyard, John Phillips, and Angel Day, to the *figurae* used by Edmund Spenser in “Astrophel” and “The Doleful Lay of Clorinda,” and by Mary Sidney in “To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney.”⁹ In the earlier elegies, I will discuss the elegists’ use of Christ’s crucifixion to legitimize the public cult of Sidney as a martyr; in the later elegies, though the comparison with Christ is still present, Spenser and Mary Sidney use the image of David to promote Sidney as the progenitor of a specifically Protestant divine poetry and politics to which subsequent poets could ally themselves.

I: Protestant Knight, Protestant Martyr and Protestant Evangelist: The 1587 Elegies for Sidney

One of the major obstacles faced by writers who wished to portray Sidney as a paragon of military skill in the immediate aftermath of his death at Zutphen was the somewhat embarrassing nature of his death. Though his actions on the field had been undeniably gallant, there was a certain feeling at the time that his death had been little more than a gesture as much “silly and out of date” as it was heroic (Buxton, “Mourning” 47).¹⁰ After all, Sidney’s death occurred not

⁸ Though none of the poets discussed here are as sophisticated in either their thinking or their poetic talents as Spenser, all of them use the biblical *figurae* to describe Sidney.

⁹ All of the 1587 elegies except for Churchyard’s are quoted from the facsimile *Elegies for Sir Philip Sidney (1587)*.

¹⁰ As an example, Buxton quotes Elizabeth herself as describing Sidney as an “inconsiderate [rash] fellow” in the wake of his death (“Mourning” 47). Indeed, contemporary military expert John Smyth attributed Sidney’s fatal thigh wound not to the gallantry that led him to throw away his thigh cuisses in “solidarity” with the armorless Sir William Pelham, but to following a continental “trend of under-arming in warfare” followed by “[o]fficers serving on horseback” (Stewart 312).

in a decisive battle but in a badly managed “skirmish” (Duncan-Jones 295) intended to intercept a convoy of supplies for the Spanish defenders of Zutphen (294). Sidney’s fatal thigh wound came not as he stormed the gates of Zutphen, but as he rescued Lord Willoughby, who had foolishly “pressed forward so deep into the enemy lines that he was in imminent danger of being captured” (294). Though he died meeting the demands of chivalry, Sidney’s death was something of a disaster for the militant Protestant cause, as it both deprived the English of the commander who was most popular with the Dutch and revealed that Leicester’s whole Netherlands campaign had become little more than a money-wasting boondoggle that stood little chance of achieving its strategic aims.¹¹

To use this military disaster to infuse the militant Protestant cause with new life, poets found an excellent vehicle for their poetic project in the discourses of Protestant martyrology that underlay many strands of contemporary commemoration. Most critics focus on the classical references that the elegists use to praise Sidney as a “Scipionic resolution of conflicting talents” (Baker-Smith 97), but the elegists’ use of biblical *figurae* subordinates Sidney’s classical forbears to an overarching ideology of militant Protestantism.¹² The use of figural interpretation in the elegies is similar to those in contemporary funeral sermons, and produces an effect like those of Foxe’s martyrologies, in which “a martyr’s revelations of conscience” at the point of death “are typically presented as compelling evidence not just of a believer’s earnestness but of the fundamental truth of his/her beliefs” (Monta, *Martyrdom* 13). By presenting Sidney’s death as if it were a “[revelation] of conscience” like those of Foxe’s martyrs, the most popular early elegists of Sidney are able to present Sidney’s death in what Poort calls a “futile skirmish” as a

¹¹ According to Van Dorsten, for example, Dutch leaders regarded Sidney “as their future Governor General” after Leicester (16). See Norbrook for a detailed description of Leicester’s total incompetence as a military commander and governor in the Netherlands.

¹² Falco, Buxton, and Alexander argue along similar lines as Baker-Smith.

self-sacrificing service to the faith that at the same time confirms the truth of the militant Protestant cause for which he died (32).

Sidney's early elegists Thomas Churchyard, George Whetstone, and John Phillips activate these martyrological themes by making a figural connection between Sidney and Christ, the primary *exemplum* for all martyrs. By comparing Sidney to Christ, the elegists are able to accomplish three tasks. First, Sidney's somewhat useless death becomes a self-sacrifice for the good of Protestantism as a whole. Second, the comparison allows the elegists to portray Sidney as a Protestant evangelist whose opinions, because of his martyr's death, hold the status of revealed truth. Third, the portrayal of Sidney's death as a reenactment of the crucifixion allows the elegists to present both their poems and the imitation of Sidney as religious ceremonies. By extension, support for the militant Protestant cause, focused on the holy war in the Netherlands, gains the status of a religious exercise.

Of Sidney's elegists, the first to take advantage of the discourses of martyrology to describe the imitation of Sidney as a religious exercise is Thomas Churchyard.¹³ Churchyard was both a prolific poet and a well-connected soldier for the Protestant cause. In addition to writing elegies on a variety of public figures (Kay 18), Churchyard was closely linked to a number of influential Elizabethan political figures whose patronage helped make him an effective apostle of the militant Protestant cause. After volunteering for service in both the

¹³ Churchyard, Thomas. *The Epitaph of Sir Phillip Sidney Knight, lately Lord Gouvernour of Flossing*. London: Thomas Cadman, 1586. Of the early elegists for Sidney, Churchyard was undoubtedly the most experienced at producing works of public commemoration, despite the fact that his elegy is in many ways the least sophisticated of those produced in the immediate wake of Sidney's death. As Kay puts it, Churchyard "was the most prolific, and typical Elizabethan elegist" (17). His elegies commemorated a vast array of public figures, from "the Earl of Pembroke" (d. 1570) [...] and finishing with Archbishop Whitgift who died, shortly before Churchyard himself, in 1604" (Kay 18). Churchyard's connections, however, are obscured by his (well-deserved) reputation as a hack writer (Kay unkindly notes that Churchyard's poetic "resources were undeniably limited" [18]).

Netherlands and Ireland, Churchyard was an associate of both Lord Grey and Francis Walsingham (*DNB* vol 10: 343), and devoted a great deal of his time to writing propaganda pamphlets on the Irish rebellions, the Jesuits, and the general duplicity of European Catholicism (344).

In his dedicatory epistle, Churchyard portrays his poem as a vehicle for the militant Protestant doctrine embodied by Sidney's career. Churchyard opens by making a distinction between a "Picture or Image" of Sidney and his own "true penned Verses" in which his memorial for Sidney has some spiritual efficacy that purely visual art, here linked with Roman Catholic practice through the use of the theologically-loaded term "Image," categorically lacks (A3r). Only an elegy like Churchyard's "searcheth the secretes of nature, gropes the inward motions of the mind, and sets forth the hidden giftes of grace" (A3r). Essentially, Churchyard argues that his elegy, by providing an example for his readers to follow, will help to reform the English church, a claim that Churchyard emphasizes by comparing the composition of his poem to the biblical image of the chaff and the corn from Matthew 3.12 and the image of gold being separated from the dross in Malachi 3.3, two biblical images that, according to the Geneva Bible, concern the separation of the faithful from the bulk of sinful humanity.¹⁴

To ensure that his elegy helps to separate the wheat from the chaff, Churchyard builds the poem around the idea that Sidney is a martyr whose perfect life is worthy of emulation and

¹⁴ Matthew 3.12 comes immediately after Jesus's explanation of baptism and reads "Which hathe his fanne in his hand, & wil make cleane his floore, and gather his wheat into the garner, but wil burne vp the chaffe with vnquencheable fire" (Geneva AA3r). Malachi 3.3 concerns the purification of the Temple, reading "And he shal sit downe to trye and fine the siluer: he shal euen fine the sonnes of Leui, and purifie them as gold and siluer, that they may bring offerings vnto the Lord in righteousness" (CCCC3r). The Geneva gloss to Matthew 3.12 compares the gathering of corn to "the preaching of the Gospel, whereby he gathereth the faithful as good corne, & scatereth the infideles as chaffe" (AA3r). The Geneva gloss to Malachi 3.3 describes the purification of the priests as the first step to purifying the church as a whole, as "He beginneth at the Priestes that they might be lightes and shine vnto others" (CCCC3r).

whose death in battle proves the truth of the militant Protestant ideal. Churchyard describes Sidney as a static figure who takes on the characteristics of a piece of religious art fit for contemplation by the faithful. According to Churchyard, Sidney is “[a] man made out of goodliest mould as shape in waxe were wrought,/Or Picture stoode in stampe of gold to please each gazers thought” (A4r). Churchyard aspires to more than giving a catalog of Sidney’s most attractive attributes, however. Instead, his purpose in describing Sidney in pictorial terms is to emphasize the role of divine providence in producing the final state of Sidney’s life. According to Churchyard, nature “fostered vp this man,/And fraught him full of maners mild when he this world began” (A3v) to make him a fit combatant for battle “[i]n Conscience cause and Countries care” (A4r). As Churchyard describes them, Sidney’s education, his activities as a literary patron, his behavior as a courtier, and his military training are a predestined course of studies through which Sidney proceeds in order to become a perfect man “where vertues buds and grace deuine” have their earthly residence (A4r).¹⁵ Sidney’s education, military abilities, grace at court, and his eventual participation in Leicester’s Netherlands campaign are all visible evidence of Sidney’s spiritual election rather than simple worldly accomplishments.

The loss of such a paragon would seem to be devastating to both the state and the faith, amounting to a palpable revocation of God’s protection. As Churchyard describes it, England is in despair after Sidney’s death. The loss of “the Pearle of precious price” leaves “His wayling wife like Image” who “stands and cannot speake for woe.” In addition, Sidney’s “Seruants shake their heads and say [...] Where is our master and our stay in this hard hapless age” (A4v). Most telling in this description of the national grief is the description of Sidney as the pearl of great price described in Matthew 13.46, which is symbolically linked with the kingdom of heaven and

¹⁵ Aside from his description of Sidney’s wounding and death, Churchyard’s description of Sidney’s life is almost absurdly generalized.

salvation. By losing Sidney, Churchyard suggests, England feels that it is being punished and removed from the presence of God.

To correct this misinterpretation of Sidney's death and to console his survivors for his loss, Churchyard explains Sidney's death as a martyrdom. Churchyard carries out this consolation with a figural comparison of Sidney to Christ. Through this figural connection, Sidney becomes a living member of the kingdom of God, a savior of the English cause, and ultimately a focus for the devotion of future Protestant knights embarking on a religious crusade in the Low Countries. Churchyard introduces the idea of martyrdom by describing Sidney as being "the Lords elect" and "a chosen Lam" (A4r). By using the image of the lamb, Churchyard is able to portray Sidney's death as a sacrifice for any errors present in the English church, as the image is used as an allegorical representation of Jesus throughout the New Testament and in commentaries on the Old Testament prophets.¹⁶

At the same time that he references the idea of the lamb as a sacrifice, however, Churchyard also invokes the traditional interpretation of Christ's sacrifice being a victory. As the Geneva glosses to Isaiah 57 make clear, the suffering servant submits to punishment to "giue life to his Church, & cause them to lie with him foreuer." Churchyard also hopes that his readers recognize the victory of the lamb in Revelation 17.14, in which the enemies of God, whom the Geneva commentators interpret as the forces of Roman Catholicism, are irrevocably defeated.¹⁷ Churchyard's portrayal of Sidney as a martyr places the entire Netherlands conflict into an

¹⁶ The most blatant use of the lamb as an image of Christ's sacrifice is in the description of the suffering servant in Isaiah 57, in which the suffering servant is "oppressed & [...] afflicted" and "brought as a shepe to slaughter" (57.3 EEE3v). The same image is used in Revelation 5.6, in which the prophet sees "in the middes of the throne, and of the foure beasts, & in the middes of the elders, stode a Lamb as thogh he had bene killed" (FFF4r).

¹⁷ "These shal fight with the Lambe, & the Lambe shal ouercome them: for he is Lord of Lords, & King of Kings: & they that are on his side, called, and chosen, and faithful" (Revelation 17.14).

eschatological context in which the pursuit of “bloodie warres” for “Conscience cause and countries care” (A4r) completes the unfinished business Sidney laments on his deathbed; by supporting the militant Protestant cause, Sidney’s emulators “some good might do” for “Religions sake” and help to bring about the victory of Christ in the second coming (A4v).

Though Churchyard’s elegy is fairly short and unsophisticated, he shares his almost religious adoration of Sidney with other elegists who published their poems in 1587. Of the vernacular elegists of Sidney, few were in better position to spread the official interpretation of Sidney’s death as martyrdom than George Whetstone. According to critics and historians, Whetstone was at least tangentially associated with Sidney’s political circle, as he “purportedly knew Sidney well” (Falco, “Instant Artifacts” 7) and “probably served under [Sidney] at Zutphen” (Colaianne & Godshalk xi). More importantly, he was connected with Protestant gentlemen like Leicester and Arthur, Lord Grey de Wilton (*DNB* vol 20: 1361), and was associated artistically with Gascoigne and Churchyard (1361).

Whetstone outstrips Churchyard’s devotion to Sidney by describing the imitation of Sidney in terms that recall the sacrament of communion.¹⁸ As Whetstone puts it, Sidney’s “losse” makes “his goodness best known” (A3v); the “holy workes” (A3v) that will follow the imitation of Sidney’s “deuine and heroical gifts” by readers (A3r) will “reuiue [Sidney] after death” in much the same way as communion revives Christ in the minds of believers (A3v). The writing and reading of the elegy constitute a kind of religious “zeale” (A4v) through which Sidney is turned into a religious text that will inspire in readers the same “Loue, loyaltie, and Zeale:/To God, to Prince, and to the common weale” Sidney displayed (B2r).¹⁹ To authenticate

¹⁸ Whetstone, George. *Sir Phillip Sidney, his honorable life, his valiant death, and true vertues*. London: Thomas Cadman, 1587.

¹⁹ Whetstone’s printer, Thomas Cadman, attributes his printing to similar religious motives in his own epistle dedicatory, writing that he “held it my dutie and held it as a religion” to print the

this reading of Sidney, Whetstone's elegy places the conflict in the Netherlands into an eschatological context in which Sidney's personal sacrifice to the militant Protestant cause becomes a symbol for the ideal pursuit of the war against the Spanish by making a figural comparison between Christ and Sidney. In addition, the figural comparison between Christ and Sidney allows Whetstone to portray Sidney as both a combatant in this eschatological struggle as well as a preacher whose poetry and deathbed words constitute a kind of sermon that readers can use to follow his path towards righteousness.

Whetstone announces his intentions in the formal qualities of the elegy. Instead of simply printing the poem, Whetstone provides each stanza with a gloss intended to guide a reader's interpretation of the narrated events. The overall effect is similar to the experience of reading the glosses of the Geneva Bible, which suggests that for Whetstone and the rest of Sidney's followers, correctly written poetry can act as a religious text. The figural relationship that Whetstone draws between Sidney and Christ is the formal technique that Whetstone uses to ensure that his elegy provides a morally uplifting treatment of Sidney's life.

Aside from the figural relationship he posits, Whetstone's treatment of Sidney's life in the elegy is quite straightforward. Essentially, Sidney is a paragon of virtue and wisdom. The first half of the elegy describes Sidney's family background, his education both in England and on the continent during his grand tour, his conduct at court, and, briefly, his poetry.²⁰ The central

epitaph of "such a Paragon of our time" (A4r). Cadman's printing ventures during the 1580s were particularly slanted towards works associated with militant Protestantism, including poems and treatises promoting military adventures on the continent and elsewhere. Aside from Whetstone's elegy, Cadman's also printed Churchyard's Sidney elegy and Churchyard's 1584 treatise on the rebellion in Ireland, *A scourge for rebels*, a 1588 Armada oration written by a certain "Zealous affected subject," and a number of Heugenot petitions to the French king.

²⁰ Whetstone's mention of Sidney's writing is as brief as Falco puts it; though the mention is "extremely flattering," Whetstone mentions only the *Arcadia*, Sidney's translation of the French Protestant theologian Philippe Du Plessis Mornay's treatise *De la verite de la religion Chrestienne*, and, oddly enough, *The Shepheardes Calender* ("Instant Artifacts" 11).

part of the poem describes Sidney's preparations for war, including his conduct in the battle of Zutphen and his subsequent wounding, which Whetstone describes as analogous to the crucifixion. The final section of the poem elaborates on Sidney's lengthy deathbed scene, and essentially plays the part of Sidney's funeral sermon.²¹

Though Whetstone's figural comparison of Sidney to Christ is overtly stated in his description of the bullet "that in his thigh did light" as the "Crosse" that Sidney must endure (C1r), this allusion to the crucifixion is only the linchpin of Whetstone's overall strategy of using Sidney's conduct to symbolize what he sees as the proper relationship between England and the rest of Europe. As Whetstone conceives it, England is the protector of Protestantism in Europe and has a duty to exercise pastoral protection against the Catholic powers of Europe, which can occur only through military intervention. Whetstone represents this allegorically as the waking of Queen Elizabeth, "the Lyon [...] that keeps the Wolfe in awe" who proceeds to "mildly first [...] Licke the wounded sheepe" before sending Leicester, "the Beare, the scattered heard to keepe" with a "[a] stoute small bande" (B3rv). Here, Whetstone imagines the Netherlands campaign to be an armed defense of continental Protestantism from the Spanish "Wolfe", with the Dutch consisting of a continental flock for Elizabeth who are potential victims if Elizabeth fails to act.²²

What makes Sidney exemplary for Whetstone is that he embodies the attitude of English dominance in the Protestant cause in his own character. This idea is first evident in Whetstone's discussion of Sidney's grand tour, in which Whetstone describes the young aristocrat's voyage to

²¹ The volume also includes two shorter commendatory poems, one written by an anonymous gentleman named B.W. that briefly discusses Sidney's funeral procession, and a short epitaph.

²² Though Whetstone rarely makes specific references to biblical verses, this stanza appears to compare Elizabeth to the lion of Judah and Leicester and his "stoute small band" to Gideon and the 300. The image of the lion of Judah is from Revelation 5.5: "And one of the elders said vnto me, Wepe not: beholde, the lion which is of the tribe of Iudah, the rote of Daudid, hath obtained to open the Boke, and to lose the seuen seales thereof" (FFF4r). Gideon comes from Judges 7.

the continent in terms that show Sidney “[decking] his minde, with Language, and with Lore” without allowing “forayne toys” to corrupt his mind (B2r). That these toys are primarily Roman Catholic doctrines is clear from Whetstone’s description of Sidney as contemptuous of the French and Italians, two Catholic powers who “[b]y virtue he, their vices did forbear” while it is “[t]he Germayne plain, his humor best did please” (B2r). It is by going to the continent and learning the ways of both his religious enemies and allies that Sidney becomes “a perfect man, to serue,/His Prince, and Countrey, both in Peace and Warre” (B2r-v).

This perfection comes into its own, according to Whetstone, in Sidney’s governorship of Flushing. Whetstone emphasizes his vision of England as the leader of Protestant Europe by using marital and pastoral terminology to make a figural comparison between Sidney’s governorship and Christ’s relationship with the Church. According to Whetstone, Sidney viewed his governorship as “[a] charge of truste” (B3v) and “crosst the Seaes” because Flushing was a wife in distress.²³ As Whetstone puts it, “Flushing then wailde, to misse her trusty Tardge,/He viu’de he loue, and for to do her good,/He vou’de he ayde and sealed it with his blood” (B4r). Whetstone’s description here heightens the stakes carried by Sidney’s governorship. By stating that Sidney has “sealed” the relationship “with his blood”, Whetstone uses a Eucharistic image that figurally links Sidney’s governorship of Flushing to Christ’s marriage to the church and to communion.²⁴ As the husband in the relationship, then, Sidney’s civic role encompasses a pastoral care for the soul of his wife; since Flushing is threatened by the forces of Roman Catholicism, Sidney’s main role is to “[watch] his charge, as shepheards doe their sheepe” (B3v), an image that evokes the traditional relationship between pastors and their congregations.

²³ Whetstone’s portrayal of Flushing as a wife in distress is very similar to Spenser’s later portrayal of Belge as a dispossessed wife in Book V of *The Faerie Queene*.

²⁴ In the gospels, Jesus refers to himself repeatedly as the bridegroom, both directly and indirectly, and the idea that communion sealed the covenant between Christ and the Church occurs during the Last Supper.

Whetstone's conception of the proper role of the pastoral governor, however, is anything but pacific, as he uses the figural comparison between Christ and Sidney to sanctify a doctrine of active military intervention. In Whetstone's description of the Zutphen campaign itself, Sidney is laudable precisely because he does not stay in his "Garrison, his charge, well arm'de to shielde" the city (B4r). Instead, "He forthwith leaues, and posted to the field./As time, and cause" made open warfare necessary (B4r). This campaign, moreover, allows Whetstone to portray the militant Protestant aristocrats and knights who accompany Sidney in apostolic terms. Luminaries like Essex, Lord Willoughby, Sir Henry Upton, and Whetstone himself are forged through their participation in the battle of Zutphen into a company whose faithfulness to Sidney's cause legitimizes their claims to leadership of the militant Protestant cause after Sidney's death.

Whetstone's treatment of Sidney's deathbed speech, which forms the climax of the elegy, allows him to further cement the ideal of military intervention in the Netherlands. According to Whetstone, Sidney's final assessment of his life is that though his "seruice is but greene," he has "brought forth Leaues of late" to "benefit the state" (C1v). At the same time, however, Sidney realizes that though "[t]he blomes were faire, but yet no fruit is seene" (C1v), admitting that the campaign in the Netherlands has yet to achieve its religious aims. The remedy for the relative failure of the English intervention is for Sidney's followers to embrace wholeheartedly militant Protestantism, because as Sidney puts it in his deathbed speech, "[t]he name of Warre is sweete" (C1v).

By focusing on Sidney's deathbed speech, Whetstone harnesses the rhetorical qualities of martyrologies to portray Sidney's militant creed as revealed truth. Sidney's final confession to "shewe his godly end" (C1r) owes a great deal to the treatment of testimonies of conscience in contemporary martyrologies, which "[use] martyrs' testimonies of conscience to suggest their

certainty in the convictions for which they die and to confirm the truth of those convictions” (Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature* 14). By making a figural comparison between Sidney’s death and the crucifixion, Whetstone ratifies Sidney’s status as a martyr, rendering the cause for which he died justifiable in the terms of Protestant theology. The “bullet sent, that in his thigh did light” plays the part of the “Crosse” that both confirms the truth of the Netherlands intervention and allows Sidney to become an evangelist whose final words provide both his gathered apostles and the readers of Whetstone’s poem an example of how best to act in an eschatological context (C1r).

Whetstone’s treatment of Sidney as an evangelist whose words carry the weight of divine truth is evident both in Sidney’s last words to his followers and in Whetstone’s description of Sidney’s poetry. Just after his wounding, Whetstone shapes Sidney’s charge to his followers as if it were an actual sermon in which Sidney wishes for continued life out of “mere zeale” to complete what he sees as an unfinished political task (C1v). Whetstone has Sidney describe his life as if it were a spring growing season cruelly cut off by his death: his “seruice” to his religion and the state “is but greene”, and his participation in the Netherlands campaign had only “brought forth Leaues of late:/The blomes were faire, but yet no fruit” in the form of a successful resolution of the revolt “is seene” (C1v). By using the image of spring, however, Whetstone is able to suggest that Sidney can be resurrected if his followers are “so chard’ged, with” Sidney’s “grace and graue advise” that they continue his support of the Dutch revolt (C2r).

Because he views Sidney as an evangelist, Whetstone is somewhat dismissive of Sidney’s poetry. According to Falco, Whetstone mentions Sidney’s poetry in order to disparage poetry as an occupation and to argue “the kind of learning” Sidney possessed “far surpasses

poetry” (“Instant Artifacts” 11).²⁵ Whetstone, however, never actually disparages poetry; instead, he subordinates Sidney’s role as poet to his role as a Christian evangelist. This is clear enough from the fact that Whetstone mentions only works with clearly didactic aims: the “Archadia, unmatched for sweete deuse”, “the Shepherds notes [Spenser’s *The Shepherdes Calender*], that haue so sweete a sounde” (B2v), and “Plesses rare worke, of true Religion,/Confuting those, which no Religion holde:/In vulgar speech” (B3r).²⁶ Each work Whetstone mentions was in some way associated with militant Protestant theology or efforts to intervene on the continent; the *Arcadia* is partly concerned with the popularization of political theories of Protestant republicanism,²⁷ du Plessis Mornay was an influential French Protestant theologian, and, despite its misattribution, *The Shepherdes Calender* was associated with militant Protestant pursuits and contemporary discourses of political prophecy.²⁸

At the same time that Whetstone portrays Sidney as a Protestant evangelist, however, he makes it clear that there is no guarantee that he will actually be resurrected by the imitation of a generation of Christian knights following his ideals. At the end of his elegy, even as he

²⁵ Kay, Alexander, and Baker-Smith make similar assumptions.

²⁶ The theological work Whetstone mentions is Sidney’s lost translation of Philippe du Plessis Mornay’s *De la verite de la religion Chrestienne*. Sidney had met Mornay, who was an influential French Protestant theologian and political theorist during his stay in Venice between 1574 and 1575 (Duncan-Jones 80-81). Duncan-Jones attributes its translation to “[a] deepening commitment to the intellectual French brand of Protestantism fostered in Francis Walsingham’s household” in the early 1580s (250).

²⁷ Norbrook mentions George Buchanan, who “had supported the Protestant coup d’etat that overthrew Mary Stuart, and had written a theoretical justification of the episode in his treatise *De jure regni*” (Norbrook 93) and Mornay, who wrote “one of the most eloquent Huguenot justifications of resistance against tyranny, the *Vindicae contra tyrannos*” as important sources for Sidney’s political thought (98).

²⁸ Falco, as well as Colaianne and Godshalk, attribute Whetstone’s mention of the *The Shepherdes Calender* to a “[muddle]” on Whetstone’s part (“Instant Artifacts” 7). However, given the fact that the work is associated with the brand of militant Protestantism he discusses in the elegy, it is quite possible that Whetstone’s muddle is a deliberate one designed to enhance Sidney’s bona fides as a Protestant prophet. On Spenser’s *Shepherdes Calender* and contemporary discourses of prophecy, see Bart Van Es’s *Spenser’s Forms of History*.

proclaims Sidney's election "to Abraham, his breast", Whetstone makes it clear that England's "sinnes did draw, and sharpe the fatall knife" (C2v). A similar anxiety about the future of the Protestant cause is evident in John Phillips's elegy.²⁹ Phillips was "a puritan writer" (Kay 69) who "was patronized by noble ladies of known puritan proclivities" (*DNB* vol 45: 202). In addition to his elegy for Sidney, Phillips also published elegies for Christopher Hatton in 1591, Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox in 1578 (203), and a series of polemical poems attacking Roman Catholicism (202).

Though Phillips seeks to show that Sidney's virtues can be revived by faithful imitators who will put Sidney's doctrines into practice, his anxieties lead him to make Sidney's resurrection literal by making Sidney's spirit the speaker of the poem.³⁰ By arguing in his epistle dedicatory that Sidney's "virtues reuiue him from the graue" and that "his euer enduring glorye hath made a conquest of death"(A2v), Phillips places Sidney into a figural relationship with Christ's resurrection that grants Sidney's speech a prophetic authority. Following Sidney's words becomes a religious obligation that Phillips hopes will unite England around the militant Protestant agenda and around the Earl of Essex as Sidney's heir, a divinely chosen champion to lead Elizabeth's crusade in the Low Countries.

Phillips needs to give his resurrected Sidney the authority of the prophets because the England he portrays is a country on the point of religious rebellion. As Sidney's ghost puts it, he saw during life "some wretchles minded mates,/Seeking by slights to worke the ouerthrow,/Of

²⁹ Phillips, John. *The Life and Death of Sir Phillip Sidney, late Lord gouvernour of Flvshing*. London: Robert Waldegrave, 1587. Phillips's publication with Waldegrave is significant; as Monta shows, Waldegrave was a printer who was "unusual in his level of ideological commitment" ("Martyrdom in Print" 272) for whom "the adaptation and redeployment of martyrological discourses" helped "further his ideological agenda" (273). See Susannah Brietz Monta's "Martyrdom in Print in Early Modern England: The Case of Robert Waldegrave."

³⁰ The *DNB* notes that Phillips uses the device of the resurrected spirit of the dead in each of his elegies (203).

sincere truth, stil kindling up debates” (A4r). Phillips makes it clear that these “debates” are religious arguments stirred up by Roman Catholic missionaries “into England sent,/The subiectes harts, from their good Queene to glean” (A4r), but what concerns Phillips is the fact that the religious arguments seem to be taking hold by making “the crue of Dathan to increase” (A4r). Here, Phillips makes a figural comparison between Dathan, one of the “captaines of the assemblie” who revolt against Moses and Aaron in Numbers 16 (Geneva F1r), and the growing numbers of people in England who resist Elizabeth’s lawful religious authority, with the main offenders being both recusant Catholics and more moderate Protestants who opposed continental military intervention.³¹ To oppose English followers of Dathan, Phillips portrays loyalty to Elizabeth as a religious as well as civic duty. According to Phillips, Elizabeth is a reenactment of Deborah, the female judge and prophet most commonly used by early modern preachers and poets to justify Elizabeth’s position as a divinely elected monarch.³² Elizabeth is particularly worthy of service by “all trustie English hearts” because she has created the conditions in England for the emergence of Protestantism: “Of poperie she the puddels hath made cleane,/And opened wide the well and way to life” (B1r). Loyal service under Elizabeth is a sacramental duty that acts as a conduit of grace, as it is only through Elizabeth’s combat against Roman Catholicism that her subjects can “that holsem liquor glean,/That fils the soule with grace and comfort rife” (B1r).

³¹ Dathan’s argument is that Moses and Aaron claim too much authority because “all the Congregation is holy” (Numbers 16.3 F1r). The Geneva gloss bluntly explains Dathan’s argument as “All are a like holy: therefore none oght to be preferred aboue other: thus the wicked reason against Gods ordinance” (Gloss to Numbers 16.3 F1r). Dathan and his followers are eventually engulfed by a gigantic hole in the ground after God rejects their sacrifices.

³² The first comparison of Elizabeth to Deborah occurs in a description of the pageants that accompanied her 1558 accession, *The passage of our most drad Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her Coronacion*. According to the description of the pageant the comparison to Deborah indicated that Elizabeth’s reign would be divinely inspired and prosperous “considering god oftymes sent women nobly to rule among men, as Debora whych gouerned Israell in peas the space of .xl. yeres” (D4r).

Because of this conception of political service, Sidney is the most perfect example of the knight who serves his monarch out of a sense of religious duty. As Sidney's spirit puts it in the beginning of the poem, his first concern was to place "[t]he feare of God [...] before my face" to internalize "[t]he fruites of faith" to such an extent that he is able "[t]o conquer death" through his assurance of election (A3r). For Sidney's spirit, however, this knowledge of truth is worthwhile only so long as it is put into practice in the service of the state:

Thus as to God obedient I was seene,
Whose sacred truth was settled in my breast.
A spotlesse heart I rendred to my Queene,
Whose honour I for to uphold was prest.
The fruites of fayth in mee were aie exprest,
Her joy was mine, her grieffe my deadly woe. (A3v)

In this stanza, religious observance and active support of the queen are described in equivalent terms, with Sidney's faith in God not bearing "fruites" until he aligns his wishes with his queen's.

The fruit with which Phillips is most concerned is the direct confrontation with the Spanish in the Netherlands, and it is here that Sidney's service to Elizabeth's divine mandate reaches its crescendo. As Phillips describes Sidney, he is strictly a servant of providence, as the "townes and forts" in the Netherlands are natural allies of Elizabeth because they "feare God" and resist the forces of Roman Catholicism. Sidney's death in battle against the Spanish, then, is the fulfillment of his religious mission and the goal of what Phillips calls Sidney's "pilgrimage in this terrestriall vale of too manifold miseries" in his epistle dedicatory (A2r). Rather than

bewailing the fact that he could not do more, Sidney's spirit here accepts his death as God's preordained end for his life and as much a part of his "glory" as his military exploits, and clearly reveals his status as a martyr for the faith (B2r) by making a sacrifice of his "spotlesse heart" (A3v).

Sidney's martyrdom is most useful for Phillips because Sidney's final words to his followers become a kind of religious text that can help to unite the nation around his appointed successors. Phillips accomplishes this by having Sidney's spirit deliver a prophetic charge to his survivors. Of the survivors, four are especially important, with Robert Sidney, who is "[charged] the tongue of truth to beare" (B2v), the Earl and Countess of Pembroke, who Sidney's spirit leaves "Christ his precious pearle," and Essex, who Sidney commends to God (B3r), each being the beneficiaries of the divine grace brought by the prophetic spirit of Sidney. Sidney's status as a martyr ratifies the status of these four as his successors in the religious governance of the realm.

Though Churchyard, Whetstone, and Phillips approach Sidney's martyrdom from slightly different angles, their aims are quite similar to those of the militant Protestant funeral preachers discussed in chapter one. By commemorating Sidney as a martyr, they hoped to both recruit other members of the aristocracy to the militant Protestant cause as well as convince Elizabeth to continue the Netherlands campaign. By making a figural comparison between Sidney's death and the crucifixion, the elegists transform Sidney from a symbol of failure and military defeat into a symbol of self-sacrifice suitable for emulation by other members of the aristocracy. By portraying Sidney as a martyr, however, Churchyard, Whetstone, and Phillips were able to define a very particular role for Elizabeth. If Sidney was a martyr whose defense of Protestantism in the Netherlands was the fulfillment of his religious life, then Elizabeth could fulfill her role as a Christian monarch by continuing the English intervention in the Netherlands.

II: Sidney as Prophetic Poet: Spenser's "Astrophel," "The Doleful Lay of Clorinda" and Mary Sidney's "To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney"

The collective praise for Sidney as a Protestant martyr conducted by Churchyard, Whetstone, and Phillips, as well as the innumerable poets who contributed Latin elegies to the Oxford and Cambridge collections, did little to stem public outpourings of grief. As Buxton puts it, "the mourning for Sidney continued, even on formal, royal occasions for several years after his death," and the loss of Sidney was a topic to which an increasing number of poets turned their pens in the early to mid 1590s (55). As critics of Sidney's legacy make clear, however, there is a categorical shift in elegists' portrayals of Sidney. Just after "the publication of the *Arcadia* in 1590 and *Astrophil and Stella* in 1591" (Falco, "Spenser's 'Astrophel' 2), elegists begin to "focus on Sidney as a poet" instead of describing him strictly in terms of his military career ("Instant Artifacts" 1).³³ To a certain extent, Sidney's later elegists are concerned with defining Sidney as "an originary and, to a certain extent, an inspirational force" ("Spenser's 'Astrophel'" 1) around whom they could define a distinct literary genealogy that would help them "to establish a national literature" ("Instant Artifacts" 2).³⁴

³³ Elegies that treat Sidney's literary reputation are Nicholas Breton's 1591 "Amoris Lachrimae" (Falco, "Instant Artifacts" 11), three elegies by Walter Raleigh, Matthew Roydon, and Matthew Dyer in the 1593 volume *The Phoenix Nest* (Kay 54), the poems published with Spenser's "Astrophel" in the 1595 *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (53), and Mary Sidney's "To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney," probably written as a preface to "the handsome volume of the *Psalmes* prepared for the queen's visit to Wilton" in 1599 (Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix* 85).

³⁴ Much of Falco's discussion of the later elegies revolves around the question of literary genealogy. Marotti approaches the same issue from a slightly different angle, viewing the publication of Sidney's poetry as "[providing] the necessary sociocultural legitimization for printing of lyric verse [...] and helping to incorporate what had essentially been regarded as literary ephemera into the body of durable canonical texts" (229-230). See Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, Falco, "Spenser's 'Astrophel' and the Formation of Elizabethan Literary Genealogy," and "Instant Artifacts: Vernacular Elegies for Philip Sidney,"

The critical attention to poetic genealogy obscures, however, the fact that Spenser and Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, Sidney's most important later elegists, used their elegies in a more pervasive inquiry about both the proper kind of poetry to write and the ways that poetry could be placed in the service of the extension of militant Protestantism. By the 1590s, an inquiry along these lines was necessary because of the radically changed Elizabethan political landscape. For the writers of elegies in 1587, the loss of Sidney was a blow to their cause, but far from a fatal one. The execution of Mary Queen of Scots and the war in the Netherlands left England open to Spanish and other foreign hostility, which made militant Protestant politics more attractive to Elizabeth. More importantly, Essex, who "inherited the Sidneian legacy of courtly chivalry yoked to leadership of [...] the 'forward Protestants'" (Alexander 63), rapidly "became the queen's newest favorite during 1587" and began advancing the interventionist agenda (Hammer 57).

By the mid-1590s, however, the godly cause seemed to be in eclipse, as "Leicester's campaign had been a disaster caused by his overwhelming pride and military incompetence" (Norbrook 133), and aristocratic support for militant Protestants was beginning to evaporate. Between 1585 and 1595, "the men of the powerful alliance of Leicester's own generation died" (Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix* 68), leaving militants little influential support at court aside from Essex, who was already exhibiting frustration at his lack of success (Hammer 268).³⁵ Godly

and Lisa M. Klein's "Spenser's *Astrophel* and the Sidney Legend" for more discussion of Sidney as a progenitor of a literary genealogy. Mallette is one of the few critics who does not read "Astrophel" as an elegy for Sidney's poetry, as he reads it as a lament for "the death of a soldier" rather than for "the death of a poet" (*Renaissance Pastoral* 136-137).

³⁵ Margaret Hannay lays out this loss of politically connected leadership in *Philip's Phoenix*; notable Protestant aristocrats who died in this period included "Bedford in 1585, Henry Sidney in 1586, Leicester in 1588, Warwick and Walsingham in 1590, Huntingdon in 1595. By the end of 1595, only the failing Pembroke was left of those great Protestant earls" (Hannay 68). Essex's frustrations mainly emerge from Elizabeth's unwillingness to support unequivocally his projects

writers and politicians turned to new polemical and political strategies in order to increase support for their agenda of militant intervention in the affairs of Europe.³⁶

The posthumous reception of Sidney as a poet in the 1590s takes place in this milieu of frustrated Protestantism and constitutes one of the more radical responses to the diminution of Protestant influence at court.³⁷ As constructed by Spenser and Mary Sidney, Philip Sidney the poet is a very specific kind of political martyr who serves as a rallying point for an alternative court to Elizabeth's. As Spenser describes him in "Astrophel" and "The Dolefull Lay of Clorinda," and as Pembroke describes him in "To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney," the ideal Sidney is not simply a courtier poet. Instead, he is the embodiment of the "right poets" Sidney describes in his *Defense of Poesy* (218). "Right poets," according to Sidney, play the role of "diviner, forseer, or prophet" (214), and their literary production "breeds desire for reformation" (Prescott 137).

For Pembroke and Spenser, then, Sidney becomes an English reenactment of David, whose Psalms Sidney calls "a divine poem" (*Defense* 215) and whom Renaissance theologians viewed as an original divine poet whose Psalms constitute "a lively and moving image that teaches goodness and self-knowledge to both old and young more effectively than the bare precepts of moral law or the specificities of history" (Prescott 134). At the same time, however, describing Sidney as a reenactment of David could be interpreted as a subversive act. This is partly because David was traditionally linked only to monarchs, but also because David was

for repeated naval operations against the Spanish. See Paul Hammer's *The Polarization of Elizabethan Politics* for a detailed analysis of Essex's growing disillusion during the later 1590s.
³⁶ Radical Protestants' increasing frustration is clearest in the highly critical 1596 *Faerie Queene*, and Essex's abortive coup in 1601, which was supported by Essex's godly preaching coterie (Hunt 104).

³⁷ Other poets of the 1590s had this objective as well. *The Phoenix Nest*, in which Raleigh's, Roydon's, and Dyer's elegies for Sidney first appeared, was published as "part of a larger movement to revive the memory of the Dudleys and Sidneys" (Rosenberg 350).

occasionally used “to advocate resistance against tyrants” (Hannay, *Philip’s Phoenix* 93).³⁸ By portraying Sidney as reenacting David’s political role, both Spenser and Mary Sidney are able to portray David as a prophet of militant Protestantism whose poetry constituted a religious discourse standing in opposition to the erotic courtly discourse of Elizabeth’s court. Sidney’s poetry, and that written by his followers, serves as an evangelistic discourse around which a new godly nobility could coalesce.³⁹

This shift in Sidney’s posthumous reception from Christian knight to prophetic poet is clearest in Spenser’s portrayal of Sidney as a shepherd in the pastoral elegy “Astrophel.”⁴⁰ Ironically, Spenser praises Sidney’s status as martyr knight and martyr poet by inverting many of the tropes of commemoration from the earlier elegies. Like the earlier elegists, Spenser portrays Sidney “as an overachiever” (Steinberg 189), a portrayal that seems to extend the traditional “exaggeration of Sidney’s diversity” (Falco, “Instant Artifacts” 5). In the course of the poem, however, Spenser proceeds to turn this praise on its head. Instead of praising Sidney’s death in the Netherlands as a glorious martyrdom, Spenser instead describes it as a “sad ensample of mans suddein end” (134) and as the culmination of a life that has been in some way “wasted”

³⁸ Hannay cites the example of Beza’s commentaries on the Psalms, which use David “as an example of outright revolt” by “[e]quating Henri de Navarre with David” and “the Catholic Valois king’s with David’s enemies” (*Philip’s Phoenix* 93).

