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Preface

The primary purpose of this bibliography is to provide students, scholars, and critics of John Donne with a useful aid to research. This study is the first to collect and fully annotate the vast amount of criticism and scholarship written on Donne during the period 1996–2012. The present volume is a continuation of my three previously published bibliographies: *John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1912–1967* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973); *John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1968–1978* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1982); and *John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1979–1995* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2004). The present work ends at 2012 because more recent studies were not always available, especially items in languages other than English, and because bibliographical sources were often incomplete after that date.

The present bibliography follows, for the most part, the principles and guidelines established for the earlier volumes. The annotations are essentially descriptive, not evaluative, because I find that what is important and/or useful to one scholar may not be equally significant to another. The annotations, however, are quite detailed and quote extensively from the items in order to convey a sense of the approach and level of critical sophistication. Therefore, readers should be able to judge for themselves whether a particular book or essay will be useful for their purposes. I have also entered items chronologically so that by reading through the bibliography readers will be able to obtain a sense of the various shifts and developments that have occurred in Donnean criticism during the 16-year period covered. Such an arrangement allows readers to observe that Donne's poetry and prose have been run through many and various critical sieves (linguistic, stylistic, bibliographical, psychoanalytic, biographical, textual, feminist, new historicist, political, formalistic, etc.) and that, in a sense, work done on him represents a kind of microcosm of what has taken place in literary criticism during the years covered. By using the three detailed indexes (author, subject, and works of Donne mentioned in the annotations), users can easily locate the individual studies that interest them.

As in prior volumes, I have tried to make this bibliography as comprehensive and complete as possible, yet even from the beginning, it was necessary to impose certain limitations. The basic guiding principle has been to include all refereed books, monographs, essays, and notes specifically on Donne recorded between 1996 and 2012; but in addition, extended discussions of Donne that appear in works not centrally concerned with him also have been included. Nearly all books and many essays on metaphysical poetry or on individual seventeenth-century poets contain some comment on or reference to Donne, but to have included all items that simply mention Donne in relation to Herbert, Crashaw, Vaughan, Marvell, Traherne, et al. would have extended the present bibliography far beyond manageable bounds and would have distorted the main directions of Donne criticism.

Also, brief mentions of Donne or short quotations taken from his works appearing in books and articles, as well as references in literary histories, encyclopedias, anthologies, and textbooks have been omitted. Doctoral dissertations have not been included because many of them are unavailable, especially those in languages other than English, and because a number of them have been published, wholly or partly, in later essays and books. Readers are encouraged, however, to consult *Dissertation Abstracts International* for summaries, prepared by their authors, of many (but not all) American dis-
sertations. Some items of little critical or scholarly interest that have Donne in their titles, such as original poems or pious pamphlets, are included so that users will not be obliged to track them down. Reprints of works and editions published before 1996 have been excluded; reprints of items published between 1996 and 2008 are recorded, when known, with the original entry. I have not annotated book reviews. However, I have annotated review articles (usually discussions of two or more books) and those with titles that may suggest that they are essays rather than simply reviews, and following the annotations of books that deal exclusively with Donne, I have listed as many as I could find of the reviews of those books only.

Many items in languages other than English (German, French, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Polish, Romanian, Hungarian, Slovak, Russian, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Finnish, Norwegian, Chinese, Turkish, Croatian, Serbo-Croatian, and Bikol) have been included, but I have no assurance that I have located all items in these languages or in others. A number of the annotations in foreign languages were summarized for me by their authors or by Donne scholars proficient in those languages. In referring to Donne's poems and prose, I have used the abbreviations created by the editors of the Variorum Edition of John Donne's Poetry, with their kind permission.

I am very pleased to acknowledge and to thank publicly all those who have generously assisted me in this project. I am especially grateful to Yoshihisa Aizawa, Ryuzo Akiba, Alla Barabtarlo, Guilherme DeSouza, Fernando Gonzáles, Carla Waal Johns, Alan Jones, L. Hunter Kevil, Hong Li, Andrea McDowell, Sean McDowell, M. Bonner Mitchell, Edward Mullen, Young Won Park, Purificación Ribes, Maria Salenius, Giuseppe Soldano, Eva Szekely, Richard Todd, Michael Volz, Yi Xiong, Kui Yan, Sachiko Yoshida, Li Zhengshuan, Hong Li, Yaakov A. Mascetti, Makiko Okamura, Donald R. Dickson, and Angelika Zirker, who assisted me with foreign language items. Also I wish to thank Anne Barker, Rhonda Whithaus, Debbie Melvin, Delores Fisher, and Ivy Hui, librarians, who were most helpful in locating books and essays that were unavailable at the University of Missouri Ellis Library, and also Georgianna Ziegler and Urszula Kolodzie of the Shakespeare Folger Library for their assistance. Many Donne scholars, critics, and friends were most kind in calling to my attention lesser known material and/or supplying me with offprints or translations of their work, especially, Marcello Corrente, Yanis Garrett, Christine Pagnouille, Purificación Ribes, Deb Rindl, Maureen Sabine, Daniel Starza Smith, Gary A. Stringer, Haruo Takiguchi, Ryszard Wolny, and Sandra Zákutná.

Finally, I should like to express my particular gratitude to Mary Farrington, Assistant Editor of the Donne Variorum, and the students at Texas A&M University who worked to make electronic publication of this volume possible. Assisted by Jennifer S. Adams, Dayoung Chung, Laura Perrings, Brandi Nicole Tevebaugh, and Carly Thompson, Ms. Farrington created the document template, laid out the text, created the indexes, and assisted in the multiple rounds of proofreading necessary to achieve maximum accuracy, as well as carrying out the HTML scripting that underlies the volume’s online appearance. Tracy McLawhorn, the current Technology Editor and Assistant Textual Editor for the Donne Variorum (now at East Carolina University), has continued Ms. Farrington’s work by completing layout and assisting with indexing and proofreading for entries in the years 2006–2012. Dr. McLawhorn was assisted by East Carolina University students Hazel Bright, Teresa M. Bryson, and Omar Sutherland.

J. R. R.
Columbia, Missouri
## List of Abbreviations

### Periodical Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEH</td>
<td>Anglican and Episcopal History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHR</td>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>Albion: A Quarterly Journal concerned with British Studies (Dept. of History, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC; North American Conference on British Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegorica</td>
<td>Allegorica: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmHeritage</td>
<td>American Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglistik</td>
<td>Anglistik: Mittelungen des Verbandes deutscher Anglisten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AngTheoRev</td>
<td>Anglican Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnH</td>
<td>Analecta Husserliana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANQ</td>
<td>ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes, and Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntigR</td>
<td>Antigonish Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>Apollo: A Journal of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appositions</td>
<td>Appositions: Studies in Renaissance/Early Modern Literature and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>The American Poetry Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>The Antioch Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArAA</td>
<td>Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASch</td>
<td>The American Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS/SA</td>
<td>Applied Semiotics/Sémiotique appliqué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AtlanticLR</td>
<td>Atlantic Literary Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUMLA</td>
<td>AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association: A Journal of Literary Criticism and Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Book Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL</td>
<td>Belgian Essays on Language and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJHS</td>
<td>British Journal for the History of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJJ</td>
<td>The Ben Jonson Journal: Literary Contexts in the Age of Elizabeth, James and Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMJ</td>
<td>British Medical Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrAS</td>
<td>British and American Studies (Editura Universitatti de Vest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bronte Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEAA</td>
<td>Bulletin de la Société d’Etudes Anglo-Américaines des XVII et XVIII Siècles (Lille, France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BStu</td>
<td>Bunyan Studies: John Bunyan and His Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CahiersE</td>
<td>Cahiers Elisabéthains: Late Medieval and Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;L</td>
<td>Christianity and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CanPo</td>
<td>Canadian Poetry Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CatRev</td>
<td>Catalan Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTEP</td>
<td>Conference of College Teachers of English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>College English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Journal Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>CEA Critic: An Official Journal of the College English Association (Youngstown, OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChiR</td>
<td>Chicago Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHum</td>
<td>Computers and the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cithara</td>
<td>Cithara: Essays in the Judaeo-Christian Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoL</td>
<td>College Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitatis</td>
<td>Comitatis: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonweal</td>
<td>Commonweal: A Review of Religion, Politics, and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompD</td>
<td>Comparative Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connotations</td>
<td>Connotations: A Journal for Critical Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContempR</td>
<td>Contemporary Review (London, England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>The Cambridge Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCL</td>
<td>Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts (Detroit, MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>Critique: Revue Générale des Publications Françaises et Etrangères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUX</td>
<td>CRUX: A Journal of the Teaching of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSLL</td>
<td>Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSQ</td>
<td>Cistercian Studies Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Christian Scholar Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTNS Bulletin</td>
<td>Center for Theology and Natural Sciences Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Città di Vita: Bimestrale di Religione, Arte e Scienza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVE</td>
<td>Cahiers victoriens et édouardiens (Univ. Paul-Valéry Montpellier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Dutch Crossing: A Journal of Low Countries Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diacritics</td>
<td>Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discoveries</td>
<td>Discoveries: South-Central Renaissance News and Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositio</td>
<td>Disposition: American Journal of Cultural Histories and Theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Dalhousie Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Etudes Anglaises: Grande-Bretagne, Etats-Unis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EarlyES</td>
<td>Early English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB</td>
<td>Etudes Britanneques Contemporaines: Revue de la Societe d’Etudes Anglaises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECent</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EESE</td>
<td>Erfurt Electronic Studies in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR</td>
<td>English Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EigoS</td>
<td>Eigo Seinen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIRC</td>
<td>Explorations in Renaissance Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>English Journal (Urbana, IL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJES</td>
<td>European Journal of English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELawr</td>
<td>Etudes Lawrenciennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELH</td>
<td>ELH [Formerly Journal of English Literary History]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELN</td>
<td>English Language Notes (Boulder, CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELOPE</td>
<td>English Language Overseas: Perspectives and Enquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELR</td>
<td>English Literary Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML</td>
<td>Early Modern Literary Studies: A Journal of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English: The Journal of the English Association (Leicester, England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>The English Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature (Lisse, Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>English Studies in Africa: A Journal of the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>English Studies in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETR</td>
<td>Etudes Théologique et Religieuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EtudesEP</td>
<td>Etudes Epistémè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplaria</td>
<td>Exemplaria: A Journal of Theory in Medieval and Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expl</td>
<td>Explicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWLS</td>
<td>Forum for World Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GaR</td>
<td>Georgia Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Genre: Forms of Discourse and Culture (Norman, OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHJ</td>
<td>George Herbert Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJEAS</td>
<td>Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLQ</td>
<td>Huntington Library Quarterly: A Journal of English and American History and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HudR</td>
<td>Hudson Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HumLov</td>
<td>Humanistica Lovaniensia: Journal of Neo-Latin Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdD</td>
<td>Ilha do Desterro: A Journal of Language and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIUC</td>
<td>Annual Research Journal of the International Islamic University Chittagong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJCT</td>
<td>International Journal of Classical Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILS</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Literary Studies: A Journal of Criticism and Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InteractionsAJ</td>
<td>Interactions: Ege University Journal of British and American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary SR</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Science Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASSSt</td>
<td>Journal of Academic Social Science Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCELR</td>
<td>Journal of Classic and English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDJ</td>
<td>John Donne Journal: Studies in the Age of Donne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEGP</td>
<td>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JELL-CB</td>
<td>Journal of the English Language and Literature (Chongwon, Korea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JES</td>
<td>Journal of European Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEMCS</td>
<td>Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEMS</td>
<td>The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JML</td>
<td>Journal of Modern Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMRS</td>
<td>Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAeEd</td>
<td>Journal of Aesthetics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOWG</td>
<td>Jahrbuch der Oswald von Wolkenstein-Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRUL</td>
<td>Journal of Rutgers University Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSBC</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of British Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kañina</td>
<td>Kañina: Revista de Artes y Letras de la Universidad de Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPR</td>
<td>Kentucky Philological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>Kenyon Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KulturPoetik</td>
<td>KulturPoetik: Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichtliche Literaturwissenschaft/Journal of Cultural Poetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;B</td>
<td>Literature and Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;T</td>
<td>Literature and Theology: An International Journal of Theory, Criticism and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATCH</td>
<td>LATCH: A Journal for the Study of the Literary Artifact in Theory, Culture, or History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBR</td>
<td>Luso-Brazilian Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiteratureC</td>
<td>Literature Compass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITRevALSC</td>
<td>Literary Imagination: The Review of the Association of Literary Scholars and Critics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LittPrag</td>
<td>Litteraria Pragensia: Studies in Literature and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livius</td>
<td>Livius: Revista de Estudios de Traducción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Library Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJHum</td>
<td>Lamar Journal of the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>Literaturenoe Obozrenie: Zhurnal Khudozhestvennoi Literatury, Kritiki i Bibliografii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRB</td>
<td>London Review of Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>Leeds Studies in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNR</td>
<td>McNeese Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MediterraneanSt</td>
<td>Mediterranean Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merkur</td>
<td>Merkur: Deutsche Zeitschrift fur Europisches Denken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES</td>
<td>Medieval and Early Modern English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Translators’ Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MilSt</td>
<td>Milton Studies: The Journal of Milton Studies in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiltonQ</td>
<td>Milton Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiltonS</td>
<td>Milton Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscélanea</td>
<td>Miscélanea: A Journal of English and American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR</td>
<td>Modern Language Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreana</td>
<td>Moreana: Bulletin Thomas More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic</td>
<td>Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Modern Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Massachusetts Review: A Quarterly of Literature, the Arts and Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRDE</td>
<td>Medieval &amp; Renaissance Drama in England: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&amp;Q</td>
<td>Notes and Queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neophil</td>
<td>Neophilologus (Dordrecht, Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewC</td>
<td>The New Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordlit</td>
<td>Nordlit: Tidsskrift i Litteratur og Kultur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRs</td>
<td>Neue Rundschau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYRB</td>
<td>New York Review of Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYT</td>
<td>New York Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYTBR</td>
<td>New York Times Book Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;C</td>
<td>Pragmatics &amp; Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;L</td>
<td>Philosophy and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parabola</td>
<td>Parabola: The Magazine of Myth and Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paregon</td>
<td>Paregon: Bulletin of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnassus</td>
<td>Parnassus: Poetry in Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhilologiaSP</td>
<td>Philologia: Naucno-Strucni Casopis za Jezik, Knjizevnost i Kulturu/Scientific-Professional Journal for Language, Literature and Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLL</td>
<td>Papers on Language and Literature: A Journal for Scholars and Critics of Language and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMPA</td>
<td>Publications of the Missouri Philological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNR</td>
<td>PN Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po&amp;sie</td>
<td>Poésie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoT</td>
<td>Poetics Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>Philological Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrant</td>
<td>Quadrant (Victoria, Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaerendo</td>
<td>Quaerendo: A Quarterly Journal from the Low Countries Devoted to Manuscripts and Printed Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quidditas</td>
<td>Quidditas: Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWERTY</td>
<td>Q/W/E/R/T/Y: Arts, Littératures &amp; Civilisations du Monde Anglophone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAEI</td>
<td>Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;L</td>
<td>Religion and Literature (Notre Dame, IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raritan</td>
<td>Raritan: A Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Reader: Essays in Reader-Oriented Theory, Criticism, and Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>Review of English and American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReAr</td>
<td>Religion in the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReligStud-Theology</td>
<td>Religious Studies and Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ren&amp;R</td>
<td>Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renascence</td>
<td>Renascence: Essays on Value in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenB</td>
<td>The Renaissance Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenP</td>
<td>Renaissance Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenQ</td>
<td>Renaissance Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenSt</td>
<td>Renaissance Studies: Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Review of English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESLJ</td>
<td>Review of English Studies (Oxford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorica</td>
<td>Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupkatha</td>
<td>Rupkatha: Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RusR</td>
<td>The Russian Review: An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCen</td>
<td>The Seventeenth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>Schuylkill: A Creative and Critical Review from Temple University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCJ</td>
<td>The Sixteenth Century Journal: Journal of Early Modern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCN</td>
<td>Seventeenth-Century News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRe</td>
<td>South Carolina Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDERI</td>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>SEL: Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelcukUFEFED</td>
<td>Selçuk Üniversitesi, Fen—Edebiyat Facültesi Dergisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Seven: An Anglo-American Literary Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShakS</td>
<td>Shakespeare Studies (Cranbury, NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR</td>
<td>Southern Humanities Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShJb</td>
<td>Shakespeare Jahrbuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShS</td>
<td>Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Form</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShY</td>
<td>Shakespeare Yearbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiJ</td>
<td>Sidney Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>SMART: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Studia Neophilologica: A Journal of Germanic and Romance Languages and Literature (Uppsala, Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoAR</td>
<td>South Atlantic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Studies in Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPWVSRA</td>
<td>Selected Papers of the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ</td>
<td>Shakespeare Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Sewanee Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSt</td>
<td>Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stii</td>
<td>Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Style (DeKalb, IL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuF</td>
<td>Sinn und Form: Beitrage zur Literatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES</td>
<td>Times Educational Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TexP</td>
<td>Textual Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Text: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalia</td>
<td>Thalia: Studies in Literary Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE</td>
<td>Times Higher Education Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THJ</td>
<td>The Thomas Hardy Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS</td>
<td>[London] Times Literary Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TranslationSt</td>
<td>Translation Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSB</td>
<td>Thoreau Society Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>Texas Studies in Literature and Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTQ</td>
<td>University of Toronto Quarterly: A Canadian Journal of the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagant</td>
<td>Vagant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLit</td>
<td>Voprosy Literatury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&amp;Lang</td>
<td>Women and Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WoWr</td>
<td>Women’s Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Women’s Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWE</td>
<td>Welsh Writing in English: A Yearbook of Critical Essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Yearbook of English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YJC</td>
<td>The Yale Journal of Criticism: Interpretation in the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWES</td>
<td>Year’s Work in English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik: A Quarterly of Language, Literature and Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Short Forms of Reference for Donne's Works

## Poems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Form</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Air</em></td>
<td>Air and Angels [“Twice or thrice had I loved”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>AltVic</em></td>
<td>A Letter Written by Sir H. G. and J. D. Alternis Vicibus [“Since every tree begins”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amic</em></td>
<td>Amicissimo et Meritissimo Ben Jonson [“Quod arte ausus es hic tua”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anniv</em></td>
<td>The Anniversary [“All kings and all their favorites”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Annun</em></td>
<td>Upon the Annunciation and Passion [“Tamely frail body”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antiq</em></td>
<td>Antiquary [“If in his study”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Apoth</em></td>
<td>Apotheosis Ignatij Loyolae [“Qui sacer antefuit”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Appar</em></td>
<td>The Apparition [“When by thy scorn”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>AuthHook</em></td>
<td>Ad Autorem [“Non eget Hookerus”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>AutJos</em></td>
<td>Ad Autorem [“Emendare cupis Joseph”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bait</em></td>
<td>The Bait [“Come live with me”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BB</em></td>
<td>To Mr. B.B. [“Is not thy sacred hunger”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfCab</em></td>
<td>Epitaph on Himself: To the Countess of Bedford [“That I might make your cabinet”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfDead</em></td>
<td>To the Countess of Bedford: Begun in France [“Though I be dead and buried”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfHon</em></td>
<td>To the Countess of Bedford [“Honor is so sublime”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfReas</em></td>
<td>To the Countess of Bedford [“Reason is our soul’s left hand”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfRef</em></td>
<td>To the Countess of Bedford [“You have refined me”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfShe</em></td>
<td>Elegy to the Lady Bedford [“You that are she”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfTwi</em></td>
<td>To the Countess of Bedford: On New-Year’s Day [“This twilight of two years”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BedfWrit</em></td>
<td>To the Countess of Bedford [“To have written then”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Beggar</em></td>
<td>A Lame Beggar [“I am unable, yonder beggar cries”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Blos</em></td>
<td>The Blossom [“Little thinkest thou”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BoulNar</em></td>
<td>Elegy upon the Death of Mrs. Boulstrode [“Language thou art too narrow”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BoulRec</em></td>
<td>Elegy on Mrs. Boulstrode [“Death, I recant”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Break</em></td>
<td>Break of Day [“’Tis true, ’tis day”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Broken</em></td>
<td>The Broken Heart [“He is stark mad”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cales</em></td>
<td>Cales and Guiana [“If you from spoil”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calm</em></td>
<td>The Calm [“Our storm is past”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canon</em></td>
<td>The Canonization [“For God’s sake hold your tongue”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carey</em></td>
<td>A Letter to the Lady Carey and Mrs. Essex Rich [“Here where by all”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CB</em></td>
<td>To Mr. C. B. [“Thy friend whom thy deserts”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Christ</em></td>
<td>A Hymn to Christ at the Author’s Last Going into Germany [“In what torn ship so-ever”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Citizen</em></td>
<td>A Tale of a Citizen and his Wife (noncanonical) [“I sing no harme, goodsooth”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Commun</em></td>
<td>Community [“Good we must love”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Compu</em></td>
<td>The Computation [“For the first twenty years”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ConfL</em></td>
<td>Confined Love [“Some man unworthy”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elegies:

| ElAnag  | The Anagram [“Marry and love thy Flavia”] |
| ElAut   | The Autumnal [“No spring nor summer beauty”] |
| ElBed   | Going to Bed [“Come, Madam, come”] |
| ElBrac  | The Bracelet [“Not that in color it was like thy hair”] |
| ElChange| Change [“Although thy hand and faith”] |
| ElComp  | The Comparison [“As the sweet sweat of roses in a still”] |
| ElExpost| The Expostulation [“To make the doubt clear”] |
| ElFatal | On His Mistress [“By our first strange and fatal interview”] |
| ElJeal  | Jealousy [“Fond woman which wouldst have thy husband die”] |
| ElNat   | “Nature’s lay idiot” |
| ElPart  | His Parting From Her [“Since she must go”] |
| ElPerf  | The Perfume [“Once and but once found in thy company”] |
| ElPict  | His Picture [“Here take my picture”] |
| ElProg  | Love’s Progress [“Whoever loves, if he do not propose”] |
| ElServe | “Oh, let not me serve so” |
| ElVar   | Variety [“The heavens rejoice in motion”] |
| ElWar   | Love’s War [“Till I have peace with thee”] |
EpEliz  Epithalamion upon … the Lady Elizabeth [“Hail, Bishop Valentine”]
EpLin  Epithalamion Made at Lincoln’s Inn [“The sunbeams in the east”]
EtAD  Epitaph for Ann Donne [“Annae Georgii More de filiae”]
EtED  Epitaph for Elizabeth Drury [“Quo pergas, viator”]
EtRD  Epitaph for Robert and Anne Drury [“Roberti Druri/ quo vix alter”]
EtSP  John Donne’s Epitaph . . . in St. Paul’s Cathedral [“Johannes Donne/ Sac: Theol: Profess:”]
Expir  The Expiration [“So, so, break off”]
Fare  Farewell to Love [“Whilst yet to prove”]
Father  A Hymn to God the Father [“Wilt thou forgive”]
Faust  Faustinus [“Faustinus keeps his sister”]
Fever  A Fever [“Oh do not die”]
FirAn  The First Anniversary. An Anatomy of the World [“When that rich soul”]
Flea  The Flea [“Mark but this flea”]
Fun  The Funeral [“Whoever comes to shroud me”]
FunEl  A Funeral Elegy [“‘Tis lost to trust a tomb”]
Gaz  Translated out of Gazaeus [“God grant thee thine own wish”]
GHerb  To Mr. George Herbert with One of My Seals [“Qui prius assuetus serpentum”]
Goodf  Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward [“Let man’s soul be a sphere”]
GoodM  The Good Morrow [“I wonder by my troth”]
Ham  An Hymn to the Saints and to the Marquis Hamilton [“Whether that soul which now comes”]
Har  Obsequies upon the Lord Harrington [“Fair soul, which wast not only”]
Harb  The Harbinger to the Progress (by Joseph Hall) [“Two souls move here”]
Heart  “When my heart was mine own”
Henry  Elegy on the Untimely Death of . . . Prince Henry [“Look to me, Faith”]
Hero  Hero and Leander [“Both robbed of air”]
HG  To Sr. Henry Goodyere [“Who makes the past a pattern”]

Holy Sonnets:

HSBatter  “Batter my heart”
HSBlack  “O my black soul”
HSDeath  “Death be not proud”
HSDue  “As due by many titles”
HSLittle  “I am a little world”
HSMade  “Thou hast made me”
HSMin  “If poisonous minerals”
HSPart  “Father part of his double interest”
HSRound  “At the round earth’s imagined corners”
HSScene  “This is my play’s last scene”
Sheshe

“Since she whom I loved”

HSShow

“Show me dear Christ”

HSSighs

“O might those sighs”

HSSouls

“If faithful souls”

HSSpit

“Spit in my face”

HSVex

“O to vex me”

HSWhat

“What if this present”

HSWhy

“Why are we by all creatures”

HSWilt

“Wilt thou love God”

HuntMan

To the Countess of Huntingdon [“Man to God’s image”]

HuntUn

To the Countess of Huntingdon [“That unripe side of earth”]

HWHiber

H. W. in Hibernia Belligeranti [“Went you to conquer?”]

HWKiss

To Sir Henry Wotton [“Sir, more than kisses”]

HWNews

To Sir Henry Wotton [“Here’s no more news”]

HWVenice

To Sir H. W. at His Going Ambassador to Venice [“After those reverend papers”]

Ignatius, verse from:

IgAver

“Aversa facie Janum referre”

IgFeath

“Feathers or straws swim on the water’s face”

IgFlow

“As a flower wet with last night’s dew”

IgLark

“The lark by busy and laborious ways”

IgNoise

“With so great noise and horror”

IgOper

“Operoso tramite scandent”

IgPiece

“That the least piece which thence doth fall”

IgPlum

“Aut plumam, aut paleam”

IgQual

“Qualis hesterno madefacta rore”

IgResemb

“Resemble Janus with a diverse face”

IgSport

“My little wandering sportful soul”

IgTanto

“Tanto fragore boatuque”

ILBlest

To Mr. I.L. [“Blest are your north parts”]

ILRoll

To Mr. I.L. [“Of that short roll”]

Image

“Image of her whom I love”

InAA

Inscription in the Album Amicorum of Michael Corvinus [“In propria venit”]

Ind

The Indifferent [“I can love both fair and brown”]

InLI

Inscription in a Bible Presented to Lincoln’s Inn [“In Bibliotheca Hospitii”]

Jet

A Jet Ring Sent [“Thou art not so black”]

Jug

The Juggler [“Thou callest me effeminate”]

Julia

Julia (noncanonical) [“Hearke newes, ô Enuy”]

Klock

Klockius [“Klockius so deeply hath sworn”]

Lam

The Lamentations of Jeremy [“How sits this city”]

Lect

A Lecture upon the Shadow [“Stand still and I will read”]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Forms</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>The Legacy [“When I died last”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liar</td>
<td>The Liar [“Thou in the fields walkest”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licent</td>
<td>A Licentious Person [“Thy sins and hairs”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit</td>
<td>A Litany [“Father of heaven and him”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LovAlch</td>
<td>Love's Alchemy [“Some that have deeper digged”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LovDeity</td>
<td>Love's Deity [“I long to talk with some old”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LovDiet</td>
<td>Love's Diet [“To what a cumbersome unwieldiness”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LovExch</td>
<td>Love's Exchange [“Love, any devil else but you”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LovGrow</td>
<td>Love's Growth [“I scarce believe my love to be so pure”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LovInf</td>
<td>Lovers’ Infiniteness [“If yet I have not all thy love”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LovUsury</td>
<td>Love's Usury [“For every hour that thou wilt spare me”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaron</td>
<td>In Eundem Macaronicon [“Quot, dos haec, linguists”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Elegy on the Lady Markham [“Man is the world”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>Raderus [“Why this man gelded Martial”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merc</td>
<td>Mercurius Gallo-Belgicus [“Like Aesop's fellow slaves”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mess</td>
<td>The Message [“Send home my long strayed eyes”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metem</td>
<td>Metempsychosis [“I sing the progress of a deathless soul”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHMary</td>
<td>To the Lady Magdalen Herbert, of St. Mary Magdalen [“Her of your name”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPaper</td>
<td>To Mrs. M. H. [“Mad paper stay”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegLov</td>
<td>Negative Love [“I never stooped so low”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niobe</td>
<td>Niobe [“By children's birth and death”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noct</td>
<td>A Nocturnal upon St. Lucy's Day [“‘Tis the year's midnight”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para</td>
<td>The Paradox [“No lover saith, I love”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo</td>
<td>An Obscure Writer [“Philo with twelve years' study”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrine</td>
<td>Phrine [“Thy flattering picture, Phrine”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>To the Praise of the Dead and the Anatomy (by Joseph Hall) [“Well died the world”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim</td>
<td>The Primrose [“Upon this primrose hill”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohib</td>
<td>The Prohibition [“Take heed of loving me”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyr</td>
<td>Pyramus and Thisbe [“Two by themselves each other”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Ralphius [“Compassion in the world again is bred”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relic</td>
<td>The Relic [“When my grave is broke up again”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Resurrection Imperfect [“Sleep, sleep, old sun”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWEnvy</td>
<td>To Mr. R. W. [“Kindly I envy thy song’s”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWMind</td>
<td>To Mr. R. W. [“Muse not that by thy mind”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWSlumb</td>
<td>To Mr. R. W. [“If as mine is thy life a slumber be”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWThird</td>
<td>To Mr. R. W. [“Like one who in her third widowhood”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWZeal</td>
<td>To Mr. R. W. [“Zealously my muse”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>To the Countess of Salisbury [“Fair, great, and good”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho</td>
<td>Sappho to Philaenis [“Where is that holy fire”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satires:

Sat1  “Away thou fondling motley humorist”
Sat2  “Sir, though (I thank God for it) I do hate”
Sat3  “Kind pity chokes my spleen”
Sat4  “Well, I may now receive and die”
Sat5  “Thou shalt not laugh in this leaf, Muse”

SB  To Mr. S. B. [“O thou which to search”]

SecAn  The Second Anniversary. Of the Progress of the Soul [“Nothing could make me sooner”]

SelfAc  A Self Accuser [“Your mistress, that you follow whores”]
SelfL  Self Love [“He that cannot choose but love”]
SGo  Song [“Go, and catch a falling star”]

Sheaf  A Sheaf of Miscellany Epigrams

Sheaf t–61: individual poems within Sheaf

Ship  A Burnt Ship [“Out of a fired ship”]

Sickness  A Hymn to God My God, in My Sickness [“Since I am coming”]

Sidney  Upon the Translation of the Psalms by Sir Philip Sidney [“Eternal God, (for whom who ever dare . . .)”]

Sorrow  Elegia [“Sorrow, who to this house”]

SSweet  Song [“Sweetest love, I do not go”]

Stat  Stationes from Devotions [“Insultus morbi primus”]

Storm  The Storm [“Thou which art I”]

SunRis  The Sun Rising [“Busy old fool, unruly sun”]

Tilman  To Mr. Tilman after He Had Taken Orders [“Thou whose diviner soul”]

Token  Sonnet. The Token [“Send me some token”]

Triple  The Triple Fool [“I am two fools, I know”]

TWHail  To Mr. T. W. [“All hail sweet poet”]

TWHarsh  To Mr. T. W. [“Haste thee harsh verse”]

TWHence  To Mr. T. W. [“At once from hence”]

TWPrev  To Mr. T. W. [“Pregnant again”]

Twick  Twickenham Garden [“Blasted with sighs and surrounded with tears”]

Under  The Undertaking [“I have done one braver thing”]

ValBook  A Valediction of the Book [“I’ll tell thee now”]

ValMourn  A Valediction Forbidding Mourning [“As virtuous men pass mildly away”]

ValName  A Valediction of My Name in the Window [“My name engraved herein”]

ValWeep  A Valediction of Weeping [“Let me pour forth”]

Wall  Fall of a Wall [“Under an undermined and shot-bruised wall”]

Will  The Will [“Before I sigh my last gasp”]

Wing  Sir John Wingfield [“Beyond th’old pillars”]

Witch  Witchcraft by a Picture [“I fix mine eye on thine”]

WomCon  Woman’s Constancy [“Now thou has loved me one whole day”]
Prose Works

**Biathanatos**

**Devotions**

**Essays**

**Ignatius**

**Letters**

**Paradoxes**

**Sermons**

Other Works

**OED**
Oxford English Dictionary

**Roberts1**

**Roberts2**

**Roberts3**
1996


Reads *Ignatius* as “a moralized exploration of the place of novelty, and hence of modern cultural formations, at the end of the Renaissance in the seventeenth century” (13). Observes how in *Ignatius* there is “a generalized anxiety about novelty, about promiscuously burgeoning forms of cultural and material production in the early seventeenth century.” Points out that, “in addition to the specific polemical target Ignatius provided Donne, the newness of the order he founded marks him, too, as an agent of ‘the new’” (41). Discusses how Donne's text “does the obvious work of conservatism” and “attempts to contain the semiotic agents of early modernity within a recursive, eschatological notion of time, to deny innovation, and hence a history recognized as such, by inserting them into the overarching scheme of retributive providence.” Claims that in *Ignatius* “[c]hange becomes sin, linear time a moral dead end.” Points out, however, that Donne's satire “partakes in what it demonizes” since “it is itself a production of the new and cannot escape its own historicity” (42).


Maintains that Donne emphasizes in his sermons that “[t]he honoring of God demands the reality of language and further of actualized speech.” Claims, therefore, that, for Donne, language is “both material and efficacious” (190). Illustrates this concept by a detailed analysis of the second Prebend sermon. Shows how such an analysis “exhibits verbal procedures and associations underlying the sermons and therefore traces of the structure of the thought that produced them” and maintains that “[t]hese suggest what the meditation, mnemonic keying, reconsideration, and final recasting that Donne himself and his biographers ascribe to his preparation [of sermons] actually meant.” Suggests further that “they especially bring home the far-reaching linguistic and perceptual implications of the simultaneous awareness of English and Latin words that characterizes educated writing in the period” but, most of all, that they “make the awareness of words themselves as a meaningful and substantial medium almost seem real” (214). Presents also a detailed analysis of “Deaths Duell,” claiming that it “surpasses” the “verbal claims” found in the Prebend sermons. Maintains that in this last sermon “it would be hard to bring life lived and life written and then spoken and posthumously printed into closer conjunction or to imagine a substantiation of the word that is more thoroughly radical: at once fictive, conceptual, and material” (229).


Discusses the significance of medieval materials on Donne's religious poetry and prose. Notes that one important feature of his occasional sacred poems is their “liturgical character,” which Donne derived from his “familiarity with early Christian and medieval hymnography” (188), such as Venatius Fortunatus's hymns on the cross and Justus Lipsius's *De Cruce libri tres*. Comments, in particular, on Donne's debt to the latter in *Cross and Devotions*, concluding that Donne was “a better medievalist than Lipsius, better able to enter the imaginative world of the Fathers than the learned interpreter of Stoicism” (190). Discusses Donne's justification of *Lit* and his modifications of traditional “romanesque piety” (191), thereby making his poem accord with Reformed theology.


An original poem that mentions Donne.

Rejects the standard antifeminist reading of *Curse* and argues that the poem is “precisely what it purports to be: a satiric attack against ‘that man’ who guessed and threatened to expose the identity of Donne’s mistress” (109)—Edmond Nevyle. Shows how Nevyle’s sordid life-story “helps to explain some of the poem’s most obscure lines,” thereby making *Curse* “much less idiopathic and illustrating how Elizabethan courtship works, in poetry and in practice” (110). Discusses also how the poem contains a “self-reflexive allusion” to Donne’s Catholicism and has “a veiled reference to the dangers” inherent in his “clandestine courtship of Anne More” (121). Believes that *Curse* was, in fact, written for Anne More at the time that Nevyle told George More that his daughter was Donne’s mistress and that “in reading the poem she would be aware—as modern critics have not been—that Donne loves her, that someone has told her father about Donne’s courtship, and that Sir George is not only irate but determined to make her break her privy contract with John Donne” (125). Shows how *Curse* becomes “a riddle or amphibology, designed variously to besmirch the man’s character, to protect Anne’s honor, to regain Egerton’s patronage, to win George More’s approval, to seek Anne’s reassurance, and to ward off Donne’s own desperate fear of betrayal” (130).


Argues that “[w]hen lyric poets in late Renaissance England responded to the demand for wonder in poetry and all courtly activity by astonishing audiences through style, they drew upon the Greek rhetorical tradition, which presents roughness and obscurity as coordinate methods of making style deinos, or admirable.” Observes that deinothēs is the term used to describe both the most powerful style and the clever style of sophistic *epideixis* and shows how “this breath of meaning helps explain both the rise and fall of wit” (289). Discusses how Donne in his poetry intends “to provoke wonder through difficulty and brevity” and comments on “the connection between the practice of strong lines and the rhetorical tradition encouraging authors to astound audiences through *emphasis* or *suspicio*” (324–25). Maintains that “[t]he breadth of meanings for deinothēs gave Donne the slack to adopt a rough and obscure style” but that “it also gave Johnson the rope to hang him with” (331).


Maintains that Donne is “more inventive than perhaps any other poet of the seventeenth century … in terms of trying the largest number of different forms” (48), noting, in particular, the extraordinary diversity of stanza patterns in the *Songs and Sonets*. Points out that, most of the time, Donne’s poems are “isostrophic but heterometric: that is, he is interested in writing stanzas whose lines are not all the same length and in uncovering the effects such structures can achieve.” Claims that Donne’s poems “explore the possibilities and limits of heterometric verse.” Cites *SGo* as Donne’s “most spectacular exhibition” (49) and comments on the close rhyme in the poem.
Suggests that Southwell’s style and uses of discursive meditation link him more closely “with Donne and his seventeenth-century successors in both verse and prose than with his sixteenth-century contemporaries” (79), noting, for example, that in *Saint Peter’s Complaint* Southwell “anticipates Donne’s capacity for close argument in strong, plain English” (93). Believes that Donne “certainly knew about Southwell and may have met him” (131). Comments on Donne’s arguments in *Pseudo-Martyr*, which present rebuttals against the kind of martyrdom Southwell endured for his Catholic faith. Observes that Donne’s “acceptance of the authority of the state over religion preserved him for a long, spectacular career in the service of the state’s religion,” whereas “Southwell’s rejection of it condemned him to death” (133). Suggests, however, that Donne was never totally at ease about his position.


Observes that although most studies comparing English metaphysical poetry and Spanish *poesía conceptista* focus on similarities between Donne and Francisco de Quevedo, there are also remarkable likenesses between Donne and Lope de Vega. Illustrates this point by comparing *Flea* and Lope’s “La pulga, falsamente atribuida a Lope” and also *HLittle* and Lope’s “Sonnet 6” from *Rimas sacras*. In an appendix, presents English translations of Lope de Vega’s two sonnets.


Compares and contrasts *ElBed* to Shakespeare’s *Venus and Adonis* and Marlowe’s *Hero and Leander*. Sees the main similarity “in how Donne constructs his persona and in how that persona apparently exercises/seeks to evoke the male gaze” and sees the main dissimilarity in “the aggressive heterosexuality of Donne’s poem.” Comments on how Donne’s persona in *ElBed* “distinctly manifests his Ovidian and, very arguably, Marlovian lineage” and shows how he has “much in common” with the narrators in both *Venus and Adonis* and *Hero and Leander* (201). Argues that “[t]he process of devaluing/foregrounding, in connection with the exercise and evocation of the male gaze by Ovidian speakers, who are complicit with the implied readers in their coercing of the female, makes all three poems akin” (202).
duction and appendices. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. xi, 228p.

Contains a preface (ix-xi), a textual note ([xii]), and an introduction (1–26) that discusses Dutch society in the seventeenth century and presents a biographical sketch of Huygen's life and works. Reproduces 42 poems by Huygen's (28–187) with English translations on opposite pages and with brief notes. In Appendix 1 (189–94), reproduces a selection of Huygen's poems in modern European languages with English translations and brief notes. In Appendix 2 (195–200), reproduces a selection of Huygen's writings in English with notes. In Appendix 3 (201–17), discusses Huygen's English literature and comments on his friendship with Donne and his translation of 19 of Donne's poems into Dutch (202–08). Concludes with a bibliography (219–21) and an index of titles and first lines (223–28).


Points out that SecAn is the source of Blake's comment that death is like “a removing from one room to another.” Notes also Blake's familiarity with Metem.


Examines varieties of thematic patterns in English, according to M. A. K. Halliday's analysis in An Introduction to Functional Grammar (1985, 1994), to find out whether clause themes, clause complexes, marked and unmarked themes, and predicated themes are present in Donne's works and presents examples drawn from selected works of Donne, both prose and poetry, to show that, in fact, marked and unmarked themes and clause themes regularly do appear whereas “[t]hematic equatives are found only rarely.”


Translates into French Donne's Christmas sermon delivered at St. Paul's on 24 December 1621. Presents a brief introduction to Donne and to the sermon, noting that it was the first sermon Donne preached as Dean of St. Paul's and noting how it is representative of the tenor and tone of Donne's sermons in general, though somewhat longer than others.


Through a study of biography, portraiture, contemporary history, comparison of poetical works, number symbolism and acrostic codes, attempts to prove that Donne wrote Shakespeare's works. Argues, primarily on the basis of elaborate number symbolism and acrostic patterns, that Corona and the Holy Sonnets were intended to complete Shakespeare's sonnet sequence.

Reviews:

- Adam Rounce in The Richmond Review (available on-line)


Discusses ways in which Donne's texts “address the human body” to show “an incipient postmodernism in Donne's poetry” (98). Regards Donne as a “fine example not only of an
incipient modernity, but also of a symptomatic emergence of a postmodern with that modernity." Argues that “Donne's engagement with the fundamental reassessments of space and time that are constitutive of the modern break is conditioned by an attitude which uncan-
nily prefi gures the notion of a 'body without organs’” (99). Also reassesses “the concept of ‘love' in Donne (and hence of the emergence of this specifically modern configuration of a cultural arrangement of eroticism) as an early modern cultural problematic, related to philosophy and to criticism in general.” Addresses this issue (i) by indicating “some of the implications of Donne's engagement with the body as space”; (2) by considering “the theme and theory of representation at work in the early modern period, taking Donne as a paradigmatic example”; and (3) by opening Donne “to a kind of schizoanalysis more frequently associated with a more recent critical philosophy” (100).


First ed.: Berlin: Henssel, 1986; reprinted: Zur-

Presents 36 selections from the Songs and Son-
ets, 4 from the Elegies, 1 epigram, 4 of the Holy
Sonnets, and Father (10–135)—with English
and German on opposite pages, followed by an
afterword (138–55) by Werner von Koppenfels
and notes (159–66).

20. ———. John Donne: Canciones y sonetos, trans. Pu-

Presents a general introduction to Donne's life
and works (9–54), a note on the text of this
dition (55–57), and a bibliography of secondary
works (59–73), followed by the Songs and Son-
ets (with English and Spanish on opposite
pages) and brief explanatory notes (76–293). Concludes with an index (295–98).

21. ———. John Donne: The Complete English Poems,

Reprint of the 1971 edition with revised and ex-
panded further readings section.

22. ———. John Donne: Going to Bed and Other Po-
ems. (A Modern Library Mini.) New York: Modern
Library. 53p.

Contains 32 poems from the Songs and Son-
ets and 2 from the Elegies—without notes or com-
mentary. On the cover: “A selection of the love
poems, sonnets, and elegies of John Donne
that perfectly demonstrates Donne's beautiful
romantic lyricism.”

23. ———. Jon Dan Zenshishu, ed. Nobuyuki Yua-


Contains a table of contents (i-vii); the first
complete translation of Donne's poems into
Japanese with notes (1–662); an introduction
divided into 3 sections: the age of Donne, three
problems in Donne's life, and a survey of Donne
criticism (663–90); a chronology of Donne's
life and his times (691–708); and an extensive
bibliography in English (1–12). (Supplied by
editor)

24. ———. Love Poems: John Donne. London: Phoe-
nix. 56p.

An abridged edition of The Complete English
Poems of John Donne published by Everyman in
1994. Reproduces 44 selections from the Songs
and Sonnets with no notes or commentary.

25. ———. John Donne: Poesía Sacra, versión y estu-
dio de Sergio Cueto. Rosario (Argentina): Beatriz
Viterbo Editora. 75p.

Translates into Spanish 19 of the Holy Sonnets,
Sickness, Christ, and a prose selection entitled
“La Cruz” (7–29), followed by a critical study
entitled “John Donne y la poesía metafísica”
(31–69), a highly selective bibliography (70–71), and an index (72). In the critical essay surveys continental criticism of Donne and the metaphysical poets, discusses Donne’s worldview, and comments on the nature of metaphysical poetry.


Contains a table of contents ([v]–x), an introduction ([xi]–xxii), a chronology ([xxiii]–xxvi), and a note on the text ([xxviii]). In the introduction, maintains that Donne’s greatness comes from “the subtlety of his tones and rhythms, the inflections and modulations, the haunting but elusive significances, the glancing light that one word sheds on another” and that “[i]t is in these respects that he far excels his imitators later in the seventeenth century—and, indeed, most other English poets.” Notes also that a “distinctive feature of his poems is that they are usually addressed to someone or something else” and thus seem like “speech-acts, with all the complications that speech brings—the emphases, the duplicities, the ironies, the persistent shadow of the unsaid” ([xi]). Illustrates these qualities by discussing, among other poetic selections, Blos, Jet, Anniversaries, Anniv, several elegies, Fun, WomCon, and passages from the Holy Sonnets. Reproduces 5 satires, 15 elegies and Sappho, EpiLin, EpiEliz, 9 early verse letters, 20 epigrams, Metem, 54 poems from the Songs and Sonnets, 10 later verse letters, 5 selections from the Epicedes and Obsequies, the two Anniversary poems, Cross, Res, Amnum, Lit, MHHMary, Corona, 19 Holy Sonnets, Goodf, Christ, Sickness, and Father ([1]–212). Notes that the texts and punctuation of the poems have been modernized. Concludes with notes ([213]–56), further readings ([257], and an index of titles and first lines ([259]–65).


Sees HSShe as Donne’s attempt to cope with his sadness at the death of Anne More, “to define whom and what he has lost, and, in so doing, to redefine himself.” Maintains that his wife’s death “deprived him not only of the woman he loves, but of a human sacrament, a tangible sign that both reveals and conceals divinity” and suggests that “the sonnet’s imagery and theme evoke in particular the unresolved conflicts in Donne’s sense of the sacramental.” Claims that Donne’s “response to the absent presence of Anne parallels his response to the Eucharist, the most hotly-debated absent presence of the period,” and that “[h]is fears about marriage reflect his fears about the efficacy of both Baptism and the Eucharist” (183), since “he defines these two sacraments in conjugal terms, as the earthly means by which the soul is wedded to God.” Maintains that HSShe “suggests that Donne’s profound ambivalence toward sacramental signs, including Anne herself as such, springs from the difference between sacramental experience and analogical orientation” (184). Explicates the sonnet to show that throughout Donne “still clings to a husband’s role,” which he realizes he must abandon ultimately “in order to become a Bride in the heavenly wedding feast.” Maintains that “[t]he dilemma of his all-too husbandly soul is that it cannot gaze upon the example of her femininity without responding to it as a man” and that although he “looks to the absent bride of Christ that he may become, like her, a responsive and utterly wifely creature” (192), in doing so he “makes present to himself the earthly bride he still desires” (192–93). Concludes, therefore, that “[i]n showing her husband how to welcome the Bridegroom [Christ], Anne can’t help but remind him of how good it felt to be one” (193).


Reconsiders “the dialogic nature of poetic practice” in the Renaissance and how not only
a manuscript culture but also “emphases on rhetoric and dialectic” fueled the practice. Maintains that “[h]owever ritualized the practice may appear, and however stylized, poetry served a primarily communicative function” (i). Discusses Donne as a poet who wrote within a manuscript culture and comments specifically on how Donne in Bait enters into a “dialectical disputation” with Marlowe’s “The Passionate Shepherd” and Ralegh’s reply, transmuting “the setting, the occasion, the premise, and the rhetorical arguments presented by both Marlowe and Ralegh” (10) and thereby offering a corrective response to their poems. Discusses also the likelihood of verse exchanges and corrective interventions between Donne and the Countess of Bedford and considers HSDeath as perhaps Donne’s response to the Countess’s corrective verse of his BoulRec.


Reproduces 6 poems from the Songs and Sonnets without notes or commentary (82–88). Points out that Donne’s “early love sonnets comply with the word’s broader meaning” and that they do not follow “any specific Petrarchan rhythmic design, but were ‘little songs,’ and therefore legitimate sonnets in the general sense, adopting a more varied lyric approach and refusing to follow in any particular narrative sequence” (13).


Presents a revisionist reading of Anniv by commenting on the theological conceits that underpin the central contrast in the poem between “worldly time and timeless love” (63) and by exploring the eschatological dimensions of the poem. Maintains that in Anniv Donne claims that the lovers “have preempted heaven, and so have purchased their redemption from physical harm” and have “earned their immortality by a unique mutual faithfulness” (65) and thus that he “projects the love as a sort of eschaton” (69). Suggests that the lovers become “the type of the Adam novus” and are “figurally entitled to a paradisal life” here on earth and that at death they will “no longer sense the privileged status they had on earth, but, in the community of the blessed, han dolce vita with them all” (72).


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and works and explores the elements of wit and humor in Donne’s poetry. Warns against assuming that Donne is the speaker of the poems and points out that although Donne is “universally regarded as a witty and humorous poet,” critics often disagree about “the nature, purpose, and presence of his wit” in particular poems. Believes, however, that most critics agree that “certain traits typify Donne’s wit and humor” (322), such as the uses of drama, argument, paradox, hyperbole, irony, striking images, clever twists of thought, and wordplay. Discusses humor in Relic, Flea, ElPerf, SGo, WomCon, SunRis, Canon, Sickness, and Father. Observes how Donne’s poems “often combine mingled seriousness and humor” and that these “mixed tones suggest the complexities of the speakers and situations that the author presents” (326). Concludes that Donne’s “playfulness conveys a sense of intellectual alertness and of spontaneity combined with disciplined artistry” and that “[h]is best poems are both serious and clever” (327). Includes a selected bibliography (327–29).


Discusses “the only descriptive testimony Walton gives us about Anne More: his specifying that she had been ‘curiously and plentifully educated’” and addresses “the most important recent discovery about Anne More: Ilona
Bell's conjecture that three unascribed letters in the Burley manuscript were actually addressed by John Donne to Anne More before their marriage” (140). Argues that Walton's testimony about Anne's education should be accepted since there is no evidence to contradict his statement and good reasons to accept it. Finds Bell's theory supportive of Walton's testimony and shows how it “fits in with other little- noticed contextual information relating Donne and his family to the ancient Catholic nobility.” Discusses, in particular, the life of Edmond Neville, who moved in the social circle of the ancient Catholic nobility and who may have been the person who betrayed Donne and Anne More to Sir George More. Concludes that “[c]onsidered in the light of these associations, the plausibility of a further association between Donne and Edmond Neville is enhanced, lending support to Bell's insight” (146).


Briefly comments on astronomical thought and imagery in Donne's poetry. Points out, for instance, that in *FirAn* (ll. 205–08) about the new philosophy calling all into doubt, Donne may have meant this comment as *contemptus mundi* or may have simply been reflecting the “popular bewilderment” at the flood of new scientific information that many found confusing. Notes, however, that "the passage is far from implying that Donne thinks of science as the enemy to religious faith" since “[t]o suppose that would be to confuse faith with certainty” (33). Observes Donne's use of stellification in *EpEliz* (ll. 39–40) and notes that to reduce these lines “altogether to social politics would underestimate both the persistence of ancient metaphysics and the strength of Renaissance beliefs in stellification” (66). Notes also that in *Canon* Donne's "ideal lover is refined into the semblance of an angel, or spiritual Intelligence in its sphere" (79).


Focuses on “the interplay between the sacred and profane” in Donne's poetry following his wife's death. Points out how during this period Donne "stresses the unlikeness rather than the likeness between the profane and sacred" (152). Discusses in detail *HSSHe* and *Christ* and suggests how the latter "offers a useful gloss" on the sonnet (155). Points out how both poems acknowledge the relatedness between profane and sacred love, stress "the primacy of divine love," and present finally "a negative valuation of profane love" (156). Concludes that Donne comes to see that God's love is "ininitely superior to any mortal kind of love, including Anne's," and that the "resignation" in *Christ* "can be read at face value," thereby making it "likely that a similar attitude of uneasy resignation also underlines" *HSSHe* (161).


