Summer 8-5-2019

Setting the Stage and Building Homes: Architecture Metaphors and Space in Donne's First Caroline Sermon

Alexander S. Laws
University of New Orleans, alexander.laws@me.com

Setting the Stage and Building Homes: Architecture Metaphors and Space in Donne's First Caroline Sermon

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English

by

Alexander S Laws

B.A. University of New Orleans, 2016

August, 2019

Table of Contents

Abstract

Through his use of "foundation" and "house" metaphors in his "First Sermon Preached to King Charles at St. James, 3 April 1625," John Donne discreetly presents his ideologies and principles before the new king, while simultaneously criticizing his contemporaries' misguided bickering over religio-political factions. This essay seeks to unpack the history surrounding, as well as the casuistical logic found within Donne's first sermon preached during the Caroline period, which both explicitly and implicitly addresses the foremost anxieties of the people of the changing age.

Keywords: John Donne; Renaissance; Sermon; Rhetoric; Linguistics; Houses

Thesis Text

It has been shown via both documentation and our understanding of common parlance that people tend to filter thoughts through binaries and dualities. There are those who divide people and things into their halves, and there are those who insist on the persistent interconnectivity of these postulated halves. Scholarship surrounding John Donne is particularly entrenched in the practice, even more so should the point of interest be his later, more religiously inclined, writings. As one scholar asserts, "Donne's formative period coincided with the most dramatic and dangerous period for English Catholics, when their persecution was most virulent. Donne himself wrote about how deeply he and his family were involved in the persecution" (Flynn 2), but then goes on to frustratedly argue, "our sense of this important formative influence, despite what we know (and can learn) about the lasting psychological effects of such experience, remains sketchy and still dominated by questions like fixing the date of Donne's 'conversion' to Anglicanism, or deciding about religious cynicism or 'apostasy' in his writings" (2). Although Flynn's overarching argument intends more broadly to draw attention to the intricate consequences of Donne's lineage and early life, the above statement highlights a potential flaw in the coterie culture of Donne scholarship: that the biography of Donne remains unnecessarily bifurcated and segmented. However, I do not mean to challenge this biographical practice, nor its influence on the study of John Donne, but rather, to take advantage of the segmentation by looking at nearly the narrowest possible sliver of Donne's life – a moment. By "moment" I mean the creation, performance, and impact of one of Donne's sermons. Even in the case of such publicly accessible, broadly reaching writing Donne is deeply personal and may seem at times to support vehemently in one moment what he rejects wholeheartedly in the next. But this conflicting of arguments in his sermons is entirely intentional, as it draws attention to Donne's core themes, which are explored to their logical limits and from multiple possible perspectives. His all-encompassing approach to argumentation plays off of his listeners' binary understanding of good and evil forces in their lives. Donne ends up playing with his listeners just as I shall play with mine.

As a preacher, Donne, of course, performed many sermons. And because these were the sermons of John Donne, indeed very few among his sermons are not worth discussing. I would agree with Peter E. McCullough's stance on the appeal and purpose of this portion of Donne's works: "[A]ttention to matters of text, place, auditory, and dating of Donne's court sermons demonstrates two more general points: that 'the court' itself is a social space much more complex than usually allowed in literary study, and that Donne's sermons (like all others) are fundamentally, although never simplistically, occasional pieces of writing" (179). However, there stands out one court sermon, which was crafted under seemingly irregular circumstances that caused a bit of a stir, and then was shelved as but a well-delivered pulpit oration. Donne's "First Sermon Preached to King Charles, at St. James: 3 April 1625," showcases a microcosm of Donne himself, and the moment in which this sermon was performed – where the intersections of Donne's style, faith(s), environments, politics, and responsibilities as a professional preacher are suddenly put on full display. Although somewhat rudimentary in their construction (but complex in biblical allusion), architectural images act as the centers of symbolic language in this prose work, communicating visually to the listeners Donne's casuistical[1] and parabolic approach towards some of the early modern period's current anxiety-inducing absurdities. As has been seen as a maturing trend in Donne, "[w]hether playfully in the *Songs and Sonets* and the *Paradoxes and Problems*, or more earnestly in "Satyre III," the *Essays in Divinity*, and the

sermons, he insists on the equivocal or casuistical nature of language and law" (Brown 72). From these architectural images branch several tangents, which further highlight the core message of the sermon. By fully exploring every example he raises, Donne attempts to relocate his fellow Englishmen's sense of panic for the nation by acting as a mediating force between the new monarchy and the Church. Though conservative in its rhetorical structure, this sermon is far from an ordinary piece of publicly distributed media. Through his use of "foundation" and "house" metaphors, Donne discreetly presents his ideologies and principles before the new king, while simultaneously criticizing his contemporaries misguided bickering over religio-political factions.

Current events have always played the largest role in determining the language employed for preaching at a Christian pulpit; second to this is the motivation for performing in the preacher profession. In Donne's case, a desire to inspire in others what his faith has maintained in him seems to be his most frequent motivation: "[he] pursues an Augustinian preaching strategy that seeks to establish the essential correspondence between the world of the Word through exhaustive elaboration of analogical parallels between mundane images and spiritual referents" (Guffey 104). And because of Donne's stylistic attachment to epic poetry conventions, whenever he employs a distinctly coded symbol, borrowed from his everyday observations, "[i]n all cases [of parabolic logic and imagery], it is apparent that the image has a pedagogical function: some aspect of human experience or the objective world is presented in order to communicate something about the spiritual life of people or the divine nature" (Guffey 106). Donne's passion for this form of linguistic expression is certainly not what is being argued here, but rather, additional factors on his motive for preaching this particular sermon ought to be noted when addressing the text of the sermon itself. Possibly strained circumstances in the formulation of this "First Sermon Preached to King Charles" stem primarily from the spontaneity by which Donne was selected to preach it. April 3 of that year marked the first Sunday after the death of James (March 27), and was announced to be the new king's first public appearance. As McCullough suggests, "rather than indecorously rushing into his deceased father's palace so soon after his death, Charles also chose to make that appearance at St. James's. Donne [who served there under the former king's household] received a peremptory summons to preach not at the old court, but the new, and that for Charles' first official appearance in only two days' time" (188). Exactly as it sounds, this sermon was scripted far more hastily than Donne's typical services. Additionally pressuring him was the uncertainty of performing before the newly appointed monarch. It was, however, possible that Donne relished the chance. To speculate one way, "[w]ith the death of King James in March and the invitation to preach to King Charles at St. James's[,] Donne was provided with an opportunity to establish clearly, at the outset of the new reign, his religious and political principles" (Shami 269). Indeed, it was common practice to utilize the pulpit in this way. Donne was no exception among his contemporaries in the practice of pushing his personal religio-political agenda through his preaching. While Donne has been noted throughout scholarship for his apparent fickleness in defending one political premise, and soon after its opposite, "[m]any of the topics that were considered within the preacher's brief – the duties of obedience and loyalty most notably – pertained to the community and the polity, and so they lent themselves readily to political treatment" (Morrissey 160). And although Donne remained polarized in his stance on "obedience" throughout his career, indeed it is this topic that comes up most often in his sermons. In the case of this sermon requested explicitly by the king, Donne speaks surprisingly unevenly in regards to obedience. In general he advocates strongly for willful and total submission as a positive virtue, utilizing the image of houses whose

foundations and frames rest within each other like the layers of a nesting doll, the larger foundation wholly responsible for supporting its smaller interiors. But, as this is in fact a traditionally constructed parabolic sermon, Donne's ultimate narrative agenda would have been to persuade his listeners, with casuistical logic and the intertwining images of familiar architectural spaces, to think more critically about his message. The audience would have been looking for a foundation in English society as strong as those Donne mentions throughout his sermon, perhaps hoping Charles I would have been framed as such a figure. However, Donne's message rests not on such liminal things as one earthly king, but rather, he aimed to talk about *real* foundations, among other, smaller points, which may have been tailored to appeal to Charles or to others in the audience more directly.

But, Charles naturally acted according to his own agenda in choosing Donne specifically: "It is well known that immediately upon his accession, Charles I inaugurated a reformation of court ceremonies and manners that put a renewed emphasis on decorum, and that this reformation consciously imitated Elizabethan practice" (McCullough 188 – 189). Donne's stance in preaching to that point had waxed and waned often on promoting the importance of decorum, manners, and personal loyalty to serve God and king. Most suspiciously then, Charles's choosing Donne would have been a most disquieting break of the very decorum he promoted. Additionally, "the Sunday sermon had, since at least the 1560s, been preached by a bishop. In hierarchical terms then, Donne's appointment to the afternoon Lent sermon replaced a bishop with a dean" (McCullough 189). However, "the supplanted bishop was not just any bishop, but the bishop of Durham, Richard Neile" (189). Coincidentally, Donne's religio-political interests and also his position relative to Neile were both to Charles's supreme advantage.

> Donne was the perfect choice of first preacher to a king who had, patronized in that chapel at St. James's a cadre of chaplains committed to zealous anti-Catholicism, unapologetic affirmation of the Synod of Dort, and the primacy of preaching as a means of grace. Just as Charles' decision to have the sermon at St. James's distanced him geographically and ecclesiastically from his father's court at Whitehall, so too [did] his reject[ion] of Neile. (McCullough 190)

Donne's appointment to preach before the king, both an opportunity and an obligation, was, regardless of Donne's actual performance at the pulpit, a deliberately interruptive decree on Charles's part. However, the sermon Donne ended up preaching before the king was, as most scholars have called it, "safe." But rather than merely agreeing upon this word as summary of the document as a whole, the sermon shows Donne's placement of himself within the preaching profession: "Donne might have agreed that being a preacher was a 'profession,' but not that being a preacher at court was. No preacher in the period was so exclusively attached to the court to deserve the misleading epithet 'court preacher.' But it is true that for Donne, the court was a preaching venue where, more than any other, he felt 'what an inthronization is the comming up into a Pulpit'" (McCullough 179). McCullough's statement here may appear to invalidate any importance the history surrounding this sermon holds. But actually it further confirms that Donne saw his occupation as one that inspires and leads, with much the same potential force as that of a monarch; therefore, it is seemingly inconceivable that he would merely preach safely. After all, it is Donne's specialty to hide radical meaning in plain view – or earshot – of his audience.