³⁹ Spenser’s treatment of Sidney in “Astrophel” thus fits into Spenser’s larger campaign to portray poetry as a prophetic discourse that holds a vital place in the creation and sustaining of the ideological structure of the Elizabethan state. For a seminal treatment of Renaissance conceptions of divine poets, see Courtland D. Baker’s “Certain Religious Elements in the English Doctrine of the Inspired Poet During the Renaissance,” and for Renaissance treatments of David as a “right poet,” see Anne Lake Prescott’s “King David as a ‘Right Poet’: Sidney and the Psalmist.”

⁴⁰ “Astrophel” and “The Doleful Lay of Clorinda” were originally published in 1595 with *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*. The collection also includes elegies on Sidney written by Spenser’s friend Lodowick Bryskett, and the poems by Raleigh, Roydon, and Dyer originally published in *The Phoenix Nest*.

(174).⁴¹ Spenser's Sidney is "a shepherd who is not content with the important work of being a shepherd but who must seek to prove himself in other ways" and a poet whose ultimate decision to participate personally in the Netherlands campaign was a distraction from his more important duties as a prophetic poet (Steinberg 189).

Yet Spenser does not criticize Sidney because of a "[recognition] that Sidney's military venture was not a just war" as Steinberg would have it (194).⁴² Instead, Spenser criticizes Sidney for abandoning his proper function as an aristocratic protector of English Protestants in favor of pursuing more temporary glory in personal military glory in the Netherlands. In the process, Sidney also becomes the center of a critique of Elizabeth's court as a place in which "the condition of female regiment" and the erotic energy of courtly discourse "[threaten ...] dishonorable effeminization" of courtiers and the subversion of proper political action (Montrose 934).

The central drama of the elegy is the romance between Astrophel, Spenser's poetic stand-in for Sidney, and Stella, who symbolizes Elizabeth in the world of the poem. Spenser portrays the relationship between the two not as an idealized romance, but as a seduction that leads inexorably to his death in battle due to Astrophel's desire to "entertain" (70) Stella "with braue deeds" (69) and "bold atchieuements" (70). Spenser's portrayal of poetry in "Astrophel" allows him to address one of the major concerns in *The Faerie Queene*, the possibility that erotic

⁴¹ At the same time, however, Spenser's comparison of Astrophel to Adonis, borrowed from Ronsard's *Adonis* (O'Connell 28), allows him to retain the christic echoes of previous elegies.

⁴² Both Steinberg and Klein base their readings of Spenser's critique of Sidney on an assumption that Spenser critiques "the values celebrated in the myth of Sidney as the shepherd-knight", and in particular on Sidney's participation in the Netherlands campaign (Klein 43). See Lisa M. Klein's "Spenser's *Astrophel* and the Sidney Legend" and Steinberg's "Spenser, Sidney, and the Myth of Astrophel."

pursuits might overtake religious and political objectives.⁴³ By engaging in the erotic discourse of the court and writing “ydle words” (67) and “verses vaine” (68), Spenser suggests, Sidney had abandoned his true duty as a prophetic poet whose verse should serve to hold together the militant Protestant faction in England and protect it from the Roman Catholic threat within England itself. Instead, according to Spenser, Sidney should have used his poetry to lead the political movement for intervention on the continent rather than participate in it directly.

The most important part of Spenser’s portrayal of poetry as a “divine labor” is his portrayal of Astrophel as a shepherd (Steinberg 192). According to King, the image of the shepherd is crucial to Protestant pastoral satires regarding the clergy, who are expected to “imitate Christ in fulfilling their clerical vocation” (*Spenser’s Poetry* 16).⁴⁴ The Astrophel of the initial stanzas of the poem is just such a shepherd, who is a paragon and a leader among the shepherd nation. At the beginning of the poem, Astrophel is careful to “keepe his sheep, his litle stock an store” (4) in a fashion “[f]ar passing all the pastors of his daies,/In all that seemly shepheard might behoue” (9-10). Moreover, Spenser’s description of the shepherd community make it clear that Astrophel holds his leading role and becomes “the pride of shepherds praise” because his poetry plays a religious role in holding the community together (7). As Spenser describes Astrophel,

He could pipe and daunce, and carol sweet,

Emongst the shepherds in their shearing feast:

⁴³ See Lauren Silberman’s *Transforming Desire: Erotic Knowledge in Books III and IV of The Faerie Queene* and Louis Montrose’s “Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary.”

⁴⁴ The image of the poet as a kind of shepherd who plays a religious role in society is central to Spenser’s *Shepherd’s Calender* as well. See chapter one of King’s *Spenser’s Poetry and the Reformation Tradition*.

As Somers larke that her song doth greet

The dawning day forth coming from the East. (31-34)

Spenser identifies the “shearing feast” here as a specifically religious celebration by relying on the religious associations of the lark. According to Bawcutt, the lark was traditionally associated with “the Psalmist,” and specifically with the initiation of a remembrance of “Christ’s sacrifice and compassion for man” (7).⁴⁵ By associating Astrophel’s poetry with the Psalms, Spenser is able to say that “verses are not vaine” (68) and to ascribe to proper poetry the power of “[teaching] goodness and self-knowledge” that Renaissance theologians associated with the Psalms (Prescott 134).

Astrophel’s problem is that he abandons his calling as a didactic poet. Instead, he succumbs to the erotic temptations of a court that seems opposed to moral improvement. Spenser represents this courtly milieu with the shepherd “Maydens” who “often did him woo,/Them to vouchsafe emongst his rimes to name” (37-38). It is true that Spenser’s description of this erotic poetry is “full of images of fertility” (Steinberg 191), as the maidens “[bring] him presents, flowers [...] Or mellow fruit if it were haruest time” in return for his poetry (47-48). However, closer analysis of these lines shows that the images of fertility are illusory, because of the dangerously seductive qualities of Astrophel’s love poems. When Astrophel’s “oaten pipe [begins] to shrill” (43), the nymphs that inhabit the landscape “[b]oth christall wells and shadie groues [forsake]/To heare the charmes of his enchanting skill” (45-46). Moreover, the nymphs’ love of Astrophel’s poetry leaves the landscape sterile; rather than

⁴⁵ Bawcutt traces the use of the symbol in this way through Chaucer and a number of other medieval and early sixteenth century poets, which makes it probable that Spenser intends the image of the lark here to be more than “an ornate and ceremonial way of indicating the time” (Bawcutt 9). See Pricilla Bawcutt’s “The Lark in Chaucer and Some Later Poets.”

participating in fruitful relationships, the nymphs leave the “wood Gods [...] sigh[ing] sore” for their absence (50). What Spenser portrays is not fertility; instead, Astrophel’s indulgence in love poetry disrupts the pastoral life of Arcadia, after which the fruits of the land are dedicated to the glorification of the individual Astrophel instead of the collective and fruitful celebration of the shepherds’ shearing feasts.

Though none of these shepherd maids or nymphs are “vnworthie of his wit” (51) or “vnworthie of the countries store” (52), Spenser uses the poem’s overarching reference to *Astrophel and Stella* to emphasize the role of erotic courtly discourse in the downfall of his hero. In the poem, Stella is less of a romantic presence and more of a seductress who plays the part of Bathsheba in the poem’s use of the biblical story of David. Like Bathsheba, Stella’s beauty tempts Astrophel so far that the knight, like David, is “drowned in sinne” and forgets his proper role in society (Geneva gloss to 2 Samuel 12.1). As Spenser describes her, Stella is a dangerously seductive. At their first meeting, Stella “Shot her sharp pointed beames through purest aire” to ensnare Astrophel (58). From this point on, Spenser’s description evokes a steady fall for Astrophel away from his proper religious vocation into an obsession with the temporal world:

His thoughts, his rime, his songs were all vpon her.

To her he vowed the seruice of his daies,

On her he spent the riches of his wit:

For her he made hymnes of immortall praise,

Of onely her he sung, he thought, he writ.

Her, and but her of loue he worthie deemed,

For all the rest he but litle he esteemed. (60-66)

Spenser's description is filled with religiously charged words that compare Astrophel's love for Stella to a kind of idolatry. Instead of writing hymns to God, he instead writes "hymnes of immortall praise" to the mortal Stella, and Spenser's description of Astrophel having "spent the riches of his wit" on Stella suggests that Astrophel has wasted talents that could have been better exercised in other areas.

Given Spenser's long-standing support for military intervention in both the Netherlands and in Ireland, his criticism of Astrophel's campaign seems somewhat ironic.⁴⁶ However, Spenser uses his critique not to attack the intervention itself but to critique "the eroticized politics" of the Elizabethan court (Montrose 917) that caused Leicester's campaign to fail because of its "power [...] to reduce her masculine subjects to a state of dishonorable inaction" (932). Though Astrophel is certainly active in the poem, Spenser makes it clear that he does not act out of ideological commitment to a right cause. Instead, his idolatrous passion for Stella leads him to abandon his pastoral role in favor of pursuing courtly fame. Astrophel campaigns overseas out of "proud desire of praise" (86) and "[h]is mistresse name, and his owne fame to raise" (88). His unworthy goal, then, leads him to pursue his quest through dishonorable means, using "subtil traines [...] the brutish nation to enwrap" (97-98) and pushing "greedily into the heard" of his enemies (104).⁴⁷ By the end of his campaign, Astrophel is little more than a killing machine:

⁴⁶ Though Strickland claims that the poem never identifies Astrophel "as fighting for God or for the Protestant cause or for any other worthy cause" (191), the poem gives enough hints that Astrophel's battle is against the Spanish, as he identifies Astrophel's enemies as "saluage beasts" (82).

⁴⁷ Spenser's description of Astrophel here evokes his description of Duessa, the personification of Roman Catholicism in Book I of *The Faerie Queene*.

His care was all how he them all might kill,
That none might scape (so partiall vnto none)
Ill mynd so much to mynd anothers ill,
As to become vnmyndfull of his owne. (109-112)

The key problem for Spenser is that Astrophel's concern with the body count of his campaign has turned him into a kind of sadist; rather than killing his enemies for a concrete ideological goal, he kills only "to mynd anothers ill" and fails to preserve himself for the future good of the state as well as religious poetry. The result of Astrophel's pursuit of courtly fame, then, is that his has become a "wasted life" even before it ends, as he abandons his true calling and accomplishes none of his major goals (174).

Spenser emphasizes Elizabeth's complicity in the waste of Sidney by portraying Stella herself as an active agent in Astrophel's destruction. Though she does mourn the knight, Spenser describes her in terms that recall the vampiric witch Acrasia at the end of Book II of *The Faerie Queene*, whom Montrose reads as a symbol of Spenser's concerns about the effeminizing powers of Elizabeth's court (930). Just as Acrasia's erotic desire for Verdant literally "sucke[s]" the knight's "spright" out of "his humid eies" (2.12.73-7), Stella's eroticized grief for Astrophel hastens the knight's death. On seeing the wounded knight, Stella "[his] palled face [...] bathed oft with teares and dried oft:/And with sweet kisses suckt the wasting breath,/Out of his lips" ("Astrophel" 163-166). By showing Stella sucking Astrophel's breath from his body, Spenser is able to emphasize her complicity in her lover's death and in the failure of his campaign.

Astrophel's erotic pursuit of Stella, however, is not simply an individual failing, but an emblem of a larger societal collapse that only the application of the right kind of poetry can reform. As the poem progresses, Arcadia appears less and less like a pastoral paradise; there is

no need for Astrophel to seek “peril [...] abroad,/Since round about vs, it doth make abroad” (89-90), and Astrophel’s “shepherd peares” (127) do nothing “[t]o stop his wound that wondrously did bleed” after Astrophel’s final battle (132). Spenser’s solution to this problem is to turn the resources of divine poetry to the reintegration of the shepherd nation. It is here that Spenser’s concern with creating a poetic genealogy with Sidney as a forefather becomes important, for the end of the poem serves as an introduction to the poems written by the “shepherds all which loued him full deare” (200) that fill the rest of the *Astrophel* collection. As he imagines this community united by grief, the poets will now fulfill the role that Astrophel abandoned, and use poetry as a religious discourse to preach right conduct to England as a whole and to reconstruct an aristocratic alliance that could reinvigorate the militant Protestant cause.

It is interesting, however, that Spenser never claims himself as Sidney’s most important poetic heir. Instead, he gives that place of honor to Sidney’s sister Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, whom he portrays in “Astrophel” as “the gentlest shepherdesse that liues this day:/And most resembling both in shape and spright/Her brother deare” (212-214). In the “Dolefull Lay of Clorinda,” the poem that immediately follows “Astrophel” in the collection, Spenser portrays Pembroke as the aristocratic center of the militant Protestant cause and an alternative queen of the shepherd nation whose elegy for Sidney aims to reform the erotic discourse of the Elizabethan court by transforming private grief for Sidney into a shared social act that integrates the disparate parts of society through shared repentance for sin.⁴⁸

Spenser approaches the reformation of the erotic court discourse that leads to Astrophel’s death by making an appeal to the shepherd maids who “woo” Astrophel (“Astrophel” 37) “[t]hem to vouchsafe emongst his rimes to name” (38). Near the beginning of the “Dolefull

⁴⁸ Though Waller and Hannay claim that the “Dolefull Lay” is actually written by Mary Sidney herself, most critics agree Spenser wrote the poem. See Coren’s “Edmund Spenser, Mary Sidney, and the *Doleful Lay*” for the most detailed discussion of the authorship question.

Lay,” Clorinda asks the “shepherds lasses” (37) to abandon the erotic poetry that signaled Astrophel’s obsession with his pursuit of Stella. As Clorinda puts it, the shepherd lasses should “Ne euer sing the loue-layes which he made” (43) or “euer read the riddles which he sayd/Vnto your selues, to make you mery glee” (45-46). Spenser’s description of Astrophel’s love poetry describes two major reasons that erotic verse should be eschewed. Instead of being openly didactic, erotic verse tends towards obscurity through its use of “riddles” and breaks up the shepherd society by inspiring competition between the shepherd lasses for the “loue-lays” written by Astrophel.

More importantly, Clorinda’s rejection of Astrophel’s love poetry repudiates the whole discourse of erotic courtly poetry because it is this discourse that leads directly to Astrophel’s death. Clorinda’s description of Astrophel’s erotic poetry makes it clear that meditation on Astrophel’s love poetry is a kind of false worship as the love poetry is simply a reminder that “Death the deuourer of all worlds delight” (49) has taken the “Ioy of the world, and shepherds pride” (53). Though the poems are “the flowre here left” by Astrophel (57), Spenser makes sure to describe them as emblems of impermanence rather than as emblems of fertility. As Clorinda puts it, the love poems are no more than “the shadow of his likenesse gone” (58) that are “[n]ought like” Astrophel except in the sense that they should remind readers that Astrophel “like a shade did pass” (60).

True commemoration of Astrophel rests on the contemplation of Astrophel’s status as one of the elect, and in his status as a divine poet. Here, Clorinda differentiates Astrophel’s erotic poetry from his more didactic poetry by identifying Astrophel as being “[w]ith all the dowries of celestially grace:/By soueraine choice from th’heuenly quires select” (62-63). As a member of the heavenly choir, then, Astrophel is identified as a poet whose didactic poetry, by implication Sidney’s Psalm translations and *Arcadia*, imitates the songs that he hears in heaven

after his death, where heavenly “birds all of celestiall brood [...] sweetly carol day and night” for Astrophel’s edification (73-74). Spenser portrays this celestial poetry as an integral part of the heavenly experience, for by putting Astrophel’s spirit to “sleep in Angelick delight,” poetry puts the listener into personal contact with the divine (76).

In addition, this divine poetry provides an image of a heavenly court that provides a corrective for the eroticized discourse of Elizabeth’s court. According to Spenser’s description, the carol of the heavenly birds gives Astrophel a dream of “Immortall beauties, which no eye may see” (78). This court of heavenly women differs categorically from the earthly court of the “shepherd lasses” Clorinda addresses at the beginning of the poem. Instead of focusing on their physical nature, as he does in the case of Stella, Astrophel “takes exceeding pleasure/Of their deuine aspects” rather than of their physical attributes (79-80). In this divine court, all of the problems associated with Elizabeth’s terrestrial court are completely absent. Rather than being fractured by jealousy and the need to pursue chivalric fame in order to impress his heavenly mistresses, Astrophel is free to feel “[s]weet loue still ioyous, neuer feeling paine” (83) without suffering the threat of “iealous rancor” (84). This alternate court, then, provides a corrective for the narcissistic eroticism of Elizabeth’s court, in which the members of the court will work in unison for the advancement of godly projects. By portraying Clorinda as the poet who enacts the prophetic vision of the sanctified Astrophel, then, Spenser is able to portray Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, as the aristocratic center of a reformed English court, in which poets who imitate Sidney’s divine poetry work together to reform the realm as a whole.

That Spenser would present Pembroke as the aristocratic center of a new court of reformist preacher-poets writing in the Sidneian tradition is entirely appropriate. Not only was Pembroke an important literary patron in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, but

she also played an important role in the inspiration and distribution of Sidney's own writing.⁴⁹ In terms of Sidney's posthumous reputation, few of Pembroke's editorial projects had as much influence as her completion and distribution of Sidney's translation of the Psalms. Though she never published the collection and never claimed her authorship of the bulk of the translations, the completion of the Sidney Psalter helped to cement Sidney's reputation as a religious poet.⁵⁰ In preparing this "funeral monument" to her brother's memory (Alexander 126), Pembroke was making a definitive intervention to resuscitate the fortunes of the militant Protestant cause in Europe.

Where Pembroke differs from Sidney's first elegists and from Spenser, however, is in the object of her didactic aim. Instead of encouraging young noblemen to engage in a holy war on the continent or encouraging young poets to write religious verse, Pembroke uses "the canonization of Philip Sidney as a type of martyred Protestant saint" to educate Elizabeth herself on the nature of the monarchy (Fisken 265). Pembroke's completed "psalter, dedicated to Elizabeth at the close of her long reign, served as a reminder of the duties of the godly monarch" (Hannay "Princes" 41). For Pembroke, the most important of these duties was to play a "central role [...] in the establishment of Protestantism in Europe as well as in England," a task that could

⁴⁹ Though studies by Mary Ellen Lamb and Michael G. Brennan suggest that Mary Sidney was not the almost all-powerful literary patroness envisaged by earlier critics, it remains important that not only Spenser, but other prominent poets like Samuel Daniel "liked to represent" Mary Sidney's residence at "Wilton as an alternative court" (Alexander 82). See Mary Ellen Lamb's *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* and "The Myth of the Countess of Pembroke: The Dramatic Circle" as well as Michael G. Brennan's *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family*. As Alexander and Hannay argue, Mary Sidney allowed Sidney to live at Wilton while he wrote the *Arcadia* (Alexander 81), and in the early 1590s, she played a key role in editing *Arcadia* for publication, in addition to completing Sidney's translations of the Psalms (84).

⁵⁰ The Sidney Psalter was widely available in manuscript in court circles (Hannay *Philip's Phoenix* 84) and "to all who might be called Pembroke's associates", including Daniel, Donne, and Herbert (Alexander 107). Moreover, Pembroke's role in their composition seems to have been well known; Alexander quotes Ben Jonson's opinion that she wrote the entirety of the collection (107).

be accomplished only if Elizabeth herself were to reform her corrupt courtly establishment and follow Sidney's example by pursuing military intervention on the continent (Fisken 265).⁵¹

Though Pembroke's reformist impulse is present throughout the Psalter, it coalesces in her commemoration of Sidney in the elegy that precedes one of the most complete manuscripts of the collection, "To the Angell Spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney." In the elegy, which she probably wrote around 1599, Pembroke builds upon the rhetorical concerns introduced by Spenser in his 1595 elegies.⁵² As in "Astrophel" and the "Dolefull Lay," Sidney is the nexus of an alternative court in which religious poetry forms the foundation of a commitment to activist political intervention on behalf of continental Protestants. Like Spenser, Pembroke describes Sidney as an English reenactment of the *figura* of David whose translation of the Psalms marks him as a prophet. According to the first and second stanzas of the poem, Sidney's translations of "[t]heise sacred Hymnes" written by the "Kingleie Prophet" (14) show him imitating "those high Tons, so in themselves adorn'd,/which Angells sing in their caelestiall

⁵¹ Alexander and Steinberg both argue that there is "doubt about whether Pembroke was ever actually seen as making any sort of political gesture" (Alexander 106-107) and that at the time of the dedication of the Psalms to Elizabeth in 1599 "the time for such counsel had long since passed" (106). Hannay and Fisken, however, make a clear case that Pembroke's psalter is a politicized text that follows both "the literary model" and the "ideological context" of "the interlocked Huguenot and English Genevan communities" that "had sent its Psalms to Elizabeth in celebration of her accession" and to encourage her pursuit of Protestant causes (Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix* 86). See Beth Wayne Fisken's "'To the Angell Spirit...': Mary Sidney's Entry into the 'World of Words,'" and Margaret Hannay's "'Princes you as men must dy': Genevan Advice to Monarchs in the *Psalmes* of Mary Sidney" and *Philip's Phoenix*. For more apolitical readings of the Psalms, see Alexander's *Writing After Sidney* and Theodore L. Steinberg's "The Sidney's and the Psalms." See Michael G. Brennan's "The Queen's Proposed Visit to Wilton House in 1599 and the 'Sidney Psalms'" for the dating of the elegy.

⁵² Though there is no definite composition date, "To the Angell Spirit" is certainly a late addition to the collection. The poem survives in a single manuscript, which Alexander dates to 1599 (106), and according to Hannay, Mary Sidney prepared this manuscript as a presentation copy "for the queen's visit to Wilton" (*Philip's Phoenix* 85). I use the text included in J.C.A. Rathmell's edition of *The Psalms of Sir Philip Sidney and The Countess of Pembroke*.

Quire” (11-12) and make it clear that Sidney’s is an “Angell’s soule with highest Angells plac’t” (59).

Despite Sidney’s status as an English David, the elegy is suffused with imagery of incompleteness. Though they are “rare workes to which no witt can adde” (68), the Psalms are decidedly “undone” (24) and “not complete” (72) despite Pembroke’s own best efforts. Instead of being “Immortall Monuments” to Sidney’s “faire fame” (71), the Psalms are more akin to unfinished temples, “goodly buildings to some glorious ende/cut of by fate, before the Graces hadde/each wondrous part in all their beauties cladde” (64-66). Pembroke’s own completion of Sidney’s translation is similarly incomplete. Instead of properly finishing them, she has “but peec’t” the rest of the poems (24), mixing her “mortall stuffe” (6) with Sidney’s “secret power” (4) of “divine” inspiration (6).

Pembroke uses the incomplete status of the Psalms to symbolize the incomplete nature of Sidney’s religious and political task, “the establishment of the Protestant faith, in Continental Europe as well as England” (Hannay, *Philip’s Phoenix* 90). Though part of the purpose of the translation is to make Elizabeth’s court a place like the heavenly court, Elizabeth’s court remains decidedly corrupt. Instead of celebrating a Spenserian alternative court of poet-shepherds who work to put the ideals of the Sidney circle into practice, Pembroke describes an England in which Sidney’s religious and military legacy remains as unfinished as his translation of the Psalms, and where the reformist goals championed by the Sidney circle are largely ignored. As Pembroke puts it, Sidney is

fixt among thy fellow lights:

my day put out, my life in darknes cast,

Thy Angell’s soule with highest Angells plac’t

There blessed sings enjoying heav'n-delights
thy Maker's praise: as farr from earthly tast
As here thy workes so worthilie embrac't
By all of worth, where never Envie bites. (57-63)

Pembroke's description evokes a clear distinction between the heavenly court and the earthly court in which Sidney's "workes" refer to his political projects as well as his poetry. While Sidney continues singing his hymns in the afterlife, Pembroke herself is left in the moral "darknes" of Elizabeth's court. While Sidney's example may have been "worthilie embrac't/By all of worth" (62-63), her description of the court as a place where "Envie bites" suggests that the Sidneian political and poetic project has been sadly neglected by the majority (63).⁵³ Pembroke emphasizes Sidney's neglect in the next stanza, in which she compares Sidney's life and work as "goodly buildings to some glorious ende/cut of by fate, before the Graces hadde/each wondrous part in their beauties cladde" (64-66). Instead of fulfilling Sidney's Davidic example by actively pursuing religious causes, the members of England's political class have left it unfinished, and are sunk in barren inaction that leaves the peace England enjoys "half-maim'd" because the war has not achieved its proper eschatological aim (18).

Even this "half maim'd peece," however, would "[sort] with the best" (18) if Sidney had not died, because the worst result of Sidney's death is that he has left England without a political or poetic heir. As Pembroke puts it, Sidney has left England a country where "lives no witt that can thy praise become" (49) and where the satisfactory completion of both the translation of the Psalms and the completion of Sidney's political projects are not "in the reach of thought" (72). Pembroke even describes herself, the only Sidney heir who appears in the poem, as an

⁵³ Pembroke may be alluding to the Blatant Beast of Envy in Book VI of *The Faerie Queene*.

inadequate replacement who has “but peec’t” together the translation of the poems that Sidney has left unfinished, and whose poetic talents play a decidedly minor role in the completion of the collection (25).

Pembroke’s willingness to give all credit for the Psalms to Sidney has caused critics some problems. Alexander ascribes her “self-effacement” mainly to a desire to flatter Sidney (106). Hannay explains it as a consequence of being “relegated to the margins of discourse by her gender” (*Philip’s Phoenix* 91). While there is an element of truth in each conclusion, Pembroke was a good enough poet to have a more complicated rhetorical objective in sight. Instead of denigrating her own poetic abilities because she is excessively modest or because she discounts the salvific powers of poetry, Pembroke minimizes her status as Sidney’s heir as part of a larger call that Elizabeth herself become Sidney’s heir by reforming her court and reenergizing the Protestant cause. While the poem as a whole is addressed to Sidney’s spirit, it is clear that Pembroke intends for Elizabeth to be the ultimate terrestrial recipient of “these Hymnes, these obsequies” (85). The images of incompleteness that permeate the poem, then, constitute Pembroke’s call for Elizabeth to finish the work begun by Sidney, the English David. It is only by imitating her erstwhile subject, and pursuing the militant Protestant agenda by recommitting England to Protestant causes on the continent, that Elizabeth herself can reenact David’s royal role.

For Pembroke, as for Spenser and the early elegists of Sidney, commemoration plays a key role in the political life of the militant Protestant cause.⁵⁴ By portraying Sidney as a martyr, Pembroke and Sidney’s other elegists were able to portray the pursuit of godly interests on the

⁵⁴ Though there is some doubt that Elizabeth ever received a copy of the Psalms, Pembroke’s elegy for Sidney emphasizes the subversive edge that permeates the Sidney elegies of the 1590s. Alexander assumes that Elizabeth never received a copy of the Psalms as Elizabeth cancelled her proposed 1599 visit to Wilton (106).

continent as a kind of religious devotion. The fact that Spenser and Pembroke each describe England in such bleak terms, however, brings to the surface the anxieties felt by militant Protestants throughout Elizabeth's reign. By using commemorative speech, Sidney's elegists were hoping for more than simple memories of Sidney. Like the preachers of funeral sermons, they hope to use their commemorative verses as spurs for the reformation of the realm. By harnessing the didactic power of poetry, as exemplified by both Sidney's theory and practice, the elegists hoped to recreate English society, producing a nation in which a new group of aristocratic protectors could influence the queen into pressing the godly agenda.

Chapter Three: Spenser, Preachers, and the Commemoration of Justice: The Lords Deputy of Ireland and Book V of *The Faerie Queene*

Critics have long recognized that Book V of *The Faerie Queene* is the place in Spenser's poetry where the intersections between poetic discourse, political discourse, and religious discourse are most obvious and most problematic. Much of this discussion revolves around Spenser's treatment of Irish politics. Spenser's interest in Ireland is not surprising given his lengthy career as a colonial official, but critics agree that Spenser's use of Ireland in *The Faerie Queene* was motivated by more than simple self-interest. Instead, Spenser's treatment of Ireland in his poetry plays a key role in a larger political and social debate in which colonial Ireland was "a crucial symbolic place in the formation of emergent English notions of nationhood, empire, and cultural self-understanding" (Highley 2).¹ As Andrew Hadfield has argued, Spenser's poetic treatment of Ireland is at least as concerned with "expressing the ideological anxieties of Spenser's understanding of Elizabethan culture" as with actual political conditions in the colony itself (Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience* 129).²

As Hadfield and others have discussed, however, Spenser is not alone in using the Irish context to express a wide range of 16th century English ideological anxieties. The body of work from the 1580s and 1590s that discusses Ireland is extensive and includes a wide array of poems,

¹ See Christopher Highley's *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland*.

² See Andrew Hadfield's *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl*. Other important critical works discussing Ireland in Spenser's historical allegory in *The Faerie Queen* include David Norbrook's *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, Richard McCabe's *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment*, and Maryclaire Moroney's "Apocalypse, Ethnography, and Empire in John Derricke's *Image of Ireland* (1581) and Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596). For other discussions of Ireland in late sixteenth century literature, most of which discuss Spenser to some extent, see Clare Carroll's "Barbarous Slaves and Civil Cannibals: Translating Civility in Early Modern Ireland," Andrew Murphy's *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us: Ireland, Colonialism, and Renaissance Literature*, and Debora Shuger's "Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians."

propaganda pamphlets, prose tracts, and sermons. Hadfield and McCabe have discussed much of this material and agree that the bulk of it is directly concerned with defining justice in the colonial realm. What critics have not examined at length, however, is the role of commemorative speech in late-16th-century debates on Irish justice.³ This critical gap is surprising given that funeral sermons on three of Elizabeth's Lords Deputy of Ireland were published, a striking fact because only around twenty-five funeral sermons were published during Elizabeth's reign.⁴ What makes the study of commemoration especially important for the study of Irish affairs is the fact that Spenser bases Book V of *The Faerie Queene* on a lengthy commemoration of Arthur Grey, Baron de Wilton's term as Lord Deputy. For both Spenser and the preachers of funeral sermons for the Lords Deputy, the use of commemoration provided the opportunity to explicate the virtue of justice and present their subjects as *exempla* of correct religious and political conduct for their readers.

Each of these authors venerates his subject to argue that justice, as a political virtue, demands political action be directed towards the reformation of religion along the lines argued by adherents of militant Protestantism.⁵ According to each writer, the task of the earthly

³ Amongst these works are prose tracts like Spenser's own *Viewe of the Present State of Ireland*, as well as Richard Beacon's *Solon His Follie*, William Herbert's *Croftus Sive de Hibernia Liber*, and Sir Henry Sidney's 1582 memoir of his service as Lord Deputy of Ireland. The most famous of the poems on the subject is John Derricke's 1580 *Image of Ireland*. Interestingly, the vast majority of these works commemorate the careers of individual colonial officials.

⁴ The number jumps to four if William Barlow's sermon for the 2nd Earl of Essex is considered; I do not discuss Barlow's sermon on the second Earl of Essex here because Barlow had bigger fish to fry than Essex's bungling of his Irish expedition. These three sermons are: Richard Davies. *A Fvnerall Sermon Preached [...] at the burial of The Right Honovrable VValter Earle of Essex and Ewe, Earle Marshall of Irelande [...]*. London: Henry Denham, 1577; Thomas White. *A Godlie Sermon preached [...] at Pensehurst in Kent, at the burial of the late Right honourable Sir Henrie Sidney*. London: Henry Middleton, 1586; Thomas Sparke. *A Sermon Preached at Whaddon [...] at the burial of the Right Honorable, Arthur Lorde Grey of Wilton*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1593.

⁵ My discussion of Spenser's concept of justice, as well as that of the funeral preachers, is indebted to critics like Kenneth Borris, Brendan Bradshaw, and Elizabeth Heale, who discuss the

magistrate is to engage in vigorous political action in the struggle against the forces of international Roman Catholicism. None of them, however, had any faith that Elizabeth or her courtiers were entirely capable of pursuing this fight. For Spenser and the three funeral preachers discussed here, the blame for the failures of the Irish campaigns and the cause of militant Protestantism overall lay on “the eroticized politics of late Elizabethan court culture” Spenser attacks so vehemently in “Astrophel” (Montrose 917).⁶ The colonial sphere, which includes Ireland, Wales, and the New World, is both a place from which Spenser and the funeral preachers can write from an oppositional stance, and a proving ground for militant Protestant politicians, “a privileged site of vision and power” in which the type of “masculine” political skills needed to reform Elizabeth’s “feminized” court could be cultivated (Highley 17).

importance of Reformation religious debates on Spenser’s definition of the virtue. Heale, for example, reads Malengine in *FQ* V.ix as Spenser’s response to “what was felt to be the growing menace within England and Ireland of secret Roman Catholic missionary priests” (171-172), Borris reads Book V as if “Revelation is its main textual source, and the extensive apocalyptic allusions delineate an allegory of universal history that evaluates historical events and traces the limits of earthly justice in effecting reform” (10), and Bradshaw argues that Spenser intends Book V to be “an allegory of supernatural justification as well” as political justification (84). These readings differ from readings that find Spenser’s primary sources in Aristotle, contemporary legal terminology, and the blunt justification of colonial politics. See Brendan Bradshaw’s “Edmund Spenser on Justice and Mercy,” Kenneth Borris’s *Spenser’s Poetics of Prophecy in The Faerie Queene V*, and Elizabeth Heale’s “Spenser’s Malengine, Missionary Priests, and the Means of Justice.” for religious interpretations of justice. T.K. Dunseath’s *Spenser’s Allegory of Justice in Book Five of The Faerie Queene*, and Mark Heberle’s “Aristotle and Spenser’s Justice” discuss Spenser’s debts to Aristotle. Andrew J. Majeske’s *Equity in English Renaissance Literature: Thomas More and Edmund Spenser* and James E. Phillips’s “Renaissance Concepts of Justice and the Structure of “The Faerie Queene,” Book V” approach Spenser’s justice from the point of view of contemporary legal theorists. See Walter S.H. Lim’s “Figuring Justice: Imperial Ideology and the Discourse of Colonialism in Book V of *The Faerie Queene* and *A View of the Present State of Ireland*,” for an argument that Spenser “promulgates a vision of justice that is necessary for containing individual and social dissent, as well as for consolidating monarchical power.

⁶ Hadfield argues that the New English community in Ireland, of which Spenser was a member and with which the preachers were associated, was a center of anti-monarchical thought (Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser’s Irish Experience* 46). For the discussion of Spenser’s views on female rule, see Louis Montrose’s “Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary” and John N. King’s *Spenser’s Poetry and the Reformation Tradition*.

For the most part, the political leaders discussed in this chapter were proponents of the use of violence in the subjugation of the English colonies. The three subjects of these texts, Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex, Sir Henry Sidney, and Arthur Grey de Wilton, were closely connected politically. In addition to holding high office in Ireland, all three men were, broadly speaking and allowing for personal rivalries and differences in tactics, members of the wing of English politics associated with Leicester and the militantly interventionist Protestants associated with him. As such, they shared Spenser's frustration with "the Crown's lack of commitment to curbing the manifold dangers and abuses" in the Irish colony and with "the Crown's lack of commitment to religious reform at home and abroad" (Gregory 391).⁷ The authors of these sermons, like Spenser, are heavily invested in ensuring that future generations of noble families see the importance of Ireland and colonial affairs in supporting England's role as the leading Protestant power in Europe.⁸ If, as Norbrook argues, Spenser is committed to providing a defense of Arthur, Lord Grey's deputyship, as well as "a sustained defense of the Leicester-Essex foreign policy" (132), this is the goal of the preachers as well. By presenting the Lords Deputy as political *exempla*, Spenser and the preachers hope both to defend the political

⁷ See Tobias Gregory's "Shadowing Intervention: On the Politics of *The Faerie Queene* Book 5 Cantos 10-12."

⁸ This concern with providing *exempla* points to an overriding concern with the problem of the succession of power in society. According to Gittings, this concern was both internal and external, with the purpose of the funeral and its associated genres being both "to stress the continuing power of the aristocracy" to society as a whole (175), as well as to emphasize the continuity of the aristocracy with public displays of succession (166). The purpose of the funeral sermon, then, was to give all members of the aristocracy, and especially those who succeed directly to power, models for how to act properly in power. As Andrew Majeskie makes clear in his analysis of the Isis Church episode in Book V, Spenser is as much concerned with the succession and legitimization of power as with the ideal of justice.

reputation of their late patrons and to use their actions as an example of a religiously justified use of political power.⁹

To commemorate these Lords deputy, however, the funeral preachers and Spenser were forced to explain the relative failures of their subjects' terms of office and to renovate their posthumous reputations in order to encourage the nobility to participate in colonial enterprises.¹⁰ To explain the failures of the Irish deputies, Spenser and the funeral preachers use the same methods of figural interpretation as the writers of elegies for Sidney and other preachers. I will argue that to achieve these goals, Spenser and these funeral preachers use variations of the biblical figure of the suffering servant, including Samson, David, Isaiah, and Christ, to portray the Lords Deputy as *exempla* of justice for members of the nobility. Each of these writers mobilizes the political and religious potential of hagiography, as all three of the Lord Deputies eventually appear as secular saints whose careers faltered more because of persecution than their own incompetence.¹¹ By casting these Lords Deputy as persecuted individuals and reenactments of the type of the suffering servant, these authors can both praise their harsh colonial policies as

⁹ The historical research done over the last thirty years on Tudor colonial Ireland supports the findings by literary critics that involvement in Ireland was a key political and cultural influence in Elizabethan England. See Karl S. Bottigheimer's "Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Westward Enterprise," Brendan Bradshaw's "Native Reaction to the Westward Enterprise: A Case-Study in Gaelic Ideology," Ciaran Brady's *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1588*, Colm Lennon's *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest*, F.X. Martin's "Ireland, the Renaissance and the Counter-Reformation," and John McGurk's *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: The 1590s Crisis*. Lennon's and Brady's books are especially useful for understanding the political climate in which Spenser wrote.

¹⁰ See Brady's *The Chief Governors* for a detailed description of how each of these Irish deputies actually failed in their goals.

¹¹ Carol Kaske defines biblical poetics as "rhetorical devices and methods of presentation which are either peculiar to Scripture [...] or prevalent in expressing certain of its favorite topics" (1). The technique of figural interpretation that I discuss is one aspect of this biblical poetics.

the necessary means of attacking the Catholic threat as well as condemning the state of the court under female rule.¹²

I: The Remains of the Lords Deputy

Despite the recent critical interest in writings about Elizabethan Ireland, there has been little discussion of these three funeral sermons. They are discussed solely in histories of funeral practice. This is particularly surprising in the case of Sparke's sermon on Lord Grey, given the intense critical scrutiny that has gone into the Irish background of Book V of *The Faerie Queene* in the last twenty years. Even the major historical sources on Elizabethan Ireland overlook them. Thomas Sparke's 1593 sermon on Lord Grey is very little discussed, and Tromly mentions Thomas White's 1585 sermon on Henry Sidney only to note that White uses the sermon to "[define] what the highest ground for true praise should be" and uses this summary to support his argument that praise is legitimate in funeral sermons only when it is "subordinate to the significance of his life as a Christian" (304). The only sermon out of the three that garners significant critical attention is Richard Davies's 1577 sermon for Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex. Here, Tromly uses the sermon mainly as the "one exception which illuminates the rule" (304) that Elizabethan funeral sermons pay more attention to doctrine than to the life of the deceased.¹³

¹² I do not argue here that Spenser necessarily read Sparke's sermon on Grey or any of the other funeral sermons I discuss here (though I think it is entirely possible, given the fact that Grey was patron to both Spenser and Sparke, and Spenser was also connected to the Sidney/Essex circle).

¹³ Despite his generally good argument, Tromly seems to be mistaken about Davies's uniqueness in this respect. Edmund Grindal's sermon on Emperor Ferdinand and William Barlow's sermon on the second Earl of Essex (discussed in chapter 1), and Thomas Sparke's sermon on Arthur, Lord Grey (discussed below), each spend a significant amount of time on fairly detailed biographies of their subjects.

Closer examination of these three sermons shows that not only Davies's sermon on Essex but also those preached by White and Sparke on Sir Henry Sidney and Lord Grey place an unusual amount of emphasis on the lives of their subjects while using them as source texts for the doctrinal portions of the sermons. This is evident not just from the details that they provide, which tend to be more copious and specific than is usual in late-sixteenth century funeral sermons, but also from the placement of the biography within the formal structure of the sermon. In each case, the life of the deceased is discussed near the center of the sermon, rather than being relegated to the end.¹⁴ This modification has the effect of highlighting the life of the deceased as the fulcrum on which the various doctrinal discussions balance, and elevating the status of the *vita* as an *exemplum* of political behavior.

It is doubtful that this symmetry in formal revision is the result of direct influence, given that the sermons were published across a period of sixteen years. Instead, the similarities stem from the fact that commemoration for each preacher involves mounting a defense of his subject's political career, focusing on their abilities as magistrates whose role is to dispense justice. Because of this, the preachers interpret their biblical *figurae* in order to explain each man's political failures as colonial officials as a matter of political persecution. Each Lord Deputy is presented as a political martyr whose attempts to enforce justice have been thwarted by the activities of political enemies allied to England's religious enemies.