Maintains that “[f]ew poets of Donne's time—or for that matter any time—show his understanding of contemporary economic theory and use it as a body of metaphor in their poetry.” Claims that Donne is “one of the first English poets to sense the vast economic changes coming over Europe in general and England in particular, and the first to work them into the understanding of intellectual experience” (497). Comments on Donne's understanding and uses of currency and debasement of currency and of aspects of credit, debt, borrowing, and taxation in his poems and suggests the sources of his information on economic issues. Observes that "economic metaphors tend to drop out of Donne's work in the latter part of
his life” and that “almost none appear in his di-
vine poems.” Discusses in some detail, howev-
er, his funeral sermon for Sir William Cokayne in 1626 as “one final superb illustration of
Donne's understanding of economic matters” (507). Shows how in the sermon Donne uses
metaphors “to praise a man who had exploited
a rapidly changing economic system” (514).

36. Friedman, Donald M. “Christ's Image and Like-
ness in Donne.” JDJ 15: 75–94.

Examines the argument of HSWhat and “its re-
lation to several ideas and themes that recur so
often in Donne's lyrics and in his sermons that
they might reasonably be thought obsessive” (75). Discusses Donne's preoccupation with
the issue of whether the soul at death imme-
diately goes before God for judgment or waits
until the general resurrection, his uses of and
transformation of the Petrarchan trope of the
beloved's image graven in the heart of the lover
and of Neoplatonic doctrines of physiognomy,
his views on election and justification, and his
Christology. Maintains that Donne's “anxiety
about how, and in what form, the sinner would
confront his saviour remained constant” (82)
throughout his life. Argues that in HSWhat
Donne's “implicit discovery of his compassion
for 'Christ crucified' is revealed in his seeing
through the mask of the God of judgment to
the face of the merciful savior” and that thus
he “proceeds as God does with the world, pre-
senting his truth in an embodiment equal or
accommodated to the understanding of his au-
dience, but leading to clearer and deeper un-
derstanding, which will in turn lead to a burn-
ing away, a purifying, an ultimate revelation of
the one image underlying all the many like-
nesses, the form under all shapes, the face that
is both his own and the other's, the face that St.
Paul promises we will see 'then'” (91–92).

37. Frontain, Raymond-Jean. “Translating Heav-
enwards: 'Upon the Translation of the Psalmes' and

Challenges those critics who regard Sidney as
little more than another of Donne's patronage
poems, the intent of which is self-advancement,
by arguing that the poem “not only resists de-
scription by its most immediate occasional
circumstances but [also] elevates encomia … to the highest spiritual function of poetic
language.” Maintains that Sidney is Donne's
“most precise definition of what he hoped to
accomplish through his religious poetry and
his most complete poetic statement of the re-
ligious power and spiritual economy of praise,”
and perhaps even reveals what he hoped to
accomplish as a preacher (104). Believes that
Donne's major achievement in the poem—“a
poem about the nature and operations of de-
votion—is that, even as he advocates to others
the reflexive action of using God's own words
to praise Him, he provides an example of how
it is to be done” (105). Discusses the important
role of psalm recitation in patristic culture and
the importance of psalm translation during the
Reformation as an introduction to understand-
ing how Donne associated "psalm translation
and singing with the re-formation of the post-
lapsarian cosmos" (107). Presents a reading of
Sidney, stressing that the poem is not a medi-
tation on Donne's own spiritual condition but
rather is primarily a meditation on “the public
role that his meditations play in spiritualizing
society and harmonizing the cosmos” (117).
Relates the poem to the Anniversaries, noting
that since he was so badly misunderstood in
his praise of Elizabeth Drury, in Sidney Donne
"prepares himself to function in a more tradi-
tionally-structured social role” (118).

38. Frost, Kate Gartner. “The Lothian Portrait: A
Prologomenon.” JDJ 15: 95–125.

Suggests “a program of study for the Lothian
portrait which goes beyond the traditional
iconographical elucidation of the art histo-
rian.” Contends that the portrait is "as fully a
product of Donne's creative imagination as
were its contemporary literary efforts, such
as the Satires and the early Elegies” and that
it “draws on Donne's vast store of knowledge
and the intricate complexities of his wit” (95),
thereby revealing his “early and knowledgeable
involvement with pictorial art and its contem-
temporary underpinnings, especially with theories of humane and mundane harmonics which informed pictorial design” and “linear perspective.” Argues, in other words, that the Lothian portrait should be studied as “a deliberate response to the context of Renaissance thought, not just as the egocentric gesture of an over-sexed young fop” (96). Maintains that although the Lothian portrait belongs to “a genre of late Elizabethan paintings of melancholics, its concerns and its programme go well beyond the demands of that rather limited genre.” Points out how “Spenser’s Castyynle of Alma, Fludd’s Temple of Music, and Arcimboldo’s elemental and seasonal series share a common ground in that they manifest a strong concern with the harmony of macrocosm and microcosm, demonstrated mathematically and musically,” and contends that the Lothian portrait “shares this concern.” Concludes, therefore, that “the portrait should be studied in the light of its geometrical construction, especially in its emphasis on the relation of circle and triangle; that it should be studied in the light of an underlying mathematical programme” (120), as found also in Spenser’s The Faerie Queene (Book II, Canto 9, Stanza 22): “that it should be studied in the light of the iconography of melancholia, temperance, and theories of contemplative imagination; that its hermetic connections should be explored; [and] that its colors, costume, and physical presentation should undergo close scrutiny” (120–21).


Presents an interpretation of Noct “by examining the interconnectedness of the poem’s alchemical and liturgical elements to its underlying mathematical substructure, a substructure itself reflective of Donne’s autobiographical impulse,” hoping, thereby “to resolve the divergence of critical direction that has heretofore characterized our understanding of this poem” (150). Sees Noct as “a commemoration of the fourth-month anniversary of the death of Anne More” and as Donne’s “moving from an earthly marital commitment to a commitment to a chaste, priestly life” as he prepares himself for “the final personal divorce of body and soul” (159). Shows how the alchemical, liturgical, and arithmetical contexts of the poem “manifest Donne’s anguish at his lone state, bereft of that other half of himself, Anne More,” but argues that he sees “this bereavement as an opportunity, quite in traditional terms, to turn his life to penitence, purification, and the works of his clerical profession,” thus transforming his loss into a “foundation for perfection” (165).


Comments very briefly on Sidney and reproduces Donne’s poem. Says that Donne’s comment in ll. 38–39 suggests that he probably was aware that the Sidneys had used the Protestant Psalms of Marot and Bèze, but notes that Helen Gardner in her edition of The Divine Poems (1952) gives a different explanation.


Presents a detailed analysis of the argument of Air, showing how Donne modified or deconstructed the traditional Renaissance double-sonnet form and how in the two parts of the poem he reverses Platonic love into erotic love. Discusses how in his use of the complicated and theological conceit of air and angels Donne succeeds in the last lines of the poem in inverting the traditional Petrarchan topos of the angel-like beloved by applying it to himself. Examines also Donne’s witty appropriation of two Platonic topoi, that of the lover as an aimless, drifting ship and that of the poet as sculptor of the beloved’s beauty. Also speculates on
the possible play on “pinnacle” (l.18) as “penis.” Maintains that Donne’s aim is wittily to show male superiority.


Surveys and evaluates some of the seventeenth-century musical settings of Donne’s poems as well as later adaptations, especially those by Benjamin Britten, prefaced by comments on the difficulty of locating these materials. Points out that composers “often offer singular and thoughtful responses to texts before them, interpretations which can provoke stimulus to literary commentary” (174). Maintains that “one’s reactions as to why a setting works—or doesn’t—will always be instructive, in both directions, that is in terms of the text and of the music, and will force one back to the text itself.” Thus believes that “efforts to come to terms with the widest range of musical reactions—including Britten and other modern composers—need to be encouraged.” Concludes that, “[i]n the end, the best music for Donne will have understood and absorbed Donne’s own music, not only of his medium but, through that, of his being” (182). Includes fragmentary samples of musical settings of Donne’s poems.


Argues that Donne the preacher “evokes the Protestant paradigm of salvation,” stressing the marring of human nature by Original Sin and the dependence upon God’s grace for spiritual restoration.” Finds that “[t]his paradigm informs his participation in the intertextual discourse on sin and salvation begun by the biblical narrative of David and Bathsheba (II Samuel 11 and 12), and continued by exegetical texts.” Shows how Donne’s sermon on Psalm 51 “reveals how he translates the biblical narrative on adultery and murder into an exhortation on the blinded state of the post-Fall Christian” (23).


Explores the theme of farewell and separation in the *Songs and Sonets* and the *Elegies*. Discusses the themes, dramatic immediacy and theatricality, intellectual play, anti-Petrarchism, and use of conceits and paradoxes in Donne’s poems that make them innovative in the Renaissance tradition of valedictory poetry. In addition to the four major valediction poems (so titled) in the canon, comments also on the theme of parting and separation in such poems as *Blos, Leg, Witch, WomCon, ElPict, ElPart*, and *ElFatal*.


Textbook for students. Includes a brief introduction to Donne’s life (viii–ix), followed by *ElBed, ElFatal, Flea, GoodM, SGo, Under, SunRis, Canon, SSweet, Air, Anniv, Twick, ValWeep, Noct, ValMourn, Fun, Relic, Prohib, Expir, HSScene, HSDeath, HSWhat, HSbatter, HSLittle, HSShe, HSvex, Goofd*, and *Father*—with explanatory notes on facing pages (x, 1–53). Contains also a chronological table (199–200), a discussion of critical approaches to metaphysical poetry (201–09), study questions on Donne’s poems included in the collection (211–20), a list of essay topics and advice about writing about poetry (236–38), a note from a chief A-level examiner (239–41), a selected bibliography (243), and an index of first lines (245–46).


Examines “the contextual dynamics” (41) of *Sapho* to show how the poem “raises a se-
ries of culturally significant questions.” Surveys various Renaissance depictions of Sappho and of lesbianism; discusses “how the concept of the ‘sister’ Muses is employed to celebrate male poetic activity” in RWZeal and in a verse epistle written to Donne by T. W; and, “within this framing context,” examines Sappho in an attempt “to assess the extent to which his project fails, and the way that this poem’s shortcomings do not hinder—and, in fact, may help to determine—Donne’s representation of his poetic relationship with Ovid” (42). Finds that although Donne “begins to assert a lesbian poetics” in Sappho, he is “uneasy with presenting a lesbian poet as a forerunner to Ovid—and by extension—as a forerunner to himself.” Concludes, therefore, that Sappho “does not set him apart from other representations of her and, more generally, of lesbianism” (54). Maintains that where Donne differs is “in his attempt to speak not just about Sappho, but in her place” (54). Maintains that Donne’s “depiction of Sappho and lesbianism is more complex than may be perceived at first glance” and that “it is only when his poem is placed in the context of other Renaissance depictions of female homosexuality that we can both appreciate his achievement and see that his putatively pro-lesbian love elegy reconfirms the message of the verse letters as a celebration of male poetic activity” (55).


Maintains that, for all their differences, there is “one striking connection” between Donne and Milton: “their celebration of the sacredness of sexual love.” Observes that, “[d]espite the considerable inconsistency, even contradiction that both Donne and Milton display in their treatment of sexual love, both were at some point in their lives attracted to the idea that sexual intercourse can be a ‘holy rite’ that allows human beings to apprehend, imitate, or partake of divinity.” Examines Milton’s treatment of prelapsarian sexual love in Book IV of Paradise Lost in relation to Donne’s “view of mutual love as the ‘mysterious’ rite of sexual intercourse in some of his Songs and Sonnets.” Points out also that the fact that both poets “find religious significance, and locate a religious impulse, in the most private aspect of human experience suggests that their views of sexual love are intertwined with their religious beliefs and their attitudes towards religious institutions” (3). Observes that Donne’s “celebration of sexual love and specifically intercourse as sacred occurs in those poems presenting a love relationship that is mutual, exclusive, committed, and as permanent as possible in a mutable, contingent world” (4). Notes that although the lovers in these poems “are not referred to as married, legally or within the church,” they are described, however, “as if they were married, bound closely to each other, perhaps more closely than those whose marriages are recognized by the church and state” (4–5). Comments specifically on Canon, Flea, Ecst, SunRis, Air, GoodM, ValMourn, Relic, and ValBook and maintains that the lovers in these poems “replace the clergy and saints of the institutional church,” that their love letters “replace the traditional books of church learning” (7), and their love acts “replace the church sacraments, providing for the lovers access to grace and divinity.” Points out that Donne, therefore, “in arguing for the holiness of a private, sexual love presents his lovers as the real saints, and their physical and spiritual union in sexual intercourse as the true miracle” and that “[n]owhere outside of these lovers does true religion seem to exist” (8). Observes, however, that the “conscious indeterminacy” in these poems may suggest Donne’s “deeply fearful uncertainty about whether love really is the true religious experience” (9). Argues, however, that Donne’s “emphasis on the importance of the body in love” and on “the holiness of sex” in many of the poems in the Songs and Sonnets “looks forward to Milton’s celebration of wedded love in Paradise Lost, where he, like Donne, ‘uses religious language in celebrating the sexual activities of his prelapsarian lovers both to sanctify the rites of love and to distinguish these ‘pure’ practices from those of institutionalized religion’” (9).

Discusses how the death of Donne's wife and her “irrevocable physical absence” are “central to the conflicts and fears” that pervade Donne's poems following her death. Points out how “these late poems express an intense anxiety about human love that gains significance when read against the earlier Songs and Sonnets celebrating a sacramental experience of love” (204) and points out how they “question the very faith in human love that the celebratory Songs and Sonnets embodied” (207). Comments particularly on Donne's fear that his continuing love for his wife might be sinful and lead to his damnation. Claims that his late poems reflect his “intensified, painfully personal sense of the contradictions in the Christian view of human love, the body, and sexuality” (213). Considers Noct as Donne's “fullest, most difficult representation of the experience of loss that shook his sacramental faith in human sexual love” (217). In an epilogue, suggests that possibly the now-no-longer-existing tomb Donne had erected for Anne in St. Clement Danes contained a visual representation of her and suggests that, if he did commission such an image of her, it would be “material evidence of his continuing desire for her visible, bodily presence, of his inability to give her up, despite the repeated attempts at renunciation in the poems” (223).

49. -----. “‘The Relique’, The Song of Songs, and Donne’s Songs and Sonnets.” JDJ 15: 23–44.

Discusses how the Song of Songs “not only illuminates Relic but also ‘bears wider relevance to Donne’s Songs and Sonnets.’” Suggests that “the conflicts about love and sexuality that mark Donne’s poetry” express “a profound tension between the erotic ethos of the Hebrew Song, with its celebration of sexual love, and the spiritualizing ethos of Paul and Pauline Christianity, with its distrust of the sexed body and sexual desire” (23). Points out that the Song of Songs “provides a fascinating context” for reading Relic since the biblical text has posed “interpretive problems” that are “curiously similar” to those raised by Donne's poem (26). Comments on those problems, most of which concern the valuation of human sexuality and of eroticism. Shows how Donne in Relic captures “the sense of interconnection between sexual and sacred, physical and spiritual, that distinguishes the ancient Hebrew text,” thereby departing from “the allegorizing, spiritualizing impulses that had dominated the interpretive history of the Song” (30). Suggests that just as Ovid's poetry “off ered Donne an anti-Petrarchan model of his Elegies and the more cynical, flippant lyrics in the Songs and Sonnets,” the Song of Songs “may well have served Donne’s poetic inspiration for imagining and celebrating the transformative power of erotic love in his celebratory Songs and Sonnets.” Discusses also how Donne’s love poetry “shares certain stylistic features with the Song of Songs” (33). Recognizes, however, that Donne, “for all his celebration of sexual love, never quite escaped the spell of Paul and Augustine, with their profound distrust of sexuality, their sense that the spirit is the essence of the human being” (35). Comments on the “deep ambivalence in Donne about sexuality and the body” (39). Believes that in the last stanza of Relic, however, “irony and skepticism give way to celebration and eulogy” and that the speaker fully embraces his love for his beloved “as a miracle, a mystery, something ultimately good” (40).


Presents a biographical sketch of Donne and a survey of his works (11–109); comments on previous translations of Donne's works in Italian; and explains the choice of selections in the present edition and the guidelines and principles followed in the translations (111–18). Presents selections (with English and Italian texts on opposite pages) from the Songs and Sonnets (119–247), the epigrams (249–53), the Elegies (255–73), the epithalami (275–83), the verse epistles (285–97), Fun (299–309), Epicedes and
Obsequies (311–17), Holy Sonnets (319–41), and Lit and Christ (343–49), followed by “Death's Duell” (with English and Italian on opposite pages) and preceded by a brief introduction (352–87). Concludes with a chronology of Donne's life and publications (389–94) and an index (395–400).


Contains a chronology of Donne's life (i-ii) and an introduction that points out that Donne was not only “the first poet in English to distinguish love from sex” but also that he pursued “the union of the two—as far as any poet ever had” (iii-vi). Presents a sketch of Donne's life and works (1–20), followed by discussions of Donne's love poems of inconstancy (21–32), those expressing Platonic love (33–44), and those of constancy (45–64). Comments, thereafter, on the divine poems (65–71) and the Anniversaries and selected prose works (72–87). Concludes with a discussion of Donne's reputation from the seventeenth century to the present (88–100) and a selected bibliography of modern editions of Donne's poetry and prose, a selected list of modern biographical studies, and a note on modern critical studies (101–03).


Discusses unresolved questions of interpretation of Goodf, especially “whether the rider’s error is a particular identifiable sin (if so what is it?); whether it is sin at all, or merely failure in meditation; whether the rider goes his way under compulsion or by choice; whether his rebellion ceases or continues; and whether the poem arrives at closure.” Reads the poem “as a radically Protestant meditation on sin and salvation—thus about sin and salvation, not about meditation.” Maintains that the sin confronted in the poem is not a particular sin but rather is “the general corruption that all branches of the Reformation insisted was inseparable from human nature” (218), the root of which was “self-devotion, hence desertion of God—a misdirection of the will.” Says that the rider in the poem, therefore, is “self-compelled” (219) but in the end he becomes “wondering and thankful in the presence of his seventeenth-century Protestant God” and counts “his blessings—his sinful desertion has produced not the deserved penalty but only (nothing but) corrections designed by mercy” (221). Believes that the poem reaches “its proper end when the speaker sees Christ on the Cross and makes his declaration of submission” (224).


Traces the history of reading Canon from Walton's biography of Donne (1640) to the publication of Cleanth Brook's’s “The Language of Paradox” (1942) in order “to account for the fact that the poem was only belatedly fitted into what might have seemed an obvious biographical context, a context from which Brook's's interpretation asked readers again to prescind” (41). Reviews historicist and deconstructionist attacks on the New Critical approach to Canon in order “better to appreciate the sharp discontinuity that Brooks wrought in Donne stud-
ies when he brought that poem to the center of Donne’s canon” (42). Notes that, until the nineteenth century, Canon received little critical attention and maintains that the principal reason that pre-twentieth-century readers of the poem failed to regard it as defense of Donne’s marriage is that Walton in his biography of Donne “had preempted such an interpretive possibility” (56). Points out, however, how Walton “ultimately inspired biographical readings of the poem” (57) by later critics. Cites Gosse (1899) as the first to regard Canon as Donne’s defense of his marriage. Comments also on how biographical readings of Relic begun in the nineteenth century have stirred up debates about the relationship of Donne’s poetry and his life that continue on in the twentieth century. Concludes that a survey of the critical commentary “shows that ever since Romantic and expressive theories of literature took hold in the nineteenth century, many readers have found biographical interpretations irresistible” and that readers of Donne “persist in trying to domesticate the remarkable energies of his erotic verses” (62).


Points out that although many of Donne’s poems may have been written to or for Anne More or at least were inspired by his love for her, his epitaph upon her death is the one work we know for sure that he wrote for his wife. Discusses some of the ways in which the epitaph “evinces many of the tensions, paradoxes, and fears that animate the poet’s better known lyrical-sermonic-meditative valedictions” (18) and also “explores some of the meditative, confessional, and inventive wit of this poignant epitaph” (19). Points out also “the incredible verbal gymnastics and typological wit of Donne’s portrait of himself as mirror and doppelganger of the divine Infans—and the ways in which he reiterates St. Jerome’s warning about the misery of the man who is created by his wife” (26). Presents a detailed critical reading and an English translation of the epitaph. Concludes that this Latin poem is one of Donne’s “most eloquent testaments to the ’vex[t] contraryes’(’Oh, to vex me’) of that immense, powerful and penetrating painful desire for ’more love’—that feverishly egocentric desire for the irresistible folly of human love—even while it confesses his devotion to and his desire to express his devotion to the eternal Passion that re-writes all desires hoc loco” (30–31).


Contains the following original essays, each of which has been separately entered into this bibliography: Ilona Bell, “If it be a shee’: The Riddle of Donne’s ’Curse’” (106–39); Theresa M. DiPasquale, “Ambivalent Mourning in ’Since she whom I lov’d’” (183–95); Dennis Flynn, “Anne More, John Donne, and Edmond Neville” (140–48); Kate Gartner Frost, “Preparing towards her’: Contexts of A Nocturnall upon S. Lucies Day” (149–71); Achsah Guibbory, “Fear of ’loving more’: Death and the Loss of Sacramental Love” (204–27); Dayton Haskin, “On Trying to Make the Record Speak More about Donne’s Love Poems” (39–65); M. Thomas Hester, “Faeminae lectissimae’: Reading Anne Donne” (17–34); Frances M. Malpezzi, “Loves Liquidity in ’Since she whom I lov’d’” (196–203); Graham Roebuck, “’Glimmering lights’: Anne, Elizabeth, and the Poet’s Practice” (172–82); Maureen Sabine, “No Marriage in Heaven: John Donne, Anne Donne, and the Kingdom Come” (228–55); Camille Wells Slight, “A Pat-

Reviews:


Argues that in his profane lyrics Donne's conceits “subsume the sacred into the profane, confounding our understanding by positing analogies between sacred and profane love in which we ‘cannot tell’ whether to privilege the vehicle or the tenor” (132). Maintains, therefore, that Donne's “profane lyrics do not 'teach' but instead present a blend of voices, connotations, and 'meanings' which confound our understanding.” Discusses examples of how Donne “frames the last clauses” of his love poems “in terms of current theological analogies” (133), commenting especially on Relic, Valmour, Canon, and Dream. Believes that “the most 'Catholic' feature of these poems is how they deny the major invention of the Protestant Reformation—the authority and assurance of the reader to determine the meaning of signs sacred and profane” (146). Concludes that “[i]n defiance of patriarchal, Protestant, Neoplatonic, and political authority... Donne would boldly plead (to Anne, to Sir George More, to the Protestant oligarchy, and, perhaps most of all, to himself): ‘For God's sake ... let me love’” (147).


Relying on “a matrix of social and cultural norms,” discusses “a specific feature of 1590s visual and performative culture, the role of interruption in court and student festive rituals, as a significantly constitutive element in Donne's verse” (103). Discusses the history of interruption as a primary feature of court ritual and royal entertainments that was clearly adopted and adapted by student festivals; examines Donne's “connections with the Inns of Court Christmas revels, particularly the 1597 Prince d'Amour; and presents a sociological and cultural reading of some of Donne's early lyrics, particularly Flea, as “representative examples of the reemergence of that feature of interruption in the poetic practice of Donne in his verse of the 1590s” (104). Concludes that the aim of the essay is “to resituate Donne's verse in the social, political, and cultural milieu from which it emerged, while demonstrating that this milieu is not simply a detachable background for that verse but significantly constitutive of it” (119).


Discusses a lesson plan designed by Marguerite Jamieson for teaching ValMourn in first-year literature courses that “uses Microsoft Word functions, including format painter for text scansion, tables to trace imagery, and annotation to explore meaning in context” (158).


In Korean. Presents a genetic structuralist approach to Donne's early love poetry, using the
method of Lucien Goldmann, to discover the structure of the naturalistic world view in these poems. Discusses, in particular, ElVar, claiming that in this poem “nature appears as the normative frame of atheism, materialism, and dynamic hedonism upon which the speaker structures his relationships and patterns of behavior.” Points out the speaker’s “unifying relationship with nature, strong rejection of social customs and unbridled desire for love” (521). (English abstract)


Maintains that in “Paradox VII: That a wise man is knowne by much Laughinge” “the superiority of the laughing subject is asserted expressly by the text and contrasted with the alleged inferiority of the object of laughter” and that “categories such as wisdom and folly—universal themes in Renaissance literature and philosophy—are submitted to quasi-serious reflection as well as rhetorical manipulation in Donne’s text.” Claims that “[w]hat is at stake in Donne’s paradox is precisely the epistemological position of folly or madness as well as reason or wisdom.” Discusses how during the Renaissance laughter underwent “a process of intellectualization” (10) and shows how Donne in his paradox uses “paralogical argumentation” and literary allusions to Martial to make his point (11).


Says that the Holy Sonnets are “both prayers and objets d’art” (33) and relates them to “the intensity of pietist self-probing.” Points out, for instance, that in HSSighs “[t]he fear, discontent, and wretchedness that the speaker wishes for—and bathes in—as if they were blessings, make the sonnet’s sighs seem an echo of the pietists” (153). Suggests a similarity between Donne’s “virtuosity” in the Holy Sonnets and the pietists’ “self-imprecation and prayerful performances.” Observes that just as the pietists were accused of “self-absorption” and “self-promotion,” so Donne has been accused of “egocentrism.” Points out, however, that “the ego in the sonnets is relentlessly and ruthlessly self-incriminating” (155). Maintains that since there is no way to settle the issue of the sequence of the Holy Sonnets, it is better “to read each sonnet as a discrete meditation on ‘true grief’ and repentance” (156). Concludes that in the Holy Sonnets Donne fashioned “the prodigal self as dramatically as did the pietists’ prayers” (161).


Analyzes HSMade apart from “the burden of commentary that tries to confine the sonnets within a preconceived pattern of strict religious contexts” (343). Suggests that the tripartite pattern in the sonnet may not result from the meditative tradition but from the Neo-Platonic ascent from the earthly realm of change to the timeless realm of the sacred” as described in Book 4 of The Courtier (345) and points out that the image of God as a craftsman recalls various biblical images of God as a potter. Maintains that “[t]he interweaving of these two traditions—classical and biblical—allows us to witness within the framework of a Neo-Platonic ascent the spiritual regeneration of fallen man.” Insists that the two traditions “nourish each other” as “parallels between them come into play.” Shows how both traditions culminate in the final couplet, in which Donne presents an emblematic image, perhaps drawn from Georgette de Montenay’s Emblemes ou Devises Chrestienne (1517), of “an iron heart drawn irresistibly by an adamant stone held out from heaven” (347), an idea that Montenay may have found in Plato’s Ion. Argues that when HSMade is freed from “one or more of a whole host of theological patterns” and is seen as simply reflecting a discrete moment in the
spiritual life of the speaker, it “takes on its own, and not a borrowed, resonance” (350).


Analyzes the Ditchley portrait and *ElBed*, thereby contrasting “the pictorial exaltation and idealization of the aging queen with Donne’s poetic satire on the excesses of the cult of Elizabeth” (44). Through a detailed reading of Donne’s poem shows how the speaker of the poem ironically adopts “the pose of a client of the queen” and “parodies a protocol of the cult of Elizabeth, whose clients interrelate the language of *amour*, the discourse of patronage, and the mystical apprehension of the macro-cosmic or heavenly woman.” Points out how Donne “wittily parodies such correspondences, which are celebrated in the Ditchley painting and in other works, both visual and verbal, by Elizabeth’s admirers.” Observes that “[t]he tone of fulsome praise in the poem enables the author to protect himself from censorious reprimand if the text while circulated in manuscript fell into the hands of an informed but unsympathetic reader” and thus “what appears adulatory is really satirical.” Concludes that *ElBed* also satirizes Sir Francis Drake.


Contains two chapters that discuss Donne. In “And Jesus Wept: Preaching Tears and Jesus” (156–85), examines Renaissance sermons on Jesus weeping (John 11: 35) and calls a sermon preached by Donne in Lent 1622 “the most eloquent sermon from this period on Jesus’ tears” and “the apex of the Renaissance hermeneutic discussion of tears.” Claims that Donne “elevates tears and weeping as quintessentially humane expressions to an unprecedentedly positive degree” (173). Maintains that the three most important points Donne makes about Christ’s tears in his sermon is that Jesus “wept to demonstrate the fullness of his humanity; that tears are for man (male gender) as well as—perhaps even more than—for women to weep; and that, to some degree, however minute, tears are inherently good” (182–83). Observes that most importantly, for Donne, tears “illuminate a particular aspect of Jesus’ psychology” and notes that he “consistently puts more faith in tears as humane expression than his contemporaries do” (183). In “‘We Are Taught Best By Thy Teares and Thee’: Donne, Herbert, Crashaw” (186–244), points out that in the poems of Donne, Herbert, and Crashaw “tears reach their fullest poetic flowering” and that, “after them, tears and weeping lack any consistent, notable application for poetic generations” (186). Discusses how in Donne’s poetry tears “surface in eclectic situations, under various witty guises, and with discordant significance” (190) and how they are “outward, visible signs of the speaker’s tension—be it grief, frustration, powerlessness, or generation” and “whether shed by the speaker or another, they are relational only to the speaker and his interests” (191). Comments on Donne’s use of tears in *Witch*, *Twick*, *ValWeep*, *Mark*, *FirAn*, *BoulNar*, and several of the *Holy Sonnets*.


Discusses in Lacanian terms how Donne “involes the language of colonial exploration and its possessive agency” not only in his “treatment of women” but also in “his repeated aspirations for a connection with God” (270). Focuses on Lacan’s view of “desire as a symptom that can never be satisfied” and how it is “a permanent metonymic displacement that will always shift to a new signifier as object” (269). Discusses, in particular, *ElProg* as an excellent example of Donne’s “colonialist tendencies” in which “conquest and sexual lust merge” (274) and compares the poem to Raleigh’s account of his first voyage to Guiana. Comments also on the use of maps in a colonial context in *GoodM* and *Sickness*. Concludes that in Donne’s work
“England’s colonialist interests inform and influence linguistic displacement” and that “it is metonymy, not the psychological drive propelling desire from some ineffable depth, where the action takes place, especially at a time in history when people died searching for El Dorado” (286).


In Part I examines some historical and theoretical premises about religious poetry in the seventeenth century. Maintains that “[t]here were great English lyrics before and after Donne, Herbert, Crashaw, and Vaughan, but none to surpass theirs” and notes that, “strangely enough, their masterpieces came into being when the belief in religiously revealed truth had to give way to the persuasive power of empirical evidence on the one hand and ratiocination on the other” (470). Examines metaphysical poetry against this period of intellectual and cultural change and observes how the metaphysical poets “looked for truth (apart from the Bible) in their own present world and private experience” (475). Maintains that the metaphysical poets “did not evade the question of knowledge” but rather “shared this theme with their contemporaries” but that, “different from the general trend of at least the academic development of the period, they saw the ‘tree of knowledge’ in its manifold context, always stressing the christological aspect” (477) and seeing in the book of nature “a multitude of meaningful signs” (479). Stresses that religious metaphysical poetry is suffused with biblical language and “was written primarily to honor God.” Points out also how one finds in it the “freedom of play, conducted in the spirit of serio ludere” (480). In Part II, focuses on individual poets. Comments on the importance of death in Donne’s worldview and in his poetry and says that for him death is “the enemy to be loved above all others, by a man and woman living in Christian responsibility as a willingly conscious partner in the Trinitarian covenant.” Notes that “[t]his view of life, which was to come into its own in the divine poems and in the sermons, was developed, and is partly present already in the *Songs and Sonnets*” (483), citing *Ecsf* as an example. Explores Donne’s treatment of death and knowledge in several poems, especially *Saty* and *HSRound* as well as in Meditation 17 of *Devi*ons. Points out how in Donne’s poems words and syntax “are tinged with ambiguity and irony and dialectic reversion.” Points out also how even his most humble prayers are expressed in the imperative and how “the energetic value of the most luxurious images is surpassed by mere particles” (488). Maintains that the metaphysical poets were, “each in his distinctive way, modern poets who endeavoured to ‘translate’ the signs of their real world (not an imaginary one) into audible, meaningful language” (505–06). Holds that “[t]he meaning they wanted to convey was an essential ‘literal’ one since in their Christian metaphysical poetics there was no such thing as an abstract meaning.” Explains that “[a]s in Holy Writ the word is the spirit and in the created world the thing is the sign, so in Metaphysical Poetry the word is the meaning” and maintains that, as a result of this affinity, “the Metaphysical Poets could take the Bible for their model and the book of nature for the original form from which to copy, when they endeavoured to offer a ‘crown of prayer and praise’ for God, in a world which refused to receive him” (506). (English summary)


Surveys Donne’s use of alchemical subject matter and ideas in his poetry. Points out that although Donne is “aware of the rich legacy of alchemical satire and often draws upon it,” for him, “alchemy rarely becomes merely a formula for producing an automatic, predetermined response of mirth, scorn, or amusement.” Maintains that Donne tends “to use al-
chemistry with an understanding of its full range of denotations, connotations, and associational nuances as well as its potential in meeting the intellectual, spiritual, and imagistic demands of the new metaphysical poetry” (155). Divides Donne’s poems that contain alchemical references into four categories: “(1) poems treating alchemy satirically; (2) poems that reveal alchemical ideas about the nature, attributes, and production of gold; (3) poems that make reference to the types of equipment, materials, and procedures that alchemists used in their experiments; and (4) poems especially concerned with transmutation and the making of elixirs and philosophers’ stones” (156). Discusses in detail Canon and Noct as “two of Donne’s most complex and original uses of alchemical themes and symbols” (174) but comments also on a number of other poems that appear in the Songs and Sonets, the Elegies, the Satyres, the verse epistles, the Epicedes and Obsequies, the Anniversaries, and the Divine Poems.


Maintains that Donne was aware that he was creating a new kind of poetry that would be understood only by “an elite of educated people trained in the same tradition as his” (153). Discusses the main characteristics of this new poetry, such as the use of the “new science”; a fusion of logical thought and passionate feeling; the transmutation of the Ovidian, Neo-Platonic, and Petrarchan traditions; the employment of dramatic techniques and strong lines; and the new uses of rhetorical devices, wit, and the conceit. Believes that because Donne was “by far ahead of his time” and “in contact with a large set of different new theories which were ignored by many of his contemporaries,” his poetry was not much liked until the arrival of the French Symbolist poets, T. S. Eliot, and the so-called “New Critics.” Concludes that Donne shows in his poetry that he is capable of “recreating and reconciling the many different traditions in which he was brought up in order to build a new conception of poetry” (156).

71. Malpezzi, Frances M. “Love’s Liquidity in ‘Since she whome I lovd,’” in John Donne’s “desire of more”: The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry, ed. M. Thomas Hester, 196–203. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses. Discusses the “crucial water/thirst imagery” in HSShe and argues that “[t]his central conceit, when placed within its scriptural context, clearly defines Anne Donne and the endeavor of human love in relationship to the divine.” Maintains, therefore, that although the sonnet “records Donne’s loss, the powerful comparison of Anne to a stream in l. 6 vibrantly recalls the meaningfulness of Anne’s life and love.” Points out how in this poem Donne “demonstrates the power of marital love to sacralize mundane existence” and claims, therefore, that the sonnet “emerges as a testament to the beneficent Creator who provides the gift of human love both to effect salvation and to typify eschatologically the soul’s union with God” (196). Illustrates how Donne, by means of water and thirst, “defines the prototypic relationship between marital partners and between the soul and God” (197). Rejects the claim that Anne More is not present in the poem and insists that, in fact, she “flows through and pervades it.” Regards the sonnet as “both a tribute to Anne’s intimate relationship to her earthly and to her divine spouse as well as a celebration of God’s love flowing freely through the world” and holds that, “[f]ar from being portrayed passively, Anne is depicted as a powerful sacralizing force in Donne’s life” (202).


Compares and contrasts the 1633 and 1635 editions of Donne’s poems to show how “the printer and the publisher play a striking part in establishing the equivalence of book and body, corpse and corpus” in these early editions. Observes how it was not the poet “who crafted this striking icon of authorship by which the book becomes a ‘real and authentic’ communication of Donne’s essence as man and poet” but rath-
er the printer and bookseller. Points out that “[t]he irony is that, as most bibliographers and editors are agreed, the 1635 Poems offers no more accurate a guide to the Donne corpus than the 1633 edition, at least in terms of its establishment of the poet’s canon, since the 1635 volume adds several poems not now attributed to Donne.” Concludes that, by examining the two editions, one sees that there is "no necessary connection between authorial ‘presence’ and historically verifiable authorship" and that, "[f]or that reason alone, these volumes have been haunting and bothersome for modern editors who hope to present authorial presence as unmediated” (198).


Argues that Donne found “very little to admire in any work of history” and that, for him, “[c]hroniclers were baggy monsters with no sense of decorum; up-to-the-minute newsbook histories would print anything, true or false; and secular, classicizing historians were no more to be trusted, whether they pretended to offer politic insights into hidden motives or served up stodgy and deluded exemplarities of moral self-sufficiency.” Maintains, in other words, that, for Donne, “[h]uman history-making would always be dogged by the pluralities of human opinion.” Points out furthermore that Donne held that “[r]eligious history (Bible record and Church history) would always be controversial” and notes that “no reformed historian ever wins Donne’s praise” (216) and that he increasingly considered Catholic historians particularly bad. Maintains that “Genesis is the only history, in fact, that moves Donne to unqualified enthusiasm” (217). Concludes that Donne felt that “modern authorship could of its nature only produce apocryphal work” (218).


Comments on Phrine as a “typical Donnean inversion” in that “the medium is found adequate only in its ability to portray (reflect) artifice.” Suggests that “[b]y implicit contrast, the medium of poetry claims the authenticity necessary to satirize the artifice of both portrait and poetry” (188). Briefly compares Donne’s epigram with Carew’s “To the Painter.”


Commemorates the 365th anniversary of Donne’s death (31 March 1631), noting how Donne himself “often incorporated numerical patterns in his writings, and frequently seemed preoccupied with the theme of death.” Points out Donne’s use in “Death’s Duell” of “the traditional image of the seven ages of life to highlight the brevity and afflictions of human existence.” Briefly comments on Corona, Goodf, Sickness, and “Death’s Duell” to show how “in major works from four different decades” Donne “draws his audience to a deeper awareness of the central Christian mystery of dying and rising with Christ” (11).


Discusses “the fate of Donne’s status as an ecclesiastical authority, the source of his prestige in Izaak Walton’s Life of Dr. Donne (1640), as it intersects with Donne’s growing reputation as a
‘libertine in wit’ in literary culture dominated by the Court and City after the Restoration.” Maintains that “[t]he radical transformation of the Renaissance divine into a Restoration libertine is one indication of the sea-change in the shape of cultural authority after the English Revolution.” In order to provide a measure of this transformation, analyzes “both Donne’s reputation as a ‘divine wit’ among his contemporaries and the obsolescence of that reputation after the Restoration.” Uses Thomas Sprat’s *Life of Abraham Cowley* (1667), “the first widely known ‘life of the poet’ in England, in order to describe the new cultural conjuncture of the Restoration” and claims that “[i]t is that field of literary production which renders the Renaissance prestige of Donne’s ‘divine wit’ a merely ‘Metaphysical school’ of rhetorical excess and thus ‘libertinage’” (7)). Having traced how Donne’s reputation became progressively secularized and how his identification as a libertine poet became firmly established, points out how T. S. Eliot in the twentieth century attempted “to piece back together the picture of Donne shattered (or ‘dissociated,’ to use his own term) in the production of a secular aesthetic domain” (140).


Discusses “metaphorical usage” in *HSBatter* “as it relates to Donne’s experimentation with metrical freedom within the strictures of traditional sonnet form, as a further inroad to the poem’s theme” (210). Presents a metrical analysis of the sonnet showing how Donne “suddenly transforms” the “metrical irregularity” of the first three quatrains “into pure iambic pentameter for the final couplet,” the couplet in which the speaker asks God to rape him. Maintains that the iambic meter in the closing couplet “reflects the peace found as the poem finds its spiritual resolution, not necessarily its intellectual solution,” as the “divine assault is now seen fully as a spiritual act.” Argues that in the final couplet “[t]he rape preserves, rather than destroys, chastity” (213) and that it demonstrates that, in God, “all paradoxes find their supra-ra-


Argues that although almost all of Donne’s poems were “originally performances designed for specific audiences” and were “only gradually circulated to wider audiences in his lifetime,” certain distinctions need to be made, “emphasizing the multiplicity of Donne’s audiences during his lifetime, the access of each of those audiences to only a part of the canon, and especially the variety of ways in which Donne addressed his primary audiences” (127). Stresses that although most of Donne’s poems were written for certain friends as the primary audience, his audience “constantly grew throughout his lifetime” (132) as “his primary audiences shared his poems with other collectors both inside and outside the various coteries” (133) and as his poems became more and more available in both manuscript and printed verse miscellanies. Concludes that although “we are only beginning to explore the question of Donne’s audiences, it is clear that they were multiple, various, fragmented, and an indispensable element of the ethos of performance that in so many ways dictated so many characteristic features of the poetry” (137).


Maintains that “the textual histories of nearly all Renaissance coteries poems share all three of the following features: first, an extensive and complicated manuscript transmission during their author’s lifetime, with the surviving manuscripts existing in multiple strands and at various removes from the author’s original; second,
a first printing after their author’s death—sometimes long after—from copies of doubtful authority; and third, an absence of surviving authorial copies” (41). Points out, therefore, that most modern editors of Renaissance coterie poetry have created “synthetic, or eclectic, texts, combining the accidentals and some verbals from initial printings with selected verbals from manuscript sources” (142). Observes that some more recent editors, in particular the editors of The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne, have attempted to correct these abuses by returning to “many of the principles and methods inaugurated by Renaissance humanists—and refined by later scholars—for the editing of classical and biblical texts as guides” (143) in order to solve similar problems. Outlines some basic principles and guidelines adopted by the textual editors of the Donne variorum edition and points out that their intention is to present “carefully edited unsynthetic, unecclectic, documentary texts based on complete collations of all known contemporaneous and near contemporaneous sources, both in manuscript and in print” (149).


Explores Donne’s recusancy “in relation to his early life and writings,” specifically “by reviewing several retrospective passages in which Donne discusses his Catholicism, underscoring the clues these passages reveal about Donne’s involvement in the Catholic underground.” Maintains that his involvement “provided Donne with exposure to if not training in lifestyle and rhetorical dissimulation, which he depicts in the Elegies generally and Satyre IV specifically,” and argues finally that “Paradox: That women Ought to Paint,” “most subtly describes and enacts the kinds of dissimulation characteristic of that underground” (52). Shows how “by defending religious dissimulation as an option to martyrdom, Donne implies that martyrdom is unnecessary, thereby anticipating his fuller development of this thesis in Pseudo-Martyr” (75).


Reviews and challenges earlier criticism on HS Batter and presents a new, detailed interpretation of the sonnet. Comments on the alchemical imagery of the first quatrain, the interrelatedness of the images and the figurative meanings of the verbs in the poem, and the complex uses of paradox. Claims that Donne’s intent in the sonnet is to show that only by means of “a violent and profound process of purification” can the corrupt soul of man “be transformed into a new being (make me new)” (149).


84. Rodríguez García, José María. “John Donne After Octavio Paz: Translation As Transculturation.” Dispositio 21, no. 48: 155–82.

Proposes that Octavio Paz’s translation of ElBed involved “a process of transculturation” by which there was “a two-way flow of signs and meanings” that “takes place between Donne’s English text and Paz’s Spanish text” (155). Maintains that Paz “singles Donne out for one of his exercises of literary translation at least in part because he feels some affinity with another poet who represents a prestigious literary culture removed from his own in both
time and space” (155–56) and that Paz “enters into a competition with Donne for cultural hegemony.” Suggests that Paz regards Donne as “a precursor of the modern sensibility” that he “claims to represent to the fullest” and that Paz sees Donne as antedating himself “in his presentation of carnal pleasures and mystical raptures as the two conflicting attractions struggling to have exclusive domain of the poet’s consciousness.” Argues, however, that Paz “deliberately sets out to antiquate Donne—to cause him to be outdated—rather than modernize him, as he claims,” thereby attempting to establish Donne as a “weak precursor” so that “he could in turn establish himself as a strong poet coming at the apex of a literary tradition that favors unity over disintegration, reconciliation over contentiousness” (156). Comments on the important ways in which Paz’s version of ElBed departs from Donne’s original and offers an explanation of the effect of these changes. Notes that Paz added to his translation “an interpretive essay riddled with questionable assumptions about Donne’s poetics and biography” (162). Maintains that Paz “recognizes the existence of similarities as well as differences between Donne’s poetic practice and his own” but that “because he is invested in demonstrating the superiority of a modern over a pre-modern ideology of value, he exaggerates those differences to the detriment of the similarities” (173).


Acknowledges that Donne’s attitude toward women “remains an enigma despite the quantity of scholarly attention directed at it.” Maintains that there is “the likelihood that Donne took seriously an ancient tradition concerning the excellence and superiority of women” and argues for “the presence of that tradition” by explaining a crux in Noct with reference to passages in the Anniversaries (172). Discusses Donne’s familiarity with the tradition and relates it to the imagery of the poems under discussion as well as with a contemporary legal debate concerning “the lawfulness of husbands beating their wives” (178). Shows how Donne’s use of the excellence-of-women tradition “is not fortuitous, or the merely adventitious poetical practice of picking images for their wit” but rather that “it is almost concealed in the poems referred to here” and “is the product of his deeply cherished Christian Humanist heritage—a steady view of mutuality to be set against the strident Reformist misogynists of the age.” Concludes that if it is by the “glimmering light” of Elizabeth Drury’s “absent presence” in the Anniversaries, it is in “the effulgence of faemina lectissima, Anne More,” in Noct that Donne, “sometimes a Renaissance skeptic, came to see clearly” (181).

86. -----. “Johannes Factus and the Anvil of the Wits.” JDJ 15: 141–52.

Maintains that Coryat is “not a disembodied instance of high spirit” but rather is “a document, however inscrutable, in the spiritual and intellectual struggle of Donne in those years of his anguish searching for a securely grounded religious position” (146). Points out several passages in the poem that “seem more than coincidentally close” to language of Ignatius, in which “we may see Donne distracted from his facetious Johannes Factus role by his continuous musing on the politics of religion” (148). Concludes that “[b]ehind this puzzling, and perhaps inconsequential, poem in seemingly facetious vein, we catch the shadow of Donne, as loaded with the uncertainties of religious questions as Coryate was brashly free of doubt” (149).

Discusses Relic, Canon, Anniv, ValName, and Noct as reflecting what Anne More meant to Donne. Shows how he considered lovemaking a “channel of grace” (237) and love as “a thing divine” (248) in his early love poetry. Explores the sexual intensity of Donne’s marriage and his undying love for his wife as reflected in his poems. Points out, however, that after his wife’s death Donne becomes less certain about the relationship between sexual and divine love that he had celebrated earlier. Observes that after Anne’s death he had to confront painfully the Christian view that “there are no marriages in heaven” (248) and “that man and woman are not made for one another but for God.” Maintains that Donne feared that “[i]f death brings our personal loving to an end, with all its adulterous excess and idolatrous intensity, it may mean the death of God as well” and that he worried that perhaps “[i]f there is no marriage in heaven, there will be no ‘new marriage’ of divine love either” (249).

88. -----. “‘A Place of Honor’: Dennis Flynn’s Biography of Donne.” JDJ 15: 203–11.


Comments briefly on ElBed (ll. 25–32) as an expression of “male self-empowerment” that “results from the control of the female body’s riches, from probing its depths and setting the male seal which identifies ‘her’ as his possession.” Points out that Donne’s “transfer of the image of the American colony to the commodified female body additionally evokes the images of the virgin soil, to be possessed and exploited by the European colonizer” (110).


Compares Devotions and T. S. Eliot’s Four Quartets, considering primarily “the nature and structure of each work” and the “generic and generative connections between them.” Examines, in particular, the ways in which Eliot “adopted a similar method, a similar set of assumptions, or indeed, in which the assumptions seem to generate the method” (1). Sees both works as “examples of meditative form, texts in which ideas are put forth, incrementally elaborated, modified and adjusted, the one in highly rhythmic prose, the other in rhythmical verse, both moving associatively to show the interconnections, the structure of reality, as these are progressively realized by the writer.” Considers in both works “how the very elaboration of the idea generates the form and, second, what differences in idea and tone this meditative approach produces.” Maintains that “[t]he juxtaposition of these two works shows, on the one hand, the connections between their metaphors and themes” and, “on the other, the differences of voice, of intensity, and of tone that distinguishes the two authors and the centuries in which they wrote” (4). Shows how “[i]n its method, the meditation on event and experience, in its subject, the consideration of time and of eternity and their intersection, and in its rhetorical strategy, a returning to points already made to force further revelations from them, Donne’s Devotions is analogous to Eliot’s Four Quartets” (35). Finds also similarities between Devotions, Thomas Browne’s Religio Medici, and Thoreau’s Walden.


Using the Articles of the Synod of Dort (1619), applies them to Donne’s divine and secular lyrics as “forms of poetic mimesis rather than
pseudo-romantic self-expression in fashionable disguise." Develops, thereby, "a ‘field’ theory based on Renaissance Augustinianism that enables one to bring Donne’s sacred and profane verse together under a single umbrella" and, at the same time, challenges "some current resurrection of biographical fallacy in Donne studies" (163). Argues how "all the mimetic works appear essentially cut of one cloth," the *Holy Sonnets*, *Corona*, and the *Divine Poems* "capitalizing on the problematics of election and assurance"; the *Songs and Sonets*, "reprobation"; and the *Devotions*, "perseverance of the saints." Maintains that this approach promotes "1) sharp discrimination among the dramatic postures and predicaments in which Donne places his speakers; 2) vivid awareness of the broad range of ironies that he employs, variously involving speaker, reader, and author in rich patterns that constantly shift, particularly between speaker and reader; 3) clear perception of the subtle entelechy behind his mocking, paradoxical use of theology and of religious allusions and imagery pervading even the most indecent of the elegies or Songs and Sonets; and 4) a firm grasp of the deft psychology informing some of the most involved tricks of syntax and diction whereby he manipulates emotional responses." Concludes that, most of all, when "profiled as Aristotelian mimesis against a backdrop of profound Christian existentialism," both the profane and sacred poetry "take on an elevating nobility and emotional power that far transcend" the merely "superficial pleasures" that critics have identified in Donne’s "amorous fictions" (171).


In the preface ([ix]–xii), discusses the discovery and publication of MS Royal 17.B.XX, “the only known autograph manuscript sermon by John Donne” (ix). Divides the introductory material into eight parts: (1) “Textual Scholarship and the Problem of Authorship” ([3]–9), (2) “Bibliographical Description” (9–11), (3) “Immediate Provenance and Textual Production” (11–14), (4) “Donne’s Corrections” (14–19), (5) “Transmission” (19–24), (6) “Comparison with the first printed version in *Fifty Sermons [1649]*” (24–35), (7) “Importance of the Authorial Sermon Manuscript” (35–36), and (8) “Works Cited” (37–40). Reproduces a facsimile of the scribal copy of Donne’s 1622 Gunpowder Plot Sermon (with Donne’s corrections) with transcriptions on facing pages and with all substantive variations of the manuscript and the first edition noted at the bottom of each page (44–185). Appendix A (189–92) lists corrections in Donne’s hand as well as those probably or possibly so. Appendix B ([195]–200) lists transcription details. Discusses how Donne’s holograph corrections “reveal more than we have hitherto known about his process of preparing a sermon for distribution after he had delivered it orally” (14) and how Donne “apparently read and corrected the scribal manuscript, adding letters, changing words, perhaps punctuating, and filling in blanks left by the scribe” (15). Points out that “[m]any of Donne’s characteristic orthographic habits … can be observed in the corrections” (16) and that as corrector Donne “clearly missed several errors and even introduced at least one error into the manuscript” (17). Observes that by comparing the manuscript with the printed version of the sermon it becomes evident that Donne “changed his sermons not only for stylistic or rhetorical reasons, but also for political ones” (36).

Reviews:

• P. J. Klemp in *MQ* 31 (1997): 151–54
• H. R. Woudhuysen in *TLS* 31 Oct. 1997: 34.


By examining a wide range of poems, including *Father, Dissol, Fever, Fure, HSMin, Dream, Leg,* and *HSSHe,* argues that we should not reduce Donne’s achievement as a poet “by limiting our reading to only one way of reading—whether as biography, or as limited to a male coterie, or as directed to a specific person only.” Suggests, in particular, that one way to arrive at a fuller meaning in Donne’s poems is not only “to see the woman in the poem” but also “the woman reader outside the poem,” who may or may not read the poem differently from a man. Maintains, however, that “[t]he female reader in the poem should not blank out the female and male reader outside the poem.” Points out that although recognizing the “biographical underpinnings” of some of Donne’s poems may lead to rereadings of certain poems, “we should not become extreme” (59), demanding that others have similar underpinnings.