"Safety" in the Jacobean and Caroline pulpit takes the form of conventionalism and professionally tailored enthusiasm. By redacting the frills in one's language and relying only on one's skill in classical rhetoric, the delivery of any sermon becomes clearer; coupled with a concise and individuated interpretation of the text, the preacher is given less guarded access to his audience's attention. By seeming to speak without having hidden meaning and agendas creates the very environment in which these things may be weaved into the speech. Therefore, "Donne and the gospel are frank about what they are doing. And even in recounting the gospel story, Donne is openly evangelical" (Doerksen 20). So it is through a careful building of performative rhetoric that Donne goes from speaking overtly to covertly about his biblical text and his application of that text to society.

As 3 April 1625 was the fifth Sunday in Lent, Donne opens his sermon simply acknowledging this fact and introducing his text of choice for the message, Psalms 11:3 ("if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"). Specifically he says, "Wee are still in the season of *Mortification*; in *Lent*: But wee search no longer for *Texts* of *Mortification*. The last *Sabboth* day, was his *Sabboth* who entred then into his everlasting *Rest*; Be this our *Sabboth*, to enter into a holy and thankfull acknowledgement of that *Rest*" (Donne 1). This invitation is followed up with a recounting of the surrounding verses to the one chosen for the message as well as two interjections from Donne. Firstly, at the end of reciting Psalms 11:2, Donne preemptively rebukes David's protest, saying, "Though he take it almost as granted, that *Foundations are destroyed*…" (2), and then follows up by reciting the rest of the relevant narrative: "And in the fifth hee fixes it thus, *The Lord tryeth the Righteous*, (he may suffer much to be done for their trial)" (2). Donne comments here at the end that David's discomfort and panic are but another trial of life, designed by God for ultimate betterment of David's character. Naturally, this recital and hyper brief interpretation too is entirely standard procedure for a sermon of this time and type. As the introduction and premise of a late Lent sermon it is made easy to accept from Donne's commentary because they play into the most apparent reception of this biblical passage, informed and made even more apparent by the turbulent zeitgeist of the time: "[T]ensions [between the denominational factions in England] came to a head unexpectedly with the death of King James. That death signaled momentous change, and sermons preached on the occasion express the anticipation as well as the anxiety that marked the transition to the new regime" (Shami 257). Certainly these tensions would not have been resolved, nor even entirely disclosed within the span of a week. Donne emphasizes the hastiness with which David believes that foundations are destroyed to act as a parallel to the real world and his audience's fear that with James's "entering into rest" another drastic paradigm shift to religious and political policy was assuredly on the way.

Being in the position of spiritual guide for the people, Donne has made the passage relatable. Although the method here is indeed rhetorically rudimentary, the fact that the sermon is spoken aloud and enunciated specifically makes communication with the audience easier. Though now we are just reading the published words, John Donne went up to the podium on that day and made an act of it. As one scholar proposes at length regarding the oratory tradition, "[t]he sermon constitutes a theatrical re-enactment of the Biblical word, especially concerning the ways in which it encourages listeners to imagine themselves in the examples offered by the preacher" (Fetzer 26). By connecting his audience to the text, they are put a little bit at ease by becoming part of the act, which facilitates the speaker's ability to introduce new ideas and coded images, inversions, or affirmations. "Just as Donne did not leave behind his erotic passions when approaching God in his divine poetry, so did he retain his predilection for the theatrical

mode in his preaching" (Fetzer 27): this penchant for performing between genres of oration surely aided Donne in retaining and raising the attention of his listeners. But more importantly, as has been the case in all forms of performance, by more fully taking advantage of the connection between the typically dry genre of pulpit oratory and the more typically radical theatre, Donne has created a setup to propose far bolder philosophies fit for facing the societal turmoil that the changing of an era brings.

Still staying within the realm of his introductory ideas in this sermon, Donne's first true argument concerns the subject of the chosen passage – *the righteous*. Donne says following his recital of the text, "this is the *Argumentation* of the righteous Man… a constant Man should not be shaked at all…[,] yet these have not moov'd mee, because I have fixed my selfe upon certaine *Foundations*" (Donne 2). In other words, Donne is suggesting his audience reaffirm for themselves faith in their institutions and in God because he, the preacher, at least has found solid ground on which to stand. These "certaine *Foundations*" take the form of the metaphysical connection between body and mind. Donne states, "If *foundatinos bee destroyed*, intimates pregnantly, that except there bee danger of destroying *Foundations*, it is the part of the righteous Man, the godly man to bee quiet" (3). And he elaborates on what is required to remain silent by saying, "*Studie to bee quiet*, sayes the *Apostle*; *Studie*, that is an action of the Minde; and then, *Operam detis*, sayes the *Vulgate Edition*, *Labour to bee quiet*, and *Labour* is an action of the bodie: Indeed it is the proper business of the *Minde* and *Bodie* too, of *Thoughts* and *Actions* too, to bee quiet" (3). Although it may read as obvious sophistry to endorse a marriage of physical and mental exercise so as to heighten one's virtuousness – in this case, respect paid unto society by withholding one's potentially inflaming and unfounded concerns – there is another layer to Donne's argument, which pervades the majority of his pulpit performances and is not bound by the moment of this particular sermon. A blanket statement that summarizes Donne's modus operandi while at the pulpit would be: "[t]he major purpose of Donne's sermons [is] humankind's reconciliation with God" (Fetzer 25), thusly suggesting that Donne's perpetual goal is to more dramatically bring his listeners closer to God. As Fetzer later puts it:

> Sermons are directed in that they are minutely planned and aim at having some particular effect on their hearers who are consequently implicated in the ritual process. As a genre, the sermon is always audience-oriented or even audience-dependent and may be regarded as an instance of performance-centered rather than liturgy-centered ritual such as the Eucharist. (Fetzer 29)

Therefore, when Donne completes his framing of a truly righteous individual by saying, "And therefore that which hee addes there, for *Morall*, and *Civill* matters, holds in a good proportion, in things of a more *Divine* Nature" (3), the audience is more naturally acclimated, through auditory reciprocation and internalization of the preacher's words, to perform in reality as they have been instructed that they are capable of through the narrative of the sermon. The characters played by the audience members to the sermon become potential modifications to those peoples' true personae. As the performance continues, the audience becomes increasingly susceptible to Donne's proposition of "reconciliation," as well as whatever other ideas are stressed through his philosophizing. Donne encourages his listeners, through the creation of the righteous figure, to remain vigilant more so of their own capacity to sew discontent and suspicion by tactlessly spouting religio-political concerns, than of the potential threat of dissentious others. Donne turns an outward paranoia inward so as to fortify the foremost foundation: the self.

It is because of the dangerous potential of this verbal medium, as well as to always maintain a consistent level of clarity in his ideas, that Donne relies heavily on listing every possibly relevant example or element to accompany his ideas. As a result of this extensive deliberation of thoughts, "[d]iscussions of Donne's figurative technique in the sermons have focused on analogy as the principal means of communicating religious ideas via the imagery of ordinary experience" (Guffey 104). This fundamentalist approach to spoken rhetoric is employed so as to simplify the relationship between the physical, spiritual, and political sections of thought, which are always in communication with each other. "Most basically, [the sermons] engage in a characterization of one's relation to God and/or Christ, and they ponder how one's conversion to God can be effected" (Fetzer 33). Donne overstates his ideas so as to render them simply. But while neither the narrative of David as audience surrogate, nor the portrait of a righteous man is the centermost point of Donne's sermon about foundations, they do introduce us to the semantic forms and interplay of performance and persuasion in Donne's style at this important event. While a large court audience was certainly in attendance, Donne's most important visiting parishioner was indeed the new King Charles I. This sermon was preached both to and for the sake of the new king. Because Charles himself may be considered the true target audience, Donne preaching on foundations serves to implant his conception of what it means to be foundational to the king; additionally, knowing that Charles is still but one of many hearers on this occasion, he insists that his court listeners become the foundation that, in unity, holds fast beneath their king, just as their king is their foundation who must come to exemplify righteousness so as to reify his subjects' loyalty as a nationalistic foundation. It would be a self-actualizing circle of trust that both halves of the circle serve as foundations to the other.

Of brief mention before opening the full discourse on Donne's four houses in this sermon[2], is Donne's lengthy warning against the antithetical form of the "righteous man." He states that the act of remaining quiet is not to be confused with becoming indifferent towards one's circumstance or the circumstances of his/her neighbor(s). He refers to this antithetical figure simply as "a jealous man" – here meaning a person who has become overly invested in worrying. He says, "And to such a jealous man, when his jealousie is not a tendernesse towards his owne actions, which is a holy and a wholesome jealousie, but a suspition of his *Superiours* actions, to this Man, every *Wheele* is a *Drumme*, and every *drumme* a *Thunder*, and every *Thunder-clap* a dissolution of the whole frame of the World" (Donne 5). Noticeably, this dramatic condemnation of the *worrywart* does not wholly dismiss worry in and of itself; rather, anxiousness in moderation – itself an exercise of the mind – is part of a virtuous life, whose worry perpetuates self-reflection and therefore growth of one's soul. Otherwise, the "jealous man" seems only able to destroy himself through a cynical disavow-ment of his "superiors" – obviously referring to Charles within this context. Donne reaffirms his claim immediately by saying that "If there fall a broken tyle from the house, [the jealous man] thinkes *Foundations are destroyed*; if a crazie woman, or a disobedient childe, or a needie servant fall from our *Religion*, from our *Church*, hee thinkes the whole *Church* must necessarily fall, when all this while there are no *Foundations destroyed*" (5). As this is framed, the "jealous man" becomes enraptured with the goings on of individuals whose actions do not actually bear significant consequences upon the institution – those with little substantiated authority. To borrow from James Cannon's article regarding sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn, in this instance as well, "Donne unambiguously stated his belief that churches were sacred buildings, made so by … the presence of believers" (208). But most importantly, these believers are united in their religion by the

presence of authority – foundational figures – rather than individually concluding to hold exactly the same beliefs.