All of these enemies, moreover, are closely connected to the court, and each sermon is written from a decidedly anti-court point of view. The sermons are dedicated to defending a

¹⁴ White's discussion of Henry Sidney's life, though brief, comes only 17 pages into the sermon, with another 19 pages of doctrinal discussion following it. Sparke is even more atypical, with two separate biographical sections, a detailed defense of Grey's conduct at Smerwick in 1581 occupying pages 48-51 followed by a more generalized commemoration between pages 59-66 of an 87 page sermon. In Sparke's case, this was almost certainly the result of pre-publication revision.

particular conception of the English colonial project in Ireland that favored the aggressive spread of Protestantism and the institution of English law. According to Brady and Lennon, colonial goals had shifted from a policy of “gradualism” in mid-century to “a pattern of pan-insular, programmatic government” that included the foundation of various new English plantations (Lennon 180). However, the rush to institute these changes led to “[t]he overdeployment of martial law” which “had brought the entire English legal system into disrepute,” making it very difficult for the Lords Deputy either to carry out their colonial missions or encourage Elizabeth to further support their policies (Brady, *Chief Governors* 155).¹⁵

Since Essex, Sidney, and Grey were all members of the same broad political group of militant Protestant interventionists associated with Leicester in the 1570s-1580s and with the 2nd Earl of Essex in the 1590s, it is clear that each of these sermons is focused on defending the politics of aggressive colonialism favored by this group. More importantly, the preachers sought to present a religiously favorable view of the colonial project in order to encourage the next generation of aristocrats who would exercise power in Ireland to follow the policies of Essex, Sidney, and Grey.¹⁶ Each preacher portrays the execution of colonial justice, and by extension, justice in general, as a never-ending fight against Roman Catholic tyranny and persecution by Antichrist’s allies both within and outside of England. By commemorating the Lords Deputy,

¹⁵ Even at the time, it was obvious to observers that neither the peaceful nor the militant policies were succeeding. Edmund Tremayne’s 1575 analysis of the situation, according to Brady, argues that both “the attempt to employ English law” and “the traditional means of coercion” were “doomed from the start” (*Chief Governors* 140). Predictably enough, Sidney’s and his successors’ shift to aggressive policies, in addition to the fact that all of these aristocrats, along with most of Elizabeth’s other Lords Deputy, tended to favor New English colonists at the expense of the Old English aristocracy, tended to foment more divisions inside of Ireland itself. According to Lennon, “[b]y 1578 their disenchantment with English government policy had intensified to the point where members of the social elite of the eastern region comprised an opposition to the administration” (188).

¹⁶ The most notable targets, of course, were Robert Devereux and Sir Philip Sidney, but each preacher undoubtedly hoped to mobilize large portions of their audiences to follow the new leaders of this political movement.

Spenser and the funeral preachers argue that the pursuit of colonial justice through the emulation of biblical figures who endure persecution and retaliate against the persecutors is the mechanism for reforming the government of England and advancing the apocalyptic agenda of the true church.

As historians of Elizabethan Ireland make clear, the policies of these officials were nearly impossible to defend, but of all the deputies whose funeral sermons are discussed, Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex was certainly the politician whose term needed the most defense as his tenure as the head of the Ulster Plantation and Lord Marshal of Ireland from 1575-1576 was particularly disastrous.¹⁷ According to historians of late sixteenth century Ireland, Essex managed to convince Elizabeth to grant him “unusually extensive civil and military powers” over his plantation (Brady, *Chief Governors* 251) in return for promising “to absorb most of its costs himself” (144). From this point, Essex led an expedition that “was almost a national effort in that it not only enjoyed the support of the queen and Privy Council, but also in its early stages attracted to its ranks the sons of many aristocratic families” (Canny 577). Despite these advantages, Essex was never able to control his plantation successfully, his “venture had manifestly failed” by 1574 (Lennon 274), and Essex himself died of dysentery in 1576 (275).¹⁸

¹⁷ See Brady’s *The Chief Governors*, Lennon, and Canny’s “The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America” for more information about Essex’s plantation scheme.

¹⁸ Oddly enough, the epistle dedicatory is signed by “E.W.,” who the *STC* identifies as Sir Edward Waterhouse, one of Henry Sidney’s longtime servants and Principle Secretary of Ireland during Sidney’s terms as Lord Deputy of Ireland, which suggests a self-conscious attempt to consolidate the two families into a cohesive political unit. Waterhouse declares Robert to be “the liuely Image” (iir) of the late Earl, and “[hopes] of a firther degree of excellencie in [Robert] to ouershine the goodnesse both of [his] Father and Grandfather” (iiv). However, Waterhouse does not leave this up to the “virtues as Fortitude, temperaunce, courtesie, affability, liberalitie and constancie ... peculiar to [his] house, discending by nature, and graffed, as it were in [his] principles” (iiir). Instead, Waterhouse dedicates the sermon as an example of how Robert should act in order to “giue [him] a reason how [he] bear [his] Armour and Badges of Honour” (iiir).

This catalogue of failure makes Davies's portrayal of Essex as an exemplum for noble behavior somewhat surprising. Tromly explains this by arguing that the sermon was a kind of vanity publication "likely to have been printed for private distribution rather than for sale" (305).¹⁹ As Tromly puts it, "Davies' sermon is distinguished by the unqualified enthusiasm with which its commendation dwells on Essex's nobility and honor" and its "concern to present Essex as a pattern of nobility" (304), especially for the young Robert Devereux (304).

Though Tromly is right that the limited publication of the sermon partially explains its effusive praise, a consideration of the network of biblical citations in the sermon makes it clear that Davies spends so much time obscuring Essex's failures in order to shift the blame for the disaster away from Essex onto jealous political rivals.²⁰ By linking Essex to *figurae* of persecution from the Bible, Davies is able to portray Essex as a magistrate whose struggle against that persecution defines him as an *exemplum* of nobility.²¹

¹⁹ Indeed, the sermon as a physical object is certainly odd and supports Tromly's argument that the sermon was a kind of "memorial" to Essex (305). Instead of simply consisting of the sermon, the book includes a great deal of prefatory material, including a representation of the Devereux family arms, an epistle dedicatory to Walter Devereux that is more elaborate than most in outlining the argument of the sermon, an ornate family tree that stretches over ten pages, and a series of poems and elegies in Latin, Greek, Welsh, and Hebrew. Hammer argues "this sermon was widely distributed in an apparent attempt to win renown for the Devereux name" and was both "printed for sale" and "specially distributed among members of the peerage" (21). Hammer also notes that the sermon was reprinted in the 1577 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*. See Evan J. Jones's "The Death and the Burial of Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, 1576" for an excellent reprint of the sermon.

²⁰ Essex certainly faced opposition from fellow English colonial officials, with Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam (Lennon 281) and Sir Henry Sidney (Brady, *Chief Governors* 144) both attempting to curtail his powers both before and during his tenure in Ireland, as well as suffering from the queen's chronic lack of financial and military support. However, it is clear from modern reports that Essex's failure was as much due to "[f]inancial and physical exhaustion" (Canny 578), a series of "callous massacres" of Gaelic Irish rebels that failed to eliminate resistance to Essex's plantation scheme (Lennon 281), and Essex's own inability to make treaties with rival Gaelic chieftains on any legal basis but good relations with Essex himself, all of which kept Essex from forming a more rational policy in his plantation (Brady, *Chief Governors* 260).

²¹ On the spectrum of Elizabethan religious politics, Davies fell squarely into the militant Protestant camp. During the Marian persecutions, he fled to Geneva (*DNB* vol 14: 149), and was

Davies begins his sermon by preaching on *Revelation* 14.13, “I hearde a voice from heauen, saying, write: Blessed are the dead which die in the Lorde, forthwith: euen so sayth the spirite, that they may rest from their labours, and their workes followe them” (C1r).²² This verse is well suited to Davies’s defense because it concerns the persecution of the True Church during the time of Antichrist.²³ Davies then discusses the doctrine of the verse, which consists of answering the three questions “what is blessednesse”, “what admonition we may gather out of these wordes” and “who dye in the Lorde” (C3v).²⁴ Davies then moves to his detailed discussion of Essex’s life, focusing on Essex’s fulfillment of the four philosophical virtues “*Prudence, Fortitude, Iustice, and Temperaunce*”. Significantly, Davies connects these virtues to both political and religious conduct, calling them “[t]he Welles of nobilitie [...]” and “the hill whence they spring [...] the feare of God, or true religion” (E1v). Davies argues that Essex’s prudence sprang from his ability to “discerne betwixt true religion, & the Hypocriticall false religion” (E2r), which led to his efforts to “[further] and [favor] all Preachers of Gods worde” (E2v). This knowledge of true religion, combined with his status as “a perfect Warriour” (E3r), made Essex an exemplary purveyor of justice so well able to “minister iustice betwixt partie and partie, without respect of parsons” that “there is no man liuing that can iustly complayne of anye oppression or wrong done by him” (E3v).

The main problem with this encomium is that it does not correspond with the reality of Essex’s death as an impoverished political failure. Knowing that the young Robert Devereux

an aggressive reformer of Catholicism after becoming the bishop of Wales after Elizabeth’s accession (150).

²² Davies uses the Geneva translation throughout.

²³ Though the wording of Davies’s translations from the Latin are slightly different, his theological outlook suggests that Davies was using the Geneva Bible for much of his theological outline. From the Geneva gloss to the verse: “For they are deliuered from the horrible troubles which are in the Church and rest with God” (GGG3r).

²⁴ Davies’s sermon resembles Thomas Sparke’s 1585 sermon for the Earl of Bedford, preached on the same biblical verse.

would eventually experience impoverishment and other political difficulties, Davies mounts a defense of the Earl that attributes his worldly problems to others' jealousy. Davies compares the living Essex to Job. In particular, Davies compares Essex to "*Iobe* in the tyme of his authoritie & wealth" (E3v), who describes himself as paragon of justice in Job 29.15.²⁵ What Davies leaves unstated, but what he assumes his audience knows, is that in the next chapter, Job describes himself as being persecuted, and his judgements ignored, because he lacks the wealth he once possessed. Because his "estate is changed" (Geneva gloss to Job 30.1), "[t]he youth rise vp at my right hand: they haue pusht my feete, and haue trode on me *as on* the paths of their destruction" (Job 30.12). For Essex, as for Job, the lack of wealth results in the scorn of the political world and political rebellion by those who cannot accept being subordinate to a poor but righteous magistrate.

The political problem with wealthy magistrates, Davies suggests, is that they are unable to provide the correct reckoning for their lives, as the "kind of reconing [...] peculiere & proper to such as God hath called to be Rulers, Gouvernours and officers in the commonwealth" consists of spending money in the service of the country and of God (D1v). Davies here cites Solomon as an ideal king and as a source for this idea of nobility. Paraphrasing the Wisdom of Solomon 6, Davies states that magistrates "shoulde apply their authoritie to set out [God's] glorie and honour" rather than accumulating wealth and secular power (D2r). According to Davies's sermon, Essex is one of the few nobles to follow this doctrine. Rather than seeking wealth, Essex "neuer esteemed much of that kinde of glorie" (E1v), choosing instead to exercise his office so that he could become "the beautifull flower of *Englande*: the precious Jewell and

²⁵ The full quote that Davies gives is Job 29.15-17: "I was the eyes to the blinde, and I was the feete to the lame, I was a Father to the poore, and when I knew not the cause I sought it out diligently, I brake the chawes of the unrighteous man, & plucked the pray out of his teeth" (E4r).

comfort of *Wales: the trusty stay of Ireland*' (F2r). Davies claims that the rest of the nobility, in contrast, "seeketh to be made blessed by worldly goodes, riches and possessions" (C3v).

Davies contrasts Essex's good work in Wales to Elizabeth's political stewardship of Wales, and by extension, her other colonial realms. Here, Davies describes "the Justices of peace with us in Wales" (D2v) as the reenactments of the unjust rulers of Israel in Amos 6.12; they are "voide of all religion and feare of God" that "they haue iustified the wicked, and condemned the iust, and so turned iudgement to wormewood" (D2v). Rather than using their wealth to make the country better, "they haue altogether applied their authoritie and office to pyll and poll the countrey" (D3r); where "they should haue bene [...] fathers of the countrey," these unjust magistrates have become "spoilors of the countrey" (D3r).

Davies blames these magistrates' crimes on Elizabeth's inaction in judging the righteousness of the Welsh justices of the peace. More damagingly, Davies accuses the queen of not being able to make use of the few good men that she has at her disposal. In discussing Essex's service to the queen, for example, Davies comes close to accusing Elizabeth of being ignorant of the Earl's virtues; as he puts it, "hir Maiestie, if he had liued, might haue used his seruice to he a terrour to all enemies, foreine or domestical" (E1r). The tone of this statement of Davies's is one of reproach. By making the tone of this statement so conditional, Davies suggests that even when Essex was alive, Elizabeth did not do enough to use him to fight her religious enemies despite the fact that Essex was "by Gods especial grace, expert to gouerne and rule under hir Maiestie, aswel in warre as peace, the strong towers of defense, both of hir Maiestie and hir highnesse realm" (E1r). By ignoring this tool of grace, Elizabeth has failed, to a certain extent, in her duty to carry out the will of God in the political affairs in her realms.

If read simply in political terms, Davies's reproach of Elizabeth and courtly culture is damaging enough. But Davies's use of Amos 6.12 places Essex's death and the materialist

English political culture that helped cause his death in an eschatological context.²⁶ According to the Geneva gloss, Amos attacks “the wealthy, which regarded not Gods plagues nor menaces by the Prophetes” (ZZZ1v).²⁷ Essex’s death is a contemporary reenactment of these Old Testament plagues, “the heauy hande of God for our sinnes, upon the whole countrey,” which follows famine, plague, earthquake and “straunge sightes [...] in the ayre” (Davies D4v).

Essex’s death is one of the plagues that God has leveled at England because of the sinful state of its political culture. The plagues have come to England, according to Davies, because the rich nobility are analogous to the biblical persecutors of the godly, while Essex uses patience in confronting them. When Essex has heard “some thrasonicall contumelious wordes, spoken by some glorious inferiour aduersarie agaynst him” (D4v), he responds by imitating Solomon’s example of temperance from Ecclesiastes 7.9 and Christ’s dictum from Luke 6.45 by “neuer [uttering] any opprobrious words” (F1r). His opponents, on the other hand, are cast as the allies of the biblical persecutors. The opening biblical verse, for example, places the sermon in an eschatological context that contrasts the elected dead and his immediate circle to a group of opponents who are linked with Antichrist and, by extension, the Roman church. By chasing “after the pleasure and riches of thys worlde,” Davies suggests, these avaricious nobles “applye all their power to further and continue the kingdome of Antichrist, defende papisterie, supersticion and Idolatrie” (D2r). By resisting this worldly alliance between wealth and Roman Catholicism with his godly policies, Essex is linked to “the Martirs, aswell of the primitiue church under the cruell Emperours, as the martyrs of all ages sithence under Antichrist of Rome” (F2r).

²⁶ Amos 6.12 reads “Shal horses runne vpon the rocke? Or wil one plowe *there* with oxen? For ye haue turned iudgment into gall, and the frute of righteousnes into wormewode” (ZZZ1v).

²⁷ The said plagues, of course, include much of the rest of the Old Testament.

By portraying the court as infiltrated by allies of the Pope, of course, Davies runs a considerable political risk. In order to show that he intends to reform the political nation with his figural reading of Essex's life, therefore, Davies provides a *figura* for Elizabeth that both links the queen to the persecutory sins of the Old Testament kings as well as provides an example of reform. Here, Davies uses the story of David and Nathan from 2 Samuel 12.1, in which Davies praises Nathan for "[fetching] Daud out of the denne of securitie, and ignoraunce of his estate betwixt him & God" after David's execution of Uriah the Hittite (D3r). Davies's focus is on Nathan's proverb of the wealthy man who stole sheep from a poor man in order to increase his own wealth. The story, of course, encourages David to sentence the rich man to death, whereupon Nathan reveals that the rich man's behavior is symbolic of David's own conduct with Uriah and Bathsheba. David promptly gets the message and repents.²⁸

In political terms, Davies's use of this biblical example is far more complicated, as he uses David, commonly used as biblical justification for divine or sacral monarchy, to attack Elizabeth's treatment of Essex. Davies does not describe David as a good king or as a good judge. Instead, he stresses Nathan's condemnation of David as the rich man of Nathan's proverb, which, given the subject matter of the sermon as a whole, indicts Elizabeth's complicity in the corrupt political system that values monetary gain over the pursuit of justice. In this comparison, Essex reenacts the trials of Uriah the Hittite, a martyr persecuted because of the monarch's jealousy.

Davies also uses David as a way of encouraging Elizabeth to reform her political system. Here, David's repentance makes him an exemplary figure, in contrast to "*Achab* the king of

²⁸ This episode has many shades of meaning, as it authorizes both veiled political speech and the authority of the prophet to dictate to powerful political figures.

Israel” who preferred “twenty deceyuing *Zedechia*” to an honest prophet like Nathan (D3v).²⁹ Elizabeth should listen to preachers discussing the true nature of justice so that she can dismiss the false members of the political community who are more interested in material gain than in justice. The practical effect, Davies seems to hope, is that Robert Devereux, the new Earl of Essex, and his political allies who favor the pursuit of Walter Devereux’s justice in Ireland will succeed to Essex’s posts in order to fulfill Essex’s promise.³⁰

In his 1586 funeral sermon for Sir Henry Sidney, Thomas White addresses political concerns fundamentally similar to Davies’s. Like Davies, White uses a portrayal of Sidney as a victim of political persecution in order to present him as an *exemplum* of political conduct and to defend the Lord Deputy’s political program as one segment of the larger international battle against Roman Catholicism. In addition, White also hopes to encourage Sir Philip Sidney to assume his father’s dominant role in Irish politics.

Although Sidney’s tenures as Lord Deputy were generally popular both in English and Irish political circles in the 1570s and early 1580s and lacked the spectacular failure of Essex’s Ulster Plantation scheme, Sidney and his followers were as hard pressed to defend his policies as Essex’s heirs (Brady, *Chief Governors* 113).³¹ Despite his popularity, Sidney was never fully successful in reducing Ireland to full obedience, and he ended both terms under political clouds.

Sidney was recalled from service after both terms, with his 1578 recall coming because of

²⁹ In 1 Kings 22, Zedechia is the false prophet who encourages Ahab to invade Syria, whereupon Ahab is killed in battle.

³⁰ Essex did martyr himself in a financial sense. Essex had “mortgaged his estates in England to Elizabeth for £10,000” in 1573 in order to finance his failed Ulster plantation scheme (Lennon 280-281). Given this fact, his son definitely needed an exemplum of how to comport himself as a poverty-stricken noble.

³¹ Brady’s reconstruction of Sidney’s Deputyship paints a fairly negative picture of Sidney’s conduct, which should not be surprising given Brady’s postcolonial background. He does offer, however, plenty of evidence that Sidney’s tenure was not as successful as Sidney and his supporters tried to portray it.

allegations of financial malfeasance (Brady “Introduction” 5).³² Worse than this is the fact that when in Ireland, Sidney had “difficulty in establishing his executive authority” (Brady, *Chief Governors* 121), was unable to achieve his political aims without going over budget, and aroused “the opposition of the leading politicians of the Pale” as well as Sidney’s allies at court (Lennon 188).³³

These administrative failures led Sidney’s political allies to produce a number of works defending his terms of service. Of these, White’s funeral sermon is the least examined.³⁴ White preaches his sermon on 1 John 3.2-3: “Deerely beloued: Now are we the sons of God, but yet it doth not appeare what wee shall bee. And wee knowe that when hee shall appeare, wee shall be like him, for wee shall see him as he is. And euey man that hath this hope purgeth himselfe, euen as hee is pure” (Geneva ed. EEE4r). From this point, White divides his sermon into three major parts. The first section defines what it means to be one of God’s sons. The second section discusses the second part of the verse, defines how believers can know if they are actually the sons of God, and includes the biographical discussion of Sidney’s life. The third section discusses the necessity of believers purging themselves of sin and uses this as the opportunity to attack transubstantiation and purgatory.

White equates true justice with a fight against religious persecution, which he does by deploying a figural network to display the pernicious effects of hypocrisy in religion and politics.

³² See Brady’s introduction to *A Viceroy’s Vindication?: Sir Henry Sidney’s Memoir of Service in Ireland 1556-1578*.

³³ According to Brady, Elizabeth saw Sidney as “the controversial man of faction” by the end of his first term as Lord Deputy, rather than as a force for political reformation of Ireland (*Chief Deputies* 127). Sidney was not helped by the fact that the Earl of Ormond, his chief enemy in Ireland, was one of Elizabeth’s court favorites (133).

³⁴ The two most famous works that defend Sidney’s tenure as Lord Deputy are Sidney’s own memoir of his political career and John Derricke’s 1580 poem *The Image of Ireland*. Both works present defenses of the aggressive colonial strategy that integrate dense networks of biblical imagery.

Like Davies, White suggests that a large part of this hypocrisy stems from the connection between economic, legal, and religious sins. Sidney's experience in the arena of colonial politics becomes White's test case; the purpose of colonial politics is to attack the forces of international Catholicism, which, in turn, earned Sidney the ire of Catholic sympathizers within England itself.

In themselves, neither White's attack on religious apostasy nor his attack on the pursuit of wealth are particularly unique. As Houlbrooke, Gittings, and others point out, these are fairly traditional themes in the funeral sermons of the period. Where White diverges from the common run of funeral sermons is his explicit use of the connection between the two in order to praise his subject politically, as well as religiously, for being a poor man. Because he spends his money in the service of the state and the church rather than in pursuit of more wealth, Sidney is persecuted by more wealthy men who have aided the cause of Roman Catholicism through their opposition to Sidney's policies.

In pursuing this argument, White posits a simple contrast between the elect and the persecuting hypocrites who oppose them by presenting Sidney as a reenactment of the figure of Isaac. In the political reading of the sermon, the sons of God are those individuals who are committed to God's justice by enforcing religious law and ensuring the unity of the righteous body politic by excluding possible threats to religious unity. As an example, White praises Abraham's pacification of "the sonnes of his Concubins" in Genesis 25.6 by giving "them certaine giftes, and [sending] them away" (A5r). According to the Geneva gloss, Abraham's goal was entirely political, as he sent away Ishmael and his other sons "To auoyde the dissension that els might haue come because of the heritage" (Geneva ed. C3r). The right and duty to deal swiftly with possible rebellion, then, is the reason that "the kinges and magistrates of the earth are called gods" in Psalm 82 (White A3v), because they ideally imitate the perfect justice shown

by God in His condemnation of Satan and his “rebellious spirites” to “the darknes of death” (A4r).³⁵

Despite this ideal of social unity, however, White uses a variety of other *figurae* to argue that good governors can be known only through visible persecution at the hands of others. White supports this interpretation with a verse from Job, always a figure of persecution, before introducing Isaac as an example for believers. According to White, Isaac is a symbol of salvation: “he that shall inherite is Isaak, the Childe of promise with whom wee are heires annexed of the same blessing” (A5r). As consolation, this seems fairly straightforward, but Isaac gains this status only after he faces the threat of sacrifice and persecution.³⁶ This persecution makes him figurally related to Israel, Christ, and the eventual Christian church, which implies that persecution is the lot of the godly, especially those who hope to institute godly rule on earth.³⁷

White uses the *figura* of Isaac, extended to include his fulfillment in Christ, to condemn economic persecution. White describes Isaac with an economic metaphor by calling him an heir of salvation, and the persecuted believers are “heire and ioynt heirs with Christ of his kingdom” (A5r). According to White’s reading, Jesus’s glory in heaven and his role as universal monarch depend on his status as a suffering saint. To this ideal of poverty, White presents the rich as hypocrites, counterparts of religious persecutors from the Bible, and links them with the spread of Roman Catholicism. Foremost amongst these wealth-obsessed religious persecutors is Judas, who “plaid the traitor kindly to sell [Jesus] for 30. silverlings” (A5v). White connects Judas’s

³⁵ See 2 Peter 2. Part of the chapter discusses obedience to magistrates as a visible sign of election.

³⁶ Throughout the Isaac story, Ishmael is cast as a persecutory figure. According to the Geneva gloss to Genesis 29.9, Ishmael “derided Gods promes made to Izhak, which the Apostle calleth persecution” (C1r).

³⁷ The Geneva headnote to Genesis 22.8 explicitly states Issac’s figural relationship with Jesus.

greed and misestimation of the relative values of money and salvation with England's wealthy. White accuses the wealthy of being the "Hypocrites and painted Sepulckers" to blame for the state of the Church in England (A7v). Economic greed allows "our cunning counterfaites in Religion which roabe themselues" with a "[professing] the gospel" to invade England "and persecute the saints" (A7r-A7v). The result is that "superstition seemeth to bee true Religion, and Hypocrisie is very like to christian profession" (A7r).

White further connects religious hypocrisy to the pursuit of economic gain by comparing the pursuit of wealth to the apples of Sodom and the gourd of Jonah. According to White, the rich and religiously hypocritical "speede well in this life" because they hold places of political power. They are "the men of this worlde, the day and time is theirs, they rule and strike the stroke" (A8v). However, their "great rents and reuenewes" are "the Aples of Sodom, which if you touch them, they turne to dust, or as the Goord of Ionas which withered in a moment: neither doe they redeeme the life from the graue" (B1r-v). Both the Apples of Sodom and the Gourd of Jonah are symbols of religious apostacy.³⁸ Here, White implies that the wealthy hope to buy their way out of hell, implicitly connecting the pursuit of wealth to adherence to the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory.

White begins the contrast between Sidney and the rich by mentioning "the infinite necessities of the poor" (A8v). For the righteous among the poor, the greatest danger is that

³⁸ The Apples of Sodom are mentioned in Deuteronomy 32.32 in the context of Moses's exhortation that the Israelites avoid pagan religion, "For their vine *is* of the vine of Sodom, & of the vines of Gomorrah: their grapes *are* grapes of gall, their clusters *be* bitter" (Geneva Bible A3v). According to the Geneva gloss, these verses teach that "The frutes of the wicked are as poison, detestable to God, and dangerous for man" (A3v). The gourd of Jonah refers to Jonah 4.6-10, in which Jonah abandons his prophetic call because of anger at God's sparing of Ninevah. The gourd that God causes to grow over the sleeping Jonah, and then smites, according to the Geneva gloss to Jonah 4.9, "declareth the great inconueniences whereinto Gods seruants do fall when they giue place to their owne affections & do not in all things willingly submit themselues unto God" (ZZZ4r).

“the euill will both hate, and hunt, and persecute them” (A8v). The worst part of this persecution, according to White, is the political aspect, as the poor “are sure to bee exposed to the tyrants of the time” (A8v). Sidney, too, according to White, has been exposed to the tyrants of his own time in his attempt to be a good magistrate, and it is Sidney’s adherence to the role of the righteous poor man that makes him a fit vehicle for political emulation. White portrays Sidney as the poverty-stricken, persecuted reenactment of Isaac whose life imitates that of Christ despite his many political preferments.³⁹ White makes no mention of Sidney’s wealth, instead describing the dead man himself in economic terms; Sidney was “a treasure to the common wealth” (B4r) whose funeral constitutes “the laying of [his] bodie in the treasury of the earth” (B3v). Rather than building his own wealth, Sidney literally spent himself; as White puts it, Sidney “truely as a candle consumed himself in yelding light to other men” (B4r) without the benefit of the reward he deserved.

Further, White portrays Sidney’s death as a prophecy of doom by linking Sidney to the righteous man of Isaiah 57, whom God takes as a punishment for a corrupt political world. As White puts it, “surely the land hath lost a mightie man, and as it were a starre is fallen which sometimes shined in his place, but nowe beholde he lieth in the dust: and so doeth the righteous person, and no man regardeth the euils that are to come” (B4r). Here, White paraphrases Isaiah 57.1, which reads “The righteous perisheth and no man considereth it in heart: and merciful men are taken awaie, and no man vnderstandeth that the righteous is taken awaie from the euil *to come*” (Geneva ed. FEE4v).⁴⁰ Isaiah 57 condemns the political establishment of Israel as being

³⁹ White here gives an overview of all of Sidney’s offices, stating that he was “of the most noble order of the Garter, and of her Highnes right honourable priuy Counsell, foure times Lord Justice, & three times Lord Deputy in the Irish parts, and also Lord chiefe President of the Countrey of Wales” (B3v).

⁴⁰ White’s lamentation of England’s loss of Sidney recalls Parker’s lamentation of Bucer as the loss of prophet.

controlled by the same religious hypocrites and unjust magistrates that White says infest Sidney's own political system.⁴¹ White's point is that Sidney's "constant perseuerance in that faith which he had long professed" (B4v) marks him as the righteous man of Isaiah, and means that his death is an apocalyptic warning to the rest of the political establishment of England.

White emphasizes this indictment of the political elite of England by linking the court with the biblical figure of Nimrod.⁴² Here, White asks God to "free our countrey from tyrants and proud persons, who as Nymrods doe but wound by oppression the poore people, and neuer heale them by counsel" (B5r). Coming on the heels of White's statement that Sidney deserved "a pillar of gold" (B4r) as a reward, White is here implicitly attacking the court, and Elizabeth herself. Though White deliberately keeps his exact historical allusion vague, he suggests that Elizabeth and her counselors have become tyrannical leaders in the mold of Nimrod, and their corrupt political judgment has brought about the apocalyptic doom that White suggests awaits England with his comparison of Sidney to the righteous man of Isaiah 57.1.

However, White's main purpose for praising Sidney and attacking the court is to encourage Sir Philip Sidney, who "must succeed him in his family," to "exceed him in his virtues, or at the least imitate them" (B4v).⁴³ By this time, of course Philip Sidney had become a political champion for the militant Protestant wing of Elizabethan politics that favored military intervention against Catholic powers on the Continent and colonial expeditions in Ireland, and

⁴¹ This chapter of Isaiah is an important one in sermons that discuss political affairs. Thomas Sparke uses it as the text for his sermon on Arthur, Lord Grey in 1593, as well as an important touchstone in his 1585 sermon on the Earl of Bedford.

⁴² In Genesis 10.8-10, Nimrod is the first figure after the Deluge who "began to be mighty in the earth" (Gen 10.8 Geneva B1r) and as "a mighty hunter before the Lord" (Gen 10.9). The annotations of the Geneva Bible interpret Nimrod strictly in political terms, describing him as "a cruel oppressor and tyrant" (gloss to Gen 10.8) whose political rule was "hated bothe of God and man" because "he passed not to commit crueltie euen in Gods presence" (gloss to Gen 10.9).

⁴³ White's treatment of this theme is very similar to Davies's exhortation to Robert Devereux to succeed to the political and familial inheritance of Walter Devereux.

had publicly defended his father's administrative and military measures in Ireland in his 1577 *Discourse on Irish Affairs* (Duncan-Jones 136).⁴⁴ Despite Sidney's posthumous reputation as a royal favorite, however, he spent much of his life underemployed and out of favor at court.⁴⁵ White's portrayal of Henry Sidney as a persecuted purveyor of justice, then, seems to argue that political persecution is actually a sign of religious election, and to encourage Phillip Sidney himself to persevere even in the face of political hostility.

White emphasizes this portrayal of Sir Philip Sidney by comparing him to Eliakim, a disgraced and persecuted royal employee whom God raises to be the steward of King Hezekiah in Isaiah 22.20. Eliakim is one of the few faithful servants of God in Jerusalem during the Assyrian siege with which God punishes the sins of the Israelites. According to White's paraphrase, Philip is "the naile of his tent in a sure place, that he may be the glorie of his father's house and a father to many inhabitants of Iuda" (B4v-B5r), a description that matches the description of Eliakim in Isaiah 22.23. According to Isaiah, Eliakim is destined to be an all-powerful political figure who will receive "the key of the house of Daud" (Isaiah 22.22), which means, according to the Geneva gloss, that Eliakim will have "the ful charge & gouernment of the Kings house" (BBB4r).

What is most important about this biblical figura is that Eliakim is a leader of righteous political revolution. In Isaiah, Eliakim replaces Shebna, under whose leadership the people of Jerusalem were engaging in "ioye and gladnes, slaying oxen and killing shepe, eating flesh, and drinking wine" rather than repenting for their sins (Isaiah 22.13). According to the Geneva gloss to Isaiah 22.15, Shebna is both a political and religious traitor who "did nourish secret frendship

⁴⁴ In particular, Philip defended Henry from the accusations of a group of discontented lords from the Pale, including the Earl of Ormond. See Katherine Duncan-Jones's *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet*.

⁴⁵ Sidney's lack of employment is well attested, and Duncan-Jones theorizes that Elizabeth found him somewhat untrustworthy and ambitious (135).

with the Assyrians and Egyptians, to betray the Church and to provide for himself against all dangers” (BBB4r). Because of this, Shebna is the figure for the corrupt political establishment that favors economic gain at the expense of the spread of true religion and which consequently aids the spread of Roman Catholicism.

White’s figural connections have potentially revolutionary overtones. By using this story from Isaiah, White places contemporary history in an apocalyptic context in which corrupt political figures are hastening political and religious judgment through their hypocrisy and pursuit of economic gain. In this fallen world, Philip Sidney and his father play the same role as Sidney would in the elegies written after his own death. The comparison of Philip Sidney to Eliakim allows White to portray him as a potential redeemer of the political and religious world of England, and as a saintly figure whose faithfulness to God gives him the authority to dictate to all members of English political culture, including the queen. The purpose of this figural connection is to encourage Sidney to take the reins of the government despite the possible persecution by evil members of political society. As with Davies’s sermon for Essex, the main concern of White’s sermon is to provide an exemplum to mold the next generation of political leaders through the valorization of political persecution.

Despite the fact that they praise their subjects as paragons of justice, both Davies and White are quite vague about what they mean by the word justice. Thomas Sparke, in his 1593 funeral sermon for Arthur, Lord Grey de Wilton, is anything but vague. While Sparke also portrays Grey as a persecuted political figure, he is far more explicit in his treatment of Grey’s actions in office and in his definition of the virtue of justice. However, Sparke’s intentions go far beyond simply defending Grey’s posthumous memory. Instead, Sparke uses his defense of Grey’s term as Lord Deputy of Ireland as the spur to reform the entire political system of

England, and to call Elizabeth and her counselors to what Sparke saw as the theologically appointed role of the magistrate.

It should come as no surprise that Sparke felt the need to defend his patron's policies, as Grey was a divisive figure in the area of Irish politics whose reputation fluctuated greatly with changes in the political climate.⁴⁶ Most discussions of Grey's short tenure as Lord Deputy⁴⁷ focus on his conduct during the second Desmond Rebellion, and specifically the 1580 siege of Smerwick, where he ordered the massacre of 600 papal and Spanish troops allied to the Irish rebels who had surrendered to Grey's forces (Lennon 228). Most historians agree with Brady's assessment of Grey's tenure as being "brief but fiercely repressive" and ultimately unsuccessful in achieving its aims of bringing the Irish to obedience (*Chief Governors* 292).

Grey's contemporary reputation was far more nebulous than his modern reception. Whatever the international consequences of the massacre,⁴⁸ English opinion of Grey's action was high; Elizabeth herself initially supported Grey's decision (Brady "Grey, Arthur" 341), and according to Canino, "there is no indication that it was ever viewed as anything but a triumph for Grey and England" (7). Anthony Munday's 1581 pamphlet on the massacre probably reflects contemporary opinion by praising Grey's actions as an example of God's providential

⁴⁶ There is no shortage of historical information about Grey's tenure as Lord Deputy and about his reputation after his recall to England in 1582, mostly because of his role in Edmund Spenser's career and his fictionalized avatar Arthegall in Book V of *The Faerie Queene*. The main secondary sources I use here are Brady's entry on Grey in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, Brady's *The Chief Governors*, Lennon's *Sixteenth Century Ireland*, Hadfield's *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl*, McCabe's *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference*, and Catherine Canino's "Reconstructing Lord Grey's Reputation: A New View of the View."

⁴⁷ Grey was Lord Deputy from 1580-1582.

⁴⁸ Few historians go into a great deal of detail about foreign reaction to Smerwick. According to Canino, "[f]oreign reaction to Smerwick seems ... to have been exceedingly mild", with both the Spanish and the Irish failing to condemn Grey outright (8-9). I find this unsurprising, since Smerwick was a fairly small massacre in comparison to other late sixteenth-century atrocities.

intervention on England's behalf.⁴⁹ At some point, however, Grey's reputation seems to have soured, which meant that he required a good deal of defending by the 1590s.⁵⁰ Sparke's funeral sermon enters into this highly politicized debate over Grey's legacy. At stake for Sparke is the future not only of Irish colonialism, but also of the way that government would be practiced in England itself. Sparke's definition of justice in his defense of Grey's character proposes an ideal gentleman who is capable of reforming the corrupt political system of England, and using that reformed political system to reform the church.

Sparke's main argument in the sermon is similar to both Davies's and White's assumption that the death of the exemplary magistrate he commemorates is a warning of apocalyptic doom to the body politic. Sparke emphasizes this idea by preaching his sermon on Isaiah 57.1-2, the biblical verse with which White frames his biographical discussion of Sir Henry Sidney.⁵¹ From this point, Sparke proceeds to discuss the abstract ideal of justice, with his defense of Grey's conduct at Smerwick providing an application for the abstract ideal.

⁴⁹ Munday, Anthony. *The true reporte of the prosperous success [...] in Ireland, in the yeare 1580*. London: Edward White, 1581. Munday claims to have letters "of most credit and circumstance" as his sources, so there is every reason to believe that this pamphlet was propaganda from the political center (A1r).

⁵⁰ Spenser is Grey's most famous defender, in the form of Book V of *The Faerie Queene* and *A Viewe of the Present State of Ireland*, but Sparke's funeral sermon precedes both of these. Canino argues that Spenser actually invented Grey's bad reputation, arguing that Grey's recall was due solely to his financial mismanagement rather than to his repressive methods (9). Canino is certainly correct about finances being the immediate cause of Grey's recall, but she ignores the fact that the ineffectiveness of Grey's methods sparked new attempts to institute a more moderate colonial regime, which had failed by the mid-1590s and convinced many writers of the 1590s that a return to rigorism was necessary (Brady, *Chief Governors* 292-297). The course of this political debate may have been enough to cause the collapse of Grey's reputation, necessitating the defenses of the 1590s.

⁵¹ "1. The righteous perisheth, & no man considereth it in hart: and mercifull men are taken away, and no man understandeth that the righteous is taken away, from the euill to come. 2. Peace shall come: they shall rest in their beddes, every one that walketh before him" (Sparke 1). As in his 1585 sermon for Bedford, Sparke uses the Geneva bible, which interprets the death of the righteous magistrate as a prelude to plagues punishing the idolatrous majority that controls Israel.

Sparke argues that by being a “stout valiaunt, and renoumed Captaine, reuerenced of all the enemies thereof, foreyne or domestical, for feare” (63), and an honorable counselor “without whom neither the Citty nor countrey, can long enioy anie good beeing” (16), Grey’s career in Ireland fulfilled his duty as a colonial administrator. By encouraging his audience to emulate Grey’s behavior, Sparke hopes that Ireland and England can avoid the apocalyptic fate that met ancient Israel. Sparke’s sermon revolves around the duties of the righteous magistrate, and specifically on the correct definition and application of justice.⁵² For Sparke, the most important duty of a magistrate who “hath any care to walke, as he ought before God” is “to deal iustlie and to shew mercy” (49). The correct application of rigor and mercy makes it possible for a man to be a good political and military ruler.

For Sparke, however, the ideals of justice and mercy are enmeshed in the exigencies of the legal, political, and military conditions of the time, rather than being fixed abstract ideals. This is evident from the ways in which Sparke uses the two words; rather than using them in a theological sense, he uses them as terms of legal discourse. For Sparke, “justice” and its related terms refer specifically to “the infliction of punishment” rather than the more general sense of “[e]xercise of authority or power in maintainence of right” (*OED*). Similarly, “mercy” for Sparke means only the “[c]lemency and compassion shown to a person who is in a position of powerlessness or subjection ... esp. in giving legal judgment or passing sentence” (*OED*).⁵³ The result of this interpretation is that for Sparke, the definitions of what it means to “deal iustlie” and to “shew mercy” are completely situational. These situational definitions mean that the

⁵² Sparke’s concern with the proper merging of firmness and mercy into the virtue of justice is just as important as Spenser’s in the Isis Church episode in Book V of *The Faerie Queene*, and at times, Sparke’s sermon almost seems like a gloss on Spenser’s poetry.

⁵³ This is opposed to the ways Davies and White use the term justice, where it refers to “[t]he quality of being (morally) just or righteous” in the sense of being one of the four cardinal virtues (*OED*).

correct application of justice or mercy depends on the ability of the magistrate to interpret properly and precisely not only the political and strategic situations in which particular legal decisions are mired, but also to interpret the religious and figural contexts that make particular acts of “justice” or “mercy” theologically acceptable.