Discusses how Donne exploited “[t]he theme of love’s intimacy and the lovers’ wish to shut out the world” in *SunRis, GoodM,* and *Break* “centuries after the first albas were sung.” Discusses how *SunRis* “demonstrates precisely how alba lovers feel their world contracted into a universe of two” and maintains that Donne’s “inversion of the alba—with the lover ultimately inviting rather than rejecting the sun’s light into his chamber—captures the feelings expressed by medieval alba lovers” (143). Points out also how *SunRis* “violates the alba poets’ and our own sense of reality yet utterly fulfills the genre’s potential” (144). Observes how in both *SunRis* and *GoodM* Donne “incorporates all the inherent and inherited conventions of the alba while exploding its potential in an inversion both grand and grandiose.” Maintains that in all of his dawn-poems Donne “employs conventions only to overturn them.” Notes that the speaker in *Break* is a female, which is “rare” in Donne’s lyrics “but not in the alba sources he parodies” and, like the speaker in *SunRis,* the speaker “deflates the sun’s power, claiming that love transcends the law of the physical world” (145) and regards the daylight “as a voyeuristic spy” (146).


Argues that in *ElServe, ElNat,* and *ElChange,* as in Sidney’s *Astrophil and Stella,* “despair is inextricably linked to issues of self-definition and identity, power and control over self and others, and isolation and exile.” Claims that “the representations of despair” by both poets “focus on the construction of the speaker as an identity and the effect despair has on that definition of identity.” Maintains that in the poetry of both poets the presence of despair “signals the realization of a perceived or actual threat to the self-definition of identity” and that “[d]espair operates as a response to an individual’s awareness of his powerlessness and his inability to define adequately his identity within a political discourse containing a demonstrably more powerful identity who possesses a greater degree of control and who is thereby in a position to exercise this power of definition over his identity.” Believes that “[d]espair exists within the poetry as an emblem not merely of the failure of each speaker’s attempt to be the sole defining agent of his identity but also of the speaker’s consciousness of that inherent failure” (493).

97. Slights, Camille Wells. “A Pattern of Love: Representations of Anne Donne,” in *John Donne’s “desire*

Discusses the issue of the absence of explicit reference to Anne More in Donne’s poetry. By means of examining how “representations” of her function in Donne’s letters and in his poems of reciprocal love, argues that she played a “crucial role” in Donne’s “construction of self-identity and in his reconceptualization of the public and private” (68). Suggests that the most striking feature about the letters Donne wrote in the early years of his marriage “is not their expression of tension between public and private areas of activity,” as many critics have stressed, but rather “their distinctive realignments of these overlapping and interlocking concepts” (71). Argues that when Anne Donne is directly represented in her husband’s letters and when she is implicitly included in references to his life of retirement and to his responsibilities as husband and father, she figures as a formative agent in the construction of a model of living that combines individual integrity with responsible engagement” (75). Points out that although we can never determine “whether or to what extent the poems of mutual love correspond to the historical reality of the relationship between Anne More and John Donne during their courtship and marriage, such knowledge is unnecessary for our acceptance of the crucial role Anne Donne plays in them.” Argues that, as “a fictional representation of a loved woman,” Anne is “a powerful and empowering presence” in these poems while “Donne’s male friends are marginalized as fictive and actual spectators and readers” (77). Observes that the poems of mutual love “not only dislocate the social and political structures of male dominance” but also “undermine the Petrarcan fantasy of female dominance” (78) and points out that they are “notable not only in their acknowledgment of threats to personal autonomy” but also “in their claims for unified wholeness through, rather than in spite of, relationships with other people” (81). Suggests that in the poems of mutual love John and Anne Donne provide us with “a pattern of reconciling duty and desire that, although it does not dismantle gender and political hierarchies, exhilaratingly disrupts hierarchical modes of perception.” Acknowledges that Donne never “completely transcended his masculinist culture,” noting that “assumptions of male superiority are reinscribed in the poetry as well as the sermons and likely influenced relations with his wife,” and that representations of her in the letters and poems do not “give us access to the reality of Anne Donne’s life” or suggest that “she (or any other woman) enjoyed full participation in the social world by nourishing her husband’s creativity.” Maintains, however, that “a broader conception of authorship allows us to consider these representations as results of Anne Donne’s active agency as well as her husband’s poetic skill” and that, “[i]n doing so enables us to recognize the exercise of female power in a past society that offered women few options.” Concludes that the letters and poems of mutual love “give voice to ideas of mutuality despite hierarchy and social interaction without submersion in society’s dominant values” (86).


Contains a table of contents (vii-x) and a preface (xi), acknowledgments (xii-xiii), a note on the text (xiv), and an introduction (xv-xlii) by Catherine Phillips. In the introduction, traces the critical reception of Donne during the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Reproduces selections of critical commentary from 1873 to 1923 from such important critics and editors as George Saintsbury, Edmund Gosse, Charles Eliot Norton, Augustus Jessopp, Francis Thompson, Geoffrey Keynes, Herbert J.C. Grierson, William Butler Yeats, Robert Bridges, Ezra Pound, and T. S. Eliot (1–462). In Appendix A (463–66), lists editions of Donne’s poems from 1922 to 1994; in Appendix B (467–73), lists poems by Donne known to have been set to music since 1872; and in Ap-
Appendix C (474), gives a highly selected bibliography. Concludes with an index (475–501), followed by a list of other volumes in the Critical Heritage Series (502–04).


Describes the Donne papers of Wesley Milgate that were given to him in June 1994, which include Milgate’s annotated proof copy of R. C. Bald’s *John Donne: A Life* (1970) as well as other sundry items, including a letter from Frank Kerins in which he points out an error in Bald’s biography, Milgate’s collation of Carey, a typescript essay by Edward Le Comte, and several offprints of articles on Donne as well as an original poem by A. D. Hope, an Australian poet, entitled “The Sun’s Answer to Mr. Donne.” Reproduces a selection of Milgate’s annotations in which he queries Bald’s suggestions or conclusions, occasionally contradicts him, and, in some instances, provides more detail. Observes that Milgate’s “more substantial annotations (including several which refer to the scholarship of I. A. Shapiro) were not incorporated” in the 1986 reprint of Bald’s biography.


Maintains that in writing his sermons Donne “seldom confers with his patristic sources directly” and that he “often quotes [them] inaccurately and out of context” since “his aim is principally to recreate these sources in accord with his immediate rhetorical purpose.” Illustrates this point by examining Donne’s uses of Tertullian, showing thereby how Donne “characteristically fashions the Fathers, and additionally how, in particular ways, he is drawn to and delights in Tertullian’s unique expressions” (153). Points out that Tertullian provided Donne primarily with “abundant stylistic examples” and that most of the 135 references or quotations from Tertullian in the sermons “function in some way to underline Donne’s rhetorical or homiletic method” (154). Discusses how Donne not only remade Tertullian’s language but also how he discovered “inspiration from certain of his ideas though often in elaborately misleading ways” (164). Concludes that Tertullian was for Donne “a rhetorical exemplar, a master of Latin style, and a valuable resource” and suggests that he “collected felicitous lines” from Tertullian, “perhaps gathering ones he liked into a common-place book with other commentators” and that “perhaps he referred to this book, or simply to his memory when he wished to fill out the main body of his sermons” (166).


Believes that when composing his sermons from the time of the ordination in 1615 onwards Donne consulted “a set of commonplace books filled with headings and sententiae extracted from patristic and later authors.” Maintains, therefore, that, “[s]ince Donne seldom confers with his patristic sources directly, he often quotes inaccurately and out of context; for his aim is to recreate these sources in accordance with his immediate rhetorical purpose” (195). Examines, in particular, Donne’s use and appropriation of St. Augustine, noting, however, that Donne also “bends” other Church Fathers, such as Tertullian, “to fit his style” (199).


Maintains that, “[i]n condemning men, Donne’s Sapho [in *Sappho*] condemns the persona in the *Elegies*, who, like the Ovidian *desultor amoris* from which he is derived, is a failure with women” and notes how Donne “performs his trick in the *Elegies* themselves.” Shows how, “[c]areful to distance himself from his reanimation of the *desultor*, the author allows his
young lover to demolish himself with his own words” (2). Observes that both Donne and Ovid “make their personae into men whom women instinctively do not like” (4). Discusses also how “Julia” and “A Tale of a Citizen and his Wife” comment on the “Ovidian unreliability of Donne’s narrator” (9) of the Elegies. Comments on how ElProg, ElBed, and ElWar “form an Ovidian tripartite cluster, a neoclassical triptych,” that illustrates “the fallibility of earthly perception in the pursuit of female flesh” and how Image “eludicates and foretells” this triptych (11), revealing that the speaker’s “perception of women is highly disproportionate” (14).


Maintains that “a number of recent treatments of Donne’s post-ordination writings, especially Devotions (1623), have been looking for the wrong thing in the wrong way and, in a sense, in the wrong places.” Claims that “the critics in question have been looking for oppositionality in bits and pieces of the texts” and thus “have equated the politics of the texts with remarks about government and state power (hence bits and pieces) rather than with the theological and, especially, the ecclesiological dimension of these texts” (93). Discusses Donne’s sermon at Paul’s Cross on 15 September 1622 in defense of King James’s Directions to Preachers as “[a] good example of both the difficulty of maintaining the oppositional view and the importance of apprehending the richness of Donne’s commitment to the established state and church” (94). Finds oppositional readings of Devotions “similar to those of the sermons” and argues that “the political content of the Devotions is to be found primarily in its attitude toward the church,” although “there certainly are remarks on and references to government in the volume” (97). Argues that “[t]he Devotions become more sustainedly and deeply political when their politics are seen not in the politics of the Devotions but in the devotion of the Devotions” (99). Reads Devotions as Arminian polemic and argues that, “when seen in this context, their overall progression and their internal emphases fall into place, and the text as a whole, which has been ignored by historians, takes its place as a significant element or episode in the story of the English Church from the 1590s to the early 1640s” (99–100).


Examines the interplay of HSBatter “with three distinct (though interlinked) Renaissance bodies and codes of discourse: (1) the theory and practice of Renaissance sonnet making—both generally and specifically with respect to two of Donne’s major poetic competitors (Sidney and Shakespeare); (2) the Biblical background; (3) the evolving canon of Donne’s own poetry” (173). Discusses how the language of HSBatter “connects with that of a number of Donne’s other poems—some quite secular/profane indeed” and suggests several “specific interconnections between this poem and poems by Shakespeare and Sidney” (178). Maintains that by alluding to the language of his love poetry in HSBatter, Donne “consciously intends to rehabilitate the language of his former carnality and make it fit for higher purpose,” that is, he “seeks to redeem the language of Petrarchism, in other words, to cleanse it of the ‘caustic’ and the ‘vile’ and to devote it to sacred employment.” Sees also the explicit echoes of Sat3 as Donne’s intention “to rewrite” what he “had formerly cast as a medieval quest-for-truth narrative in the more modern form of the Petrarchan sonnet cycle” (179). Shows how the language and form of HSBatter “seems to link Donne’s sonnet—indeed, his whole revised cycle—with Sidney’s in an unmistakable way” (181) and that, thereby, he consciously was choosing not to imitate Shakespeare’s sonnets.

Comments on Ernst Krenek’s 1941 twelve-tone work for baritone, mezzo-soprano, organ and percussion based on Corona and the authors’ soundtrack in the film La Corona (1987), adopted from Krenek’s work to show how “[t]hrough the circular structures inherent in all three works, the audience is poised on the horizon of the Infinite” (107). Relates all three works to icon painting in which there is “a similar departure from word and concept in an effort to transcend the intellectual and narrative in sacred expression” (108). Maintains that “the icon’s legacy through centuries of sacred expression has been evidenced in the film, music, and poetry” of Corona and that “[t]he spiritual solidity of the icon has rekindled mankind’s need to create works which in their transparency open onto the ungraspable” (111).


Discusses the possible genesis and transmission of the anecdote/pun “John Donne, Anne Donne, Vn-done.” Points out that Archibald “Archie” Armstrong, the jester in the court of Charles I, may be the source of the anecdote, which King Charles embelleshed and which later was revised and included by Walton in his 1675 edition of his Life of Donne. Maintains, however, that likely Donne “actually coined the pun” at the time of his marriage and was referring to his union with Anne More and was playing with the sexual ambiguity of “un-done.” Believes, therefore, that the pun had “a very different context and implication” than later recorders of the pun, such as Manningham, Winstanley, and Walton, gave it (38).


Discusses how printings of Donne’s uncollected verses (i.e., verse that did not appear in collected editions) “leads to a new understanding of the way verse functioned in Renaissance culture” (153) and how “[r]ecollection of these uncollected printings has far-reaching implications involving historical, literary, and culture aspects of Donne’s influence.” Points out that the uncollected verses suggest that Donne’s audience was “more diverse and more European than previously thought” (154) and also “offer substantial inferential evidence for a large and previously unsuspected audience—the functionally illiterate—and demonstrate an unexpected range of roles for verse at all levels of Renaissance society” (154–55). Identifies 59 readers who made use of Donne’s verse in their own works. Comments on the extent and early date of Donne’s continental reception and influence and on his readership among the functionally illiterate. Points out how the compilers of works intended for the illiterate expected their readers “to use the verse as some form of self-help” (168). Maintains that “[t]he uncollected verse printings ultimately suggest that both Donne’s fully literate and functionally illiterate audiences were influenced in the same way by Donne’s verse” and that “[t]he wit in the verse had commercial, social, and personal value for both audiences” (176). Concludes, therefore, that the uncollected verses “establish that Donne had influence because his verse had value and a greater diversity of value for a greater diversity of users in England and in Germany and in Holland than previous analyses of the manuscripts and collected editions would suggest” and that they show that “his influence on language, literature, society, and culture of Renaissance England as well as the Protestant continent was larger than even the very great influence with which he is presently credited” (177).

Presents a very brief introduction to Donne's life and work. Points out that, “[a]lthough Donne's satires are pervasively epigrammatic, he himself wrote few epigrams” and that “all are datable to his early period (1596–1602).” Notes that “[n]one are translations of Martial” but that “they show his influence not only in wit, puns and paradox, but in epigrammatic structure, subject-matter and satirical thrust.” Observes that “one of the last epigrams [Martial] satirizes a recent expurgated edition of Martial himself” (35). Reproduces Hero, Pyr, Niobe, Ship, Wall, Beggar, SelfAc, Licent, Antiq, Disinher, Prhine, Philo, Klock, Martial, and Ralph—with brief notes.


Discusses dramatic elements in Witch and sees the poem as characteristic of Donne's frequent tendency "to intimate his attitude towards his own art." Maintains that the poem, “in small, reveals Donne's aesthetic principles” and shows that his aesthetic was “largely performative.” Analyzes Witch primarily as “a performance of art instead of an argument for or against a particular theme.”


Points out that in Sappho Donne “constructs a detailed argument for the superiority of lesbian love as more 'mutual' and sweeter than heterosexual love.” Maintains that “the speaker's desire is presented unironically, with sympathy” (49). Notes that Jane Austen's poems on Anna Lefroy (“In measured verse I'll now rehearse”) “deftly inverts, in Donne's own idiom and rhythms, his portrait of a woman as a land to be conquered” in ElBed (109).


Presents a general introduction to the metaphysical poets, gives a brief biographical sketch of Donne, and comments on general characteristics of his poetry and sermons, which are seen as essentially autobiographical. Stresses Donne's Anglicanism and staunch Protestantism and focuses primarily on Donne's theology as reflected in his religious writings.


Challenges those critics who construct an historical persona for Anne More from the intellectual and historical realities of the times and/or from Donne's letters and poems. Warns that most biographical readings of Donne's poems are "suspect at best and critical wish-fulfillment at worst" and condemn as even worse “using the poems themselves to construct a biography” of Donne or Anne More. Singles out ValName, however, as an exception since it is “a poem to which Donne signs his name internally, in the text of the verse itself, a poem that therefore requires no multiple-choice matching of jigsaw bits from imagery and biography and speaking persona and auditor.” Maintains that in ValName “no one need theorize an autobiographical speaking persona” since Donne “has identified the personae by name and has thrown open the door—or the window, to be more accurate,” behind which “we find Anne More” (93). Supports this claim by discussing the elaborate numerological conceits, gematria, and puns in the poem. Concludes that although “[t]he play upon her name within the poem allows us to conclude that Donne did use his wife as a persona within his poetry,”
we must not “selectively generalize” the Anne More in ValName “to other female pronouns within the lyrics” (103).


Discusses how the tension between “the dominant discourse of Petrarchan love poetry” and “other emergent possibilities,” such as Ovidianism, “allowed Donne to create poetic texts which embody contradictions in male attitudes to love expressive of the tensions in attitudes to masculinity.” Notes that “[w]hat this reveals is an uncertainty about male gender identity not dissimilar to our own time’s” (53). Maintains that “[i]n so far as Donne’s writing took part in the ongoing construction and reconstruction of male gendered subjectivity during the period, the ‘masculine persuasive force’ in the language of his love poems often displays an anxiety which lets us see some of the different masks of masculinity” (54). Illustrates this concept by discussing in particular Fare, ElBed, BloS, Canon, Anniv, and ConFl. Argues that the collapse of Donne’s “career hopes, triggered as it was by a conflict between his personal life and his public life as a man, helps us contextualize the contradictions over masculinity in his love poetry” and suggests that, his having given all for love, perhaps is the reason why Donne is “so energetic in challenging and undermining the assumptions and conventions of the court love poetry” (60). Sees in the love poems an “attempted translation of sex into discourse, an attempt at constructing an imaginary domain of power, a possible compensation for non-existent or compromised power in the ‘real’ world” (61). Comments on Sappho to show how “[u]nder the veil of female homoeroticism” the poem is “in fact an invitation to male narcissism or homoeroticism” (64). Concludes that Donne’s love poems are “male texts which speak of men, for men, through men and about men” (65), “love poems addressed to the male ego” and “surreptitious or overt reinforcements to the spurious security of male sexual identity” (66).


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s love poetry, stressing that its main concern is “human behavior” and that “its power is the vitality of his own mind trying to seek truth.” Discusses Twick as a cynical poem that reflects “the vicissitudes of love” (40) and presents women as “volatile, never to be trusted” and contrasts it with SSweet, a poem informed by Platonic concepts of love. Suggests that the contrast of these poems “illustrates the range and variety of Donne’s exploration into faithful love” (41). Maintains that Donne’s best poems, however, are those in which there is a unity between the body and the soul, as seen in Ecst, a poem that “marks Donne’s movement toward Truth” (42). Concludes that Donne’s love poetry reflects “a vigorous mind tirelessly searching for truth in the concept of love that best demonstrates the relationship of man to man, man to woman, man to society, and man to an ideal” and that it
is “the spirit of exploration” that best explains Donne's greatness as a poet, as a love poet who “attempts to justify love as it is and as it ought to be” and “to explore the nature of ‘love’s philosophy’ which regards the essence of truth as its ultimate end” (43–44).


In Chinese. Maintains that although tension is common to all poets, the tensions in poems of Donne and of the Tang Dynast poet Li Shangyin have certain similarities. Examines these tensions in the poetry of both poets.
1997


Presents a general evaluation of Donne’s poetry, noting that it ranges from focusing on private, human experience to complex views on the cosmos. Discusses how, using fascinating imagery, Donne contemplates the place of human beings in the universe and in their relation to God. Points out that he is often skeptical and ambivalent, employing both traditional medieval metaphors and concrete premodern images and that stylistically his poetry is characterized by rough meter and compact imagery. Says that Donne’s wit reflects the complexity of his worldview and points out how he was influenced by the scientific revolution of his time. Observes how often Donne describes the dissection of the body, the body serving as a map of the cosmos. Cites also the influence of Ficino, Paracelsus, and Jesuit poetic models on Donne’s poems. Comments on SunRis, noting how the lovers in bed become the whole world, and on FirAn, noting how the death of Elizabeth Drury is seen as the death of the whole world. Observes in Donne a sense of desperation and dichotomy as he balances the poetic strategies of wit with his Christian faith.


In Japanese. Presents an extensive reading of the Anniversaries to show how they reflect Donne’s overwhelming sense of alienation from the world and the chaos of his mind (his inner cosmos) in the wake of his marriage, as well as his deeper “analytical” awareness of and insight into the impenetrable fragility of human existence and the universe. Suggests that the end of the SecAn points to Donne’s will to live an extremely difficult life of paradoxes. Maintains that the Anniversaries reflect Donne’s extraordinarily stark realism as opposed to his speculativeness.


Discusses major characteristics of the Songs and Sonnets and briefly surveys past and present criticism of Donne’s love poetry. Relates the poems to Donne’s life. Cites examples primarily from Ind, Ecst, ValMourn, GoodM, Dream, WomCon, SunRis, Canon, and Flea as examples of Donne’s various negative and positive attitudes toward love. Claims that “the most striking feature of these poems is, no doubt, the way in which the most diverse thoughts, images and allusions are pressed into the service of love poetry” (270). Presents a detailed analysis of Canon as exemplifying “two things essential to Donne’s love poetry”: (1) “that an image usually suggests more than one thing” and is “overlaid with a variety of implications” and (2) that Donne is primarily “interested in his own feelings, not in the feelings of his mistress” (277). Comments also on the diction, wordplay, and complex stanzaic patterns in the love poems.


Presents a general biographical sketch of Donne and comments on the major themes and characteristics of his secular poems, especially their wit and intellectual cleverness and the “staged-voice” and emotional distance of the speaker in them. Says that the Songs and Sonnets are “dramatic, energetic, verbally and intellectually exciting—but they are not love poems” (122). Finds “the self-referentiality” of Donne’s cleverness “distracting” and re-
gards the love poems primarily as “the self-advertising of a frustrated courtier/statesman.” Briefly comments on past and present Donne criticism and finds particularly appealing John Carey's views (1981) of Donne and his poetry. Believes that “Donne seems like a good candidate for critical reassessment” (124). Concludes with a very brief bibliography.

121. Ballestros González, Antonio. “‘The Rest is Silence’: Absent Voices in John Donne’s Songs and Sonnets.” SEDERI 8: 59–64.

Interprets the Songs and Sonnets “from the mute perspective of the unsaid, of the absent voices populating the poet’s rhetorically overloaded lines” (59). Finds the male audience for whom the poems are written to be “the first level of absent voices thinly disguising themselves behind Donne’s lines” and the second to be the unheard women’s voices, “absent in most of his poetry” (60). Points out, however, citing Flea as an example, that the male speaker does not “always win in the usually deaf struggle to seize permanent control” of the mistress (62). Cites other “less semantically rich silenced voices” in the Songs and Sonnets, such as the poet’s addressing Love, who is “not given the possibility of defending himself” (63), or his addressing objects, such as a jet ring, a flower, or the sun. Notes that even in the Holy Sonnets God is “always the absent presence which is thinly manifested throughout the questions, syllogisms, hesitations, and dialogic inferences veiling divine reactions.” Concludes that both the “torrent of words” that pours out from the speaker of the Songs and Sonnets and the absent voices of his addressees “evince the essential loneliness of human beings” (64).


Argues for the canonicity of Token “by means of a deconstructive method once fashionable, but now less so.” Argues also “on behalf of authorial presence—on behalf of the concept of authorship—by means of a method that has served to deny such presence and to question the very notions of canonicity” (258). Presents a deconstructive reading of the poem and gives reasons for believing that only Donne “could fashion a poem at once so self-reflexive and yet intertextual, so Petrarchan (if only parodically so) and yet wittily metaphysical, so argumentative and yet patently unpersuasive—in a word, so (deliberately) untrustworthy.” Claims that Token “declares itself Donne’s own, even as it self-destructs” (266). Maintains that deconstruction “teaches us to recognize the intertextuality and rhetorical play—that is, the double-voiced nature—of much early-modern discourse” and that deconstructive readings “serve to identify and explore the ‘rhetorical moment’ or ‘turn’ in a text, the moment when competing motives of language subtly intersect and undermine one another’s claims” (268).


Traces the etymological development of the word “cliché” and discusses Donne’s line from Devotions (“No Man is an Island”) as an example of how a “literary reference” becomes cliché (34). Recounts the publishing history of Devotions to show that the mystery of its becoming a cliché does not result from its popularity since it was mostly neglected until the 1920s. Points out that Hemingway got the title For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940) from Quiller-Couch’s The Oxford Book of English Prose (1925), significantly after he had finished chapter 35 of the novel, thereby ruling out Donne as inspiration for the novel. Observes that from 1940, however, “the pathway out into many peoples’ minds begins” (39) and that by the 1960s “the uses mushroomed, awaking into peoples’ consciousness, provenance lost.” Notes that “[t]he loss of provenance is a mark of cliché” (40). Attempts to account for why the cliché has become increasingly prevalent in recent years. Concludes that cliché is “a way of neutralising dreads and yearnings within a community,” acting as “a sealant, a kind of polish or patina, over things that won’t bear too analytical scrutiny” and that it functions “to dampen ardour while claiming
community” while often, however, retaining “the capacity to reawaken as insight, perhaps as warning: No man is an island” (47).


 Argues that Elizabethan women “play a central role in the lyric dialogue of courtship: as subjects, as authors, and, above all, as the primary and prototypical lyric audience” and that thus women had “an important impact on the evolution of the lyric genre.” Proposes to explore “connections between a poetics of courtship and an erotics of secrecy,” noting that, “[f]or Elizabethans, poetry was the preferred language of courtship and seduction precisely because both poetry and seduction are, by their very nature, enigmatic and ambiguous” (79). Examines Isabella Whitney’s Copy of a letter, lately written in meeter, by a yong Gentilwoman; to her vnconstant Louer. With an Admonitio to al yong Gentilwomen, and to all other Mayds in general to beware of men’nes flattery (1567), “perhaps the first original poem written and published by an Englishwoman,” which “offers an Elizabethan woman’s adaptation and critique of the poetry of courtship” and her “assessment of clandestine courtships and privy contracts, or corner contracts” (83). Points out that “[m]any Elizabethan poems of courtship were specifically designed to mean one thing to a mistress and something quite different to a male coterie or the wider reading public” and maintains that, for that reason, Leg poses “such an interesting interpretive challenge” (87). Presents a reading of the poem as epitomizing “the enigma of lyric courtship” and shows how the poem can mean “different things to different members of the private lyric audience” and also how it “captures the hermeneutical dilemma that both the male poet/lover and the female/reader/listener face” (90–91).


Based on a letter by Kepler, argues that Donne met Kepler at Linz on 23 October 1619 and that he agreed to serve as an intermediary for presenting a dedication copy of Kepler’s Harmonica Mundi to James I. Speculates that Kepler may have discussed with Donne his unhappiness in Linz as the result of the religious turmoil at the time. Points out that in 1620 Wotton, perhaps knowing of Kepler’s situation from Donne, visited Kepler and tried unsuccessfully to persuade him to leave Linz and relocate in England. Notes that we know Donne read Kepler’s De Stella Nova (1610) from a marginal note in Biathanatos and that he possibly had read Somnium. Surveys the life, religious background, and intellectual development of Kepler and notes that we know he read Ignatius from notes in Somnium, although apparently he did not know Donne had written it. Observes that in his letter mentioning Donne Kepler does not mention Ignatius “or indeed anything Donne wrote” and suggests that Kepler perhaps did not have “any idea of exactly who Donne was” (186).


In the Introduction (1–12), points out that, in examining Donne, this study focuses primarily on Donne’s motives for “pursuing wonder through style” and “what it meant in Renaissance critical culture to be marvelous” (7). Dis-
discusses *Hero* and *Pyr* as examples of “the strong lines lyric poets produced in response to the demand for wonder” and “of how they are designed to operate” (14). In Chapter 1, “Strange and Admirable Methods” (23–66), comments briefly on Donne’s use of paradox in his early love lyrics, noting how he takes “multiple stances on inconstancy” (61). In Chapter 2, “The Most Dangerous Game: Wonder, Melancholy, and Satire” (67–93), discusses *Sat1*, showing how in the poem Donne “hedges, playing both sides of his culture’s ambivalence toward satire and jesting,” and seems to be testing “the waters before committing to the even more dangerous game he plays” in *Sat4*, “where the primary targets are much closer to the center of power, and the self-accusations more damaging” (93). In Chapter 3, “Suspicious Boldness” (94–127), discusses Donne’s intention to “provoke wonder” by means of difficulty and brevity and “to amaze through the darkness of strong lines” (109). Comments on *Sat4* to show how Donne introduces “the strange wonders so popular at court, satisfying the audience’s demand for them even while conveying a sense of his own immunity from the craze” (119) and how he slips “in and out of the satirist’s role, shadow-boxing with its most dangerous associations, jumping back and forth over the line” (125), pushing “the game as far as it can go” (126). In Chapter 4, “Powerful Insinuation: Obscurity as Catalyst and Veil” (128–54), discusses how Renaissance poets used obscurity to evoke wonder and comments on how Donne was influenced by St. Augustine’s view on metaphor “as cause of continued wonder at the doctrine it conceals and reveals, and of scripture as wonderful in both its simplicity and its profundity,” as seen in *Devotions*, in the fourth Prebend sermon, and in *Essays*, where Donne “treats metaphor and obscurity as methods of inquisition most fully” (141), as well as in his secular and religious verse. In Chapter 5, “Passing Wonder or Wonder Passing?” (155–200), points out that although “[t]he incentives driving poets of the late sixteenth and seventeenth century to produce wonder through style were varied, powerful, and interrelated, often in subterranean ways,” by the 1650s lyric wonder was “out of fashion” and was “nearly dead in poetic practice” (155), although “the reputations of assorted quick wits, Donne above all, kept the movement alive despite the disappearance of the conditions that gave rise to it” (156). Observes that “[f]ar-fetched metaphors had the longest vogue, in part because they were so adaptable to devotional verse re-presenting the Christian mysteries, and in part because no courtly culture seems able to operate without hyperbole,” whereas “[r]oughness disappeared more quickly, falling to the combined force of the increasing cosmopolitan tone at court…, the pacifism of James, and the banning of satire.” Notes that “[e]quivocation and quick wit became increasingly suspect early in the Stuart era” (200). Comments on Donne’s sermon on the anniversary of the Gunpowder plot (1622) in which he “magnifies the institution of the monarchy without limit even while alluding cautiously but repeatedly to the causes of widespread discontent with the court” and with James (166). Bibliography (200–20) and index (221–26).


Calls Donne “one of the most poignant seventeenth-century writers on conscience” (48) and argues that his views on “the relationship between political authority and individual conscience went through distinct periods of change.” To show this development, examines three of Donne’s “key casuistical works, each written at pivotal points in his life” — *Sat3*, *Pseudo-Martyr*, and his sermon on the Book of Esther 4:16, which contains his “most poignant ideas on conscience” (49). Discusses how these three works, “each stepping stones in Donne’s intellectual development as a moral theologian and philosopher, make up a cohesive trilogy on the uneasy boundary between religion and politics, individual faith and political and religious authority.” Maintains that these works “share two common themes—that the individual search for true religion may be
outside the realm of human authority, and that the conscience is itself an important source of moral and spiritual authority” (58).


Presents stylistic analyses of *Flea* and *Relic*. Comments on the complexity of the extended metaphors and metrical structure of *Flea*. Using the linguistic theories of Roman Jakobson, shows how Donne’s speaker in *Flea* “effects a number of radical shifts from the logic of metonymy to the more adventurous illogic of metaphor” (38) and how in the poem there are “linguistic elements that relate to all the contextual influences of ordinary language” (42). Discusses the stanzaic complexity of *Relic* and shows what “various techniques and strategies of modern stylistics” (101) can tell us about the poem. Contrasts *Relic* with Herbert’s “Prayer (I).”


Surveys the intellectual, social, religious, educational, and literary contexts of English literature from 1580 to 1625. Comments briefly on Donne’s life, his education, marriage, poetry, patrons, and uses of Neoplatonism. Discusses, in particular, Donne’s religious situation and the enduring influence of Catholicism on his works. Maintains that “his Catholic upbringing enabled Donne, more than any other poet of his time, to draw back into the mainstream of English religious verse the kinds of images and analogy that had largely been in abeyance in the sixteenth century” (88). Contrasts Donne and Herbert as preachers and suggests the differences between their sermons result from their very different congregations, Donne addressing “a smart London congregation” who expected “something witty” and Herbert addressing an unsophisticated congregation in “a remote parish near Salisbury” (90). Maintains that Donne “recognized, perhaps more clearly than any other man of his age, that while choice of religion was the single most vital question in life, every organization from the family unit to the state itself competed to pre-empt that choice and pressurize the individual into a reassuring conformity with its own position” (91).


Presents a brief biographical note on Donne, Herbert, Marvell, Vaughan, and the editor ([vii]–viii), a chronology of the poets’ lives and a chronology of their times on opposite pages ([x]–xix), and a general introduction to metaphysical poetry and to the four poets ([xx]–xxiv). Suggests that all of the metaphysical poets “inhabited a world of darkness” and that “[f]or Donne it was the tortured darkness of the hell and damnation he fights off in his Holy Sonnets, the gloom of the sick-room, the shadowy fragmentation of an imperfect world fallen (with him) from grace, the enclosed beds in which he postures with whichever woman he imagines himself to be accompanied by at the time” ([xx]). Reproduces 16 selections from the *Songs and Sonets*, lines from *FirAn*, 8 of the *Holy Sonnets, Christ*, and *Sickness* (3–26), with notes and glosses on the poems ([91]–94).


Discusses Donne’s participation in the Cadiz and Azores expeditions and argues that ships and sea travel “pervade Donne’s mind” and “populate his epigrams, verse-letters, satires, secular and sacred lyrics, and the sermons, as do their deadly and eschatological counterparts, shipwrecks, drownings, the Flood and the Ark.” Maintains that “the ships and sea journeys, real and figural, described in Donne’s poems,” reveal a Donne who is a survivor of disasters and who “favors the private social world he shares
with lovers or friends over the Great World of public esteem” (137). Discusses how “[t]he sheltered, shared, better world exalted in Donne’s verses is said to resemble a fragile ship”; how “the public realm Donne fears, downgrades or repudiates is sometimes itself a ship, and sometimes an imperiling sea” (137–38); and how “[h]is smaller shared realm, of Ark, shore and home, becomes in the religious poetry not the human spaces of friendship or love, as fragile and timebound as the ships which represent them, but Heaven, God the Father and Christ, who appear in the late works as the hope of the shipwrecked, and as a protected and peaceful shore” (138). Surveys Donne’s use of his naval experiences and knowledge in the epigrams, verse letters (especially Storm and Calm), the Satyres, Biathanatos, Met, the Elegies, several of the Songs and Sonets, the sermons, Christ, and Father.


Points out that Calm and Storm are the only poems in which Donne deals extensively with a real experience of a sea voyage and that both poems are often highly praised as accomplished examples of descriptive poetry. Observes, however, that the realistic elements in both poems do not prevent the reader from catching the emblematic value that Donne attributes to the events in the poems. Suggests possible sources for such ship images in contemporary emblem books. Notes, for example, that in certain emblem books a stately ship tossed about in the ocean is presented as symbolic of human instability and Fortune’s mutability. Suggests that in Calm there emerges a contrast between the apparent immutability of natural elements and the human condition, which is always subject to corruption. Points out that Storm ends with the hope that God can restore order out of chaos but that in Calm this hope seems to have failed, the calm representing the impossibility of movement and action and a general feeling of human inadequacy.


In a discussion of iambic pentameter, comments on what has been termed Donne’s “rising accents.” Points out, as an example, “All wealth alchimie” in l. 24 of SunRis, noting that “[i]f we read these words responding to the metrical context with ‘all’ and ‘al’- on the beats, then ‘wealth’ will be stressed but not accented, since it is off the metrical beat, and ‘alchemy’ will be accent ed because it is on the beat and because it follows a stressed syllable” (406–07). Observes “[t]hat a syllable on the beat and following a stressed syllable will be accent ed and so emphasized is an important tool for iambic poets in general for controlling emphasis” (407). Cites also l. 1 of HSBatter, noting that “this particular line will work if ‘three’ is stressed but not accented—that is, uttered as a full vowel but not obtruded with a sudden change in pitch or loudness” (408).


In “Introduction: The Subject of Donne” (11–22), explains how his approach to Donne has been shaped, in part, by “new historicism.” Argues that “Donne’s textual practice in some of his poetry rehearses important aspects of the problematic relationship between literature and history” and that “[t]his textual practice, continued and developed by his readers and
installed in the academic field of Renaissance literary studies, contributed to and continues to contribute to the creation of a literary ideology that has become an important way of thinking about the relationship between subjects and history” (14). Notes that the aim of this study is “to explore the interrelationships of representation, identification, and desire in Donne’s poetry and the criticism of that poetry” and “to suggest a shift in emphasis, invited by Donne’s texts, from representation, to identification, to desire.” Points out that this study, unlike those of most new historicists, who focus primarily on power, is “multifarious in two closely related aspects”: (1) it extends “the notion of the subject of Donne to include the speaking subject of Donne’s texts, the reading subject, and the academic ‘subject’ known as Donne’s poetry” and maintains that “the study of Donne’s poetry is, in actuality, a study of speaking and reading subjects dedicated to producing a form of literary subjectivity”; and (2) it regards “the constitution of this subject (speaking, reading, academic) as a process of being called to various subject-positions” that also, however, reckons with “desire, which can produce contradiction and resistance… as well as containment and domination.” Argues that “this interplay between desire and ideology… constitutes a powerful form of literary subjec-
tivity” and thus treats Donne “as the site of an ideological struggle to represent a Renaissance literary subjectivity that continues to influence the practice of teachers and scholars of Renaissance literature.” Notes that new historicists’ readings of Donne “tend to limit historical meaning to a reconstruction of the past,” whereas this study attempts “to include as part of the historical meaning of Donne the act of reading him in an English literature class” (17). In Chapter 1, “Donne’s New Historicism and the Practice of Satire” (23–54), “focuses on the subject of power, particularly as it has been analyzed by new historicists’ work on representation in Renaissance drama.” Examines verse satire “in a new historicist context” but then “inverts text and context to read new historicist texts in the context of Donne’s subject of satire,” thereby arguing that Donne’s “satirical rendition of late Elizabethan ideology, on the one hand, and the new historicist representations of the same period, on the other hand, are early and late stages of a long historical process of working on the relationship between the literary text and ideology.” Maintains that Donne “is obsessed with the problem of investing moral authority in a subject who speaks for a moral minority” and that his satires “display the instability of the marginal subject of satire,” thus making Donne’s satirical production of ideology repeatedly slide into “a satirical production of the subject of satire” that “contributes to the creation of a new literary subject of history.” In Chapter 2, “Donne’s ‘Disparitie’: Inversion, Ideology, and the Subject of Love” (55–86), challenges the “ politicization” of Donne’s love poetry by new historicists and of their “conflation of desire and power” and aims at complicating their approach “by treating the poems as struggles of a desiring subject of love to hold a position of male hegemony,” noting, however, that the poems “remain sites of gender struggle.” In Chapter 3, “Mutual Love and Literary Ideology” (87–106), discusses Donne’s poems of mutual love “in competing contexts of coterie poetics and Protestant marriage theory” (19), showing how Donne’s particular concept of mutual love “shares some discursive origins with Protestant teaching on companionate marriage” but that it “finally offers a different resolution of contradictions from that provided by the Protestant ideology of marriage” (19–20). Argues that in Donne’s love poems “the defense of mutual love is constructed as a defense of poetry” and shows “how these poems participate in a larger cultural production of privacy” and emphasizes that Donne “constructs the private life as a literary domain based on elitist and masculinist assumptions” and that “this construction has a continuing effect on the way literariness is conceptualized as an autonomous zone of privileged textuality.” In Chapter 4, “The Obscure Object of Desire: Elizabeth Drury and the Cultural Production of the Idea of a Woman” (107–33), through a reading of the Anniversaries and an examination of the critical commentary the poems have generated, “attempts to balance a new his-
toricist thematics of power and representation with a psychoanalytic focus on love and identification against a feminist critique of these perspectives based on the place of the daughter in Renaissance patriarchy. Maintains that this chapter extends the discussion of Donne’s “contribution to the invention of literature by developing a gendered account of the link between literary/critical production and the production of the ‘Idea of a Woman’” in the Anniversaries and also “points to the need for further study of the construction of daughters as cultural ideals in other works involving transactions between artists and patrons.” In Chapter 5, “The Subject of Devotion” (134–66), examines the Holy Sonnets “in the light of competing accounts of subjectivity offered by new historicist and psychoanalytic critics.” Arguing primarily from an historicist perspective that “the powerful sense of subjectivity in these poems is the effect of ideological conflict not the cause,” suggests that “the subjectivity-effect so produced harmonizes in many respects with a psychoanalytic account of the structure of subjectivity.” Suggests, thereby, that “a close connection between literariness and psychoanalysis” (20), “pressing this argument at length in the last third of the chapter, where Zizek’s Lacanian understanding of the ideological fantasy and recent psychoanalytic work on masochism and male subjectivity are read in the light” of HSBatter (20–21). Concludes with notes (167–205), a bibliography (207–19), and an index (221–27).

Reviews:

- Susan Zimmerman in RenQ 52 (1999): 1181–82.


Maintains that, like most English Reformation preachers, Donne “self-consciously staged his performance in the pulpit” (39), noting in particular the theatrical dimension of “Death’s Duell.” Points out that the “special role” the preacher was expected to play was that of “God’s anointed prophet,” noting that “[p]reaching was called ars praedicandi—invariably translated in English homiletic manuals ‘the art of prophesying’” (42). Observes that the preacher/prophet was expected to work “a kind of sacred magic, transforming the very souls of the listeners,” and that, therefore, he, “like the magus and like the actor, donned special vestments, heightened his diction, and used dramatic gestures for every performance” (43). Points out that the preacher, like an actor, was advised “to conceal the human element” and “to disguise his ordinary role as a biblical scholar in order to play a prophet” (44). Notes how this “deliberate concealment amounted to an artful dramatic deception” (45). Discusses the emphasis of Protestants on the aural since they regarded “the power of sight especially vulnerable to idolatry” (47). Concludes, therefore, that Reformation pulpit performances “were clearly a form of theater” (46) and sees Donne’s death as dramatically marking “the end of the theatrical sermon’s golden age” (52).


Compares and contrasts the lives and sermons of Donne and the Portuguese-Brazilian Jesuit António Vieira (1608–1697), both of whom served the interests of the state by their sermons. Discusses how in their pulpit oratory both preachers “reacted against the stylistic fads of their day” (46) and how “their range of expression often exceeds that of their contemporaries” (47). Finds similarities also in their use of “the rhythms of speech” (48) in their sermons, employment of the “Ciceronian
style” (49), and “the use of figures of speech, analogies, allegories, and allusions ranging from classical to current learning” (50). Concludes that both Donne and Vieira “represent the height of Renaissance learning in contact with New Learning and the New World,” but sees Vieira as “the greater writer” (51).


In Chapter 1, “‘Thou Didst Lately So Triumph and Shine’: The Jacobean Church” (13–24), discusses the effect that the pre-Laudian church had on the great religious writers of the Jacobean era, especially Donne and Herbert. Maintains that a “significant unifying factor, one that gave energy to the Jacobean church, was its sense of being Reformed and Protestant” (15) and comments on its Calvinistic leanings. Examines the important role that James I played in English religious politics, describing him as a “predestinarian Calvinist in his theology” who opposed “the extremes of puritanism or papistry” (19), and says that one consequence of his policy, which was “quite significant for both Herbert and Donne, was the absorption of fully conforming puritans into the mainstream of the English church, and a considerable tolerance for those with puritan scruples, provided they avoided extreme positions and actions” (20). Argues that English church people of the period followed a via media, but “a clearly Protestant one, marked off on the right by the Roman church and on the left not by Calvinism or puritanism, but by those who separated” or those “considered heterodox in theology” (21). Maintains that Donne “participated in the Calvinistic mainstream” of his time (23) and that some of the “most interesting and appealing passages in the Sermons can be shown to grow out of this milieu” (24). In Chapter 2, “‘Thy Book Alone’: Conforming to the Word” (25–35), discusses the biblical and evangelical character of English Calvinism and “its rooting in Scriptures” and defines conformists as those, unlike the extreme puritans, who “accepted the disputed forms and rites without any hesitation” as well as “the dominant theology of the Church of England” (25) but who, at the same time, “sought inner conformity to the Word more than a compulsory external compliance with humanly instituted church ritual” (35). In Chapter 3, “‘Take the Gentle Path’: Moderate Conformity” (36–47), argues that “the Calvinist majority of church hierarchy pursued conformity, but did so in moderation, and by means of moderation” and “intentionally sought to avoid extremes” (36). Points out that, for most conformists, except for the small circle of Laudians, “liturgical practices remained secondary” (37) and that the piety of most conformists was “word-centered” (39). Comments on the “increasingly aggressive” kind of conformity of the Laudians that led to the Civil War, exploring briefly their basic position and calling them “reactionaries” (40). In Chapter 4, “‘Prayers and Preaching’: St. Martin-in-the-Fields” (48–59) and Chapter 5, “‘Not … Putting a Holiness in the Things’: Other Churches and Chapels Herbert Knew” (60–70), examines churches and chapels in which Herbert worshipped to show that in the pre-Laudian church conforming puritans and
reform-minded conformists got along well with each other and “did not worry about doctrinal disputes (because everyone was in agreement about basic doctrine), nor about differences in non-scriptural patterns of worship.” Maintains that “[g]ood preaching by educated and dedicated preachers, along with a generally accepted prayer book ritual, made for an excellent middle way between two extremes” (59). In Chapter 6, “‘Golden…, Beautiful… Glorious’: Doctrine in the Church of Herbert and Donne” (71–83), examines the nature and importance of doctrine in the pre-Laudian English church, noting, in particular, that predestination was an accepted, though not central, teaching of the established church and that in Donne’s time it had “a largely unifying effect in the church” (80). In Chapter 7, “‘The Rules’ versus ‘Fair Entreaty, Gentle Persuasion’: Hooker and Andrewes, Donne and Herbert” (84–100), contrasts Lancelot Andrewes and Richard Hooker with Donne and Herbert to show differences between Jacobean Laudians and mainstream Calvinists (84), emphasizing how the latter were more moderate in their ideas about conformity than Hooker and Andrewes. In Chapter 8, “‘Evangelical Counsels’: Herbert and Donne” (101–12), examines some common features in the sermons of Herbert and Donne and maintains that, even though Donne was a city preacher, whereas Herbert was a country parson, Donne’s “style of moderate conformity seems closer to Herbert’s—much closer than to either Hooker’s or that of Andrewes” (101). Maintains also that although neither Donne nor Herbert were puritans, they “had much in common ground with them” (106) and that they were “very different from the Laudians,” “steering clear of Laudian asperity and rigor regarding matters of external form or ceremony” (112). In Chapter 9, “‘Honest and Religious Men, … Sometimes Traduced’: Conforming Puritanism and Herbert” (113–21) and in Chapter 10, “Picturing ‘Spirituall Conflicts’: Herbert, Sibbes, and the Christian Life” (122–34), discusses the moderate puritan writer Richard Sibbes to show that there is “a significant relationship between Herbert’s writings and those of some of the conforming puritans” (116). Comments on Sibbes’s emphasis on “the inner life and its consequences (something the Laudians had little time to address, but [which was] of real interest to both puritans and more moderate conformists like Donne)” (121). In Chapter 11, “Conforming, Not to the Letter, But to the Word” (135–39), summarizes the thesis of this study. Concludes with notes (140–65), a bibliography (166–73), and an index (174–81).

Reviews:

• James S. Bauml in *RenQ* 52 (1999): 574–76.
• Christopher Haigh in *EHR* 114 (1999): 185–86.
• Tom Webster in *History* 84 (1999): 156–57.
• Annabelle S. Wenzke in *Church History* 68 (1999): 185–86.


Contains a biographical note on Donne and on the editor ([vii]), a chronology of Donne’s life and times ([viii]–xvii), a general introduction to Donne’s poetry ([xviii]–xxii), and a note on the text (xxiii). Based on a modernized version of Grierson’s text, presents 35 poems from the *Songs and Sonnets*, 5 elegies, 2 epithalamia, *Sat3*, 3 verse epistles, *MHMary*, 15 of the *Holy
Sonnets, Annun, Goodf, Tilman, Christ, Sickness, and Father ([3]–[85]), followed by glosses on lines ([86]–[104]). In the introduction, calls Donne “our great poet of love, and of death” and points out that “[h]owever widely the subjects differ, notably as between the love poems and the divine verse, the profane and the sacred, the poet’s voice and his strategy are unmistakably the same” ([xviii]).


Contains a list of illustrations ([vii]–[viii]) and an introduction to Donne’s life, times, and prose works, excluding Pseudo-Martyr and Ignatius (ix–xxi). Reproduces (with modern spelling and punctuation and silent ellipses) extracts from Paradoxes (3–14), Biathanatos (17–31), the prose letters (35–57) with brief biographical notes on the recipients of the letters ([33]–[34]), the Devotions ([61]–[82], Essays ([85]–[87]), and the sermons ([91]–[198]), each of which is preceded by a short introduction.


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and works, especially commenting on the Paradoxes and Devotions ([7]–[15]), followed by Spanish translations of the Paradoxes (paradoxes only) ([21]–[40]) and the Devotions (meditations only) ([45]–[107])—without notes or additional commentary. Concludes with a bibliographical note, commenting, in particular, on previous Spanish translations of Donne (109–10).


Comments on Virginia Woolf’s views on Donne, noting that she liked him “because he belonged to her band of outsiders” (71). Observes that “[t]he excitement which she finds in Donne’s writings comes from her recognition that he was not only in rebellion against his elders, but disjoined from his own contemporaries” (73). Points out that Woolf thought that Donne wrote from a position that was not unlike that of women and notes that she claimed that “no woman can read Donne without falling in love with him” (77). Believes that Woolf “tuned in to a John Donne who seemed to live in a woman’s world rather than a man’s, and who recognised this fact for himself and came to relish it as a source of creativity even as he records his reluctance to accept it” (77). Maintains that Woolf saw in Donne a kindred soul, who, like her, “knew what it was like to watch others at the centre of an intellectual and social world from which he was excluded, not by his sex, but by a deliberate revolt against the mores of his time.” Concludes that “[t]he irony, elusiveness and needling, rebellious energy of her words” make Donne Woolf’s “natural ally and accomplice” (93).


Briefly comments on Donne’s view of language as it is illustrated in “Expostulation 19” of the Devotions. Points out that Donne believes that figurative language has “the power to change the world in which we find ourselves, to transport us, at least in imagination into a world transfigured” (7). Suggests that Donne can speak of “the emparadising power of language not only because he is considering what he takes to be the word of God but also because heSee the whole of reality to be figurative.” Points out how Donne by relating certain “theological concepts quite explicitly to writing” develops his concept of a “Christian poetics” (8).

Discusses Donne’s references to sea voyages and use of sea images and metaphors. Observes that although Donne “relishes the authority of the traditional and time-honoured tropes of the sea,” he also creates voyage images that are “quite unexpected and newly thought-out, using specific knowledge personally acquired—by reading if not by experience” (71). Notes that “a great many of the voyages which Donne brings into service, in his poetry as well as in his sermons, are trading voyages.” Stresses, however, that “[s]eafaring matters in Donne’s writings vary greatly in what they can be used for and applied to as metaphors” and that they are “also equivocal and contradictory in the value they impart to what they are charged to clarify and illuminate” (75). Examines Donne’s methods and motives in using sea metaphors in several poems, letters, and sermons, especially in Devotions, Storm, Calm, Christ, Sickness, and Father. Concludes that “[t]he great value of the voyage images in Donne is that in their volatility, and their free accommodation of contrasting significations, they become the means by which the play of possibilities in answering every question of importance is opened out” (98).


Discusses the nature of Donne’s “intelligently incisive” (90) conceits, differentiates them from those of earlier Renaissance poets, and claims that they reach “their full maturity” in the Holy Sonnets. Maintains that the Holy Sonnets are “especially remarkable in terms of adopting and adapting conceits, because the sonnet form controls the conceits and the conceits challenge the traditional form of the sonnet.” Claims that, “[a]s a result, the conceit becomes increasingly integrated into the text, texture, and structure of the sonnet” and “fulfills its function by increasingly filling the poem with tension” (91). Comments on each of the Holy Sonnets and maintains that “[b]aroque conceits, paradoxes, compositional counterpoints, and semantic and musical polyphony so determine the constellation of values crystallized in the formal constitution of the Holy Sonnets … that any analysis that disregards them in a prosaic prose paraphrasing verges on an involuntary parody.” Believes that “[t]he parallel between Donne’s and Eliot’s conceits bears witness to the modern validity of Donne’s metaphysical wit” (97).