Donne prefaces his introduction of the four houses with a politically charged railing against the Roman Catholic Church. And, "[t]he conception of Donne as an anti-Catholic polemicist is hardly new or surprising; but nevertheless, as with most sermon prefaces, such arguments should be treated with a pinch of salt" (Cannon 207). Donne participated as much as any other Anglican preacher in the act of conflagrating Roman Catholicism; generally this was to emphasize the radical disconnect from an audience's conception of a political problem and the actuality of it by displacing the hearers' anger with their neighbor onto a foreign enemy. But where from his contemporaries this practice bears varied degrees of relevance to the main topics of their sermons (as apposed to zealous railing), Donne makes a point to utilize the same key metaphor in denouncing the Catholic Church as he does in affirming England and its Church. Just to take an adequate portion of this section from the sermon, for example, Donne says:

> But the uncharitablenesse of the *Church of Rome* towards us all, is not a *Torrent*, nor it is not a *Sea*, but a *generall Flood*, an universall *Deluge*, that swallows all the world, but that *Church*, and *Churchyard*, that *Towne*, and *Suburbes*, themselves, and those that depend upon them; and will not allow possibilitie of Salvation to the whole Arke, the whole *Christian Church*, but to one *Cabin* in that *Arke*, the *Church of Rome*; and then denie us this Salvation, not for any *Positive* Errour, that ever they charged us to affirme; not because wee affirme any thing, that they denie, but because wee denie some things, which they in their afternoone are come to affirme. (Donne 6)

The apparent comparison is to that of Noah's ark, and claiming that the Catholic Church denounces the Anglican with the same force as the great flood swept away wicked things. This passage includes several reversals: primarily that the Church of Rome is placed on the ark, while the Anglican Church is placed below in the water, but then that water is not purifying as it is contextualized in the biblical tale. Instead, these waters from Rome are thereafter addressed as "heresy." And Donne says, "It is true, that all *Heresie* does concern *Foundations*" (6). This melodrama is more than Donne's style building up to the main point however. "[I]n the 1620s, a new breed of anti-Catholic polemic was emerging, which aimed not so much to create 'clear water' between the Church of England and Rome, but to distance the former as much from puritan ideas and practices" (Cannon 208). It was more important to differentiate Anglican from puritan than it was to distinguish Protestant from Catholic, thus complicating the definition of "heresy" and muddling conception of its potency in the Church of England. Donne once again plays into the expectations of a court-commissioned preacher at this time, exploiting the safety of these religio-political practices to further build interest in his more radical propositions by generating a comfortable atmosphere – in this case facilitated by the comradery found in verbal persecution of the Catholics. He further condemns the Roman Church through a casuistical metaphor where he rails:

> All those Sentences of *Fathers*, or *Councells* that mention *Heresie*, and they call in *Brachium Saeculare*, all those *Lawes* which punish *Heresie*, and whereas *Fathers*, and *Councells*, and *States*, intended by *Heresie*, Opinions that destroyed *Foundations*, they bend all these against every point, which may endamage, not the *Church of God*, but the *Church of Rome*; nor the *Church of Rome*, but the *Court of Rome*; nor the *Court of Rome*, but the *Kitchen of Rome*; not for the *Heart*, but for the *Bellie*; not the *Religion*, but the *Policie*; not the *Altar*, but the *Exchequer of Rome*. (Donne 8)

Rome is thus reduced to but a physical place, where a Church so happens to exist, and it spouts "Heresy," where in turn England spits it out. This performative action against the Roman Catholic Church extends beyond theological disputes; it also satiates the listeners' distrust and dissolution towards their fellow Englishmen. By raising the most familiar straw man target, Donne initially distracts the audience from the closer, more frightening worry that their new king may become their religious enemy depending on whose clergy he shows favor towards. However, Donne backpedals by taking the moral high ground despite there being no particular need to, when he says, "But the Righteous lookes to *Foundations*, before hee will be scandalized himselfe, or condemne another" (8). This may be because, "Donne complicates absolutist interpretations by characterizing the text" (Shami 259), text in this case being social ideology, "as a case of conscience and by encoding within it… imagined expostulations" (259). And so before burying his intended message in the setup, Donne says, "but when every thing must be called *Foundations*" (Donne 9), as he has indeed inclined much of his speech thus far to make the assumption nearly anything could be foundational, "we shall never knowe where to stop, where to consist" (10). Thence it is here, halfway through the sermon, where Donne explicates the four houses.

There may be no more striking and easily understood Christian architectural image than that of a house – the word itself seeming to have infinite replacements with any other enclosed structure, be they physical buildings with walls and a roof, or the entirely abstract location of the habitation of the mind. It is, additionally, quite a simple task for a rhetorician such as Donne to order objects referred to as houses in hierarchical or symbolic order. "Logical codes include how certain types of people should behave in a given context, the value-judgment typically assigned to certain objects, and the scales by which various situations and relations are to be measured" (Guffey 107). The geographic truth behind a building taking up space in relation to another building which is also taking up space lends metaphors comparing houses subconsciously to these sorts of orderings. Implicit biases regarding architecture – such as the presumptions of which class of people get the larger houses – permit philosophizing with these kinds of symbols to be encoded with additional intended meanings at little cost to the accessibility of these symbols to their interpreter. Perhaps it is because of this rhetorical flexibility that Donne employed the most obvious overarching image to discuss his passage on foundations, foundations themselves having been largely contextualized as figures such as King Charles up to this point. By switching frequently between visual language to describe humans and abstracts as objective structure and vice/versa, he forces his audience to interact through processing the interchange. This generates questions in the mind of the listener, which Donne aims to answer adequately purely through repetition of ideas and extensive pronouncement of his topics. Questions as contemporaneous and direct as, "what societal strictures should actually be obeyed," are as frequently presented as abstract theological inquiries such as "in what place does one actually communicate with God." However, "Donne raises questions not to domesticate

them, but to offer them as reasonable, and therefore legitimate, extenuations of the letter of the law" (Shami 259). As I have been insisting, Donne is most certainly putting on an act with accessibility to his message as the main performative consideration. Regardless of whatever pressure he may or may not have felt being called to preach before the new king, "[i]t is significant that outside of the Lincoln's Inn pulpit Donne is far more straight-laced…" (Rhatigan 206), suggesting that though we may see the intertwining of Donne's usual metaphysical postulations and the history of his current moment whilst reading in hindsight, in lacking his typical audience, Donne's usual performance has been masked. In order to offer assurance to his listeners that the foundations of England have in fact *not* been destroyed, he cannot/does not merely state as such, but translates and breaks down his message into the symbols of the four houses and their foundations.

He introduces the houses thusly: "when wee speak of *Foundations*, wee intend a *house*: heere, wee extend this *House* to foure Considerations; for in foure *Houses* have every one of us a dwelling" (Donne 10). Donne's use of "this" here indicates the structure of the extended metaphor to be that there are four houses (Church, State, Family, and Self) existing within a singular larger house, and in each layer of this larger house Donne and all his listeners possess the right to own. I specify *layer* as each house that is introduced is framed as being within, or built so as to support the previous house – specifically, the smaller house must exist somehow under the next largest in the series. The largest, encompassing house, which is not discussed by any name, can therefore be surmised to be "the world," or "the universe," as its sole purpose is to contain the other four. And within this series of four houses there seems to exist a bifurcation. The first and second houses are explored and subsequently kept in tandem to one another for the unified purpose of addressing the new king directly. The third and fourth houses are kept in tandem with one another for the unified purpose of addressing those in service to Charles – otherwise known as "everyone else." It is in these pairings that the purpose of the righteous figure and the jealous figure become relevant to his message on so-called foundations.

From this point in the sermon onward definitions attributed to "foundations" are shifted away from persons of authority, such as prophets, scholars, or Charles, and planted primarily on objects that invoke authority, such as tangible forms of legislature and scripture. It is here that Donne truly begins his *play*. "As dramatic re-enactments, Donne's sermons strongly depend on the rhetorical concepts of *enargia* and *energia*, in order to make present that which is otherwise non-presentable, the divine" (Fetzer, 26), as well as to convey overlapping metaphors in a consumable manner. However, "[w]hat is particular to Donne's preaching is the way in which it adapts the communicative system of the theatre to the genre of the sermon" (26). Donne's performance style operated smoothly in a genre built upon bolstering Homeric metaphors – seen most prominently in this sermon where he verbally assaults Catholicism, as well as at the ends of each house, where he relates the plausible collapsing of foundations.