This specifically legalistic use of these two words allows Sparke to defend Grey’s actions at Smerwick as fulfilling the duties of the righteous man from Isaiah 57.1 while describing his political rivals as the idolatrous mass that populates the rest of the chapter. Grey’s conduct at Smerwick is the biographical event that anchors this theological reading of the political situation in England. Instead of being the “plaine cruelty” (50) Grey’s enemies have insisted it was, Sparke’s defense of Smerwick on political, military, and religious grounds turns it into a paradigmatic instance of leadership, the kind of action that any “Captaine, having comission under his Prince, to gouerne and defent a contry” should imitate (50).

The political and military aspects of Grey’s massacre are fairly simple. Most of the troops there deserved rigor, according to Sparke, because they were “treacherous, and traiterous horeborne wretches” in rebellion against the queen, “uppon whom iustice only indeed, is to be done” (50). Mercy on the rebels, therefore, would have been “foolish pity” rather than legitimate legal restraint (50). Militarily, Sparke argues that the massacre was the most just outcome, given the fact that taking the rebels prisoner would be “of ineuitable perill to his owne company, being them so few, and so weakned with long being abroad” (51).⁵⁴ Indeed, Sparke goes so far as to

⁵⁴ Sparke goes into a fair amount of detail about this, arguing that “being also so meanly victuailed as they were, only for themselues: & that which is most of al, hauing to passé home so many 100. Miles through the cuntries of their friends, and their owne enemies” it was militarily impossible to take the garrison prisoner (51). Given this situation, any promise of clemency would be not only a breach of “wisedome or pollicy” (51) at the level of government, but also a false promise that Grey would not be able to fulfill, as “neither any maner of promise that euer” the Catholic troops “could get of him, nor their own desert, sould any way put them in any hope of better then they found” (50-51).

argue that the massacre was the most merciful option available to him, as it allowed him to show “mercy towards them, to whom it was to be shewed indeed” (51), by which Sparke means the country as a whole, as releasing the Spanish and Italian troops would have “cruelly and childishly haue hazarded both all the cuntry, and his own company also, to a further perill then they as yet had been in” (51). Through this analysis, Sparke is able to portray Grey’s political enemies, who have slandered Grey as a cruel leader, as the real threat to England and its overseas empire.

In addition, Sparke argues that Grey’s massacre of the papal troops was religiously justified because it was the direct result of his religious devotion and the resulting ability to interpret political events through the lens of Protestant ideology. According to Sparke, “he must haue his direction and light from the Canonick scriptures, rightly understood” (60-61), and supported this desire by having “attentiue heard them read, and preached upon, both publickely and priuately” (61).⁵⁵ The most important result of this devotion is the fact that “God had giuen him great iudgment, when to shew iustice and when to shew mercy” (62).

Sparke supports this interpretation by placing Grey’s life in general and Smerwick in particular into the apocalyptic context of the sermon as a whole; this allows Sparke to interpret Ireland in eschatological terms as one of the battlegrounds between the true Church and Antichrist. Grey is one of the “worthy Earles, Lords and Knights” that God has taken away from an England “growne to an extreme height in all sin and impiety” (1), corresponding to the righteous man and the idolatrous Israel of Isaiah 57.1. The foreign troops at Smerwick are one of the many weapons that “the cursed sea of Rome” (31) has used in its quest to eliminate Elizabeth, “the light of our Israell” (31), and Grey’s massacre helped preserve England, the

⁵⁵ Sparke here significantly leaves out the Apocrypha, which includes most of the Roman Catholic justification for purgatory.

modern Israel. Due to Grey's massacre, the Catholics' "courage in Ireland was so puld downe, and their combs cut, that neuer since any more of them haue had any hart, to giue any like attempt there againe" (32).⁵⁶

Sparke reinforces his representation of Grey's massacre as a divinely mandated exercise of justice through a pair of figural counterexamples that link Grey's detractors with Saul and Ahab, two of the Bible's least admirable magistrates. Specifically, Sparke praises Grey at the expense of the two biblical kings because they "shewed mercy, when they should rather haue done iustice" (49), with Saul showing mercy to Agag, king of the Amalekites, and Ahab showing mercy to Bennadad, King of Aram, despite the fact that each of them had been specifically ordered to put the defeated kings to death.⁵⁷ What makes these two episodes relevant to Sparke's reconstruction of Grey's life is the fact that they concern the question of clemency, and the place that clemency plays in military actions motivated by religion. Mercy in each case is a religious crime since God has condemned them to death; as the Geneva gloss to 1 Kings 20.39 puts it, Ahab is condemned because he "made a couenant with Gods enemie, and let him escape whome God had appointed to be slaine" (S2v).⁵⁸ The Irish rebels and the Spanish and papal troops at Smerwick correspond to the condemned enemy kings in these biblical examples. Their status as religious outcasts justifies Grey's massacre of the Smerwick garrison.

Just as importantly, Sparke's defense of Grey forms the center of his critique of Elizabeth's Irish policy. By lauding Grey as an active opponent of Catholicism in the Irish

⁵⁶ History shows, of course, that this was a somewhat optimistic interpretation of the political situation in Ireland.

⁵⁷ The relevant biblical chapters are 1 Samuel 15 for Saul and Agag, and 1 Kings 20 for Ahab and Bennadad.

⁵⁸ The Geneva gloss to 1 Samuel 15.23 is slightly more charitable to Saul, saying, "God hateth nothing more then the disobedience of his commandment, thogh the intent seme neuer so good to man" (I3v). Samuel, God's prophet, corrects this religious crime by chopping Agag to bits in front of Saul as an example of the way God's magistrate should treat the enemies of God.

rebellion, Sparke provides a contrast to Elizabeth's policies.⁵⁹ What Sparke implies is that by restraining her Lords Deputy and allowing them to be subjected to unwarranted political criticism, she has shown too much clemency toward the Roman Catholic-oriented Irish rebels, and that by sparing these "malicious enemies" of the state, risks the same fate that Ahab eventually faced (50). Sparke's objective, then, is to change government policy in Ireland, either by convincing the queen and her closest advisors to return to the harsh regime of justice practiced by Grey, or by convincing the next generation of Irish colonists that rigor was the only way of conducting political affairs in Ireland.⁶⁰

Sparke emphasizes what he sees as Elizabeth's lackadaisical enforcement of religious law by offering Josiah as a model of the ideal monarch. Sparke claims that Josiah's greatest accomplishment was to "purge the Church of al corruptions" in order to "preuent Gods iudgments" (29). Sparke's use of Josiah here is especially resonant because Josiah "was one of the most important images of godly monarchy offered to Calvinist kings" (Murdock 1047), especially in terms of encouraging the monarchy's leading role in the reform of the church (1052). In terms of English political history, Edward VI was the prime secular exemplar of Josiah that the monarchy had to offer, and various tracts encouraged Elizabeth (without much notable success) to emulate Edward in becoming a reenactment of the *figura* of Josiah (1050).⁶¹

⁵⁹ Specifically, Sparke here elaborates on the sense among New English colonists in Ireland that they were "caught between the twin evils of hostile natives and neglectful metropolitan authorities, both of which threaten their efforts to establish good government" (Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience* 17).

⁶⁰ With the outbreak of the Nine-Years War in 1594, Sparke probably would have felt completely vindicated in his interpretation that Elizabeth's "foolish pity" on the Irish had been the cause of the new outbreak of hostilities.

⁶¹ See Graeme Murdock's "The Importance of being Josiah: An Image of Calvinist Identity." The image of Josiah was important to reformers using "[p]arallels and lessons from the history of Old Testament Israel" to "fashion Calvinist confessional identity" for rulers to follow (Murdock 1044). Reformers pointed to Josiah as an example of a king who was a religious reformer, an iconoclast, and as a territorial expansionist whose ultimate death in battle against the Egyptians

In the apocalyptic context of the sermon as a whole, Sparke's use of Josiah is a warning. He suggests that the death of Grey and the other political leaders he mentions at the beginning of the sermon are the direct result of Elizabeth's failure to emulate Josiah by combating the forces of international Catholicism. Even as his sermon commemorates Grey, Sparke also uses it as a polemical tool to attack Elizabeth's later policies in Ireland, as well as in the larger arena of international affairs in which he and other aggressive Protestant interventionists saw Ireland as playing a key role.

II: Spenser and the Art of Commemoration

For readers of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, the rhetoric Sparke, White, and Davies use in their encomia of the Lords Deputy is eerily familiar. Much like Sparke's sermon, Book V of Spenser's epic is devoted to defending Grey's policies in Ireland while simultaneously criticizing Elizabeth's handling of colonial affairs, all while interpreting contemporary political events in apocalyptic terms and promulgating an ideal doctrine of justice to be followed by members of the nobility. In this section, I will discuss Spenser's use of the figure of the suffering servant in his commemoration of Lord Grey, and will argue that this aspect of what Carol Kaske calls Spenser's biblical poetics enables Spenser to mobilize the polemical possibilities of hagiographical literature without risking political reprisals or turning Grey into an icon. By presenting Arthegall as a reenactment of the biblical figures of David and Samson, Spenser

could be used as a warning of destruction if the nation as a whole failed to live up to the high demands of reformers. English reformers were especially enamored of using Josiah in their polemical tracts and sermons, as Edward IV, Elizabeth, and James I were all exhorted to follow Josiah's example upon their accessions (1050). The *figura* of Josiah would become especially important for militant Protestant preachers during James I's reign, as I will show in Chapter 4.

valorizes Grey as an *exemplum* of the active pursuit of justice in opposition to a court made corrupt by Elizabeth's overly feminized and overly-cautious colonial politics.

The strategic similarity between Spenser's poetry and the funeral preachers is clearest in the way that Spenser uses techniques of figural interpretation to portray Arthegall as a persecuted figure who can be recognized as a good governor only through visible persecution at the hands of others. These figural connections are most apparent in two episodes: Arthegall's persecution by the hags Detraction and Envy at the end of canto xii and his submission to and redemption from Radigund. Through these two episodes, Spenser illustrates Arthegall's education on both the limits of his power and the fact that true justice involves a struggle against false religion. Persecution at the hands of these religious enemies becomes the sign that Arthegall has become an *exemplum* of true justice.⁶²

Spenser's handling of Envy and Detraction is the clearest of the two episodes, as it illustrates Arthegall's ability to show clemency in a case in which he has no clearly defined political authority. Spenser portrays Arthegall as a reenactment of both David and the early apostles, each of whom showed restraint in dealing with enemies that they had no clear mandate for destroying. Spenser's description of Detraction provides the biblical warrant for this reading. Spenser draws Detraction's "tongue full sharpe and short/[which] Appear'd like Aspiss sting, that closely kils,/Or cruelly does wound, whom so she wils" (V.vii.36.3-5) from Psalms 140.3 and Romans 3.13.⁶³ The first of these verses is from a psalm in which David laments political

⁶² Here, I rely on Dunseath's reading of Book V as being about the education of Arthegall in the practical pursuit of justice in the fallen political world. See T.K. Dunseath's *Spenser's Allegory of Justice in Book Five of The Faerie Queene*.

⁶³ The biblical references are from Naseeb Shaheen's *Biblical References in The Faerie Queene*, which is an invaluable reference work for Spenser's use of the Bible. According to the Geneva translation, Psalms 140.3 reads "Thei haue sharpened their tongues like a serpent: adders poyson is under their lippes. Selah" (Xx1r) and Romans 3.13 reads "Their throte is an open sepulchure: they haue Vsed their tongues to deceit: the poyson of aspes is under their lippes."

persecution at the hands of his enemies; the second is from a verse in which Paul warns his listeners about religious persecution at the hands of gentiles and Jews. Spenser extends this comparison of Arthegall to David in stanza 43, in which Arthegall's sparing of Detraction from Talus's retribution is connected to David's sparing of Shimei, who is a kinsman of Saul who curses David during David's exile from court during Absalom's rebellion, in 2 Samuel 16.5-13.

The restraint that Arthegall has in common with David is laudable because it shows his understanding of the limits of his authority. According to the Geneva gloss to 2 Samuel 16.10, David restrains his lieutenants because Shimei's curses are "the iudgement of God for his sin" (N3r), and he shows a similar willingness to allow God's judgment to take its course in Psalm 140.4, in which his only weapon against his persecutors is a prayer to God to "Kepe me, O Lord, from the hands of the wicked."⁶⁴

Arthegall's restraint echoes David's because he does not overstep the bounds of his mission; charged with rescuing Irena, Arthegall loyally returns to the Faerie Court when recalled rather than attacking the hags as he might have earlier in the book. Spenser presents Arthegall's restraint as admirable, despite the fact that the hags are indisputably demonic, because their origin is not entirely clear. Even though "enuies cloud" that "dimmeth vertues ray" (V.vii.27.7) is the cause of the recall, the source of the recall is still "Faerie Court" (3), which means that Envy and Detraction can be interpreted as perverse agents of the corrupted central government. Moreover, Envy and Detraction, being connected to Shimei, can be interpreted as part of God's punishment on Arthegall for his earlier immoderacy in the book. Arthegall refrains from attacking the hags because he realizes that he cannot properly interpret the origin of the hags. By placing this scene last in Book V, Spenser emphasizes Arthegall's acknowledgement that

⁶⁴ According to the Geneva gloss to this verse, this is "the remedie of the godlie, when thei are oppressed by the worldelings" (XX1r).

clemency is part of the virtue of justice, and shows that he values it as much as the funeral preachers who commemorate the restraint of Sir Henry Sidney, Walter Devereux, and Lord Grey in their sermons.

What is puzzling about the ending, however, is the fact that Spenser presents Arthegall's actions as laudable despite the failure of his mission and the accompanying loss of political initiative that Spenser laments. Spenser's praise of Arthegall's restraint, then, is explicable only by reading it as the culmination of Arthegall's political education, a shift in his character that Spenser signals by making a figural comparison between Arthegall and Samson in the Radigund episode. By connecting Arthegall to "that mighty Jewish swaine" (V.viii.2.1) who like Arthegall "lay his spoiles before his lemans traine" (3), Spenser is able to cast Arthegall's redemption from captivity and subsequent pursuit of justice in the second half of the book in terms of religious redemption. Spenser's defense of Grey's harsh regime relies on presenting justice as a religiously sanctioned war against Roman Catholicism and of the female rule that Spenser saw as inhibiting that war. At the same time, Spenser uses the *figura* of Samson obliquely to attack Elizabeth by portraying her reluctance to use rigorous methods in Ireland as complicity with that Catholic threat. Grey's political enemies become unmanly renegades who have forgotten the proper vocation of the nobility.⁶⁵ Arthegall's self-sacrifice at the end of the book mirrors Samson's death in that he accomplishes part of God's plan for justice, making him into a kind of

⁶⁵ The critical reading of the Radigund episode as part of Spenser's critique of female rule is almost universal. For more detailed treatment, see Katherine Eggert's *Showing Like a Queen*, Louis Montrose's "Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary," James E. Phillips Jr.'s "The Woman Ruler in Spenser's Faerie Queene," Simon Shepherd's *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama*, Pamela J. Benson's "Rule, Virginia: Protestant Theories of Female Regiment in *The Faerie Queene*," Suzanne Woods's "Spenser and the Problem of Women's Rule," John N. King's *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition*, Joanne Craig's "Monstrous Regiment: Spenser's Ireland and Spenser's Queen," and Richard McCabe's *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment*.

political martyr that other political actors should emulate in order to assure the blessedness of their political aims.

This *figura* works for Spenser because the Samson story draws a direct connection between sexual incontinence and political and religious tyranny. The Bible portrays the Philistines as tyrants who “reigned ouer Israel” (Judges 14.4) because of the unfaithfulness of the Israelites (13.1). Radigund’s rule over the Amazon realm is clearly connected to the Philistines, both because she is described throughout the episode as a tyrant, and because of her connection to Delila.⁶⁶ Like Delila, who uses sexual guile to invert the proper social order and weaken Samson, Radigund uses sexual temptation both to enslave the male population of her kingdom and to defeat Arthegall, whose defeat comes when “his cruell minded hart/Empierced [is] with pitiful regard” (V.v.13.1-2) for Radigund’s beauty.⁶⁷

Likewise, the biblical story makes it clear that Samson’s sexual immoderacy in falling prey to Delila is a result of his larger political and religious crime of failing to fulfill his obligations as a magistrate. The glosses to the Geneva edition are particularly explicit about this. According to the gloss to Judges 14.4, Samson’s vocation is “[t]o fight against [the Philistines] for the deliuerance of Israel” (F3r), a description that is repeated in the glosses to Judges 15.13 and 15.18.⁶⁸ By succumbing to Delila’s charms, Samson commits the larger sin of “negelecting his office” (gloss to Judges 16.30), which “is to execute Gods iudgements vpon the wicked”

⁶⁶ Aptekar describes her as one in a series of tyrants who inhabit the entire book (154-55).

⁶⁷ The Samson story also engages with the same kinds of concerns with ethnic corruption that worried New English colonists in Ireland.

⁶⁸ Which read, respectively, that Samson is “the means that God had giuen for their deliuerance” (F3v) and “he did these things in faith, & so with a zeal to glorifie God & deliuer his countrey” (F4r).

(gloss to Judges 16.28). The result is that he “[becomes] the slaue vnto them, whome he shulde haue ruled” (gloss to Judges 16.17 F4v).⁶⁹

Spenser includes the same idea in Book V in his description of Arthegall’s failure. The “crueltie of womenkynd” (V.v.25.1), as Spenser puts it, may cause Radigund to “all rule and reason . . . withstand/To purchase a licentious libertie” (4-5) in conquering the Amazon realm, but Spenser makes it clear that when Arthegall succumbs to sexual temptation, he “to her yielded of his owne accord” (V.v.17.2) rather than being defeated in battle. By surrendering to sexual temptation in his battle, Arthegall surrenders his proper political role of pursuing justice for Irena. Being “dight/In womans weedes, that is to manhood shame” (V.v.20.7-8) is a sign of his personal failure analogous to Samson’s shaved head and subsequent emasculation.

In the case of both Samson and Arthegall, however, these physical marks of emasculation signal larger political failures in their societies. Samson’s fall in the biblical account is intimately connected to the failures of Israelite society, both the general failure of the Israelites to obey God’s law, which brings about the Philistine oppression to begin with, and the Israelites’ subsequent collaboration with the Philistines when Samson waged war against them. This is particularly clear in Judges 15, during Samson’s war of vengeance against the Philistines in the wake of their murder of his wife and father-in-law. When the Philistines invade, “thre thousand men of Iudah” go to Samson and ask him “Knowest thou not that the Philistims are rulers ouer us? Wherefore then hast ye done thus vnto vs?” (Judges 15.11) before telling Samson that they plan to “binde [him] and deliuer [him] vnto their hand” (15.13). According to the Geneva glosses to these verses, the Israelites’ actions stem from a mixture of ignorance and cowardice, as they refuse to “vse the meanes that God had giuen for their deliuerance” (gloss to Judges

⁶⁹ The actual text of this part of the story does not go into nearly so much detail. On the face of it, it reads more as a tale of sexual morality.

15.13). In doing so, they fail to recognize their true responsibilities and willfully choose to make themselves “slaues to infidels” as Samson does when he falls into the power of the Philistines (gloss to Judges 16.25).⁷⁰ Samson’s sexual submission to Delila is a metaphor for the submission of all Israel to the Philistine tyranny.

Arthegall’s submission to Radigund stands in a similar relation to the other knights under Radigund’s control as Samson’s submission does to the Israelites; they, like Arthegall, are captives because they have abandoned their political duty along with their masculinity. Though Radigund is certainly a formidable warrior, Terpin’s description of the lot of the knights suggests that they remain imprisoned and emasculated because cowardice leads them to deny their political obligations as knights. As Terpin puts it, Radigund’s regime depends on “guile” (V.v.31.1) as much as armed force. In order to “them compell to worke, to earne their meat” (5), all Radigund needs to do is issue a “threat” (4) of violence to “them of warlike armes despoile/And cloth in womens weedes” (2-3). The diet of “bread and water or like feeble thing” (8) that Terpin says Radigund feeds the knights seems too weak to prevent true knights “from reuenge aduenturing” (9), as the examples of Terpin and the other knights hanged for rebellion provoked by “stout disdain of manly mind” (32.1) seems to indicate. Radigund’s emasculating regime exists mainly because the knights are too filled with cowardice to exercise their masculine prerogatives to reform the political life of Radigund’s realm.

Despite his condemnation of the knights’ and Arthegall’s failures, Spenser’s main target in using the *figura* of Samson is the insidious effect of female rule on the English and Irish bodies politic. As other critics have noted, Radigund can be read as an analogue of Elizabeth, and by linking Radigund to the Philistines, Spenser suggests that Elizabeth has become, or is at

⁷⁰ Immediately after this, Samson allows the men of Judah to bind him and hand him over to the Philistines, at which point Samson immediately kills 1000 Philistines with the jawbone of an ass.

risk of becoming, a political and religious tyrant whose femininity identifies her with the female rulers whom Simon Shepherd reads as personifying the international Catholic threat (22-24). By portraying the other knights of Faerie Land as initially willing captives of Radigund, Spenser criticizes the nobility's acceptance of "Elizabeth's imposition of a Petrarchan code of romantic love as a means of political control" that has imposed their political emasculation (King, *Spenser's Poetry* 134). This emasculation has made it impossible for the nobility to reverse Elizabeth's opposition to "the imposition of martial law in Ireland" (McCabe 95), which Spenser sees as the only workable method for purging Ireland, and by extension England, from the international Catholic threat.

In terms of Spenser's commemorative aims, Spenser uses the connection between Arthegall and Samson to praise Grey's use of unrestrained violence in Ireland as the proper method of reforming the Irish polity.⁷¹ Moreover, Samson's death at the end of his story provides an example for politicians to follow when facing political opposition, as even in death, Samson returns to his proper political vocation. Here, it is significant that the biblical account of Samson casts his death as a martyrdom in the service of a combined religious and political enemy of God's people. Samson's humiliation at the hands of the Philistines occurs when the Philistine princes are gathered "together for to offer a great sacrifice vnto Dagon their god" (Judges 16.23). The link between idolatry and political tyranny allows the Geneva commentators to interpret Samson's vocation as the execution of "iudgements vpon the wicked"

⁷¹ Spenser's comparison of Arthegall to Samson accompanies comparisons to Hercules and Antony. Though Samson dies at the end of his story, the most significant detail of the Samson story is that he returns to his vocation before his death, unlike the other two heroes. For a thorough discussion of the comparison between Arthegall and Hercules, see Jane Aptekar's *Icons of Justice: Iconography & Thematic Imagery in Book V of The Faerie Queene*.

(gloss to Judges 16.28). More importantly, the combination of religious and political tyranny justifies the extreme violence of Samson's retribution on the Philistines.⁷²

Arthegall's experience in the second half of Book V reenacts Samson's combined political and religious vocations. After Britomart frees him, Arthegall's energies, and those of his compatriot Arthur, are bent toward the destruction of a series of tyrants who are closely associated with idolatry as well as political oppression. In canto viii, for example, the Souldan "Idols serves" (19.9) and his wish "to subuert [Mercilla's] crowne and dignity" (18.4) is driven partly by his worship "of his vngodly pelf" (19.8). In canto ix, Malengin's "vncouth vestiment" (10.7) and general appearance link him with both Roman Catholicism and the Gaelic Irish.⁷³ In cantos x and xi, Arthur's foe Gerioneo is supported by "that cursed Idole" (x.28.4) whose "sinful sacrifice" (6) requires "[t]he flesh of men" (7). In canto xii, of course, Arthegall faces Grantorto, "who no lesse/Then all the rest burst out to all outrageousness" (xii.2.8-9). It is because Arthegall and Arthur fight figures linked with Roman Catholicism that Spenser can justify the incredible amount of violence involved in each of these campaigns, with Arthegall's unleashing of Talus being the most similar to Samson's final act.

If Spenser uses the connection between Arthegall and Samson to encourage the nobility to follow Grey into enacting harsh policies in the colonies, then he uses a similar kind of *figura*

⁷² Much of the scholarship on Renaissance interpretations of Samson focuses on Milton's *Samson Agonistes*. Though many critics echo Derek N.C. Wood's judgment of Samson's final act as "incomprehensible, deeply ambiguous in its workings, and difficult for the believers to understand" (157), and the recognition that some early modern interpretations were marked by "guarded questioning" (Wittreich 77), most early modern commentators portrayed Samson as God's agent "in the freeing of God's chosen people from servitude" (Bowers 216). Wittreich quotes William Perkins as describing Samson as "taking just revenge upon his enemies, and the enemies of God" (79), and it is this interpretation of Samson as a scourge of God for whom extreme violence is justifiable that Spenser uses in Book V of *The Faerie Queene*. See Joseph Wittreich's *Shifting Contexts: Reinterpreting Samson Agonistes*, Fredson Bowers's *Hamlet as Minister and Scourge and Other Studies in Shakespeare and Milton*, and Derek Wood's *Exiled from Light': Divine Law, Morality, and Violence in Milton's Samson Agonistes*.

⁷³ See Elizabeth Heale's "Spenser's Malengine, Missionary Priests, and the Means of Justice."

in the Isis Church episode to encourage Elizabeth herself to do the same.⁷⁴ To make this episode the “true locus of justice” in the book (Fletcher 266), Spenser must present the embrace of activist, militant policies as a religiously justified choice for the monarchy.⁷⁵ Spenser does this by portraying Britomart as analogous to the woman clothed with the sun in Revelation 12.1-15.

Spenser makes this connection in Britomart’s dream in Isis Church in canto vii stanzas 13-16, in which Britomart is an object of religious persecution who is rescued only after adopting the military strength embodied by the crocodile. Spenser makes this connection by comparing Britomart/Isis’s appearance with that of the woman in Revelation 12. In her dream, Britomart sees “transfigured,/Her linen stole to a robe of scarlet red,/And moone-like Mitre to a Crowne of gold” (V.vii.13.4-6), a description that resembles the woman in Revelation, who appears with “the moone ... under her feete, and upon her head a crowne of twelue stares” (Revelation 12.1).

Significantly, religious enemies threaten both Britomart/Isis and the woman from Revelation. Britomart is threatened when the “holy fire” of the altar “kindle[s] privily,/Into outrageous flames” (6-7), a religious threat that corresponds to the situation of the woman in Revelation 12, who is persecuted by “a great red dragon” (Revelation 12.3) who “stode before the woman, which was readie to be deliuered, to deuoure her childe when she had broght it forthe” (Revelation 12.4). Only after her persecution by the dragon does the woman bring “forthe a man childe, which shulde rule all nations with a rod of yron” (Revelation 12.5), much as Britomart’s pregnancy with the “Lion of great might;/That shortly did all beasts subdew” (V.vii.16.6-7) follows the religious threat that faces her at the beginning of the dream.

⁷⁴ This connection is most evident mainly because the priest’s speech at the end of Britomart’s dream falls neatly into the series of homiletic sites that Richard Mallette has identified in the poem as a whole (205), and as a “comforting interpretation of [Britomart’s] vision, falls into the larger category of consolatory speaking.” See Bart Van Es’s “Privie to his Counsell and Secret Meaning’: Spenser and Political Prophecy” and Richard Mallette’s *Spenser and the Discourses of Reformation England*.

⁷⁵ See Angus Fletcher’s *The Prophetic Moment: An Essay on Spenser*.

Spenser follows the militant Protestant interpretation of the political content of this figure. The Geneva glosses to this chapter, and those that follow, provide a historical interpretation of the true church in conflict with the forces of Antichrist.⁷⁶ What is most important about this interpretation is the emphasis placed on the political implications of the advent of Antichrist, who, according to most of the rest of the glosses to Revelation, prefigures the Pope and Roman Catholicism in general.⁷⁷ In Revelation 12, the dragon is glossed as “prince of this worlde” (gloss to Revelation 12.3) whose plot is to infiltrate governments allied to the true church: “By his flatteries and promises he gaineth manie of the excellent ministers and honorable persons and bringeth them to destruction” (gloss to Revelation 12.4). The threat that Antichrist poses, then, is essentially an internal one, in which loyal members of the government are subverted from their proper tasks in order to serve the plans of the Roman church.

As with the woman in Revelation, the threat to Britomart/Isis is an internal religious one that emerges in her own territory. It is only after the crocodile has “[awaked] in horrible dismay” (V.vii.15.3) to “streight deuour” (5) the flames that threaten Britomart’s reign and after she has mated with the crocodile, incorporating its powers into her own being, that the “Lion of great might” is created (16.6). Arthegall is this lion, a tool of political power whom Britomart then uses to reform the newly male-controlled land of the Amazons by making the freed knights “magistrates of all that city” (43.3) giving “to them great liuing and large fee” (4). By this example, Spenser hopes to encourage Elizabeth to use her nobility to destroy the Roman Catholic forces in Ireland and in England itself.

Neither Spenser nor the preachers of the Lords Deputy’ funeral sermons are unique; though their political doctrine is undoubtedly brutal, it emerges from the same urge to reform

⁷⁶ “In this third vision is declared how the Church which is compassed with Iesus Christ the Sonne of righteousness, is persecuted of Antichrist” (Geneva gloss to Revelation 12.1).

⁷⁷ See the glosses to Revelation 13, 14 and 17 in particular.

Elizabeth's court that motivated Sir Philip Sidney's elegists in the 1580s and the preachers of other funeral sermons throughout the late sixteenth-century. By comparing Arthegall to Samson, who suffers to fulfill his divine mission against the Philistines, Spenser portrays Lord Grey as the same kind of political martyr as Davies, White, and Sparke describe in their own commemorations of the Lords Deputy. Their status as political martyrs who have suffered for their political decisions confirms the legitimacy of their political programs. Like Sidney's elegists, Spenser and the funeral preachers encourage other members of the aristocracy to reform the "idle and corrupt courtly establishment" (Montrose 924). The goal of Spenser and the other funeral preachers is to spur political action that would constitute "a decisive forward movement, a diminution of the forces of Antichrist" (Norbrook 128).

Chapter Four: “Our Succeeding Charlemagne”: Funeral Sermons for Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales and the Education of Charles I

Of the various crises that faced militant Protestants in the early reign of James I, few posed as much danger to the godly cause as the death of Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales on November 6, 1612. According to J.W. Williamson, from his childhood on, “Prince Henry was the product of a powerful mythologizing force” that constructed him in the terms of Protestant interventionism as a figure whose life’s work was “the destruction of Catholicism” (1).¹ From his assumption of power at his own court at St. James’s in 1610, Henry cultivated the support of militant Protestants by “unreservedly [embracing] and consciously [developing]” the idea that he was heir to the legacies of “Sir Philip Sidney and Robert Devereux” (Strong 14). By “[offering] an unambiguous agenda of anti-Catholic militant Protestantism” Henry made himself “the charismatic focal point of hopes for a well-defined vision of the Church of England as well as of pan-European Protestantism” (McCullough, *Sermons at Court* 192).

For the most part, Henry’s self-presentation worked. Militant Protestants who had become disillusioned during the 1590s by the increasing gap between their religious and political ideals and “Elizabethan realities” initially hoped that James would “adopt a more sympathetic

¹ See J.W. Williamson’s *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of 17th Century Personation* for an excellent discussion of both Henry’s life and the construction of the myth of the Protestant conqueror around him. For more biographical information, see Roy Strong’s *Henry, Prince of Wales and England’s Lost Renaissance*. For a detailed discussion of Henry’s ecclesiastical establishment at St. James’s, see Peter McCullough’s *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. For information about Prince Henry’s funeral, see Williamson and Strong, but also Jennifer Woodward’s *The Theater of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England 1570-1625*. For the posthumous production of published sermons and elegies describing Henry’s life and death, see Woodward, Williams, and particularly Daniel Kay’s *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton*, which includes a detailed discussion of the various collections of elegies to Prince Henry published after his death.

attitude to the Puritans” (Norbrook 195). As James’s reign progressed, however, militant Protestants like “the survivors from the Essex circle” became steadily more disillusioned with James’s policy of European peace (196).² Because of “Henry’s advanced Protestantism” (MacCullough, *Sermons at Court* 183), the prince’s court became a natural focus for dissent, and a wide array of godly politicians, preachers, and poets frustrated with James’s devotion to European peace and his avoidance of religious wars flocked there in hopes of gaining favor and advancing the cause of militant Protestantism on the continent. According to the most militant Protestants, Henry promised a return to the chivalric “values of Elizabeth’s court” embodied by Sir Philip Sidney (Kay 130), in which England would once more act as Protestantism’s military protector (Cogswell 14).³

Though the prince’s death left militant Protestants without their most important political patron, the greatest threat to godly hopes came from James’s public reinterpretation of Henry as an *exemplum* of political moderation. Instead of portraying Henry as a specifically Protestant hero, James used the lavish funeral ceremonies for his son “to reinscribe his relationship with Henry” as a loving relationship between a father and an obedient son who did not oppose

² According to Thomas Cogswell, James was “particularly horrified” of religious warfare on the pragmatic grounds that religious warfare would both make “life precarious for prince and peasant alike” as well as “make things quite uncomfortable for the reformed churches” in Europe (13). Given the fact that “Catholics substantially outnumbered the various reformed creeds and ruled the two largest European states”, and the fact that the Thirty Years War left Germany a smoking ruin, James’s devotion to peace is certainly more understandable than the militant Protestants’ push for war (13). See Cogswell’s *The Blessed Revolution*.

³ Henry’s opposition to James’s pacific policies went beyond giving lip service to militant Protestantism. Henry openly opposed the Catholic marriage alliances that James wished to make for Henry (Williamson 133-140; Woodward 161), and was involved in “the rupture between Venice and the Papacy [...], the crisis provoked by the succession to the tiny German state of Julich-Cleves [...] and, finally, the negotiation between England and the League of German Protestant Princes [for] the marriage of his sister, Elizabeth, to Frederick V, Elector Palatine” (Strong 1986 73).

James's pacific policies (Woodward 162).⁴ By emphasizing his familial ties with Henry, James hoped to mask the fact that Henry had become a focus for political dissent against James's policies. At the same time, his manipulation of funeral pageantry, which incorporated English and continental Protestant nobles in the funeral ceremony, allowed James to create "the illusion of political consensus" (Woodward 162).⁵ In essence, Henry's funeral pageantry played a role in James's extended polemical control of religious debate, in which James's ministers preached an ideal of moderation that steadily marginalized members of the militant Protestant wing of the church.⁶ By portraying Henry as a loyal son, James was able to reinterpret the prince as a loyal son of the church, a presentation that allowed him to underline "the premature truncation of [the] ambitions" of the militant Protestant nobles who participated in the funeral (Woodward 162).⁷

For the godly, it was crucial to replace Henry as a center for religious and national aspiration to keep their goals of European intervention alive. Efforts toward reviving the militant Protestant cause naturally focused on the education of the young Prince Charles. At the time, as Strong and Williamson suggest, Charles was an unknown quantity religiously and politically (Williamson 173). Militant Protestants viewed Charles as something of a political cipher; rather than relying on him as a staunch follower of Henry, they feared that he would follow James's "political style of compromise and [...] religious and political heterogeneity" (McCullough,

⁴ According to all accounts, "the scale and magnificence of [Henry's funeral] broke all precedents and constituted a great tribute to the Prince's memory" (Woodward 148).

⁵ Woodward argues that the inclusion of a funeral effigy of Henry in the procession, which was usually "the mark of the funeral of a deceased monarch," added to James presentation of his son as a supporter of the monarchy (150).

⁶ For the purposes of this chapter, I rely on Lori Anne Ferrell's discussion of James's polemical definition of moderation as "sacramental conformity as an act of loyalty to the royal supremacy" (5). See Lori Anne Ferrell's *Government by Polemic*.

⁷ The funeral ceremonies definitely had their desired effect as the "ambitions" of godly politicians like Frederick, Count Palatine, the Prince's brother-in-law and most important political ally were "neutralized" and their "sphere of political activity [...] abruptly curtailed" (Woodward 155). Instead of leading military campaigns, they were "constrained to the passive role of following Henry's effigy and coffin in the funeral convoy" (155).

Sermons at Court 193). According to the more paranoid of the godly authors and preachers, the inevitable result of James's policies of compromise would be the inability "to hold back the traitorous Catholics" (Williamson 178).⁸

Given James's strict control over the prince's funeral ceremonies, however, godly courtiers, authors, and preachers had little opportunity to intervene directly in Charles's political education. Much like the authors of the funeral elegies for Sidney and the preachers of funeral sermons in the late sixteenth-century, adherents of the militant Protestant cause found the commemorative genres to be perfect vehicles with which to attack and undermine the illusion of political and religious consensus built by James in Henry's funeral ceremonies.⁹ Like the elegists who published commemorative poems after the death of Sidney, the writers of elegies and funeral sermons on Prince Henry used the commemorative genres to oppose the official construction of Henry created in James's lavish funeral preparations. Rather than portraying Henry as an obedient son, funeral preachers and poets represented him as a reforming prince whose opposition to James's pacific policies fulfilled the mandate demanded of a divine ruler. Specifically, by portraying Henry as a reforming prince whose religious policies reenacted the biblical models of Josiah, David, and Solomon and as a warrior willing to go into combat for the good of continental Protestantism, the writers of funeral elegies and funeral sermons hoped to

⁸ Fears of James's inability or unwillingness to stem a suspected tide of Catholic infiltrators almost certainly led to rumors that Henry had been poisoned by Spanish agents and even James himself (Williamson 167).

⁹ All historians of Henry's funeral agree with Williamson that the sheer volume of publications in the wake of Henry's death was "virtually unprecedented," exceeding even the outpouring of published elegies that followed Sir Philip Sidney's death in 1586 (171). Woodward counts "almost fifty different volumes of memorial writing [...] produced for him: elegies; epicedia; epitaphs; emblems; impresa; devices; meditations and sermons" (153). Kay's *Melodious Tears*, however, is the authoritative work on the elegies for Henry. Kay provides both descriptions of most of the major elegies and an analysis of the way the elegies fit into the longer history of English elegiac literature. Where Kay is weakest, however, is in his analysis of the ways different parts of elegiac publications interact with each other, and in detailed analyses of the way the elegies respond to the specific historical and political conditions of the early 1610s.

encourage Charles to “step into the mythic robes of Henry” and become the royal protector of militant Protestantism (Williamson 192).¹⁰

I: “Let *Policie Religion* obey”: Elegies for Prince Henry

For the most part, the elegies written after Henry’s death follow the tradition of Protestant commemoration laid down by the writers of the Sidney elegies in the 1580s and 1590s. Just as Spenser, Pembroke, and Sidney’s other elegists were concerned with portraying Sidney as the apotheosis of Protestant knight, Protestant poet, and Protestant patron, “Henry became [...] the focus for a series of exercises in ‘Protestant poetics’” (Kay 134) in which he was praised variously as an artistic patron and a paragon of chivalric virtue (133).¹¹ At the same time, however, the vast majority of the elegies take an exceedingly dim view of contemporary England. According to Kay, many of the elegists “claim the role of prophet” and interpret Henry’s death through an “apocalyptic view of history” (134) that blames “England’s own sinfulness” for Henry’s death (Williamson 176).¹² Rather than using this apocalyptic worldview

¹⁰ The portrayal of Henry as a godly warrior owes a great deal to the widespread presentation of Sidney as a Christian knight in the elegies published for him in 1587. Where Henry’s elegists and preachers were at a disadvantage, however, was the fact that they could not credibly describe Henry as a martyr. Though some blamed Henry’s death on “the treacherous Spaniards,” Robert Carr, Viscount Rochester, and even King James himself, enough people realized that he had died of natural causes that few of his elegists even mention the possibility of assassination, and death by fever makes for a less compelling martyrological tale than death by Spanish assassin (Williamson 167).

¹¹ Though both Strong and Williamson have some discussion of the Henry elegies, Kay’s *Melodious Tears* offers by far the most extensive critical overview of the body of elegiac poetry published after Henry’s death.

¹² Williamson goes on to argue that the passage of time allowed writers to “lay aside self-laceration and aggressive anti-clericalism” in favor of “[focusing] on the prince’s virtues” (180), an analysis that does not take into account the fact that praise and denunciation hold almost equal pride of place in Daniel Price’s funeral sermons for Henry, which were written almost immediately after Henry’s death.

as a vehicle for simple “self-flagellation” (177), however, the majority of the elegies critique English society in hopes of educating Charles and James on the proper duties of the monarchy. The adoption of the prophetic voice and the apocalyptic worldview allows the elegists to argue that proper exercise of political power by the monarch depends on the monarch’s willingness to base his policies on the religious principles of militant Protestantism.

Since this attitude is so similar to the assumptions of the Sidney elegists, it should come as no surprise that Henry’s elegists rely on similar methods. Like Sidney’s commemorators and the sixteenth-century funeral preachers, Henry’s elegists use figural interpretation of Henry’s life to portray him as an exemplary monarch fit for Charles’s emulation. Since Henry was actually a member of the royal family, biblical *figurae* like Solomon, David, and Josiah offer Henry’s elegists the opportunity to vent their frustrations with James’s unwillingness to intervene decisively in the affairs of continental Protestantism and to encourage the king to change his policies to support militant Protestant intervention in Europe.