146. Ferry, Leonard D. G. “‘Till busy hands/Blot out the text’: ‘Realme’ in Satyre III.” JDJ 16: 221–27.

Proposes a solution to the controversial ll. 33–35 of Sat3 by reading “Realme” (l. 35) as the earth rather than as hell. Suggests that the lines mean something like this: “Acting out of hate, not love, the Devil would willingly allow you to be free from the earth.” Maintains that the Devil “would willingly allow this to occur, for hate” because he “stands to lose nothing in seeing the sinful … depart this world unrepentant and so depart this world for hell” (224). Sees the phrase “to be quit” (l. 35) as meaning to die. Concludes that “the perverse erotic relation suggested by the lines concerning the devil and his supplicant” in Sat3, “where love is requited by hate, looks forward to the confused relations of Mirreus and company and the false churches they pursue” (226).


Explains that in the FirAn Donne does not mention Elizabeth Drury by name within the poem because her name is “so great that the speaker is unable to do so.” Maintains that thus Donne appropriates in the poem “the biblical understanding of word and name” in order to suggest “in human language what humans are incapable of knowing except through faith” (32). Sees the Anniversaries as Donne’s “most daring appropriation of biblical language and rhetorical operations in an attempt to write poetry that … actually makes something happen” (33) and sees Donne as taking on the role of a “prophet-like speaker who is the mediator
of the Divine Word” (33–34). Maintains that Donne “appropriates the biblical concept of the word as event in hopes of making something happen” and concludes that “the best that he can do to create a poem which makes something happen is adopt the voice and stance of the prophet who testifies to the Divine Word, and to appropriate biblical language about the unnameable” (35).


An Italian translation of Canon with English and Italian texts on opposite pages. No notes or commentary.


In the introduction (7–34), presents a general introduction to the political, philosophical and religious situation in England during the early seventeenth century and briefly surveys the drama and poetry of the period. In Chapter 1, “John Donne” (35–65), presents a general biographical sketch of Donne and an introduction to his secular and religious poetry. Offers detailed readings of GoodM, SunRis, Dream, ValMourn, HSbatter, and HSDeath, commenting on the theme, form, tone, imagery, and dramatic elements in each. In an appendix (93–97), reproduces (in English) the poems discussed.


Notes Donne's uses of hair and hair jewelry in SGo, LovUsury, Canon, Fun, Relic, and ILRoll. Points out that the basis for regarding hair as both a symbol of love and death lies “in the ambiguous nature of hair” and also “in its unusual durability.” Notes that Donne in his love poems “brings out another property of hair

and hair-tokens, one of the most striking of all, and one which is essential to the mystique of all hair-jewelry”—namely that “when hair is allowed to stay on the head, it eventually turns gray,” but “when it is cut off and given away, on the other hand, it remains young and golden, even while the giver grows hoary and eventually dies.” Observes that the “ability of severed hair to stay young (‘bright’) is its most striking feature” in Fun and Relic and that “the lesson seems to be this: if you keep it to yourself, it will fade, and will die with you; if you give it away, it will outlive you, and serve as a memento of your beauty” (225). Believes that Donne's use of hair bracelets “takes on a resonance which transcends most of Donne's famous idiosyncratic conceits, for the bracelet implies continuity, and real security, at both a private and public level” (229).


Argues that Donne, as a dramatic preacher, subsumed “his ego to the truth he articulates and dramatizes” and is not, therefore, “an ego-involved self-dramatist” nor “an ego-subsumed dramatizer of truth.” Examines “some links between Donne's sermons and the drama of the period, in order to place Donne's rhetoric, delivery, and roles within the tradition of which he is a part” and, in doing so, draws attention to “some important distinctions between the sermon and the drama” (2). Maintains that although Donne's sermons cannot be “categorized simply as drama since they lack the element of purposeful creation of an illusion, they can be read profitably with attention to their general relation to drama as well as to their general dramatic elements.” Points out that the sermon, viewed as “part of the ritual of the worship of the English Reformation, can be seen as a component of sacred drama especially when we consider that in spirit it replaces earlier cancelled ceremonies.” Maintains, therefore, that Donne's sermons can be seen as “examples of a particular form of dramatic rhetoric, distinct but related to the theatre of the same period”
(11). Observes that “the matter of sincerity and intention to effect transformation will always divide the sermon from the drama” and that “the preacher as he performs himself, will play out the struggle and the victory of Christ’s life, and by his life, will, like John Donne, be the ultimate validation of the text” (11–12).


Essentially a review of Barbara L. Estrin’s Laura: Uncovering Gender and Genre in Wyatt, Donne, and Marvell (Duke, 1994). Says that the book, a work of theory, “starkly illustrates how much theory has become unreflecting reverie” (185). Maintains that the chapter on Donne is “the best in Estrin’s book” (190) but challenges many of her critical assumptions and readings of individual poems.


In discussing various aspects of the sonnet, points out that in ll. 21–30 of Fare Donne expresses the generally accepted Renaissance notion that each time a man ejaculates he shortens his life by one day. Notes that the Latin expression “omne animal post coitum triste,” which is “attributed alternately to Aristotle and Galen, refers to post-coital sadness, and was said to blight all creatures, except, in one account, turtles, and in another, cocks, and lions.” Notes also the rediscovery in the early Renaissance of the medical work of Aulus Celsus, known as “Cicero medicorum,” in which he says: “The ejaculation of semen is the casting away of part of the soul” (142). Also notes that in ll. 71–72 of Ect (“Loves mysteries in soules doe grow,/ But yet the body is his booke”), Donne’s metaphor “turns the body into the Bible.” Observes that Donne was “following what had become established literary practice” when he wrote these lines, “as though the mysteries of the soul could best (perhaps only) be explicated by consulting the text of the body” and that “a strict respect for the spirit demanded that it be ‘incarnated’ in the act of sexual union, thus ‘piously’ mimicking the Incarnation of the Spiritual Godhead in the body of the person of Christ and through the agency of the Virgin’s womb” (145). Observes that Donne was able “to bring the spiritual and the carnal into so close (and, for some, uncomfortable) a balance” that he could end HSBatter, “a sonnet of self-inquisition and acknowledged sinfulness with a prayer amounting to something like a desire for sexual violation (with a pun embodied in the word ‘ravish’)” (146).


Rejects “an age-old tradition of criticism that refuses to acknowledge Donne’s commitment to some of the most hazardous and far-reaching aspects of the Copernican world-view” and that removes “the most strident heterodox, and daring aspects of Donne’s world-view by reducing them to mere figurative waste or rhetorical extravagance” (65). Argues, therefore, that Donne’s use of Copernican and Neoplatonic imagery is “not just a persuasive or ornamental device—a performative trope or masquerader”—but rather that it is “loaded with precise cognitive or constative force” (68). Suggests Giordano Bruno’s influence on Donne, such as “the feeling of permanent dislocation of place that we find in Donne’s verse and also in his Sermons and Devotions” and “the feeling of existential urge (in the forms of erotic compulsion or eschatological anxiety) that dominates his verse.” Claims that “Donne’s world looks very much like Bruno’s; both are unbounded, placeless, unrestrained, ontologically productive and fearfully erotic” (71). Points out that in FirAn “[c]haos, destruction, endless production and eternal transformation are the Brunian notions that support the imaginative construction of this amazing poem.” Concludes that we should realize that “certain metaphors, certain amplifications and certain hyperboles, are the real meaning of poems, and that the rest is just an organized es-
cape from this central and unbearable chaos” (72).


Argues that during the seventeenth century in both Catholic and Protestant countries the relationship between science and religion was more a “creative tension” than a “warfare” and “was characterized either by indifferent co-existence or by mutually beneficial interaction.” Notes that “[s]cientific endeavor and religious apology—and this was particularly true in England—were closely interwoven and often found expression in the work of the same person” (2). Comments briefly on Donne’s skepticism and ambivalence about the “new science.” Says that Donne’s view is that “even if the new philosophy provides us with a closer approximation to truth in the physical sciences, this remains incidental like all other merely human learning—unless it guides us in the direction of spiritual salvation.” Maintains that despite Donne’s “genuine interest in and respect for the new science, his theological rhetoric was still founded upon the time-worn geocentric cosmology and Aristotelian physics of four elements” (3).

156. Hu, Jialuan. [Compass that “makes mee end, where I begunne.”] *Foreign Literatures Quarterly* 3: 31–39.


In Chinese. In a discussion of compass images in Renaissance poetry, comments on the last three stanzas of *ValMourn*. Maintains that in Donne’s poem the compass image functions as an image of the perfect soul and of eternal life. Claims that Donne was probably the first poet in English to use the compass image but points out that other poets also used it. Traces the image back to Plato and the Bible and points out that it is often incorporated with garden images and cosmological dances, and is linked to the idea of resurrection. Says that often it is also a symbol of man’s spiritual journey from birth to re-birth to eternal life.


Discusses *Noct* in the light of Donne’s lifelong fascination with festival and in the context of late Renaissance visual culture. Points out that Donne “seems to have seen festivals as those visible and participatory moments in everyday communal life that provided a specific kind of insight” (209). Shows how the personal and the ritualistic “are linked in festival and thus provide the force of the poem” (211) and how the *vigilae nocturnae* of the office of St. Lucy’s Day both structurally and thematically shape the poem. Maintains that the feast of St Lucy, “blind patroness of sight and insight,” is “the perfect shaping festival for a poem that demonstrates the resiliency of life by stressing a speaker’s blindness to that resiliency” (216). Calls *Noct* “one of Donne’s greatest achievements in giving poetic shape to personal feeling set within the communal eloquence of culture” (217).


Explores Donne’s decision in *Sappho* “to restore Sappho’s lesbian identity—which Ovid had replaced with her longing for Phaon—and Donne’s desire to represent his own voice in a synchronic conversation with the original authors in terms that ensured his recognition and his authority.” Examines also “the extent to
which early women writers were constrained by a masculine literary tradition of voicing abandoned women that appears to invest male writers with the power to speak ‘for’ and ‘as’ women” (94). Suggests one reason for Donne’s interest in a lesbian Sappho in a poem on poetic failure is that she embodied the prevalent notion or trope that “poetry is the offspring produced from the sexual union of the male poet with his ‘indifferent’ muse,” a muse able “to inspire poetry but not give it birth” since that privilege was reserved only for the male poet (95). Believes that “[t]his configuration of lesbianism by Donne and by his fellows in their formal correspondence suggests why the lesbian was appropriate to their discourses on poetic creation” and explains “how their concept of the lesbian functioned metaphorically as a poetic figure (like the muse).” Observes that, “[a]s a poetic metaphor, this masculine formulation of lesbianism emphasizes the unproductive nature of sexual and textual relations that exclude men” and sees “lesbian and muse alike, while autonomous in achieving sexual bliss, ultimately depend on the man to give their activity direction and purpose.” Holds that Donne’s “lesbian conceit,” therefore, “guarantees his creative power as author by foregrounding the muse’s dependence on the male poet for her fruition: poetry” (96). Reads Sappho not as “an erotic or lesbian idyll” but rather as “a linguistic fantasy configured in erotic terms” (101) and explores possible reasons Donne assumed a lesbian persona in the poem.


In Korean. Compares Donne’s religious poetry to Italian mannerist religious paintings of the sixteenth century, especially to the work of Pontormo and Parmigianino. Sees in Donne’s divine poetry a reflection of the anxiety, self-criticism, deep spirituality, and pictorialism found in these paintings. In particular, compares Corona to Pontormo’s “Madonna and Child with Saints” and to Parmigianino’s “Madonna and Child with Saints John the Baptist and Jerome,” noting, in particular, similarities between the spatial and temporal organization of the paintings and Donne’s sonnet sequence.


Discusses Pope’s imitations of Donne’s Satyres, especially Sat4. Examines why Pope chose to imitate Donne and comments on how the fact that Pope’s poems are imitations “affects, limits, or broadens the possibilities of interpretation” (107). Shows how as a satirist “modelling himself on Horace, Pope fashions his Donne after the model of Lucilius, a relentless arbiter of morals.” Maintains that as a Catholic, Pope “asks for the help of another satirist who was—at the time he was writing his satires—of the same religion” and that, “as someone discriminated against for his faith,” Pope “invokes the Anglican Dean of St. Paul’s to back his risky endeavour” (124).


Believes that the reference to the positioning of Venus and Saturn in l. 38 of ValName suggests “the interesting possibility of dating the engraving of the name and the poem” (80). Argues that the location of the window was York House, that the name was carved in the window there in either 1598 or 1599, and that the poem was written “after early 1598” and “before early 1600 when Ann More left York House” (81). For a reply, see Robin Robbins below.


An original poem.

Contends that the literary Elizabethan Age could be called “The Golden Age of Spying” because so many writers were preoccupied with the presence of governmental surveillance. In support of this conclusion, studies the presence of weighted words such as “interrogation,” “search,” “bribery,” “surveillance,” and “denunciation” in several plays and poems before providing a detailed analysis of ElPerf. Dates the poem no earlier and not much later than November 1597 because ll. 39–42 of ElPerf appear in Ben Jonson’s The Isle of Dogs, thought to have been first performed in 1597. Suggests also that ll. 11–16 in Sat2 allude to facts regarding Jonson’s death and funeral service. Touches briefly on ElJeal and its theme of deception and points out how Donne creates sympathy for the young conspirators of love thrust into a cruel world surrounded by denouncers and spies.


Maintains that English baroque literature can be summarized under the following points: conceit and emblem, theatricality, antithesis, paradox, quiddity, private mode and lyric ego, amor divinus-amor eroticus, religious meditation, strong lines, plain style, and ars est prae sentare artem. Maintains that the baroque became “the dominant tradition and very much the fashion of the day” and that “[i]ts roughness, novelty, and juxtaposition of extremes mirrored the disorientation of the age.” Discusses Donne as a revolutionary baroque poet and cites his poems as examples of breaking with “the artistic and ethical restrictions of the Renaissance.” Stresses that both in his life and his works Donne the divine and the erotic are never totally separated.


Sees Devotions as addressing many of the sociopolitical problems that the Jacobean Church faced at the time Donne composed his prose work and maintains that Donne “rushed the Devotions into print because he wanted to diffuse partisan tensions in order to preserve church unity” (63). Believes that, by dedicating his prose work to Prince Charles, Donne meant to encourage the prince “to follow the wise ecclesiastical path of his father” (64), whose death was imminent. Maintains that in the dedication Donne addresses “those specific problems facing the Church of England—namely the threat of further division and strife from those who objected to the non-scriptural ceremonies of the Church” and that he addresses his work specifically to the Calvinist reader, whom he encourages “to participate in the existing church” (67). Notes that one of the main effects of the Devotions is “to demonstrate the futility of seeking a private path to salvation” and to emphasize that “private devotions should be accompanied by ecclesiastical and ceremonial assistances” (68). Discusses how Donne accomplishes this aim by turning “the Calvinist anti-ceremonial argument on its head” (71). Argues that Donne “privileges private devotion by insisting that external occasions (ceremonies) serve only as guides and comforts” and, by doing so, “he invites the Calvinists to participate enthusiastically and sincerely in the existing (and fallible) Church of England” (74).


Discusses Donne’s uses of light, both natural and supernatural, in his poetry and his fascination with optics and optical theory. Briefly comments on Donne’s understanding of how the eyes emit beams and the resultant mirror image of the viewer in the eyes of the beloved (in Ecst); his uses of reflective tears and convex mirrors (in ValWeep and GoodM); his predilection for anamorphoses and for the baroque concept of the subjectivity of vision (in Canon); his uses of telescopic images (in Har); and his
distinction between natural and divine light (in Eclog). Points out that although Donne was interested in science and although he creates images and conceits drawn from science, he remained skeptical about the value of human knowledge.


Discusses the Neoplatonic conceit of the lovers’ gaze in Ecst and argues that “the implied voyeurism of the final stanza marks the eye’s transformation from its complex, double-sexed status in the initial stanzas to its traditional role as the vehicle for an analytical male gaze.” Maintains that the poem “evokes the image of the eye as womb only to exclude it, replacing it with an image of male subjectivity, an eye that scrutinizes the female body for meaning” and yet “in the process the probing male eye begins to look remarkably like the image it seeks to efface: the eye as wound, as womb, the site where the masculine subject is conceived” (208). Concludes that this ambiguity “reveals an impulse to restore the eye’s threatened power by dematerializing it, moving it—like the basilisk—from the realm of flesh to status of pure idea” and that, “as metaphor, the eye retains its power to affirm the male subject, not so much by projecting its gaze upon the visual world as by imposing its form on the gaze that it solicits” (208–09).


Examines seventeenth-century views of Donne the poet, particularly those of Jonson and Carew. Gives special attention to the predictions of both concerning “the likely fate of Donne’s poetry when subject to the test of time as a means to question the extent and adequacy of our century’s claims to understand John Donne” (97). Maintains that although later critics have “tended to disregard or downplay the difficulties of Jonson’s view of his contemporaries in favor of Thomas Carew’s seemingly unequivocal praise of Donne,” Carew’s positive evaluation cannot be set “in any straightforward opposition to Jonsonian doubts.” Maintains, in fact, that Carew’s elegy “pours Donnean wine into a Jonsonian bottle, pleasing two literary fathers and yet securing independence from both” (102). Points out that, for Jonson, Donne “will not survive, and that is an indictment of Donne” but for Carew, Donne “will not survive, and that is an indictment of time and of language.” Notes that, for Jonson, Donne “should not be imitated” and for Carew Donne “cannot be imitated.” Maintains, in other words, that Jonson and Carew “see the same Donne but value him differently” (108). Observes that although Donne has received an “extraordinary amount of critical attention” in the twentieth century, his “place in [the] history of literary appreciation” has been “intermittent and unstable, as has been our understanding of his work and of each of his individual works” (114). Suggests, therefore, that, in the case of Donne, “criticism needs to relearn the least fashionable of lessons, a lesson which is indeed anathema to the academy—to relearn the humility that admits the varying and variable limits of its own understandings” (115).


Review article of Antoine Berman’s Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne (Paris: Gallimard, 1995).


Examines the use of hypotipsis in Donne’s poetry and argues that for Donne “hypotipsis
works as a device by which the poet absents himself from the scene of his poem and disappears from the view of, usually, his mistress behind a simulated image” (185). Points out that the “sub-category of hypotiposis that such poems invoke is that of prosopographia, a trope in which things come to speak for, and in place of the poet” (185–86). Claims that “poems in which the trope of avoidance is deployed are verbalizations of metaphors that turn out not to be representative of the fidelity of their author but reflections of the desire of their addressee behind which the poet disappears from view” (186). Argues that Donne’s poems of avoidance are “figurative halls of mirrors in which an encounter with the object of a simultaneous desire and loathing is constantly put off through devices of misrecognition and transference.” Claims that “[d]eeper within them than the image of a betrayed and abandoned other lies the presence of the poet’s own overmastering mistrustfulness, a condition so endemic to his character that it blinds him to the real presence of a woman and leads him to address instead the creations of his own imagination.” Maintains that Donne in his poems “cannot trust his women—or his God—not because he cannot trust them, but just because he cannot trust” and because he “cannot allow himself to be seen by them, not because their gaze threatens to penetrate his epistemological inscrutability” but rather “because, as creations of his imagination, they are in themselves the signs of that penetration having already taken place.” Concludes that “[a]n encounter is always being avoided in these poems to be sure, but this should be called an encounter with an other only so long as it is recognized that what is observed in the mirror of otherness is a vision of the self” (200). Comments specifically on Donne’s Easter Day sermon of 1630, ValMourn, ValBook, SSweet, ValName, Leg, Damp, WomCon, GoodM, Image, and Goodf.


Points out that although Donne is “not usually considered a musical poet” (94), his hymn Father and several of his Songs and Sonnets were set to music by such contemporaries as Alfonso Ferrabosco, William Corkine, John Hilton, Thomas Ford, John Coprario, William Lawes, and Martin Peerson, as well as by several anonymous composers. Observes, however, that Donne’s “connections to music are not limited to his poems that were actually set and sung or to his complications of themes found in musical genres; there is also a kind of musicality in the forms and textures of some of his poems” (97). Claims that “we can learn from singing to place accents appropriately and appreciate the uses of Donne’s metrical variety” (101). Discusses Donne’s uses of song and madrigal themes in the Songs and Sonnets and shows how these poems “deepen the themes and conceits found in the texts of songs and madrigals and, by combining lightness and seriousness, tenderness and tough wit, directness and ironic allusion, incorporate the expressiveness and dramatic tension supplied by multiple simultaneous musical lines in settings of those texts” (108). Calls Corona “perhaps Donne’s most musically constructed poem” (118) and comments on the influence of the psalms on the Holy Sonnets, Lam, Sidney, and the hymns. Concludes that Donne was “always at work liberating language, throwing off the tyrannies of customary or unregenerated words, entering new verbal space” (133).


Points out an allusion to the Devotions (Meditation 17) in Hardy’s short lyric “Drawing Details in an Old Church.” Suggests that Hardy evokes Donne’s world of community and human connectedness to illustrate his “acute sense of loss between the England of Donne’s time and the England of his own” (95), in which death, like life, has little significance.

173. Mueller, Janel M. “Pain, persecution, and the

Argues that the account of bodily torments of the Marian martyrs described in Foxe's Acts and Monuments provided religious poets of the seventeenth century, specifically Donne and Herbert, with powerful tropes. Maintains that both poets "began to write religious verse in English by tapping into a Foxean discursive context, where the religious/poetic identity to which they lay claim is closely bound up with the Marian Protestants' struggles to attest to their own identity relation with divine truth in the foundational phase of the Church of England." Proposes that "this ontology of self-presence in excruciating physical suffering significantly undergirds the first-person utterance of Donne and Herbert as religious poets." Observes that in both poets "the lyric speaker typically lays claim to the Marian Protestant mode of identity-making, which proceeds by catalytic testing through bodily pain." Points out, in particular, how Marian Protestant figurations suggest "transformative and sacramental readings for Donne's images of transmuting bodily violence" (180).


Presents a general biographical sketch of Donne, commenting on his life as a poet, preacher, soldier of fortune, diplomat, fashionable dandy, and spiritual councilor to James I. Also gives an overview of Elizabeth I's interest in alchemy and reviews the interest of Sir Walter Raleigh and his circle in mathematical symbolism and Christian Cabal. Notes Donne's taste for numerology and how he introduces the topos of ars moriendi in his poetry. Points out that, in contrast with other thinkers of his time, Donne argues that humanity is the most complete creation of the cosmos (12–26). Presents translations by divers hands of selected Elegies (V. L. Toporov) (3–11) and selections from Devotions with commentary and notes (Anton Nesterov) (26–31), a translation of Donne's Sermon to Whitehall on the first Friday of Lent, 28 February 1622/23 (A. Kurt) (32–39), a translation of Rupert Brooke's review of The Poems of John Donne by Grierson (Anton Nesterov) (40–41), and a translation of T. S. Eliot's "Metaphysical Poets" (K. Chukhrukidze) (42–46). Contains also an essay on Raleigh by Nesterov (53–60) and G. Krushkov's translation of 9 poems by Raleigh (60–63).


Discusses how humor in Donne's poems often arises from his uses of irony, paradox, hyperbole, witty language, wordplay, puns, and cynicism. Notes that he often employs humor "to cope with pain, and to intensify his 'serious' feelings" (138). Comments briefly on his use of humor in FirAn, the Flea, ElPerf, GoodM, SGo, SunRis, Father, and the Satyres. Points out that Donne's humor is "a vehicle of instruction, not one for entertainment"; that it is "the humor of intensity, not the humor of relaxation"; and that it is "usually satirical, and often sardonic" (140). Gives a short bibliography (141).


In the preface and acknowledgments (vii–viii), announces that the purpose of this study is to offer "an introduction to Donne's religious poetry and prose," to place these works "in their literary contexts," and "to explicate them in terms of the political and religious circumstances of Donne's lifetime." Notes, in particular, the pervasiveness of Calvinism in Donne's time and maintains that an awareness of his in-
terest in Calvin “illuminates the extent to which Donne was independent of the reigning orthodoxy in several significant ways.” Argues that before his ordination Donne's religious poetry “contains both Calvinist and anti-Calvinist resonances,” thereby reflecting “the fluidity of the contemporary English religious scene” (viii). In “Introduction: The two Donnes” (1–19), examines the myth of Jack and John Donne and argues that Donne wrote “a secular kind of religious poetry” (10) and that his religious writings show “a striking continuity with the amatory and satirical verse he had already written” (11). Maintains that Donne's religious poetry is not intended as “aids to devotion” (12) and does not rely on “his own thinking and experience to underwrite its authenticity” but rather “[w]hat makes it authentic is its location in the religious debates of his day” (18). In Chapter 1, “From Catholic to Protestant” (20–50), sketches the religious history of Donne's time, his life, and his religious development. In Chapter 2, “The individual and the state” (51–80), analyzes Sat3 to show that it reflects “a complete lack of interest in specific religious doctrines,” encourages one to find his “own truth” (58), and challenges monarchical authority. Sees Cross as “less radical” than Sat3 in that, although “it does not openly question the rights of monarchs and their governments,” it does enforce “a concentration on the steps individuals can take towards their own salvation” (80). In Chapter 3, “The art of devotion” (81–109), views Lit as a failed attempt to reconcile Catholicism and Anglicanism and argues that “[t]he difficulty of synthesising diametrically opposed doctrines causes the poem to tread with a delicacy which borders on awkwardness” (86). Sees in the poem an ambivalence to both the Church and the court and concludes that in the poem Donne “has not made up his mind about how far he really wishes to proceed with harmonising divergent beliefs, and in the irreconcilability of the beliefs themselves, which results in such comic contradictions in the poem’s handling of the topic of the intercession of the saints” (98). Discusses Corona as Donne's closest approach to a meditative poem” (106) and sees it as unlike Donne's other poems. Finds Goodf “not moving in the way La Corona is,” in part because “it uses paradoxes to encapsulate theological truth rather than ‘human moments,’” such as one finds in Cor5, and in part because the speaker is describing “the likely effects on him of watching something which he is not watching” (108). Sees Calvinistic leanings in Goodf but claims that “our view of the speaker's religious allegiance will vary according to which part of the poem we choose to prioritise in discussion” (109). In Chapter 4, “Sighs and tears: the Holy Sonnets” (110–36), analyzes HSWhat to challenge the critical approaches of Helen C. White, Helen Gardner, and Louis Martz to the Holy Sonnets, in particular, their seeing the sonnets as meditative poems that reflect uncritically Donne's use of Ignatian meditative techniques. Sees HSWhat rather as exploiting “the fluidity and instability of the contemporary religious situation, and in particular the variety of manifestations of Calvinism,” calling it “the most developed example of a mock-meditation to be found among the Holy Sonnets” (118). Maintains that Donne's manipulation of the meditative techniques found in the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises, as seen in HSWhat, “is observable throughout the Holy Sonnets” (119) as is his manipulation of Calvinistic doctrine. Warns against reading the Holy Sonnets as “devotional poems of a man whose approach to religion was entirely serious,” noting that Donne “found Catholicism and Protestantism about equally amenable to comic treatment” (134). Suggests that the ways in which Donne exploits religion comes “close to ridiculing it” and reflects “a poetic personality that impinges so strongly on the poems that their religious basis is left looking very much like a platform for self-promotion” (136). In Chapter 5, “The originality of the Holy Sonnets” (137–62), argues that the critical approach of Barbara Lewalski and other critics who see the Holy Sonnets “as drawing on and developing a specifically Protestant poetic is potentially more misleading than the now discredited claim that they drew uncritically on the Ignatian meditative technique” (137) and that “[d]educing a Protestant world-view from the Holy Sonnets means ignoring what their speak-
ers say about Protestant beliefs and their tone of voice when they express those beliefs” (141). Argues that Donne did not invent the holy sonnet but participated in a fairly well-established tradition and comments on several individual poems to show how Donne uses the sonnet “as a platform to rehearse different, often mutually hostile, religious positions.” Finds Donne’s secular love poems “with their introspection, inconsistencies and, most importantly, use of role-play” as the closest analogues to the Holy Sonnets (150). Maintains, furthermore, that since “the religious positions adopted in the Holy Sonnets are so multifarious, it is obvious that it would be dangerous to make deductions about Donne’s own religious beliefs from them” (159). In Chapter 6, “Tracts for the times” (163–93), discusses how political forces and Donne’s self-advertisement shaped Biathanatos, Pseu-Martyr, and Ignatius and claims that Essays is “the first work of Donne’s from which it is safe to infer an interest in religion as a philosophical and moral system rather than merely a rich source of exploitable literary raw material” (193). In Chapter 7, “Revelations of self” (194–213), points out that, except for Ham and Lam, all of Donne’s post-ordination poems allude to his own circumstances. Presents revisionist readings of GHerb, Til, HSShe, HSShow, and HSVex, commenting on how these poems reveal Donne’s mind and conflicts during this period. In Chapter 8, “The art of death” (214–35), offers readings of Christ, Sickness, and Father to show that in these hymns Donne “returned to the practice of using poetry as a means of dramatising the predicament of the persona, and exploited religion for artistic purposes every bit as vigorously as in the verse composed during the period 1608 to 1613” (214). Insists that “[t]he cracks in the assurances he invents in the hymns make them entertainingly contradictory and paradoxical,” thereby linking them to the early Holy Sonnets and the love poems (228). Discusses also Devotions, noting how in it Donne emphasizes personal striving and prayer, thereby affirming “confidence—not certainty—of salvation” (32). Comments also briefly on Ham, calling it “a piece of hack-work” (235). In Chapter 9, “Reco-


Discusses Donne’s “commitment to images of various kinds, including his own portraits, in terms especially of Caroline history.” Argues that Donne “not only anticipated but, under pressure, vindicated in advance the age of Van Dyck in England” and that the issues Donne and Van Dyck faced “were similar, and reciprocally enlightening.” Discusses how Donne dealt with “the fact of inherited and legalized iconoclasm in England” and shows how the conflict over images, “intimated in some of his early
poems, became outspoken in the pictorial theory of his Caroline sermons.” Believes that an understanding of what caused Donne “finally to deliver a manifesto against iconoclasm will sharpen our sense of the sharp cultural shift that began in 1625 and by 1632 had brought Van Dyck to England” (2). Reviews and interprets known portraits of Donne and discusses several of his early poems, especially ELPIC and several verse epistles, noting that until he was in his early forties, Donne “appears usually untroubled by the debate over either secular or religious images” and “[h]is frequent recourse to pictorialism seems, rather, the sign of a humanist education in the visual arts.” Points out, however, that Cross is “a striking exception to this rule” and shows how this poem “directly pertains to the position on images” that Donne developed in his sermons (14). Comments in detail on the sermon Donne preached at St. Paul’s on 6 May 1627 in which, sounding like “an apologist for the Caroline church as it would develop in the 1630’s,” he offers “his only definitive statement on images and the iconoclastic controversy” (20). Maintains that in his defense of images in this sermon he “not only capitulated to what he saw as the new order, but inadvertently authorized its next stage: fully-fledged Laudian formalism in league with monarchical absolutism” (26).


Argues that during the reign of James I the “problem of royal address influences epideictic style even in occasional verse not directed to the king” and that the “[s]ophisticated, courtly verse addressed to a variety of early Jacobean subjects” by Donne and others shows “their mastery of court fashion by reflecting the epideictic maneuvers developed to praise the king.” Emphasizes that Donne “obsessively interrogates the coupling of subservience and authority in the person of the poet” (9). Discusses BedRef to show how in the poem “the exaggerated—even uselessness—of the poet, as well as the God-like self-sufficiency attributed to the addressee, are the hallmarks of a panegyric gesture” that is modelled on the king’s “style of authority”—with the Countess being simply “an alternative” to the king (44). Discusses how SunRis, on the other hand, “miniaturizes the complementary strategy” (46) that Donne uses in BedRef and expresses his “deep-seated ambivalence about the Jacobean court.” Claims that Donne’s “most explicit theoretical account of the exchangeability of topoi of praise” occurs in Satl (47). Contrasts Donne and Jonson in their responses to “the problematics of early Jacobean courtly panegyric,” noting how Donne theorizes problems that “remain more submerged” in Jonson’s poetry and calls attention to “the subtle usurpations and transgressions available within—and by means of—the Jacobean panegyrist’s disempowered stance.” Concludes, therefore, that Donne’s poems “reflect more fully the limits of James’s authorial power” (48).


Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne. Calls the Westmoreland Manuscript “[p]erhaps the single most important manuscript source for Donne’s poetry” (21) and reproduces a photocopy of two pages containing four of the Holy Sonnets. Notes that the manuscript is the sole manuscript source for three of the Holy Sonnets. Reproduces also a photocopy of two pages from Sir William Dugdale’s History of St. Pauls Cathedral in London (1658) that contains a long-lost drawing of Donne wrapped in his burial shroud that may have provided the basis for Nicholas Stone’s effigy of Donne in St. Paul’s Cathedral.

Discusses “what, aside from fashion and curiosity, might have drawn Donne to Rabelais” (37). Maintains that Donne definitely read the controversial Frenchman as did many Englishmen of his time but that his “particular appropriation” of him is different from “his culture’s collective interest in or horror at Rabelais.” Says that “[w]hat seems to have fascinated him was, on the one hand, how in Gargantuana et Pantagruel words relate to things or—just as intriguing—to no-things, and, on the other, how one figure famous for words but also for sexual dysfunction,” namely Panurge, “relates to dangerous words and even to words that one might trace back through the generations to the Word itself” (38). Points out that both Donne and Rabelais shared an interest in “voyages and new-found lands” (43); that Donne perhaps had in mind Rabelais’s Panurge when he composed Sat1 and Sat4; that he was aware of Rabelais’s list of nonbooks in the fantasy library of the Abbey of St. Victor in Paris when he wrote Catalogus Librorum Aulicorum; and that, like Rabelais, he was “drawn to nullity as such, to airy nothings that have names, if no local habitations, and live only in language” (50). Stresses that, for Donne, Rabelais was not a “wine-swilling bon vivant” nor an irreligious scoff er” nor “the evangelical promoter of Pantagruelism”—and “only minimally the scatological and obscene writer who still shocks the squeamish”—but rather was a writer “who thought deeply about words, about what they can do: make up something, make up nothing—lots and lots of nothing—deceive, betray, perhaps substitute for love and life, and even (some hope) trace themselves back to an oracle in a bottle that encourages us to take the plunge and that has, famously, a word of advice often welcome, if not always literally, even to the most arid of academics: ‘Drink!’” (53).


Proposes to “deghettoize” early modern women and “to place them in that local historical context where they, like their male counterparts, are most specifically revealed” (42). Juxtaposes Donne and Mary Wroth to show how “[t]heir sexual ideologies were forged through the impact of patriarchal structures on each” and how “their responses to the voyages to the New World are formulated through gender” (43). Points out that both “transgressed against the social rules prescribing conduct in the selection of appropriate mates” (44). Suggests that they may have known each other’s work and notes that both were personally interested in the colonization of the New World. Contrasts, as an example of the differences between female and male subjectivity, Wroth’s Pamphilia to Amphilanthus (Sonnet 22) and Donne’s ElBed, noting how Wroth identifies with the West Indians that appear in her poem, whereas Donne sees himself as the “masculine owner of the New World, claiming an absolute sovereignty of the male self-owning subject over the feminized new world” (45). Contrasts also Wroth’s use of the compass in The Countess of Montgomeries Urania and Donne’s compass conceit in ValMourn to illustrate “the sexual difference that marks their generational experience” (47).


Points out that, “[i]n contrast with the male poets of the period who usually emphasize the Sappho and Phaon legend or Sappho’s erotic relationships,” the women poets of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries ignore, for the most part, “the flamboyant legends surrounding the name of Sappho” and “concentrate on her stature as the first and greatest Greek lyric poet” (111). Locates Donne’s Sappho in its historical and literary context. Observes how Donne, “assuming the Sappho persona, refers to the Phaon legend but emphasizes her love for the woman and the inferior quality of heterosexual love.” Notes that Donne, “unlike most of the other male poets, emphasizes the beauty and power of lesbian love” and that “his subject is precisely that erotic relationship, not Sappho’s lyric poetic genius.” Says that Donne, like Lyly, Pope, and Addison, focuses on Sap-
Sappho’s “erotic passion and her sexual intensity.” Points out that, in spite of “incomplete, or even, in the case of the Phaon legend, totally spurious, connection to Sappho’s texts, these associations with a licentious or promiscuous lifestyle were transferred to the Renaissance and Augustan women poets when they were given the Sappho label” (116) but notes that, nevertheless, Sappho “represents [for them] their ‘ancient claimie,’ their right to writing” (128).


Reply to Tony Kline above. Argues that the most likely date for Donne’s having engraved the window of York House is between February and March 1599 and that likely *ValMourn* was written between 23 August and 26 September 1599. Comments also on the possible pun on Anne More’s surname in l. 9 and l. 40.


Discusses *Witch* as “a complex and revealing depiction of a struggle for dominance between male and female amatory magic.” Points out that “[s]ince female witches were often accused of attempting to harm or destroy through image magic,” *Witch* “might be thought of as female art, as the first stanza implicitly assumes,” but notes that “magical operation by ‘images’ was also a practice of high magic.” Maintains, therefore, that “the struggle between the poet and the witch mistress in Donne’s poem is initially enacted through the concept of a kind of magic practiced by both female witches and male magicians” (69). Comments also on the magical power of women’s eyes as manifested in the poem.


Examines the way Donne and Lanyer “use the language of religious devotion to demarcate the border territory dividing the inwardness that devotion demands from the conduct that Renaissance Christianity enjoins.” Claims that, “[i]n pursuing analogies between human and divine love with a zest unmatched by most
previous and subsequent writers, Lanyer and Donne convert the discourses of religious devotion into narratives of gendered subjectivity” (209). Maintains that both poets “force Christianity to reveal the tense relationship it shares with the social structures it ostensibly underpins” and observes that, “[w]here Lanyer eroticizes the relations between female followers and a Christ whose feminine qualities she accents, Donne interrogates the erotic unconventionality of the gender-specific positions conventional devotion demands men assume” (211). Discusses in particular the Holy Sonnets and the hymns. Argues that “[f]rom different gendered subject positions,” both Donne and Lanyer “show how the devotional subject is drawn to articulate desires which transgress the precepts of the society it inhabits” but that whereas Lanyer “attempts to liberate heterosexual desires from masculinist oppression by turning them to God, Donne heightens the violence that invades heterosexual eroticism in a patriarchal culture as a measure of the absolute submission God demands of him” (228). Concludes that, taken together, Donne and Lanyer “reveal some of the most profound truths, and some of the deepest contradictions, implicit in the collusion between religious injunction and social organization that constitutes the western tradition” (229).


Sees the Anniversaries as Donne’s “dramatizing the process of discovering spiritual certainties amid excruciating and agonizing doubts that his Zeitgeist presented to him,” a work primarily “concerned with understanding the meaning of death rather than presenting an outpouring of private grief” (117). Discusses how SecAn “builds upon the insights” in FirAn, specifically “the speaker’s discovery of the ineffectuality of reason and empirical method, and the lack of correspondence between heaven and earth.” Shows how in SecAn the speaker “engages in an intense dialogue with his soul in which he prepares himself for the spiritual epiphany of the later sections” (118). Believes that the Anniversaries are “the dramatization of a man who, by coming to understand the implications of the death of a young girl, discovers an inclusive system of spiritual values.” Discusses how T. S. Eliot draws upon the SecAn in Gerontion. Observes that whereas the speaker in the Anniversaries “moves from despair to faith and finally to a point where he imagines himself having a vision of God, in Gerontion the speaker cannot reconcile himself to death because he cannot meditate effectively” (120). Maintains that the SecAn is “a model of successful meditation against which Eliot is intentionally juxtaposing Gerontion’s ineffectual attempts at meditation” (121).


Examines Donne’s sense of the self by examining “the role of the feminine in Donne’s thought, by looking at the prose letters that express “intimacy yearning for community,” and finally by exploring “the Pauline conception of vocation” that he embraced in his later years. Maintains that “[t]he concept of the Jobian self ‘redintegrates’ to use one of Donne’s own terms—the broken fragments of his earlier experience” (66). Discusses how through his identification with St. Paul “[t]he transmogification of Donne’s suffering, the source of his lifelong pain, becomes the avenue of his joy” and how “in his personal accommodation of the Pauline truth lies the essence of his mature work and the gist of his conception of vocation.” Maintains that “[a]t the center is conformity with Christ that subsumes the androgyny, dominant psychological imprints and desire for participation in community that color his thought throughout his previous works” (95). Explains how “the hydroptique Donne satisfied his amorousness, ambition and covetness in the priestly vocation” (97).

Discusses the artistic strategies of *Corona* as a sonnet sequence, showing how its “repetitive element … reinforces the kind of lexical doubling” that Donne favors in his mature poetry and how “the movement from sonnet to sonnet on the same line is mirrored inside each sonnet by the movement from phrase to phrase on the same (or the antonymic) word.” Comments on how the “extravagant artifice” of *Corona* “is integrated into the persona of the speaker, whose obsessive repetitions and replayings of words are part of his or her attempt to order the world and the text and art at the same time” (39). Discusses also the *Holy Sonnets* as an informal sonnet sequence, pointing out how textual evidence allows a critic “to argue for his or her own sequencing, or for none” (108). States reasons for thinking of the poems as a sequence, although clearly not a formal, ordered meditational sequence, and believes that Donne perhaps intentionally left the *Holy Sonnets* in their “present indeterminate form” to reinforce the fear and uncertainty that he expresses about his spiritual destiny in these poems.


Explores psychoanalytically male masochism in the poetry of Donne and Crashaw. Argues that Donne’s masochism “checks itself by transforming into a sadistic mode of aggression (i.e., aggression turned inward to the self), which then enables the poet to resituate himself in the Oedipal framework of Christianity” but that, “conversely, Crashaw’s masochism transgresses these limits, exposing the ‘perversity’ underlying dominant modes of human desire and Christian mysticism itself.” Maintains that Donne’s religious poetry “spans both non-erotic and erotic forms of masochism—morbid obsession with death, homoerotic masochistic desire, and rape fantasy” and claims that “these obsessions revolve around the masochism that structures Christianity, in which death takes the primary role.” Points out how Donne’s “ambivalent desire for and preoccupation with death is deeply implicated in his relationship with the dying Christ.” Concludes that Donne “never lets masochism get the ‘best’ (or worst) of him” because he “counts on God to help him ultimately conquer it by giving in and submitting himself to the Father.”


Challenges critics, especially “radical feminists” and “cultural materialists,” who disparage Donne as a misogynist and maintains that
when reading Donne’s “irreverent poems,” especially the *Elegies*, they take seriously what Donne intended as fun. Argues that, in fact, “some of Donne’s best poems succeed, not in spite of, but because of their rakish, insouciant, male-to-the-marsh speakers” (236). Using Wittgenstein's “critiques of philosophical investigation,” argues that “the evidence for Donne’s poetry being ‘misandrist’ is at least as great as that for its being misogynist” (15). Discusses, in particular, *ElAnag* to show how this often attacked elegy is not simply “a diatribe against women” (242), as some critics hold, but is also aimed facetiously at men, thereby showing how the “charge of misogyny” is “overstated and, so, erroneous.” Maintains that “[b]efore we can rush to judgment about the dramatic and ethical characteristics of such poems, we need to know more about how such witty expressions were construed in Donne’s time” (249).


Comments on Katherine Philips’s borrowing of Donne’s compass conceit in her “Friendship in Emblem, or the Seale, to my dearest Lucasia.” Maintains, however, that in the poem she is not simply “reinscribing a male text, but embracing a female poetic that reaches beyond male discourse to an alternative French female literary tradition” (93). Observes that whereas Donne “fuses disparates together with striking originality” in *ValMourn*, Philips “breaks down, or de-fuses, the constituent parts of a borrowed conceit” in her poem and, “[w]orking within quite different literary conventions and epistemological assumptions, Philips at once reconstitutes a metaphysical conceit and de-intensifies its metaphysics into safe, stable assertion” (97).

196. **Sussman, Henry.** “The Knowledge of Modernity: Tragedy and Empiricism,” in *The Aesthetic Con-


Discusses *Canon* as a poem that “places eroticism and aesthetics in diplomatic, legal, and commercial contexts with specific nuances within an emerging modern age with an ideology of heightened personal experience” (81). Claims that eroticism is “the ultimate proving ground of the de-institutionaled self” and that Donne’s erotic poetry “celebrates the founding of a subjectivity defined by its sexual behavior and language” and, at the same time, is “unique in pursuing the diplomatic, legalistic, and commercial implications of the erotic.” Maintains that Donne’s poetry “spans the only two possible sources for ideas, according to Locke, sensation and reflection,” and “coordinates intense sensual descriptions of eroticism with metaphorical elaborations of this behavior in terms of the prevalent cultural terms into which it can be translated: law, theology, politics, and even medicine” (82).


Discusses the concept of “disinterpretation,” i.e., “a textually legitimate multiplication of interpretation” (108). To support his argument, disagrees with Cleanth Brooks’s interpretation of *Canon* in *The Well-Wrought Urn* (1947).


Discusses *ValName* as an example of a poetic text that “thematizes the liminality of inscription.” Points out how the poem “simultaneously describes a text in a liminal sense (the window itself)” and also “describes the interstitial exchange between text and reader that drives the operations of inscription” (23).


Contains a brief introduction to Donne’s life
and explains the devotional purpose and arrangement of the selections that follow ([vii]–xi). Thereafter presents modernized selections from Donne's sermons for each weekday of Lent and Easter Week and a poem (selections from *Holy Sonnets*, *Cross*, *Father*) and a prayer (from *Devotions*) for each Sunday of Lent and for Easter Sunday (1–106). Concludes with a list of sources for the readings (107–09) and suggestions for further reading (111). No notes or comments on individual selections.

Reviews:


Argues that Donne's conceits are intentionally obscure and examines Donne's Thomistic concept of memory in shaping them. Explains how Donne sees memory working “in distinct ways” to guarantee the survival of his poems “not in books or on paper but in the reader who encounters the poet's conceits and then lodges them in his or her own memory” (119). Discusses how Donne regards the metaphysical conceit as “a mnemonic device that imprints itself (unforgettably) as an image in the memory of the reader” (220) and illustrates this concept by discussing *Relic*. Believes that Donne “shuns print not to remain in obscurity but to make that obscurity functional and just” since he believes that “to mistake the physical poem for its meaning is to make it a relic and to misdevote, rather than turn body into soul and perfect the poet's resurrection through memory.” Concludes that “[t]he metaphysical conceit as mnemonic device is Donne's answer (in advance) to Hobbes's view of the memory as nothing more than 'decaying sense'” and that memory is “where he locates the primary office of the poet,” that place “between the understanding and will where Donne entrusts his poetry, where the perplexed understanding is rectified by the ennobled memory, and where the manuscript poet placed his own hope for salvation” (129).


While recognizing differences in genre, verse form, narrative structure and tone between *FirAn* and Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*, compares the two works to show “how a woman and a man, publishing roughly the same year and with similar social goals, portray the world and claim authority for their portrayals” (138). Discusses how Donne in *FirAn* “imitates the idea of the Christian soul, and, in the process, dominates his ostensible authorizing subject and becomes himself the authority for his vision of the world.” Points out that Donne “becomes the voice of God” and that Elizabeth Drury “has no independent existence outside the voice of the author.” Maintains, therefore, that the male poet “engenders his subject and disengenders her as part of the process of asserting his own authority.” Observes that “[w]hile the godly authority that Donne ultimately claims for himself tends to distance him from his subject, to make him a transcendent divinity in relation to his poem, Lanyer's approach to authority [in *Salve Deus*] merges her voice and presence with the creation of the poem (up to a point), making her much more of an eminent creative force within the territory of her creation” (144).


Points out that Donne's favorite motto for books from his library was “Per Rachel ho servito, & non per Lea,” which he adapted from Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, which itself comes from Genesis 29:25. Notes that usually Rachel represents the contemplative life and Leah the active and suggests that Donne was witnessing in his books “his belief that the active life had been forced on to him” but that he “would rather have preferred one of learning and private piety.” Observes that “[o]f the 250 books which survive from Donne's library, many can be connected with the writing of *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610)” and points out that “the evidence of the dates of publication suggests that Donne bought few books after his ordination in 1615.” Comments on the dispersal of Donne's library after his death. Notes, in par-
ticular, two books from Donne's library that are bound together, Henry Creccelius' *Collectanea ex Historiis de Origine et Fundatione omnium fere Monasticorum Ordinum in Specie* (with Donne's signature and motto) and David Paré's *Irenicum: sive de unione et synodo evangelicorum concilianda*, both published in 1614 and on sale at Bloomsbury Books Auctions for an estimated price of 5000–7000 pounds.


Discusses how the originality of *SunRis* "comes from a totally subversive but subtle process of variation" on Ovid's *Amores*, I, xiii, "which prepares the reader for the surprising final conceit" (211). Shows how Donne re-interprets Ovid's text "in such a way that, in terms of Renaissance cosmovision, man's self-trust is highlighted and pushed to the fore" (212).


In Chinese. Defines and comments on ironic tension in the poetry of Donne and Li Shangyin. Maintains that irony arises primarily from understatement, overstatement, or paradox. Reads Li's poems as examples of irony resulting from understatement and reads Donne's *Relic* and *HSDeath* as examples of irony arising from overstatement. Sees the irony in *Canon* as arising from Donne's use of paradox. States that both Li Shangyin and Donne express the notion that the feeling of love contains both love and hate.
1998


Documents alchemical symbolism with an emphasis on “literary and intellectual references to alchemy in the Western tradition, written in or translated into English.” Focuses primarily on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century works. Includes in each entry “a definition of the symbol, giving the literal (physical) and figurative (spiritual) meanings, an example of the symbol used in alchemical writing, and a quotation from a literary source” (preface). Reproduces fifty visual images. Includes references to Donne under the following terms: “ablution” (Sermons); “alembic” (Noct ll. 21–22); “balm” (BedfReas ll. 21–24); “cement” (Ect ll. 5–6); “chasm” (Noct ll. 24–27); “chemic” (Cross ll. 27–28); “chemical wedding” (Ect ll. 18–72); “conversion” (Sermons 4:110); “divorce” (Ect ll. 29–46); “dropsy” (Noct ll. 6–24); “dung” (BedfHon ll. 1–12); “grave” (Mark ll. 23–24, Noct ll. 21–22); “peace and strife” (FirAn ll. 321–22); “pot” (LovAlch l. 8); “receiver” (FirAn ll. 415–18); “red earth” (Lit ll. 1–9); “red elixir” (Mark ll. 26–28); “still” (Cross ll. 25–30); “tincture” (Res ll. 13–16); “vitrification” (BedfCab ll. 11–14); and “womb” (ElComp l. 36).


Surveying the representation of the visual arts in English Renaissance literature, comments briefly on Donne’s presentation of his portrait in *ElPict*. Assumes the poem is addressed to Anne More and says that Donne “offers the portrait, with its capacity to memorialise his appearance, as a means for Anne of justifying her love for him” (38) if he should return from military service physically changed.


Comments on Katherine Philips’s reworking of Donne’s love poetry. Notes that in her “Friendship in Emblem” (poem 29) Philips presents a “subversive transcription” of Donne’s compass conceit in *ValMourn* by representing “same-sex friendship and heterosexual marriage as competing and incompatible modes of coupledom” (244). Points out also how Philips in “A Friend” (poem 64) “uncannily repeats Donne’s erotic depiction of Sappho’s desire for Philaenis” from *Sappho* (ll. 45–48).


Reply to George Bellis’s response (below) to Baumlin’s “Donne’s ‘The Token’: A Lesson in the Fashion(ing) of Canon” (*CE* 59 [1997]: 257–76). Maintains that in his original essay he had “already presented a ‘double reading’ of Donne’s poem, the first reading proceeding from an attitude of skepticism, the second from an attitude of faith” (455). Defends his deconstructive reading of *Token* by discussing the rhetorical and theological contexts that shape the poem. Argues that Donne “refuses to persuade or compel readers, refuses to reduce truth to a single answer or attitude,” but rather, “true to the humanist argumentum ad utramque partem, he presents each side, and awaits his reader’s response.” Accepts, therefore, Bellis’s interpretation of the poem “to the extent that it presents a ‘faithful’ reading” but does not accept his reading “as a refutation of alternative, skeptical readings—since these, too, are sanctioned by Donne’s rhetoric” (458).