Beginning with the first and broadest house, the Church, Donne describes it as, "that *house* which hath no walles, but is spread over the face of the whole Earth" (Donne 11). He continues later, saying, "[o]f the first *House* then, … the foundation is *Christ, Other foundation can no man lay, then that which is layd, which Iesus Christ*" (11). Thus, the supposition is that Christ acts as the foundation of all the earth; but, more relevantly here, he is the foundation of England and cannot be shaken or modified, even by the king, thence rendering concerns that Charles's may reform the *Religion* moot. This may seem presumptuous, however, "[b]y assuming the orator's powers to teach, delight, and move, the Renaissance poet [in this case, preacher-poet] adopts a thoroughly rhetorical conception of literary form" (Baumlin 293). To a

certain extent, Donne had full reign to say whatever he pleased. Should members of the audience be alarmed by the potential change that yet another new monarch brings, such alterations to policy and ceremony, even within the Church, would not have exclusively defined the Church as Religion – whose soul foundation is Christ. So too, if observed inversely, Donne's description validates Charles's desire to reinforce decorum and propriety in the Church, as his decrees may enter into the liturgy without fear of supplanting "true religion." It is for this reason that Donne's further explanation of this house is framed almost exclusively as another denouncement of the Roman Catholic institution. Catholicism is specifically charged with fraud here, where by obvious contrast, the Church of England is exalted for it being a place in which God's acts may regularly manifest. Donne saying, "some *Synodes* and *Councells* of men of our owne Religion have said [the Church of England] is *Catholique* (And yet a *Harmony of Confessions* is good Evidence)" (Donne 11), may initially suggest that by way of ceremonial/traditional similarities that the also so-called "old Religion" remains in the Church by but a different name, however, this is not the case. Rather, this statement is calling out the zealous Calvinists for rebuking the Church of England in this very way. But Donne is known to have occupied a neutral, or at least circumstantial, position to criticizing both sides. As Cannon points out, "Donne's ability to create bridges between the moderate and Laudian camps… is testified to by the enthusiastic reaction of Donne's original audience, the distinctly unlaudian Society of Lincoln's Inn. Not only did members of the Inn throng to hear Donne's opinions, but they were enthusiastic enough about what Donne had said to encourage him to print his sermon[s]" (213). And so Donne reasserts that the only firm evidence for a Church to be validated in its faith is "onely this one, sayes hee, *Quia ipse Dominus Iesus, &.* because the *Lord Iesus* himself is the *Foundation* of this Church" (Donne, 12).

However, even considering Donne's habit of generously giving large spaces to images of powerful expressions, such as love and faith, in order to adequately frame the immensity of the object, in this case the foundation of Christianity, due to the setting under which this sermon was preached, more object-oriented evidence is illustrated in order to convey the reality of Christ as being the currently present foundation of the Church of England. Acknowledging the ever-skeptical nature of the courtly congregation, Donne says:

> But may not this be subject to reasoning, to various Disputation, Whether wee have that *foundation*, or no? it may; but that will goe farre in the clearing thereof, which the same Father sayes in another Booke, *Nihil in Ecclesia catholica salubrious fit, quam ut Rationem praecedat Autoritas*: Nothing is safer for the finding of the *Catholique* Church, then to preferre *Authoritie* before my *Reason*, to submit and captivate my *Reason* to *Authoritie.* This the *Romane Church* pretends to embrace; but *Apishly*; like an *Ape*, it kills with embracing, for it evacuate the right *Authoritie*; (Donne 12)

Further patronizing the Catholic Church, Donne points to an overdependence on institutional papal authority as dangerous. Blind allegiance to unwavering religious tradition is seen in this passage as having the inevitability of wringing the religion dry of any Truth. This relates explicitly to Donne's present listeners as their concerns for the Church as a pillar of society comes primarily from James's doubling down on Elizabeth's cultish reforms and their unease towards Charles's potential to spontaneously side with either the Laudian or moderate, or altogether alien ideology. "[E]xperiments in public debate [involving the 'educated laity'], coupled with a shift from the threat of a Spanish match to the reality of a French match" (Shami

257), – that Charles's potential engagement to a Catholic princess of Spain had shifted to the reality of Charles's actual engagement to a Catholic princess of France – "… provoked a crisis of identity for the English church" (257). The "apish" vice of Catholicism must have seemed terrifyingly close to strangling the Protestantism right out of England. Compounding confusion over intersection of religious, political, and philosophical topics delivered by untrained or silver-tongued speakers, lead to an ever-bubbling fear of Catholicism, as well as a budding distrust of opaque symbolism in liturgical ceremony, and dissonance among the hearsay of clerical figureheads. So realizing that a purely abstract or historically distant foundation is insufficient to satiate the audience's desire for a strong Church, or to be a foundation at all, Donne attempts to ground Christ as a present object kept within the first house. He says, "*Christ* then, that is, the *Doctrine of Christ*, is the *foundation* of this first *House*, the *Church*. *Hae sunt fundamenta quae jecit Salomon* layde; and then our *Translation* hath it, *These are the things in which Salomon was instructed*" (12). Donne then further clarifies the latter half of this by saying, "One calls it *Foundations*, the other *Instructions*; All's one; The *Instruction of Christ*, the *Doctrine of Christ*, the *Word*, the *Scripture of Christ*, are the *Foundations* of this *House*" (12). The foundation of the all-encompassing house, the Church, is the document by which it swears the deepest obedience.

> For, when the Apostle sayes, *Christ Iesus himselfe is the chiefe corner Stone*, et hee addes there, *Yee are built upon the Prophets and Apostles*: for the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, had their part in the *foundation*; in the *laying*, though not in the *beeing* of the *Foundations. The wall of the citie*, sayes Saint *Iohn, had twelve Foundations, and in them, the Names of the twelve Apostles*: But still, in that place, they are *Apostles* of the *Lambe*, still they have relation to *Christ*… (Donne 12)

The scriptures being the cornerstone, because, as it says in Genesis, "the Word was with God and the Word was God," and Christ being God and therefore the Word, serve as but another stone within the dwelling place that is the Church. Indeed, as the scriptures are said to be the cornerstone, their responsibility and capability to bear the weight of the Church is instrumental to the Church maintaining its sturdy form. However, this contextualizes that foundations as Donne means them, while grand is their commitment to be foundational, they are possibly quite unnoticeable in corporeal stature; the scriptures are but another stone in a manor built entirely of stones. As one critic puts it, in their chapter on an aspect of Renaissance aesthetic language, "[t]he artist and his reader might ultimately be reduced to silence before divine truth, but the artifact was intended to remain a means to that silence, a step in the process of quiescence, as long as time lasted – very much alive, speaking, intrinsically mimetic, and permanent in the intention of its structure" (Frost 80).

Donne goes on to describe the stone bases of the church where, "The *foundation* of the Wall, is sayde to bee *garnished with all manner of precious stones; Garnished*, but not *made* of that kinde of precious stones" (13). These stones are emblematic for the liturgy, decorum, and propriety, among other behavioral election within the Church. These stones are "understood to bee the *Determinations*, and *Resolutions*, *Canons*, and *Decrees* of general *Councels*: … bee understood to bee the Learned and Laborious, the zealous and the pious *Commentaries* and *Expositions* of the *Fathers*; For *Councells* and *Fathers* assist the *Foundations*; But the *foundation* it selfe is Christ himselfe in his *Word*" (13). As Donne claims, regardless of the parishioners' disputes over the garnishments upon the Church's walls, the walls yet remain as

walls, and the foundation remains as the foundation. Any change that Charles may bring to the Church is, therefore, but more adornments for that monumental pillar of English society.

However, Donne has embarked on this rhetorical tour through the four houses not especially to exalt the sturdiness of their foundations; but still, he does do this firstly in each house. Instead he brings warnings of what does indeed "destroy foundations." Even in this first house, for although its foundation is supposed to be Christ, the infallible deity, those who dwell within God's house are not also infallible. And their dwelling there may wear or upheave the respective house's foundation through error or deconstruction (malice). Such errors were seen to come about because "there was significantly more variety than consensus in establishment and anti-establishment views of the English Church, so much so that the heretofore easy terms – 'puritan,' 'Anglican,' 'Anglo-Catholic,' 'conformist,' and so on – have of late been more carefully qualified, and even occasionally discarded" (Hurley 152). In this first case, Donne warns, "[a]nd then, certainely they love the *House* best, that love the *foundation* best: not they, that impute to the *Scriptures* such an *Obscuritie*, as should make them *in-intelligible* to us, or such a defect as should make them *insufficient* in themselves" (Donne 13). Misinterpretation is shown to be a far greater threat to the Church of England than any dressing up of the religion – as he and many others have accused the Catholics of doing. In this way, Donne elicits a newfound anxious response from the audience. Suddenly, the straw-man enemy, the Church in Rome, is but an underwhelming example of poorly executed faith, whose faults come from naivety rather than intentional defamation of a true religion. And although, "[f]or Donne, there is some virtue even in infirmity, since it still leaves room for conversion" (Fetzer 35), here it becomes the incompletely informed and the misinformed evangelists in London's streets who pose the greatest threat to England's most important institution. As he dramatizes the portrait of these unwitting usurpers, "[t]o put such a Majestie upon the *Scriptures*, as that a Lay man may not touch them, and yet to put such a diminution upon them, as that the writings of men shall bee equall to them; this is a wrinching, a shrinking, a sinking, an undermining, a destroying of *Foundations*, of the *foundation* of this first *House*, which is the *Church*, the *Scriptures*" (Donne 13). The image evokes not particularly those who would diminish or usurp the foundation of the Church, but instead portrays their actions similar to the "*generall Flood*" imposed by continental Catholicism. This flood is one that washes away the foundation and makes it unrecognizable; Truth and order become buried by a falsified or unsubstantiated Word in much the same way that the sudden intervention of the climate destroys the potential of mankind's architectural advancement.