Though most of the elegists clearly expect that Henry’s death would be a catalyst for James’s own repentance for tolerating Roman Catholicism, few of them are willing to rely on the king alone to provide for Charles’s godly education. Instead, a significant number of elegists use their commemorations to encourage the creation of an entire alternative court around the young prince, in which Charles would receive both political guidance from reliably godly political figures and religious guidance from the circle of poets that would coalesce around this new princely court.¹³ The rest of this section will discuss elegies from four poets, Joshua Sylvester, Henry Peacham, George Wither, and John Donne, in terms of the ways that they define this alternative court for Charles. Each poet represents a different spectrum of the poetic landscape

¹³ For the most part, the elegists adopt a strongly Spenserian view of poetry, in which poetry is “a means of revealing transcendental truths” (Kay 167). Henry’s court “served as a focus for” the “disillusion” of Spenserian poets with James’s political policies (166).

of early Stuart England. Sylvester and Peacham were both members of Henry's court and Wither was one of the younger Spenserian poets who responded to Henry's death. All three poets supported military intervention on the continent. Donne, though he was the most important poetic figure to write an elegy for Henry, was something of an outsider attempting to gain entry into James's court. Because of their differing political allegiances, these poets' conceptions of the purpose of Henry's alternative court differ, with Donne in particular making a poetic argument that peace rather than religious war should be the goal of Charles's government, but they each use figural interpretation to support their political agendas.

Of Henry's elegists, few are as committed to using verse to instruct James in the reformation of his own court as Joshua Sylvester in his 1612 *Lachrymae Lachrimarum*.¹⁴ As Kay puts it, "Sylvester takes on the Spenserian mantle as spokesman" (184) by using his poem to critique the national sins that "were the Mouing Cause" for the "Heauie Iudgment" of Henry's death (A4r). In Sylvester's analysis, these sins are not restricted to simple immorality. Instead, Sylvester makes it clear that the national sin that brought about Henry's death is the toleration of Roman Catholicism in the English political realm. To urge James to repent of his toleration of supposedly Catholic practices in the church and his toleration of Roman Catholics, Sylvester portrays Henry as a "Prop" for the true, Protestant, church (A3r). This resemblance to the reformist king Josiah reveals him as a true king "[t]o all the Godly" (A2r) whom James should emulate in order to bring England into conformity with God's wishes.

¹⁴ *Lachrymae Lachrimarum or the Distillation of Teares Shede For the vntymely Death of The incomparable Prince Panaretus*. London: Humphrey Lowne, 1612. Sylvester was best known as a translator of Du Bartas, but he did receive a pension from Henry as a reward for his poetry (*DNB* vol 55: 261). Though Kay notes that the elegy was republished in 1613 in "a major expansion" that contained elegies from a number of poets who were in "Donne's circle", he is far more interested in the elaborate and "appropriately gloomy" decorations of the volume than in Sylvester's rhetorical treatment of Henry's death (Kay 182).

As Sylvester describes him, Henry is both a repository of true religion and a reforming monarch who protects the rights of the militant Protestant party in England. Like Grindal and Sparke during Elizabeth's reign, Sylvester's most important figural comparison for Henry is "good Iosiah (HENRY's parallel)" (B2r). As for the Elizabethan funeral preachers, Josiah was "one of the most important images of godly monarchy" that Sylvester and Henry's other elegists offered to James in the wake of Henry's death (Murdock 1047).¹⁵ According to Williamson, Sylvester finds Josiah a fitting biblical predecessor for Henry because "the Old Testament king had been anointed for rulership while still a boy and he had purged the Temple and harrowed the heathen with vigor and zeal" (177). For Sylvester, it is Henry's status as a religious reformer that cements the comparison, as the prince is the "cleerest Beame of Vertues" and the "purest Spark of Pious Princely Zeale" (A3r).

If Henry is primarily a religious figure, then the sins of the English court should be read strictly as crimes against the true church, and Sylvester's description of the court makes it clear that he associates the sins of the court with the presence of Roman Catholicism in England. As he describes them, James's courtiers are best compared to "poore Nothings (fixed in no Spheare,/Right Wandring Tapers, Erring euery-where)" who "All, All are guilty, in a high Degree,/Of This High Treason and Conspiracie" (B1r) of the "Two-hand SINNES of Profit and of Pleasure" (B2r). In his detailed description of how the different estates have participated in the profit-mindedness of the court, Sylvester makes it clear that the adoption of Catholic practices have corrupted the English court. As Sylvester puts it, religious corruption flows from the "Clergie first who too too oft haue stood/More for the Church-goods then the Churches good" (A4r), a clear attack on ministers whose excessive emphasis on the material trappings of

¹⁵ Williamson and Kay both mention the heavy use of the image of Josiah in the surge of elegiac poetry published after Henry's death (Williamson 177, Kay 134).

worship moves them perilously close to both avarice and the ceremonial practice of Roman Catholicism. Just as bad as the corrupt clergy are the “Courtiers [...] who French-Italianate,/Fashion our Faith after the forme of State” (B1r). What Sylvester attacks here are those members of the court, including James, who tolerate Catholicism because of their desire to maintain peace with the Catholic powers in Europe, and change the “forme” of the English church to follow the whims of political expediency.

Because of the prevalence of these “French-Italianate” courtiers in England, Henry’s death marks a decisive victory for Roman Catholicism.¹⁶ To emphasize the culpability of the English court in this Catholic victory, Sylvester compares the court to the “NINEVITES” of the book of Jonah (B4r). Sylvester compares the court to Nineveh because the court is an obstacle to the true church in much the same way as Nineveh, as the capital of the Assyrians, is the biblical enemy of the Israelites. Like the Ninevites, the English are guilty of committing “haynous, horrid, high ABHOMINATIONS/Both seen and secret; both in High and Lowe” (B4r), a description that links the failings of the English court to religious crimes, especially idolatry, throughout the Old Testament.

Despite the religious crimes of the English, Sylvester’s figural comparison of the English court to the Ninevites provides James with the means of repentance. According to Sylvester’s reading of the biblical *figura*, James can imitate the Assyrian king’s repentance by engaging in a ceremony of public mourning for Henry. In Jonah 3.6, the Ninevites repentance for their religious crimes upon hearing Jonah’s prophecy is ratified only after their king engages in a public ceremony of mourning by laying “his robe from him, and couered him with sacke cloth,

¹⁶ Sylvester identifies the political power of Roman Catholicism by mentioning the increased power of “S.P.Q.R.,” (A2r) and “Sauoy’s Dukelings, or the Florentine” (B3r). The two refer to the motto of the Roman Empire and to the secular rulers of Italy.

and face in ashes.”¹⁷ Similarly, Sylvester argues that the English court can be purified only if the members of that court, from James down,

In blackest Sack and Cinders shrowded All,
With bended Knees, but more with broken harts,
And th’inward rest of right Repentant Parts,
Prostrate our Soules in Fasting and in Praier,
Before the Foot-stool of th’Empyreal CHAIRE. (B4r)

Essentially, what Sylvester demands of James and his courtiers is a purging of the court from its corrupt religious practice. Mourning for Henry becomes a new religious ceremony that imitates the praiseworthy repentance of the Ninevites and repudiates the designs of the Roman Catholics in England and the continent, reforming James’s court into a righteous imitation of Henry’s.

For other poets, the reformation of James’s court was not enough to ensure the correct education of Prince Charles. Instead, Henry Peacham and George Wither, like Spenser and Pembroke in the wake of Sidney’s death, demanded the construction of an entirely separate court. In this alternative court, Charles would be brought up in the care of a godly nobility and educated by a coterie of godly poets. For Peacham and Wither, the ideal protector of this alternative court was Frederick, the Elector Palatine. The marriage between Frederick and James’s daughter Elizabeth was the culmination of a long campaign by “German Calvinists” and militant Protestants in England like “the Earl of Southampton and the young Earl of Pembroke”

¹⁷ Unless otherwise stated, all biblical citations in this chapter come from the Geneva edition.

for a “union of England and Continental Protestants” (Cogswell 15).¹⁸ The first meeting between Frederick and Henry, just before Henry’s death in October 1612, was “characterized by an escalation of Protestant agitation against Catholic Europe” (Williamson 141), and there were very real expectations among some militant Protestants that the marriage between Frederick and Elizabeth was the signal that Frederick would “take a leading role alongside the Prince in the European Protestant crusade” against the Catholic powers (Woodward 154).¹⁹ After Henry’s death, many of the elegists saw Frederick as Henry’s political heir and expected him to provide for Charles’s education in the politics of militant Protestantism.

Frederick’s importance to the godly is immediately evident in Henry Peacham’s 1613 collection *The Period of Mourning*, which appends a series of nuptial hymns for the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine to his series of commemorative poems on the prince.²⁰ Throughout the series of allegorical “visions” and straightforward elegies, Peacham combines biblical *figurae* and allegorical imagery borrowed from *The Faerie Queene* to present Henry as the representative of the true church whose life has been cut short by the proliferation of Catholic practices in England. By adding the marriage hymns to Frederick and Elizabeth, however, Peacham portrays their union as an event that promises a new reformation in the English court.

¹⁸ According to Strong, Frederick was by far the most attractive prospect for a Protestant husband for Elizabeth, as he was “the senior Elector of the Holy Roman Empire who counted emperors in his lineage and was descended from Charlemagne” as well as being “the head of the League of Protestant Princes” (78-79).

¹⁹ James, of course, had a completely different idea about the political situation in Europe, and his plan to marry Henry to a Catholic princess was intended to “re-establish the balance of power, and so ensure continued peace” (Cogswell 15).

²⁰ Peacham, Henry. *The Period of Mourning. Disposed into sixe Visions*. London: John Helme, 1613. According to Strong, Peacham was a “minor figure” at the “fringes” of Henry’s court, but his best known work, *The Compleat Gentleman*, popularized “the ideals of the gentleman virtuoso first cultivated with deliberation at the St. James court” (49). Kay argues that his commemorative volume “is remarkable as a public elegy that is structured by Henry’s cult” (160).

Like Sylvester, Peacham uses a figural comparison between Henry and Josiah to portray the prince as an ideal Christian monarch and to lay blame for his death on the penetration of the court by Roman Catholic doctrines. As he puts it in the two short poems that follow his long allegorical elegy for Henry, the prince was a “young Iosias” (C4v) who was “[t]he richest Iemme ere nature wrought [...] for Churches zeale,/For care and loue of common weale” (D2v). To support the idea that Henry’s life was dedicated to the military extension of Protestantism overseas, Peacham argues that Henry expressed his religious zeal through the “Loue of Armes” (D2v). According to Peacham, Henry’s military ambitions were as ominous to the Catholic powers as “a Comet [that] doth amaze/The world with its prodigious blaze,” as when he “in Armour shone,/He was with terror look’d vpon” by the Catholic powers of Spain, Rome, and France (C4v).

As in Sylvester’s poem, the comparison of Henry to Josiah allows Peacham to explain Henry’s ultimate death as a divine punishment for England’s sins. Like Josiah, whose death at the hands of the Egyptians was God’s punishment for “the wicked heart of the people, which would not turne vnto him by repentance” (Geneva gloss 2 Kings 23.26 X4v), Henry is “shot” because the “Earths all Horrid crimes,/Hatch’d in these faithlesse fruitlesse times” have “drawne the deluge downe” (Peacham C4v). Because of his death, England and “all the Christian continent” then are left as bereft as biblical Judah (C4v).

The figural comparison of Henry to Josiah in the elegies is a commentary on the allegorical representation of Henry in the six symbolic poems that precede them. In these poems, Peacham places Henry into an eschatological context in which the sins committed in the English church are connected to the practices of the Roman Catholic church. This is clearest in the fourth vision, in which Peacham portrays Henry as “[a] warlick Impe [...] set on high” on the top of

A Carre Triumphall, all of massie Gold,
And foure fierce Lyons yoaked in the same,
The which a Virgin, louely to behold,
With gentle raine did guide and show the way,
She *Vna* hight, none else they would obey. (B3r)

In this vision, Peacham makes a direct allusion to *The Faerie Queene* to articulate his view of the proper relationship between political action and religious virtue, and his opinion that Henry was the agent of a reformist crusade on the continent. As in *The Faerie Queene*, Una symbolizes “the theological and the political dimensions of the Elizabethan church” and particularly of the goal of “universal religious reform” (Brooks-Davies 705).²¹ Peacham represents the church as leading the “four fierce Lyons,” symbolic representations of the political institutions of England and Scotland, with Henry leading this politico-religious construct into battle to pursue “high designs” of religious reform (B3r).

That Henry is eventually struck down by “a firey wand” (B3v) is a sign that the Stuart state, under the control of James and his courtiers, has strayed from what Peacham considers its most important task, leading an international coalition of Protestant powers against Roman Catholicism. Peacham makes his identification of these sins with Roman Catholic practices clearest in the third vision. In this vision, Peacham portrays the English court as “a Caue” much like the Cave of Despair in *The Faerie Queene*. Peacham’s representation of England is bleak and depicts James’s court at Whitehall as an earthly version of hell. The cave sits beside the Thames, transformed into “a Brooke as blacke as Lethe” and sucks all comers to a kind of

²¹ See Douglas Brooks-Davies’s entry on Una in *The Spencer Encyclopedia*.

damnation along “[a] common roade” that “led [...] with descent/So steepe, that none return’s
that euer went” (B2r). Death is the main inhabitant of this “vncouth Dungeon” (B2r) where

all formes of Monuments were seene,
Whose superscriptions were through age defac’d,
And owners long agoe consumed cleane
But now as cofers were in order plac’d,
Wherein inditements lay, charmes, Dead-mens wills
Popes pardons, pleas, and Pothecharies bills. (B2v).

Aside from the apothecaries bills, all of the monuments in Death’s house are in one way or another associated with Roman Catholic funeral practice, with the “Popes pardons” and “pleas,” presumably prayers to the saints, being Peacham’s most direct references to Catholic ceremonies. The presence of these Catholic practices have corrupted the court, making it a sinful place incapable of supporting a prince like Henry, whose duty was to lead the “Carre Triumphall” into battle against the forces of Catholicism (B3r).²²

To provide a focus for the reformation of Jacobean society, Peacham includes his nuptial hymns for the marriage between Frederick and Elizabeth Stuart. Instead of a simple marriage, the ceremony becomes a visible sign that Frederick has assumed Henry’s role as the leader of militant international Protestantism. Peacham expresses this idea by presenting the marriage as a union between two royal families committed to open warfare against opponents of the true

²² Peacham elaborates on the idea that the court harbors a lurking strain of Catholicism in the second vision, which represents Henry as an edenic “Palme [...] Vpon whose braunches Crowns did depend” (B1v) and whose “euery bough did bloome with fruitfull store” (B2r). As in Eden, however, “a fearefull Serpent lay” at the base of the palm, “vndermin[ing] the Body night and day” with sin (B2r).

church. For example, Peacham's description of Elizabeth Stuart is clearly intended to harness the growing nostalgia for "the Golden Legend of Eliza" in which Elizabeth I's war against Spain was "romanticized" as an activist intervention against the forces of international Catholicism (Cogswell 14). Throughout the wedding hymn, Peacham refers to Elizabeth Stuart as "Eliza" (E4r), makes it clear that the wedding ceremony includes no Roman Catholic elements,²³ and describes the ceremonies as a marriage between the rivers of England and Germany that both recalls the marriage of the Thames and Medway from Book IV of *The Faerie Queene* and invokes the interpretation of Spenser as the poet of pan-European militant Protestantism. Just as important as princess Elizabeth's ancestry, however, is Frederick's descent "from that braue Rolando slaine,/And worlds great VVorthy, valiant Charle-Maigne" (F3r). According to the footnotes with which Peacham guides his readers' interpretation of the poem, these are Frederick's most important forebears because each of them spent much of his life "warring against the Infidels" (F4r). Moreover, Frederick's position as "Arch-Sewer, and Elector" of the Holy Roman Empire put Frederick in a perfect position to wage the crusade against the Catholic powers that Henry had promised before his death.

While Peacham's praise of Frederick as Henry's political heir offers a general solution to what he saw as the corruption of the English court, it is notably silent on the mechanics of how the ideal of Frederick should be imparted to Charles, apparently assuming that the creation of an alternative court would do the work itself. George Wither, another Jacobean poet heavily influenced by Spenser and more dedicated to the international alliance between Protestant states,

²³ For example, Peacham writes that Elizabeth enters her bridal chamber directly, and "past/The doubted Threshold" without superstitious fear. According to one of Peacham's footnotes to the poem, Elizabeth's boldness stands in opposition to the "custome [...] yet obserued in some places in Italy" in which brides pass the threshold warily "least charmes or some other kinde of Witch-craft might be laid" (F2r). Peacham apparently intends his readers to interpret Elizabeth's confidence as a sign of her confidence in Providence, which is "enuyed" by "Tyber," a clear reference to Roman Catholic brides (F2).

is far more directly concerned than Peacham with the question of educating the prince in his 1612 *Prince Henries Obseqvies*.²⁴ In the series of forty-five sonnets and the dialogue between a personified England and the spirit of the prince that make up the volume, Wither emphasizes the legacy of Philip Sidney, placing England, and specifically the purification of the English church at the center of the international Protestant alliance.²⁵ In Wither's estimation, Frederick should play an auxiliary role to England, providing an ideal that will "raise dejected *Brittaines* head" (B3r) by giving Charles an example to imitate. According to Wither, Charles has the potential to be a godly monarch in the tradition of David, whose ultimate goal is to lead England on a providential campaign to liberate Protestant Europe from the Catholic powers.

Wither invokes the ideal of Sidney by describing Henry as an *exemplum* of Protestant chivalry. Rather than being a simple "proppe of *Vertue*" (C2v), Henry's "Royall person did fore-tell,/A Kingly statelines" that "with terror did annoy,/His forraigne foes so farre as he was knowne" (D1r). According to Wither, Henry was destined to use his "honest pollicie [...] Ioyn'd with religious fiermnes" to lead an apocalyptic war against Catholic Europe (D1r). Wither describes this ideal in a prophetic vision near the end of his elegy, in which he represents Henry's projected campaign in terms of an apocalyptic conquest of "*Behemoth the Babylonish*

²⁴ George Wither. *Prince Henries Obseqvies or movrnefvll Elegies Vpon his Death*. London: Arthur Johnson, 1612. Throughout his life, Wither was solidly aligned with militant Protestant causes. According to Kay, Wither was "the most vigorous of the younger generation of Spenserians" (172), and the *Dictionary of National Biography* argues that he was "a convinced puritan" who "made it a point of conscience to devote his ready pen solely to the advancement of the political and religious causes with which he had identified himself" (vol 61: 732) and who eventually served with the parliamentary forces in the Civil War (734). His elegy on Henry gained him the patronage of princess Elizabeth (*DNB* vol 61: 730), who intervened on his behalf in 1613 after he was imprisoned for printing a series of satirical essays (731) that Norbrook describes as "politically inflammatory" (210).

²⁵ Wither's devotion to the Sidney legacy is so strong that he dedicates his elegy to Philip's brother, Robert Sidney.

VVhale” (D1r). In this vision, Wither sees “Prince *Henries* armes,/Aduanc’t about the Capitoll of Rome” (C4v) to “stop the tide,/Of [Rome’s] ore-daring and insulting pride” (D1r).

That Henry’s prospective conquest of Rome is symbolic of England’s larger role in international affairs is clear from Wither’s handling of the prince’s death. Rather than marking an end to Protestant hopes, Henry’s death provides the opportunity for a new beginning, as he predicts that Henry’s “zealous triumphs” over Rome “are ordain’d to be” the “taske” of another “branche” of “the *Stewards* line” (C4v). Though Wither does devote a great deal of space to addressing Frederick early in the elegy, it is clear that he sees Charles as Henry’s most important successor. As he puts it, Charles is “like enough to be *Charles* the great’st” (B1v) and promises to be “a Sunne and *Pheonix*” like his father and Henry (B2r), which suggests that Charles has the potential of becoming not just the greatest English ruler of all time, but also a universal monarch greater than Charlemagne. Wither is clear that Charles will only reach his full potential as a Christian monarch if he follows correct Protestant doctrine, which he emphasizes by making a figural comparison between Charles and David based on similarities between David’s anointment and Charles’s elevation to the status of royal heir. As Wither puts it,

The *Hopes* that we haue lost were faire:
But we beheld [Henry] with an outward eye,
And though he in our sight most worthy seem’d,
Yet God saw more, whose secrets none can spy,
And finds another whome we lesse esteem’d:
So *Iesses* eldest *Sonnes* had most renowne,
But little *Dauid* did obtaine the Crowne. (D3r)

Here, Wither refers to the story of David's anointment by Samuel in 1 Samuel 16.7, in which Samuel passes over Jesse's oldest son Eliab because God judges David more worthy to be king.²⁶ Henry's death becomes an example of "Gods prouidence" because it marks the elevation of England's true king (D3r).²⁷

At the same time that he praises Charles as a potential reenactment of David, however, Wither uses this description of Henry's death to attack what he sees as the corruption of the English court by Roman Catholic practices. Like Sylvester and Peacham, Wither is convinced that Henry's death, while partly caused "by a Popish trap" planned by "*Romes* damned fiends" (D1v), is divine punishment for England's sins. Wither's description of Henry as Jesse's oldest son Eliab allows him to define English religious sins in terms of an overreliance on external ceremony. Though his description seems to imply criticism of the prince, its main attack is on the English people, who "beheld [Henry] with an outward eye" rather than giving serious thought to Henry's true purpose in the state (D3r). The ceremonies of the church constitute further over-reliance on external appearances, which makes James's commitment to religious moderation between the extremes of recusant and Puritan seem like a kind of religious hypocrisy gnawing at the spiritual core of England.

Wither emphasizes his view of England's religious hypocrisy by making a figural comparison between Britain and the church of Laodicea, the lukewarm church John reproveth at the beginning of Revelation. As Wither puts it, the English church is guilty of lack of fervor in its worship of God. As he puts it in a direct address to England,

²⁶ "But the Lord said vnto Samuel, Loke not on his countenance, nor on the height of his stature, because I haue refused him: for *God seeth* not as man seeth: for man loketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord beholdeth the heart."

²⁷ Wither's description of Henry as a Phoenix and Charles as David are two further evocations of the Sidney myth, as both images were used in a number of the elegies on Sidney.

Thou wert not halfe-halfe thankfull for his care
 And mercy that so well preserue thee,
 His owne he neuer did so often spare:
 Yea he thy Lord, himself hath serued thee,
 Yet *Laodicea* thou, nor hot nor cold
 Secure, and careless dost not yet repent [.] (D2r)

Wither's attack on the English is a direct echo of John's rebuke to Laodicea in Revelation 3. Here, John describes the church of Laodicea as being "luke warme" (Rev. 3.16) because it was so "riche & increased with goods" that it believed it had "nede of nothing" from "God" (3.17), an offense for which God promises to "spewe" Laodicea "out of [His] mouth" (3.16). According to the Geneva glosses, the church of Laodicea is symbolic of religious hypocrites who "boast of their owne power and do not vnderstand their infirmitie to seke to Christ for remedie" (Geneva gloss to Rev. 3.17).

Wither's solution for England's spiritual crisis is for Charles to purge the English church of all remnants of Roman Catholic religious practices. Wither describes this program in the second part of his volume, "A Svyposed Interlocvtion Betweene the Spirit of Prince Henrie, and great Brittainne," in which Henry's spirit returns from the dead to advise Charles on the best way to rid the nation of "*Romes Locusts*" (D4v).²⁸ According to Henry's ghost, Charles should "[I]et *Policie Religion* obey,/But not *Policie, Religion* sway" (E2r). According to Wither, Charles should do this partly through the political expedient of eliminating "such as haue profest/The worship of that *Antichristian* beast" from his political counsels (E2r). More importantly, Wither

²⁸ Wither's poem uses a similar strategy as John Phillips's *The Life and Death of Sir Phillip Sidney, late Lord gouernour of Flyshing*, in which the first-person account ascribes prophetic authority to the Protestant hero.

has Henry's spirit exhort Charles to purge the English church from the ceremonies that militant Protestants often describe as Catholic incursions into the English church. To emphasize the flawed nature of English church ceremonial, Wither has Henry's spirit condemn the prince's own funeral ceremony as an example of a flawed religious ceremony that ascribes the same salvific benefits to the funeral that Catholics ascribe to "the *Saints of Rome*" (E1v). Rather than praying to God, according to Henry, English worshippers

Cal'st thou on thy *Prince* still; as if he,
Could either *Saviour* or *Redeemer* be:
Thou tel'st him of the wicked *Whore* of *Rome*,
As if that he were *Judge* to giue her doome. (E1v)

Wither's charge is far more radical than Sylvester's or Peacham's. Where Peacham and Sylvester regard the mourning for Henry as a conduit for godliness, Wither worries that the cult of Henry will encourage "Idolatry" in the English church by "[making] meane-while another *Whore* of him" (E1v). For Wither, the mourning for Henry is justifiable only if it inspires the English to follow the biblical examples that Henry embodied on earth. It is only by purging the English church of flawed ceremonies and enacting the militant Protestant ideal, instead of simply imitating his brother's political actions, that Charles will be able to fulfill his destiny as a new English David and "fight the *Lambs* great fight" (E2r).

None of the elegies for Henry has been as widely discussed by critics as John Donne's "Elegie on the vntimely Death of the incomparable Prince Henry."²⁹ The most striking aspect of

²⁹ I use the text of the poem from *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne Volume 6: The Anniversaries and the Epicedes and Obsequies*.

Donne's elegy is its concentration on the abstract consequences of the prince's death. Donne's elegy uses Henry's death to meditate on "the gulf separating earthly from heavenly understanding, and the relationship of reason to grief" (Kay 193). As he describes it in the elegy, the human soul has two "*Centres*" (2), Faith and Reason, the first of which governs the soul's understanding of "God's *Essence, Place, and Prouidence*" (11) and the second of which governs the understanding of "All that this naturall World doth comprehend" (6). According to the elegy's lament, the living prince was a contemplative center where "*Reason* put t'her best *Extension/Almost meetes Faith, and makes both Centres one*" (15-16) because the prince represented "All that *Faith* could credit Mankinde *could*" while offering a good case for "*Reason*" that "This Prince *would*" achieve the maximum human potential during his lifetime (19-20). Because he was such a paragon, Henry's death is one of God's "Plagues" (46) on the nation and the individual believer; Henry's death threatens the stability of both faith and reason, and provokes the speaker's apocalyptic assumption that Henry's death is a sign "that Now/The *last Dayes* came" (39-40). To resolve these anxieties, the speaker shifts his contemplation onto an unnamed "*Shee-Intelligence* which mov'd This *Sphear*" (90).

Critics have read the elegy as everything from "an entry in a coterie context" in "Donne's ongoing attempt to gain royal patronage" (Pebworth & Summers 205), to a theological examination of "the dislocation of reason and faith in the world caused by the death of the expected savior" (Lewalski, *The Anniversaries* 65) that "[reflects] Donne's apparent preoccupation with moral, spiritual, and theological issues at this stage in his career" (Kay 193). What critics have not adequately investigated is that Donne, "perhaps surprisingly" according to Kay (134), uses the same kind of apocalyptic rhetoric as Sylvester, Peacham, and Wither in his praise of Henry. Even more surprising than the fact that Donne uses apocalyptic rhetoric is his application of it. Instead of using apocalyptic imagery to exalt the philosophy of Protestant

militarism that pervades the rest of the Henry elegies, Donne uses it to argue that peace, rather than war, is the best way for England to fulfill the earthly ideal of the apocalyptic New Jerusalem. In the political world, Donne uses his exemplary portrayal of Henry to persuade James and Henry's sister Elizabeth that the true role of the Christian monarch is to be an "agent for political 'peace' [...] linking earth and heaven" (Sherwood 57).³⁰

Like the other elegists, Donne places a great deal of emphasis on Henry's reputation in the rest of Protestant Europe. As Donne puts it, Henry's "*Reputation was an Extasie/On Neighbour States; which knew not Why to wake/Till Hee discovered what wayes Hee would take*" (25-27). Where Henry's other elegists claim that Henry's "wayes" were primarily devoted to the study of war and the pursuit of chivalric virtue, Donne describes Henry's main goal as the pursuit of peace. According to Donne, Henry was not an adversary to his father. Instead, the prince was "His great *Father's* greatest Instrument,/And activ'st spirit to conuey and tye/This soule of *Peace* through Christianitie" (32-34). In the course of this description, Donne

³⁰ Though its tone diverges widely from Sylvester's, the elegy was first published in the third edition of Sylvester's *Lachrymae Lacrymarum* in 1613 and also circulated widely in manuscript (Pebworth & Summers 205). Though Donne's elegy is by far the most discussed of the Henry elegies, it has garnered comparatively little interest in comparison with Donne's other poems. Kay does the best job of placing Donne's poem into the larger context of the Henry elegies. Most of critics focus on the poem's place in Donne's coterie activities, with Leonard D. Tournay arguing that the poem is simply an "excessively witty" example of a poem that "followed the social and poetic conventions of his time" (474). Pebworth and Summer, who do address the differences between Donne's treatment of Henry and that of the other elegists, discuss the elegy as Donne's response to "the particular difficulty" of praising a prince "whose political agenda was in many ways antithetical to his father's, without implicitly criticizing either the prince or the king and thereby alienating the prospective patron" (205), a conclusion echoed by Marotti. Lewalski and Sherwood discuss Donne's theological ideas, with Sherwood reading the elegy as an "Augustinian assertion [...] that the rational mind can begin to reconstruct value, which is threatened by mortal catastrophe" (53), and Lewalski arguing that the poem is a religious meditation whose "object" is "the Divine manifested in the individual" (67). See Arthur Marotti's *John Donne, Coterie Poet*, Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers's "Contexts and Strategies: Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry," Terry G. Sherwood's "Reason, Faith, and Just Augustinian Lamentation in Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry," Leonard D. Tournay's "Convention and Wit in Donne's *Elegie* on Prince Henry," and Barbara K. Lewalski's *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: The Creation of a Symbolic Mode*.

completely reverses the actual political relationship between Henry and James. Instead of the disobedient son whose court provided an alternate center of power for disaffected militant Protestants, Henry appears as a loyal apostle of his father's policy of maintaining peace on the continent, whose opposition to a Catholic marriage and support of military intervention on the continent are obscured in favor of maintaining the unity of the English polity.³¹

Though Pebworth and Summers attribute Donne's praise of peace to part of an opportunistic search for royal patronage, Donne actually uses his revision of Henry's posthumous reputation to make a larger theological argument about the duty of the monarch to maintain peace.³² Donne's hopes for Henry's reign were that he would "make/This *general Peace* th'eternall ouertake" (35-36) and "that *His* Times might haue stretcht out so far/As to touch Those of which they *Emblems* are" (37-38). As Donne describes him, Henry is not simply an obedient son to his father. Instead, Donne makes a figural comparison between Henry and Christ, arguing that his obedience to his royal father mirrors the relationship between Christ and God the Father, with the goal of the royal alliance being the spread of peace between the nations. By working towards peace, Henry's reign as prince and later as king would "ouertake" the eternal peace that was supposed to follow the apocalypse, meaning that James and Henry are best serving the cause of the true church by imitating the ideal peace of the New Jerusalem on earth.³³

By praising Henry's role in the maintenance of peace at the expense of describing Henry's chivalric pretensions, Donne suggests that the saber-rattling of the more militant Protestants surrounding the prince is a misinterpretation of Henry's intentions, and is itself as

³¹ Donne is probably referring here to James's plan to marry Henry to a Catholic princess, which takes his representation of the prince even further from historical truth.

³² Given Donne's persistent search for patronage throughout the 1610s, however, it is almost certain that royal patronage was one of his objects.

³³ Lewalski notes this connection, arguing that Donne portrays "Henry as a type (recapitulation) of Christ" (*Donne's Anniversaries* 64).

much a sign of the coming apocalypse as the prince's death. As he puts it in the elegy, England can know that the "*last Dayes*" have come because "Heauen did allow/That but from *His* aspect and Exercise,/In *Peace*-full times, Rumors of *Warrs* should rise" (40-42). By reversing the typical interpretation of Henry's political goals, Donne portrays the militant Protestants as poor interpreters of the correct role of the Christian monarch, whose own "Rumors of *Warrs*" fulfill Christ's prophecy in Matthew 24.6 that the apostles of the church "shall hear of wars and rumors of wars" (King James Version). Because of this persistent misinterpretation of Henry's goals, then, what Donne sees as his more orthodox faith in the duty of the monarch to spread peace has become "*Heresie*" (Donne 43), as a sign that "the Earth" has been "throw'n lowest downe of all" (49).

To redeem his faith in the European peace and to provide both Faith and Reason, each of which has been shaken by Henry's death, with a new focus for devotion, Donne appeals to Henry's sister Elizabeth to continue the prince's peacekeeping work. Like his representation of Henry, Donne uses his representation of the court of Elizabeth and Frederick to invert the perception of the Elector as heir to Henry's militant policy evident in Peacham's and Wither's elegies. Instead of praising Frederick as Henry's heir, Donne focuses on Elizabeth as Henry's successor in "embrac[ing] the *Fires of Loue* with" England (88). Rather than being a simple princess, Donne describes her as the "*Shee-Intelligence* which mov'd this *Sphear*" (90) who will "[duplicate] his rare virtue" (Sherwood 66) by fulfilling "all the *Charmes* [Henry] spoke" in favor of peace (93). By exhorting Elizabeth to fulfill Henry's policies, Donne hopes that she will be able to bring peace to the true church.³⁴

³⁴ Critics are far from unanimous in identifying this mysterious female figure at the end of the poem, reading her as everything from a reference to "a lady whom the Prince might have loved" (Milgate 195), with the most "obvious candidates [being] the Prince's mother and sister" (Kay 195), to an abstract "angelic guide" (Pebworth & Summers 218).

With its emphasis on the preservation of peace between the various faiths, and its refusal to exalt the interventionist ideals of the militant Protestants in England, Donne's elegy for prince Henry represents a significant divergence from the bulk of the elegies written about him. More importantly, however, the elegy holds an important place within the larger body of Donne's commemorative work and within the larger context of Donne's opinion on early 17th-century religious debate. As Kay argues, the elegy is not only reminiscent of the poetry of *The Anniversaries*, it "resembles the form of the sermons he was soon to write" (193). More importantly, his representation of Henry as a peacemaker in the elegy shows Donne's moderation in addressing the idea of religious debate in England. As in his earlier "Show me deare Christ" and in his 1625 funeral sermon for King James, Donne continues to argue for moderation in religious debate and that the preservation of peace is the key duty of the true Christian monarch.

II: Turning Charles into Josiah: Daniel Price's Funeral Sermons for Prince Henry

Though Henry's elegists devoted a great deal of ink to influencing James and the young Charles, historians and critics have devoted relatively little attention to the funeral sermons preached at court after Henry's death. What preachers lacked in numbers in comparison to the elegists, however, they more than made up for in their access to James, which allowed them to address the monarch directly in their attempt to reform the religious opinions of the court.³⁵ One of the most important goals for the militant Protestants at court who wanted to influence

³⁵ For the importance of the court sermon in manipulating access to the monarch and influencing royal opinion, see McCullough's *Sermons at Court* and "Out of Egypt: Richard Fletcher's Sermon before Elizabeth I after the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots," in addition to Margaret Christian's "Elizabeth's Preachers and the Government of Women: Defining and Correcting a Queen." Though the second two articles discuss the Elizabethan court sermon, McCullough's *Sermons at Court* makes it clear that the techniques of access and address to monarchs changed relatively little between the two reigns.

Charles's education was the need to "reassemble Henry's circle" of preachers around the young prince (McCullough, *Sermons at Court* 196). As McCullough makes clear, Henry's ecclesiastical establishment played a large role in the formation of both "Henry's advanced Protestantism" (183) and the political policies that went along with that religious stance and constituted the seeds of the political opposition between Henry's court at St. James's and James's at Whitehall (192). Moreover, Henry's court preachers "spoke much more univocally" than those at James's court (189), using the pulpit as a way to advance the "politicized Calvinism of the Leicester-Sidney-Essex tradition" (183). By reconstructing Henry's ecclesiastical establishment around Charles, Henry's preachers hoped that the young prince would, like Henry, become a supporter of the political and religious tradition focused on the militant eradication of Catholicism.³⁶

Foremost in this attempt to convince Charles to adopt militant Protestant politics was one of Henry's court preachers, Daniel Price.³⁷ Though George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury,

³⁶ Oddly enough, given Charles's ultimate devotion to the high ceremonialism of Archbishop Laud, Henry's preachers initially had some success in reconstructing Henry's ecclesiastical circle around Charles. According to McCullough, "[w]ithin one month of Henry's death, news circulated that, in order to protect the prince-apparent from the wiles of popery, "two sober divines, Dr Hackwell and another, are placed with him, and ordered never to leave him'" (197). By the 1620s, James's "pursuit of a Spanish marriage for Charles pushed James away from the Calvinists who largely adopted an anti-Spanish policy" toward an alliance with ceremonialists like Andrewes and Laud (Woodward 126). Charles himself was headed in this direction by the end of James's reign as well.

³⁷ The fortunes of Price's career shifted with the winds of religious and political change, but he held a high place in the preaching circles around Henry, James, and Charles for much of James's reign. According to the *DNB*, Price became one of Henry's chaplains in ordinary in 1608 (vol 16: 324), and unlike most of Henry's preachers, used the medium of print to publish many of his sermons (McCullough, *Sermons at Court* 189). McCullough describes Price's preaching style as "the brand of 'apocalyptic utterance' and 'prophetic discourse' that Patrick Collinson has pointed to as the ground-base of English national Protestantism" (189). After Henry's death, Price went on to become a chaplain to both James and Charles, but given the fate of Price's brother Sampson, also a chaplain to James and Charles who was "sent to the Fleet for some remark in a sermon preached before James I," it is probable that Price's brand of militant Protestant churchmanship slipped out of favor with James and his heirs (*DNB* vol 16: 324).

preached the sermon during the actual funeral ceremony, Price was the most active preacher in the wake of the prince's death, preaching six separate commemorative sermons that were later published in two collections in 1613.³⁸ Historians have given little attention to these six tightly connected sermons, either using them mainly as examples of the kinds of rhetoric used by writers in the wake of Henry's death, as in Williamson, or discussing them in the context of the attempt to recreate Henry's ecclesiastical establishment around Charles.

What Williamson and other historians of Henry's funeral do not consider, however, is that Price's commemoration of the prince's life had a considerably more important target than the material considerations involved with the reconstruction of Henry's ecclesiastical establishment at Charles's new household. Instead, Price's sermons offer an interesting counterpoint to Ferrell's discussion of James's control over the pulpit in the early part of his reign. Though James certainly exercised a great deal of control over ministerial speech, Henry's death offered Price the opportunity to make a direct intervention into the public discourse surrounding the ceremonies of the church. Price's use of the kind of "violently anti-Catholic" rhetoric common in commemorative works on Henry's life constituted a direct attack on James's religious policies (180). Closer attention to the formal and stylistic qualities of Price's funeral sermons reveals their participation in a larger context of militant Protestant polemic stretching back to the sixteenth century, as well as the cracks in the Jacobean church. Though Price blames

³⁸ Abbot's sermon for Henry does not survive, though it is mentioned in the official descriptions of the funeral. Price's two collections are *Lamentations for the death of the late Illustrious Prince Henry*. London: Thomas Snodham, 1613; and *Spiritual Odours to the Memory of Prince Henry*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1613. The first of these collections contains two sermons preached almost immediately after the prince's death, while the second consists of a series of sermons preached during the preparations for the funeral itself, culminating with Price's sermon preached before the body as it lay in state. In addition, Price went on to preach two other commemorative sermons on the Prince, *Prince Henry his First Anniversary*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1613; and *Prince Henry his Second Anniversary*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1614. These sermons continue Price's attempt to manipulate Henry's memory through the use of the commemorative sermon.

Henry's death on the sins of the nation as a whole, his main target is James's court, guilty of tolerating Catholics and Catholic practices in the English Church.³⁹ To attain this end, Price's funeral sermons for Henry use an intricate net of biblical *figurae* that attacks James's toleration of what Price considers Catholic practices within the English Church. His main goal was to convince James and the rest of the English elite that the only hope of repentance came in raising Charles as a militant Protestant and in purging the church from these Catholic elements.

Price began this campaign almost immediately after Henry's death with the two sermons published as *Lamentations for the Death of the late illustrious Prince Henry and the dissolution of his religious familie*.⁴⁰ The sermons are preached on Matthew 26.31, "I will smite the Sepheard, and the Sheepe of the flocke shall be scattered" (3). The first sermon discusses the death of the prince, who is the shepherd, and the second discusses the scattering of the sheep, which Price interprets as both the scattering of Henry's pastors as well as the destruction of the English people in general. Price has three major goals in the sermons. First, he presents the prince as a religious as well as civil officer whose loss is both divine punishment for the sins of the nation as well as the cause of further depredations by foreign religious and political enemies. Second, Price places Henry's death into an apocalyptic context to define the national sin as a toleration of Roman Catholicism. Third, he places the responsibility for this toleration squarely at the feet of James and his court.

³⁹ McCullough mentions this idea in his discussion of Price's churchmanship, but does not provide a detailed analysis of the ways the techniques of commemoration might have helped Price get his point across.