Discusses the reasons for Donne’s reluctance to have Biathanatos published. Points out, however, that he did send manuscript copies of the work to Sir Edward Herbert and later to Sir Robert Ker, thereby entrusting the preservation of his treatise to their care. Examines in detail the Herbert Manuscript since it is “the first copy known to have been made—and actually survives” (35). Surveys briefly the text of Biathanatos and what modern editors have assumed about it. Announces the discovery of a new manuscript of Biathanatos found in Canterbury Cathedral and describes it in detail, noting that the manuscript “shows no signs of having been produced under Donne’s supervision, or, for that matter, of having any direct connection with the author himself” (40). Argues, however, that Canterbury supports the conclusion that the summary-sidenotes in Biathanatos are authentic and that “the overall arrangement, division, presentation, and layout of Biathanatos, as we now have it in both the Quarto and Canterbury, represent not a later editorial construct, but, on the contrary, an elaborate, rather cumbersome, highly academic, and also somewhat archaic mode of presentation, which Donne himself adopted, in this his first major prose discourse” (52). Concludes, therefore, that John Donne, Jr., “was doing precisely what he claimed he was doing” when he published his father’s treatise in the 1640s: “first, making available to the public a work which had been seen hitherto only by a few close friends of his father many years before; second, publishing a text composed entirely and solely by his father... with no substantive additions by anyone else; third, establishing it irrefutably as a work by his father so that no one else could plagiarize it; fourth, offering the complete text of a work which had generally (though maybe not exclusively) been seen in ‘imperfect’ form (imperfect even in the manuscript given to Herbert); and fifth—and perhaps ironically (this being his excuse for publishing given to Cavendish)—he was trying to ‘defende it from the mistakes of careless transcribers’” (52–53). Speculates that Canterbury may have been commissioned and owned by the Countess of Bedford. Prints 11 plates.


Discusses “the tendency of Elizabethan love poems not only to represent an amorous thought, but [also] to conduct the courtship itself” and “examines the ways in which the tropes and rhetoric of love poetry were used to court Elizabethan women (not only at court and in the great houses, but in society at large) and how the women responded to being wooed, in prose, poetry, and speech.” Also “investigates a range of texts addressed to, written by, read, heard or transformed by Elizabethan women” and “charts the beginnings of an early modern female lyric tradition” (jacket). Although there are no extended discussions of Donne, he is mentioned, and examples from his poetry are cited throughout. Comments briefly on revisionist criticism of Donne, his courtship and marriage to Anne More, his patrons, and his puns.


Response to James Baumlín’s “Donne’s ‘The Token’: A Lesson in the Fashion(ing) of Canon” (CE 59 [1997]:257–76). Agrees with Baumlín that Token consists of “a Petrarchan quatrain nailed on top of a Shakespearian sonnet” (451) but questions Baumlín’s interpretation of the poem in which he claims that the “Donne-like sonnet deconstructs the Petrarchan quatrain” and that “[t]he second part of the poem doubles back on the first part, turns on it, and denies the assurance of fidelity which the first part asserts of the token” (452). Maintains that such a view “causes a useless spinning of wheels” and is “the dead-end of skepticism.” Argues that,
in *Token*, “the sonnet contrasts with but does not contradict the quatrain, and may actually confirm it” (454) and reads the poem as the triumph of faithful love. For a reply, see Baumlin above.


Discusses Donne’s attitude toward the New Philosophy, in particular his knowledge of Kepler’s works on astronomy, and surveys what is known about Donne’s reported visit to Kepler in Linz while accompanying Doncaster on his continental mission. Points out that this interest led him to Gosse’s *The Life and Letters of John Donne*. Comments on Gosse’s life and works, especially his part in the twentieth-century rediscovery of Donne’s poetry.


Evaluates the importance of Shakespeare’s prose and its “dominating influence on English prose” in the seventeenth century. Maintains that “[i]n the history of English literature it is very difficult to find any other century when the dialogue with Shakespeare was more confessional and openhearted than it was in the essayistic meditations of his young contemporaries,” citing as examples Donne’s sermons and particularly the *Devotions*. Sees Donne as a “Hamlet investigating the same tragedy of the experiencing mind” (116). Says that Donne’s aim in prose is “to reevaluate speech canons, to seize by a word everything that is real—feelings and thoughts—penetrating into the real, not fictive (as in a ‘romance’) life, reproducing directly the sensations of the living mind” (123). Argues that “[o]ne finds unmistakable proof of the fact that very early in the seventeenth century Shakespeare was accepted so completely by the English prose writers,” including Donne, “as to become part and parcel of their imaginative process and their aesthetic orientation in prose” and notes how “[t]hey use his words and images in ways that were already predominately theirs” (124).


Points out that l. 4 of *HSShe* is a direct translation of l. 13 of Petrarch’s Sonnet 75 in *Rime in Morte di Laura*. Notes that this fact refutes “the stale repetition of the suggestion that Donne’s poetry is written in reaction to the Petrarchanism of the Elizabethans.”


Points out that Donne and Jonson, though often placed in antithesis, were “linked not only through their own testimony, their patrons, the book-trade and scribal copying, but also through mutual friends” and maintains, therefore, that it is “not surprising that at some point they worked together on a manuscript.” Argues that the Bodleian Manuscript of *Biathanatos*, which Donne sent to Edward Herbert and referred to as *Herbert*, was “prepared initially by Jonson” (156) and that Donne later added his marginal notes and corrections. Discusses how the handwriting of the manuscript, the paper used, the watermarks on the paper, and the unusual manner in which the paper was folded and cropped led to the unavoidable conclusion that Jonson “was responsible for preparing and copying the *Herbert* manuscript of *Biathanatos*.” Maintains that “paper, biography, and correspondence coincide” also to suggest that the “most plausible” date of the manuscript is 1609 (177). Sees Jonson, therefore, as “a collaborative participant in the creation of the text” (178) and suggests reasons for Jonson’s interest in the project.

Briefly examines Donne’s view of the New Philosophy as expressed in FirAn. Maintains that in the poem Donne argues that “divine contemplation is the only sane response to the examination of a dying, disintegrating world.” Claims that modern critics forgive Donne, considering the times in which he wrote, for “failing to see that the disintegrating intellectual, political, and social hierarchies of his ‘spent’ world were also components—material knowledge, representative government, and individual rights—of an emerging, new world” (248). Notes that while modern critics praise Donne for “being ahead of his time because he identified some profound implications of the new learning, Swift is censured for stubbornly ignoring and denying the evidence that a salutary new order had emerged or was emerging” (249). Points out that in Donne’s time “the modern discoveries, geographic, astronomic, or philosophic” still served “to illustrate the condition of fallen humans in a fallen world,” thereby making “religion and poetry the only lasting human interests.” Maintains that “[i]t is not that Donne, panicked by the chaos of the collapse of the old order, retreats into a mystical piety” but rather that he “poetically reads the modern innovations as the most recent evidence that humans are profoundly ignorant” (250). Compares and contrasts Donne’s views with those of Swift and Cowley.


In a discussion of Jonson’s Poetaster and the Essex Rebellion of 1601, refers several times to Donne’s association with Essex and notes how in Sat5 Donne, like Jonson, condemns the corruption of the court.


Maintains that Donne “was ipso facto a political figure in his preaching” but believes that “his politics may best be construed in terms of his theology and Prayer Book liturgy, the tropes of religious life, and the fact of dialogue” (132). Believes that Donne’s “pastoral theology tended to look beyond vicissitudes, especially beyond the transient manifestations of political power, toward natural graced anticipations of Divine eternity and ultimate loving fulfillment in the civitas Dei” (135). Examines the sermons to show that Donne’s politics were “God-oriented, heaven-oriented, eternity-oriented, and dialogic” and “were centered on what he conceived as his God’s loving call and his own and his auditors’ charitable response to it” (137). Discusses elements of Donne’s general politics that emerge in a number of specific sermons, emphasizing, however, that “[h]is preaching manifested a sort of parable or allegory of the biblical, Augustinian, liturgical Christian journey of rightly ordered loves” and “proceeded with a zealous alertness that tried to avoid the dejection of spirit or uncharitable disputatiousness he associated with Separatism and to avoid the power-mongering tendentiousness he associated with spiritual complacency, Pelagianism, and Rome” (151). Surveys the “stoutly orthodox and coherent theology” (153) that informs the sermons, especially exploring Donne’s view of sacred and profane time; his use of the tropes of theater, journey, and calling; and his concept of the sermon as dialogic.


 Discusses the “interaction and interdependence” of meditation, conceit, and emblems
that characterise Donne's metaphysical ekphrasis" (91–92). Presents a detailed reading of HSMade and argues that Emblem CXXI in Alciati's Emblemata Liber is the source of Donne's conceit in ll. 6–13 of the sonnet, "in conjunction with Psalm 55" (97). Maintains that in the sonnet Donne "builds a self-dramatisation based on this emblem in an exercise of sacred parody or contrafactum of the emblem, an adaptation of the emblem for the purposes of meditation exercise." Notes that, if, in fact, Alciati's emblem is "a reworking of Psalm 55," then HSMade is a "double parody: a religious parody of a secular parody of a Biblical text, thus coming full circle back to the original spirit of Psalm 55" (98). Maintains that the religious content of the sonnet, however, "is not the only one" and shows how Donne introduces "a secular subtext," perhaps addressed to the Countess of Bedford. Argues that in HSMade Donne "was making the most of his capacity for complex writing" and "was fully aware of his possible 'audiences,' offering two distinct compatible roles in the same performance: that of the repentant sinner, and the one, closer to reality, of the intelligent man afflicted by poverty." Concludes that "in this coupling of simultaneous meanings" the sonnet is "a perfect ingenious example of the complex strategies of Renaissance self-fashioning and theatricality" (103).


Explores Donne's "preoccupation with the metaphysics of death," especially in the FirAn, Biathanatos, Devotions, several sermons, and the Holy Sonnets, and comments on "his behaviour around his own anticipated death," especially as reflected in "Death's Duell." Points out that in Biathanatos Donne "explicitly attributed its writing to his own susceptibility to a death-wish" (71) but maintains that Donne "emphasizes not the desire for non-being suggested by Freud, but rather the opportunity which death affords of achieving the transcendence of self in the afterlife" (72). Observes that Donne regards Christ's death as a suicide and discusses how Donne sees death as "encoded in life's drive for perfection" (73). Comments on FirAn, Devotions, and the Holy Sonnets as examples of the early "modern obsession with mutability," "decay," and "impending disintegration" (77).


Points out that in FirAn Donne alludes to the song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32 and shows how the two Anniversaries "reflect the didactic function of Moses' song" and how "they also reflect a Thomistic argument which requires the progression of the argument in a manner reflected by the Anniversaries." Presents a rhetorical examination of Moses' song to show how it "lends insight into the Thomistic imagery Donne uses to juxtapose the terminal condition of the world, as Donne represented it through the example of Drury as his song, and the eternal world of the Christian God's goodness" (134). Maintains that the Anniversaries operate as "documentation" that serves as "the vehicle to understanding God's goodness and, by extension, man's state of alienation from that goodness" and that the readers are encouraged
“to see themselves as dead in this world,” and therefore to strive “to reach the goal of God’s perfection through death” (136). Discusses how the “complex argument in the **Anniversaries** is resolved by the apostrophizing of Drury as a perfect model of God’s goodness and the microcosm of the dead world” (139). Argues that although **FirAn** “generally looks downward in its dissection of the world in an attempt to direct the reader’s thoughts upward,” **SecAn** “focuses almost exclusively on the ascent of thought in both content and structure” (142). Maintains that the tone of **FirAn** “recalls a dirge” but the tone of **SecAn** “rejoices in the re-alization of Drury’s individual ascent and what it symbolized for the whole of seventeenth-century Christianity” (143) and expresses “a sustained examination of the degree of joy to be found beyond earthly existence” (145).


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and poetry (5–14), followed by translations into Polish (with English texts on the opposite page) of 34 selections from the *Songs and Sonnets,* 8 elegies, 10 epigrams, *Satyr,* *Storm,* *Calm,* *Goodf,* the *Holy Sonnets,* *Christ,* *Sickness,* and *Father* (16–197) with notes (200–13). Concludes with a selected bibliography (214–16), an alphabetical list of the English and Polish titles of poems (217–20), and a table of contents (221–255).


Volume 1: In the introduction (13–42), contextualizes Donne’s poetry within the intellectual parameters of the seventeenth century, showing how his poetry reflects the philosophical concerns of his day. Emphasizes Donne’s use of the conceit and compares his poetry to that of Baltasar Gracian. Presents a general introduction to the themes and stylistic characteristics of Donne’s secular and religious poetry. Contains English texts (from A. J. Smith’s edition [1971] with Spanish translations on opposite pages) of the *Songs and Sonnets* ([41]-157), the *Elegies* ([159]–235), the *epitaphia* ([237]–67), the epigrams ([269]–77), the *Satyres* ([279]–325), and 24 cantos of *Metem* (326–47)—with glosses. Vol. 2: Contains English texts with Spanish translations on opposite pages of cantos 25–52 of *Metem* (8–29), the verse epistles ([31]–139), the *Obsequies and Epicedes* ([141]–81), the *Anniversaries* (182–251), and the Divine Poems (252–347)—with glosses.


Briefly examines the syntax of the first stanza of *Canon,* noting how the speaker of the poem “foxily seeks to check the naysayer’s tongue by overwhelming him with his own” and does so by resorting to “the time-honored means of extending one’s speech ad infinitum: the list.” Notes how Donne “primps his list by constantly varying its syntactical order, shuffling the verbs and their objects around,” and by “outstanding chiasmas.” Points out how in the first stanza of the poem Donne “cobbles together his evidence until it reaches a critical mass of irrefutable persuasiveness” in a very “lawyerly” manner (83). Observes also that in Donne’s poetry “the stanza and the sentence are often coterminus” (82).


Maintains that the lady in *Damp* is “very much a Duessa figure in her immorality and her destructive abilities” and that “Donne’s use of italicized personifications in allegorical moral
meanings is modelled on Spenser’s allegorical personae” (219). Sees Damp as a gloss on The Faerie Queene (Book 1, Canto 7, stanzas 6 and 7). Points out how Red Crosse “is redeemed” in Spenser’s epic but that Donne in Damp “rejects redemption” (220).


Reimagines “the early modern woman writer using Donne rather than Shakespeare [as Virginia Woolf did] as a starting point. Surveys the debate over whether or not Anne More was literate and creates an imaginary Judith Donne as a possible model of the woman writer of her time. Suggests that such an approach “not only permits us to consider new ways in which the sites of authorship for women could be reconceived and possibly reconstructed but also suggests that there may be evidence awaiting to be recovered if the right questions were asked of the archives.” Maintains that “the switch from Shakespeare to Donne as a model for the practices of authorship would give us several new ways to consider evidence when searching for early modern women’s texts.” Observes that “by switching to Donne, we are seeking to reconstruct not a commercial world of literature but a social one” and believes that “we need to be looking less for commercial playwrights and poets among women and more for the type of social literary activity practiced by Donne and his male friends and female patrons.” Points out also that, “continuing our focus on a manuscript audience rather than a printed one, Donne’s example reminds us that we should investigate the correspondence networks of Catholic families and look more closely at Catholic women both at home and in the convent” (26). Believes that “the artificial exercise of imagining female life without constant reference to what the men were doing would refresh our investigative imaginations and force us to recognize what we assume about early modern life.” Concludes: “[T]he end goal of such frivolous imaginings is not to assert that my imagined story of Judith Donne is true, but to suggest possibilities for new ways to look at what it means ‘to be an author’ and to permit us to explore the archives for new materials relating to the domestic nature of literary culture as well as commercial and to consider the intersections between religion, technology, and authorship” (26).


Maintains that although Lancelot Andrewes, “the hero of the Anglo-Catholic Library,” and Donne, “the hero of Eng. Lit. 101,” have been consistently “touted as characteristic preachers of the Jacobean age,” recent scholarship “questions their place in the Anglican pantheon” (1–2). Believes that both preachers “have come to occupy a more interesting space, one where their stylish opinions on liturgy and theology were somehow both important and at the same time relegated to the ecclesiastical fringe.” Adds that “[t]his description might most accurately capture the essence of their roles as members of a religious literati” but that, “as a way of understanding early Stuart cultural and political history, it remains unsatisfying” (2). Further maintains that “the place of the sermon in literary studies is too often limited to the contexts of Donne’s metaphysical poetry” (12).


Argues that although there was a “radical cultural transformation” occurring when Donne wrote the Anniversaries and although “anxieties provoked by unresolved epistemological concerns pervade the poems,” they nevertheless “enact a working through of these tensions” (33) and that “the oscillation between theological certitude and conflicting empirical evidence provides the fundamental movement of the poems” (33–34). Maintains that “[f]irm in their faith and solid in their essence, the Anniversaries address the paradoxical relations between substance and accidents” and “upset
the kinds of expectations of formal coherence that modern readers bring to poetry” and rather assert “a formal, doctrinal coherence that is unfamiliar.” Maintains, however, that Donne “habitually flirts with an intellectual curiosity that ravishes dogma” and that, just as his “investigation of the New Science threatens his religious beliefs,” in like manner, “his inquiry into the vicissitudes of print culture challenges his attitude toward books.” Points out that Donne held that “the proliferation of books through mechanical reproduction invites a kind of interpretive chaos” (34) but explains why he was not reluctant to publish the An- 
niversaries. Argues how in the poems Donne regards Elizabeth Drury as “a text homologous to the Bible” and “analogous to heaven” and how he “offers a kind of definition of the act of reading his own poem, sola scriptura” (41). Discusses how the “printed book’s potential for expanded circulation invigorated Donne for the brief period during which he devised and produced the Anniversaries” and that, “[e]xperimenting with print as a mode of publication for verse, Donne assayed its impact on the book as a metaphor for the universe,” thus recreating in the Anniversaries “the traditional metaphors for the forms in which humanity partakes of divinity”(49).


Discusses Triple as a poem that says “a great deal about the significance of performative and musical context, insofar as both contribute to the unfettering of verse that has been ‘tame[d]’ through the repetition of clichéd and conventional Petrarchisms associated with love” (115). Argues that “[m]usic and performance, setting and singing, free verse from staid conventions that minimize and dilute the emotion being expressed.” Points out that in Triple “the poet is thrice foolish in Donne’s ironic context, not only because of his love, his writing of poetry brought on by that love, but because he reminds himself of his suffering by permitting someone to ‘increase’ his love and grief through song.” Notes, however, that “the musical setting and performance of love and grief, ‘delighting many,’ revivifies the tame poetic tradition in which ‘Grief [is] brought to numbers’” (116). Suggests that “[t]he reference may be an oblique nod of the head toward the ayre, whose appearance on the English cultural horizon coincides, not surprisingly, with the date of composition ascribed to the Songs and Sonets.” Maintains, therefore, that Triple “clearly acknowledges a vogue for the setting and performance of verse,” which purges poetry of “its turgid conventionality” and thus lifts “the restrictions of semantic constraint.” Claims that Donne’s poem, “with its sinuous metrical structure, its spurious but engaging scientific images, its playful conceits, and its self-deprecating seriousness, exemplifies how far English verse had come in breaking free from its dependence on outworn continental models” and “marks, however obliquely, the emergence of a poetics that found its voice quite literally in song” (117).


Discusses the emergence and development of the author’s interest in Donne’s biography. Surveys the biographical work of Izaak Walton, Edmund Gosse, Augustus Jessopp, and R. C. Bald. Comments on how Bald’s use of Walton’s essential pattern in writing his biography of Donne rather than accepting Jessopp’s rejection of it “has caused much harm to Donne studies.” Cites, as examples, “three of Walton’s legends given currency and impetus by Bald” that “continue to mislead many critics”: (i) that “even when dealing with Donne’s early life, all we really need to know about his Catholic lineage, formation, and continuing associations is
that he rejected them”; (2) that Donne “chose during his early twenties … to reinvent himself as a Protestant” (46); and (3) that Donne’s ministry in the Church of England was “primarily a result of personal, professional, or spiritual development, rather than an engagement with the political and theological conflicts that had both torn and shaped his and his compatriots’ lives” (46–47). Points out, however, that although “praising Walton’s Life and making it his pattern, Bald at the same time undermined and refuted Walton’s central theme: namely, that by the grace of God Donne came to exemplify the best of pieties, that of the Church of England.” Says that, to the contrary, Bald regarded Donne as “an opportunist who used ‘the arts of the courtier’ without much success until he finally turned to climb the social ladder of ecclesiastical hierarchy” (48), a view that remains dominant today, as seen in the biographical work of John Carey and Paul M. Oliver. Argues that “we should not rest content with legend and spin when facts are available” and insists that “many facts up to now unnoticed by Donne scholars are available” (49), such as the Loseley Manuscripts in the Surrey Historical Centre, the funeral monuments in the More chapel at St. Nicholas Church in Guildford, and the Surrey Archaeological Collections.


In Portuguese. Presents a critical survey of Brazilian criticism and scholarship on Donne. Concludes that although Donne has been increasingly recognized as a major literary figure since the 1960s, much of the work remains at the level of large generalizations taken mostly from non-Brazilian scholars rather than being original critical and scholarly investigation based on a close reading of the texts.


Discusses Donne’s “spatial imagination: its cosmographic assumptions, and its many contradictions—between old and new ways of imagining the cosmos, between cosmographic and cartographic ways of imagining the world, and between his spatial imagination itself and his narrative voice.” Points out that Donne was less interested in the appearance of space than in its shape and notes that “he used the same shapes over and over again in his poetry and prose, as if they formed a kind of language for thinking about relationships; as if he had a spatial apprehension of a thought… and imagined a relationship’s intangible configurations of power, passivity, privacy, and fusion in spatial terms, as shapes.” Observes that, for Donne, space was “material, forceful, meaningful, full, and arranged into concentric circles.” Shows how this traditional interpretation of space “formed the background to his spatial imagination” and allowed him “to imagine metaphysical relationships in spatial terms; in terms of the sphere, circle, centre, circumference and set of concentric circles that gave shape in the closed cosmos, where space took shape and meaning from the forms that filled it.” Discusses how the New Philosophy brought uncertainty about the older notions of the cosmos and how Donne’s poetry “plays upon the uncertainties of the time” as well as “his own uncertainties: his radical changes of perspective, his radical juxtapositions of different perspectives, his balancing of possibilities.” Maintains that fundamentally Donne “chooses the philosophy that illustrates what he wants to say” but that “he fits both philosophies and both relationships onto that one image of a circle and its centre, and the arrangements of relations that it represents in spatial terms.” Illustrates Donne’s uses of space by commenting on the prose letters, *Ignatius*. 
FirAn, Devotions, Corona, Goodf, the Elegies, and several of the Songs and Sonets, pointing out how Donne’s poetry “presents the conflict between love and time in the conflict between spatial imagery and his narrative style.”


Maintaining that poetry is the prerogative of the young, who passionately revolt against the dissatisfactions of this world and develop a sense of wonder that remains with them in later years, presents a study of two of his favorite English poets, Donne and Coleridge. Discusses from the non-specialist’s point of view, Donne’s social, intellectual, and religious background, focusing particularly on his psychological and religious sensibilities. Shows particular interest in the struggle Donne had in rejecting his Catholic heritage and in deciding finally to enter the Anglican priesthood. Admires Donne as a very human person of deep faith, who in later life became increasingly indifferent to worldly honors and fame.

Reviews:


Points out that in the seventeenth century “poetry distanced itself from actual funeral ritual” and that “imaginary ceremonies represented in elegy became fragmentary or deformed.” Maintains that the Anniversaries “begin with public occasions but veer into private anxieties which obstruct the completion of the poet’s ceremonial obligation” and thus reflect “the emergence of the modern distinction between public and private” (77). Observes that, “[a]s the ceremonial forms that had bound the community together began to seem hollow, poets had to work harder to justify their participation in the mourning of strangers” and that, in order “[t]o write credible poems, they had to connect public occasions to private and authentic sources of emotion within themselves.” Maintains that in the Anniversaries the result was “an effacement of the poet’s original charter” and in writing about the death of a stranger, he “found himself obsessively imagining his own death.” Claims that in these poems “elegy pulls hard against its connection to funeral ritual and to the consolation of a group of mourners” and that “the ceremonies represented in the poems are imaginary, internalized, and truncated or deformed by the pressure of the poets’ personal anxieties.” Maintains, therefore, that “the poems begin with a public occasion but become locked in a private melancholy” (86). Shows how in the Anniversaries “the private imperatives master and distort the imaginary ceremony” (93) and how Donne’s consolation in the poems, “like his melancholy, is essentially private” (93–94).


Discusses how the addition of Lanyer’s Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum to the canon “might change the way we read other more familiar poets so as to recreate a narrative of our literary history in its relation to the present” and briefly reflects upon “what that revision or reconstruction of the familiar might generally indicate about the sort of knowledge literary history affords.” In order to illustrate “the potential power of Lanyer’s work as an intervention in the present construction of a literary historical narrative,” contrasts it with the Anniversaries, a poem in which Donne “laments the contemporary reduction of the world to its ‘atomies’ by the death of Elizabeth Drury, a young girl he never met and whose most salient feature in the poem is her indiscernible as an individual” (129). Maintains that Donne “produces Woman as idea, or concept, while silently erasing the relations of actually existing mothers, daughters, and sisters, which would tend in every case to disable the concept by making it more concrete.” Points out how “Donne’s substitution of the ‘idea of
a woman’ for the material existence of the girl whose death he commemorates shifts the focus of the poem from the loss of Elizabeth Drury, the daughter he has been commissioned to memorialize, to the failure of the cosmic order as traditionally represented” (130).


Presents a reading of the Anniversaries, “supported by readings of two philosophically related poems,” Air and Noct, and argues that “these poems treat a timely tendency to forgo metaphysics—the futility of which they metaphysically explore—in favor of epistemology, that is, to shift the focus from the world to be known to the knowledge of the world.” Seeks “the rhetorical ground on which the distinction between style and content becomes obscure, and the style itself becomes metaphysical.” Says that “in calling these poems metaphysical,” he wishes “to push past the critical tradition, almost as old as the poems themselves, that uses the term to refer to a set of stylistic affectations (e.g., the conceit, argumentative tone and form, appropriation of esoteric scientific, alchemical, and Scholastic vocabularies, use of the unexpected comparison)” and “to consider the poems as instruments of a serious philosophical inquiry” and “to seek the rhetorical ground on which the distinction between style and content becomes obscure, and style itself becomes metaphysical in the strong sense.” Maintains that “[t]his ground, which is in a given historical moment more or less conscious of the ways in which rhetoric configures being, constitutes the metaphysics of Donne's metaphysical style, the use of style as a primary mode of philosophical elaboration.”

Argues that “to understand the philosophical content of these poems—at the level on which that content is deployed as rhetoric—is also necessarily to historicize them.” Holds further that “to understand the ways in which they are at once metaphysical and historical is to bring to bear a properly mediated understanding of the extrinsic pressures of material history on the intrinsic development of intellectual history at the end of the sixteenth century.” Maintains that “[s]uch an understanding will help us achieve an exemplary aim and a general one: to step outside the fallacious dichotomy that has reinscribed the poet’s retrospective and expedient disjunction of Jack Donne and Doctor Donne as a disjunction of a ludic, conventional, masking Donne and an ambitious, neurotic, obsessive Donne, and, procedurally, to step outside the dichotomy that has needlessly separated material and intellectual historiography into an extrinsic determinism and an intrinsic idealism” (165). Reads the Anniversaries literally, i.e., as “the diagnostic postmortem of a dead world and a contemplation of the soul’s progress to a better one,” thus allowing the themes to “include a philosophically serious account of a dislocated subjectivity in the garden of epideictic verse” (165–66). Argues that to say that the poems “record the substitution of an epistemological meditation for a thwarted metaphysical meditation is to say that they are thematically aware of an inability to accommodate in a single metaphysics the universe and the subject who knows it” and that to say that “the style they deploy is irreducible to, yet inseparable from, the thematic statement which they encompass is to refuse the displacement of the ideal object intrinsic to the poems by the extrinsic circumstances that stand in a determined relation to it.” Maintains that “[t]he details of Anniversaries tell something of the story of the historical moment in which their dislocated subjectivity, always in excess of its own knowledge, begins to be established as a rhetorical norm” and that “[t]he self produced by the rhetorical configuration that emerges from their confrontation with 'new philosophy' speaks as an inward stranger.” Says that in the Anniversaries Donne “tracks the production of the self constituted specifically as difference, as that which is not (and cannot be) represented adequately, and offers an intellectual historical retrospective of some of the material conditions that underlie its appearance” and that “[t]his self appears precisely in the
space opened by the failure of metaphysics that Donne's poems metaphysically identify.” Discusses how FirAn is “a mimesis, an imitation of the world that is passing” whereas SecAn is “a noesis, an insight into the life of the world to come” and that the relationship between the two poems “parallels that between species and genus, imitation and understanding, in the analogy of microcosm and macrocosm.” Maintains, furthermore, that the “movement from representation” in FirAn to “contemplation” in SecAn “may be understood as a movement inward that is also a fall from metaphysical ontology into the beginnings of a critical epistemology.” States that contemplation for Donne “ultimately situates the object inside the self, possessing it as one's own knowledge” (166). Holds that “to understand how it comes about that this rejection of being in favor of knowing gives rise to both the historical method and the epistemological-subjective tradition around which history formed” (166–67).


Compares and contrasts Donne’s partial triumph over the finality of death as he controls the details of his last days with how Tennyson in In Memoriam portrays himself as dead by “structuring death as a temporary condition, to be wished into being, and also assuring a continuity of earthly companionships into the next life” (2). Notes how Walton’s “description of Donne’s death portrays it as a triumph of the will over fate, and as a kind of extension of the self beyond death.” Observes that in Tennyson “[t]he combination of an interest in survival beyond the grave with a fascinated dwelling on the fate of physical remains” is similar to Donne’s “sensibility regarding death” (4). Points out how in his sermon for Lady Danvers Donne “enthusiastically contemplates the possibility of magical, instantaneous transformation into another state of being” and “rescues Lady Danvers’ body from the process of decomposition by envisaging its future reconstitution” (5).


Contains references throughout to Donne's poetry, noting his uses of rhyme and unusual imagery and his intellectual brilliance. Reproduces GoodM and comments briefly on the poem (175–76), noting how its “intellectual content causes no decrease of passion” but rather “makes the passion more inclusive and convincing” (175).


Discusses how Aemilia Lanyer “presents homoerotic affection as a way for women to overcome the ravages of men’s proprietary claims and as a positive ground for real-world communities” (167). Briefly comments on Sappho as a help to “broaden understanding of early modern homoeroticism” and to “clarify the originality” of Lanyer’s poetry (169). Suggests that Lanyer’s “vision of an ideal female community, is like that of Donne’s Sappho, predicated on mutuality” (173).


Considers “what has been excluded, or ‘abjected,’ in order to arrive at the narrative coherence of Donne as both subject and object of critical representation.” Focuses on ElComp, which “provides a negative picture of signification and authorial control that serves as a powerful antidote to the self-propagating mythology” surrounding Cleanth Brooks’s reading of Canon. Maintains that “[t]he conflicting strategies of the narrative voice[s]” in ElComp, “when confronted with the breakdown of boundaries between the clean and unclean, are mirrored by
criticism’s conflicted appropriation of Donne as a canonical poet.” Argues that ElComp “suggests its own methods of reading the Levitical underpinnings of critical and editorial practice, in particular the idealization of the ‘authorial’ text” (142).


Maintains that “tropes of pornography thread themselves through the verbal landscape” of Donne’s poems, “broaching not only the thematic gully” between “lusty seduction and Christian piety but also the philosophical seas separating the notions of ‘nature’ and culture.” Discusses ElBed and HSBatter to illustrate “the pervasiveness of pornographic imagery over the course of Donne’s transformation from a rake to deacon,” noting how the theology in both poems “grounds itself in the pornographic image of rape” (70). Points out that the central image in ElBed is that of striptease, “a defining characteristic of pornography and the oppression it purports,” (71) and comments on the “language of colonial conquest and sexual lust” in the poem and how the presence of religious imagery in the poem “perhaps counterintuitively complements the pornographic imagery” (72). Claims that in HSBatter “[t]he shared metaphorical realm of pornographic sex, religion, and the colonization of new and mysterious lands is illustrated even more strikingly” (72–73), noting how the speaker in the sonnet, unlike the speaker in ElBed, “does not cast himself as a possessor, humiliator, and colonizer” but rather “assumes the role of the ‘woman’ in the pornographic model” (73). Points out, however, that, for Donne, pornography “may not be so much a dangerous psychological state as a trope which he knows makes for provocative poetry.” Concludes that, “[w]ithin the context of pornography, Donne moves from romance to rape, from cavalier philanderer to devout evangelist, from wild nature to viceroy of culture—always playing off the disparate relations of power inherent in pornography to his poetic, witty or not, advantage” (76).


In Korean. Argues that Donne’s poetry reflects aspects of mannerist painting, “exploiting its character, tones and devices” in order to establish its “own metaphysical gesture.” Maintains that his poems, like mannerist paintings, negate actuality and withdraw into the inner self as “the real world loses its meaning” and that they evidence “spiritual agony and self-torture” in the person’s struggle to resolve “the tensions and the contradictions” in attempting “to achieve salvation.” Notes that this struggle demands “troubled introspection and near-despair” and that, therefore, there is a great deal of psychological turmoil in Donne’s mannerist poses. Says that Donne’s mannerist “images of the self” come from “his lifelong effort to turn his attention upon an interior image, a disegno interno, rather than the outer reality.” Claims that Donne succeeds in unifying “a disegno interno and esterno to create the final artistic expression” of both “inner” and “outer emotions” (160).


Maintains that critical discussions of Donne’s conversion from Petrarchism, “at least in reference to his devotional poetry, are greatly exaggerated.” Discusses how Donne overtly uses Petrarchism in HSWat to pray for and simultaneously prevent, or at least defer indefinitely, his commitment to a loving relationship to God” (140) and shows how it is “specifically as Petrarchan devotional poetry” that the sonnet “achieves Donne’s poetic and spiritual purposes” (143). Argues that in the sonnet Donne “chooses Petrarchan rhetoric because it allows
him to assume an attitude of devotion, to ask for God's judgment, to offer praise and prayer in fear and trembling, but never bring himself over the threshold of change" (144). Discusses how in his devotional sonnets Donne "displays the same contradictory desire and reluctance to come to closure as Petrarch in the Rime Sparse (150), citing the first sonnet in Corona as an example, and discusses how in HS Bat ter he adopts for his own purposes Petrarch's "agonized immobility in the face of death and judgment" (154) and "the deliberate failure of Petrarch's praise to seduce the object of his devotion" (155). Insists that although Donne's "repeated renunciations of his role as a Petrarchan poet have been understood as evidence that his life exemplifies an Augustinian conversion," the evidence of the Holy Sonnets suggests rather his "embattled inertia" before his conversion. Concludes that "when Donne most strenuously turns away from conventional Petrarchan objects of praise in order to adore God, he employs quintessentially Petrarchan rhetoric" (157) and that this stance, "whether at the feet of a woman or in the face of God, makes the kind of conversion that is usually claimed by and for Donne impossible for the first person subject of his devotional lyrics." Claims, therefore, that Donne "renounces his secular, generic Petrarchan role to signal a conversion which never occurs in his divine poems, the most truly, specifically Petrarchan works in his oeuvre" (157–58).


Examines "the implications of the many images of cremation" in English Renaissance literature and argues that "ashes and urns assumed philosophical importance in the period, that they served as metaphors for the rediscovery of antiquity, and that they framed a shared understanding of Renaissance humanism" (4). Points out Donne's "fascination with the relationship of body and soul—and with the 'crudities' of the corrupted body"—throughout his prose and poetry, in his sermons and in the Anniversaries, especially in FirAn. Comments on Donne's view of indissoluble atoms, citing Me tem as an example, a poem in which Donne "explores with comic results the Pythagorean notion of an essential being independent of the body" (6). Notes that in Canon Donne concludes that "it is every bit as good to burn as to be buried in a good cause." Points out that "the argument is radical and counter-cultural" and that "the burning is metaphorical, sexual" (8). Observes that Donne, like Sir Thomas Browne, seems to have had "a concept of the Renais-
sance as being a renascence two hundred years before such a notion was to have currency” (13) and claims that for both “cremation offered a fully developed view of the Renaissance as a revivification of antiquity symbolically out of the ashes of burial urns” (17).

249. Levy-Navarro, Elena. “‘Goe forth ye daughters of Sion’: Divine Authority, the King, and the Church in Donne’s Denmark House Sermon.” JDJ 17: 163–73.

Argues that in his Denmark House sermon, given on 26 April 1625, a few days before James I’s burial, Donne “rewrites history so that the audience understands that true divine authority and power is to be found in the Church rather than in the King” and that thereby he “proves to be more interested in the well being of the Church of England than in the well being of the monarchy” (163). Points out that Donne reminds his audience that “the Church of England remains viable and important regardless of which monarch is the current temporal head” and assures them that “the Church will remain intact because Christ, rather than James, is and was always the ‘head’ of the Church.” Maintains that thus Donne “dismantles the Jacobean absolutist model of kingship by applying it to Christ” and “implies that no King can usurp the authority properly invested in Christ as the true ‘head’ of the Church” (165). Points out how in the sermon Donne “strategically deflates James’s absolutist model of kingship,” “shores up the authority of the Church of England” (169), and “uses James as a reminder to the audience of their membership in the Church of God” (171).


Points out that in Renaissance England, “expansion of the epistemological and geographical domains leads to the construction of a self and subjectivity riddled through with exhilaration and terror” and that “[a] sense of relentless urgency predominates, expressed through the terrifying need to outstrip time and the fracturing of existing societal and theological structures” (64). Observes also that “[u]nsettling expansions of this kind also lead to the crystallization of new metaphors used to describe and construct subjectivity” and cites Donne as “one poet in the English Renaissance who effects this memorably” (64–65). Says that Donne gives to the reader “a self launched excitedly into space and time.” Comments on Donne’s uses of metaphors of the sea and travel; of maps, cartography, and cartographers; and of colonizing and conquering new worlds. Discusses, in particular, Donne’s figuration of the New World as the female body as reflecting the politics of colonial expansion, commenting especially on ElBed and ElProg. Discusses how Donne’s interest in the New World is found in his sermons and other religious writings, “where metaphors of travel and navigation frequently appear” (76). Particularly focuses on Donne’s sermon to the Virginia Company (13 November 1622) to show how the New World “occupies a central place” in Donne’s “creative imagination and theological understanding” (72). Points out that in the sermon Donne stresses “the important need to bring the gospel to the natives of the New World” (73) and shows how his “interest in the sea controls the polemic thrust of his sermon” (74). Observes, however, that in addition to invoking “the missionary mandate to extend English authority and territory into the New World, Donne also makes use of an understanding in medieval concepts of Natural Law, where uninhabited territories become the possession of the first nation to discover them” as well as expressing other “rationalizing and legitimating pretexts” for territorial expansion (78). Sees in Donne “a vision of theological imperialism that, despite its ostensible disavowal of physical violence, nevertheless uses the language of transformation and cultural appropriation” (84). Constrasts and compares Donne’s view with that of Samuel Purchas, who in 1625 published “Vir-
ginia Verger, “a discourse of theological imperialism” that argues for “displacing the Amer-
indians from their land and for Christianizing Virginia” (86–87).

251. Lindenberger, Herbert. “Monteverdi, Caravaggi,
Donne: Modernity and Early Baroque,” in Opera

Points out that the careers and the later recep-
tion of Donne and Caravaggio “parallel” those of Monteverdi “in surprisingly similar ways.”
Notes that each was “immensely famous in his time”; each “developed a distinctly new and
identifiable style” that “situated itself against an earlier, more ‘idealizing’ mode”; each “created
what we view today as a distinctly dramatic,
even theatrical form of representation”; each “was charged with being ‘harsh’ or ‘rough’ both
in his own time and in subsequent centuries”; each “exerted so strong an imprint on his fol-
lowers that he left a decisive mark on the history of his particular art form”; and each “suffered a
period of neglect lasting centuries,” after which each “emerged as one of the founding heroes of
modernism” (20). Traces Donne’s fluctuating
critical reception and compares and contrasts it with that of Caravaggio and Monteverdi,
pointing out that Donne and Caravaggio, un-
like Monteverdi, became “thoroughly institu-
tionalized by the mid-twentieth century” (44).


Argues that seeing HSBatter and its meta-
phor of ravishment “in its specific historical
context—and not simply as an example of the
metaphysical conceit in extremis, an Ignatian
spiritual exercise, or a window to Donne’s sub-
conscious—will … restore something of its
original impact” and “will show that the terms
of its imagery are at once more complex and
more socially constructed than Donne criti-
cism has generally assumed.” Maintains that
although the Augustinian trope of the ravish-
ment of the soul was prevalent and familiar to
seventeenth-century readers, Donne’s sonnet
also “speaks, with power and subtlety, to the le-
gal condition of women in Donne’s England by
playing off the ravishment of forced marriage
against that of consensual abduction against
that of carnal rape in a context which invokes
at once the captivity of women as chattel and
the ecstatic captivity of religious rapture” (75).
Discusses the history and development of rape
laws in England and shows how the language of
Donne’s poem reflects the “tangled history of
the concept of ravishment, its definitions and
penalties” (77). Maintains that the rape meta-
phor “enables Donne to glance at the claims
of feminine love and at the subjugation of the
female to unsought possession as a normative
social state” (83–84).

Brodsky’s Bol’shaia Elegiia Dzhonu Donnu.” RusR
57: 424–46.

Argues that Donne’s influence on Joseph Brod-
sky’s work “develops over the years” and that “it
is greatly altered because it interacts increas-
ingly with the influence of Søren Kierkegaard
and Lev Shestov’s existentialism” (424). Pres-
ents a critical analysis of Brodsky’s poetical
tribute to Donne, “Bol’shaia elegiiia Dzhonu
Donnu” (1963), showing, in particular, how
the Russian poem is “a reworking of some of
the central themes” in Donne’s poetry (442).
Maintains that “[t]he influences of Donne and
existentialism run parallel [in Brodsky’s work]
until 1972” and that “in this year they operate
together to project the poet into an experience
that is like both Kierkegaard’s religious stage
and the post-Donnean religious art of the Ba-
roque” (443). Concludes that “Donne left Brod-
sky with a way of thinking, a type of cognitive
dualism which orders the way the Russian poet
experiences the unfinished task of completing
the Existentialists’ three stages with a resigna-
tion to the religious stage” (444–45).

254. Makurenkova, Svetlana. “Intertextual Cor-
respondences: The Pastoral in Marlowe, Raleigh,
Shakespeare, and Donne,” in Russian Essays on
Discusses how Marlowe’s “The Passionate Shepherd to His Love” was answered and parodied by Raleigh, an anonymous author in Englands Helicon, Shakespeare in The Merry Wives of Windsor, and Donne in Bait. Compares and contrasts Donne’s poem with those of the others and claims that such a comparison “with the original lines all together with the conceptions of Raleigh, Shakespeare, and the anonym provides the opportunity to sound the character of Donne’s poetics” (196). Maintains that, in general, Bait “is written in the European tradition of love poetry that reached a climax in the sonnet form of the English poetry of the late-sixteenth century” but that, “as an original craftsman, Donne escapes strict domination of the genre.” Shows how the poem is composed of “an extended metaphor with its own particular scale” and how “[t]he poetic pattern of Donne’s verse constitutes an opposition to the plain logic of Marlowe’s poem with its sequential development of imagery and thought” (199).


Comments on Donne’s relationship with the Herbert coterie in an essay that argues that George Herbert’s religious lyrics “did not originate as private meditations but as entries into the poetic debates that characterized his family circle,” as seen most clearly in numerous “answer-poems” (205). Points out how William Herbert’s “Soules Joy” is a “musical, simpler version” of Donne’s ValMourn (211), noting that “originality was not the goal for these writers, but rather skillful wit and sophisticated argument” (212). Maintains that Ecst, like Edward Herbert’s “Ode upon a Question Moved,” is a response to Sidney’s Astrophil and Stella (Song 8). Points out the influence of Metem on Edward Herbert’s “State-Progress of Ill” and observes how Donne and Edward Herbert “exchanged and answered each other’s poems regularly.” Points out how Donne’s love poems reflect the on-going debate concerning sacred and secular verse, noting how he “argues for love in one poem and against it in the next” and how in his religious poetry he “compares love for his mistress and for God” (212). Comments briefly on ElAut, traditionally considered addressed to Magdalen Herbert, and on GHerb and Herbert’s reply. Notes that the exchange of verses between Donne and George Herbert “reveals that religious poetry was as appropriate in coterie performance as secular verse” (215).


Argues that “[a]n accurate assessment of Donne’s attitude towards the memory is essential for understanding the epistemology of the sermons.” Points out that, although memory “is the faculty through which Donne hopes to teach his congregation,” he regards it, like the will and understanding, as “subject to decay” (99–100). Maintains, therefore, that “the sinful, feeble memory is for Donne both the means by which we come to God and an obstacle in the way of such knowledge” but that it “must be engaged and engaged accurately in order for man to come to a saving knowledge of God,” which is basic to his “Thomistic epistemological framework.” Points out, however, that Donne’s sermons make clear that he believes that the memory is “seriously marred by the fall” (106). Discusses how Donne “attempts to counter the frailties of memory in a number of ways” (102), such as “dividing his sermons into manageable parts” and especially by “his adaptation of the classic mnemonic device loci et imagines” (103). Discusses how, “[a]s counterbalances to the tainted, weakened condition of the memory, the loci become in Donne’s hands tools of sanctification for fallen humanity” (106).
257. ––––. “Teaching Donne’s Devotions Through the Literature of AIDS.” SMART 6, no. 1: 51–66.

Explains that in order to arouse student interest in Devotions, she assigned various selections from AIDS literature to be read concurrently with Donne’s work and that, as a result, the students found Devotions “more meaningful, relevant, and worth their effort” (51). Presents the results of an informal survey of teachers and students to determine “the efficacy of using paired readings” in teaching the Devotions (52) and to determine what goals and difficulties teachers had in presenting Donne’s prose work. Explains her pedagogical approach in the classroom and the success of the project. Maintains that “exactly why the AIDS literature makes the seventeenth century world view clearer or how the discussion of modern psychological concepts illuminates the seventeenth-century understanding of self and soul is not altogether clear” but that “somehow reading the literature of AIDS does help modern students consider Donne’s views of morality and mortality more deeply.” Claims that, “in fact, the converse is also true, that is, Donne’s Devotions can illuminate the literature of AIDS and help students clarify and reconsider their own assumptions about the human condition” (64).


Contains brief references to Donne’s sermons and his preaching. Discusses in some detail, however, his sermon preached to Queen Anne at Denmark House on 14 December 1617, in which Donne hoped to inspire the Queen “to move from outward conformity to full communion” with the Church of England. Points out how in the sermon Donne attacks, both obliquely and directly, “institutional and covert Catholicism” (179); argues that the Queen’s covert Catholicism is “a threat” to her soul; and urges her to return to the faith of her birth and baptism (182).


Using the critical approach of Luce Irigaray, presents a feminist reading of some of Donne’s “constructions of gender” (1), exploring principally the early verse letters, Sappho, EpLin, a wedding sermon, and the Anniversaries. In “Introduction” (1–23), states that the purpose of this study is to “analyze the function of the feminine” in Donne’s “gender constructions”; surveys recent feminist criticism of Donne, indicating how this study builds upon and differs from it; uses three excerpts from Donne’s poems to show how they work against “received notions of gender in the Renaissance” and reveal “Donne’s readiness to question even ontological categories” (9); and maintains that “an assessment of just how Donne is situated in relation to Renaissance discourses of gender will aid in a much needed reassessment of his whole canon” (23). In Chapter 1, “Donne’s Domestic Muse: Engendering Poetry in the Early Verse Letters” (24–84), explores Donne’s relationship with his Muse in the early verse letters and argues that this is “fundamental and at least latently gendered.” Discusses how these poems reflect “how the young Donne and the friends to whom he exchanged poems imagined the engendering of poetry.” In Chapter 2, “The Desire for the Proximate: Lesbian ‘Likennesse’ in Sapho to Philaenis” (85–138), comments on this, often ignored, “first lesbian love poem in the English language” and explores how it changes “our sense of Donne” in the Elegies and the Songs and Sonets as “the poet of ‘masculine persuasive force.’” In Chapter 3, “The Mother in the Hungry Grave: Marriage, Murder, and the Maternal” (139–99), discusses EpLin and Donne’s wedding sermon on Gen. 2:24 and sees “a common foundation” in the way each “represents and defines the marriage relationship” and how each owes an “unacknowledged debt to the maternal feminine” (6). In Chapter 4,
“He Sings the Body Electrum: Re-membering Elizabeth Drury” (200–40), explores questions that arise when one compares “the domestication or the making ordinary of mythical figures of the feminine such as the Muse with the inversely proportional apotheosis of a young female contemporary of Donne.” Traces Elizabeth Drury’s “sexual-/textualization from her epitaph where she is described as ‘sine sexu’, or sexless,” through to SecAn, “where she is described as a double-sided scroll and addressed as the ‘father’ of Donne’s poems, metaphorically inseminating his Muse” (7). In “Coda” (238–40), concludes that “[t]here are certainly grounds for extending Donne’s reputation for originality and iconoclasm to his construction of gender, especially in his exploration of lesbian love, his evocations of mutual love between men and women, and the fluidity of gender boundaries in poems such as the early verse letters” (238). Claims that “Donne’s significance for constructing new paradigms” lies in a kind of a “incomprehensibleness” which keeps us constantly wondering” and that “Irigaray’s notion of style allows us one way of coming to terms with Donne’s work as a whole so as to view its difficulty neither as a failure of the artist nor as a failure of interpretation on our part” (239). Contains a selected bibliography (241–66) and an index (267–73).

Reviews:


Points out that Donne did little titling of his poems and that most titles were given by the editors of the 1633 and 1635 editions. Says that the titles are “a sort of stamp marking the poems’ entry into the public world” (203).


Presents an introduction to HSDeath for students that includes a brief biography of Donne; the text of the poem; a summary or paraphrase of the sonnet; a discussion of its themes, style, and historical context; suggestions for further study of the sonnet; and a critical overview of the poem, which includes an original essay by Joanne Woolway (108–10), which is entered separately in this bibliography, and a reprint of Roberta J. Albrecht’s “Montage, Mise en Scène, and Miserable Acting: Feminist Discourse in Donne’s ‘Holy Sonnet X’,” ELN 29 (1992): 23–31 (110–14). (See Roberts 3).


Briefly sketches Donne’s place within Jacobean conformity. Maintains that the Devotions in its “concern for the ordinances and its anti-Puritan jabs are best located within a basically Calvinist contented conformity” and that this context “allows us to reconcile Donne’s anti-Puritanism with the Augustinian theology and the use of the self as spiritual exemplar” (116) found in the work. Calls Devotions “holy soliloquy” since “meditation is too broad and diverse a category” (118) and compares Devotions with Sir John Hayward’s Sancturarie of a Troubled Soule (1601) to show how Donne’s work “participates in that genre” (121) while, at the same time, transforming it. Maintains that the advantage of classifying Devotions as “holy soliloquy” is that such a classification “attends to his piety, or style of religiosity, rather than to theology or ecclesiology alone.” Holds that Donne’s “devotional style is anti-systematic, expressive, and associative” and that “he chose a genre in which he confessed before others his ongoing (and non-Arminian) sense of simultaneous sin and Grace, thereby ignoring questions about God’s decrees that he found over-curious and harmful to faith, and resisting the Puritan drift toward a privatized
self-examination at the same time that he rejected an anti-Calvinist distaste for intense self-examination.” Concludes that “[f]amiliarity with the devotional context makes it clear that Donne adopted a ‘contented conformist’ genre, and adapted it to heighten its effectiveness as a model of Protestant devotion neither Puritan nor Arminian but true to the moderate, essentially Calvinist piety of the church as established” and that “[t]his choice provides us with a strong indication of the context in which to read Donne’s statements about the means and ordinances, or Puritans, or soteriology, and makes it clear that we need to focus renewed scholarly attention on conformity as the forgotten middle” (129).


Analyzes the argument of Biathanatos to show how Donne’s defense of conditional suicide is based on natural law, reason, and divine law and maintains that his goal is to persuade the reader to be tolerant of and to show sympathy for those who commit suicide. Points out that Donne holds that suicide is allowable only if it honors God and maintains that in some cases it can become a duty, citing the death of Jesus as the most famous suicide of all time.