In his discussion of the second house, the state, Donne most directly addresses Charles, as it is the closest institution to the new king. However, Donne does not merely instruct that the king act pious, and strong, and kind, or in any other such fashion as would romanticize the role. As it is Donne's job as preacher, deliverer of the message, he translates a pointed message into a broadened one. As Morrissey asserts:

> This emphatic division between the text's doctrines and its *application* to the circumstances of the accession, is… merely illustrative of what the text describes. Any teaching the text has to offer on the king's duty to love good men is definitely not *applied* to an auditory made up of subjects, for whom such advice would be inappropriate: the lesson that they are to take from Donne's sermon is that England has been blessed with good and religious monarchs who can therefore be trusted to befriend good advisors. (Morrissey 165)

Though Donne pushes most strongly here for favor towards and from Charles, the foundation of this second house is of course not anything as impermanent as the highest born individual. "Enter wee now into a Survay of the second *House*, The *State*, the *Kingdome*, the *Common-wealth*; and of this *House*, the *foundation* is the *Law*" (Donne 13). Once again, the foundation of the house is the document most crucial to its perpetuation as a societal pillar. Donne reifies as well as elevates this foundation by stating:

> The *Law* is the mutuall, the reciprocall Suretie betweene the *State* and the *Subject*. The *Lawe* is my *Suretie* to the *State*, that I shall pay my Obedience, and the *Lawe* is the States *Suretie* to mee, that I shall enjoy my Protection. And therefore, therein did the *Iewes* justly exalt themselves above all other Nations, That *God was come so much nearer to them then to other Nations, by how much they had Lawes and Ordinances more righteous then other Nations had*. (13 – 14)

The law of the nation is given the romantic qualities of being organically cyclical and also being timeless in its appeal to mankind. England's laws are compared here to Hebrew ordinances as if to draw the connection that England too is sworn to God and protected by Him because good and faithful men designed them. Donne calls for obedience to the law not merely because this is the required expectation to dwell within any human nation, but also because he suggests allegiance to England is comparable to a relationship with the Almighty. This is just one location in this sermon where his "examples of parabolic logic occur in places where [he] posits an image according to the logic of analogy, then points to the inadequacy of that logic to describe the spiritual referent" (Guffey 116). The metaphor here is epic in its construction so as to emphasize how close the house known as the State is to the house known as the Church. Donne's desire to conjoin all meaningful words with the Word shows most strongly in describing this house. But in order to reasonably validate that the laws of men were comparable to the law of God as found in Scripture, Donne is tasked with deliberating every angle of the connections he makes. "Elaborating on the relationship between the text's doctrine and the circumstances of the sermon was the task of *applying* the text to the hearers, and it usually included exhortations to some virtue" (Morrissey 161). Then, Donne reminds his audience that the king, while not the foundation himself of either house, presides over both with full earthly authority (more so a regurgitation of common fact than an endorsement on the king's behalf). As he puts it, "[n]ow, as it is sayd of the *Foundations* of the other *House*, the *Temple*, *The King commaunded in the laying thereof*, the *King* had his hand in the *Church*, so is it also in this *House*, the *State*, the *Common-wealth*, the *King* hath his hand *in*, and *upon* the *foundation* here also, which is the *Lawe*" (14). Donne additionally lays forth what the king's authority in these houses takes the form of: "[S]o farre, as that every *forbearing* of the *Lawe*, is not an *evacuating* of the *Law*; every *Pardon*, whether a *Post-pardon*, by way of mercy, after a Lawe is broken, or a *Prae-pardon*, by way of *Dispensation*, in wisedome before a Lawe bee broken, is not a *Destorying of this foundation*" (14). Key in this description of ways by which the king executes his authority in both Church and State is that his power in upholding the foundation is likened to the spiritual power of Christ to forgive. Only through the king's earthly right to forgive legal sin, does he exude force upon the foundations of these houses, this power to forgive still being limited by the existence of the foundations themselves. Without the document of the law, there is nothing for which the king may rightly judge to forgive someone, so too, without the physical book of

scriptures, there is no means for a human to seek forgiveness through the Church. Here, "[Donne's] interest lies less in dictating when his congregation should [act upon the law], than framing the rule in such a way that they can decide for themselves when it is, and when it is not relevant" (Rhatigan 204). The king's authority is thusly exalted because of the strength of the societal foundations, which generate his authority in the first place. Insofar as this is a pragmatic, rather than a dogmatic, praise of the role of the king in this time, Donne's claim is rather bold.

But once again, the purpose of showcasing these places where foundations have been built is not solely to praise their existence, but also to discourage their incidental destruction. In the case of the second house, Donne most certainly does not openly suggest that Charles should reign in any particular way. Instead he draws our attention once more to the multitudinous enemy of dissentious crowds. He describes the failing of the law thusly:

> But where there is an inducing of a *super-Soveraigne*, and a *super-Supremacie*, and a *Sea* about our *foure Seas*, and a *Horne* above our *Head*, and a *forraine Power* above our *Native* and *natural Power*, where there are dogmaticall, Positive Assertions, that men borne of us, and living with us, and by us, are yet none of us, no *Subjects*, owe no *Allegeance*, this is a wrinching, a shrinking, a sinking, an undermining, a destroying of *Foundations*, the *Foundation* of this second *House*, which is the *State*, the *Law*. (Donne 14)

Once again, the destroying of foundations is coded as the flooding of water, in this case, the sailing of invaders from every direction into the island nation and bringing the tide of war, subjugation, and indoctrination with them. However, the source of these invaders is not from the outside. Also similar to Donne's argument in the first house, the dissenters are not those who bellow from the gates of the English Channel on armed ships, but those who hide within English borders, covertly acting in opposition to the nation's law, which in turn means they act in opposition to the Church's law. These people, as the moniker "dissentious crowds" suggests, are the closeted Catholics, whose public facades bely their inner rejection of royal English authority. Because these Catholics are both Englishmen and Catholic they are considered, according to this argument, master-less, for they are raised explicitly to perform falsely before their fellow Englishmen, whilst acting disobediently in private, therefore invalidating the foundations of the English Church *and* State. Because of this, "[u]ndoubtedly Donne accepted the serious implications of outward conformity, but he and some members of his Lincoln's Inn congregation seem also to have been able to enjoy a perspective on the more absurd side of the debate" (Rhatigan 186). This absurdity Rhatigan mentions refers to the English conception of Anglo-Catholics and their allies occupying a comically evil role, described akin to rat-folk, living literally in the walls of Anglican and Puritan homes and waiting for a lull in the religious factions' arguing to "strike" at England – for there were many Catholics in England, and few could help but to point fingers at whichever houses were most infested with their heresies. However, it was absolutely more likely the case in reality that English Catholics lived as ordinary people, disguised simply as cynics belonging to some other doctrine. Donne's choosing to rebuke his former brethren in this blunt, dramatic manner plays off of the fact that he has persisted in a career built on faith for so long.

> Donne's Catholicism, like that of the Heywoods and More, was of a sort that could survive the Council of Trent only through fierce resistance on its own terms. Deprived of normal conditions for spiritual and institutional development, such Catholics clung to old ways increasingly irrelevant as the sixteenth century wore on. Their isolation became increasingly painful and confounding, and became also the source of their increasingly ineffectual ironies about religion. (Flynn 8)

In other words, regardless of our ability to ever actually evaluate Donne's stance on Catholicism at this junction, it remains true that Donne, like many former and closeted Catholics, has grown tired of institutional disputes interrupting his faithfulness. For the house, Donne is drawing attention to the threat of a form of Catholicism that, in England, has become so divorced from its parent religion that its potentially harmful influence on the Church and State of England may otherwise be left unrecognized: "[t]he old Church 'died' under Elizabeth, and the 'sect' that subsequently replaced it under the name of Catholicism was an exotic or hybrid growth of a distinct character" (Flynn 3). In this way, Catholics who remain in hiding from English persecution incidentally create confusion in religious as well as in legal forums by being made to adhere to outdated philosophies. This supposed threat to English authority and ceremonial tradition is only made relevant, however, because of England's generally unyielding policies towards such individuals, causing a cycle of doubling down in retaliation to the other side.

To return to a previous suggestion – that the four house structure is bifurcated, with the first and second being linked, and the third and fourth houses thereafter being linked – the first half of this division, the houses of Church and State, comprise the public houses, and also pertain to concerns and obligations of the righteous figure from Donne's introductory argument. Where then by process of binary elimination, the third and fourth houses comprise the private houses, and pertain to concerns and obligations of the jealous figure. In the case of the former pairing, the purpose of this linkage is to formulate a direct address to the new king. "Most striking about this sermon from a religio-political point of view is how differently Donne treated the matters of Charles' family, church, and state from the way that bishop Richard Neile might have done on this auspicious occasion. Donne preached to Charles with a vocabulary and tone well-rehearsed by godly conformists" (McCullough 190), suggesting a show of approval explicitly for Charles's attachment to ceremonies; but as I have pointed out, Donne's own attachment to the decorations of the Church, and therefore advocates of such things, is inconsistent at best. Although the arguments presented for the first and second houses are directed rhetorically for the more general audience, there is a clear through-line where the maintaining of these houses' foundations rest mostly upon the shoulders of those with the greatest authority – and none could be higher than the king. Additionally with Charles in the audience after having explicitly requested Donne be the preacher, while it can neither be assumed nor proven, there is room to speculate that Charles had a distinct expectation for the dean. That the first two houses are the broadest reaching sources of religio-political influence, and both are defined by their conflict with civil disobedience and unrest is more than just structurally sound in that the houses become progressively closer to the individual. The proposition Donne suggests by declaring these dissentious elements as both houses' potential destroyers is that he is primarily nudging the king to consider certain courses of action, as no one else in attendance could reasonably assume the role of society's sole defender and savior. The righteous man's defining trait is his patient stoicism, which neither teeters towards hubris, nor towards disillusionment (indifference). The righteous man exists in contrast to Donne and other Catholic-affiliated people, as well as morally

and capably above the majority of his fellow man. This figure is responsible for reinforcing the foundations of Church *and* State, a role that only a ruler can occupy. Because of this it is safe to say, "Donne seems to have delivered the right message on the day, for the sermon swiftly appeared in print with a dedication to the king, both of which facts imply royal approval" (McCullough 190). Donne's veiling of this personal address is done out of respect for the medium of pulpit oratory. He always speaks generally and dramatically, so as to enthrall all his listeners, whilst proposing his own opinions and endorsements of societal reform with precise target audiences in mind.