⁴⁰ According to the title page, these two sermons were preached at St. James's on November 10 and 15, 1612, four and nine days after the prince's death, making them two of the first public responses to that death (A1r). Price offers two dedications in the collection, the first to "THE HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE, PRINCE CHARLES" (A1v) and the second "To the Honorable, Religious, and worthy Gentlemen, the great *Officers* to the late renowned Prince" (A2r). Significantly, the letter dedicatory is addressed to the members of Henry's household, emphasizing the role these preachers and officers had played in making Henry's court a stronghold for militant Protestantism.

Price accomplishes these goals by deploying an intricate network of figural allusions to Old Testament history that defines the ideal monarch as a reformer of corrupted religion. This religious ideal, in which the king is simultaneously the head of the state and the church, and the reformer of each, emerges directly from the verse from Matthew on which Price preaches his sermon. Here, Christ is prophesying his own death and the dispersion of the apostles, but the verse is also a quotation from Zachariah 13.7, which makes a connection between political and religious authority in the smiting of the shepherd.⁴¹ This connection between Christ and the monarch is an important one because the two play complementary roles in the lives of believers. As Price puts it, princes and kings are “the chosen shepherds of the world [...] who as *Christ* communicated of mans miserie, so these participate of Gods Maiestie” (14-15).

Price praises Henry as the paragon of this conception of kingship by making the same comparison between Henry and Josiah made by many of Henry’s elegists. Price uses this broader reformed model for the polemical use of Josiah not simply to praise Henry, but also to excoriate as the cause of Henry’s death an English religious culture that tolerates the presence of Catholics and Catholic ceremonies. Price’s contempt for Catholic toleration emerges from Price’s emphasis on Josiah’s role as a religious reformer who “destroyed the idolatrous *Priests, & monuments of Baal*” (15).⁴² Here, Price writes that “*Iosias* was smitten [...] for the sinnes of the times” (16-17). According to the account of Josiah’s death in Zephaniah that Price relies on

⁴¹ According to the Geneva gloss to Zachariah 13.7, the prophecy contains a political warning to “the Iewes, that [...] there shulde be an horrible dissipation among the people: for their gouernours and pastors shulde be destroyed” (CCCC1v). The context of the words in Zachariah 13 concerns a prophesied reformation of Israelite religious behavior; here, the death of the shepherd, the scattering of the sheep, and the subsequent death of two thirds of the people (presumably the wicked, leaving a saved remnant) are necessary parts of this reformation of religion and society.

⁴² Price paraphrases Ecclesiasticus 49.1-2 to support his interpretation, in which Josiah is described as “[behaving] him self vprightly in the reformation of the people, and toke away all abominacions of iniquitie.” Significantly, Price uses the Geneva translation “reformation” here, where the KJV uses the word “conversion”.

here, the sins of the time are “some strange *abomination*” (17) linked to resistance to Josiah’s religious reforms by the remains of the Baal worshippers in Judah.⁴³

According to Price, the remnant of Baal described by Zephaniah is a biblical prefiguring of the Anglican ceremonialism and Roman Catholic practices that threaten the contemporary English church. As Price puts it:

There was a *remnant of Baall* in the land resembling our *Papists*. Secondly, *Priests* and *Chemarims*, fit parallels to our *Priests* and *Jesuits*. Thirdly [...] there were *some that sware by the lord, and sware by Malcham*, equaling the *false-harted, halfe-hollow-harted* Hipocrites of two *Religions* in these days. Fourthly [...] *some that turned backe from the Lord*, like to our *Ephraimitall Apostitaticall* reuolters. Fiftly, *some that sought not the Lord, nor inquired after him*, shadowing the *Atheists* of our land. Sixtly [...] such as were cloathed with *strange apparell*, the characters of the *guls* and *gallants* of our days. In the 9[th] verse, *some that daunced vpon the threshold* so proudly; the note of the quaint *Crane-paced* Courtiers of this time. (18)

In this paraphrase of Zephaniah 1.4-9, Price attacks Catholic missionary priests, Jesuits, recusant Catholics, atheists, and worldly courtiers as the source of the sins that cause Henry’s death, much as McCullough and Williamson state. However, Price’s juxtaposition of the Jesuits and courtiers in this passage, combined with the fact that Zephaniah’s prophecy is directed explicitly against religious crimes, makes it clear that Price is most concerned with the obsession with material

⁴³ See Zephaniah 1.4: “I wil also stretche out mine hand vpon Iudah, and vpon all the inhabitants of Ierusalem, & I will cut out the remnants of Baal from this place, and the names of the Chemarims with the Priests.”

objects at the expense of spiritual truth evident at James's court. The courtiers "cloathed with *strange apparel*" are a secular manifestation of the overreliance on religious ceremony introduced into the English church by a steady stream of Jesuit infiltrators and missionary priests.

This is especially evident from Price's attack on the hypocrites "of two religions" within the English church. Here, the hypocrites are the most important to his case. According to the Geneva gloss to Zephaniah 1.5, in which those who "swear by the Lord, and by Malcham," the prophet attacks people who worship both God and Moloch: "he here noteth them that wil bothe say they worship God, & yet wil swear by idoles and serue them" (AAAA4r). Price links this reference to hypocritical adulterers with a reference to the tribe of Ephraim, which is consistently described as one of the most religiously rebellious of the tribes of Israel, drawing the ire of the prophet Hosea as well as of Josiah.⁴⁴ All of these figures in the English court are apostates because like the Ephraimites, they have fallen away from the true church, and have fallen into the worship of one kind of ceremony or another. The recusants and proto-Laudian priests embrace ceremonial forms of worship associated with Catholicism and the courtiers embrace the ceremonial trappings of the court at the expense of fulfilling their true political function as counselors to the king and protectors of the church. According to Price, this constitutes part of the "*inundation of Popery*" initiated by the "*idolatrous Priests in our Land*" (21).⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Ephraim, for example draws much of the ire of the prophet Hosea, who describes them in Hosea 9.9 as "corrupt as in the daies of Gibeah: *therefore* [God] wil remember their iniquitie, he wil visite their sin." Josiah's religious campaign against Ephraim is described in 2 Chronicles 34.6.

⁴⁵ Though Price paints a bleak picture of the state of the English church and nation, he offers some consolation for his listeners and readers in the second sermon by interpreting the scattering of Henry's ecclesiastical circle as a recurrence of the scattering of Christ's apostles, who are destined, despite losing "the most religious, gracious, holy, chaste, virtuous, valorous Prince [...] that euer the Christian world enjoyed" (35), they could expect "to serue another Prince" (36) in

Price expands on his conclusion that James and his court are the source for all of these religious sins that have led to Prince Henry's death in his second collection of funeral sermons, *Spiritvall Odovrs to the Memory of Prince Henry*, published in 1613.⁴⁶ In this programmatic series of sermons working up to the sermon he preached before the body on the Sunday before Henry's funeral procession, Price is far more interested in defining the proper expression of public grief than on praising the prince himself. The arrangements for Henry's funeral become a site of contestation, in which Price interprets James's public response to his son's death in terms of the king's religious policy. Through the use of biblical *figurae* that compare James to David and Saul, Israelite monarchs who have lost their sons as punishment for their sins, Price is able to suggest that James's leniency towards Catholicism has corrupted the English court and society to the extent that it must be punished by the death of Henry. Price suggests that national renewal will occur only when James reverses his policy of leniency towards Roman Catholics, a reversal that will be revealed by both his conduct of Henry's funeral, and his further education of the young Prince Charles.⁴⁷

the person of Charles, the "*remnant*" of the royal family who could be expected to carry on Henry's work (38).

⁴⁶ Price, Daniel. *Spiritvall Odovrs to the Memory of Prince Henry*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1613. This collection contains, according to the title page, "fovre of the last sermons preached in St James after" Henry's death and includes the sermon Price preached "before the body, the day before the Funerall". The collection itself is interesting bibliographically; the first two sermons are grouped together as "Meditations of Consolation in our Lamentations", while the third and fourth sermons are given separate title pages. The third, entitled *Sorrow for the Sinnes of the Time*, explicitly draws the attention of readers away from contemplation of the prince and towards the contemplation of the sins that have caused his death while formulating a proper method for mourning the prince. The fourth sermon, preached "on the Sunday before the Prince his Funerall" (L4r), is entitled *Teares Shed Over Abner*, and again addresses the question of the proper ceremony for mourning the prince.

⁴⁷ Price's insistence on interpreting the prince's lavish funeral arrangements as a quasi-sinful ceremony probably had something to do with the fact that it was the more moderate Abbot rather than Price who preached Henry's official funeral sermon.

Price centers his criticism of James on a figural connection between James and David made in the second sermon of the collection. Here, Price preaches on 2 Samuel 12.23, a verse that describes David's reaction to hearing of the death of his first son by Bathsheba.⁴⁸ On one level, this verse makes it easy for Price to portray Henry's death as punishment for James's sin. As Price puts it, David's unjust execution of Uriah means "no lesse then foure of [David's] own *children* must die the *death*" in atonement, a number that matches the number of James's offspring who had died before Henry (28).⁴⁹ Henry's death constitutes a "misery [...] without all *parallel*," suggesting that James's sins have exceeded David's (30).

However, this episode is valuable to Price because its mention of fasting allows him to address the proper role of ceremonies in religious life. As Price puts it, "*Fasting* spoken of in the *Text* of it self is but an outward *ceremony*" (38) that symbolizes "all the *Circumstances* of mourning" (30). According to Price, fasting is "*commendable* and *profitable*" insofar as the fast is focused on separating the spirit of the mourner from the concerns of the world. As Price puts it, a fast should be

A shutting vp and imprisoning of the *body* from all pleasures of *life*, thereby to pull downe the *height* and *strength* and *pride* of the soule, that the *soule* heare not, thinke not, mind not mirth, that the *body* see not, touch not, taste not meate, such should be our sorrowes when we see *Corporall punishments* for spiritual *iudgements*. Such was *Dauids* diet, it was a real, hearty sorrow, not countenanced

⁴⁸ "Now he is dead wherefore should I fast, can I bring him againe, I shall goe to him, but he shall not returne to me" (17).

⁴⁹ James's deceased children at this point included Margaret, Mary, Robert, and Sophia, all of whom died in early childhood between 1600 and 1607.

with a *heavie* looke, or with a solemne *sigh* blowne from the lips and lungs, but it was a *weeping, watching, fasting* sorrow. (31)

Price's concern with the nation's mourning for Henry echoes Wither's concern that mourning for Henry might lead to an increase in idolatry. The important part of the passage describes the physical actions associated with grief, such as facial expressions and exhaled sighs, as part of "carnall [...] sorrow" (38). The danger Price points to is that a mourner might concentrate on the physical aspects of the ceremony to the exclusion of the desired effects on the soul, thereby misusing commemoration. The ceremony of the fast has the danger of becoming an idol that would distract the believer's attention away from proper worship. In contrast, David's fast does not lead to idolatry because it instead of concentrating on the external actions of "a *heavie* looke" or "solemne *sigh* blowne from the lips and lungs," it focuses on the state of the soul by being a "*weeping, watching, fasting* sorrow."

If Price uses David's paradoxical abandonment of fasting upon hearing of his son's death as an exemplum for the proper ceremonial conduct of grief, he uses David's conduct after Absalom's death as an example of a sinful king whose overwhelming grief is itself the sign of succumbing to the forms of grief rather than using it as a focus for contemplating his own sinfulness.⁵⁰ Here, David indulges in the kind of carnal mourning Price warns about: "The *King* was moued, exceedingly moued [...] his sorrow must haue a *vent*, it is a precipitat *torrent*, with *Oceans* in his eies, & a *tongue* fired at the altar of his heart" (36). Rather than showing "holy patient resolution" (37) in the aftermath of Absalom's death, David is consumed by the form of his grief. The theological problem with David's immoderate grief is that it is a sign of David's essentially idolatrous response to Absalom. According to Price, Absalom is "the Idol of

⁵⁰ The biblical account of David's mourning for Absalom is in 2 Samuel 18-19.

[David's] *affection*" (35), a phrase that Price uses to define David's inability to interpret properly Absalom's true religious and political status as a traitor to Israel.

Though Absalom is not a parallel to Prince Henry, Price does argue that the kind of mourning permitted for the prince is of critical importance to the religious life of the nation as a whole. Price's argument revolves around the contrast between David's reaction to the death of his first son and the death of Absalom. Price hopes that by imitating David's resolution in responding to Henry's death, the English church can be reformed and purged of the idolatrous elements brought into the church by Roman Catholic enemies who have infiltrated all levels of society. As Price puts it,

The *Cananite* is amongst vs, the blasphemous *Traiterous* Papist is neither *exiled*, nor *suppressed*, but hath more *countenance* and *maintenance* secretly, then *good men* openly, and more *pleasure & content* in *prisons*, then many holy men in their *houses*. This snake lyeth close in the *City*, this spider creepeth vp into the *Court*, and hath *feeding* in our *Church & housing* in our *universities*. (51)

Mourning properly for Henry becomes a weapon against this wholesale corruption of church and court. Rather than idolatrously focusing on their own feelings toward the prince, Price hopes that his fellow mourners will use the prince's death as the opportunity to "[humble themselves] *before God*" (51) by creating a more direct connection between the English church and the Protestant churches on the continent. As Price puts it, the English should model their mourning ceremonies after those of the fully reformed "*French and Dutch Churches* in this *citty*, who in *consideration* of Gods iudgment vpon *us lament* with fasting and praying as may be seene in their *congregations* weekly" (38).

Only through this simplification of religious ceremonies, according to Price, may the English church avoid “[becoming] an *Egypt*, a *Sodome*, a *Rome*, a prostituted *stewes* for all comers” (51). Price elaborates on the connection between English ceremonies and Catholic religious practices in the third sermon in the series, *Sorrow for the Sinnes of the Time*.⁵¹ Here, Price becomes fairly explicit in equating English religious ceremonies with those of the Catholic Church and argues that the mourning for Prince Henry is valid and valuable only insofar as it is directed at mourning for the religious national sins that caused Henry’s death. Price justifies this interpretation of Henry’s death and the subsequent funeral as a way of protesting religious abominations by preaching on Ezekiel 9.4, “Set a marke upon the foreheads of them that sigh and that cry for all the Abominations” (1).⁵²

Price explicitly links these biblical abominations with the infiltration of the practices of the Roman Catholic church into the English church. As he puts it, abomination is a term associated only with “all manner of *impetuous* impiety” that is most closely related to “the whore of *Babylon*” (18). More importantly, these abominations spring from the possibility of idolatry. In the court, “the *Idoll* of *indignation*” holds sway “the *Ancients* or *Nobles*” are “committing *Idolatrie*,” the “women [are] *weeping* over an *Idoll*” and even the Priests “are *committing Idolatry*” (19). Because of this list of idolatries, Price argues that all levels of Israelite society are irredeemably corrupt: “*people*, and *Prince*, *women*, *Priests*, all are found *faultry*, all are *abominable*” (22).

According to Price, Ezekiel “prophecied *purposely* for this *age*” because each of these types of abomination exists in England (24). Price describes the English church as a nation

⁵¹ In order to emphasize the importance of mourning for these religious sins, Price separates this third sermon from the rest of the collection by giving it its own title page and pagination.

⁵² This verse is one of Ezekiel’s prophecies on the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. The Geneva glosses to the chapter make it clear that the abominations spoken of by the prophet are religious sins “committed against Gods glorie” (Geneva gloss to Ezekiel 9.4 OOO2v).

under siege by “the furious *battrry* of tempestuous *Popery*” (26), which has had its worst effect on the internal workings of the English church. As Price puts it, the English church has been infiltrated by “*Idolatrous* Priests of our owne Tribe of our owne *Temple*” who wish for “more *Rome* in the *Land*.” Price sees the worst offenses of these false priests, as their adherence to idolatrous ceremonies, shown in their willingness to “offer strange *fire* vpon the altar” (24).⁵³

This ecclesiastical idolatry has a secular counterpart in the nobility’s obsession with the court. Price even describes courtship as a kind of secular idolatry that the nobility pursue to the exclusion of religious observance. As Price puts it, the nobles “seeke great *preferments*, and desire *continuance* in the *blandishments* of Court,” a pursuit that becomes one with the other abominations of the nation because of the nobility’s misunderstanding of the true nature of courtship. Rather than seeing courtship as an opportunity for glorious display, Price sees it “[a]t the best” as “*splendida miseria*.” Instead, the nobles, when they see some who “haue *vipers* hanging on their hands [...] do daily expect their *downefall*” (14). Price’s reference is to the barbarians of Acts 28.3-4 who are unable to interpret properly Paul’s survival of a viper attack as a sign of God’s grace.⁵⁴

Prince Henry’s death, then, serves as a key turning point in the religious life of England, in which the king, nobility, priesthood, and people of England have the opportunity to use the prince’s funeral ceremonies as a spur to further reformation of the church. Though “the *Philistins reioice*” and “the *Popish* uncircumcised triumph” at the death of the prince (16), Price suggests that the funeral service can be put to good use if the English mourn the fact that the “the *bride-groome* is taken from” them and that “*Iosias* is dead, and slaine *among* you” (17). Price

⁵³ Price’s rhetoric is very similar to Sparke’s discussion of the Rhiems seminary in his 1583 sermon for Bedford.

⁵⁴ According to Acts 28.3-4, Paul is attacked by a viper while kindling a fire, and shakes the snake from his hand without harm. The barbarian onlookers successively misinterpret this attack as a sign that Paul is a sinner, and his redemption from the attack as a sign that Paul was a god.

suggests that by mourning the loss of Henry as the loss of a religious leader rather than as a leader of the court and a font of patronage, the English church can begin a process of repentance for the religious abominations they have allowed to enter the true church. The act of mourning for these sins at the same time that they mourn the prince, then, is a palpable sign that the English church resembles “the *Saints* marked in my Text” in being part of “the *militant* Church [...] and therefore *marked* to be *preserved*” (12), and provides surety that God’s providence will allow Charles to be educated as a militant Protestant, who will be “so *gratious* a Protector of *truth*, so true an enemy to *Popish falsehood*” that he will become, like Henry, a “blessed *Modell* of heaven” on earth (25).

For writers of the Jacobean period, both poets and preachers, it was the creation of these “blessed *Modell[s]* of heaven” that made the commemorative genres of the funeral elegy and the funeral sermon into such powerful weapons in the drive to redefine the life of the court. Though Donne and Henry’s other elegists differed in their aims, all four of the poets discussed here built on the commemorative model of the prince as martyr developed by Sir Philip Sidney’s elegists. By portraying Henry variously as reenactments of the earthly potential of Josiah, David, and Christ, and by defining his death as divine punishment for England’s sins, Henry’s elegists defined the prince’s death as a key event in the continuing reformation of the English church and in the relationship between English and continental Protestants. In much the same way, Price built on the commemorative models developed by the Elizabethan preachers of funeral sermons, especially those who preached on the Lords Deputy of Ireland. By using figural interpretation in his sermon on Henry’s life and death, Price could circumvent the increasing control that James was exercising over godly preaching, and press his own political and religious agenda. For both Price and Henry’s elegists, commemorating Henry became a new religious ceremony through which the political and religious life of the nation could be reformed.

Chapter Five: David, Moses, or Solomon?: The Funeral Sermons for James I

Despite James's efforts to make Prince Henry's funeral the most lavish in England's history, militant Protestants like Daniel Price seem to have been relatively unopposed in their bid to define public response to the prince's death. According to McCullough, Price and other members of Henry's ecclesiastical household consolidated their positions around Prince Charles "[w]ithin one month of Henry's death" (*Sermons at Court* 197). Their consolidation of power within Charles's household appears to have borne fruit in the 1610s into the 1620s, as Charles consistently protected his anti-Catholic preachers from royal retribution (201-202), and his household, like Henry's, "very self-consciously defined itself as made up of 'true sons of the Church of England'" (205).¹

By the time of James's death and Charles's accession to the throne, however, neither ceremonialists like Andrewes and Laud or militant Protestants like Price and Charles's other chaplains could be completely sure of Charles's ecclesiastical sentiments.² As late as 1623, Charles's failed trip to Madrid and subsequent support for war against Spain sparked "great rejoicing both of godly citizens and of his godly chaplains" (208).³ Despite this godly support, and despite the prince's ambitions for a war against Spain, however, there is ample evidence that both Charles and James had moved definitively toward more ceremonialist forms of worship as James's reign came to a close. Instead of taking militant Protestant preachers with him to

¹ As an example of Charles's support for his more radically Protestant preachers, McCullough cites his petition for Daniel Price's brother, Sampson, who was confined to the Tower by James for a 1621 sermon that attacked too openly James's policies regarding foreign Catholic powers (202).

² In this, early modern clerics and politicians mirror modern historians, who "have despaired at ever finding the roots of Charles I's religious convictions" (208).

³ See Thomas Cogswell's *The Blessed Revolution* for a detailed account of James's shift towards placing England on a course for war with Spain in the early 1620s.

Madrid in 1623, “[t]wo Arminian chaplains accompanied him” (Woodbridge 127).⁴ In supporting Arminian chaplains at this date, Charles was continuing his father’s policies. Beginning in 1619, James began to turn the English church in a decidedly ceremonial direction by introducing “ministers [...] amenable to the Spanish Match and committed to a strict observance of the ceremonies and hierarchy of the English church” into Charles’s ecclesiastical establishment (McCullough, *Sermons at Court* 205).⁵ Even after James put England on a war footing in 1623, however, he maintained his ceremonialist directions for the church, “[distancing] himself from doctrinal Calvinism and its concomitant hostility to Rome” to “retain a credible claim to apostolic Christianity” and avoid “a confessional conflict he abhorred” (Fincham and Lake 35).⁶

Though subsequent events make it clear that Charles was a definite member of the ceremonialist wing of the Church, the prince’s public faith was uncertain enough to make James’s death a “transitional moment in English politics and religion” (Shami 263).⁷ The

⁴ Tyacke dates Charles’s conversion to a ceremonialist churchmanship firmly to this period (114).

⁵ Significantly, Lancelot Andrewes used a serious illness on James’s part in 1619 to argue for this shift in policy towards Charles’s ecclesiastical household (McCullough, *Sermons at Court* 204).

⁶ James’s shift toward ceremonialism emerged from his increasing reliance on avant-garde conformists (Peter Lake’s term for anti-Calvinist preachers) like Lancelot Andrewes who convinced him “that Calvinists had corrupted English Protestantism” (Fincham and Lake 32). As a result, James attempted to quiet militant Protestants “through proclamations, confinement of offenders and eventually in 1622 a set of Directions to Preachers to avoid discussing matters of state” (34). See Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake’s “The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I” for an excellent overview of the respective ecclesiastical policies of the two monarchs.

⁷ See Jeanne Shami’s *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*. After Charles’s accession, ceremonialists quickly came to the fore in the new regime. William Laud preached at the openings of Charles’s first two Parliaments and Archbishop Abbot, though he was a decidedly moderate Calvinist, “was sequestered from his ecclesiastical jurisdiction in 1627,” leaving the ground open for the advancement of an ever increasing number of ceremonialist clerics (Woodbridge 127). Shami also notes that godly preachers quickly came to suspect that Charles would not support them (265), but despite their ascendance at this point, the

ceremonies that surrounded James's funeral became a key site of contestation for the definition of the future of the English church, in which both militant Protestants and avant-garde conformists could make polemical arguments about the place of ceremonies and the role of the new king in the Church.⁸ These sermons participated in the elaborate ceremonies devised for James's funeral, which in their size, grandeur, and modification of existing English funeral ritual constituted a significant break from past royal funerals.⁹ For one thing, the cost and size of the funeral procession is estimated to have been £50,000, and consisted of around 9,000 people, a level of extravagance that was unmatched in English history (Gittings 227). More importantly, however, organizers of the funeral procession significantly departed from previous English funeral practices in organizing James's procession, including ritual trappings like candles, which had been "stripped from funeral symbolism at the time of the Reformation because of their connotations of popery and intercession for the dead" (Woodbridge 194).¹⁰ A more important change in the ritual was Charles's participation in the ceremonies himself, which placed him "at the centre of the funeral performance" to create a closer identification between the old and new king (183).¹¹

majority of the ceremonialists did not go as far as Laud was later to go in their wish for a ceremonial transformation of the English Church.

⁸ It also became a site at which various preachers jockeyed for professional positions in the household of the new king, at which a "preacher's credentials were visibly exhibited in the public sphere" (Shami 265).

⁹ By this time, there were enough ceremonialists in places of power around James and Charles to organize the funeral ceremony around the defense of highly elaborate ceremony.

¹⁰ These trappings included the silver candlesticks that Charles has brought from Madrid in 1623 (Woodbridge 195).

¹¹ Neither of the increased use of funeral trappings that resembled those of Catholic ceremonies nor Charles's participation in the ceremony itself was particularly popular. Woodbridge cites Pesaro, the Venetian ambassador as saying that "[d]ifficulties arose" about Charles's participation because "since William the Conqueror the King had only thrice been present at funeral celebrations" (183). Charles was also forced to bar Catholic nobles from the funeral procession in order to "quell fears that there would be increased toleration of Catholics under his

According to Woodbridge, the display was “part of a propaganda campaign in favor of the hereditary component of divine right kingship” (182) that relied on “the re-legitimization of the image and the re-ceremonialism of religion” favored by Charles and the avant-garde conformists who surrounded him (184). The funeral ceremony was intended to help create a “*religion royale*” (194) that would bring the funeral ritual “into line with Stuart political philosophy” of divine right kingship and place Charles firmly in the center of both religious and political life (182). Charles and the other organizers of the funeral ceremonies hoped that the imagistic program of the ceremonies would emphasize both Charles’s orderly succession to James’s royal throne as well as his inheritance of the divine office of kingship. Loyal performance of religious ceremonies would mirror and induce political loyalty in celebrants.

Though Charles and his supporters undoubtedly intended James’s funeral to create “a paradigm of social order” and national unity, the series of funeral sermons preached for James between his final sickness and his actual funeral sermon reveal that the king’s death was a site of intense contestation over the future of the English church and the role of the monarch within the church. The emphasis on the imagery of divine monarchy in the funeral ceremonies, and especially the fact of a “Protestant-Catholic mix in the funeral ceremonies” meant that ceremonialists were forced to defend their definitions of proper monarchy from the attacks of godly ministers who used commemorative preaching to appeal directly to Charles himself (Woodward 195). The commemorative sermons preached on James by both conformists and militant Protestants spend most of their time providing biblical examples of kingship for Charles to follow. This section will discuss four of the sermons preached in the period leading up to and following James’s death. Two of these sermons were preached by militant Protestant preachers:

rule” (197). This, predictably, did nothing to convince more militant Calvinists that they were witnessing the opening salvoes of a Roman Catholic invasion of England.

Daniel Price's sermon preached on March 27th, just before James's death, and Phineas Hodson's sermon preached over the body on May 3rd.¹² The other two come from more conformist preachers: John Williams's May 7th funeral sermon for the king and John Donne's sermon over the body on April 26th.¹³

Though all of the preachers use figural connections between James and biblical leaders, each preacher chooses a different leader in order to focus his argument about the proper role of the ceremonies in the church and the role of the monarch in religious affairs. For militant Protestant preachers, the important biblical *figurae* are David and Moses, who are used to promote a simpler church hierarchy with a prophetic king at its head. For ceremonialists, Solomon becomes more important, as the Israelite king provides a focus for an absolutist conception of both king and Church.¹⁴

Daniel Price, still chaplain to James and to Charles despite the increasing prevalence of ceremonialist clerics in Charles's ecclesiastical establishment, was the first of the preachers to

¹² Price, Daniel. *A Heartie Prayer in a needful time of trouble*. London: M, Flesher, 1625. Hodson, Phineas. *The Last Sermon Preached Before his Maiesties Funerals, at Denmark house*. London: M.F., 1625.

¹³ Williams, James. *Great Britains Salomon*. London: John Bill, 1625. Donne, John. *Preached at Denmark house, some few days before the body of King James was removed from thence.* *The Sermons of John Donne*. Vol. 6. Ed. George Potter and Evelyn Simpson. Berkeley: U of California P, 1953-1962. 280-291.

¹⁴ Despite the importance of James's funeral in the political and religious history of early Stuart England, there has been surprisingly little critical discussion of the cycle of commemorative preaching intended to direct public discourse about Charles's transition to power. Aside from Donne's sermon, which has been of interest to Donne scholars, only Woodbridge and Shami have given detailed attention to the sermons preached around the king's death. Woodbridge discusses Williams's funeral sermon in her treatment of James's funeral ceremonies, but restricts her discussion mainly to Williams's focus on the image of the king in his sermon, both in the form of James's funeral effigy as well as in the person of Charles himself, and Williams's association with Solomon (175-180). Shami provides an excellent overview of the sermons preached in the period around James's death, but focuses most of her attention on Donne's sermon, as her main concern is to isolate Donne's theological position within the church as well as his possible influence over the doctrinal direction of the church (263-269). More attention has been paid to Donne's sermon than the others, with Goldberg and Levy-Navarro discussing his funeral sermon for James in terms of Donne's political views.

enter the polemical fray surrounding James's death.¹⁵ According to the title page of the published version of the sermon, Price preached the sermon to Charles and the Privy Council "an houre before the Death of our late Soueraigne" (A1r), a timing which illustrates the use of James's death as a time of "transitional significance" (Shami 264).¹⁶ In the sermon, Price uses James's death as an argument for Charles's reformation as a monarch. He makes his argument by mounting an aggressive attack "on worldly ambition" and Catholicism, which portrays James as a monarch who has sinned in his execution of his divine mandate as monarch (264). His argument is that Charles can fulfill his role as a divine monarch if he repudiates his father's sinful embrace of the court and his leniency towards Catholicism, which Price equates with the more ceremonial wing of the church.

Price stresses the need for Charles to reform fully the English church and court of all Catholic practices by preaching on James's mistakes as much as on his magnificence as monarch. Throughout the sermon, Price creates a network of biblical citations to portray James as a Christian perpetually on a razor's edge between salvation and damnation because of his indulgence of the court and the Roman Catholic influence that Price claims has infested the court. Price uses the king's deathbed drama to portray James as "our Royall *Iacob* [...] now in Combat with the last enemy that shall be destroyed" (2), whose legacy vacillates between that of Jehoiakim, the idolatrous king of Israel who embodies the worst parts of James's indulgence to Catholics and the court, and David, the good biblical king that Price holds up as "the most worthy of al *Kings*" (14). In assuring his courtly audience that James is, indeed, bound for heaven despite his earlier sins as a monarch, Price describes David as a king who relies on prayer

¹⁵ Price, Daniel. *A Heartie Prayer In a needful time of trouble*. London: M. Flesher, 1625.

¹⁶ Another sign of the transitional significance of James's death can be seen in Laud's behavior before James's death; MacCullough cites Laud as interrupting a sermon he was giving at the time of James's death when he heard news of the king's demise in his congregation (1998 166).

and its resultant personal relationship with God to determine the correct course of the ship of state. By portraying James as a monarch whose only success comes with his reliance on prayer, Price links the ceremonialists with Roman Catholics and corrupt elements within the court, and makes the argument that Charles could become a godly monarch only if he imitates David by beginning his “*Rule with the rule of Prayer*” (30).¹⁷

Price’s emphasis on prayer as a mechanism for good government stems from his source text, Psalm 118.25, David’s prayer of thanksgiving upon his accession to the throne of Israel.¹⁸ As Shami puts it, the verse was particularly appropriate given the fact that Charles was soon to take the throne (264); however, it is also notable because of its lack of any sense of personal triumph on the part of the monarch. David’s prayer in the psalm ascribes all credit for the victory “to Gods fauour” (Geneva gloss to Psalm 118.14), as his victory marks God’s redemption of the Israelite church, as the elimination of the impious Saul places a godly monarch on the throne¹⁹ who will acknowledge the role of God in his kingdom.²⁰ Price further suggests that it is this reliance on prayer allows David to become “the *principall* and *Paramount Patterne* of all the *Royall* line” of good monarchs of both Israel and England (12).

In the beginning of the sermon, however, Price is anything but optimistic that James has lived up to this royal example. In describing the need to mourn for James, it is neither David nor Hezekiah, the two monarchs to whom Price eventually compares James, to whom Price alludes,

¹⁷ As Shami notes, Price’s emphasis in the sermon “is hardly tactful given the circumstances,” but it is fairly clear that Price treats this sermon as his last chance to use James’s death as an argument for the evangelical Protestant point of view (Shami 264). The fact that Sir Simon D’Ewes describes Price as “[weeping] often whilst he prayed and preached” may give some indication of Price’s desperation to insert his interpretation of James’s reign into public debate (*Autobiography*, I, 262).

¹⁸ “Saue now I beseech thee, O Lord: O Lord, I beseech thee send now prosperitie” (Price 1).

¹⁹ “God by creating Dauid King, shewed his mercie toward his afflicted Church” (Geneva gloss to Psalm 118.1).

²⁰ “He willeth the doores of the Tabernacle to be opened, that he maie declare his thankful minde” (Geneva gloss to Psalm 118.19).

but Jehoiakim, one of Israel's famously idolatrous kings. As Price puts it in a paraphrase of Jeremiah 22.18, "In the time of *Jeremy*, it was the *style* of *mourning* for *Royall* Personages, *Alas*, *Alas*: for that noble Prince, wee may take up that *Alas*, *Alas*" (3). This plea for proper mourning for James, however, is deeply ironic given the original biblical verse, which is a prophecy of Jehoiakim's death in which the prophet tells the king that his people will not mourn him after his death.²¹

According to the Geneva gloss to Jeremiah 22.18, Jeremiah ascribes the lack of mourning for Jehoiakim to the fact that "euery one shall haue enough to lament for himself," because of Jehoiakim's leading role in bringing about the Babylonian captivity of Israel. This state of affairs came about, according to Jeremiah, because of Jehoiakim's return to the idolatry that had existed in Israel before the reforming reign of his father Josiah.²² Instead, Jehoiakim commits a series of "abominacions" against the religious establishment of Israel (2 Chronicles 36.8).²³ According to Jeremiah, these crimes included the persecution of God's prophets; Jehoiakim was guilty of murdering Uriah (Jer. 26.20-23) and burned a scroll of Jeremiah's prophecies (Jer. 36.23).²⁴ More damningly, Jeremiah accuses Jehoiakim of fostering "Pastors that destroie and scatter the shepe of my pasture" (Jer. 23.1) such as Hananiah, a false prophet who prophesied prosperity to Israel because of his status as a "wicked [hireling]" of the king's court who had "no

²¹ Jeremiah 22.18-19 in the Geneva edition reads "Therefore thus saith the Lord against Jehoiakim, the sonne of Iosiah King of Iudah, Thei shal not lament him, *saying*, Ah, my brother, or ah, sister: neither shal they mourne for him, *saying*, Ah, lord, o ah, his glorie. He shalbe buried as an asse is buried, *euen* drawn and cast without the gates of Ierusalem" (Iii1v).

²² Politically, Jehoiakim's depravity can be seen from the fact that he was vassal at various times to both the Egyptians (see 2 Kings 23.34-36) and to the Babylonians (2 Kings 24.1-6).

²³ According to the Geneva gloss to this verse, Jehoiakim was found with "superstitious markes [...] vpon his bodie, when he was dead: which thing declared how deeply idolatrie was rooted in his heart, seing he bare the markes in his flesh" (Ff2v).

²⁴ Unsurprisingly, this seems to have been the straw that broke the camel's back, for soon after this incident, Nebuchadnezzar besieges Jerusalem and takes the population to exile in Babylon.

zeale to the trueth, but [was] led with ambition to get the fauour of men” (Geneva gloss to Jer. 28.10).

The result of Jehoiakim’s reign, then, is that the people do not mourn their king because God’s punishments leave the people with “enough to lament for” themselves (Geneva gloss to Jer. 22.18). At the time of preaching his sermon, Price clearly thinks that England is in the same state as Israel under Jehoiakim, as James’s death is a day of tribulation that reveals all of the flaws in English society.²⁵ These flaws, according to Price, are both political and religious in nature, as the lure of the Court and the threat of Roman Catholicism have caused the decay of English church and politics. According to Price, James’s Court has made England a counterpart to Jehoiakim’s corrupt Israel. Price describes the Court as a “*witchcraft*” that has “so *inticed* and *intangled* many, that setting their *eyes* vpon *sublunary* objects [...] they *forget God their helper*” (10). This godlessness makes the courtiers hope “to steale away *preferment* without *Gods knowledge*” (11). Like the false prophet Hananiah in Jeremiah, the courtiers care less about godly living than their own advancement, and are turned into “*bladders* puft vp with the *wind* of *false hope* and *selfe loue*, confused *heapes* of *enuy*, *pride*, and *emptinesse*” (11).

More threatening, according to Price, is the possibility that the gathered courtiers, despite the fact that they were listening to a sermon, were actually committing a religious crime by committing a “strange neglect of the *Sabbath*” in not using James’s death to reform the nation and Church (2). The most obvious sign of this neglect of religion, of course, is the presence of Roman Catholic practices in England, partly in the persons of “*interloping Priest[s]*” and “*Iesuited Proselyte[s]*, that commeth to pry and spy” in preparation for invasion (4). Worse,

²⁵ Price argues that March had been a particularly bad month for England, not just in 1625, but throughout recent history, as “in this *Moneth* wee were deprived of *blessed* Queene *Elizabeth*,; who came so neere vnto the *blessed Virgin Mary*, that shee was *borne* vpon the *Vigil* of her *birth*, and *died* vpon the *Vigil* of her *Annunciation*” (32)

however, is the fact that many of the people seem to have succumbed to Roman Catholic subversion, as they are forced to mourn, instead of the dying king, the fact that Catholic practices exist within England: “*apish Popish Idolatry of many who call vpon, not onely imaginary saints, but vpon Statues, and pictures, and medalls, and Idolls, creeping to Crosses, bowing to Images, like those who turned the glory of the invisible God, into the similitude of a Calfe that eateth hay*” (6-7).

The slant identification of James as an English Jehoiakim allows Price to attack James for allowing corrupt courtiers and Catholicism began to threaten England. In allowing these sins, then, James does become a kind of Jehoiakim in relation to Queen Elizabeth’s Josiah, whom Price describes as “the *Paragon of mortall Princes, the Woman after Gods own heart, the Virgin Queene of the Earth, the glory of the Christian, the enuy of the Infidell World*” (31-32). Rather than reforming the Church, James seems to have left it open to the influence of religious abominations. This appears to be the reason for Price’s advice that the gathered listeners “Trust not then in Princes” (10).²⁶

Despite these indictments, however, Price ultimately deems James “Our *Royall Hezekias,*” comparing the dying monarch to one of Israel’s best kings and one noted for reforming Israel’s religion (32). Price bridges the gap between these two extremes of royal behavior by using the *figura* of David as a pattern for James’s kingship. Price argues that David is the fit representation for James because David’s rule is based entirely on prayer, submission to God’s will, and the willingness to repent for his sins. As Price puts it, David is the “*Paramount Patterne of all the Royall line*” (12) because religious “*deuotion was his daily bread, his meat, his drinke, his diuine and dearest exercise*” (15).

²⁶ This probably did not make Price very popular with Charles.

The form of David's divine service, however, is significant, because Price emphasizes David's reliance on direct conversation with God through the medium of prayer without a great deal of elaborate ceremony. Price emphasizes this fact by stating that David's example is supposed to "incite *Rulers* to enter into the *Tabernacle*, to *consult* with God; not to come to their *Counsell Table*, before they *aske counsel*, and pray for *counsell* from God" (17). Price's use of the word "Tabernacle" here is significant, as the word during the 17th century suggested a kind of temporary place of worship in which prayer, rather than more formal and ceremonial kinds of worship, holds center stage.²⁷ Price emphasizes this through consistently describing David as a national leader who

both *priuately* alone, and *publikely* in the Congregation, *prepareth* himself to prayer, in [Psalm 118], and the *people* prouoked by their Kings example, pray for the *continuance*, and long life of their *Prince* and *Prosperity*, That God may *distribute* to the King *gifts* proportionable to his *greatnesse*, that the head may *enioy* all the *senses* of the whole body, that the *Church* and *Common-wealth*, the *King*, and *Iudges*, and *Lawes*, & all, may flourish[.] (30)

The key detail of Price's description of David is that he leads the people of Israel in a prayer for national renewal rather than leading them in a celebration of a variety of religious ceremonies.

Price's implication is that it is David's reliance on prayer, and thus direct communion with God,

²⁷ Tabernacle either a "temporary dwelling" (*OED* 1, n.) or "The curtained tent, containing the Ark of the Covenant and other sacred appointments, which served as the portable sanctuary of the Israelites during their wandering in the wilderness and afterwards till the building of the Temple" (*OED* 2 n.). The term came to be applied to "the meeting-houses or places of worship of Protestant Non-conformists" during the later 18th century (*OED* 6.b).

that enables David to triumph in the “*great and dangerous warre*” with the Philistines that loomed over the inauguration of his reign (30).