Discusses how Dorothy Sayers uses literary allusions to Donne in her novels, “showing us, without seeming to do so, what is going on beneath the surface.” Points out that Sayers is attracted to Donne primarily because his best love poems “deal with the perfect balance and combination of the body, the soul, and the intellect” and thus show “the same reluctance” as Sayers “to be forced to choose between them” (18). Maintains that, like Donne, the main theme of Sayers’s work is “the fundamental importance of intellectual and emotional integrity if you want to be all you were meant to be, both in your personal life and in your work.” Discusses, in particular, Sayers’s use of Eclog in Busman’s Honeymoon to show how she used Donne “to convey a certain feeling, that is the ecstasy of the ‘marriage of true minds,’ hearts and bodies” (20) but also notes her use of the Songs and Sonnets. Observes that, because of the differences in their religious temperaments, Sayers never alludes to Donne’s Divine Poems and that her religious writings contain very few “echoes of Donne.” Notes that Sayers “found Dante the perfect guide in religious matters” and “left Donne behind, at least in her work.” Concludes that both writers “have an unusual knack of making the reader feel on top of the world, drunk on life, love, words, without hardly ever being sloppy or sentimental” and both have the ability “to combine both heart and brain” (23).


Says that in her review of Howard Jacobson’s novel No More Mr. Nice Guy (TLS 24 April) Germaine Greer makes “perhaps the most absurd slur” ever on Donne. Notes that “[a]fter a wholly unbalanced use of Donne’s work came this: ‘… Donne watched his wife Elizabeth suffer and die five days after the still-birth of her eleventh child, knowing that it was his unspiring lust that had destroyed her.’” Maintains that “[a]part from the fact that Donne’s wife was called Ann, Ms. Greer’s review betrays as little understanding of his love poetry as it does of heterosexual marriage” and states that apparently she “has no conception that some men and women may choose to copulate and create a family out of love, rather than lust.”

Analyzes “those things, objects, which attract Donne's attention as enclosed, self-contained spaces representing a reality he seeks to perpetuate” (123). Concentrates on images found in some of his most popular love poems. Comments specifically on the flea in Flea, graves and tombs in Relic, the room and bed in SunRis, the tear and coin in ValWeep, the book in ValBook, and the sonnet in Canon. Maintains that, for Donne, “[d]efined, self-contained spaces” are “all primary elements of his poetic imagination” and are “meeting points of the material and immaterial, of the imagined world and the real one,” resolving “the tension between microcosmic/macrocosmic realities” (127).


Examines the numerous connections between Huygens’s translation of Goodf and Rembrandt’s The Raising of the Cross and The Descent from the Cross. Focuses on three major concepts in Donne’s poem: (1) “the dilemma of the westward rider’s self-imposed separation from the Crucifixion,” (2) “the speaker’s attempt to come to terms with the confounding nature of Christ’s sacrifice through the use of paradox,” and (3) “the rider’s hope for reconciliation with Christ” (93) and points out how Rembrandt incorporates them into his paintings. While acknowledging that Donne’s poem does not entirely explain “the profundity” of Rembrandt’s paintings and while insisting that there is not “a one-on-one relationship between every detail of these pictures and every line” in Goodf, claims that “the evidence is strong that Rembrandt was influenced by the poem” and finds the “most compelling points of comparison” in the “treatment of the figures of the Centurion, Christ, and Mary, as well as the dramatic way Rembrandt used contrast and paradox in the juxtaposition of The Raising and The Descent” (101).


Comments on Donne’s relationship with and influence on members of the Herbert family. Points out that Donne visited the Danvers House in Chelsea, “corresponded with members of the Herbert and Danvers families, wrote verses for Magdalen Herbert, exchanged verses with George and Edward Herbert, preached Magdalen’s funeral sermon” (2–3), and perhaps was an influence on Captain Thomas Herbert’s poem “The Storme … from Plimmouth.”


Discusses the Reformation notion that divine truth is “embodied” in the written word, thereby suggesting that there is “something profoundly spiritual about the nature of language.” Explores this concept in order to show “how religious doctrine is reflected in language and in turn how language itself is seen in the light of religious doctrine” (49). Focuses primarily on the Eucharist, which both Catholics and Anglicans viewed as “the primary example of the Divine Word,” and shows how the debate on the Eucharist is relevant in understanding Donne’s “discourse theory” (51). Comments on the relationship between Donne’s understanding of the concept of the “real presence” in the Eucharist and his concept of the nature of language. Maintains that throughout his sermons one of Donne’s primary goals is “the development of a rhetoric or concept of language which would allow for the discussion of God, a conception of language (or logology) which would take into consideration God’s creative power and ‘ineffability.’” Notes that Donne regarded “the study of the divine as in some way a study of language” and points out that he recognized that “literal language is limited in its ability to represent things spiritual” (54) and also that “metaphoric language will always be a form of mimesis, not a reality in and of itself” (57). Compares and contrasts Donne’s view of the “real presence” with that of the French Protestant Pierre Du Moulin in his treatise entitled An Apology for
the Holy Supper (translated into English by Edward Skipwith in 1612). Notes how Du Moulin “develops an understanding of language which sees words as words, not reflective of anything outside themselves” (59) whereas for Donne “signs are both res and signifiers” (60).


Argues that Donne read and was influenced by Rabelais and that the French satirist was Donne's “most likely model” (173) for The Courtier’s Library. Also finds echoes of Rabelais in Donne's Satyres, especially in his witty disdain for court life, his “insistence that the abuse of language corrupts society” (95), and his sexual allusions; and notes that both writers had an interest in “voyages and newfound lands”(70).


Discusses how and why Donne “subverted the traditional rhetorical conventions” in his poetry, often organizing “a topic or argument by means of postponement and deception” (129). Illustrates the point by commenting on the “suspenseful enigma” in ValWeep (130) and the surprise at the end of WomCon. Argues that Donne's poetry is “best suited to oral performance, for conditions in which the time available for comprehension was limited and in which the poet's deceptive argumentation would be most effective, and that this is the condition which Donne has in mind during the composition of his poetry” (133). Maintains that Donne's poems were intended for his coterie readers whose “participation in the performance of the poem” would confirm the sharpness of their wit and would thereby “serve as a means to intensify the affective and intellectual ties among the members of the coterie.” Concludes that we “ordinary mortals” are thus excluded—“unless we prove that we too are wits” (133). Warns that we should not look for “seriousness and conceptual coherence in a kind of poetry which was not intended to be read so, but rather appealed to sophistry and falsification of a playful context whose main communicative purpose was the confirmation of affective ties, not the transmission of information” (133–34).


Argues that those who charge Donne with “sycophancy” have read Eclog “too selectively.” Points out that the poem is a “generically mixed work, a poem of praise framed by a pastoral eclogue,” and claims that “[w]hat the poem achieves by nesting its song of praise in this way is a final artistic product that is, arguably, two removes from the actual wedding itself.” Shows how the poem’s “mixed genres and its poem within a poem structure are of crucial significance to Donne's praise strategies” (29). Discusses how, “if separated, the eclogue would be insulting and the wedding song would be flattering” but maintains that the poem, in fact, is “a single work whose parts tug at one another” and that “[i]n the end, whatever it is that the Somerset Epithalamion hopes to express about Frances Howard and Robert Carr is lost in the confusion the poem itself has created” (32).


In Chapter 1, “Christ's Ganymede” (11–71), explores the homoerotic dimension of the
seventeenth-century religious lyric and suggests that in the metaphysical poets “we find figurations of devotion, desire, and redemption that are indeed hardly less corporeally spectacularized than those that comprise the conversion-minded porn” (13) found in such films as the contemporary gay film More of a Man. In Chapter 2, “Devotion and Desire” (73–101), discusses how there is “an early modern awareness of how a discourse of amorous devotion to Christ could speak and be spoken of as a discourse of the erotic” (97). Argues that in the early modern period “the erotic and the religious are not always thought of or experienced as two necessarily separate domains” but rather “we find relays along which the soul and the body, the figurative and the material, the other-worldly and the this-worldly, even the sacrosanct and the profane, have served, sometimes in contest with each other, sometimes in collusion, in the stimulation of devotion and ecstasy” (101). Briefly discusses Donne’s 1617 sermon on the text of Proverbs 8–17, in which Donne accords the sexual and the religious “adjacent psychic or, perhaps better, affective sites” (98). In Chapter 3, “The Prayer Closet” (103–35), discusses how the devotional literature of the seventeenth century, both poetry and prose, “abounds in injunctions sending Christians to the closet, to the intensified experiences of the individual encountering God in this private, hence deemed more intimate place” (103). Points out how the prayer closet “becomes the space to which effusions of sacred eroticism are increasingly relegated, closeted” (104). Calls Donne and Herbert as meditative poets “unqualified advocates of closet devotion” (109) but points out that in his sermons Donne insists that “closet devotion is not to be pursued exclusive of attendance at church, that Christians are to be exercised in both private and public forms of piety” (117).


Asks for help in identifying the sources of two references in Essays—one by Pico della Mirandola and another concerning a general that Donne mentions in Essays.


An original poem addressed to Donne.


Calls HSBatter Donne’s “most poignant religious poem.” Claims that “[i]n it, better than in any other of his Holy Sonnets, he portrays through poetic means, particularly metaphor and paradox, his religious struggle,” which in this case is “his despair at the idea of his possible damnation.” Points out HSBatter shares with Donne’s amorous poems “a great dramatic force, a spotless and rigorous argumentative process, a subtle, and at the same time, ambivalent use of symbols and a perfect adequacy between its phonic resources and the expression of an intensely personal and dramatic relationship with God” (221). Reviews recent interpretations of the sonnet and proposes a new reading in which he sees three major kinds of images in the poem—“metallugical, military and sexual—through which the poet attempts to portray his spiritual state” (226).


Maintains that Ausiàs March’s (1397–1459) Cant Espiritual (poem CV) and HSBatter “bear astonishing resemblances” and discusses how both poets “stand ahead of the poetic movements of their day” (135). Comments on how both “deal with religious concepts in a some-
what rebellious or at least ambiguous way, which is the outcome of their strong individualism" (136). Stresses that both poems “arise from the anguish felt at the idea of the soul’s almost certain damnation” and that both recognize that “only God’s quick and effective intervention may put an end to their desperate situation” (137). Recognizes that, despite many similarities between the two poems, there are “important differences as regards religious experience,” noting that “[w]hereas Donne expresses in a concise and emotive way the intensity of his religious feelings, of his love for God,” March “expresses with identical sincerity how difficult it is for him to love God” (140). Observes that although both poets express rebelliousness, March’s is “openly uttered,” whereas Donne’s is “more covert” but claims that “[t]he rebelliousness, whether open or overt, that both March and Donne share when approaching the mystery of salvation constitutes another important element of union between these two poets” (143).


Points out how in the 1620s and 1630s various “apocalyptic formulations took on subversive, politically dangerous connotations for King James and King Charles.” Maintains that Donne emphasized “the difficulty and danger of interpreting the Apocalypse of Saint John as a political document about the way national or ecclesiastical affairs should be conducted” and thus, “whenever Donne takes up the issue of the Antichrist and popery in his sermons, he dramatizes the proliferating ambiguities that result from a reading of the ‘letter’ itself.” Discusses how in HSShow Donne “reaches ecclesiastical consensus regarding the true church by obscuring altogether the Spenserian opposition between Una and Duessa” and by hinting that the true church is “both bride and whore” (12). Discusses how Donne’s “inclusive habit of mind” as seen in HSShow “is gradually revealed in the political and prophetic choices Donne makes as a preacher” (102) and further suggests that this habit of mind also appears in Lit and HSBatter. Concludes that Donne “articulates his own response to the question over which many theologians of his time were in disagreement, one concerning the evident corruption of the visible church, and her frequently impure membership” by putting “his answer in the words of the church and so makes her chastity the final, liberating act of God himself” (105).


Comments on the following passage in “Meditation 17” of Devotions: “all mankind is of one author, and is one volume; when one man dies, one chapter is not torn out of the book, but translated into a better language; and every chapter must be so translated; God employs several translators; some pieces are translated by age, some by sickness, some by war, some by justice; but God’s hand is in every translation, and his hand shall bind up all our scattered leaves again for that library where every book shall lie open to one another.” Sought out the passage on the internet to comfort himself when his grandmother died. Compares Donne’s passage with the Talmud.


Argues that “canon-formation was going on well before the eighteenth century but was based on a very different set of literary and cultural values” and traces “the evolution of cultural attitudes towards literature in English society, highlighting the diverse interests and assumptions that defined and shaped the literary canon” (preface). Comments on the elegies honoring Donne that were published in the first edition of his poems and on the printer
John Marriot’s insistence that they be placed at the end of the volume rather than at the front. Observes that the “overriding concern” of the elegists was to protect Donne’s “good name” (127), noting that Carew’s contribution is “the only one to celebrate openly and without embarrassment the early poet’s achievements and to affirm, at the levels of both argument and style, Donne’s productive influence on English poetry” (128).


Points out that the reference to “one hill” in HSShow has been considered problematic by critics, some suggesting it refers to Geneva and others claiming it alludes to Mount Moriah. Argues that the final image of the poem in which the Church is seen as a promiscuous wife, as well as the reference to one hill, “finds antecedents in Christ’s conversation with the Samaritan woman in John’s Gospel” and that “[r]ecognizing the intertextuality of this New Testament passage with the poem not only resolves the ‘crux’… but also unlocks a significant reading of the poem” (12). Points out that Jesus makes clear to the Samaritan woman that “true worship is no longer tied to a geographical location, but rather to a disposition of the heart” and thus, in the poem, the speaker “errs comparably to the Samaritan’s woman’s protesting that Mount Gerizim is the true place of worship.” Notes that the speaker’s problem is that “he wishes to see that which is invisible, invisible because no longer localized, though the traditions of Christendom erroneously attempt to make it so” and that thus “Christ’s true spouse, comprehending all traditions of the visible church without being bound to any, is therefore ‘open to most men’” (13).


Argues that the purpose and function of the poetic elegy as seen in the Anniversaries is “to remedy humanity’s sense of disjunction from the divine through the poetic incarnation of virtue.” Observes that “[i]n the poet’s evocations, virtue is much more than an abstract pattern or set of particular moral qualities”; rather it is “the life force occulted in all beings through which God animates his creation,” i.e., it is “the vital agent of divine creativity.” Maintains that “[t]he poetic embodiment of this creative power, therefore, can only be achieved by expressing the imagination’s own creative dynamism” and that “the elegy must embody the process of creation by foregrounding the febrile inventiveness of fantasy.” Discusses how “Donne’s unusual evocation of virtue and his unconventional espousal of the powers of imagination … reflect the influence of hermetic and Neoplatonic perspectives on knowledge and reality.” Explains that “[b]y incorporating in the Anniversaries ideas about virtue and imagination common in these traditions, Donne was able to articulate a highly original vision of the moral and poetic function of poetic creation” (378). Discusses how “[a]gainst the background of competing constructions of the world that revealed the moral debility of human knowledge, Donne discovered, in heterodox theories of virtue, spirit, and imagination, a version of his own intuitive sense that poetry has the capacity to ‘emprison’ the ultimate if mysterious reality of God’s involvement in the world.” Concludes that “though on the one hand Elizabeth [Drury] is a fictional construct, on the other hand the activity itself of the poetic imagination through which such a redemptive construct comes into being manifests the creative vitality of the divine in which all humanity participates” and thus “[p]oetry, in the Anniversaries, is a constant striving for life” (410).


In the preface (i-iii), announces that the aim of this study is to look at a number of Donne’s sermons “through one of the most powerful
Discusses Michel Le Blon’s stay and activities in England as the Swedish Agent at the Court of Charles I and comments on his role in the publication of Johannes Grindal’s translation of Devotions into Dutch in 1655.


In the preface, indicates that the purpose of this study is to define the mannerist aesthetic; to show its presence in poems by Donne, Herrick, Carew, Lovelace, and Marvell; and to chart “a development of the mannerist poetic from Donne's early Mannerism to Marvell’s high Maniera” (8). Surveys Donne’s knowledge of and comments about art and continental art theory, especially in his sermons, all of which testifies to his “preoccupation with the stylistic elements that constitute high Maniera” (55). Discusses in detail Storm and Calm, early verse epistles that “document the development of the Maniera out of early Mannerism” (56), and shows that these poems “are typified by the radical invenzione and overt difficütà of early Mannerism” (68). Examines also Donne’s complimentary verse epistles and maintains that they are “an ideal testing ground for the Maniera,” noting that “[i]n Donne’s poetry, the movement toward high Maniera is characterized by the increasing power of elegance and logical control to dominate and subdue the incongruity of the images used” (69). Discusses in detail TWHail as an example of Donne’s “poetic virtuosity” (70) and argues that in the poem Donne’s “growing fascination with the artifice of his own wordcraft manifests itself in sophisticated explorations of a poetic that aptly may be labeled high Maniera” (76). Comments also on Donne’s “artistic manipulation and exploration of woman” in the Songs and Sonets, limiting the investigation to “highlighting a point of intersection between the mannerist
Points out “not only the necessity of female resistance and self-definition as preconditions for Donne’s art but also the appearance and recognition of aspects of woman as other in his poetic style” and shows how “[t]he elegant and sophisticated involutions of the mannerist aesthetic are ideal for Donne’s exploration of these complex concerns in artifacts that are ultimately and restrictively governed by the criteria of high Maniera” (88). Finally examines the Holy Sonnets to show how they also reflect “the highly artificial mannerist aesthetic” (89). Concludes by claiming that Father is perhaps Donne’s “most brilliant aesthetic development and, indeed, a superbly controlled resolution of the mannerist impluses so radically unleashed” in Storm and Calm and that this poem “demonstrates the existence of Donne’s largely unexplored potentiality of writing verse not based on labor and difficulty but on resolution and ease” (94).

Notes the discovery of Donne the Younger’s presentation inscription in the copy of Biathanatos that he presented to “I. Marckham in 1647” that is preserved in Sir Clements Markham’s Markham Memorials (London, 1913).

Suggests ways that critics and scholars can use advantageously the published volumes of The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne. By discussing three examples, Pyr, Ham, and ElBrac, shows how the variorum edition “amply provides its users with not only earlier readings and criticisms, but should suggest how many of those readings and criticisms can lead to fuller, more perspective readings of certain poems, to corrections and particularly deflection of former critical agendas, to items that have not had attention or at least not adequate attention in the past, and to a still greater awareness of the importance of text” (239–40). For a reply, see Gary A. Stringer, “More on ‘How It Goes,'” JDJ 18 (1999): 267–75.

Based on a collation of the 46 known manuscript versions of Twick, argues for emending l. 15 of the poem from “not yet leave loving” (found in the 1633 edition) to “nor leave this garden” and suggests that “the corruption of the second stanza of the poem in the first edition is the result of an effort to repair the defective line” with a phrase from LovDeity (191). Points out that although the textual change makes “little difference to the meaning of the
poem,” it “makes better sense, however, because in lines 15–18 the speaker asks Love to make him part of the garden” (192). Concludes that “[t]he evidence of the manuscripts substantially endorses ‘nor leave this garden’ as the preferred reading by offering a clear picture of how the need for a new phrase originated,” how LovDeity “provided the phrase to fill the gap created by the omission of the four words,” and how the phrase borrowed from LovDeity “entered the printed text” of Twick “through a text very much like that of WN 1” [Dolau Cothi ms. 6748] (200–01).


Argues that Commun deals with “an ideological problem in which Donne paraphrases the controversial Protestant doctrine of adiaphora or ‘things indifferent’ (objects, actions, beliefs, or ceremonies not in themselves necessary for salvation) in sexual terms while never explicitly mentioning sexual acts, thereby skirt ing for satirical purposes the obvious objection that adultery cannot be a thing indifferent because it is clearly outlawed by God in Exodus 20:14.” Surveys the Calvinistic doctrine of things indifferent and “in the process advances a less ironic, more straightforward, and more respectful interpretation” of Donne’s poem “than most critics have given it.” Argues that the poem “is less ironic than satiric” and that “its satire is directed not at its own argument or speaker but at us” (55). Concludes that Donne the satirist did not think that “men should treat women as things indifferent” but rather that “he thought that they do treat them as things indifferent” (67).


Argues that the Holy Sonnets “represent an experience of subjectivity that was emerging in late sixteenth-century England and that the concept of the conscience is the key to understanding it” (233). Discusses, in particular, the influence on the sonnets of the “insistent Protestant exhortations for every Christian to examine his conscience” (235). Maintains that Donne’s poetic meditations “typically proceed not from sensory perception, through rational analysis, to emotion direct toward God” but rather “through a process of self-examination” and they “articulate individualized interiority rather than communal Christian responses to the divine.” Points out that “[t]his individualized interiority, moreover, is generated through a deliberate process of analysis that involves detachment from, as well as focus on, the self” (236). Observes, however, that “[c]onscience was not defined merely as self-consciousness, the mind’s reflection on itself, but as the internalized voice of God” and thus in Donne’s religious poems “a mind disturbed by passion corrects itself against a communal standard of truth, or a rebellious will subjects itself to God’s power and authority” (238). Points out that the experience of interiority, therefore, “is seen as a mechanism by which external authority was internalized, and self-exploration is interpreted as self-censorship” and thus “[t]he consequence of interiorized self-hood… appears as the privatization and de-politicization of the individual” (239). Maintains that the most striking feature of the Holy Sonnets is “the combination of interiorized self-consciousness with intense awareness of intractable external reality by which the self is constrained and to which it must inevitably submit, and with an equally intense sense of the opaque ambiguity of that reality” (240). Analyzes HSMin as an example of “a mind in the process of reflection on itself” which also “explicitly acknowledges that such self-analysis involves an act, an operation in relation to external reality” (242) and as illustrating how Donne “has constructed a textualized representation of himself as an instructive example” (244–45). Concludes, therefore, that the Holy Sonnets “can best be seen as examples of the conscience in operation, participating in ‘the labours of mutual society’ by serving as a looking-glass for self and for others” (245).

In “Walton the Biographer: Donne and Wotton” (12–30), discusses Donne’s relationship with Walton and how Walton’s *Life of Donne* established his reputation as “the outstanding biographer of his age” (12). Points out that Walton’s aim in writing the biography was “to dignify Donne’s early years so that he may be seen as worthy of the grave responsibilities that fell to him as the holy dean and preacher of St. Paul’s” (16). Comments on the composition and accuracy of the biography and observes how “a lasting picture of Donne is everywhere carefully and subtly delineated, the figure of the pious churchman sharply contrasts with the earlier courtier, whose experiences now are but a memory submerged in a stricter and better life” (19). Comments on Donne’s friendship with Wotton and his having introduced him to Walton. Notes also that Walton in his *Life of Herbert* says that Donne wrote *ElAut* in honor of Magdalen Herbert, although his “testimony has no corroboration” (47). In “Walton’s Fame and Influence” (77–101), discusses the complex history, reception, and influence of the *Life of Donne*.


Discusses the complicated history of transmission of the text of *ElBrac*, which appears in 62 manuscripts and 7 seventeenth-century print sources. Explains the technical and evaluative procedures employed by the textual editors of *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne* in “trying to unravel the tangled threads of transmission extant in these numerous and diverse transcriptions” (175). Points out that *ElBrac*, excerpted from the 1633 edition, was first published in the 1635 edition and “was set from a manuscript far down the family tree of Group-I texts that had been disallowed two years previously” and that “the corrupt redaction became the basis for all subsequent editions of the poem, from the 1639 resetting of the 1635 text up to the OUP issue of Donne’s *Selected Poetry* in 1996” (176). Observes that John Marriott, Donne’s publisher and printer, “apparently decided to finesse the problem” in 1635 “(a) by using a different—and less easily recognizable—copy-text for the poem, (b) by altering a significant offensive word in line 11 of the poem, and (c) by hiding the poem as the twelfth of a newly expanded numbered sequence of elegies, placing it far down the list from the number-one position it had occupied in his Group-I manuscript” (188).


Discusses how Donne and later his elegists “exploit a particular conceit taken from the late sixteenth century sonnet sequences: the idea that the sonneteer’s poetry contains and thereby memorializes his beloved.” Points out that “[w]hen the figure is taken literally by a sardonic Donne, in certain mock-elegies on himself in *Songs and Sonnets*, it results in a competition between himself and his elegists for the position of ultimate irony, as the latter hastily disavow their ability to build a permanent memorial”; thus “a lively, imperious, and self-immured Donne replaces the sonneteer’s monumentalized object of desire, and is displaced in his turn by his own elegists.” Observes how “the same trope—‘this poem contains my love’—is squeezed into different shapes by these two generations of poets, turning the lament of the elegy into a sophisticated comedy when the topos is taken literally” (129). Maintains that such poems as *Appar*, *Dissol*, *ValBook*, *ValName*, *Leg*, *Expir*, and *Will* “provide Donne with the opportunity to join in with sonneteers who tease the pose struck by the Petrarchan lover, deliberately dying for the love of an unresponsive woman,” noting, in particular, Donne’s pun on “dying and orgasm” (131). Notes how in such poems as *Canon*, *Fun*, *Damp*, *Para*, and *Rel* Donne’s wit “lies in treating the trope literally” and how he “assumes an artless tone, blandly inviting the reader into his grave, stage-managing his own death, providing her with souvenir relics, and opening one
eye to check her response” (132). Points out how these poems “exploit the absurdities of self-reflection in the conceit as a form of poetic competition” (133). Discusses how “Donne’s exploitation of the nuances of the Golden Age conceit left his elegists with a problem”: how were they to make “a fitting urn for the unique art of Donne without destroying his claim to originality?” (137). Observes that ironically “it is the originality with which Donne nuanced the Golden Age Ovidian conceit of the self-memoralizing poem which stops the elegists from preventing the return of that style” (139). Discusses how, by “[a]dopting Donne’s technique of proving his own originality by taking a conceit literally, the elegists’ solution to the problem of the urn-poem was to put an elegant spin on competitive troping, by taking Donne himself at his own words” (141).


Traces the concept of suicide from classical antiquity to early modern times and comments briefly on Biathanatos. Notes that Donne admits in his work to having been inclined to suicide and is strongly opposed to unconditional hostility towards the deed. Says that Donne believes that the most important role that suicide plays is in martyrdom since it is a good thing to die for one’s faith, citing Christ’s self-sacrifice in order to redeem mankind, an act that was anything but “self-murder.”


Maintains that the term “philosophy” in Lect “locates the poem within a specific intellec-
tual tradition” (61) and “invites an analysis of the nature and degree of its participation in the field of philosophical discourse” (61–62). Points out how “[t]he rhetoric of sunlight and shadow” that informs the poem “recalls the Platonic ontology expressed in the allegory of the cave in Book VII of the Republic” and that “more recently, Jacques Derrida’s meditation on the role of the sun in the production of metaphor offers a similar useful gloss on this poem’s comparison of the course of the sun to that of love” (62). Discusses how in Lect “the sun’s symbolic eclipse, the exaggerated indeterminacy of the word ‘reduc’d’, the fact that the lecture ends with the word ‘night’ jointly point up the fact that the lecturer’s ‘oration’ splendidly undoes itself.” Claims that Derrida’s insights about the tangled relationship between metaphor and metaphysics in the tradition of Western philosophy provide an illuminating context for considering the ruptures that define the speaker’s oral performance in Donne’s poem” and that, “[a]t the same time, such insights intensify the pathos of the poem by suggesting the impossibility of the desire it alternately reflects and deflects” (71).


Comments on the four main arguments in HS-Death that the speaker directs against the personified figure of Death and maintains that, in spite of the “seemingly conclusive last line” of the sonnet, “the poem’s ending is ambiguous” (108). Examines the poem in the light of its sonnet form, the irregularity of its rhyme and rhythm, and its metaphors.
300. Zhang, Xuchun. [Inner Tension: Li Shangyin and John Donne as Philosophical Existence.] *Journal of Sichuan International Studies* 69, no. 3: 7–12.

In Chinese. Compares Donne and the Tang Dynasty poet Li Shangyin and says that the anxiety that Donne expresses in his poetry is similar to the Confucian anxiety found in the Chinese poet. Maintains that Donne never escapes anxiety after his marriage and that it includes his fear of sin, as seen in *Father*, his fear of nothingness as seen in *Noct*, and his fear of the absence of God as seen in *HSBatter*. 
1999


Surveys the influence of Gwen and Jacques Raverat on the painter Stanley Spencer. Notes that they gave him a copy of Donne’s sermons and points out paintings of his based on Donne’s writings, such as John Donne Arriving in Heaven (1911), Resurrection, Cookham (1924–26), The Resurrection of Soldiers (1928–29), and The Hill of Sion (1946). Notes that Spencer admitted that, although he always loved reading Donne, he understood little of what he read.


Points out that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the term “emblem” was “often taken to refer to any kind of emblematic sign.” Observes that Donne’s usage of the word in ll. 1–4 of Christ “conforms exactly to the type of figure identified by Joseph Hall as appropriate for ‘occasional’ or ‘extemporal’ meditations, a type which Hall himself habitually describes as ‘emblem’” (56). Points out seven places in his poetry in which Donne uses the word “emblem” and notes that “[a]ll of these examples apply the word specifically to the symbolic image and not to its application” (56–57). Concludes, therefore, that, “for Donne, ‘emblem’ means almost any kind of symbolic image or speaking picture” (57).


Argues that, when read in the light of the via negativa tradition, the Holy Sonnets reflect not despair but rather “God working to effect the salvation of his believers even in their experience of his silence” and in “his apparent absence.” Focuses on ten of the poems that “are, either wholly or in part, addressed to God” since they are the ones in which “God’s silence is most striking” (96). Concludes that, read in the light of the via negativa tradition, we realize that “the absence of God need not be read as evidence that God does not exist, that he is not omnipotent, or that he is unconcerned” but rather, “as in the ‘dark night’ experience, the silence of God in the Holy Sonnets may be seen as an indication of God’s radical otherness, and paradoxically, as a sign that God demonstrates the limitations of human reasoning and human language, making the speaker trust less in feelings and depend less upon his own efforts while being more dependent upon God.” Maintains that, “at the same time, the reader can see evidence in the speaker’s words and attitudes of the presence of God not as an active participant in the dramatized moment but as a silent presence beyond human words and human reason” (107).


In Chapter 1, “Faith versus Suspicion, Pluralism versus Monism” (1–6), states that one aim of this study is to examine several major contemporary schools of interpretation “as they come into contact and, often, into conflict” with Donne’s love poetry. Maintains that, “far too often, recent critics treat the poetry as an adversary … with the goal of stripping away the masks and revealing the disguised meaning of what they regard as cunning distortions” (1). In response to this “hermeneutics of suspicion,” proposes a “hermeneutics of faith,” in which “the manifest content [of a poem] is a meaning which coexists with other meanings and creates sense through interaction” and in
which “the goal of interpretation is to explicate the fullness of that language” (2). States that a second aim of this study is “to argue implicitly and explicitly against ... monism which seems to afflict so many current critics,” i.e., examining Donne’s poetry from only one viewpoint or formula. Proposes to “counter this critical trend by refuting the often facile certainties produced by critics who have zealously applied a narrow methodology... by offering a flexible pluralism, often appropriating in combination the various single paradigms” proposed by monists (3). Points out that the early chapters of the book concentrate on the critical approach of those critics devoted to feminist, historicist, psycho-biographical, and philological readings of Donne’s poems, recognizing advantages and drawbacks of each of these paradigms. In the final chapter, informed by “a pluralist approach in the context of the hermeneutics of faith,” discusses a number of Donne’s love poems, “appropriating some of the techniques of the paradigms criticized in the earlier chapters” (4). In Chapter 2, “Donne and Feminist Critics” (7–21), surveys the wide range of recent feminist criticism of Donne’s attitude toward women in his love poetry, and in Chapter 3, “Contextual Studies of Donne” (23–102), examines the strengths and weaknesses of the new historicism and of recent psycho-biographical and philological readings of Donne’s poems, recognizing advantages and drawbacks of each of these paradigms. In the final chapter, informed by “a pluralist approach in the context of the hermeneutics of faith,” discusses a number of Donne’s love poems, “appropriating some of the techniques of the paradigms criticized in the earlier chapters” (4). In Chapter 2, “Donne and Feminist Critics” (7–21), surveys the wide range of recent feminist criticism of Donne’s attitude toward women in his love poetry, and in Chapter 3, “Contextual Studies of Donne” (23–102), examines the strengths and weaknesses of the new historicism and of recent psycho-biographical and philological criticism. Rejected the notion that the real subject of Donne’s love poems is power, not love, and that Donne is culturally determined rather than simply being influenced by his culture. In Chapter 4, “Towards a Pluralist Hermeneutics of Faith” (103–37), presents a pluralistic reading of ElPart, ElJeal, ElProg, Lect, Anniv, and Fever to show that “by avoiding granting privilege to a single approach, and by laying a number of interpretive grids over the work, one does in fact come closer to an understanding of the many meanings of the work as a coherent whole” (137). Contains endnotes (139–40) and a list of works cited (141–47).


Discusses Donne as a letter writer and suggests that his letters “offer insights into the style and content of his poetry” as well as his sermons. Points out that Letters to Severall Persons of Honour (1651) is “the first published volume of personal letters of any major English poetic figure, assuming we can safely rule out James Howell as major.” Maintains, therefore, that Donne’s letters “make literary and epistolary history.” Suggests that the letters “intervene in Donne’s creative productivity, as do the poems, prose works, and sermons” and “throw into high relief Donne’s artistic accomplishment” (15). Discusses Donne’s views on letter writing and comments, in particular, on his very personal and self-conscious letters to Henry Goodyer.


Discusses how in the course of the seventeenth century “[l]yric wonder, and especially its conceits, became the targets of critics who simply would not buy the idea that rough, bold, and obscure epigrams, satires, and love poems could be viewed as miniature equivalents of epic and tragedy.” Observes that, although wonder remained “an important goal of poetry,” the neoclassical critics “refused to accept the methods that Donne and others had used to provoke it” (295), such as far-fetched metaphors, extreme brevity, roughness, and obscurity. Cites examples from Donne’s poetry to illustrate what neoclassical critics found objectionable. Points out, for instance, that in GoodM (ll. 19–21) and in HSDeath (ll. 5–6) “[t]o be properly astounded the reader must follow the syllogistic structure of the argument and both recognize and ignore the faults of its premises” (306) and that in ValMourn (ll. 21–26) “we must not pause to reconcile the various qualities of the compass that Donne compares to absent lovers” (315).

Indicates in the user’s guide that the purpose of this study is to present “biographical, critical, and bibliographical information” on Donne’s “best-known or most important poems” (7). Contains the editor’s note (8), the editor’s introduction (9), in which he contrasts *Ecst* and *Father*, presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne, and comments on Donne’s poetry in general (10–13). Thereafter presents a general introduction to the *Songs and Sonnets* (14–15) and thematic analyses of *GoodM*, *SunRis*, and *SGo*, followed by critical extracts on those poems by Rodney Edgecomb, Alfred W. Satterthwaite, D. C. Allen, James S. Baumlun, Clay Hunt, John Carey, and Donald L. Guss (15–33); thematic analyses of *LovAlch*, *Anniv*, and *Ecst*, followed by critical extracts on the poems by N. J. C. Andreasen, Clay Hunt, Arthur F. Marotti, John Carey, Dwight Cathcart, James S. Baumlun, and Helen B. Brooks (34–62); thematic analyses of *ValMourn*, *Canon*, and *Father*, followed by critical extracts on the poems by Jay Dean Divine, A. B. Chambers, John Freccero, Allen Tate, Maureen Sabine, Dayton Haskin, Joseph E. Duncan, and David J. Leigh (63–93); and a critical overview of the *Holy Sonnets* (94), with thematic analyses of *HSDeath* and *HSBatter*, followed by critical extracts by Wilbur Sanders, Frederic B. Tromly, Paul M. Oliver, and William Kerrigan (95–107). Concludes with a list of works by Donne (108), a selected bibliography of works about Donne (109–10), and an index of themes and ideas (111–12).


Rejects the theories of certain modern critics of Donne’s religious poetry (especially those of Stanley Fish), who seemingly “reject the whole universe of theological and philosophical discourse of the period in favor of modern explicitly political ideologies.” Argues that “in order to keep moving ahead in our understanding of Donne’s religious poetry—especially those poems which dramatize the crucial theological paradoxes of, say, the crucifixion—sometimes it may be helpful to look backward” (107). Discusses in detail how in *Goodf* “the individual conceits combine their metaphorical energy to focus our attention on the central paradox of the poem” and argues how a discussion of this one poem illustrates that “the best critical approaches to Donne’s divine poems operate within the context of metaphor and paradox as they were understood and accepted in Donne’s own time” (112–13). Surveys in the discussion recent critical interpretations of *Goodf*, both agreeing and disagreeing with the critics. Concludes that Donne was “a religious man”; that his religious poems are “ultimately informed by subject matter that by nature resists clarity”; and that “to attempt to understand this poetry by ’maintaining a skeptical distance’ from the religious and theoretical foundations of the period or by trying to demystify that which is inherently mysterious, is to find ourselves concluding that his poetry just doesn’t make sense—or worse, that it is ’sick’” (124).


Argues that the so-called “stigma of print” is based on “a misunderstanding of the traditional modesty *topos*” and that “[g]enre and subject matter, not social class, seem to have played a decisive role in an author’s decision to use manuscript or print as the medium of publication.” Points out that although Donne’s career is often seen as that of “a gifted amateur or coterie poet who wrote for a small circle of friends,” such a characterization “misrepresents his relationship to the printing press” (30). Notes that Donne during his lifetime published two editions of the *Anniversaries*, *Pseudo-Martyr*, *Ignatius*, and many of his sermons.


Cites *Twick* (ll. 1–9) as a structural model of Empson’s seventh type of ambiguity in which
“two opposite meanings [are] defined by the context, so that the total effect is a fundamental division in the writer’s mind.” Points out that although the speaker in the poem “bitterly condemns himself for falling in love and for bringing the contamination of love into the garden,” the “religious connotations of such words as ‘manna,’ ‘gall,’ and ‘transubstantiates’ create tensions within the conceit.” Maintains that the notion of transubstantiation especially “creates positive shock waves” that “bring out an element of masochistic self-congratulation” so that the speaker “simultaneously despises and relishes the perversion love has wrought” (32).


Briefly comments on Donne’s sermon of 1 April 1627, preached before King Charles I, in which Donne, although “apparently trying to defend the Church and the king against criticism,” actually “caused the king serious displeasure” by pushing “a long standing metaphor too far into reality” (30). Maintains that the king “felt criticized and threatened” by Donne having made a comparison in the sermon between the king’s “actual wife and analogical wife” (i.e., between Henrietta Maria and the Church of England) and that he felt that Donne’s analogy “exposed both relationships to danger” (30–31).


Maintains that it is Donne’s “crossing of the language of love and money in a lyric itinerary of restitution and repayment” that gives to *ElBrac* its “special and powerful semiotic charge.” Calls this energy “commodity” since this trope “connects commodity, chiasmus, poetic production, and rhetoric as fundamentally economic sites of subjective loss and poetic gain” (143). Referring to the work of Marx and Jean-Joseph Goux, presents a critical analysis of the elegy to show how it “reveals the poet’s psychosocial investments and vexing concerns” and how “the speaker’s fate is linked with that of the twelve coins he will lose in order to replace the lost object.” Maintains that “more than heavenly metaphysics and commerce are at stake, for crossing between the two yields affectively invested figures of economically inflected metaphor: commodification” (157). Shows how *ElBrac* “plays with, by crossing, contents and contexts: socio-economic, amatory-erotic, theological, scriptural, elegiac, and cultural-masculine, and locating the sites of commodification that semiotically enrich the poem even as they impoverish the subject of the lyric utterance” (164). Argues that “[a]s the instrument of Donne’s mastery, or the signifier of mastery, language always becomes rather the thing that masters Donne” and that “[i]t is language that leaves the evidence of his entry into the symbolic and inscribes the masculine in the sacrificial symbolic contract of exchange and commodification.” Concludes that Donne’s “territorial desire for a familiar, masculinized text of mastery can only be destined to bankrupt and fail” (165).


Discusses Walton’s *Life of Donne* (1640) as an example of early literary biography and calls Walton the first modern biographer. Comments on Walton’s intention, rhetorical strategy, style, uses and manipulation of sources, and revisions of his biography of Donne. Observes how Walton cares less about historical accuracy, often combining sources, and how he focuses rather on the psychological and spiritual motivation of his subject. Maintains, for instance, that Walton is interested in Donne’s poetry only to the extent that it throws light on his life.


Surveys the poetic expression of Anglicanism in English lyric poetry and mentions Donne throughout, citing examples primarily from the Holy Sonnets and the hymns. Maintains that Donne gave to the emerging tradition of Anglican poetics “a certain psychological realism, a willingness to look directly at our complex emotional and intellectual lives without reducing them to mere principles or theory, an insistence on our need for God’s grace and its power to produce hope and connection where we could not produce it for ourselves.” Points out that Donne “seems to have sensed how much darkness is possible in the human soul as well as how much delight we can encompass.” Observes that his works are “imbued with what might easily become desperation were it not for the hope that grace can still give us wings to escape death and loss and alienation from all that we love” (142). Says that when in Donne’s poetry God’s absence stands out more than God’s presence, it has more to do with a sense of his own finitude and God’s sovereignty than with his own sinfulness. Comments on how Donne can often be witty and whimsical in his divine poems but stresses that such playfulness is “not unserious” (95).


In the “Introduction” (1–26), argues that many of Donne’s poems, both profane and sacred, “may be better understood in light of sixteenth and seventeenth century sacramental theology, which helped shape Donne’s understanding of the written word as a visible sign, of the poet as the quasi-divine maker or priestly minister of that sign, and of the reader as its receiver” (1). Announces the intention “to focus on sacramental theology and on conflicting conceptions of the Eucharist” as the “point of departure for reading Donne’s lyrics in their post-Reformation context” (3). Discusses how Donne “maintains an orthodox Anglican stance on the issue of the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist,” noting, however, that he was “capable of combining Calvinist formulations and Catholic-sounding language in a way distinct from the methods of men such as Andrewes and Laud” (10). In Chapter 1, ‘Sacramental Crossing” (29–57), presents a detailed reading of Cross in which Donne “argues passionately for the sacramentality of crosses” and argues how the poem “provides an excellent introduction
to his ideas about the sacramental role poetry can play.” In Chapter 2, “Deigne at My Hands” (58–100), discusses Corona as celebrating “a poetic Eucharist, using language liturgically to make a sacramental offering to God.” Maintains that, by manipulating form and genre, Donne “invites the believing reader/communicant to unite his or her own voice with that of the poet/speaker and, in so doing, to experience the saving power of Christ’s Eucharistic body.” In Chapter 3, “Cunning Elements and Artful Turns” (101–41), discusses HSLittle and Goody as poems in which Donne considers “the spiritual dangers of sacramental art” (22) and expresses his doubt about “whether any human action, including poetry as sacramental opus, can prove a reliable means of grace” (23). In Chapter 4, “Toward an Anti-Petrarchan Love-Religion: ‘Aire and Angels’” (145–52) and Chapter 5, “Donne’s Catholic Petrarchans” (153–72), discusses Donne’s secular lyrics and verse epistles in which he “defines the relation between the Petrarchan lover and his beloved as insufficient or pernicious, differentiating efficacious inscription from the futile practice of ‘whining Poetry.’” Comments specifically on Air, HuntUn, LovDeity, Fun, and Twick—poems that “struggle toward a reformation of the love lyric, portraying Petrarchan speakers as the ultra-conservative Catholics of love-religion.” In Chapter 6, “‘The Flea’ as Profane Eucharist” (173–86), discusses how in Flea the speaker “makes ambivalent use of both Catholic and Reformed theological language, inviting his lady—and the reader of the poem—to participate in a theologically-charged erotic disputation and, ultimately, to partake of a sexual sacrament.” Points out that in the poem “the signs and verbal gestures are as polyvalent and as open to interpretation as the signs and gestures of the Eucharist” but that “the goal is erotic fruition and literary pleasure rather than spiritual grace.” In Chapter 7, “Ways of Having Donne” (187–222), discusses TWHence and HWKiss, poems addressed to male friends that demonstrate Donne’s “desire for an alternative to the definitely noncommunicative and reflexive art of Petrarchan love” (24), followed by analyses of Jet and ValMourn, poems apparently addressed to women, that are “circular in structure” and “play upon the idea that poems—like rings—may serve as sacramental pledges of love and fidelity only when they are offered to and accepted by ‘worthy receivers.’” Maintains that both poems “proceed from a sacramental poetics,” similar to that found in Corona. In Chapter 8, “Equivocal Devotion” (223–48), discusses HuntMan and BedfDead, verse epistles addressed to specific women, in which Donne “makes ambivalent use of Roman Catholic sacramental imagery.” Points out how the first, along with a prose letter to Henry Goodyer in which Donne enclosed the poem, proceeds from Donne’s “conception of the written text as sacrament, the effect of which depends both upon who the reader is, and upon how he or she responds” and how in the second Donne “draws analogy between confession … and his poem of apology” and “in his failure to complete that confession … confirms his commitment to a distinctly nonconfessional art” (25). In “Appendix” (252–59), surveys the theological positions of Catholics and Reformers on the nature of the Eucharist and claims that Donne’s position, as seen in his sermons, is often “equivocal and evasive” (257) and that his language “draws upon many different Catholic and Protestant formulations” (259). Concludes with notes (260–313), a bibliography (314–32), and an index (333–38).

Reviews:


Presents a reading of Fare, a poem “based on an analogy between religion and love.” Discusses how the speaker “traces his history as a lover, looks back on the time when he had yet to experience love and was a naive believer in its divinity, and professes his current rejection of such faith” and how “[h]is perspective in the poem is that of “a disillusioned atheist who is all the more scornful toward religion because he once believed in a divinity only to conclude, on the basis of experience, that his creed was false and his god a nonentity.” Maintains, however, that the speaker, by using the simile of dying atheists (ll. 4–6), “undercuts his current attitude of unbelief” and that “his profane allusions to scripture do not so much support his case against the religion of love as cast an ironic light on his worldly-wise stance” (243). Shows how the speaker in Fare “has made the mistake of rejecting not only the naive superstition of his youth” but also “the One True Faith that should have grown out of it” (250).


Contains a table of contents (v–vi); a preface about Vintage Spiritual Classics by the general editors of the series (vii–ix); a preface to the works included by Andrew Motion (xi–xxi), in which he calls Devotions one of Donne’s “most paradoxical works” and “Death’s Duell,” a work that “finds its energy in exhaustion and its spiritual hope in bodily defeat” (xi); a general critical evaluation of both works, and comments on the biographical contexts in which they were written; a chronology of Donne’s life (xxiii–xxxii); and a note on the texts (xxxiii). Hereafter follows edited and modernized texts of Devotions (1–152), Death’s Duell (153–77), and Walton’s Life (179–223), followed by notes (225–31) and suggestions for further reading (233–34).

Reviews:

• James Fenton in NYR 50 (February 13): 45–49.


In Chinese. Based on Grierson’s 1912 edition of Donne’s poems, translates into Chinese selections from Songs and Sonets (2–120); Elegies (121–90); and Divine Poems (191–251). Contains a biographical sketch of Donne (252–63) and an essay by Fu Hao on the Holy Sonnets (264–67).


Contains a brief introduction to Donne’s life and religious writings ([vii]–xiii), followed by modernized texts of Corona, Holy Sonnets, Cross, Christ, Sickness, Father, Annun, Goodf, Lit, selections from the sermons and Devotions, and “Death’s Duell” ([1]–97). No notes or commentary on individual works.

Reviews:


Maintains that the modernity in Donne’s sermons can be seen primarily by observing ways in which he breaks with the past or with the generally accepted views of his contemporary
society. Observes that we readily recognize this element in his poetry, in which he challenges traditional Petrarchism and pastoralism but that we often miss the elements of modernity in his sermons. Discusses, therefore, those aspects of the sermons that seem to reflect Donne’s modernity, especially his encouragement of religious tolerance and ecumenism; his rejection of certain Calvinist positions, especially extreme predestination; his view of women that is often more positive than those of his contemporaries; and his keen awareness and presentation of his sense of self. Observes, for example, that Donne attempts to heal the rancorous division between the Church of England and the Catholic Church, although he thinks that Anglican worship is more conducive to genuine devotion than the excesses of Catholic devotion. Comments on Donne’s views in the sermons on faith, reason, the new philosophy, asceticism, and marriage. Notes, for example, that Donne maintains the importance of the indissolubility of the marriage contract but that, like many Protestants, he emphasizes the notion of mutual help between the partners. Finds Donne’s self-consciousness in the sermons as well as his expression of personal and intense emotion in them also as signs of his modernity. Compares Donne to Montaigne and says that Donne’s sermons reflect a kind of baroque sensibility, in which Donne affirms himself in contemplating himself.


Summarizes and expands upon Claude Gandelman’s “The Poem as Map: John Donne and the ‘Anthropomorphic Landscape’ Tradition” from Arcadia 19 (1984): 244–51. Rather than “spontaneous reversals” between the human body and landscape, as Gandelman proposes, argues for “the simultaneous relevance of macrocosm and microcosm in Donne’s poetic.” Maintains that “[t]he tensions between sexuality and the spirit” and “between the individual and the community are reflected in the way in which the anthropomorphic map sheds light on well-known passages from Donne’s poetry and prose” (463). Discusses the use of geographic imagery that reflects the tradition of the anthropomorphic map in Devotions (Meditation 17), ElBed, and GoodM.


Presents a general evaluation of Donne’s poetry (and to a much lesser degree his prose), commenting on how Donne’s work reflects his “capacious personality” and calling him “a poet who means what he says and mocks it” (36). Comments on such aspects of Donne’s art as his unique uses of language, oxymoron, the speaking voice, stanzaic variety, rhetorical strategies, and colloquialism. Discusses how in the Songs and Sonets sex and science “make an odd couple” (26) as, for instance, in GoodM and ValMourn. Maintains that “sexual glory irradiates” Donne’s love poetry (20), that even in his religious poems he has “sex on the brain” (21), and that “[h]is sexual bravado is the other side of his misogyny” (22).


Argues that “by identifying himself with the Mosaic prophet” at the conclusion of FirAn and as “a Johannine visionary in the trumpet signature” at the conclusion of SecAn, Donne makes clear his intention to function in a way similar to the biblical prophets. Maintains that “Old Testament Law and New Testament Grace, Mosaic voice and Johannine vision are ‘united’ in a single poem” and that, “like the Bible the Anniversaries is composed of two distinct but complementary testaments” (156). Discusses how in the FirAn Donne’s speaker “castigates his reader/auditor for occupying him/herself with earthly matters and forgetting to praise Elizabeth Drury,” whereas in SecAn he “encourages the reader with a vision of the soul’s progress to heaven after the death of the body.” Considers only “the biblical situation” of FirAn
and focuses on “the interrelationship of law, song, and memory as suggested by the Mosaic signature at the end of that part of the poem” (157). Shows how in *FirAn* Donne’s speaker “insists that poetry is the one thing which will triumph against a people’s amnesia” and that by “assuming the Mosaic voice” in the poem, Donne “positions himself—or his rhetor—as the prophet ‘like unto’ Moses whom the Lord promised He would later raise and unto whom the people ‘shall hearken’” (170). Concludes that the *Anniversaries* contain Donne’s “most confident statement of the public role of the poet” and suggests that perhaps for that reason he allowed the poems to be published during his lifetime (171).


Reads Virginia Woolf’s *The Waves* (1931) in the light of her essay “Donne after Three Centuries” in *The Second Common Reader* (1932), seeing it as Woolf’s mixture of identification with, and re-visioning of, the complexities of Donne’s life and the diversities of his writing for her own use in prose fiction” (212). Maintains that in *The Waves* the “deconstructs the aristocracy within which Donne struggled for preferment, writes her own secular *Divine Poems*, feminizes Donne’s cosmology, and, incorporating Donne-like imagery, gives voices to some of the kinds of people, historically marginalized and silent, addressed in his poems” (214). Points out that although *The Waves* was published before Woolf’s essay, the relationship between the two works “is not so much one of influence as of affinity with Woolf’s own mature perceptions” and shows how both works “reflect and develop, in different ways, her earlier interest in Donne” (220). Surveys Woolf’s knowledge of and interest in Donne.


Discusses how Donne “makes space a quality of tone” in his poems and how in them space is “domestic” but also “emblematic, and often exhilarating.” Points out how Donne’s lovers “call upon images of the cosmos,” how space is “the imaginative language they use to describe love’s privacy, and its power,” and how they “imagine the cosmos opening in spheres around small rooms” and “contract its vast spaces into the small and private space of love” (61). Discusses Donne’s use of space and his spatial imaginations in *SunRis*, *ValMourn*, *Goof*, and the *Anniversaries* and shows how he “finds a new language for human consciousness in the spatial uncertainties of his time” (69).


Fictional account of bondage that makes allusions to *Fun*.