As I have been mentioning here and there, Donne has never been a writer to remain married to one idea for a long time, even should he return to that thought later. That in this case he appeals to Charles to be a fair and righteous king is not as shallow as it may initially sound. Donne's definition of what it means to be tolerant, fair, righteous, and other romantic ideals are informed more so by his texts than by his own opinion on the matter. "Donne's sermon not only begins with a scriptural text but also actually adheres to that text and focuses on it, drawing as well on many more biblical passages. And beyond that, Donne's high and loving esteem for the Bible is everywhere evident in his sermons" (Doerksen 11). There is a critical process behind any comment or argumentative direction Donne makes. Naturally he would preach positively about the king to the king's face, especially considering that Charles's accession marked a chance for Donne to advance professionally, after having stagnated under James. As McCullough states, "Charles saw in Donne a churchman almost *sui generis* – one so complicated in his confessional past and present opinions as to be the almost perfect herald for religious compromise and consensus in the new reign. Here was a preacher whose commitment to the crown was unimpeachable" (192). Donne's personal voice shows more so through his erratic forays with mixing poetical elements in more familiar territory. So instead, what we have by way of the first two houses is a fairly conservative proclamation to *do a good job*. However, this does not account for the second half of the four houses. Donne's most apparent goal may have been to preach to the king, but it was not his only goal. Having delivered the bulk of his message for the king by this point, the latter half of the houses (Dwelling Home, and Self) serve as a message for the rest of the congregation; Donne presents these houses so as to firstly assure the rest of his audience that the foundations of their spheres of influence are yet intact, but also, and more pointedly, he criticizes the "jealous" concerns of his contemporaries for being the very upheavals of foundations they sought to root out.

So on the other hand, the third and fourth houses address the nature of private spaces, and seem to aim at correcting or balancing the behavior of the jealous figure from Donne's introductory argument. Whereas the first two houses promote the act of changing one's perspective in order to more constructively reach social reform, the latter two emphasize the virtue of introspection. Both halves tackle the effects of early modern anxieties and paranoia, but the third and fourth houses more corrective and pointedly. The third house is described as, "*Domus quae Domicilium, Domus habitationis*, our *Dwelling house*, or *Family*, and of this *house*" (14), and of this house, "the *foundation* is *Peace*" (14). Peace here takes a modified form from what a modern reader may expect. It is not the peace found in oneself through religious assurance or familial interdependence, but the peace of submission. As Donne says, "for *Peace* compacts all the peeces of a *family* together; Husband and Wife, in Love and in Obedience, Father and Sonne, in Care and in Obedience, Master and Servant, in Discipline and Obedience: Still *Obedience* is one Ingredient in all *Peace*; there is no *Peace* where there is no *Obedience*" (14). Firstly, this obedience is due unto the ultimate Father, God, then unto the

earthly father, the king, and as it is expressed in Donne's catalogue, unto the patriarch of the household. In turn, said patriarch returns love, care, and discipline in exchange for the peace he provides. Therefore it is the patriarch's obligation to have "peace" – or leadership and security – available, and it is his irrevocable responsibility to uphold that peace. Naturally, this patriarch is afforded certain freedom because of his position of authority over all others who dwell within his house. But with that freedom and authority comes the anxiety that he may lose it. This anxiety is, of course, called jealousy. And so, the source of the third house's foundation – peace – is also the jealous figure, whose own jealousy creates the potential to upheave the house's foundation. This self-actualizing dilemma caused by the importance of obedience to another individual within the house's dwelling stems from the most heated debate in the public forums of the time. Across its whole, it is stated that:

> [This sermon] engage[s] the most vexed theological questions in the public sphere of late Jacobean preaching; obedience to human and divine law; conversion and conformity; … [This sermon] also continue[s] Donne's fundamentally casuistical interpretive habits by balancing moral alternatives within the context of competing human and divine laws. This way of approaching moral issues shows Donne's audience how to redefine for their own consciences the meaning and practice of obedience. (Shami 258)

Because the leading figure is poor in managing his role as the head of that community's ideology, those who dwell with them may not pay obedience, and thus he becomes jealous over this minor incursion. But, not every instance of jealousy, causes the destroying of the foundation. As Donne illustrates, "[n]ow every smoke does not argue the house to bee on fire; Every domestique offence taken or given, does not destroy this *Foundation*, this *Peace*, within doores. There may bee a *Thunder* from above, and there may bee an *Earth-quake* from below, and yet the *foundation* of this House safe" (14). The house known as *family* is not so easily torn asunder by the climatic interventions, which disrupt the first two houses (floods, which are emblematic of heresy), because this house is built of smaller, more easily accounted for, moving parts – people in relationships with one another. The third house confirms, "[f]or Donne, belief is the key, not the relative efficacy of word versus image" (Hurley 142). And even should the foundations be shaken by such natural disasters as jealousy or the happenstances of life, it does not immediately mean the collapse of this house. The pillar of the family is far more flexible in the face of opposition than the Church or State. But of course, where the foundations may fail is where:

> [I]f there bee a windowe opened in the house, to let in a *Iesuiticall firebrand*, that shall whisper, though not proclaime, deliver with a *non Dominus sed Ego*, that though it bee not a declared *Tenet* of the *Church*, yet hee thinkes, that in case of *Heresie*, Civill and Naturall, and Matrimoniall duties cease, no Civill, no Natruall, no Matrimoniall Tribute due to an *Heretique*; Or if there bee such a fire kindled within doores, that the Husbands jealousie come to a *Substraction* of necessary meanes at home, or to *Defamation* abroad … and prey upon him … and such as there, there is a wrinching, a shrinking, a sinking, an undermining, a destroying of *Foundations*, the *Foundation* of this third *House*, which is the *family*, *Peace*. (Donne 15)

And once more, Donne redistributes the source of the house's shaking foundations onto Catholicism. Simply put, he reiterates the point that anxiety over not knowing the full location and influence of closeted Catholics in England causes unnecessary strain in family life. In this case, the trait of jealousy found in the homestead's patriarch is escalated by his paranoia about his neighbors. To a modern audience, this may sound as though Donne is simply ignoring the more probable cause for concern being said patriarch's own sense of inferiority, thus heightening his fear of the unknown, and disrupting his capacity to trust those in his home. In the most positive expression of a moderate jealousy, "[t]he individual, as he conformed more perfectly to the pattern of Creation, partook in that perfection and reflected it to others" (Frost 88). So, when one's sense of this communication with the natural/divine order was disrupted by fallacy and self-doubt, it translates this same sentiment into melancholy and malice. Most certainly, the sentiment that even one's wife or child could be a religious enemy would have been felt by Donne's court audience, as well as by the educated laity who read his sermon. But the point being made here is that the failure of the father figure is a collective failure on part of all parties within the home. The unit of the family, as is asserted for this house's core argument, is in a pact of exchange with the fatherly authority and must be a relationship built on trust. For Donne and his audience, a failure to control – which is not to be mistaken with "snuff out" – one's jealousy would be understood as a failing of peace, of the whole family. "Donne's appeal here to doctrinal peace at home is in turn a battle cry for at least a spiritual war with Rome" (McCullough 191), as indeed, the pent up anger and unrest of the English populous had only been quelled, imperfectly, through mutual hatred of Catholicism. Once again, the sense of comradery emphasized through the medium of preaching is framed as the currently most important state of mind and action any righteous Englishman could take.

But then for the fourth and final house – the self – there is much more of Donne's noteworthy style to unpack. As one critic asserts, "Donne conceives of the text in terms of both a temporal structure and an architectural anatomy. Both the body and the text house the soul, and just as the body is made up of parts, so too is the text. In his sermons, Donne describes the text as made up of three parts: the context, the pretext, and the text itself" (Collins 29). In order to address the amorphous object of the self, Donne establishes the biblical text – which precedes the sermon –, then explicates preliminary metaphors and comparisons in preparation for this deeper assertion, and finally speaks directly about the complex object for which his entire argument has built towards. It would then seem no surprise that it has been readily observed since criticism about Donne began, that his works are generally obsessed with discovery and qualification of the self, or placement and reclamation of the self. The self is to Donne a narrative object to be manipulated for the sake of its own discovery. "Donne views the self in spatial terms, and as partaking in both body and soul, all things corporeal and intelligible" (Collins 33). The self occupies a place, always where that which is entirely tangible is situated outside of logical cohesion with the real world and most often that tangible object that has been displaced is the observable "self." In this sermon, Donne begins speaking of the fourth house, the self, where he says:

> [It is] a poore and wretched *Cottage*; worse then our *Statute Cottages*; for to them the *Statute* layes out certaine *Acres*; but for these *Cottages,* wee measure not by *Acres,* but by *Feete*; and five or sixe foote serves any *Cottager*: so much as makes a *Grave,* makes up the best of our *Glebe,* that are of the *Inferiour,* and the best of their *Temporalties,* that are in the greatest *Soveraigntie* in this world: for this *house* is but *our selfe,* and the *foundation* of this *House* is *Conscience*. (Donne 15)

Donne's approach to selfhood here is still surprisingly literal. The house is the body, described according to its approximate dimensions, and contextualized by its mortality. The foundation of this house is one's self-awareness. As he has been insisting since the onset of the sermon, it is introspection that both grounds and makes resolute the foundations of these houses. The house of the self is the most individually fragile for obvious reasons, but it is elected as being the most influential, the conduit from which affirmation and reformation of the three other houses comes out, the most humble dwelling, and therefore the most Christ-like, and the house responsible for the acquisition and expression of faith; "[t]he relationship between God and humankind is imagined as one of mutuality even interdependence, where giver and recipient, God and each man and woman, can hardly be distinguished. Such a view of the relationship between God and the self proves typical of Donne's sermons" (Fetzer 25).