The mention of the Philistines here also allows Price to apply the various biblical *figurae* to Charles to give the prince the choice of becoming an impious Jehoiakim or another English Hezekiah. The key for Charles becoming a reenactment of David is that David puts his faith into prayer at the expense of elaborate religious ceremony. By following David in cultivating a direct relationship with God, Charles would then be able to allow “*true Religion*” to “*flourish*” under him (35). Price makes this point by connecting the state of affairs in England with those at the accession of David; as he puts it, 1625 is a particularly perilous year for England, as it has seen the deaths of “many of the choyce *Peeres and Pearles*” of the English nobility” (31). Worse, the month of March has proven to be an especially deadly time, as it has seen deaths, over the previous decades, of Queen Elizabeth, Queen Anne, and now King James (31-32). All of these deaths have left England particularly open to the twin threats of foreign Catholic powers and what Price would have seen as the corruption of the English church by corrupt ceremonies. It was for this reason that Price sees the accession of Charles as a particularly important time. Instead of simply praising James, Price offers Charles a warning that if he fails to pray for prosperity in the same way that David does in Psalm 118, he risks becoming a second Jehoiakim who allows the church to become corrupted and presides over England’s own Babylonian captivity at the hands of the forces of international Catholicism.

In his funeral sermon preached at Denmark House on May 3rd, Phineas Hodson makes a similar argument to Price’s about the role of the monarch in religious affairs. Though his language is certainly less inflammatory than Price’s, his sermon still mounts an effective attack on the increased ceremonialization of the English church that the godly feared would accompany Charles’s accession to the throne. Hodson portrays James as a typological reenactment of Moses

who performed a prophetic role in promoting the church, and treats Charles as a prospective Jacob who should lead a crusade against England's Catholic enemies.²⁸ Hodson's exhortation that Charles become an English Joshua depends entirely on the preacher's construction of James as an English Moses who has led the nation in a prophetic capacity. He bases his commemoration of James on Joshua 1.2, which Hodson describes as the "*Funerall [Sermon]*" God preaches for Moses (4).²⁹ Hodson uses this verse to make three main arguments: first, to suggest the possibility that elaborate religious ceremony could easily become a center for idolatrous practices; second, to portray James's laudable religious policies as the following of a prophetic calling; third, to suggest that Charles should conquer the Canaan of Catholic Europe.

The first of these arguments sets the stage for Hodson's critique of the ceremonialist wing of the Church. Hodson admits that "solemnities at Funerals" are both "act[s] of civility" and "act[s] of faith and religion, as thereby teaching others" (5), but he limits his praise of burial rites sharply. Burial is praiseworthy only to the extent that it is "a godly and charitable work" like that described in the Bible regarding the "place, pompe, care, cost of embalming the bodies of the *Patriarkes*" and "the *women* in he Gospel [...] approued for their intended care to our *Sauours* bodie" (6). Even this much pomp, however, is justifiable only if it does not lead worshippers away from obedience to divine law. Hodson uses the example of Moses to argue that extraordinary individuals should have only the most modest funeral ceremonies lest they become the foci for idolatrous practices. As he puts it, Moses's

²⁸ Shami gives a particularly apt description of Hodson's sermon, calling it a sermon "whose invention and style are pedestrian" but that "[expose] the frustration of the godly, in the process suggesting just how strained the positive rhetoric used to describe James actually was at the time of his death" (268). Though he was one of James's godly preachers, Hodson was evidently less radical than Price.

²⁹ "Moses my seruant is dead: now therefore arise" (Geneva Joshua 1.2 Aiiiiiiv). Throughout the sermon, Hodson uses the Geneva translation.

Buriall was not ordinary, other men had *Sepulchures*, as monuments of their mortality; *Moses* had none, lest his *body* should haue beene *abused to Idolatry*. Others haue *Sepulchers*, to shew they haue beene; *Moses* had none, lest he should haue beene thought that, which hee was not, and adored for a Deity. And more honorable it was for *Moses* he had none, then for others, when they are most sumptuous [...] (5).³⁰

Hodson's point is that he attacks the material accoutrements of the funeral service, the body and the sepulcher, which are ritual objects that might become the focus for fears of possible idolatry. The funeral sermon God preaches to Joshua, on the other hand, carries none of these idolatrous taints, being described instead as "Commemoration" and "honourable recognition" (4) that carry the true "Commission" of God to Joshua (3). By imitating Joshua's sermon, Hodson justifies militant Protestant methods of commemoration that he inherited from previous generations of funeral preachers and funeral elegists.

Hodson's contrast between God's funeral sermon for Moses and the absence of ritual objects associated with the prophet carries two historical applications. First, it censures Charles and his supporters, whose elaborate preparations for James's funeral could easily be seen as idolatrous and less "honourable" than Moses's unknown grave (5). More importantly, however, the condemnation of ritual objects and the praise of preaching allows Hodson to present two opposed visions of the English church, one built on direct preaching to worshippers and the other based on an increased level of ceremonial worship. In contrast to the ritual trappings of funeral ceremony that encourage idolatry and threaten Moses being "adored for a Deity" (5), the funeral

³⁰ Hodson here refers to the Geneva gloss to Deuteronomy 34.6, which attributes Moses's secret burial to God's wish to keep the Israelites from any "occasion thereby to commit idolatrie" (A4v).

sermon preached for Moses provides a fit place for both the “testimony of” the dead and a divine “commission” that the living Joshua uphold the religious law of Israel “*which Moses my seruant commanded*” (3).

Hodson bases his own commission to Charles on this paraphrase of Joshua 1.7, in which God charges Joshua with following Moses’s religious laws precisely.³¹ Hodson, however, interprets God’s charge that Joshua follow the law precisely as a divine mandate to pursue a policy of moderation in religious affairs. He then uses this interpretation of the verse to argue that Charles pursue a moderate religious policy that marginalizes the demands of both militant Protestants and the avant-garde ceremonialists associated with Laud.³² Accordingly, Hodson focuses his praise of James on the king’s ability to keep peace within the church. As he puts it, James should be praised both because he “represented *Moses his Zeale*” (22) as well as for being “as great a *Peace-maker*” as “*Moses [was] a great Warrior*” (20). James’s combination of zeal and peacemaking abilities is clearest in his conduct as head of the church in Scotland and Ireland:

In these, I say, hee restored *one Church*, and in effect new planted another; hee restored *Scotland*, and how did he do this? By wresting from the possessours such titles as they had gotten to their reuenues? No, but by restitution of what the

³¹ “Onely be thou strong, and of a moste valiant courage, that thou maiest obserue and do according to all the Lawe which Moses my seruant hathe commanded thee: thou shalt not turne away from it to the right hande, nor to the left, that thou maiest prosper whethersoever thou goest.”

³² This moderation is a little surprising, given the fact that Hodson sympathized with the godly part of the English church enough to conclude his funeral sermon with a call for an open and apocalyptic battle between England and the Catholic powers on the Continent. However, Hodson seems to use a bit more tact here than Price does in his own funeral sermon for James, hoping that Charles might be convinced into following moderate religious policy. Considering the trends in religious patronage over the last years of James reign, this is probably the most that Hodson could have hoped for.

Crowne had gotten; by purchase and redemption vpon valuable consideration, out of his owne coffers, he restored and settled the *torne Church of Scotland*: so as now it beareth the goodly face of a *glorious Church*. And by new endowments, shere the old could not bee recovered, hee founded many both *Bishopricks* and *Churches* in Ireland. (21-22)

Hodson uses this description of James's religious campaign to exalt a moderate religious policy. In James's restoration of the Scottish church, it is clear that the imposition of episcopal government is part of James's success, as it takes power away from both rapacious nobles and militant Protestants who have usurped the "reuenues" of the church. At the same time, however, Hodson does not describe James's reformation of the Scottish church as a purge of its former members. Instead of "wresting" religious titles from their Scottish "possessours," James used his own revenues to improve the church's material wealth. Most importantly, Hodson does not describe any overarching change in the liturgy of the Scottish church, a focus that continues in his treatment of James's establishment of the Irish church.³³ Here, it is important that James founds both "*Bishoprickes*" as well as "*Parish Churches*" in Ireland, a division of power that provides for both a strong preaching clergy as well as a strong organization that encourages the church's growth in hostile climates like the largely Roman Catholic Ireland.

According to Hodson, then, James's greatest accomplishment was the maintenance of a moderate religious policy that ensured the unity of the English political body, and the imitation of this policy was what would enable Charles to rule in line with the religious laws laid down by

³³ The omission seems odd given James's 1618 passage of the Five Articles of Perth, which sought to "bring worship in Scotland closer into line with English practice," but this omission can probably be explained by James's willingness to "minimize confrontations over such issues" throughout his reign (Benedict 387).

the English Moses. However, by comparing Charles to Joshua, Hodson is able to advance the religious and political agenda of militant Protestant interventionists. Though Charles had played a large role in turning James towards a policy of war against Spain, Hodson and other militant Protestants felt that the war had to be prosecuted in the right way.³⁴ It was only by imitating Joshua by maintaining the religious law that Charles could carry out a holy war with any hope of succeeding. According to Hodson, Joshua's religious loyalty gave him the power "that at his word the *Sunne and Moone stood still till hee was auenged on his enemies*" (25).³⁵ Hodson applies Joshua's ability to make the sun and moon stand still to the contemporary political and religious situation by referring to Roman Catholic texts that "make the *Pope the Sunne*, and the *Emperor the Moone*" (25). The proper application for Charles's new power to make the sun and moon stand still is in an invasion of the continent to

bee auenged of the *blood of those Saints*, which hath been so prodigally shed; and till *Those* of his owne *Royall blood* be deliuered from the oppressions, which now they suffer, and bee restored to those *Inheritances* and honors, which haue so violently beene torne from them. (26)

Hodson's reference is "specifically for the restoration of the Palatinate to Frederick and Elizabeth" (Shami 268), but Hodson clearly sees this as the first stage in a Protestant crusade that would see the English Joshua lead the armies of European Protestantism to "thrust the vsurper,"

³⁴ According to Cogswell, Charles's and Buckingham's belligerence after their return from Madrid played a large role in changing James's mind about maintaining peaceful relations with the Spanish (58-59).

³⁵ Hodson paraphrases Joshua 10.12-13, in which Joshua prays for the sun and moon to stand still so that he and his army can pursue and execute five Cannanite kings who declared war on Gibeon for allying with the Israelites.

or the Pope, “out of his seat” (Hodson 26). By ending on this blatantly military note, Hodson reveals his sympathies with militant Protestant interventionists in the English government who wished to intervene on behalf of the European Protestants who were already fighting the Thirty-Years War, and articulates an ideal of religious moderation at home that would support Protestant crusade abroad.

As warrior kings and prophets, David, Moses, and Joshua provide Price and Hodson with the perfect biblical models for activist monarchs engaged in battle against the Roman Catholic Antichrist. For John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, and John Donne, the two preachers of funeral sermons supporting ceremonial worship, Solomon provided the opportunity to preach on two topics. First, by using Solomon as their biblical figure for the ideal king, both preachers were able to make arguments that the king occupied a key role as supreme head of the English church by using early modern theories of sacral monarchy, as described by Shuger and McCoy.³⁶ Second, Solomon’s temple and his elevation of the priesthood at the expense of prophetic preaching allow both Williams and Donne to support a ceremonialist conception of the English

³⁶ Simply stated, sacral monarchy refers to the increasing tendency from the middle of the sixteenth-century onward to view monarchs as the source of sacred power in society; rather than acting as the protectors of the church, monarchs became its center. According to McCoy, the proscription of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the suppression of the mass forced worshippers to find an alternative focus for devotion (McCoy, *Alterations* 11-15). By appropriating the sacred presence previously embodied in the elevated host, Tudor and Stuart monarchs became the “sovereign [reformers] and [embodiments] of the realm’s temporal and spiritual health” (Shuger, *Political Theologies* 3) and were assigned “almost messianic authority” (16). Though Elizabeth made use of this ideology in her cult of personality in the late 16th century, it achieved its height under James and Charles I. As Shuger summarizes James’s thought, “the assertion of the king’s divinity underlies his claim to absolute power” (*Habits* 153). See Richard McCoy’s *Alterations of State: Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation*, Deborah Shuger’s *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance* and *Political Theologies in Shakespeare’s England: The Sacred and the State in Measure for Measure*.

church. Solomon, then, provides Williams and Donne with the perfect opportunity to place the king at the center of England's religious and political life.³⁷

Solomon's importance for Charles's consolidation of religious as well as political power is nowhere more evident than in John Williams's sermon preached at James's funeral ceremony, which exalts the religious status of the material accessories of worship and the position of the monarch at the center of religious life.³⁸ Though Williams was no Laudian, and indeed opposed Laud's proposals later in Charles's reign (Woodward 175), in this sermon, the bishop comes down squarely on the side of a highly ceremonial worship with the king as its focus.³⁹

Williams's doctrinal concerns are clear from his description of James as "a liuely *image*" (Williams 3). As both Shami and Woodward note, this is a controversial term in the context of early modern debates over idolatry, and Shami is right when she describes Williams as

³⁷ Solomon was a favorite figure for preachers discussing the powers of monarchs; in Elizabeth's reign, innumerable preachers used Solomon to praise the queen's reign, and James was praised as a new English Solomon at his accession (Woodward 176).

³⁸ John Williams. *Great Britains Salomon*. London: John Bill, 1625. The sermon is clearly connected to the larger ceremonial focus of James's funeral ceremony. According to Woodward, the "sheer length of James's funeral address is indicative of its importance in the ritual proceedings; it lasted for two hours" (175) and the sermon makes constant reference to the fully articulated effigy of the king that "was present in [Westminster] Abbey" and played a starring role in the funeral ceremonies (176). What Woodward does not mention is that the published edition of the sermon is an elaborate monument to James's memory as well, as it includes an elaborate portrait of James dressed in his monarchical regalia before the title page.

³⁹ Despite his later opposition to Laud, Williams seems to have been the perfect spokesman for the late-Jacobean and early-Caroline conception of the respective roles of preaching and ceremony in the church. According to Woodward, "Williams was [...] the epitome of Jacobean moderation" who "combined attendance at the sermons of the Puritan William Perkins with support for the discipline and ceremonies of the Church of England" (175). Shami states that Williams "did not find favour with Charles [...] as a result of this sermon" (269) despite the facts that it clearly articulates the case for "ceremony" in religious practice and that it was printed by the king's printer as part of the propaganda campaign surrounding the funeral (268).

“unabashedly [invoking] the devotional connotations of these words, drifting much closer to the Catholic use of images” (268).⁴⁰

What Shami and Woodward do not discuss, however, is the way that Williams uses the figure of Solomon to portray the ceremonialist worship service of the English church as the true apostolic church in contrast to “*Papists*” and “*Nouellists*” (46). Though Williams praises Solomon, and through him James, for a variety of regal attributes,⁴¹ he uses the sermon primarily as a forum for defending conformity to the ceremonies of the English church. From the relatively straightforward summary of Solomon’s reign and funeral in 1 Kings 11.41-43,⁴² Williams makes a figural connection between Solomon’s and James’s religious policies that exalts the episcopal and ceremonialist version of the English church as the true heir of apostolic church.⁴³ As Williams puts it, he allows the figure of Solomon to “lend *King James a Tombe*,” that the English church will receive with the “happinesse of the Queene of the *South*” (8). By drawing on the traditional allegorical link between the Queen of Sheba and the true church, and the interpretation of Solomon as “a *Type of Christ* himself” (3), Williams promotes the ceremonies of the English church as true religion supported by a sacralized monarch.

⁴⁰ In contrast, see Daniel Price’s condemnation of idolatry in both his funeral sermon for James and his sermons after the death of Prince Henry, in which he “[condemns] the idolatry of those who creep before statues and images” (Shami 268). In acknowledging the controversial nature of Williams’s comparison, Shami is much more convincing here than Woodward, who ascribes Williams’s use of this terminology as an indication of “the extent to which image-making had been rehabilitated by the official church” rather than to a deliberate and provocative stance on doctrinal matters (176).

⁴¹ These include both kings’ qualities of wisdom, as peacemakers, rulers of expansive kingdoms, and as erudite patrons of the art.

⁴² “And the rest of the words of Salomon, and all that he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the Book of the Acts of Salomon? And the time that Salomon reigned in Hierusalem over all Israel, was forty yeeres. And Salomon slept with his Fathers, and was buried in the Citie of Daud his Father” (A1v). Throughout his sermon, Williams uses the 1611 Authorized Version of the Bible, which is appropriate given his consistent praise of James’s religious accomplishments.

⁴³ In using the funeral ceremonies of his biblical figure, Williams’s sermon is startlingly similar to Hodson’s violently iconoclastic use of Moses’s funeral sermon in his own sermon for James.

In his discussion of Solomon's funeral, Williams makes a clear argument for the spiritual efficacy of the material. Williams describes Solomon's death as a happy one partly because his body was "no way despised, or neglected, but solemnly interred in the *Sepulchers* of the *Kings*, in the *Tower of Sion*, and the *Citie of David his Father*" (5). This is important for two reasons. First, being buried with David marks Solomon as one of "the better Kings" (33), and for Williams's purposes, the fact that Solomon was "solemnly interred as a great *Prince*" provides biblical warrant for James's own elaborate funeral ceremony (33). More importantly, however, Williams argues that the nature of the ceremony itself is a gauge of Solomon's status in the afterlife: "*Salomons sleeping* in this place was not to rot with his Fathers in the *graue*, but to lie with them in the Kingdome of Heauen" (32).

From this mention of Solomon's presumed salvation, Williams argues that physical ceremonies have a definite spiritual efficacy. Solomon, according to Williams, deserved salvation because he understood that the proper use of religious ceremony both marks a proper respect for God and has spiritual efficacy in the lives of believers. In contrast to more militant Protestants who preferred to concentrate on the spiritual state of the deceased, Williams argues "the *Bodies* of *Saints* must bee respected, as *Phideas* his *Images* were wont to be; not for the *Stuffe*, but for the *Makers* sake" (34).⁴⁴ Williams again uses the deliberately provocative word "Image" here in order to emphasize the role of the body as a visible focus for religious veneration: "this Body of his, so *glorified* by God while he was *aliue*, must be glorified in some proportion, although he bee *dead*" (34). Moreover, Williams argues that funeral ceremonies have a salutary effect on onlookers. As he puts it, "[t]he *Buriall* of the Dead is a lesson to the *Liuing*, to put them in mind of the *Resurrection*" (34). In this, Williams appears to agree with

⁴⁴ Incidentally, Williams's placement of the classical reference to Phideas on the same plane as his biblical references recalls John Fisher's pre-Reformation sermon for Henry VII.

more aggressive Protestants who argued that the only justification for funeral sermons was to preach healthy doctrine, but Williams argues that bodily resurrection is just as important as spiritual. As he puts it, “we *Christians* must bee more carefull, where we lay these cloathes, being to weare them againe in the *Resurrection*” (35). Rather than seeing the body and religious ceremony as temptations toward iconophilia, Williams argues that they are necessary for believers to forge a connection with God. Accordingly, Solomon exemplifies the proper use of religious ceremony to both honor God and to edify worshippers in his own treatment of his father’s body. Indeed, Williams argues that Solomon proved himself worthy of salvation because of his proper observance of funeral ceremonies. As Williams puts it, “[a]mongt other magnificencies of his owne, hee built this *Sepulchre* of *Dauid* his Father, and therefore was rightly interred in the Sepulchre of his *Father*” (34), an act that illustrates Solomon’s respect for God and his assurance of his own salvation and gives Williams proof of Solomon’s righteousness.

Williams draws a parallel, then, between Solomon’s foundation of David’s sepulcher and James’s conduct of the church because these activities “in the *Church Militant* [...] prepare a Soule for the *Church Triumphant*” (42) and allow Solomon and James to meet their religious obligations of using their “*Kingdomes* to fit, and praepare men for [God’s] *Kingdome*” (46). James’s funeral, then, becomes James’s last opportunity, and Charles’s first opportunity, to meet their obligations to religious life by commemorating James’s patronage of the doctrine, discipline, and physical structure of the church. The contemplation of “the Statue, and Repraesentation of our *Brittish Salomon*” at the funeral itself becomes a ceremonial acknowledgement that the ceremonialist vision of the English church is a fulfillment of the Temple of Solomon (46).

Williams describes this ideal English temple in decidedly material terms, in which proper discipline of the body of the church forms the superstructure through which proper theology can be dispensed. As Williams puts it, worshippers should “*imagine Discipline to be the Walls, Maintenance the roofe, and couer, true Doctrine the sweet perfume, and Incense of the Temple, and you haue Salomons first Act before your eyes, the Building of Gods House*” (53).⁴⁵ In James’s reenactment of Solomon’s Temple in England, then, it is his disciplining of the church that takes center stage.⁴⁶ According to Williams, the thrust of James’s policy from the beginning of his reign, has been to defend the church “*against the Nouellists*” who threatened the stability of Episcopal government and the worship of the Prayer Book (46). Williams states this ideal in no uncertain terms; it consists of “*the Hierarchie of the Bishops, and the vse of Chapters, and Cathedrall Churches, as a gouernment recieued from Christ, and his Apostles*” (50). For Williams, the claim to the apostolic succession is an important one, as it places James, as the preserver of the direct line from Christ to the English church, in a position of unparalleled power and righteousness in opposition to the adherents of the “*new Discipline*” of Presbyterianism (51).

⁴⁵ In keeping with this materialist and monarch-centered church is Williams’s discussion of the people in charge of it. Instead of venerating the prophets as speakers against overweening royal authority, as more radically Protestant preachers like Price consistently portrayed them, Williams portrays prophets as the servants of the crown, as the “*three famous Prophets, famous in the their times, Nathan, Abias, and Addo had their seueral pens in the Acts of Salomon; the Booke of the Acts of Salomon. And indeed Bookes, especially such as these, written by Prophets, and Honest men, are most necessary both for applauding of the good, and the terrifying of ill-deseruing Princes*” (18-19). In a similar fashion, Williams stresses that it is the priests in charge of the ceremonial worship in the English church, the “*House of Leui*” that should praise James (46).

⁴⁶ Williams does, of course, mention James’s religious policies opposing Roman Catholicism, as his “*Translation of the Bible*” is directed “*against the Papists*” (46) and he claims that James “*in all the time I seru’d him, did neuer out of deepe, and iust reason of State, and the bitter necessities of Christendome in these latter times, giue way to any the least Connivence in the world, towards the person of a Papist*” (49). However, Williams seems to make these assurances to attack the concerns of opponents of the Spanish Match, and he devotes far greater time in the sermon to defending ceremonial worship from Presbyterians.

In contrast to episcopal government, Williams portrays presbyterian discipline as a politically contingent sect that, at best, is subject to the whims of political partisans, and, at worst, tends towards anarchy. Williams discusses this idea in terms of the “Abberations” of the Scottish church, that allowed James to “*be lawfully surprised by three Earles*” in 1583, protected preachers from the control of “*King, or Councell*”, forbade James “*to pray for his Mother*” in 1586, and attempted to “*call Synods without the King, and Make Lawes too*” (51). The picture that Williams paints of presbyterian Scotland is of a kingdom turned upside down, in which fractious preachers and nobles have brought about a state of chaos. In contrast, Williams describes the English church, with its organization around the rule of bishops and its use of the Prayer Book as “the only *Discipline* that euer agreed with the *Fundamentall Lawes* of any *Christian Monarchie*” (50).

Williams makes it clear that even though this ceremonial church is the heir to the apostolic church, the monarch occupies a privileged place at the center of the church hierarchy as the source of correct doctrine. Williams makes this point by comparing Solomon’s and James’s “*Eloquence*,” particularly their religious writing. Part of Solomon’s preeminence among the Old Testament kings, according to Williams, came because he is a veritable font of religious works, including “the *Prouerbs*; the *Booke of Wisdome*; and *Ecclesiasticus* [...] together with *Ecclesiastes*, the *Canticles*, and many of the *Psalms*” (11). According to Williams, James is a fit reenactment of Solomon in this area because “[i]n his *Style* you may obserue the *Ecclesiastes*, in his *Figures* the *Canticles*, in his *Sentences* the *Prouerbs*, and in his whole *Discourse* [...] all the rest that was admirable in the *Eloquence of Salomon*” (41). Though Williams notes that both Solomon and James use their religious speech “for the *praise* of God” (42), the effect of his description of each monarch as being divinely inspired in his speech is to sacralize the monarch and make him the center of the religious life of the nation, not simply the protector of true

religion, but the source of true religion. Given Woodward's assertion that Charles and his advisors sought to create a *religion royal* that would place him firmly at the center of English political and religious life, it is no surprise that Williams would discuss him in connection to Solomon in this manner (Woodward 194).

Given Williams's position as a theological moderate and his later opposition to Laud, his absolutist application of the figure of Solomon is somewhat ironic. What is more ironic, however, is the fact that John Donne, who has recently been interpreted as a staunch supporter of absolutist politics, applies the same biblical king to James in a far less absolutist fashion. Donne's funeral sermon for James is important because it helps to illuminate one of the major debates current in Donne studies, Donne's political orientation in regards to absolutist theories of the monarchy.⁴⁷ In contrast to Williams, Donne uses Solomon to make a complicated intervention into the religious and political debate surrounding Charles's accession in which he both supports the use of elaborate ceremonies in the English Church, and argues for some limits on the power of the monarch in relation to the church. If Williams's formulation of the

⁴⁷ According to Shuger and other new historicists like John Carey and Jonathan Goldberg, Donne was an adherent of James's absolutist policies, and "consistently and insistently deploys language associated with absolute monarchy in his treatment of the divine" (Shuger, *Habits of Thought* 164). Goldberg uses the sermon as evidence "Donne's self-constitution is absolutist [...] the court is the center and the only reality of society" (219). James, then, is "God's image" and "God's instrument" on earth, so that "[t]he dead body of the king is an equal authority to the text in which the name of Solomon represents Christ" (215). Shami and Levy-Navarro, on the other hand, argue that the sermon is as sign of Donne's lack of absolutist political beliefs, with Levy Navarro arguing that Donne "proves to be more interested in the well being of the Church of England than in the well being of the monarchy" ("Goe forth" 163) and Shami reading Donne as moderating political absolutism, arguing that Donne believes "that authority resides in the institution rather than the person" (267). My position falls somewhere in the middle; though Donne certainly argues for the primacy of the church, the fact that he uses Solomon as his figure for the king does emphasize the notion that the monarch plays an integral role in the maintenance of the church and its ceremonies. See John Carey's *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art*, Shami, Shuger's *Habits of Thought*, Elena Levy-Navarro's "'Goe forth ye daughters of Sion': Divine Authority, the King, and the Church in Donne's Denmark House Sermon," and Jonathan Goldberg's *James I and the Politics of Literature*.

relationship between church and monarch comes close to relegating the church to the position of supporting the monarch, Donne makes it clear that the monarch's status as "God's image" and "God's instrument" on earth (Goldberg 215) depends on his or her role in maintaining the "classic Jacobean and Donnean position between extremes" of Puritan and Roman Catholic (Shami 266).⁴⁸

Donne both supports church ceremony and subordinates the monarchy to the church by basing his sermon on the celebration of the marriage between Solomon and the Queen of Sheba in Song of Solomon 3.11.⁴⁹ Donne follows the traditional reading of the Song of Solomon as an allegory for Christ's marriage to the church, but his use of this particular verse allows him to emphasize the agency of the institution of the church in this spiritual marriage.⁵⁰ As Donne puts it, the speaker of the verse "is the *Church*, the *spouse* of Christ" (280), the daughters of Sion are

⁴⁸ Though many critics have argued that Donne supported absolutist politics and that he allowed his need for political patronage to affect his political and theological positions, Donne actually followed a fairly moderate theological path throughout his poetic and preaching career. Donne's consistent moderation has led to as much discussion of the theological biases of Donne's poetry as his sermons, with critics like Carey arguing that Donne's *Holy Sonnets* reveal the poet's guilt about his apostasy from the Roman Catholic Church (43), and others like P.M. Oliver arguing that Donne's shifting theological opinions reveal nothing more than his desperate need for patronage to support his family (41). However, the evidence of poems like the Holy Sonnet "Show me deare Christ" and "A Litanie" seem to reveal that theological moderation was long one of Donne's goals. Indeed, Shami and Levy-Navarro offer a compelling description of "Donne's vision for the Church of England" being a moderate vision that "meant that he resisted the pressure to radicalize" his preaching (Shami 2) in order to "[develop] strategies to repair" the "divisions in the church, widening in the 1620s" (Levy-Navarro, "Breaking Down" 273). See P.M. Oliver's *Donne's Religious Writing: A Discourse of Feigned Devotion*, and Levy-Navarro's "Breaking Down the Walls that Divide: Anti-Polemicism in the Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions."

⁴⁹ "Goe forth ye daughters of Sion, and behold King Solomon, with the crown, wherewith his mother crowned him, in the day of his espousals, and in the day of the gladnesse of his heart" (Donne 280). Donne uses the 1611 Authorized Version of the text.

⁵⁰ The allegory was just as often used in early modern biblical scholarship to refer to the relationship between Christ and the individual soul as between Christ and the church as a whole (Shuger, *Renaissance Bible* 172).

“the obedient children of the Church, that hearken to her voice” (280), and “*Solomon crowned*” is “Christ invested with the royall dignity of being *Head of the Church*” (280-281).

Donne proceeds to describe the church in terms that define it as an absolutist institution that mediates all believers’ experiences of the divine.⁵¹ Donne makes this point by comparing the church to the maintenance of a royal household in which the orders of the monarch are passed down a chain of command to the servants at the bottom of the hierarchy:

Now, as it were a contempt in the *Kings house*, for any servant to refuse any thing, except he might heare the King in person command it, when the King hath already so established the government of his house, as that his commandments are to be signified by his great Officers (281).

Because of this hierarchical organization, believers should not expect “that God should speak to us *mouth to mouth, spirit to spirit, by Inspiration, by Revelation*, for it is a large mercy, that he hath constituted an Office, and established a Church, in which we should heare him” (281). The organization of the church, then, takes over the role of direct divine inspiration that “fell upon *Christ, at his Baptism*” and “upon the *Apostles* (who were the *representative Church*) at *Whitsontide*” (282).⁵²

Donne uses the apostolic charge given in Matthew 18.17-18 to emphasize that absolute obedience to the doctrinal and ceremonial dictates of the church is required for believers to be

⁵¹ It is this description of the church that leads to Goldberg’s contention that the sermon is a sign of Donne’s absolutist temperament.

⁵² Donne here cites Matthew 17.5, the appearance of the Holy Spirit at the Transfiguration.

considered faithful daughters of Sion.⁵³ Again, Donne describes the duty of the believer in terms of submission to an absolutist authority; believers are required to “submit [...] to the authority of the Church expressed in the Scriptures” and are told that “in what fetters soever” church authorities “*binde* you, you shall rise bound in those fetters” (282). The fetters that Donne describes here are entirely restricted to the ceremonies of the established church, which become the medium through which believers show their loyalty to God. Believers, Donne says, “cannot divest [their] loyalty to the *Church*” any “more then [they] can to the *State*” because the church has literally created them as individuals “within the *Covenant* of God” through the ceremonies of baptism, catechism, preaching, and communion (283), with even the ceremony of “*Christian burial* [giving] a man a good rise, a good help, a good advantage” in the attainment of resurrection (284). The faithful observance of these ceremonies will allow Donne’s listeners to become reenactments of the daughters of Sion in his text. They will “*Goe forth, and behold Solomon*” as long as they

Despise not her person, nor her apparell; Do not say, *she is not the same woman, she was heretofore, nor that she is not so well dressed, as she was then*; Dispute not her *Doctrine*, Despise not her *Discipline*; that as you *sucked her breasts* in your *Baptism*, and in the *other Sacrament*, when you entred, and whilst you stayd in this life, so you may *lie in her bosome*, when you goe out of it. (284)

⁵³ These verses primarily describe the administrative abilities in the church that Christ gave to the apostles: “And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (KJV Matthew 18.17-18).

By using the maternal image, moreover, Donne moves his conception of the English church significantly away from the conceptions of royal absolutism. Instead of being a controlling presence, the Church becomes a nurturing one for both individual believers as well as for England as a whole.

At the same time that he enjoins ceremonial observance on his listeners, however, Donne offers his definition of the English Church as a happy medium between the extremes of Roman Catholicism and Puritanism. This is evident from his plea that believers not attack the “apparel,” or the ceremonial dress of true religion; those who “say, *she is not the same woman, she was heretofore, nor that she is not so well dressed, as she was then*” is a clear reference to Laudians who wished to institute a more sweeping receremonialization of the Church.⁵⁴ On the other hand, Donne also castigates Puritans who might “Despise [...] her *Discipline*.” Each of these groups, according to Donne’s definition, show “an ambitious pride, that they might enjoy a licentious liberty” through their “aptnesse to quarrel at the proceedings of the Church” (282).

Donne makes his moderate ideal even clearer by linking the English Church with the God’s commandments as mentioned by Moses in Deuteronomy 30.13.⁵⁵ According to Donne,

the word of God is not beyond Sea; so the Church of God, is not so beyond Sea that we must needs seek it there, either in a painted Church, on one side, or in a naked Church, on another; a Church in a Dropsie, overflowne with Ceremonies, or a Church in a Consumption, for want of such Ceremonies as the primitive

⁵⁴ As well as to recusant Catholics, for whom no amount of receremonialization would be acceptable unless it were accompanied by submission to Rome.

⁵⁵ According to Deuteronomy 30.13, Moses says of God’s commandment, “Neither *is* it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it?”

Church found usefull, and beneficiall for the advancing of the glory of God, and the devotion of the Congregation. (284)

Donne here covers the same ground as he does in the Holy Sonnet “Show me deare Christ” by positing the English church, with its episcopal form of government and its ceremonial forms of worship, as the true heir of the “primitive Church,” with the foreign forms of Roman Catholicism and militant Calvinism being branded as diseased and foreign offshoots of the main branch of Christianity that “take heed of opinions vented by a *few new men*, which have not had the establishment of a Church” (285) and thus become either “*Idolatrous Chapels*” in imitation of Roman Catholic churches (284) or “*schismaticall Conventicles*” (284-5) that are severed irrevocably from the main body of the true church.

Donne’s concern in the sermon, however, is to explicate the benefits of church ceremonial for believers rather than preaching on the benefits of an absolutist church for maintaining political order.⁵⁶ As Donne describes them, the point of the English church’s ceremonies is to encourage worshippers to “tread in *ashes*, in the ways of holy sorrow, and *religious humiliation*” and to engage in serious self-reflection (285).⁵⁷ His ultimate biblical figure for church ceremonies emphasizes the role of ceremonies in purification and in

⁵⁶ Donne’s moderation should not be surprising, given that he took a consistently moderate approach towards ceremony throughout his preaching career. As an example, see Donne’s approach to the debate over kneeling, which became a flashpoint for debate over “liturgical and episcopalian conformity” in the early 1620s (Rhatigan 185). Rhatigan shows that though “Donne accepted the serious implications of outward conformity” (186), he hewed a moderate line between arch-ceremonialists like Launcelot Andrewes and Puritans like Joseph Hall, and consistently argued that church ceremonies were necessary for “the exalting of [believers’] devotion” (206). See Emma Rhatigan’s “Knees and Elephants: Donne Preaches on Ceremonial Conformity.” For a more extensive discussion of the place of debates over kneeling in the larger debate over church ceremony, see Lori Anne Ferrell’s “Kneeling and the Body Politic.”

⁵⁷ Donne here links true religion to “*Daniel’s way*” in *Bel and the Dragon* 14, in which the prophet strews ashes in the temple of Bel to expose the cult of Bel as an idolatrous fraud perpetrated by fraudulent priests.

encouraging the need for self-reflection, as he compares it to the “*looking-glasses*” placed by Moses “in the Old Temple, *In, or about that laver of brasse*, where the water, for the uses of the Church was reserved” so that worshippers “entering into the Temple” could “make use of that water, if they had contracted any foulness, in any part about them (286).⁵⁸ The ceremonies of the church provide worshippers with the means to engage in self-reflection and purify themselves from sin in order to gain a closer relationship with God.⁵⁹

Given his emphasis on issues of dominance and humiliation in his discussion of church ceremonies, however, Donne’s use of the figure of Solomon is surprising. Instead of following the traditional Jacobean use of Solomon as support for sacral monarchy, or following militant Protestants like Price and Hodson in presenting the ideal king as an activist prophet, Donne uses the typological connection between “*Solomon crowned*” and “Christ invested with the royall dignity of being *Head of the Church*” to present an ideal of the monarch as a model of humility (280-281). Instead of being a reformer who constantly tinkers with the ceremonies of the church, the monarch best fulfills his function as head of the church when he is a peacemaker and when he imitates Christ in his humiliation.

Donne accomplishes his goal by focusing less on the actual character of Solomon, whom he barely mentions in the sermon, and more on the typological meanings of the linked images of Solomon’s crown and his marriage in Cantic 3.11. According to Donne, both crown and marriage are ceremonies typologically linked with Christ’s passion, with Solomon’s crown a type of “Christ’s crown of *Thornes*, his *Humiliation*, his *Passion*” (281) and Solomon’s marriage a type of Christ’s “*uniting of himselfe to this Spouse*, in his becoming *Head of the Church*” (288). In each case, however, Donne uses the typological connection to Solomon not as a way of

⁵⁸ Donne refers here to Exodus 38.8,

⁵⁹ The fact that the ceremonies are only a “*glasse*,” however, indicates that they have no intrinsic salvific benefit; instead, they only reflect God’s glory.

glorifying Christ's marriage, but as illustrations that Christ's union with the church constitutes a diminution in Christ's status and a conscious act of submission to the institutional needs of the church. The crown described in Donne's text, for example, is far from being a sign of Christ's glorification. Instead, "the *Crown*, wherewith *his Mother crowned him*" is "his humane nature" and constitutes a significant slide in status from "that glory, wherewith he was glorified, with the Father" (287). More importantly, however, Donne describes Christ's marriage to the church not as Christ's glorious union with believers but as Christ's submission to death. As Donne puts it,

He is the *Head* of this body, the *Bridegroom* of his Bride, the Head of this Church, as he is *The first-borne of the Dead*; Death, that dissolves all ours, made up this marriage. His Death is his Marriage, and upon his Death flowed out from his side, those two *Elements of the Church*, *water* and *bloud*; The Sacraments of *Baptisme* and of the *Communion* of himself. (288)

Donne's treatment of Christ's self-sacrifice has two main effects. First, his description of the crucifixion as the source of baptism and communion validates these ceremonies as theologically appropriate methods of remembering and reenacting Christ's suffering on the individual level. As Donne puts it, believers can assure themselves of salvation only by attempting to make themselves into reenactments of Christ by "conforming [themselves] to his *holy sadnesse*, and *humiliation*" (289). Baptism and communion provide the tools for this conformity, as the first sacrament provides for the entrance of the believer into Christ's "*Institution*" and the second sacrament provides a ritual that shows that a believer "hath conformed himself to Christ, in fulfilling his *sufferings*" (288).

Donne's treatment of Christ's self-sacrifice also emphasizes Donne's opinion that the ideal monarch, acting in his or her role as head of the church, should submit him or herself to the established ceremonies of the church without introducing a large number of ceremonial innovations. This is clear partly from Christ's position in the sermon; though Donne described Jesus as a model of submission and self-sacrifice, he is always described in the paradoxical position of being the unquestioned head of the church. In addition, Donne's treatment of Solomon in the sermon supports this reading, as Donne never discusses Solomon as anything other than a type of Christ whose role as the leader of Israelite church is subordinated to his allegorical function. Rather than discussing Solomon's acts, he prefers to treat him as "an *appellative*; a significative word" in his chosen text. Here, "Solomon is *pacificus*, the *Peacemaker*" (286). The role of the monarch within the church, Donne suggests, is to provide for peace, which is best accomplished through the dutiful upholding of the ceremonies of the church, which, after all, were instituted by the apostles.

In his application of this ideal of monarchical behavior to James himself, then, Donne finds James to be praiseworthy for two main reasons. First, he describes James as a peacemaker who embodies the promise of Solomon and imitates Christ to the best of his abilities by holding "the *Keyes* of all the Christian world, and locked up, and let out, *Armies* in their due season" (290). Though Donne does mention James's abilities as a patron and as a curer of the sick, he emphasizes that the most important act of James's reign was his ability to "[balance] his *own three Kingdomes* so equally, as that none of them complained of one another, nor of him" (290).⁶⁰ Secondly, Donne describes James's death within the rituals of the English church as the proper way to die. Mourners, Donne writes, should interpret James as "an abridgement of that

⁶⁰ Donne, of course, overstates the case for James's peacemaking abilities, but at the very least, he accurately describes James's ability to keep his fragile territorial conglomeration from falling apart or being drawn into the Thirty Years War on the continent.

Solomon in the Text” (290). His crowning with eternal life has come about because the king has been “reconciled to God” through the ceremonies of absolution and communion: he has been “*signed with his hand in the Absolution, and sealed with his blood in the Sacrament*” (290).

In death, James becomes an encouragement for his subjects to participate in the ceremonies of the church and to become a more unified nation through a shared participation in these ceremonies. Instead of leaving the church as soon as they have “laid his Sacred body, in Consecrated Dust” (291), Donne encourages his listeners to mourn as a sign of loyalty to both James and the church that he represents: “till our teares flow to that heighth, that they might be called a *murmuring* against the declared will of God, it is against our Allegiance, it is *Disloyaltie*, to give our teares any stop, any termination, any measure” (290). Donne is more concerned with religious loyalty than political loyalty here, as he compares these actions to those of Anna from Luke 2.37, who “*departed not from the Temple, day nor night*” (290).⁶¹ This mourning is justifiable because “The *dead bodies* of his Saints are his Temples still” (290), and attendance on James’s body provides the opportunity for believers to contemplate their relationship with God in much the same way as contemplation of Christ’s crucifixion provides believers with a model for correct behavior.