Claims that the theology of incarnation is “a major strand in Donne’s religious writing (which is in fact the whole of his writing)” and maintains that understanding it “helps us to make sense of the disparate elements which other critics have found puzzling or unsatisfactory.” Argues that in Donne’s poetry “the physical dimension points to and symbolizes the more important spiritual dimension of life, that it is in the body and through the body that the divine is revealed to us” (165). Further argues that although Donne presents “a fairly conventional view of the soul” in the *Anniversaries*, regarding it as “a separate entity imprisoned in the flesh until its release at death,” in many of his other writings he “goes beyond this” and “sees the soul and body as interdependent and mutually supportive” (165–66). Illustrates this point by discussing Donne’s treatment of tears in his love poems. Comments also on the theme
of “the incarnation of the lover in his mistress, or vice versa” (166), noting how often for Donne the woman is “a mirror in which the male poet sees himself reflected, a sounding board for sharpening his witticisms and bouncing back his ideas,” thereby obtaining “both self-knowledge and knowledge of the other, and at the same time a merging of the two” (167). Cites Sappho as an example in which the “notion of merging is most complete” (168). Discusses a wide range of poems, but especially the Holy Sonnets, Air, and Ecst.


Argues that although Donne “may be seen as trying to mitigate the worst effects of English colonialism,” in his sermon to the members of the Virginia Company in November 1622, after news reached London of the massacre of English settlers in Virginia, he nevertheless, unwittingly, “helped to construct an intellectual and imaginative discourse that led to extermination” (128). Shows how Donne “contributed to the imaginative force and the religious authority that ensured that English dominance and coercion became a reality.” Maintains that “[d]espite his admirable motives in accepting the inherent value of native people, and their place in the Kingdom of God, his harmful effects may be traced in a complex of attitudes and rhetoric.” Points out how Donne, in fact, “denied the substantiality of a native narrative by making the native equivalent to the natural man” and, by so doing, “indicates that the natural man’s only destiny is to become converted to Christ, an endeavor that gains souls for Christ and subjects for England simultaneously.” Describes how Donne conveys his thought in “paradisal and sexual terms” and suggests that “[h]idden within such intimate desires are fears of America—projections of what the English find distasteful, actually or potentially, in themselves—barbarism, criminality, idolatrous popery.” Concludes that after the 1622 massacre, the English “felt empowered to sever America from the power of the Devil, a perspective which finds its most memo-


In Chapter 1, “Introduction” (13–25), points out that this study is centrally concerned with Donne’s “continual struggle to define his own gendered soul” as reflected in “the relationships between spiritual cultures and tropes of feminine identity” in his works. Suggests that these relationships are most clearly apparent on those occasions, such as baptisms, churchings, marriages, and funerals when, “as preacher and as patron-dependent poet,” he had to address them. Examines, therefore, “the nexus of literary, theological, and legal texts surrounding such particularly transitional social events” by focusing on “the sermons and sonnets as they respond to such social transitions” and by examining Biathanatos, Devotions, the hymns, epithalamia, sermons, and those poems, “in which, in response to such occasions, Donne’s sacred gendered soul is most clearly articulated.” Notes that the “capstone chapter for this examination of Donne’s acquisitive interest in ‘the idea of a woman’ will be a discussion of the Anniversaries,” which is Donne’s “most famous work celebrating a gendered rite of passage” (14). Announces that this study “will also analyze the series of conflicts over gender which became especially pressing in the liturgical rites and texts of the Church of England and with which Donne engages in his occasional texts” (14–15). Surveys and evaluates feminist criticism of Donne’s works and proposes to show that Donne’s “attempts to put on the personae of mothers, daughters, and brides in his sacred texts is part of a larger dynamic pattern in his culture” (25). In Chapter 2, “Baptism: ‘The Second Birth’” (26–70), discusses how Donne often sees his poetic identity and
priestly vocation as “emblemized by figures of maternality and birth” (71) and observes how in Corona, the Holy Sonnets, and the sermons, he tries “to establish his poetic and priestly identity alternately identifying and rejecting the literary tropes of maternal creation,” thereby engaging in a “complex textual fashion with the construction of the birth-mother in his spiritual culture” (70). In Chapter 3, “Marriage: ’Joyes Bonfire’” (71–112), discusses how Donne’s texts on marriage “address the potential and the problem of retaining a masculine self after becoming one flesh with a woman” and how he often depicts “the deconstruction of masculine subjectivity through images of brides and wives” (71). Examines selected sonnets, sermons, and epithalamia in which he expresses “the deeply conventional anxieties over loss of the masculine self in marriage” and his “ambivalence toward the institution of marriage” (111). Maintains that, for Donne, marriage to real brides or to the Bride of Christ is “a resistless force whose consuming power he both desires and fears” and that his “theological investigations of that conflict in relation to his own gendered subjectivity form an important part of his search for a gendered identity” (112).

In Chapter 4, “Death: ’Involved in Mankind’” (113–61), investigates the relationship between Donne’s “fascination with erotic deaths” and his “intense, ambivalent, and ambiguous interest in gender and death, especially his appropriation of a relationship with feminine figures in a defense against the finality and isolation of death” (113). Discusses the “crisis of gendered subjectivity” (160) in the Songs and Sonnets, Bia thanatos, the Holy Sonnets, the hymns, and his funeral sermons to show how “Donne and his sense of his own public and private identity are so clearly caught between death and the mother-daughter bond” (161). In Chapter 5, “The Anniversaries: ’The Idea of a Woman’” (162–87), discusses how the Anniversaries “because of their fascination with liminal gendering fits into the pattern of Donne’s other works.” Maintains that “[t]he transformation of real women into an idea of daughterly submission, maternal fruitfulness, or bridal consumption marks Donne’s sacred works” and that he “names this dynamic of idealization explicitly” in the Anniversaries (186), a set of poems that “contains the same manipulations of gender and subjectivity which mark so many of Donne’s sacred works which enter in the bonds of the idea of a woman” (187). Concludes with notes (188–207), a list of works cited (208–17), and an index (218–23).

Reviews:


Argues that Lam “can be profitably read as a powerful work of Jeremiah/Donne’s lament for the destruction/death of Jerusalem/Anne [More].” Notes that the church calendar of the Book of Common Prayer indicates that the liturgical readings assigned for August 12, 13, and 14 are from the Lamentations and that on August 15, 1617, Donne’s wife died. Points out that “[n]o great religious sophistication is required to see the applicability of the text to the tragedy” and that, “as a priest himself, Donne certainly would have read these chapters in services that he led.” Believes that Lam, therefore, is a “verse translation” to “memorialize the tragedy” (19). Shows how, in a few instances, Donne “seems to have modified the biblical text to match his own condition” (20).


Introduces papers presented at the 13th Annual John Donne Society Conference on Fare by Richard Todd, Graham Roebuck, and Theresa DiPasquale (entered separately in this bibliography along with the collation and discussion
of the poem’s text by Gary Stringer). Presents a
discussion of ll. 11–15 of Fare, maintaining that
the image in these lines reflects the language of 
Reformation discourses on images and that “[t]he effect of reading Donne’s handling of 
the image against the language of Reformation
discourse is to notice that the poet’s accusation 
against his speaker is against his effort to trivi-
alize what cannot be trivialized, to name what 
cannot be named, to deflect what cannot be de-
lected” (199).

333. Jagodzinski, Cecile M. Privacy and Print: Read-
ing and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England. 
Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia 
Press. 218p.

Points out that Donne had “a penchant for 
secrecy, for cloaking his writing in actual or 
metaphorical codes,” and that he tried to shield 
his writings “from the eyes of unauthorized 
readers” and to represent his letters as “the em-
bodyment” of his “true, undisguised” self (21). 
Observes that Donne’s letters constitute “one of 
the first major collections of letters” published 
in the seventeenth century and are important 
for “what they tell us (and may have told con-
temporary readers) about a burgeoning sense 
of self.” Comments on how the publication of 
the letters “illuminates the consequences of the 
purposeful readdressing of private letters to 
a larger audience” (86) and how Donne’s son 
“took vast liberties with the order and address-
ees of the letters” (87). Discusses the reasons for 
Donne’s reticence about having his letters made 
public. Points out that, for Donne, letters were 
“the means of staving off separation from oth-
ers,” for “resolving his own internal divisions” 
(89), and for conferring “upon loving corre-
spondents sanctity, power, a self-contained and 
protected world” (90). Concludes that Donne 
shows “the ways in which publication can both 
confirm and conflict with the physical and psy-
chological realities of the private self” (93).

334. Jiang, Honghong. [A Comparative Analysis of 
Two Sonnets by Donne and Shakespeare.] Journal of 
Zhangzhou Teachers College, no. 4: 91–95.

In Chinese. Compares the structure, prosody, 
rhetorical devices, and religious implications 
in HSBatter with Shakespeare’s Sonnet 146. 
Points out that Donne’s sonnet focuses on the 
relationship between death and eternal life and 
illustrates his belief in life-after-death, whereas 
Shakespeare’s sonnet emphasizes the body-
soul relationship and can be called religious 
because it has meditational elements.

335. Johnson, Jeffrey. “Recovering the Curse of Eve: 
John Donne’s Churcbing Sermons.” Ren&R 23, No. 
2: 61–77.

Surveys seventeenth-century views on the 
churcbing of women following childbirth and 
discusses Donne’s two churcbing sermons (one 
for Lady Doncaster and another for the Count-
ess of Bridgewater) as “orthodox correctives for 
rerecovering the larger theological significance 
of the churcbing service, which had become 
overshadowed by the social importance at-
tached to it.” Maintains that these two sermons 
are, in fact, extended homilies on the doctrine 
of repentance, in which Donne “seeks to dilate 
his auditors’ understanding of churcbing be-
ond the strict biblical and liturgical contexts 
informeded by Eve’s fall and her resultant curse of 
travail in childbirth,” reading “the churcbing of 
these aristocratic women in terms of the fallen 
condition of all humanity” and, thereby, fulfill-
ing “his own sense of calling by preaching the 
gospel of repentance” (63) in which he “calls all 
those in attendance to a communal participa-
tion in the body of Christ” (68).

336. -----. “Spectacle, Patronage, and Donne’s Ser-
mon at Hanworth, 1622.” SP 96: 96–108.

Discusses how in his sermon given at Han-
worth (1622) Donne “personalizes his homily to 
fit the circumstances” of two of his aristocratic 
patrons, James Hay and his father-in-law, Hen-
ry Percy. Observes how in the sermon Donne 
“reaffirms his views regarding the iconoclastic 
controversy of his time by providing a compel-
ing reading of the private lives of Hay and Per-
cy.” Points out how Donne used the occasion
“to correct and to dilate, through biblical exegesis and allusion, the spiritual vision of his chief auditors so that they might attain the right and godly use of vision discovered in the spectacle of Christ crucified.” Surveys Donne’s views on the on-going sectarian debates about sight and spectacle and maintains that Donne consistently argues for the instructional use of images and pictures in worship. Holds that “[w]hat Donne is finally after is an understanding that seeing and knowing conform one to right action” and that “pictures and emblems are beneficial to the extent that they foster community in the Church.” Discusses how Donne uses this backdrop to contrast the two very different sensibilities of Hay and Percy and how he argues that “while Hay’s pursuit of outward extravagance and ceremony keeps him from the error of iconoclasm, and while Percy’s attraction to a Stoic tranquility of mind tempers the idolatrous trappings of material prosperity,” both “the former’s indulgence in worldly magnificence and the latter’s negation of his passions in a type of inner iconoclasm must be moderated through the spectacle of Christ crucified,” which “makes possible the communion of saints.” Notes that Donne in his will gave to Hay a painting of the Virgin and Child thought to be the work of Titian.


In the “Preface” (ix-xiii), states that the purpose of this study is “to describe the distinguishing features of Donne’s theology, as revealed in the most extensive record of his mature thought, the Sermons, and to read the historical/political circumstances in which he preached in relation to these theological foundations.” In Chapter 1, “So Steepy a Place” (1–36), examines Donne’s view of the Trinity, “the fundamental and distinguishing belief for regulating Christian faith and practice.” Shows how Donne “conceives of the essential nature of the godhead as a divine community that through mutual consolation enlarged itself to create and then embrace humankind” and shows also how “[t]his image of dialogic unity serves Donne as the model for individuals to conform themselves to the triune God specifically through a liturgical participation in the Church.” Presents a reading of Donne’s sermon on Genesis 1:26 (April 1629), which “not only provides the most extensive explanation of his views of this doctrine” but which also “applies his theology to the immediate context of Charles I’s dissolution of Parliament (March 1629)” in order to influence the king “to maintain political unity through a dialogic process.” Maintains that as Donne’s “theological first principle, the doctrine of the Trinity informs every aspect of Donne’s religious thought and lays the foundation for the subsequent chapters in this study.” In Chapter 2, “To Batter Heaven” (37–60), discusses “the liturgical practice of common prayer Donne articulates in the Sermons and the private prayers that he made publicly available in his Devotions” (x). Presents a reading of Donne’s sermon preached before the king at Whitehall (5 April 1628). Points out that rather than a sermon on the fast that the king had ordered as a result of the military defeats in trying to free the Protestants at Íle de Rhé, Donne presents “a theologically nuanced explanation” of how prayer “should precede and inform acts of penitence such as fasting,” thereby illustrating “the manner in which common prayer proper defines the communion of saints.” In Chapter 3, “Through His Own Red Glass” (61–88), comments on Donne’s response to the on-going iconoclastic controversy. Observes how in the Sermons Donne insists that “sight is preeminent among the human senses” and how “[h]is persistent pleas for the use of pictures and images, both those tangible representations created by human hands and those painted in the mind by the spoken and written word, informs his understanding of the sacrament of baptism, including the signing of the cross.” Maintains that his views on sight and spectacle “speak to one’s responsibility for religious self-fashioning, especially for those in authority such as ministers and nobles, by perceiving and reflecting images worthy of imitation.” Illustrates this concept by discuss-
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ing Donne's sermon preached at Hanworth (25 August 1622), in which he “seeks to adjust the spiritual vision” of his two aristocratic patrons, James Hay and Henry Percy, “specifically Hay’s penchant for lavish outward display and Percy’s inclination toward Stoic resignation, by directing their sight to the spectacle of Christ crucified.” Maintains that in this sermon Donne exemplifies that “seeing leads to knowing, and to loving union, with God.” In Chapter 4, “Voice of the Turtle” (89–118), explores Donne’s doctrine of repentance and maintains that, for him, repentance is the central message of the gospel. Illustrates his views on repentance by (1) commenting on Donne’s two extant sermons on churching of women after childbirth that show his wish “to move his auditors beyond a strictly liturgical or a culturally delimiting understanding of the churching service” and “to lead them to a humble confession” (xi) and (2) his valediction sermon preached at Lincoln’s Inn before becoming chaplain for the embassy led by James Hay to Bohemia, along with Christ, written for the same occasion, to show how “[t]hese texts complement Donne’s concern expressed throughout the Sermons that proper repentance is accompanied by purifying communal contexts of prayer, preaching, and the Sacraments” (xi-xii). In Chapter 5, “O Taste & See” (119–47), discusses Donne’s doctrine of grace and his views on Christ’s presence in the Holy Eucharist. Points out that Donne holds that justification “comes through both faith and works” and that “the Word and Sacraments are together the effectual means of grace.” Observes that, regarding Christ’s presence in the Eucharist, Donne “espouses that the real presence of Christ is manifested in worthy communicants as they eat the bread and drink the wine,” thereby rejecting both Catholic transubstantiation and Protestant memorialism. Concludes that “the assimilation of oneself to God in the Church is for Donne the only theologically informed response to the Trinity’s diluting its own community to enfold humankind” (xii). Contains a bibliography (149–54), an index to Donne’s sermons that have been cited in this study (155–56), and a general index (157–62).

Reviews:


Comments on A. Alvarez’s critical understanding of Donne as reflected in his *The School of Donne* (1961). Points out that Alvarez considered Donne “the first intellectual realist in poetry” (22) and a “masculine rhetorician” whose “rhetoric came from emotions fully investigated, fully imagined and expressed by a mind that could not ignore the pressures of love and death.” Maintains that Alvarez was attracted by Donne because Donne “took risks” and “had much ambition and energy” as did Alvarez. Calls Alvarez’s book “an impressive start to a writing career” and “an achieved book, clever and sincere.” Observes that he “never tried anything quite like it again; that part of his development was over, his interests and gifts were too various to go on with work of just that kind” (23).


Discusses “some of the more important moments in European literature when poetry and
music went their separate ways” and shows how “poetry henceforth developed as an independent art form” (1). States that poetry that was sung to music “ended with Wyatt” (6) and maintains that any number of Donne’s poems could be cited to show “how completely some varieties of poetry in England had severed musical connections.” Observes that “the argumentative and rhetorical manner of some Metaphysical poems, and the extravagant and ingenious figures of speech—together, often, with a certain logical complexity—make solitary reading a requirement for their comprehension,” adding that “their verbal content would usually overwhelm any melody” and “appeals as much (or more) to the analytical intelligence and the visual imagination as it does to the ear” (110). Cites Canon as “deliberately unsingable” (129). Points out that although several of Donne’s poems were, in fact, set to music, such as Bait or Father, in these poems the “line of thought and the imagery are less challenging” and “easier to follow as a vocal performance,” than, for instance, in Ecst (137).


An original poem.


Argues that fishing is a “significant metaphor” in Air. Points out, for instance, that even the wordplay in the title of the poem suggests “hair,” the material used to make fishing lures and to hold their parts together, and “angles,” which are “crucial means in presenting the lure.” In particular, maintains that the phrase “loves pinnace” (l. 18) “designates a handmade artificial lure, specifically a fly.” Describes, therefore, “fishing with artificial lures in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in England” and explains “how and why the handcrafted lure, ‘loves pinnace,’ manifests the trifold nature of women,” a topic found in many of Donne’s love poems, but “never so wittily integrated with the sport of fly fishing” than in Air (75). Comments on other nautical and piscatorial words in Air. Discusses how a lure “may arouse carnal appetite that it cannot gratify” or that it “may induce a sublimated response that it cannot fulfill” and shows how these notions drawn from fly fishing inform the poem.


A detailed review of a production of Margaret Edson’s WIT at the Union Square Theatre in New York City on 9 January 1999. Points out connections between the play and Donne’s erotic and sacred poetry, especially HSDeath.


In Korean. Evaluates major trends in twentieth-century criticism of Donne and suggests that, “broadly speaking,” there are “two distinct trends,” one represented by T. S. Eliot and the other by Rosemond Tuve. Points out that Eliot argued that Donne’s poetry broke with tradition and created something new in lyric poetry while Tuve held that Donne did not create “a new poetic style but was conforming to the Renaissance doctrine of decorum.” Endorses Eliot’s view and comments, in particular, on the “dramatic elements” in Donne’s poetry (231).


Discusses Pope’s versification of Donne’s Satyres, citing as an example Sat4 (ll. 1–16). Maintains that the re-writing of these lines shows not only a “contrast in technique” but also a “contrast between two cultures.” Points out that Pope’s “double programme—tidying up the couplets, removing the bristly particulars and awkward syntax [that he found in Donne’s poem]—shows a rage for order” (7). Stresses that the extensive changes Pope made were not
simply stylistic but, in fact, were ideological changes.


Discusses “what seventeenth century writers themselves understood to be the relation—or non-relation—between time and literary value” and comments on “the concerns and anxieties specific to a period where concern with posterity is commonly recognized as ‘a particularly notable feature’” (3). Argues that Donne is “merely a twentieth century editorial and critical invention” and notes that “[t]he best criticism of Donne has always conceded the limits and instability of its own claims at understanding” (3). Reviews the view of seventeenth-century elegists who commented on the survival of Donne’s poetry, most of whom saw the Donnean moment as over. Claims that “[t]he challenge for our critical moment, sophisticated as it may be, lies in grasping the notion of a writer whom the twentieth century has made into a classic malgré lui, a writer who had no concern for literary posterity, whose contemporaries expressly denied such a possibility, and who is thus perhaps misrepresented by our persistence in thinking in such terms” (6). Points out that Donne was “an elitist coterie poet who eschewed print and, in some poetic genres at least, actively cultivated obscurity and exclusiveness.” Notes that Marotti, in fact, “has recently presented Donne as no author at all in the modern sense, but as manifesting the social textuality and instability of a manuscript culture to such a degree that we now have virtually ‘no documentary remains of Donne’s Donne’” (7).


11th impression in 2008.

In Part 1, “Introduction” (6–14), offers advice to students on how to study a poem, how to read Donne, and specifically how to read the Songs and Sonets and the Divine Poems. In Part 2, “Commentaries” (15–72), indicates that the text of the poems are taken from John Hayward’s 1950 edition; presents introductory notes to and glosses on individual lines in Sat3, ElPict, ElFatal, ElBed, Flea, GoodM, SGo, Under, SunRis, Canon, SSweet, Air, Anniv, Twick, LovGrow, Dream, ValWeep, LovAlch, Noct, Appar, ValMourn, Ect, LovDeity, Will, Relic, Expir, HSDue, HSScene, HSMin, HSDeath, HSBatter, HSShe, Goodf, Christ, Sickness, and Father. In Part 3, “Critical Approaches” (73–80), discusses the themes, rhythm, and language of Donne’s poems as well as three key terms—“metaphysical,” “wit,” and “conceit.” In Part 4, “Extended Commentaries” (81–106), gives more detailed critical discussions of SunRis, Appar, GoodM, LovAlch, and Anniv. In Part 5, “Background” (107–21), presents a biographical sketch of Donne and comments on the historical, religious, literary, and intellectual background that shaped Donne’s poetry. In Part 6, “Critical History and Further Reading” (122–32), discusses critical approaches to Donne’s poetry, primarily its twentieth-century reception. Comments on “new criticism,” psychoanalytical approaches, gender readings, and post-structuralist interpretations, followed by a partially annotated list of further readings. Concludes with a chronology (133–37) that lists in parallel columns historical events, Donne’s life, and major literary events, followed by brief definitions of selected literary terms (138–42) and a note on Phillip Mallett (142). Lists also other titles in the series (143–44).


Discusses briefly Ignatius, noting how Donne portrays the Jesuits as “Machiavellian ‘innova-
tors; threats to the modern nation-state because of their support for papal temporal supremacy and deposing power, their practices of equivocation, mental reservation and of not keeping faith with heretics, their international spying and manipulation, their questioning of the ideology of monarchy, and their sanctioning of invasion and regicide for changing a state's religion.” Points out how the work is a “dystopian fiction” (20).


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and works. Maintains that Donne was “arguably the most influential lyric poet in seventeenth-century England” and that “[h]is intellectualism, ‘conceited’ and forceful style, urbanity, rhetorical complexity, and dramatic handling of the lyric form all had a strong impact on such successors as Thomas Carew, Abraham Cowley, and Andrew Marvell.” Comments on Donne's fluctuating reputation, noting that in the early twentieth century he was “rediscovered and appropriated by modernist poets and critics, in particular by T. S. Eliot and the New Critics, the latter inaugurating a large body of formalist interpretations before more historically oriented scholars and critics of the last quarter of the twentieth century resituated Donne’s poetry and prose in their original sociocultural matrix.” Concludes that Donne’s “status in the canon of early modern English writing is now secure” (178). Contains a selected bibliography of primary and secondary works.


Maintains that metaphysical poetry “explores the problem of finding some transcendent principle that will unify and harmonize the warring multiplicities of human experience” (26) and cites the Anniversaries as an example. Discusses how the three powers of the soul—understanding, memory, and will—according to Augustinian psychology, operate in the two poems. Argues that the final goal of the whole meditative sequence is to reveal “the process of repairing the Image of God in man and woman, as far as this can be achieved in earthly life,” which Donne sees as “a goal available in some measure to every human being.” Emends his earlier work on the poems in which he had labelled only the first part of each section of FirAn as a “meditation” and argues that, in fact, “the whole threefold sequence of every section constitutes a meditation by the three powers of the soul, while the whole five-part or seven-part sequence [SecAn] constitutes a complete meditation,” with FirAn “clearing the ground for the ‘Progres’ envisaged” in SecAn. Maintains that thus one can see how “the terms ‘metaphysical’ and ‘meditative’ coincide” since “both terms indicate a profound search for the One principle that lies within or behind the bewildering multiplicities of human existence” (33). Contrasts T. S. Eliot’s Quartets and The Wasteland with Donne’s poems, noting that for Eliot the “meditative, metaphysical probing seems to have no plan, no rational schema to follow, as Donne had” (34). Points out that Donne, unlike Eliot, had “behind him the whole European tradition of methodical meditation, a tradition based on a profound theological principle.” Maintains that “[t]he Augustinian theory of the three powers gave men and women dignity, with the assurance that they had within them a divine principle, a trinity of powers,” whereas Eliot “has none of this” (34).


Maintains that Donne’s religious poetry “conforms to seventeenth-century ideas about edification” but that “the ways it conforms are simply hard to see because of our understanding of Donne’s original audiences and the kind of mimesis Donne tries to achieve in the Divine Poems” (2). Argues that “[t]he solution to the problem of edification in Donne’s poems
lies in looking past the specificity of Donne’s readership and toward the poet’s investment in rhetorical theory” (10). Discusses how Donne’s religious poems “imitate nature as it is,” i.e., they portray “spiritual conflicts realistically without attempting to quell feelings of doubt, uncertainty, or disorder” and that they “explore the affective dimensions of Christian truths and doctrines with an eye toward acknowledging, not denying or passing over, the significant hardships they pose for anyone who would contemplate them honestly.” Maintains, therefore, that “[c]ollectively, the Divine Poems establish a compelling representation of a spiritual seeker who works desperately for understanding but has trouble overcoming his fears and his incredibly powerful sense of himself.” Believes that in his religious poems Donne “attempts to alleviate the tormented soul’s isolation by showing its commonality” and thus that Donne believes that edification will result from “experiencing a sense of connection with others whose anguish was understandable and mutually experienced” (11).


Briefly comments on how Donne is “a particularly good example of the cultural elite and the lesser gentry and military attempting to change the basic reluctance of company merchants and landed gentry to risk investments in settlements abroad.” Calls Donne “one of empire’s most avid and poetic supporters” and notes that he was “bitterly disappointed when William Strachey was chosen over him for the secretarial post for Jamestown.” Maintains that, for Donne, “the new world of battling empires is as everyday, intimate, and private as a lover’s nakedness.” Points out how he did his best in his sermon to the Virginia Company in 1622 “to show all ills at home … could be turned into benefits through colonization” (99).


Originally published as Histoire du suicide: La société occidentale face à la mort volontaire (Paris: Libraire Arthème Fayard, 1995).

Discusses Biathanatos and points out that Donne was “neither a marginal figure nor an eccentric” but rather “a responsible clergyman” and, therefore, “[t]hat fact lends his treatise undeniable gravity.” Observes that Donne claims that “in some cases suicide is justifiable” and notes that it was “the first work wholly devoted to a rehabilitation of suicide.” Says that, like Justus Lipsius, Donne, fully recognizing the audacity of his treatise, considered destroying it and refused to have it published during his lifetime, “limiting himself to circulating copies among friends whom he could trust.” Suggests that this reluctance was based on his not wanting to take responsibility for the deaths of those who might read his treatise: “[i]t was one thing to profess admiration for Brutus and Cato, figures from so remote a past as to be nearly mythic” but that “it was quite another thing to demonstrate that suicide is an act that does not violate natural or divine law” and thus “should not be penalized” (94). Points out that Donne “insists that he is not writing a defense of suicide and refuses to specify the precise conditions under which suicide might be condemned” (94–95). Maintains that Biathanatos “is rooted” both in Donne’s life and in the theological and philosophical trends of his time. Notes that one of Donne’s “most daring moves” was “to treat suicide within the framework of Christian thought.” Points out how in Biathanatos Donne argues that suicide is not “contrary to the law of nature, to the law of reason, and to the law of God” (95). Concludes that although his “reasoning has its weak points; his style is heavy and tiresome; and he overuses syllogism and analogy,” Donne’s arguments, nonetheless, are “undeniably forceful” (96). Notes that following the publication of Biathanatos in 1647, there were a number of attacks on Donne’s
treatise.


Collection of 10 previously published essays or extracts from books: Achsah Guibbory’s “‘Oh, let mee not serve so’: The Politics of Love in Donne’s Elegies” from ELH 57 (1990): 811–33 (25–44); Tilottama Rajan’s “‘Nothing sooner broke’: Donne’s Songs and Sonnets as Self-Consuming Artifacts” from ELH 49 (1982): 805–28 (45–62); Catherine Belsey’s “John Donne’s Worlds of Desire” from Desire: Love Stories in Western Culture (Oxford, 1994), 130–49 (63–80); Barbara Estrin’s “Small Change: Defections from Petrarchan and Spenserian Poetics” from Laura: Uncovering Gender and Genre in Wyatt, Donne, and Marvell (Durham, NC, 1994), 149–79 (81–121); Richard Halpern’s “The Lyric in the Field of Information: Autopoiesis and History in Donne’s Songs and Sonnets” from The Yale School of Criticism 6 (1993): 185–215 (104–21); David Aers’s and Gunther Kress’s “Darke texts need notes’: Versions of Self in Donne’s Verse Epistles’ from Literature, Language and Society in England 1580–1680, ed. David Aers, Bob Hodge, and Gunther Kress (Dublin, 1981), 23–48 (122–34); Elizabeth Harvey’s “Matrix as Metaphor: Midwifery and the Conception of Voice” from Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts (London, 1992), 76–115 (135–56); Stanley Fish’s “Masculine Persuasive Force: Donne and Verbal Power” from Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry, ed. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus (Chicago, 1990), 223–52 (157–81); Nancy Wright’s “The Figura of the Martyr in John Donne’s Sermons’ from ELH 56 (1989): 293–309 (182–97); and William Kerrigan’s “The Fearful Accommodations of John Donne’ from ELR 4 (1974): 337–63 (198–216). Each of these essays is annotated either in Roberts 1 or Roberts 2. In the introduction, the editor comments on major characteristics of Donne’s poetry and prose, such as his “astonishing versatility of perception,” his “verbal gymnastics” and “endless play of language” (3), and his “mobility of mind” (4). Maintains that Donne “remains other to the attempt to reduce his work to one or another philosophy, attitude, or social and political context” and that “[p]erhaps it is this resistance of Donne to translation that defines his problematic, intangible identity” (5). Surveys shifts in literary criticism since the publication of the first Casebook in 1972, introduces the essays included, outlines some of the new critical theories upon which the essays are based, and discusses “the identifying marks which separate one thing off from another thing” (10), such as “the particularity” of Donne’s style and “the ostensibly internal dynamics of phenomena, like desire and lyric poetry” (11). Concludes with further readings (editions, bibliographies and cross-period collections of criticism on Donne, assessments of twentieth-century criticism on Donne, essentialist criticism, Renaissance studies and modern critical theory, recent critical approaches to Donne, some recent books and collections of essays on Donne, and some introductions to modern theory) followed by notes on contributors and an index (217–233).

Reviews:


Calls Carew’s elegy on Donne and also his verse letter to Ben Jonson “two of the most accomplished examples of literary criticism in English verse” (89). Focuses on “the main medium within which Carew’s verse was read in the Caroline period—the manuscript verse miscellany,” and argues that the two poems “should be approached in terms of the tradition of answer-poetry which was generated by the competitive ethos of that literary form.” Maintains that, “when this context is recovered, the audacity and skill of Carew’s responses to Jonson’s ode and Donne’s death are more readily appreciated: Carew does not seek merely to celebrate,
but actively to engage with both writers” and to “demonstrate his ability to distill, reflect, and move beyond their poetic achievement” (90). Argues, therefore, that Carew’s elegy on Donne “should be approached as a poem of competition and self-definition rather than one of unqualified praise.” Points out that the poem circulated in manuscript before it appeared in the 1633 edition of Donne’s poems, noting that Henry King’s elegy in the first edition “seems to answer Carew almost word-for-word.” Discusses how Carew’s elegy is an answer-poem that echoes the techniques and language of Donne, thereby showing Carew’s “control over them” and inviting “a comparison between his own poetic skills and those of Donne” (100). Notes, for example, that Carew’s “image of Donne’s struggle with language is more easily read as a reference to Donne’s limitations than to his greatness” (102). Concludes that Carew’s “display of his mastery of Donne’s conceits and language is intended to send out a clear message to his reader: you might have lost Donne, but you still have me” (105).


Presents a brief introduction to Donne’s life and poetry, which stresses his religious background and development, his marriage, and his being primarily an unpublished coterie poet (1–3). In “Part 1: Analysing Donne’s Poetry” ([15]–163), presents the texts and critical analyses of ElBed, ElProg, Air, SGo, Satt, Leg, GoodM, LovUsury, Flea, ValMourn, Fever, Ecst, Prohib, WomCon, Appar, LovInf, Anniv, Noct, ValWeep, Fun, Damp, Sat3, Twick, HuntMan, HSMade, HSWhat, HSBattery, Goodf, Father, HSShe, HSSpit, HSScene, and HSDeath. In “Part 2: The Context and the Critics” ([165]–205), discusses Donne’s life and works (167–73); surveys the critical history of the reception of his poetry from Dryden to T. S. Eliot (174–88); comments on contemporary views of Donne’s poetry, especially those of John Carey in John Donne: Life, Mind and Art (1981); John Staniewski in The Persecutory Imagination (1991); and Stevie Davies in John Donne (1994) (189–202). Gives a list of further readings (202–05), followed by notes (206–08) and an index (209–11).

Reviews:


Briefly comments on HSBatter, noting how Donne addresses God as one would a lover. Points out the paradoxical and passionate, even violent, language in the sonnet.


Maintains that, in writing Lit during a difficult time in his own life, Donne employed “a spiritual exercise used by crisis-plagued Christians as early as the fourth century” but that, in doing so, he knew that he was “at odds with his intention of avoiding religious controversy” since use of the litany during the Reformation was highly controversial (399). Argues that although Donne used Lit “as a means to pray his way out of the crisis of nothingness” that he was experiencing at the time, he, in fact, “compounds his plight by the poem’s end” as he becomes “increasingly aware of his own sinfulness and more skeptical about human agency, including the power of prayer itself” (400). Outlines the events in Donne’s life during this period that brought him to his “crisis of nothingness” and shows how “the causes and symptoms of Donne’s crisis inform most of the poem’s parts” and how, “[h]oping to find personal relief, Donne takes an historically communal prayer and turns it into an examination of his own conscience,” thereby making “his crisis more debilitating” (413).

Compares and contrasts Donne throughout this study with both his predecessors and followers, especially the Petrarchists, the Roman elegists and satirists, Jonson, Drayton, Joseph Hall, Carew, Suckling, Lovelace, Herbert, Milton, Vaughan, and Margaret Cavendish. Devotes Chapter 1, “Irremediably Donne” (1–22), to a discussion of the novelty of Donne’s poetry, not only its difficulty but, more importantly, “the hyperbolic quality of Donne’s imagination” and the “indecorous” nature of his verse (3). Points out how Donne was able “to redetermine the expansive energies of his predecessors into a radically different idiom.” Comments on “the searching, colloquial immediacy that Donne brought to all his poetry” (5) and how he re-imagined amatory verse, asking us “to imagine a fuller range of attitudes and expressions than previous amatory verse had acknowledged” (9). Discusses how Donne “combines the frank eroticism” of Ovid and Propertius “with contemporary expansionist discourse” (10) by commenting on ElBed; surveys Donne’s range of attitudes about and witty expression of love in the Songs and Sonets by commenting primarily on Flea, GoodM, Sun-Ris, Anniv, ValWeep, and Noct; and discusses how “the problems and effects” (16) found in Donne’s secular poetry reappear in his religious poems by commenting on the Holy Sonnets, Goodf, Christ, and Sickness. Concludes that “however we contextualize Donne, it must also be said that he sounds very little like anyone else” (22). Contains notes (287–309) and an index (310–23).


Briefly discusses the Satyres. Says that “[a]t its best (which probably means Donne), Elizabethan satire implicitly explores the unstable mentality behind its claims to cure society’s ills” and that “[i]t is at its subtler in probing with some nervousness the nature of language, the verbal enormities committed by social misfits, and the government’s power to muzzle those who bark” (289). Points out that Donne favors the satirical vituperation of Juvenal rather than the urbanity of Horace.


Discusses the tear conceit in ValWeep, noting how “one single tear is transformed into a coin, then into a globe, and finally into the world” and how “the mistress’s tears are given the power to physically destroy the poet’s whole world” (92). Maintains that “[i]n having as its very centre its own far-fetchedness, in actually telling the reader that it is now making nothing into everything, the poem seems to draw attention to the conceit as a rhetorical figure, and as such a purely literary construct,” thereby drawing attention “to its own status as a literary and rhetorical construct” (94).


Argues that Pseudo-Martyr and Essayes should be considered as companion pieces since, “behind them, at their basis, the role of eternity is pivotal.” Maintains that “[n]either work reveals its true sense unless Donne can be clearly perceived in each as wrestling to grasp how things in time reflect the eternal, and how the eternal gives time its significance” (1). Examines this “play of eternity behind both works” (2), noting that an “essential thought” in both is “that everything that is in time passes and that the presence of anything in the universe must be measured pressingly, immediately, by the existential eternal reality of whatever time has to offer” (4), an idea that also underlies the Anni-versaries. Claims that Donne emerges in both Pseudo-Martyr and in Essayes as “a Renaissance humanist navigating in the world of human affairs between the Scylla of altering conceptions of the spirit on the left, and the Charbydis of crumbling conceptions of temporal political
state authority on the right,” who tries “to find a point where spirit and state, as in the defunct medieval ladder of being, still inhabit each other.” Explains how both *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Essays* are “embedded deeply in the humanist tradition” and are informed not only by the Greeks and Romans, the Ancient Jews, and the early and later Fathers of the Church but also by “the subculture of Ancients of the Zoroastrians, the Cabalists, the Hermetists and the Chaldean oracles” (5). Comments on how both works “draw on these Ancients and on the subculture Ancients and on what contemporaries of the then modern Europe had to say about them in relation to the political state of God’s eternity” (6).


Argues that although Donne wrote *Pseudo-Martyr* in order to convince Catholics that they could take the Oath of Allegiance to James I “without betraying their spiritual loyalty to Rome,” his argument also “develops a barely veiled exhortation” to Pope Paul V “to show monarchical clemency to James I on the grounds that the mercy of magistrates is a virtue of the Christian philosophy of power” (157–58). Maintains that “although it is replete with Donne’s considerable humanist learning in the law, philosophy, theology, and political warfare, and while it supports the Oath of Allegiance, *Pseudo-Martyr* also propounds what was an ancient and still vital current of political thought on royal mercy and pardon.” Describes how “[r]oyal mercy, clemency, and pardon were not only considered to be Christian virtues in some abstract fashion, but were also a form of very practical everyday political conduct as well” and “constituted a vital avenue of political activity with a virtuous character for both the beseecher and the beseeched.” Points out that Thomas Aquinas is the main source of this concept and that in the Renaissance, “such mercy, clemency, and pardon had become conditions of the exercise of absolute power by kings and popes.” Points out how Donne’s treatise, “seen in the light of the Renaissance’s heritage of the virtues of royal mercy, clemency, and pardon tends to reconcile a number of divergent modern opinions about the work” (158).


Presents a reading of *ElBrac* to illustrate its indebtedness to Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius. Argues that *ElBrac* is a poem that “avoids telling its audience directly what we cannot fail to perceive—that the woman loves gold better than her lover” (16). Shows how Donne, like the Roman elegists, comments on the political and social evils of gold and how it corrupts not only religious and political relationships but also amatory ones.


Discusses the challenges of translating Donne’s polysemic language by considering four different versions of *HSBatter*—those by Cristina Campo (1971), Giorgio Melchiori (1985), Rosa Tavelli (1995), and the Catalan version by JoSEP SobrèS (1982). Points out that an analysis of the different translations reveals that Donne’s polysemia has not been consistently rendered into the target language, not even when equivalent terms are available. Suggests that this probably results from Donne’s complex and elusive language.


Maintains that *Sickness* “revisits geographical images” from Donne’s earlier writings, “ones which were deployed in the interests of religious toleration.” Argues that it is “apt that the personal anxiety attendant on Donne’s own apostasy should emerge in poems,” such as *Sickness*, that “concern death and sickness.” Points out that “the globe, and the rolled-up
‘flat mapp’” in Sickness “had long suggested to
the poet a likeness among branches of Chris-
tendom” and “the multiplicity of 'straits' the
different but cognate ways in which men could
come to God.” Maintains that the “straits” in
the hymn “give equal weight not simply to the
varieties of Christian experience, but [also] to
the suffering which informs all of them” (257).

Streets, and Urban Environments in English
Poetry from Donne to Gay,” in The Nature of Cities:
Ecocriticism and Urban Environments, ed. Michael
Bennett and David W. Teague, 33–54. Tucson: Uni-
versity of Arizona Press.

Cites Wall as an early urban poem but notes
that it does not contain “the kind of informa-
tion about city life that we typically expect from
urban poets” (34). Notes the wordplay and wit
in the epigram but says it lacks “the intensely
subjective and problematic experience of indi-
viduality” found in modern urban poems and
that the urban space and the wit in Wall are
“specific to a time and place that are not acces-
sible to us” (35). Points out that Sat1 “borrows
the kinesthetic satiric method of Horace’s Ninth
Satire, Book I” (50), which “moves the reader
out of the private space of the individual into a
relentlessly social representation of space and
back again.” Points out that, in the London of
Donne, “the relationship of experience to envi-
ronment is mediated by performative codes—
gestures, manners, and clothing—that shape
the human body itself into a walking transcrip-
tion of the urban space.” Claims, therefore, that
Sat1 “launches a critical representation of ur-
ban London with the active reading of its mo-
bile sign system” and that the satire should be
read “as a part of the historical development of
the kinesthetic rhetoric of urban poetry” (51).

367. Roebuck, Graham. “Into the Shadows…:

Observes that Fare is a “notoriously difficult”
poem and that recent critics have found “no
consensus beyond the obvious certainty that it
is a poem expressive of disillusionment at the
possibility of fulfillment of sexual love” (215).

Presents a critical overview of the poem and
suggests that Fare, though not autobiographi-
cal, reflects some of Donne’s “deepest and most
persistent concerns” and that “the tortured
syntax of the poem enacts the intellectual
struggle of the speaker against the bondage of
his condition, while the cool cynicism of his at-
titude projects a wished-for freedom from that
bondage that we know he will not achieve.”

Maintains that, “as we attend to the speaker’s
argument, doomed, as it is, to futility by its
solipsism, we discover those pervasive con-
cerns of the poet, discovering their presence,
one might say, by their shadows” (218). Sugg-
est that in Fare Donne is “exploring through
a persona the penumbra of extinction” and that
it becomes a “journey down into the Egypt of
self-love” (223). Comments on the reference to
“worme-seed” in the last line of the poem, not-
ing that Ovid comments on the bitterness of
wormwood and refers to it to emphasize “the
harshness of the region of his exile” and “the
blackness of his fate” (224). Suggests that pos-
sibly Donne remembered “these bitter Ovidian
verses” when he wrote Fare, which would add
“another dimension to the sense in which the
speaker and, possibly, the poet, like Ovid, say‘vale’: farewell to love” (225).

368. Rude, Donald W. “John Donne and The Female
Tatler: A Forgotten Eighteenth-Century Apprecia-

Maintains that the discovery of an essay enti-
tled “Emilia’s Day” that appeared in The Female
Tatler (No. 110. From Friday, March 24 to Mon-
day, March 1710) “does not completely discred-
it the notion that the prevalent view of Donne
in the early Eighteenth Century was negative”
but that “it does attest to the fact that an op-
posing view did exist.” Points out that “[i]ts
appearance in a newspaper designed for a fe-
male audience indicates that the popularity of
Donne among women prevalent in the later
Seventeenth Century continued to prevail.”

Points out how the author holds up Donne
“as a model poet and a model lover” and how
she “lavishes praise upon Donne the man and Donne the writer” (162). Notes that the essay is “the longest assessment of the poet and his works to appear between Dryden’s ‘Discourse’[1693] and John Oldmixon’s commentary on Donne’s works in The Arts of Logic and Rhetoric (1728)” and shows how it “offers an implicit rebuttal of Dryden’s views of Donne and the response of women to him.” Comments, in particular, on the “purported reactions” of a group of female readers to Ecst and Anniv (154). Suggests that the author of the essay “may well have been Susannah Centlivre,” a minor playwright of the period (155).


Original poem about Donne, suggested perhaps by Ham.


 Maintains that the two voices in Ignatius, that of the narrator and that of Ignatius, represent two prose styles: “the Senecan, or anti-Ciceronian, style of the narrator and the Ciceronian style of Ignatius” (84). Argues that Donne “is highlighting two competing prose styles prevalent in later sixteenth and early seventeenth century England” but that “because those two voices are part of a Menippean satire, it becomes difficult, perhaps impossible, to tell which style is to be preferred” (84–85). Shows how Donne uses “both competing styles” in Ignatius “in an effort to broaden the satire ostensibly directed at the Jesuits” (86). Points out that in one instance, when Ignatius “loses his Ciceronian calm, and begins speaking in Senecan fashion” (94), “the narrator’s voice and Ignatius’ voice overlap” (95) and the “sentence structure makes it difficult to distinguish the voices from one another.” Maintains that this “confusion of voices (and therefore the confusion of sentence structure) occurs by design: Donne wants two characters not only to clash but to seem indistinguishable from one another.” Concludes that in Ignatius “the very form the narration takes becomes suspect in the hands of Donne’s hapless narrator” and that, “[s]een in this way, the objects of satire can of course include the Jesuits and Ignatius Loyola, as well as the competing prose styles of the day and those who employ them” (96).


Discusses the longstanding argument over Donne’s “irregularity” to show that “the sheer persistence of this notion within Donne studies not only reveals something about Donne’s texts and the responses they encourage, but also tells us something of the pleasurable excitation, the ideological functionalism, and finally, the explanatory limits of meter itself, as it has been traditionally conceived” (172). Argues that “the study of versification cannot afford to be less sensitive than any other branch of contemporary literary criticism of the ideological effects and historical contingencies of even the most apparently formal linguistic properties.” Suggests that “a radically historicized reading of Donne’s ‘metrics’ [should] take the bold step of refusing to apply a traditional foot-based schematic to his verse” (181) and that one should ask if Donne perhaps “adopts distinct principles of versification according to his poetic mode.” Stresses, however, that the purpose of this study is not to resolve the question of Donne’s irregularity so much as “to show what the debate itself reveals about the implication of the aesthetic (as represented by metrics) in the psycho-sexual and moralistic sphere.” Believes that the argument over Donne’s irregularity reveals that “the ability to recognize metrical regularity in a piece of poetic language has constituted one of the more abiding and even downright weird cultural fantasies of the literary profession” (182).

Discusses Donne's sermon to the members of the Virginia Company, in which he urges all Englishmen “to support the colonial enterprise, especially the work of converting the natives to Christianity” (119). Points out that Donne “clearly indicates that he has embraced a colonial ideology that emphasizes the importance of love without ruling out the usefulness of fear” and that his vision of the native population is essentially “that of vassals, ultimately to God, but first to the King of England.” Notes also how in the sermon Donne “asserts that England’s colonial activity in Virginia will help solve social and economic woes at home” (120). Maintains that although the sermon “echoes both the logic and rhetoric of earlier promotional literature,” it introduces “a new, potentially troubling, strain”: Donne “urges his listeners to regard their rivals for colonial territories as ‘Doctrinal’ ones rather than ‘National’ ones,” i.e., they must save the New World from the colonial activities of Catholics. Observes that during the first decade of the seventeenth century the colonial enterprise was envisioned by Donne and others primarily as projecting “a unified and coherent English Protestant identity into the New World” (121) but that, in fact, “it would not be long before England’s colonies themselves would be transformed into sites of doctrinal and political conflict” (121–22).


Surveys Donne’s life, works, and fluctuating critical reception and comments on major characteristics of his poetry. Maintains that “religious and secular, soul and body, are so intertwined in Donne, his thinking and feeling, so of a piece, that what he says in one sphere remains true of another” and that for that reason “his religious and devotional poems affect with force even readers who disbelieve or detest the vexed Anglican faith they arise from” (203). Points out that “[a]mong the papers he kept by him until he died was a copy of Bacon’s then famous poem “The World” and notes similar themes in Bacon’s poem and Donne’s poems, such as “the vanity of life” and “the fact of death and the need to prepare for it” (204). Contrasts Marlowe’s elegy “To Dawn, not to hurry” and SunRis to illustrate Donne’s original treatment of the traditional love elegy. Argues that “[t]he thematic concerns and radical procedures of Donne’s poetry reveal a personality as complex and controversial as the verse itself” (209) and maintains that “if one misunderstands the man one misreads the poems” (211). Holds that Donne’s “actual achievement has been obscured by those who praise his eccentricities, paint him as a contemporary and deprive him of his authority as a rich, even an alien, other” (212). Praises the profound ambiguities in both Donne’s life and poetry and his reluctance to solve them too facilely as well as his ability to combine piety and wit.


Maintains that in the dramatic monologue speakers are “less often self-conscious casuists than unconscious self-deceivers” who unintentionally reveal themselves. Sees Donne’s poems, therefore, as “dramatic lyrics rather than dramatic monologues since they lack the essential feature of unconscious revelation.” Notes that in Ecst and Canon, for instance, the speakers are “highly self-conscious casuists.” Points out that, in contrast to many of Browning’s speakers, Donne’s lover in Ecst “comes out exactly where he had planned” and that “[h]is argument is carefully rehearsed, and proceeds logically to its foreseen conclusion.” Observes that “[e]ven when Donne’s seducers are themselves momentarily seduced by a metaphysical conceit or metaphor, the foreseen conclusion of their arguments, though temporarily delayed, is never in doubt” (442). Points out that in Canon “[e]ven when the witty ironist denies any use of Petrarchan hyperbole as he passes
swiftly through the whole gamut of drowned merchant ships, tear-flooded ground, and love-sick fevers, he deftly converts his contradiction into a rhetorical trope, paralipsis, over which he continues to exercise full and self-conscious control” (445).


Lists 21 heretofore unrecorded eighteenth-century allusions to Donne or to his works.


Briefly discusses *Metem*, calling it a conversion-narrative that exploits “the freedoms of Menippean satire to say the unsayable” and uses “the Pythagorean notion of the transmigration of souls to explore the moral implications of linearity” (184). Compares and contrasts Donne’s satire with the anti-Jesuit, anti-Catholic works of Richard Carpenter. Maintains that both writers “show the suitability of Menippean satire as a means to describe ideological voyaging within a writer” and both “demonstrate how the genre was thoroughly implicated in the conventions of seventeenth-century religious controversy” (186).


Maintains that the purpose of preaching, according to Donne, is “to make Christian believers subject to God’s voice, through the voice of the preacher” and that, for him, “[t]he authorized voice of the church is the preacher’s” (264). Notes that Donne distinguishes between “the mere pleasure of listening” to a sermon and “an inspiration to act upon the word preached” (268).


Discusses how clothing in *ElBed* “provides imaginative structure, metaphorical depth, and sexual ambiguity” and how “what seems to be a chaos of discarded garments is actually a meticulous catalogue of feminine costume with connotations that intensify the references in each line, charging the images with erotic fire and ingenuity.” Shows how, “[d]esigned around an orderly striptease, dress in the poem materially represents the changeable, urgent, and mysterious nature of desire” and how the speaker in the poem “uses costume to command and describe a series of erotic acts that ascribe to specific accessories complex and abstract imagery.” Observes that in *ElBed* Donne “does not employ any exclusively feminine article of clothing,” that “all the items he mentions in the poem were worn by both men and women,” and thus points out how he “plays on Renaissance sensibilities of dress and gender” (25). Points out that in the Elizabethan age fashions were “extravagant, and constrictive, differentiated by rank more than gender; and centered on what was underneath—not the body, but the underclothing” (27). Comments on the girdle, the breastplate, the corset, the stomacher, the watch, the busk, the gown, the chemise, headgear, and shoes to show how “the particulars of the mistress’ wardrobe” illuminate “Renaissance witticisms of love and costume” and both embellish and complicate “the orderly scenario the poem’s structure initially presents” (54).