The compact frame in which the self dwells is described as wretched here for two reasons. Donne's acknowledgement of and strong bond with the physicality of life shows here, as the literal filthiness of the human form is invoked by comparing it to a dilapidated state-sponsored home. And also, the body is called wretched because its physical barrier hinders its foundation, "conscience," from being expressed to its fullest capacity: "[w]hile inner transformation is the goal… [the means of deliverance] suggest that the way is both early and communal" (Shami, 261). Of course, one's self, the governor of one's conscience, is the individual who dwells within this home and rests upon its foundation, as well as being the frame around that foundation. "Self," then, is to Donne the result of conscience, as the latter is this house's foundation. As he says, "[t]he *House* comes not till the time to come" (15), almost assuredly referring to physical birth, "but the *Foundation* must bee layde heere" (15). In this way, the foundation of one's self is laid before they may occupy it, as would make sense for any actual house. But here, this would confirm Donne's current allegiance to at least some kind of predestination, where although a person's soul is but a tenant of their body, said body comes prefurnished with a conscience, the product of modification(s) of the parent's conscience, and so on into history. Donne says a conscience "hath but these two *Elements, Knowledge,* and *Practice*; for *Conscientia presumit Scientiam*" (16). He then explains by recounting a commonly held philosophical view of deeds, "[h]ee that does any thing with a good *Conscience,* knowes that hee should doe it, and why hee does it: Hee that does *good* ignorantly, stupidly, inconsiderately, implicitely, does *good,* but hee does that good *ill*" (16). In other words, he means to persuade listeners to act kindly because of an inherent sense of nobility found in themselves. However, rather than also stating the typical inversion – that good deeds done out of desiring something else is ignoble – he returns to his overarching point about introspection and self-awareness. One must be aware of their actions; else they find their good deeds do little good. Among Donne's audience would have been prominent ideologues and propagandists, who took pride in their proselytizing *for the good of England*. Donne's argument here is that such "good" can only do "ill" because those preaching their religion in that way do not also take their message to heart and act according to an inherent love of their religion, but instead act out of

narrow allegiance to a religious faction; a similar zealousness had come to be expected from even the more moderate members of a typical courtly congregation. This is not to say that Donne explicitly condemned the act of proselytizing here – as he in fact did in "Satyre III" – but that he condemned the lack of independent thinking on part of his social peers.

As the foundation of the fourth house is abstract, partially mobile, and not entirely observable – like that of the third house – so too is the active force that destroys the self. Donne claims the destruction of conscience to be "s*innes*, which by *Gods* ordinary grace exhibited in his *Church*, proove but *Alarums*, but *Sentinells* to the *Conscience*: The very sinne, or something that does naturally accompany that sinne, *Povertie*, or *Sickenesse*, or *Infamie*, calls upon a man, and awakens him to a remorse of the sinne" (16). Then the great threat to the foundation of oneself is in fact, possibly, equally as impermanent as the house itself. Sin is rudimentarily understood to be damning, particularly in the belief that the accumulation of sin permits more easily the chance to transgress. But in this instance, while the mark of sin may be in direct opposition to a good conscience, acknowledgement of the source of that sin will most probably lead to healing that conscience, and thus revitalize the self's foundation. As Donne continues in this line of thinking, "some sinnes helpe him in the way of repentance for sinne; and these sinnes doe not *destroy the foundation*" (16). Through the act of transgressing, one may be presented a new opportunity to repent for that transgression, and the same is theoretically true each and every time. So, according to Donne, the loop created by Man's constant sinfulness degrading one's selfhood, simultaneously generates another loop whereby the individual becomes awakened to their reconcilable relationship with God, thus causing the creation of an organic, perpetual communication with the Divine. So he decides here that in fact sin too is but another venue through which one may make contact with God and replenish peace within oneself. It is not necessarily an ultimate destructive force.

So instead, what seems the enemy of conscience, and does destroy the foundation of the self, is something that immobilizes the fourth house. That is to say, "a *Feare*, as (as it is added in the next verse) *Betrayes the scours that Reason offers him*, That whereas in reason a man might argue, *God* hath pardoned greater sinnes, and greater sinners, yet hee can finde no hope for himselfe; this is a shrinking, a sinking, an undermining, a destroying of this *Foundation* of the fourth *House*, the *Conscience*" (16). Fear – the ultimate source of all anxiety – permeates throughout the house of the self and severs the link between man and God – to Donne, perhaps the greatest outrage – and from there spreads infectiously to the third house, where it dissolves the relationship of kin, and then it infects the second house, where it generates disdain for authority and reason, and finally it spreads to the first house, where it causes eruptive disputes and destructive rumors, and worst of all, disillusionment. "In the context of Donne's… condemnation of 'indifferency,' one may even suspect that inevitable disaster announces itself as soon as a person is no longer vulnerable. A notion of the self as inherently, but also ideally unstable and thus open to conversion, either to God or to temptation, is at the heart of [the] sermon" (Fetzer 35). Fear, the least tangibly described of all the destroying forces begets all former destructions.

Donne does not seem to provide a certain answer to repudiate fear. After all, Fear is mankind's most primordial sensation besides possibly love. So instead Donne reiterates his foremost argument: "[t]ill *foundations* are shaked, the righteous stirres not" (16). And soon after this he relocates the foundations of all the four houses as being together. He says, "and all their Centers are in wheeles, and in perpetuall motions" (17). This image clearly invokes the wheel of fate, going so far as to say each house's fate moves parallel to the others, yet independently. So,

in the face of a predestined destruction, as it may have seemed to loom over England upon the occasion, Donne gives command for action, asserting, "[s]o then, in the *Text,* we have a *Rule* implyed, *Something is left to the righteous to doe, though some Foundations bee destroyed*; for the words are words of *Consultation*, and *consultation* with *God*; when Man can afford no Counsayle, *God* can, and will direct those that are his, the righteous, what to doe" (17). The force of fear may come to dispel any connection to God, but Donne persists, suggesting courage to seek God still is indeed the only remedy. Said courage also bears the capacity to reunify a family, a neighborhood, a government, or a Religion, as courage promotes faith in all places. This is a conversion of fear to fascination and though it may be argued this idea was put forth too late, "[i]f the central agenda of the Biblical word is to move and invite individuals to consent willingly to their conversion, the difficulty of translating the Biblical word in all its performative might can be brought about solely by way of performing what is said in the Bible as immediately as possible in each sermon" (Fetzer 37). Donne ought to have by this point, through his exuberance, pleasantly coerced his listeners over to his side of strong, yet un-invasive faithful surety. However, as persuasive as Donne's rhetoric may be, history obviously shows the tide of the religio-political debates in England were not so dramatically punctuated by this singular oration, nor did King Charles become the impartial righteous figure Donne promoted in this sermon.

A solution, which can be framed so idealistically as "courage," would not have appealed to the realist listener. "The co-operation with God promoted on the level of story is to be effected by conversion into one or several of the dramatic personae presented there. Although Donne's sermons aim at motivating listeners to court God, this courting goes hand in hand with the preacher's courting of his listeners" (Fetzer 38). The ritual of this courtship through monologue, in Donne's case, relied on the power of melodrama. In a way it was to the already conscious listener a welcomed distraction with the side effect of supplementing one's communication with God: whereas beyond the chapel's walls, the general turbulence felt across English society had culminated in widespread skeptism and manifested the very real fear of civil and religious rebellion. And these feelings of dissatisfaction at the overarching dysfunctional relationship between the levels of English institutions had reached a level of stress-inducement that began to generate true indifference to the possibly controllable fate of England and its Church. "The illocutionary force of each sermon comes down to an encouragement and promotion of conversion on the part of the speaker, so that the sermon's felicitousness would be limited merely to the audience's recognition of its illocutionary force as an invitation to identify with its examples" (Fetzer 39). In order to accomplish this, Donne is only left to preach the obvious in hopes that some number among his audience feels reassured by his words when he says, "[h]ee is safe in *God*; and then he is safe in his owne *Conscience,* for, *The Righteous is an everlasting foundation*; not onely that he *hath* one, but *is* one; and not a temporary, but an everlasting *Foundation*; So that *foundations* can never bee destroyed, but that hee is safe in *God*, and safe in *himselfe*" (Donne 18) Protection of oneself is assured through God; this is, of course, the most fundamental of Christian resolutions, thus potentially quieting Charles's restless new subjects.

As I stated earlier, the third and fourth houses are paired so as to address private spheres and Donne's "jealous man" in more detail. Because of the nature of these houses in his arguments, both their foundations and their destroyers are dramatically more abstract than those of the former pair. The fourth house in particular operates almost entirely in abstractions and explications of positivist platitudes: "[Donne's] mind opens outwards, past the horizon of place,

into a space beyond matter and experience, a dimension of awareness, formed by the old philosophy of the cosmos" (Gorton 63). The only grounded image we are most certainly given in this section of the sermon is of a weathered, tiny house, placed in an undescriptive plot of most presumably uninteresting land. While in the third house, the figure of the jealous man was charged with curbing his nature in order to exercise the foundation of peace, which would be accomplished through bearing a good conscience, in the fourth house, this figure's conscience is more pointedly the target. The surrogate figure is corrected harshly for poorly practicing good will, and is characterized positively only in the humility of their stature and presence. In either case, however, these descriptions, while applicable to any singular audience member's intrapersonal relationship, seems starkly contrasted to the role suggested to be filled by Charles – the righteous figure who is justly proud. So if this section of the sermon is directed at some other portion or person in the audience, little to nothing can be confirmed. After all, "[t]he active discretion of Donne's performance at court, and the strenuous reiteration of foundational principles, mark precisely the anxieties of the incoming monarch's church, but also the ethical demands of preaching in the public sphere in 1625" (Shami 271). But what is indeed observable, as it is here in the text, is how each individual house exists within and/or adjacent to the next, and yet they are subdivided into sorts of urban neighborhoods – centers of public discourse in London. Environment and atmosphere are crucial to Donne, yes as a poet, but also as a performer. For all that I have gone on about his ecclesiastical intentions, we much always also remember the secular in Donne. "John Donne was a Londoner born and bred, and his [writings] take much of their life from the life of that city. His most tender [works] have that satirical edge – the awareness of an outside world that has no time for love. It makes them seem real, and immediate" (Gorton 61). This consciousness towards the relationship between spiritual and corporeal is just as integral to reading his sermons as it is his early love poems, for Donne seems inclined to always think in pairs, starting first with the pairing of ethereal and real.