Donne’s description of James presents him as entirely static. The king’s virtue is evident only from his own adherence to religious ceremonies and his posthumous role in encouraging onlookers to participate in the ceremonies of the church rather than through his activities regarding the church during his life. Donne’s radical reinterpretation of James, in opposition to the activist portrayals given by Williams, Price, and Hodson, has a particular relevance when considering Charles’s unknown intentions regarding the church. Donne’s plea for his listeners to

⁶¹ In this verse, Anna is described as a paragon of faithfulness who serves God faithfully after the death of her husband: “And she *was* a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served *God* with fastings and prayers night and day” (Luke 2.37).

mourn James is based on a fear of the social and religious dissolution that might come with the accession of Charles. He wishes his listeners to extend their mourning for James because the beginning of the new reign will inevitably involve courtiers

going forth in many severall wayes: some to the service of their *new Master*, and some to the enjoying of their Fortunes conferred by their old; some to the raising of new *Hopes*, some to the burying of old and all; some to new, and busie endeavours in Court, some to contented retirings in the Countrey. (291)

The threat of all this varied activity, according to Donne, is that England as a whole, and the church in particular, might lose its grasp on the peaceful moderation that Donne argues James strove to inculcate. Donne's use of Solomon, then, falls closer to Price's and Hodson's use of the *figurae* of David and Moses; though he does not want Charles to become an activist monarch vis-à-vis the church, he does use the biblical king in his funeral sermon as a warning for Charles to maintain the ideal that Donne felt that James had created.

Conclusion

By the end of James I's reign, the commemorative genres of the funeral sermon and the funeral elegy were firmly entrenched elements of English political and religious controversial writing. Between Charles I's accession and the Restoration, the numbers of published funeral sermons skyrocketed, with well over 300 being published between 1630 and 1670 alone.¹ As the 17th-century progressed, sermons and elegies became not only more numerous, but more open about their political and sectarian allegiances; "the Civil War created deep and open divisions" in the use of commemoration as political speech (Houlbrooke 320), and funeral sermons and elegies were key texts in the polemical arsenals of both "the Anglican establishment" and "the radical reformers who had been the erstwhile opponents of" commemoration (Tromly 311).²

In large part, it was the development of the literary technique of figural interpretation that made the increasing use of commemoration such an acceptable part of political and religious debate. Not only did the figural interpretation of the lives of the dead overcome the objections of early reformers like John Knox and Thomas Cartwright by giving praise a measure of scriptural warrant, but it also made the medium of praise an extremely flexible polemical tool. As the sermons discussed in this project show, the figural interpretation of the dead made it possible for militant Protestants, presbyterians, and conformist members of the church to create scripturally

¹ According to Houlbrooke, 32 funeral sermons were published in the 1630s, 96 during the 1640s, 119 during the Commonwealth in the 1650s, and 61 during the 1660s after the Restoration. The numbers only continued to increase in the last two decades of the century, with 83 being published in the 1670s, 110 in the 1680s, and 161 published during the 1690s (386).

² The funeral sermon, for example, becomes so acceptable that scholars of the Puritan funeral sermon in America, like Etta Madden, are able to treat the genre as entirely unproblematic. In her discussion of American funeral sermons, Madden glosses over the controversies about the acceptability of praise and calls the funeral sermon a perfect ritual that replaced purgatory and other Catholic funeral rituals (233).

based Protestant saints to serve as figureheads for their various political and religious causes. In addition, the techniques of figural interpretation developed by early preachers like Edmund Grindal and Matthew Parker provided poets like Edmund Spenser, George Whetstone, and the Countess of Pembroke with the tools necessary to reform Catholic models of commemoration like martyrology and hagiography and to create poetic representations of English political saints that could act as *exempla* for readers of their poems.

Despite my project and the work of scholars like Houlbrooke, Gittings, Tromly, and Kay, the field of early modern English commemorative writing remains a field in need of further examination. Though scholars of American history and literature have discussed the origins and uses of the funeral sermon, there has yet to be an extensive examination of the Puritan funeral sermon in England itself.³ What is particularly needed is a discussion of the role of funeral sermons and funeral elegies during the last half of Charles's reign and the Civil War. As the funeral sermons for James I show, the different biblical *figurae* that authors of various religious persuasions used in praising the king played a large role in shaping their commemorations and the sermons that they produced. Similarly, there has been a great deal of research on the royalist representation of the executed Charles I as a martyr and the use of the political cult of Charles to support the restoration of the monarchy. Further inquiry into the use of commemorative speech by both royalists and parliamentarians before and during the Civil War could lead to greater understanding of the polemical climate of the 1630s and 1640s, and could shed light on the literary methods of important poets like John Milton.

³ For the Puritan funeral sermon in America, see Madden as well as Emory Elliott's "The Development of the Puritan Funeral Sermon," Sacvan Bercovitch's "From Horologicals to Chronometricals," Terry Odell's "Pillars of the House: Puritan Funeral Sermons through the *Magnalia Christi Americana*," and David E. Stannard's *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change*.

Moreover, further research needs to be done on Protestant methods of commemoration and figural interpretation as a context for the work of other major poets of the period. Since the funeral elegy was a genre that all poets were expected to write at one point or another, whether they eventually published their elegies or not, the techniques of commemoration would have influenced many of the poems of the period. For Spenser, my discussion of Book V of *The Faerie Queene* offers only a start; a more thorough discussion of commemoration in the poem could reveal a great deal about Spenser's allegorical method. Similar enquiries about the role of commemoration could also illuminate Shakespeare's work and build on the valuable research already done by Greenblatt and McCoy.

The poet whose body of work offers the greatest opportunity for this kind of inquiry is John Donne. Though I discuss only Donne's elegy for Prince Henry and his funeral sermon for James I, these were far from being his first or last forays into the realm of funeral commemoration. From the late 1590s to the early 1630s, Donne penned a number of short elegies, preached numerous funeral sermons, and published the two *Anniversaries*, the two most influential and important commemorative poems published during the early 17th century.⁴ The scholarship on the *Anniversaries* is vast, and there are a number of illuminating studies of the poems as commemorative pieces and of the theological and biblical aspects of the poems.⁵

⁴ In his study of the early modern funeral elegy, Kay notes a number of similarities between the poetic methods of the *Anniversaries* and the majority of elegies that follow them.

⁵ One of the few critics who discusses Donne's *Anniversaries* in connection with contemporary funeral sermons is Lewalski in *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: The Creation of a Symbolic Mode*. Along with Kay's *Melodious Tears* and W.M. Lebars's "Donne's *Anniversaries* and the Tradition of Funeral Elegy," Lewalski is the major critic who discusses the *Anniversaries* as examples of commemorative speech. For theological examinations of the poems that take into account Donne's use of biblical *figurae*, see Lindsay A. Mann's "The Typology of Woman in Donne's *Anniversaries*," Emory Elliott's "Persona and Parody in Donne's *The Anniversaries*," Jill Pelaez Baumgaertner's "Political Play and Theological Uncertainty in the *Anniversaries*," and Raymond James-Frontain's "Law, Song, and Memory:

There are comparatively few studies of the poems, however, that bring these two lines of inquiry together and ask how Donne used the methods of figural interpretation prevalent in early modern commemorative speech to authorize his effusive praise of Elizabeth Drury and to shape the political and theological reception of his own Protestant saint. More surprising, however, is the fact that there are few studies that consider Donne's own funeral sermons in the larger context of early modern commemoration.⁶ Since Donne preached a number of funeral sermons, as well as other commemorative sermons treating the deaths of members of his parish in the plague and the survivors of an Indian massacre in Virginia, a further study of Donne's use of figural interpretation is necessary to investigate the connections between his earlier poetic practice, his shifting political and religious opinions through the 1620s and early 1630s, and his use of the pulpit to advance his own views about the necessity for ecumenical peace in the Church of England.

The Mosaic Voice of Donne's First *Anniversarie*" and "Donne's Protestant Paradiso: The Johannine Vision of The Second Anniversary."

⁶ Aside from the massive scholarship on *Death's Duell*, Donne's final funeral sermon, critics focus on Donne's consolatory speech. See P.G. Stanwood's "Consolatory Grief in the Funeral Sermons of Donne and Taylor."

Works Cited

Primary Sources:

- 1559 Book of Common Prayer. Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook.* Ed. David Cressy and Lori Anne Ferrell. New York: Routledge, 1996. 40-56.
- Barlow, William. *A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse [...] With a short discourse of the late Earle of Essex his confession, and penitence, before and at the time of his death.* London: Matthew Law, 1601.
- Beacon, Richard. *Solon His Follie, or A Politique Discourse Touching the Reformation of common-weales conquered, declined or corrupted.* Ed. Clare Carroll and Vincent Carey. Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1996.
- Bede. *The History of the Chvrch of Englande.* Trans. Thomas Stapleton. Antwerp: John Laet, 1565.
- The Bible: Authorized King James Version.* Intro. Robert Carroll and Stephen Prickett. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Churchyard, Thomas. "The Epitaph of Sir Phillip Sidney Knight, lately Lord Gouvernour of Flushing." London: George Robinson, 1586.
- Davies, Richard. *A Fvnerall Sermon Preached [...] at the burial of The Right Honovrable VValter Earle of Essex and Ewe, Earle Marshall of Irelande [...].* London: Henry Denham, 1577.
- Day, Angel. "Vpon the life and death of the most worthy, and thrise renowned knight, Sir Phillip Sidney." London: Robert Waldegrave, 1587. *Elegies for Sir Philip Sidney (1587).* Intro. A.J. Colainne and W.L. Godshalk. Delmar, NY: Scholar's Facsimiles & Reprints, 1980.
- Denison, Stephen. *The Monument, or Tombstone.* London: Richard Field, 1620.
- Derricke, John. *The Image of Ireland.* London: John Day, 1581.
- D'Ewes, Simonds. *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'ewes, Bart.* Ed. James Orchard Halliwell. London: Richard Bentley, 1845.
- Donne, John. *Preached at Denmark house, some few days before the body of King James was removed from thence.* *The Sermons of John Donne.* Vol. 6. Ed. George Potter and Evelyn Simpson. Berkeley: U of California P, 1953-1962. 280-291.
- . *The Epithalamions, Anniversaries and Epicedes.* Ed. W. Milgate. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1978.

---. "Elegie on the vntimely Death of the incomparable Prince Henry." *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne Volume 6: The Anniversaries and the Epicedes and Obsequies*. Ed. Gary A. Stringer, Ted-Larry Pebworth, John T. Shawcross, and Ernest W. Sullivan. Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1995. 160-162.

Fisher, John. *This sermon folowyng was compyled [and] sayd in the cathedrall chyrche of saynt Poule within ye cyte of London by the ryght reuerende fader in god Iohn bysshop of Rochester, the body beyng present of the moost famouse prynce kynge Henry the. vij. the. x. day of Maye, the yere of our lorde god. M.CCCC.ix. whiche sermon was enprynted at the specyall request of ye ryght excellent pryncesse Margarete moder vnto the sayd noble prynce and Countesse of Rychemonde and Derby*. London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509.

Foxe, John. *Actes and Monuments*. London: John Day, 1563.

Foxe, John. *Actes and Monuments*. London: John Day, 1570.

The Geneva Bible: A facsimile of the 1560 edition. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969.

Grindal, Edmund. *A Sermon, at the funeral solemnitie of he most high and mighty Prince Ferdinandus, the late Emperour of most famous memorye, holden in the Cathedrall Church of saint Paule in London, the third of October. 1564*. London: John Day, 1564.

Grindal, Edmund. *Concion Funebri in obitum Augustae memoriae Ferdinandi Caesaris recens defuncti, in celeberrimo procerum ac magnatum conuentu Londini in Ecclesia Cathedrali D. Pauli habita*. Trans. John Foxe. London: John Day, 1564.

Herbert, William. *Croftus Sive de Hibernia Liber*. Ed. Arthur Keaveney and John A. Madden. Baldoyle, Ireland: Colour Books, 1992.

Hodson, Phineas. *The Last Sermon Preached Before his Maiesties Funerals, at Denmark house*. London: M.F., 1625.

Hooper, John. *A funerall oration made the xiiij. Day of Ianuary by Iohn Hoper, the yere of our saluation, 1549. vpon the texte wrytyne in the Reuelatyone of Sayncte Iohne. Ca. 14*. London: S. Mierdman for Edward Whitechurch, 1549.

Hyperius, Andreas. *The Practise of Preaching, otherwise called the Pathway to the Pulpit*. Trans. John Ludham. London: Thomas East, 1577.

Martin, Gregory. "The Preface to the Reader." *The Nevv Testament of Iesvs Christ, Translated Faithfvly into English [...] In the English College of Rhemes*. Rhiems: John Fogny, 1582.

Munday, Anthony. *The true reporte of the prosperous success [...] in Ireland, in the yere 1580*. London: Edward White, 1581.

- The New Oxford Annotated Study Bible*. Revised Standard Version. Ed. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford UP, 1977.
- Parker, Matthew. *Howe we ought to take the death of the godly, a sermon made in Cambryde at the burial of the noble clerck. D.M. Bucer*. London: Richard Jugge, 1551.
- . *A funeral sermon preached at the burial of M. Bucer*. London: Thomas Purfoote, 1570.
- . *A Funerall Sermon, both Godlye, Learned and comfortable, Preached at St. Maries in Cambridge, Anno 1551 at the burial of the Reuerend Doctor, and faithfull Pastor of the Church of Christ, Martin Bucer*. Trans. Thomas Newton. London: Thomas Purfoote, 1587.
- Peacham, Henry. *The Period of Mourning. Disposed into sixe Visions*. London: John Helme, 1613.
- Phillip, John. "The Life and Death of Sir Philip of Sidney, late Lord gouvernour of Flvshing." London: Robert Waldegrave, 1587. *Elegies for Sir Philip Sidney (1587)*. Intro. A.J. Colainne and W.L. Godshalk. Delmar, NY: Scholar's Facsimiles & Reprints, 1980.
- Price, Daniel. *Lamentations for the death of the late Illustrious Prince Henry*. London: Thomas Snodham, 1613.
- . *Spiritvall Odovrs to the memory of Prince Henry*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1613
- . *Prince Henry his First Anniversary*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1613.
- . *Prince Henry his Second Anniversary*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1614.
- . *A Heartie Prayer in a needful time of trouble*. London: M. Flesher, 1625.
- Sidney, Henry. *A Viceroy's Vindication?: Sir Henry Sidney's Memoir of Service in Ireland 1556-1578*. Ed. Ciaran Brady. Cork: Cork UP, 2002.
- Sidney, Mary. "To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney." *The Psalms of Sir Philip Sidney and the Countess of Pembroke*. Ed. J.C.A. Rathmell. New York: NYUP, 1963. xxxv-xxxviii.
- Sidney, Philip. *The Defence of Poesy. The Major Works*. Ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. 212-250.
- Sparke, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached at Cheanies the 14. Of September, 1585. At the burial of the right Honourable the Earle of Bedford*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1585.
- . *A Sermon Preached at Whaddon [...] at the burial of the Right Honorable, Arthur Lorde Grey of Wilton*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1593.

- Spenser, Edmund. *A Viewe of the Present State of Ireland*. Ed. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.
- . *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. A.C. Hamilton. New York: Longman, 2001.
- . "Astrophel." *Edmund Spenser: The Shorter Poems*. Ed. Richard A. McCabe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1999. 372-380.
- . "The Dolefull Lay of Clorinda." *Edmund Spenser: The Shorter Poems*. Ed. Richard A. McCabe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1999. 380-384.
- Sylvester, Joshua. *Lachrymae Lachrimarum or the Distillation of Teares Shede For the vntymely Death of The incomparable Prince Panaretus*. London: Humphrey Lownes, 1612.
- The passage of our most drad Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to Westminster the daye before her Coronacion*. London: Richard Tottill, 1559.
- Whetstone, George. "Sir Phillip Sidney, his honorable life, his valiant death, and true vertues." London: Thomas Cadman, 1587. *Elegies for Sir Philip Sidney (1587)*. Intro. A.J. Colainne and W.L. Godshalk. Delmar, NY: Scholar's Facsimiles & Reprints, 1980.
- White, Thomas. *A Godlie Sermon preached [...] at Pensehurst in Kent, at the burial of the late Right honourable Sir Henrie Sidney*. London: Henry Middleton, 1586.
- Wither, George. *Prince Henries Obseqvies or movrnefvll Elegies Vpon his Death*. London: Arthur Johnson, 1612.
- Williams, James. *Great Britains Salomon*. London: John Bill, 1625.

Secondary Sources:

- Alexander, Gavin. *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney, 1586-1640*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Aptekar, Jane. *Icons of Justice: Iconography and thematic Imagery in Book V of The Faerie Queene*. New York: Columbia P, 1969.
- Aston, Margaret. *England's Iconoclasts*. Vol.1. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1988.
- Auerbach, Erich. "Figura." *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature. Six Essays*. New York: Meridian Books, 1959. 11-76.

- Baker-Smith, Dominic. "‘Great Expectation’: Sidney’s Death and the Poets." *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*. Ed. Jan van Dorsten, Dominic Baker-Smith, and Arthur F. Kinney. Leiden: Leiden UP, 1986. 83-103.
- Backus, Irena. *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Baumgaertner, Jill Pelaez. "Political Play and Theological Uncertainty in the *Anniversaries*." *John Donne Journal* 13 (1994): 29-49.
- Bawcutt, Priscilla. "The Lark in Chaucer and Some Later Poets." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 2 (1972): 5-12.
- Beier, Lucinda McCray. "The Good Death in Seventeenth-Century England." *Death, Ritual, and Bereavement*. Ed. Ralph Houlbrooke. New York: Routledge, 1989. 43-67.
- Benedict, Philip. *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2002.
- Benson, Pamela J. "Rule, Virginia: Protestant Theories of Female Regiment in *The Faerie Queene*." *English Literary Renaissance* 15 (1985): 277-292.
- Bercovich, Sacvan. "Horologicals to Chronometricals: The Rhetoric of the Jeremiad." *Literary Monographs* 3. Ed. Eric Rothstein. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1970. 1-124, 187-215.
- Black, Joseph. "The Rhetoric of Reaction: The Martin Marprelate Tracts (1588-89), Anti-Martinism, and the Uses of Print in Early Modern England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28 (1997): 707-725.
- Borris, Kenneth. *Spenser’s Poetics of Prophecy in The Faerie Queene V*. Victoria: English Literary Studies, 1991.
- Bos, Sander, Marianne Lange-Meyers, and Jeanine Six. "Sidney’s Funeral Portrayed." *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*. Ed. Jan van Dorsten, Dominic Baker-Smith, and Arthur F. Kinney. Leiden: Leiden UP, 1986. 38-61
- Bottigheimer, Karl S. "Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Westward Enterprise." *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America 1480-1650*. Ed. K.R. Andrews, N.P. Canny, and P.E.H. Hair. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1979. 45-64.
- Bowers, Fredson. *Hamlet as Minister and Scourge and Other Studies in Shakespeare and Milton*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1989.
- Bradshaw, Brendan. "Native Reaction to the Westward Enterprise: A Case-Study in Gaelic Ideology." *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America 1480-1650*. Ed. K.R. Andrews, N.P. Canny, and P.E.H. Hair. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1979. 65-80.

- . "Edmund Spenser on Justice and Mercy." *The Writer as Witness: Literature as Historical Evidence*. Ed. Tom Dunne. Cork: Cork UP, 1987.
- Brady, Ciaran. *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1588*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1994.
- . "Introduction." *A Viceroy's Vindication?: Sir Henry Sidney's Memoir of Service in Ireland 1556-1578*. Ed. Ciaran Brady. Cork: Cork UP, 2002. 1-39.
- . "Grey, Arthur, fourteenth Baron of Wilton." *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Ed. A.C. Hamilton, Donald Cheney, W.F. Blissett, David A. Richardson, and William W. Barker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990. 341-342.
- Bremmer, Jan. "Prophets, Seers, and Politics in Greece, Israel, and Early Modern Europe." *Numen* 40 (1993): 150-183.
- Brennan, Michael G. "The Queen's Proposed Visit to Wilton House in 1599 and the 'Sidney Psalms.'" *Sidney Journal* 20 (2002): 27-53.
- . *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Breuggemann, Walter. *The Prophetic Imagination*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Brooks-Davies, Douglas. "Una." *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Ed. A.C. Hamilton, Donald Cheney, W.F. Blissett, David A. Richardson, and William W. Barker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990. 704-705.
- Buxton, John. "The Mourning for Sidney." *Renaissance Studies* 3 (1989): 46-56.
- . *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance*. New York: St. Martin's, 1964.
- Carey, John. *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1990.
- Carlson, Eric Josef. "The Boring of the Ear: Shaping the Pastoral Vision of Preaching in England, 1540-1640." *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*. Ed. Larissa Taylor. Boston: Leiden, 2001. 249-296.
- . "English Funeral Sermons as Sources: The Example of Female Piety in Pre-1640 Sermons." *Albion* 32.4 (2000): 567-597.
- Canino, Catherine. "Reconstructing Lord Grey's Reputation: A New View of the View." *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 29 (1998): 3-18.
- Canny, Nicholas P. "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America." *William and Mary Quarterly* 30 (1973): 575-598.

- Carroll, Clare. "Barbarous Slaves and Civil Cannibals: Translating Civility in Early Modern Ireland." *Ireland and Postcolonial Theory*. Ed. Clare Carroll and Patricia King. South Bend: U of Notre Dame P, 2003. 63-80.
- Carter, Harry. *A History of the Oxford University Press*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1975.
- Cheney, Patrick. "Dido to Daphne: Early Modern Death in Spenser's Shorter Poems." *Spenser Studies* 18 (2003): 143-163.
- Coren, Pamela. "Edmund Spenser, Mary Sidney, and the *Doleful Lay*." *SEL* 42 (2002): 25-41.
- Christian, Margaret. "Elizabeth's Preachers and the Government of Women: Defining and Correcting a Queen." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 24 (1993): 561-576.
- Clegg, Cynthia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Collinson, Patrick. "'A Magazine of Religious Patterns.'" *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*. Ed. Derek Baker. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977. 223-249.
- . *Archbishop Grindal 1518-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church*. Berkeley: U California P, 1979.
- . *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1967.
- . "Biblical Rhetoric: the English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode." *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*. Ed. Claire McEachern and Debora Shuger. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 15-45.
- Craig, Joanne. "Monstrous Regiment: Spenser's Ireland and Spenser's Queen." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 43 (2001): 1-28.
- Cressy, David. "Death and the Social Order: the Funerary Preferences of Elizabethan Gentlemen." *Continuity and Change* 5 (1989): 99-119.
- D'Avray, David. "The Comparative Study of Memorial Preaching." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 40 (1990): 25-42.
- Dickson, Donald R. "The Complexities of Biblical Typology in the Seventeenth Century." *Renaissance and Reformation* 11 (1987): 253-272.
- Dobin, Howard. *Merlin's Disciples: Prophecy, Poetry, and Power in Renaissance England*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1990.

- Doran, Susan. "Religion and Politics at the Court of Elizabeth I: The Hapsburg Marriage Negotiations of 1559-1567." *The English Historical Review* 104 (1989): 908-926.
- . "Juno versus Diana: The Treatment of Elizabeth I's Marriage in Plays and Entertainments, 1561-1581." *The Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 257-274.
- . *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.
- Duncan-Jones, Katherine. *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1991.
- Dunseath, T.K. *Spenser's Allegory of Justice in Book Five of The Faerie Queene*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968.
- Eggert, Katherine. *Showing Like a Queen: Female Authority and Literary Experiment in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton*. Philadelphia: U Penn P, 2000.
- Elliot, Emory B. "Persona and Parody in Donne's *The Anniversaries*." *Quarterly Review of Speech* 58 (1972): 48-57.
- . "The Development of the Puritan Funeral Sermon and Elegy: 1660-1750." *Early American Literature* 15 (1980): 151-164.
- Engammare, Max. "Calvin: A Prophet without a Prophecy." *Church History* 67 (1998): 643-661.
- Falco, Raphael. "Instant Artifacts: Vernacular Elegies for Philip Sidney." *Studies in Philology* 89 (1992): 1-19.
- . "Spenser's 'Astrophel' and the Formation of Elizabethan Literary Genealogy." *Modern Philology* 91 (1993): 1-25.
- Ferrell, Lori Anne. *Government by Polemic: James I, the King's Preachers, and the Rhetorics of Conformity, 1603-1625*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.
- . "Kneeling and the Body Politic." *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*. Ed. Donna Hamilton and Richard Strier. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 70-92.
- Fichner, Paula Sutter. "The Disobedience of the Obedient: Ferdinand I and the Papacy 1555-1564." *Sixteenth-Century Journal* 11 (1980): 25-34.
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake. "The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I." *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. Ed. Kenneth Fincham. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1993. 213-49.

- Firth, Katherine R. *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979.
- Fiskin, Beth Wayne. "'To the Angell Spirit...': Mary Sidney's Entry into the 'World of Words.'" *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print: Counterbalancing the Canon*. Ed. Anne M. Haselkorn and Betty S. Travitsky. Amherst: U Mass P, 1990. 263-275.
- Fletcher, Angus. *The Prophetic Moment: An Essay on Spenser*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1971.
- Freeman, Thomas S. "Over Their Dead Bodies: Concepts of Martyrdom in Late Medieval and Early Modern England." *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700*. Ed. Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer. Rochester, NY: Boydell P, 2007. 1-34.
- . "'Imitation Christi with a Vengeance': The Politicisation of Martyrdom in Early Modern England." *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700*. Ed. Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer. Rochester, NY: Boydell P, 2007. 35-69.
- Frontain, Raymond-Jean. *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives*. Ed. Mary Arshagouni Papazian. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2003. 113-142.
- . "Law, Song, and Memory: The Mosaic Voice of Donne's First Anniversarie." *Literature and Belief* 19 (1999): 155-174.
- Gilman, Ernest B. *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation: Down Went Dagon*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.
- Gittings, Clare. *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England*. London: Croom Helm, 1984.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. *James I and the Politics of Literature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1983.
- Goldring, Elizabeth. "The Funeral of Sir Philip Sidney and the Politics of Elizabethan Festival." *Court Festivals of the European Renaissance: Art, Politics and Performance*. Eds. J.R. Mulryne and Elizabeth Goldring. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002. 199-224.
- Greaves, Richard. *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1981.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001.
- . *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Gregerson, Linda. *The Reformation of the Subject: Spenser, Milton, and the English Protestant Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Gregory, Tobias. "Shadowing Intervention: On the Politics of *The Faerie Queene* Book 5 Cantos 10-12." *English Literary History* 67 (2000): 365-397.

- Gross, Kenneth. *Spenserian Poetics: Idolatry, Iconoclasm, and Magic*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- . "The 'sacred hunger of ambitious minds': Spenser's Savage Religion." *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*. Ed. Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 27-45.
- Hager, Alan. "The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney's Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader." *Sir Philip Sidney: An Anthology of Modern Criticism*. Ed. Dennis Kay. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987. 45-60.
- Hammer, Paul E.J. *The Polarization of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585-1597*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Hammill, Graham and Julia Reinhard Lupton. "Sovereigns, Citizens, and Saints: Political Theology and Renaissance Literature." *Religion and Literature* 38.4 (2006): 1-11.
- Hannay, Margaret. "'Doo What Men May Sing': Mary Sidney and the Tradition of Admonitory Dedication." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Hannay. Kent OH: Kent State UP, 1985. 149-165.
- . "'Princes you as men must dy': Genevan Advice to Monarchs in the *Psalmes* of Mary Sidney." *English Literary Renaissance* 19 (1989): 22-41.
- . *Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.
- Harding, Vanessa. *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500-1670*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Heale, Elizabeth. "Spenser's Malengine, Missionary Priests, and the Means of Justice." *Review of English Studies* 41 (1990): 171-184.
- Heberle, Mark. "Aristotle and Spenser's Justice." *Studia Neophilologica* 63 (1991): 169-173.
- Herman, Peter C. *Squitter-wits and Muse-haters: Sidney, Spenser, Milton and Renaissance Antipoetic Sentiment*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1996.
- Herr, Alan Fager. *The Elizabethan Sermon: A Survey and a Bibliography*. Philadelphia: U Penn P, 1940.
- Highley, Christopher. *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph. *Death, Religion, and the Family in England, 1480-1750*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998.

- Hunt, Arnold. "Tuning the Pulpits: the Religious Context of the Essex Revolt." *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600-1750*. Eds. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough. New York: Manchester UP, 2000. 86-114.
- Imbrie, Ann E. "'Playing Legerdemaine with the Scripture': Parodic Sermons in *The Faerie Queene*." *English Literary Renaissance* 17 (1987): 142-55.
- Jansen, Sharon L. *Political Protest and Prophecy under Henry VIII*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991.
- Jones, Evan J. "The Death and the Burial of Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, 1576." *Carmarthen Antiquary* 2 (1957): 180-201.
- Jones, Norman L. "Elizabeth, Edification, and the Latin Prayer Book of 1560." *Church History* 53 (1984): 174-186.
- Kaske, Carol. *Spenser and Biblical Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.
- Kay, Daniel. *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1990.
- King, John N. *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.
- . "'The Light of Printing': William Tyndale, John Foxe, John Day, and Early Modern Print Culture." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001). 52-85.
- Kinney, Arthur F. "Intimations of Mortality: Sidney's Journey to Flushing and Zutphen." *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*. Ed. Jan van Dorsten, Dominic Baker-Smith, and Arthur F. Kinney. Leiden: Leiden UP, 1986. 125-148.
- Klein, Lisa M. "Spenser's *Astrophel* and the Sidney Legend." *Sidney Newsletter & Journal* 12 (1993): 45-55.
- Knapp, Jeffrey. *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theater in Renaissance England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002.
- Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- and Michael Questier. *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Have: Yale UP, 2002.
- Lamb, Mary Ellen. *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1990.
- . "The Myth of the Countess of Pembroke: The Dramatic Circle." *Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981): 194-202.

- Laroche, Rebecca. "'O Absent Presence,' Sidney is not here: The Lament for Astrophil and the Stellar Presence of a Woman Writer." *Sidney Journal* 20 (2002): 21-44.
- Laurence, Anne. "Godly Grief: Individual Responses to Death in Seventeenth-Century Britain." *Death, Ritual, and Bereavement*. Ed. Ralph Houlbrooke. New York: Routledge, 1989. 62-76.
- Lebans, W.M. "Donne's *Anniversaries* and the Tradition of Funeral Elegy." *English Literary History* 39 (1972): 545-559.
- Lennon, Colm. *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1994.
- Lerner, Robert. "Medieval Prophecy and Religious Dissent." *Past and Present* 72 (1976): 3-24.
- Levy-Navarro. "Breaking Down the Walls that Divide: Anti-Polemism in the Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions." *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation*. Ed. Mary Papazian. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2003. 273-292.
- . "'Goe forth ye daughters of Sion': Divine Authority, the King, and the Church in Donne's Denmark House Sermon." *John Donne Journal* 17 (1998): 163-17.
- Lewalski, Barbara. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979.
- . *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: The Creation of a Symbolic Mode*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.
- Lim, Walter S.H. "Figuring Justice: Imperial Ideology and the Discourse of Colonialism in Book V of *The Faerie Queene* and *A View of the Present State of Ireland*." *Renaissance and Reformation* 19 (1995): 45-70.
- Llewellyn, Nigel. *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- . *The Art of Death: Visual Culture in the English Death Ritual c.1500-c.1800*. London: Reaktion, 1991.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation*. New York: Penguin, 2003.
- McCabe Richard. *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- McCoy, Richard. *Alterations of State: Sacred Kingship in the English Reformation*. New York: Columbia UP, 2002.
- . "Thou Idol Ceremony": Elizabeth I, *The Henriad*, and the Rites of the English Monarchy." *Urban Life in the Renaissance*. Ed. Susan Zimmerman and Ronald F. E. Weissman. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1989. 240-266.

- McCullough, Peter E. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- . "Out of Egypt: Richard Fletcher's Sermon Before Elizabeth I after the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots." *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*. Ed. Julia M. Walker. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. 118-149.
- McGurk, John. *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: The 1590s Crisis*. New York: Manchester UP, 1997.
- Madden, Etta. "Resurrecting Life through Rhetorical Ritual." *Early American Literature* 26 (1991): 232-250.
- Majeske, Andrew J. *Equity in English Renaissance Literature: Thomas More and Edmund Spenser*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Mallette, Richard. *Spenser and the Discourses of Reformation England*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1999.
- . *Spenser, Milton, and Renaissance Pastoral*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1981.
- Mann, Lindsay A. "The Typology of Woman in Donne's *Anniversaries*." *Renaissance and Reformation* 11 (1987): 337-350.
- Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.
- . *John Donne, Coterie Poet*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1986.
- Martin, Ellen E. "Spenser, Chaucer, and the Rhetoric of Elegy." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 17 (1987): 83-109.
- Martin, F.X. "Ireland, the Renaissance and the Counter-Reformation." *Topic* 13 (1967): 23-33.
- Matthew, H.C.G. and Brian Harrison, ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 60 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.
- Mills-Courts, Karen. *Poetry as Epitaph: Representation and Poetic Language*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1990.
- Millward, Peter. *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*. U of Nebraska P, 1978.
- . *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1977.
- Monta, Susannah Breitz. *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

- . "Martyrdom in Print in Early Modern England: The Case of Robert Waldegrave." *More than a Memory: The Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity*. Ed. Johan Leemans. Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2005. 271-293.
- Montrose, Louis. "Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary." *ELH* 69 (2002): 907-46.
- Morgan, Peter. "Of Worms and War: 1380-1558." *Death in England: an Illustrated History*. Ed. Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2000. 119-146.
- Moroney, Maryclaire. "Apocalypse, Ethnography, and Empire in John Derricke's *Image of Ireland* (1581) and Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596)." *English Literary Renaissance* 29 (1999): 355-374.
- Mozley, J.F. *John Foxe and his Book*. New York: Octagon, 1940.
- Murdock, Graeme. "The Importance of being Josiah: An Image of Calvinist Identity." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29 (1998): 1043-1059.
- Murphy, Andrew. *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us: Ireland, Colonialism, and Renaissance Literature*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1999.
- Nichols, John. *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*. London: J.B. Nichols, 1828.
- Norbrook, David. *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.
- O'Connell, Michael. "Astrophel: Spenser's Double Elegy." *Studies in English Literature* 11 (1971): 27-35.
- Odell, Terry. "Pillars of the House: Puritan Funeral Sermons through the *Magnalia Christi Americana*." *DAI* 43 (1982): 440A.
- Oliver, P.M. *Donne's Religious Writing: A Discourse of Feigned Devotion*. New York: Longman, 1997.
- The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989. *OED Online*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984.
- Pebworth, Ted-Larry and Claude J. Summers. "Contexts and Strategies: Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry." *John Donne Journal* 19 (2000): 205-22.
- Phillips, James E. "Renaissance Concepts of Justice and the Structure of 'The Faerie Queene,' Book V." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 33 (1970): 103-120.

- . "The Woman Ruler in Spenser's Faerie Queene." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 5 (1942): 211-34.
- Pigman, G.W. *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- Poort, Marjon. "'The Desired and Destined Successor': A Chronology of Sir Philip Sidney's Activities 1585-1586." *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*. Ed. Jan van Dorsten, Dominic Baker-Smith, and Arthur F. Kinney. Leiden: Leiden UP, 1986. 25-37.
- Prescott, Anne Lake. "King David as a 'Right Poet': Sidney and the Psalmist." *English Literary Renaissance* 19 (1989): 131-151.
- Rhatigan, Emma. "Knees and Elephants: Donne Preaches on Ceremonial Conformity." *John Donne Journal* 23 (2004): 185-213.
- Richey, Esther Gilman. *The Politics of Revelation in the English Renaissance*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1998.
- Ringler, W.A. "Sir Philip Sidney: The Myth and the Man." *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*. Ed. Jan van Dorsten, Dominic Baker-Smith, and Arthur F. Kinney. Leiden: Leiden UP, 1986. 3-15.
- Rosenberg, Eleanor. *Leicester: Patron of Letters*. New York: Columbia UP, 1973.
- Sacks, Peter. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1985.
- Shaheen, Naseeb. *Biblical References in The Faerie Queene*. Memphis: Memphis State UP, 1976.
- Shami, Jeanne. *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003.
- Shepherd, Simon. *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama*. New York: St. Martin's, 1981.
- Sherwood, Terry G. "Reason, Faith, and Just Augustinian Lamentation in Donne's Elegy on Prince Henry." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 13 (1973): 53-67.
- Shuger, Debora. *Political Theologies in Shakespeare's England: The Sacred and the State in Measure for Measure*. New York: Palgrave, 2001. 39-71
- . *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance*. Berkeley: U Cal P, 1997.
- . "Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (1997): 494-525.

- . *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.
- Silberman, Lauren. *Transforming Desire: Erotic Knowledge in Books III and IV of The Faerie Queene*. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1995.
- Stannard, David E. *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.
- Stanwood, P.G. "Consolatory Grief in the Funeral Sermons of Donne and Taylor." *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture: Shakespeare to Milton*. Ed. Margo Swiss and David A. Kent. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2002. 197-216.
- Steinberg, Theodore L. "Spenser, Sidney, and the Myth of Astrophel." *Spenser Studies* 11 (1994): 187-201.
- Steinberg, Theodore L. "The Sidney's and the Psalms." *Studies in Philology* 92 (1995): 1-17.
- Stewart, Alan. *Philip Sidney: A Double Life*. London, Chatto & Windus, 2000.
- Strickland, Ronald. "Pageantry and Poetry as Discourse: The Production of Subjectivity in Sir Philip Sidney's Funeral." *ELH* 57 (1990): 19-36.
- Strong, Roy. *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1986.
- Sutton, Dana. "Introduction." to Fizegeoffrey, Charles. *Sir Francis Drake, His Honourable Lifes Commendation, and Tragicall Deathes Lamentation* (1596).
<<http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/drake/intro.html>>.
- Taylor, Larissa Juliet. "Funeral Sermons and Orations as Religious Propaganda in Sixteenth Century France." *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Bruce Gordon and Peter Marshall. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 224-239.
- Taylor, Rupert. *The Political Prophecy in England*. New York: Columbia UP, 1911.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- Tourney, Leonard D. "Convention and Wit in Donne's *Elegie* on Prince Henry." *Studies in Philology* 71 (1974): 473-83.
- Tromly, Frederick. "'Accordinge to sounde religion': the Elizabethan Controversy over the Funeral Sermon." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1983): 293-312.
- Tyake, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1986.

- Upton, C.A. "‘Speaking Sorrow’: the English University Anthologies of 1587 of the Death of Philip Sidney in the Low Countries." *Academic Relations between the Low Countries and the British Isles, 1450-1700*. Ed. H. de Ridder-Symoens and J.M Fletcher. Ghent: Afdeling Geschiedenis van de Faculteit der Letteren en Wijsbegeerte van de Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, 1989. 131-141.
- Van Dorsten, Jan. "The Final Year." *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*. Ed. Jan van Dorsten, Dominic Baker-Smith, and Arthur F. Kinney. Leiden: Leiden UP, 1986. 16-24.
- Van Es, Bart. *Spenser’s Forms of History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
- . "‘Privie to his Counsell and Secret Meaning’: Spenser and Political Prophecy." *English Literary Renaissance* 30 (2000): 3-31.
- Walker, Simon. "Political Saints in Later Medieval England." *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society*. Ed. R.H. Britnell and A.J. Pollard. New York: St. Martin’s P, 1995. 77-106.
- Walsham, Alexandra. "‘Frantick Hacket’: Prophecy, Sorcery, Insanity, and the Elizabethan Puritan Movement." *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 27-66.
- Waller, G.F. *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke: A Critical Study of Her Writings and Literary Milieu*. Salzburg, Austria: Salzburg UP, 1979.
- Williamson, J.W. *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart: A Study of 17th Century Personation*. New York: AMS, 1978.
- Wittreich, Joseph. *Shifting Contexts: Reinterpreting Samson Agonistes*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2002.
- Wood, Derek N.C. *‘Exiled from Light’: Divine Law, Morality, and Violence in Milton’s Samson Agonistes*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001.
- Woods, Suzanne. "Spenser and the Problem of Women’s Rule." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 48 (1985): 141-158.
- Woodward, Jennifer. *The Theater of Death: The Ritual Management of Royal Funerals in Renaissance England 1570-1625*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997.
- Zakai, Avihu. "Reformation, History, and Eschatology in English Protestantism." *History and Theory* 26.3 (1987): 300-318.

Vita

Sean Flory was born to Wayne and Rita Flory in Vermillion, South Dakota. He grew up in College Station, Texas, and earned his bachelor's degree in English and history at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas in 2000. He entered the PhD program at Louisiana State University in August, 2001 and earned his doctorate in English in 2008. He currently lives in Jamestown, North Dakota, with his wife Ilana Xinos, where he teaches medieval and Renaissance English literature at Jamestown College.