But, that was not the end of this sermon. Donne's final points consider the proper responses should foundations actually be destroyed. Most strikingly among these responses is to the disruption of the first house. Donne poses, "[f]or such things then, as concerne the *foundation* of the first *House*, … Call not *Ceremoniall*, and *Rituall* things, *Essentiall* parts of Religion, and of the worship of *God*, otherwise then as they imply *Disobedience*; for *Obedience* to lawfull Authoritie, is alwayes an *Essentiall* part of Religion" (18). On the one hand this statement is in contradiction with Charles's sentiment for bringing back into the Church practices from Elizabeth's reign, and also with Donne's own observance to ceremony and decorum in delivering this sermon. To think of such things as nonessential does align with the description of gemstones from the first house, but here it would further suggest that not only are such rites merely supplemental to religion, but they are also superfluous. "Repeatedly, then, while Donne asserts that although images, rituals, ceremonies, even when connected with sacraments, in themselves do nothing, incite no belief, he still finds them informative" (Hurley 141). In the case of the second house, Donne simply restates as he did in his initial argument: that obedience to the law supersedes one's complaint of the law. And he goes further to say that private disobedience of a law one finds dissatisfactory is perhaps more dangerous than public refusal to obey, as at least in the latter case, one may be corrected so as to thencely follow and trust in the law. However, when switching to resolutions within the third house, Donne emphasizes the importance of private defusement of altercations. He says, "For those things which concerne the *Foundations* of the third *House*, the *Family*, Call not light faults by heavie Names; [do not] … let every light disorder within doores, shut thee out of doores, or make thee a stranger in thine owne

House" (19). The persistent underlying concern for the dangers of isolation and alienation come out here as they did when discussing the active destruction of the fourth house. Zealous persecution seems to occupy the same consequential space as indifference for Donne. However, as has been observed both here and throughout his other works, moderation is hardly an acceptable response either. But then again, he is perhaps projecting his own indecision of his identity. By resolving the house metaphors – by way of hypothetically destroying their foundations – Donne seems to try to reconcile both the message he is delivering to the congregation, as well as to convince himself that he is right. As stated by Collins, "Donne's use of both satire and epic conventions [such as his combination of the dramatics of oration with the extenuated metaphors of epic here] reflects his notion of selfhood as an unfinished fusion of contrary elements" (42). He seeks to bring everyone to a level of conviction, which reproduces certainty in both institutional protection and in the valuation of oneself. However, this is distinctly different from desiring a stoic tolerance of differences within communities. Returning to the casuistical base of this sermon's argument, "[a]s laws and conventions vary according to circumstances, so must our actions. Moral judgments, Donne affirms, should be qualitative [and] contingent" (Brown 73). Therefore, Donne actively encourages conflict, but suggests discretion and constructivism be observed in causing it, and seems determined to drag people from their subsisting positions into more assertive roles within reason of their station.

An unsophisticated phraseology for summarizing Donne's intent with this sermon would be to suggest he's telling people to *get over themselves*. He says of the fourth house in his closing argument:

> Lastly, for those things which concerne the *Foundations* of the forth *House*, *Our selves*, Mis-interprete not *Gods* former Corrections upon thee, how long, how sharpe soever: Call not his Phisicke, poyson, nor his Fish, Scorpions, nor his Bread, Stone: Accuse not *God*, for that hee hath done, nor suspect not *God*, for that hee may doe, as though *God* had made thee, onely because hee lacked a man, to damne. (Donne 20)

This is both reassuring to those burdened most by the uncertainties of the period, as well as condemning those who seem content to wallow in cynicism towards every possible slight against them. Neither religion, nor monarchy shall fall out of a purely verbal disagreement. Donne's final purpose is to reject his listeners' rejections of God's providence and protection. "[They] are afforded a call, and Donne assures them that unless they hear God's word as a voice, it will be unintelligible, ineffective for salvation…. God's canon and music, can support faith; but unless we hear them as a *voice* we think of them as emergent contingencies and natural accidents. We can be said to hear… when we know whence the voice comes" (Shami 261). It is, as most of the sermon is, a rather formalized and conservative means by which to culminate all his arguments, but as the virtues of waiting in a state of introspection and social awareness – known to us now as "thinking" – are most central to the message being delivered, perhaps a blunt and un-radical belting of the point served his purposes best. But Donne has always made it clear from both his poetry and his prose that a lazy or rushed construction never adequately accounts for a change in Donne's style or writing habits; nor does his loud spirit seem to alter course in the face of pure professionalism. It has always been his habit to freely jump from one style to the next, only to return to the previous with elements from the second. However, his pursuit of authenticity seems never to wane. This pursuit is practically cubist in how determined Donne has shown himself to be in wanting to show every angle at once of his next idea, be those angles imaginary or real.

And it is for this reason that the simple architecture and urban spaces illustrated in his first Caroline sermon stand out as hallmarks of Donne's way of communicating symbolic language. It is relatively pointless to interpret the four houses here as either wholly spiritual metaphors or wholly corporeal metaphors. There is an abstract mathematical correlation between each metaphor, but said math is kept away from the listener's ear in service of the mystic or epic tone through which these symbols are coded and relayed. And if nothing else, these are the images of houses – of homes – and are therefore, at the most basic level, designed with the intent to soothe and to welcome, and to be lived in: "Donne makes space a quality of tone. Space in his [writings] is domestic, but it is also emblematic, and often exhilarating" (Gorton 61). Donne teases us by *destroying* these dwellings, but swiftly reminds us, as indeed this is a sermon, that God is charged to protect and rebuild these living spaces.

End Notes

1. "Also called practical theology or case divinity, casuistry is a method of adjudicating the conflicting claims of self and law. Its purposes are to address the tensions that arise from legal or ethical antinomies, and to respond to those who are uncertain about 'acceptable conduct.'" (Brown, 72)

2. Donne employed a similar yet distinct arrangement of four houses as part of a hierarchical symbolic order in his "Sermon Preached at St. Dunstans January 15.1625/6 – The First Sermon After Our Dispersion, by Sickness." The passage Donne chose for this sermon is Exodus 12:30, "For there was not a house where there was not one dead."

References

Baumlin, James S. “Coda: Rhetoric and Form Reconsidered.” *John Donne and the Rhetoric of Renaissance Discourse*, University of Missouri Press, 1991, pp. 292 – 306.

Brown, Meg Lota. “‘Though it be not according to the Law’: Donne’s Politics and the Sermon on Esther.” *John Donne Journal, Studies in the Age of Donne*, ed. M. Thomas Hester, ed. R.V. Young, Jr., vol. 11, no. 1 – 2, North Carolina University Press, Raleigh, 1992, pp. 71 – 84, sponsor. John Donne Society.

Cannon, James. “Reverent Donne: The Double Quickening of Lincoln’s Inn Chapel.” *John Donne’s Professional Lives*, ed. David Colclough, D.S. Brewer, 2003, pp. 207 – 214.

Collins, Siobhán. “Thresholds: ‘Porches and Entries.’” *Bodies, Politics, and Transformations: John Donne’s Metamorphosis*, Ashgate, 2013, pp. 29 – 42.

Doerksen, Daniel W. “‘Holy Love, and Sober Studie’: Donne’s Approach to the Scriptures in the Sermons.” *John Donne Journal, Studies in the Age of Donne*, ed. Sean H. McDowell, vol. 34, no. 1, John Donne Society, 2015, pp. 11 – 28, sponsor. Seattle University.

Donne, John. “The First Sermon Preached to King Charles, at Saint James: 3 April 1625.” *The Sermons of John Donne*, ed. Evelyn Mary Spearing Simpson, ed. George Reuben Potter, vol. 6, no. 12, University of California Press, 1951, 21 p., Brigham Young University, 2004.

Fetzer, Margret. “Pulpit Performances – Sermons.” *John Donne’s Performances: Sermons, poems, letters, and Devotions*, Manchester University Press, 2010, pp. 25 – 76.

Flynn, Dennis. “The ‘Annales Schools’ and the Catholicism of Donne’s Family.” *John Donne Journal, Studies in the Age of Donne*, ed. M. Thomas Hester, ed. R.V. Young, Jr., vol. 2, no. 2, North Carolina University Press, Raleigh, 1983, pp. 1 – 10, sponsor. John Donne Society.

Frost, Kate Gartner. “Chapter IV: Donne and the Tradition of Number Symbolism.” *Holy Delight: Typology, Numerology, and Autobiography in Donne’s Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*, Princeton University Press, 1990, pp. 78 – 105.

Gorton, L. M. “Philosophy and the City: Space in Donne.” *John Donne Journal, Studies in the Age of Donne*, ed. M. Thomas Hester, ed. R.V. Young, Jr., vol. 18, no. 1, North Carolina University Press, Raleigh, 1999, pp. 61 – 72, sponsor. John Donne Society.

Guffey, Robert. “Parabolic Logic in John Donne’s Sermons.” *John Donne Journal, Studies in the Age of Donne*, ed. M. Thomas Hester, vol. 26, no. 1, North Carolina University Press, Raleigh, 2007, pp. 103 – 126, sponsor. John Donne Society.

Hurley, Ann Hollinshead. “Donne and the Crisis in the Image: The Internal Made Visible.” self-contained, Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2005, pp. 133 – 159.

McCullough, Peter E. “Donne as Preacher at Court: Precarious Inthronization.” *John Donne’s Professional Lives,* ed. David Colclough, D.S. Brewer, 2003, pp. 179 – 206.

Morrissey, Mary. “John Donne as a Conventional Paul’s Cross Preacher.” *John Donne’s Professional Lives,* ed. David Colclough, D.S. Brewer, 2003, pp. 159 – 178.

Rhatigan, Emma. “Knees and Elephants: Donne Preaches on Ceremonial Conformity.” *John Donne Journal, Studies in the Age of Donne,* ed. M. Thomas Hester, ed. R.V. Young, Jr., vol. 23, no. 1, North Carolina University Press, Raleigh, 2004, pp. 185 – 214, sponsor. John Donne Society.

Shami, Jeanne. “‘If the Foundations be Destroyed’: Rules of Engagement.” *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*, D.S. Brewer, 2003, pp. 256 – 271.

Vita

The Author was born in Mobile, Alabama. He obtained his Bachelor's degree in English with a concentration in creative writing from the University of New Orleans in 2016. Immediately following, he joined the same university's English graduate program to pursue a Masters in English, specializing in British Literature.