Surveys the history of the term “metaphysical poetry” as it is applied to Donne’s love poetry and then questions “the appropriateness of applying the term” to Herbert’s devotional poetry (43). Comments especially on Dr. Johnson’s criticism of the metaphysical poets and points out that Johnson regards them as “purely egotistical and vain intellectuals” who have “no real interest in human life, feeling, or experi-
ence” and who “aimed neither to move nor to illuminate but merely to startle—through erudition or through incongruity” (47). Maintains that to answer Johnson’s criticism “one would have to show that Donne was truly concerned with representing and moving the emotions in his lyrics” (49). Says that in a poem such as ValMourn, a poem Johnson cites as objectionable, one would need to take seriously both the possibility and undesirability of “extravagant grief in the implied situation”; “to think seriously about respect, trust, intimacy, and ongoing commitment”; to take “the precision and almost the fussiness of the language as part of the meaning of the gesture of the poem”; to attend to “refusals of hyperbole” and to the subtle language of the poem; to recognize the “internal logic” of the closing compass image; and finally to show thereby that, contrary to Johnson’s claim, “Donne’s mind is not ‘turned…more upon that from which the illustration is drawn than that to which it is applied’” (50–51). Notes that similarly the last line in GoodM is not “dragged into the poem merely to show off Donne’s erudition and arcane knowledge” but rather sees how it “arises in the course of the poem” (51). Concludes that “with regard to both Donne and Herbert (and perhaps quite a number of other poets), we should be sure not to allow affecting the metaphysics to obscure the emotional and spiritual content that makes this poetry worth reading in the first place, that makes it worth reading by us as suffering and enjoying beings, and not, to return to Dr. Johnson on the ‘race of writers who may be termed the metaphysical poets,’ as ‘Epicurean deities, making remarks on the actions of men, and the vicissitudes of life, without interest and without emotion’” (59).


Presents a brief history of the Donne variorum project and explains the purpose of the edition, the textual principles followed by the editors, and the importance of the critical commentary in each volume. Points out several concrete results of the work on the text, commenting particularly on Ham, Antig, and the matter of poem sequence in the epigrams. Comments also on the creation of the John Donne Society and its annual conferences.

381. ———. “More on Reading ‘How It Goes.’” JDJ 18: 267–75.


Presents a collation of the text of Fare and reviews its transmissional history. Maintains that “[t]he surety of knowing that the text we [now] have of ‘Farewell to Love’ is the text Donne intended us to have stands to invigorate and redirect the critical enterprise” (213).


Points out that Donne, in contrast to the Presbyterian conformists who regarded the common prayer service of the Church of England as a “depersonalized and mechanical performance,” held that these set forms of prayer “empower rather than efface the expression of the individual voice” and points out that in his sermons he argues that the “internalization of external forms” collapses “all divisions between personal and liturgical prayer.” Maintains that this “representation of the relationship between the individual worshipper and the established church suggests a striking alternative to the common critical account of devotional subjectivity in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, an account that tends to identify private practices alone as capable of edifying the
worshipper’s internal self” (469). Challenges specifically this “dominant opposition between personal and liturgical worship in criticism of the religious lyric” and demonstrates “the ways in which a first-person and subjective poetics emerged out of public devotional practice.” Explores “the theological efficacy that the Established Church attributed to formal perfection in prayer” and examines “the ecclesiastical conditions that promoted the use of formalized devotional language.” Maintains that such a survey helps one understand “the particular motivation of seventeenth-century religious poetry.” Argues that “no form of worship more closely approximates the poet’s conjunction of a simultaneously personal and paradigmatic voice than that of common prayer” (471). Focuses primarily on Herbert’s poetry but briefly discusses Donne’s *Sidney*, in which Donne “reiterates the liturgical relationship between formally perfected texts of prayer and the acquisition of spiritual grace” and “envisions the Sidney Psalter as an exemplary text for devotional reformation” (478).

### 384. Todd, Richard.

Points out that *Fare* is one of Donne’s “most problematic lyrics” and that it presents “unusual textual difficulties.” Argues that “the interpretative difficulties” come not only from the shortcomings of textual editors but “are enhanced by what all extant forms of the poem contain in the shifting significance of one deceptively simple word: ‘thing[e]s’ (however spelt)” (229). Paraphrases the poem and maintains that “more than any other example of this subgenre of the erotic elegy that renounces erotic love, *Fare* is ‘preoccupied with the passing of time’” and that Donne “expresses that passing by being simultaneously concrete and abstract” (233). Examines the complicated syntax, uncertain tone, various textual cruxes, and the general textual instability of *Fare*.


Discusses Donne’s tolerant, yet ambivalent view of lesbian love in *Sappho*. Points out that Donne considered lesbian desire as belonging to a prelapsarian or utopian moment and notes that he expresses “both an attraction to its utopian promise of plenitude as well as the fear that this promise may prove an illusion and dissolve into a barren autoeroticism” (53). Argues that Donne’s “construction of the love between Sappho and Philaenis as a postheterosexual relationship of intimacy” offers “a kind of counterdiscourse to the dominant themes of libertine literature and its representation of female-female desire as a form of sexual expression that attracts, fascinates, threatens, and yet is ultimately distanced as insignificant.” Maintains that Donne constructs “a homoerotic intimacy that occupies a liminal position between a nonpenetrative, traceless (and therefore ‘invisible’) model of female homosexuality, drawn from classical descriptions of tribadism, and an emerging construction of sex between women as emulating or countereffecting phallic sexuality in a way that *could* become visible and intelligible within a dominant heterosexual ideology.” Maintains that Donne presents “female intimacy within the terms of libertine discourse but in a manner that challenges the underlying assumptions of that discourse and that exceeds its conventional parameters” (71). Compares and contrasts *Sappho* with Aphra Behn’s “To the Fair Clarinda, who made love to me, imagin’d more than woman” and notes how Katherine Philips used Donne’s language of paradox to conceal in her poetry her lesbian desires.

### 386. Wheeler, Edward T.
“Continuing the Conversation.” *Commonweal* April 9: 35.

Considers the resolution of Margaret Edson’s *Wit* a “betrayal of Donne’s poetry.” Maintains that the *Holy Sonnets* are “not about preserv-
ing an essentially sentimental belief in human physical incorruptibility” but deal with “the damnation of the soul.” Says that Donne “wields his wit in a confessional struggle with God and against the forces that would damn him, including all those fallen aspects of his body,” and “faces the ultimate frailty of our bodies and faculties, and his own utter reliance on Christ crucified.” Maintains that “[t]here is no God in Wit, not even a generic God or a plain-wrapper religion” but only a “struggle with words, the words of a secular humanist against the medical researcher” and that the play “trades faith for spectacle, sacramental sign for irony” (35).


In the preface (7–11), announces that the aim of this study is “to examine the crosscurrents of philosophical and religious thought that contributed substantially to the making of, and found their issue in, the philosophy of death” expressed in Donne’s writings and in earlier seventeenth-century poetry and prose in general (especially in the prose works of Thomas Browne). Notes that the main objective of this study is to emphasize “the role of philosophy in literary studies, particularly as regards ontology and such philosophical methods of inquiry as phenomenology or hermeneutics” (8) and that it should be seen, therefore, as “a collection of essays in which philosophy and religion mingle, interact and interweave with poetry and prose, thus making one univocal texture (‘texture’ being very close to ‘text’) of human written expression” (8–9). In Chapter 1, “Death and Its Meaning: An Ontological Approach” (13–36), surveys Heidegger’s ideas in Being and Time in which death is seen “as part of totality of Being or, more precisely, of man’s Being-there” and comments on certain “ontological terminology together with a brief analysis of the structure of Dasein and the categories assigned to it” (13). In Chapter 2, “A Rose That Must Die: Some Seventeenth-Century Images of Death’s Inevitability” (37–70), discusses examples of Donne’s images of the inevitability of death and the temporality of life and beauty from his poems and prose, especially Devotions, sermons, and ElNat. In Chapter 3, “John Donne’s Imagery of Death as the Expression of the Seventeenth-Century Philosophy of Doubt” (71–109), (1) examines in a seventeenth-century context images of death found in Donne’s love poems and religious poems, commenting on “the source of his enormous interest in death and its social and psychological motivation”; (2) focuses on “the idea of death as departure and/or departure as death with the objective to show love’s destructive and killing force enclosed in the word ‘Go’”; and then (3) concentrates on “the seventeenth-century ‘If’ which seems to be the explication of the age’s doubt and uncertainty” (73). In Chapter 4, “Biathanatos: The Freedom of Death: Towards the seventeenth-century interpretation of suicide” (111–39), comments on Donne’s contribution in Biathanatos to the debate on suicide that was waged during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Suggests that Donne’s treatise should be considered not only as “the first English defence of suicide” but also, “in a wider context, as part of the struggle between authoritarian institutions” and “individual consciousness” (114). Points out that “[a]lthough Donne’s ideas may sound controversial and to a considerable degree rebellious and heretical, by no means were they a complete novelty” at the time (124) and cites examples to support this position. Observes that during the seventeenth century there emerged “a certain relativisation of truth” and a wider spread of “libertine ideas,” which are reflected in Biathanatos. Sees Donne’s argument as a rejection of Augustinian biblical exegesis and therefore “not only as a reinterpretation, or a new interpretation of suicide, but, more importantly, as an interpretation of a (literary) text” (139). In Chapter 5, “Microcosm of the Body: The Idea of Decay and Distortion” (141–78), comments on the notion of universal and inevitable decay in Donne’s writings, especially in Devotions, FirAn, and the sermons. Concludes with notes (179–81), a bibliography
(182–85), and a note on the author (186).


Compares and contrasts the use of the image of Christ as bridegroom and the image of the bride as both the Church and the individual soul in Donne’s _Holy Sonnets_ and in the religious poetry of Aemilia Lanyer. Notes that in _HSBatter_ the “implicit physicality may be more like the Catholic tradition in which Donne was raised” but that the sonnet is “Protestant in its plea for a grace that will overcome the worthless degradation of the longing soul and in its use of spousal imagery to describe the struggle of pilgrimage rather than the ecstasy of union” (142). Points out that _HSShow_ “offers a distinctively male twist on the Canticles imagery” and has the speaker identify with the bridegroom rather than with the bride (143). Compares and contrasts also _FirAn_ and Lanyer’s _Salve Deus_ to illustrate “gender differences between these near contemporaries,” noting that although “both poems concern the evil and injustice of the world,” they are quite different “in how they portray gender and assert authority in the poetic enterprise” (145). Discusses how Donne in his poem “uses the image of idealized virginal purity to assert his own authority as a poet in terms that suggest important differences between what a man could claim and what a woman, such as Lanyer, might find or claim through her own idealization of another woman” (147). Maintains that Donne “dominates his ostensible subject and becomes himself the authority for his vision of the world” and that he “engenders his subject and disengenders her [Elizabeth Drury] as part of the process of asserting his own poetic authority,” aligning himself “with the voice of God” (148). Notes also Donne’s “particular appreciation” of the Virgin Mary in _Goodf_ and _Lit_. Says that “Donne is most like Lanyer in his willingness to take risks with both language and idea” (151).


Reviews the stage production of Margaret Edson’s _Wit_. Points out that the play “draws out contrasts and parallels between two kinds of knowledge—medical and literary—and two ways of approaching life—via thought and via sympathy.” Suggests the play reminds one of a Donnean poem in which “the emotion is in the thought” and refers to T. S. Eliot’s notion of dissociation of sensibility.


Briefly comments on _Eclog_, calling it “a vertiginous mix of resentment and abjection, a quality nicely caught in the allusion to an investment opportunity in which the impoverished Donne could not participate” (see ll. 55–58) (228). Notes that Donne associated “unbridled courtly license with the trade in luxury goods” (229).


In Chinese. Argues that Donne’s poetry reflects an orderly past and a disorganized present, a point of view seen most clearly in _FirAn_, in certain of his love poems and divine poems, and in the _Satyres_. Maintains that these poems reflect Donne’s religious faith in opposition to the “new philosophy” and that his intention is to search for the truth and to foster a theological understanding of life. Concludes, therefore, that in these poems Donne is a very traditional poet.


Original poem in which the poet alludes to _Goodf_.

In Chinese. Argues that Donne’s poetry reflects an orderly past and a disorganized present, a point of view seen most clearly in _FirAn_, in certain of his love poems and divine poems, and in the _Satyres_. Maintains that these poems reflect Donne’s religious faith in opposition to the “new philosophy” and that his intention is to search for the truth and to foster a theological understanding of life. Concludes, therefore, that in these poems Donne is a very traditional poet.
2000


Gives an historical survey and description of Pyrford and Pyrford Place in Surrey and describes and comments on a brick summerhouse at Pyrford Place known as Queen Elizabeth’s summerhouse, “where it is thought that Donne and his wife spent the first years of their marriage.”Maintains that although it cannot be proven that the existing building was there when Donne lived at Pyrford, “it is very likely that it was.”Notes that Sir John Wolley is “the best candidate for building the summerhouse, on grounds of style and the fact that he entertained Queen Elizabeth” at Pyrford Place (350).Notes, however, “there is no documentary evidence connecting the Queen to the summerhouse” (344). Reproduces 10 illustrations—2 seventeenth-century maps and 8 photos by Dennis Flynn of the summer house and its garden wall.


Points out that the best example of the claim at the time for the superiority of the manuscript over the printed text is Donne’s Libro.


Reproduces 9 letters written by Yvor Winters to Allen Tate during the 1950s in which Winters briefly mentions Donne in several places. For instance, contrasts his poem “Sir Gawaine and the Green Knight” with ValMourn and maintains that his poem is “not Elizabethan or even 17th century: it is post-symbolist and post-imagist” (33). Says that the references to gold and compasses in Donne’s poem are ornaments—“extremely good ornaments, but ornaments,” adding that Donne is “a typical Renaissance poet in this respect” (34). Thinks Wyatt’s “It was my choice, it was no chance” and Jonson’s “To Heaven” are “better poems” than ValMourn (35). States that in Donne’s poem “the emotion asserted is far in excess of the situation, and is melodramatic,” and that the first 8 lines are “a series of hyperbolic clichés, purely ornamental in intention.” Believes that “the poem comes through by the grace of God and by the grace of a few good strokes” but that “the sound of the poem rattles like the sound of a Model T Ford.” Concludes that, “[i]n spite of the brilliance, it is a second-rate poem: S[dney]’s command of sound is more civilized.” Claims, nevertheless, that Donne is “a greater poet than Sidney” but that “he resembles Sidney closely” (36).


In the preface, calls Donne “the strangest poet in the English language and one of the all-time greatest poets who ever was” (9). In the introduction, presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne (11–12). In Part 1 ([13]–84), reproduces and comments in the form of a dialogue between Beardsley and Purdy on Canon, GoodM, ElBed, SGo, SSweet, SunRis, Flea, Fever, Leg, Relic, Noct, and HSVex. In Part 2 ([85]–103), reproduces ElFatal, ElBed, ElPict, and ElJeal, followed by five original poems that are “free renderings” of Donne’s poems into contemporary English (86). In Part 3 ([105]–09), each author presents an original poem in honor of Anne More.

John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1996–2012

Presents a biographical sketch of Donne, briefly surveys and evaluates his poetry and prose, and comments on the religious situation in England during Donne's lifetime. Says that what gives Donne's love poems “their unmistakable quality” is Donne's “habit of thinking clearly about the mysterious collision of the spiritual with the physical in sexual passion, a habit acquired, precisely, in the beleaguered sacramental intensity of thought about, and devotion to, the Incarnation, Resurrection and the Mass.” Maintains that Donne “perceived everything, in other words, through the medium of a Catholic sensibility he could not lose simply by defecting from the hidden Church of his forebears” (278). Maintains also that Donne's religious poems, especially Lit, Corona, and Annun, clearly reflect Catholic doctrine and piety and that “[m]ore Catholic in feeling even than his poems are his sermons” (280). Briefly comments on the influence of St. Augustine on Donne's thinking.


Explores ways that Anne More “can help explain” the Songs and Sonnets. Begins with a review of “what we know about her” and about Donne's “courtship of her” (59). Suggests that Donne's “passionate, powerfully persuasive poetry of courtship” played a part in Anne's decision to elope with him. Notes that some scholars question if she would have been able to read Donne's poems but dismisses the issue by pointing out that since Donne's poems “were clearly written to be performed,” they “were probably recited to Anne, either by Donne himself or by his carefully chosen envoy.” Points out, furthermore, that “all evidence suggests that Anne More was extremely well educated” (62) and that the Burley letters “show that Donne courted her in witty, metaphoric, sprightly, enigmatic language”—the kind of language found in the Songs and Sonnets (63). By means of a detailed reading of Flea illustrates how many of the poems in the Songs

and Sonnets “can be read as poems of courtship” (65). Says that such a reading of Flea “does not replace the witty seduction poem that has delighted so many readers” (74) but rather makes it “a more complicated and brilliant poem precisely because every line and every stanza allow these two diametrically opposed readings to coexist in tension with each other” (74–75). Shows how, if read as a poem of a lover to his betrothed, Flea can be seem as “an intricate analogy constructed … to convince Anne More to accept his proposal despite her fears and her family's objection,” a “carefully constructed rhetorical artifice, written to be performed for the private female lyric audience's benefit, designed to amuse her with his wit, to dazzle her with his mental agility, to reassure her with his attentiveness to her concerns, and to embolden her with his passion—and his principled but unconventional code of ethics” (75). Points out that Elizabethan readers saw poetry “as the ideal language of courtship precisely because it provided a coded language, full of ambiguity and innuendo, that could mean different things to different readers” and “could hint at sexual intimacies and emotional complications that were better left implicit” (77). Concludes that Anne More's “implied presence makes Donne's love poetry more complex, more enticing, and more convincing” (80).


Maintains that the Holy Sonnets, influenced by the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola, reflect “the conflicted impulses that inhere in the Ignatian meditative form itself.” Argues that Donne's "spiritual dilemma" in the Holy Sonnets is “due in part to the impact of the turbulent religious climate on the final form of the Spiritual Exercises” (102). Finds in the Spiritual Exercises two shaping "co-ordinates": (1) “an unresolved conflict in the Ignatian model between the Protestant-like emphasis on a private, inward spirituality and the Roman Catholic emphasis on a communal, or church-mediated spirituality” and (2) “a related tension
in the model between the goal of meditation and that of contemplation, with contemplation having as its object a higher form of spirituality than meditation proper, namely mystical union with the divine, which Donne's speakers pursue but fail to attain.” Maintains, therefore, that Donne's sonnets are “vexed in their quest for spiritual certainty” as a consequence of “the indeterminate nature of the Ignatian meditative paradigm itself” (103). Maintains that “the history out of which the Ignatian model arose explains much about the ambivalent features of the model, which Donne's speakers appear to repeatedly confront in their struggle to enact a redemptive poetic form” (105). Emphasizes that “the relationship of the Ignatian meditative model to mystical union with God is ambivalent, and perhaps intentionally so, given the perceived heretical atmosphere created by the alumbrados during the time that Ignatius was actively composing.—and, we are told, heavily revising over the course of twenty-five years—his spiritual manual” (126). Sees, therefore, the ambivalence and “indeterminate nature of the Ignatian model” (128) as a factor in shaping the religious sensibility found in the Holy Sonnets.


Presents “an introduction to, an update of, or simply a review of pedagogic materials” that teachers might “find useful when teaching shorter Elizabethan poetry” [3], noting that much of the information comes from colleagues who answered a questionnaire sent by the editors. Points out, for instance, that 44% of the teachers surveyed teach Donne in their course and that the Songs and Sonets “remain popular” (14).


Maintains that Donne, unlike other poets of the time, makes “no attempt to modify the exercise of wit” in his religious poetry, except for Lam, which is in “the Reformed poetic tradition of simple form and metre” (405). Comments briefly on the Holy Sonnets, suggesting that they be read in an English tradition of holy sonnets; discusses briefly Goodf, calling it an Ignatian meditation; and maintains that the hymns, like many of Donne's secular poems, “stage elaborate rehearsals for death,” citing Sickness as Donne’s “most complex” hymn (406). Suggests that Father is Donne’s “one religious poem with impeccable claims to lyric,” noting that it is “as sparse and simple as any Puritan poetic might demand—except for the incessant playing on the poet's name” (407).


Comments very briefly on the possibility of John Hoskyns's influence on Donne and notes that one poem, “Absence,” was once considered part of Donne's canon.


A devotional pamphlet in which Donne is praised as “one of the greatest Divines and poets of the Anglican Church” and “the first great Confessional Poet” (2). Presents a biographical sketch of Donne and comments on his spirituality and preaching, likening him to St. Augustine and considering him a mystic. Cites HS Batter and HS Death as representative of his spiritual sensibility.


Discusses the “homiletic performances” of Thomas Playfere (1561–1609), a “poetically gifted, theatrically florid, and highly idiosyncratic preacher” (59), in “the context of the interplay among early modern theology, theatre, and politics”; examines his “dominant habits of mind as they inform his stylistic extravagances”; and suggests how his “rhetoric may have worked in performance” (61). Compares and contrasts Playfere and Donne as preachers and suggests the possible influence of Playfere on Donne. Calls the “poetic tone” of Playfere’s sermons “Donnian” and suggests that it is possible that Playfere read Donne’s poetry in manuscript although his sermons show no direct borrowings. Maintains that Playfere “anticipates Donne’s psychology as well as his theology” and that both preachers used the pulpit “to stage their own psychological turmoil” and that both played to “eagerly appreciative audiences” (63).


Presents a brief introduction to Donne’s life, a survey of his works, and a selected bibliography of editions and critical works (35–37). Says that “[s]trangely for a poet who more than any other determined what poetry would look like for the rest of the century, Donne affected to consider his poems unfit for sale” (35). Includes Air, Canon, Ecst, Fun, GoodM, LovDeity, Noct, SunRis, Twick, ValMourn, ValWeep, Holy Sonnets, BedRef, Har, Christ, Father, and Sickness—with an introduction, notes, and glosses on each poem.


Collection of 70 selections from the ancient classics, the Bible, Western masterpieces, and contemporary literature with study questions for each chapter at the end of the book. Includes HSBatter, preceded by a brief biographical note on Donne, a general comment on his poetry, and a short commentary on the poem (74–75). Says that in HSBatter Donne “meditates dramatically on Christian doctrine, beginning with a reference to the Trinity and proceeding with a series of powerful images in which each word literally batters the reader in a description of warfare and struggle, dramatizing the believer’s battle with God.” Notes how Donne “draws also upon the language of his earlier love poems to describe the drama of God’s conquest of the heart, soul, and mind” (74). In the study questions, asks “what is the importance of paradox” in the sonnet? (181).


Briefly discusses Donne’s conversion from Catholicism to Anglicanism. Points out that there was “considerable surprise and suspicion over his taking orders in 1615” (120). Suggests that “[f]uture biographical work on Donne should consider him within this broader context of conversion” (121). Comments on Donne’s sermon preached in 1625 before Charles I, a few days after the death of James I. Observes that the sermon is “noteworthy in presenting a moment of transition for the church and England” and that “it seems to point toward imminent change, but suggests that such change will not involve the foundations, and thus should be peaceably accepted” (160).


Suggests that the last paragraph of Thoreau’s Walden may contain an echo of Meditation 17 from Devotions. Notes that Thoreau quotes from Donne in several works and suggests that his “ability to compose wonderful conceits and
great philosophical meanings into strikingly plain sentences” may owe something to his study of “the rhetorical ingenuity” of Donne and other seventeenth-century English religious writers.


Translates into Rumanian the Songs and Sonets (13–89), the Epigrams (93–97), the Epithalamia (101–17), 8 of the Elegies (121–40), 4 of the Holy Sonnets (143–46), and Father (147)—with a few glosses on words, preceded by a brief, general introduction to Donne’s poetry (7–9) and followed by an index of poems (149–51).


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and works by Valerii Dymshits (5–18), followed by the Songs and Sonets (20–199), the Epigrams (202–13), the Elegies (216–310), Sappho (314–19), the Epithalamia (322–59), and the Satyres (362–413)—with English and Russian (by various translators) on opposite pages. In the “Addendum” (416–668), reproduces Russian translations by earlier translators. Concludes with commentary and notes by Valerii Dymshits (609–66) and a table of contents (661–71).


Translates into German (with English texts on the opposite page) 7 Elegies, Storm, 16 epigrams, Corona, the Holy Sonnets, and 4 hymns (12–115), followed by an afterword (116–126), and notes (127–[32]). In the afterword surveys major characteristics of Donne’s poetry, such as the use of conceits, argumentation, and various rhetorical figures and techniques, as well as the rough meter, the use of paradox, and the dramatic elements. Discusses HSBatter as an unmistakable example of Donne’s style. Also presents a biographical sketch of Donne, stressing his religious background and development. Offers brief introductions to the Elegies, the Epigrams, Corona, and the Holy Sonnets. Notes that Georg Rudolf Weckherlin (1548–1653) made a very rough German translation of the Epigrams.


3rd ed.

Translates into German (with English texts on the opposite page) the Songs and Sonets (10–145), followed by an afterword (146–62) and notes (163–66). In the afterword surveys Donne’s life and works.


414. ––––. Sermon Preached to the Lords upon Easter-day. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.

Reprint of “Sermon XXVII” preached on 28 March 1619 from LXXX Sermons (1630). Typed and converted to HTML by Elizabeth T. Knuth from LXXX Sermons (1640) and available online.

Presents a newly edited text based on an exhaustive study of all known manuscripts and printed copies of Donne’s 17 love elegies along with 3 poems introduced among the elegies in the second edition (1635), followed by a chronological summary of critical commentary on these poems from Donne’s time through 1993. Contains also a newly developed stemmata showing the step-by-step transmissional history of 2 of the elegies in their entirety and 6 others in part, thereby providing “a far more complete picture than previously known of the changes that were introduced into Donne’s texts as they passed from copyist to copyist in a scribal culture” (jacket). Contains acknowledgments (xv–xviii); short forms of reference for Donne’s works (xix–xxv); abbreviations used in the commentary (xxvi–xxxi); sigla for textual studies (xxxii–xlii); symbols and abbreviations used in the textual apparatus (xliv); general introduction (xlv–lix); introduction to Volume 2 (lx–xcix); texts and apparatuses and textual introductions (1–444); critical commentary [445–998]; works cited (999–1025); an index of authors cited in the commentary (1026–34); an index of writers and historical figures cited in the commentary (1035–39); index of other poems and works of Donne cited in the commentary (1040–41); an index of titles (1042–43); an index of first lines (1044); and notes about the editors (1045–46).

Reviews:


Discusses Donne as a love lyricist, noting that “[t]he rapid variation in tone and style from poem to poem, as well as within a single text, renders his work as difficult to encapsulate as it is intriguing to read.” Cites the major characteristics of Donne’s love poetry—“the argumentative stance, the conversational voice, the witty playfulness, and the intellectual knottiness” as well as “its philosophical speculation, its interest in abstract ratiocination, and its so-called metaphysical conceits, startling images that typically link apparent opposites, such as sexuality and spirituality.” Notes, however, that Donne also wrote simple songs that “one would not be surprised to find in any Elizabethan miscellany” (182) and that 6 of his love poems were set to music. Notes also his writing of hymns.


Cites a number of poems in the Songs and Sonets that “present a deific love in which the participants implicitly borrow the properties of godhead” that suggests, thereby, that “[t]his love, unique in the sublunary world, is by implication a heaven on earth” (286). Discusses, in particular, how the conceit in ll. 40–44 of Canon “presents a God’s eye view of the world, a view conferred on the lovers by their agapaic, eternal love” (289). Points out that “a similar participation in God’s awareness” can be found in Sir Thomas Browne’s notion of heaven in Religio Medici (290).


Explores “the structures which determined individual modes of perception and thought, imagination, and sensibility” of seven metaphysical poets, including Donne, focusing on “three systems of correlated traits: the various modes of self-awareness; the forms of perception of time and space and the modes of world-awareness; [and] the predisposition of the individual mind to apprehend the sensible and the spiritual, the natural and the supernatural, the
human and divine, either jointly or separately, and when jointly, either distinctly or confusedly” (18–19). Maintains that “[i]n each of these systems the various structures are shown to have a direct influence on the modes of literary expression and account for stylistic particularities” (19) among the poets. In “John Donne: Self-Oriented Self-Consciousness” (25–46), traces in Donne’s secular and divine poetry and prose his “inordinate egoism,” his “acute self-consciousness of a special kind,” and his “ever-defeated search for his own identity” (25). Suggests that Donne’s “rational awareness of multiple issues and multiple answers bred a critical and occasionally sceptical mind” and compares him with Montaigne, “despite obvious differences” (34). Argues that Donne’s self-consciousness affected his emotions and his expression of them and points out how “[t]he consequences are traceable in Donne’s attitude to love and death and in his religious feelings.” Maintains that the origin of the “complexity of tone” in Donne’s poems “results from a self-awareness characterized by a self-conscious duality” (38) and that his “unsatisfied desire to know himself” may account for his “brooding over the prospect of his own death” (41). Observes that there is “an essential continuity in Donne’s aspirations, whether profane or sacred” and that even in “his most devout elevations his self remained the object of his attention” and “his quest for reality and substance was unending” (43). In “John Donne” (111–26), discusses how Donne’s attention is “usually focused on the here and now” (111) and how he is “only capable of present emotion” (112). Comments on how Donne’s imagination is able to contract both time and space in his poetry. Maintains that “[b]ecause of his acute, exclusive perception of the present Donne was disinclined to cultivate the literary genres that call for a sense of continuity” (119). Holds that Donne’s world “appears to be a universe where the poet is the centre of reference and where he becomes at times his own world” and concludes that “presence to the world meant for Donne presence to the self in accordance with his fundamental mode of consciousness” (126).

In “John Donne and Bifold Natures” (187–204), discusses Donne’s “recurrent insistence on the relations between body and soul and the paradox of the Incarnation” (187), comments on how Donne “seeks to link the bifold nature of man with his own experience of individuality” (189), and suggests that “[t]he fascination that dual natures held for Donne’s mind was reflected in conceits,” which “flowed imaginatively, if not logically, from the fundamental paradox of the Incarnation” (197). Stresses the “interpenetration of the abstract and the concrete” (203) in Donne’s poetry and how “his mind and poetry achieve a conjunction of two different orders of reality” (204). In “Conclusions” (357–62), as throughout the study, compares and contrasts Donne’s mode of thought, imagination, and sensibility with those of Crashaw, Herbert, Marvell, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and Traherne, thereby presenting a succinct summary of the whole study. Concludes with an index of topics (363–64) and an index of names (365–69).

Reviews:

- Mary A. Papazian in RenQ 54 (2001): 1676–79


Points out that Doris Bett’s in her story “Beasts of the Southern Wild” (written in 1969 and first published in 1973) introduces titles and lines from three of Donne’s poems, “devices which serve as a corollary to the major element of the story: the escape from real life by creating a demi-paradise in the imagination, and the awakening of Carol Walsh to real love in the person of a black man named Sam Porter” (165).

420. Ferrell, Lori Anne and Peter McCullough, eds. The English Sermon revised: Religion, literature and history 1600–1750. (Politics, culture and society in early modern Britain, gen. eds. Ann Hughes, An-

---

John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1996–2012

[2000] 153
Contains 11 essays, 5 of which discuss Donne and have been separately entered into this bibliography: Lori Anne Ferrell’s and Peter McCullough’s, “Revising the study of the English sermon” (2–21); Andrew Fitzmaurice’s, “Everyman, that prints, adventures: the rhetoric of the Virginia Company sermons” (24–42); Bryan Crockett’s, “Thomas Playfere’s poetics of preaching” (59–83); Debora Shuger’s, “Absolutist theology: the sermons of John Donne” (115–35); and Jeanne Shami’s, “Anti-Catholicism in the sermons of John Donne” (136–66). Includes notes on contributors (ix-x) and an index (265–70).


The editors introduce the collection by stressing the importance of reassessing the significance of sermons in literary study and by surveying past and present scholarship in the field. Suggest why, for the most part, the study of sermons has been neglected and maintain that even Donne’s sermons would not have been privileged with “a distinguished modern university press edition had he not been the poetic pin-up boy for the generation of scholars that laid the foundations of modern literary studies of the English Renaissance.” Maintain, however, as Jeanne Shami points out, that Donne’s sermons “have been used less for the study of the sermons in their own right than as prose glosses on the poetry, or as a collection of psychological case studies for biographical and political analyses of the author” (7). Claim that Donne’s sermons are “central to the present renewed interest in early modern religion and literature” and cite the work of Jeanne Shami and Debra Shuger as “compelling models for those who wish to treat sermons with the literary and historiographical respect … they deserve” (8).


Points out that the Virginia Company “employed sermons from its foundation in 1606 through its dissolution in 1624 as the principal means of promotion in the first successful foundation of an English colony in America” and discusses how the use of sermons “as the foremost instrument of propaganda reflects the humanistic sensibilities of the Virginia Company’s leaders” (24). Surveys the sermons and the historical occasions they addressed and comments on Donne’s involvement with the company both as a stockholder and, in November 1622, as a preacher. Comments briefly on the rhetorical strategy of and political caution in Donne’s sermon.


Suggests resemblances and parallels between William Baldwin’s “The Spouse to her beloved” in Canticles, of Balades of Salomon (1549) and Donne’s HSShow, noting how both poems “address Christ and ask that he identify the ‘true Church,’ both refer to and dismiss Roman Catholic claims, and both assume in some sense readings of Canticles” (60). In particular, calls attention to how Baldwin “frames the nature of the true church in terms of feminine sexual appeal” and how Donne in his sonnet “reworks and ironically disrupts male concern about the woman’s behavior with other men as the bride becomes sexually available.
to as many believers as possible.” Maintains that with Baldwin’s poem “as an intertext for Donne’s sonnet,” the final couplet of HSShow “can be read as an updated re-enactment of the allegorization and subsequent restoration of sexuality to the text of the Canticles” (60). Also suggests that the language in Robert Aylett’s “Of Heauenly Loue” in The Brides Ornaments (1621–25) “recalls the bitter, misogynist tirade” (105) in LovAlch but notes how Aylett “appropriates the language of sexuality and redirects it away from the recognition and articulation of the carnality that Donne had invoked” (106). Notes also that at the outset of The Brides Ornaments Aylett’s speaker introduces “images of fire and violence” that recall HSBatter and suggests that perhaps Aylett had seen Donne’s sonnet in manuscript (115).


Announces the discovery of 3 previously unrecorded manuscripts of Donne’s writings in archives in Cheshire: (1) a copy of Donne’s letter to Susan Vere, Countess of Montgomery; (2) a copy of Father; and (3) a copy of ElBrac. Describes each of the manuscripts and comments on its contribution to Donne studies. Notes that these discoveries remind us of Donne’s close association with the Cheshire gentry, support “the recognized popularity of Donne’s work in the seventeenth century,” and illustrate that “even in well-trodden Record Offices such manuscripts may still be found to lodge among seemingly unrelated papers” (291). Contains 7 plates.


Argues that Donne’s seclusion following his marriage, as well as his gradual return to public life after 1608, “may be more clearly understood in relation to political developments than as results of his personal ambition” (335). Sees the composition of Biathanatos, Pseudo-Martyr, and Ignatius, “if not also some of Donne’s other writings at about this time,” as a response to the political decline of Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury (337). Explores various aspects of Donne’s life during this period; in particular addresses the question of Donne’s “ambition in the years following his marriage” and also “some possible implications of the friendship reported by Walton between Donne and Paolo Sarpi, probably begun in Venice in 1605–6” (339). Regarding the first, maintains that during the period 1602–1610 “we learn of only three attempts [on Donne’s part], all evidently half-hearted, to secure an appointment” and that “these are invariably referred to, by Donne as well as by his friends, in terms suggesting his reluctance toward rather than his ambition for public employment” (349). Regarding the second, comments on events surrounding Donne’s probable meeting with Sarpi and the influence of Sarpi’s writings on Donne’s thinking and works. Notes that Donne had a portrait of Sarpi, which he willed to Henry King.


Maintains that in Margaret Edson’s play Wit, the main character, Dr. Vivian Bearing, “comes to understand” that wit “is not an intellectual game one plays, the artificial creation of difficulty simply to befuddle others” and thereby “assert or maintain a sense of one’s own superiority” but rather that wit is a way of “reaching for the light”—“of extending oneself beyond the limitations of the body—as opposed to de-
fending oneself against challenges to one’s self-image.” Points out that what Vivian, like Donne, learns is that “the only way to be raised up is to allow oneself to be thrown down by sickness” and that “only after absorbing this lesson can she—like Donne—wittily and metaphysically fashion her own death” (1). Discusses the many “Donnean operations” in the play and suggests that it can be seen as a meditation upon “the ways in which the life of the individual is extended by the vitality of his/her culture, upon the ways in which reading a poet like Donne can stimulate and redeem both the individual and his/her emotionally and spiritually impoverished world” (2). Discusses how it is from Donne that Vivian learns “to fashion her own death” (6) and how, like Donne, she transforms herself “into a living emblem that teaches the audience to reach for the light” (8).


Examines “several internal theological and poetic features” in HSDue that suggest that the poem was “likely intended to serve as the first in the Holy Sonnets sequence” (139). Rejects interpretations of the sonnet that conclude that the speaker’s “end is despair, sinning against hope as he rejects the possibility of divine mercy.” Argues rather that the speaker sees himself in “distinctly Trinitarian terms as he sequentially and traditionally images himself... as [h]e once was, and potentially may again be, a servant of the Father (who creates all life), a sheep of the Son (who oversees the Father’s flock), and a temple of the Holy Spirit (who instrumentally dwells within the soul and body of each redeemed person).” Points out that “the restoration of the narrator’s Trinitarian roles would also necessarily mean the restoration of his divine ‘Image,’ the interior trinity of reason, will, and affections, known collectively as the Imago Dei imprinted on the soul” (140). Shows how the speaker’s “vexed effort to renounce Satan and affirm Christ... represents an informal effort to renew his baptismal vows” and also shows how “[t]he theological and poetic matrix in which this dramatic representation of the narrator emerges induces a traditional, albeit intricate, connection between the Trinity, Baptism, and the sign of the cross.” Comments on how baptism, Trinitarianism, and the signing of the cross in HSDue provide “internal narrative and structural evidence for positioning this poem at the head of the Holy Sonnets” (158).


Presents a general evaluation of Donne’s life and works and finds in both an ambivalent presence of “sensuality and spirituality,” “a mixture of the divine and the mundane” (169). Discusses the “mundanity” of Donne’s sermons, citing as examples his excessive use of Latin, his frankness, his dislike of vagabonds and beggars, and his pandering to the rich and noble, as well as the political aims of many of his sermons. Maintains that throughout his life Donne “remained essentially the same person” and thus “the poems and the sermons were produced by a mind imbued with the same structure of imagination and ambition” (172). Discusses Donne’s fascination with women, love, death, and God but claims that Donne’s foremost preoccupation was with “getting ahead in the world.” Concludes that Donne was “divine as a poet but mundane as a man of religion” (183).


Points out that Donne devoted an entire sermon to the theme “Be ye not as the horse,” in which he agrees with St. Augustine that “the horse represents atheistic philosophers” and applies the notion to “modern philosophers who have lapsed from Christianity.” Notes that, for Donne, the horse “represents those who think they can ‘come to be good men’ without a Church and Sacraments and who ‘pursue the
truth it self’ along a way other than the one Jesus Christ ‘hath laid open to us.’” Observes that Donne claims that such men “end up not with truth and virtue but ‘the Horses pride.’” Notes that “[l]inking the atheist to the horse in this manner was common in the 17th century” (229).


In Portuguese. Presents a survey of Donne’s twentieth-century reputation in Brazil, divided into three time periods: (1) From the end of the 19th century to 1940, (2) the 1940s and 1950s, and (3) the 1960s to the present. In each time period discusses the work of three critics as being representative of critical evaluations of Donne in each of the periods: For the first, the work of Silvio Romero, Araripe Júnior, and José Verissimo; for the second, the work of Otto Maria Carpeaux and Afrânio Coutinho; and for the third, the work of Augusto de Campos, Paulo Vizioli, and Alfonso Félix de Souza. Discusses how and why the critical response to Donne differed greatly in each of the three periods. Observes that before 1940 Brazilian literary critics and scholars showed no interest in Donne; but that renewed interest in the baroque in the 1940s led to an interest in his poetry. Discusses how in the 1960s this interest greatly increased. Argues for a more intensive study of Donne’s poems as poems rather than as cultural and historical objects. Concludes with a bibliography.


Suggests that *Devotions* had a possible influence on Woolf’s “On Being Ill” but believes that, “[w]hether or not Woolf had Donne’s work in mind, though, is less important than the search of the two writers, living with different religious orientations at different cultural moments, for language to describe the experience and the significance of illness.” Discusses how Woolf both agrees and disagrees with Donne’s depiction of sickness. Observes that *Devotions* “incorporates certain metaphors that Susan Sontag challenges in *Illness as Metaphor and AIDS and Its Metaphors* (1989),” especially military metaphors (127), and points out that, Woolf, like Donne, “initially images the body both as a battlefield and as a little world, a landscape buffeted by natural forces,” and that both writers “express astonishment at the body’s sudden transformation by illness and at human mortality.” Notes, however, that although Woolf “exclaims, with the parallel grammatical structures, elaborate metaphors, and intimations of mortality reminiscent of Donne” (128), she “shifts the military metaphors from the experience of illness to the everyday routine of ostensibly healthy people” and that “[t]he respectable, so-called civilized life of the body politic is the scene of warfare” (129). Notes that although Woolf and Donne comment on the isolation caused by illness, Woolf would not have agreed with Donne’s conclusion that “No Man is an Island.” Contrasts Donne’s Christian eschatological and theological view of sickness with Woolf’s non-Christian perspective.


Evaluates the role of the anthology in the formation of the concept of authorship. Discusses Donne as a scribal poet who maintained his “amateur status in a system of literary patronage” and who produced “texts for a courtly audience” (81), circulating his poems, for the most part, in manuscript. Observes that in the first edition of 1633, Donne’s poems appear “in the kind of order one might find in a manu-
script collection,” thereby reflecting “the social conditions of literary production in a scribal culture,” whereas in the second edition of 1635, the generic grouping of poems indicates “a tendency towards further decontextualization of the poems by the formation of a canon” (86).


Compares and contrasts ElBed with the erotic elegies of Ovid but finds no direct Ovidian model for Donne’s poem. Presents a critical reading of ElBed to show that it was “not written to a woman, is not a negotiation with a woman, but is an exploration of a paradigmatic confrontation between the overt, obvious sexuality of a man and the elusive and inscrutable object of his desire.” Observes that “[t]hat desire, clearly carnal and specific, is sanctified by divine mandate at the same time as it is beleaguered by fantasy and human perversity.” Calls ElBed “teasingly ambiguous” and claims that the love expressed in the poem is “captious and captivating, occasionally cruel, heated to irresistibility by what distinguishes a great lover according to all the imitators of Ovid, the flame not of lust but of wit” (222).


Discusses Coleridge’s marginalia on Donne’s sermons to show that Coleridge read Donne’s sermons “with a remarkable independence from the High Church perspective offered by Walton” (312). Argues that a study of Coleridge’s “mature reading of seventeenth-century religious writing stands as an alternative to the narrower thinking about Donne and Milton as polar categories that T. S. Eliot sought to bequeath to future readers” and that, “[f]rom the perspective offered by Coleridge, recent treatments of Donne as a supporter of James I’s claims for royal absolutism can be seen to allow far too much credit to Eliot’s tendentious insistence that readers and critics are necessarily involved in an unconcluded civil war” (313). Maintains that, in fact, Coleridge “saw that Donne and Milton were, in fundamental ways, allied in thought and approach” and that “the sophisticated understanding of biblical revelation that characterizes Milton’s major poetry was a piece with Donne’s learned reflections on the complex relations between classical and biblical texts.” Stresses, therefore, that “both the appropriation of Donne for ‘Anglo-Catholicism’ and the idea that the metaphysical poets represent an alternative literary and political tradition, a main current from which Milton diverged, are primarily the work of the modernist movement” (333). Concludes that reading Coleridge’s marginalia frees one from grouping Donne with Eliot and therefore from reading him “as a spokesman for Walton’s High Church party” (334).


Discusses how the references to Donne in Wallace Shawn’s play, The Designated Mourner (1996), are “integral to the workings of the play” (184) and that Shawn’s affinities with Donne as a designated mourner are “extensive and occasionally profound” (188). Maintains, however, that “the features of Donne’s writing that have contributed most to the shaping of the play are not the ones for which most twentieth-century readers have valued him” but rather “are more akin to … the gestures of bad taste and impertinence for which Donne was castigated” following the publication of the Anniversaries (195–96). Points out that Shawn’s play, in fact, “engages just those aspects of Donne’s poetry that most resist the sentimentalizing that would take away their edge” and “helps us to see the daring in Donne’s insistence that love is tested, and rightly tested, by having to face what is unseemingly and ugly and closely allied to death” (197). Maintains that The Designated Mourner “allows the possibility of—even posits
it as a fait accompli—Donne’s obliteration from the cultural record” but suggests that Shawn “attempts to throw his lot in with a poet whom High Culture has not fully assimilated, taking his chances that the energetic impertinence in much of Donne’s writing will be rediscovered as a context within which his own writing will be appreciated” (200). Points out also how Shawn’s earlier play, The Fever, is also reminiscent of Donne’s poetry and prose.


Throughout this collection of essays by individual authors, Donne is mentioned frequently; however, only those essays that contain extensive discussion of his work have been included in this bibliography: Elizabeth Clarke’s “Religious Verse” (404–18); Germaine Greer’s “Donne’s Nineteenth Elegy” (215–23); John Lyon’s “The Critical Essay” (267–75); and Robin Robbin’s “Poets, Friends and Patrons: Donne and his Circle; Ben and his Tribe” (419–41).


Considers “the place of publication and the identity of the printer” of the continental edition of Conclave Ignati, as well as “the extent of surviving copies and the priority of the Latin edition published in England” (401). Argues primarily on the basis of typographical material that the continental edition was printed at Hanau by Thomas Villerianus. Argues also that the Latin version printed in England is likely a reprint of the continental version, which suggests that the Latin publication of Donne’s work was “primarily intended for an international audience” (409). Maintains that Conclave Ignati “seems to be the first of Donne’s works to be enlisted on behalf of the Reformed faith abroad” and that “the very appearance of Conclave Ignati at Hanau tends to corroborate speculation regarding Donne’s Reformed leanings” (413). Maintains that the continental Latin edition “serves to underscore the remarkably international character of Donne’s mind and of the political and religious culture that his works addressed” (416).


Maintains that the Anniversaries “treat the crisis of representation and interpretation as both the cause and effect of the death of the world and as inextricably related to the corruption of the Jacobean court” and notes how Donne “implies his own practice in the corrupt economy of Jacobean court patronage.” Argues that Donne’s awareness of “the moral and political compromises that he makes in fashioning his verse to patrons and would-be patrons strongly informs his skeptical critique of the New Philosophy and of the role that it would ostensibly play in reinforcing James’s claims to divine and absolute power.” Claims that “[t]he ambiguity of the central ‘she’ of the Anniversaries, and the hyperbolic rhetoric of praise in which Donne shrouds her, is an important element of his critique of the corruption and flattery at court and of attempts to establish the absolute prerogative of the king through arguments from natural law” (67). Maintains that in the Anniversaries “virtue, like truth, is defined primarily by absence, and as such is associated with the ambiguity of a fallen language and with a positive skepticism that affirms the political and interpretive freedom of the individual” (68). Argues that, whoever the “she” of the poems may be, “she” is “a hollow and resounding echo that contests authoritative claims to truth while it celebrates the poet’s mastery of the fine art of equivocation, an art that enables him simultaneously to pay self-interested fealty to patron and monarch while engaging in a pious meditation on the absence of divine truth.
in the corrupt economy of the Jacobean court." Maintains that although "the central premise of the Anniversaries, the death of the world, is a common convention of Donne's day, both the extent to which Donne implicates natural philosophy in the sickness of the world and the role that the poet assigns poetry as physic are original" (76). Believes also that the Anniversaries "provide important insight into Donne's refusal in 1611 and 1612 to take holy orders, as they demonstrate the poet's ambivalence, if not resistance, to the compromises demanded by the entire economy of patronage and power in which the church is also fully implicated" (98). Concludes that although the poems "specifically target natural philosophy and astronomy for the new roles they threaten to play in legitimating James's absolutist claims, the Anniversaries also implicate poetry in their encompassing critique of the ideological and material interests that shape representation within the Jacobean court" and "provide an argument for scrutinizing the variable uses of the rhetoric of contingency" (102).


Discusses ElBed to show undergraduate students "the ways in which race can be made part of the study of Elizabethan poetry" (179). Considers race "as signifying not only color or phenotype but also nationality, ethnicity, genealogy, or typology" (180–81). Points out to students how in Donne's poem, "the mistress subtly becomes identified with non-English and non-European cultures and spaces that, typically, are represented as alien, dangerous, exotic, and barbaric in early modern English writing" (181).


Argues that the fact that Donne's close literary circle might have heard or might have read Bait "differently from another group of readers or even from one another of the circle of friends for whom the poem was intended is borne out by recollection of the various contexts and lexicons of the poem" (25). Maintains that the poem's "equivocally phrased political incorrectness" would have appealed to Donne's "fellow recusant readers" and shows how the poem "not only relies on the imagery of fishing to mock both the pastoral mode and Petrarchan convention but also revises the diction of that subgenre in order to insinuate a parodic critique of Marlowe and of his religio-political associates" (28). Argues that although Bait would have appealed to "both a (public) coterie audience of court wits and to a (private) coterie of recusant readers, some of whom may have been in both groups, it finally indicates most fully not Donne's enthrallment to any religio-political audience as much as it attests to the brilliant wit of an independent genius adept at reframing norms and forms of coterie poetic to express his own 'personal and intellectual' criticism and positions." Points out that "[c]entral to the wit" of the poem is Donne's "revision of those duels between literary circles endemic to the Elizabethan social and political scene into a witty—and, finally, a personal assault." Concludes that although Protestant readers "interested in the literary debate initiated by Marlowe and Raleigh would have found much 'delight' in Donne's poem" and although his Catholic readers "would have found much 'teaching' in it," this "should not distract from our recognition of the brilliant wit that lies at the heart of Donne's transformation of his 'personal and intellectual' impulses into an enduring poetic achievement" (43).

442. Same. "'Over Reoning' the 'Undertones': A Preface to 'Some Elegies' by John Donne." RenP, pp. 137–53.
Maintains that Ovid’s *Amores* provided Donne in his *Elegies* “not only a precedent (along with the elegies of Catullus) for the shameless display of exuberant promiscuity and racy quips but [also provided] a form for daring, even dangerous, political commentary and critique of the Establishment similar in tone and manner and subject to that which (probably or at least in part) led to the final exile of the Roman satirist.” Argues that the *Amores* “provided the late Elizabethan Donne not just a ‘new’ voice, persona, and subject matter, but [also] an old format for satirical dismay, not only a vehicle for flaunting the anarchistic power of sexual desires, but [also] an instrument for commentary on the paradoxical desires of power itself—a counterpoint, in other words, to what this young Catholic recusant in the late Elizabethan court arena must have seen as the hypocritical” (139). Cites Ovidian models for several of the *Elegies*, in particular, *ElBed* as the “best-known appropriation of the Ovidian elegy as a vehicle of political and religious commentary,” a poem in which Donne “challenges the major apologies for the Elizabethan New World imperialism by exploiting the rich analogies of sexual and imperial conquest in order to embed a veiled attack on the Ralegh enterprises in the late 1590s” (141). Discusses also *ElBrac* in which Donne comments covertly on “the predicament of a man of conviction within the repressive and dangerous arena of Elizabethan courtly ambition and salaciousness” and suggests the plight of a Catholic “in a world of Calvinian repression” (142). Also comments on *ElWar* in which Donne “offers another potentially fearful and shameful critique of the generic foundations of his literary and political counterparts in the English Protestant Court” and, in particular, presents an “outright rejection of the courtly aesthetic of the Sidney-Spenser circle of poets and the religio-political imperium it endorsed” (144). Points out, however, that neither Donne nor Ovid “engaged in what is exclusively an encoded moral satire” in their elegies (150), noting that their poems were meant as witty entertainments which, nonetheless, pointed out the absurdity, shallowness, and human frailty in their society. In an afterword, suggests that Donne may have been influenced by Plato’s *Cratylus*, in which Socrates “spins out his fantastic surmises about the derivation of words” (151).


Essentially a review of Vols. 2 (2000), 6 (1995), and 8 (1995) of *The Variorum Edition of John Donne’s Poetry*. Calls the edition “a landmark edition, not only (and obviously) within the field of Donne studies but also within the broader spectrum of editions of nondramatic texts of the early modern period” and suggests that it “constitutes a triumphant solution to the manifold problems that the surviving Donne poetical corpus presents to the scholarly editor” (445). Expresses, however, some reservations about both the text and critical commentary of the edition.


Maintains that there is “a difference between the paradigm governing the editing of the texts of Donne’s poetry in the *Donne Variorum* and its predecessors.” Sees the difference as twofold: (1) the editors of the variorum edition “recognized that the operative textual unit was the poem—or sequences of poems—not the manuscript in which it or they appear, as such manuscript collections will inevitably contain individual poems of widely differing authority” and (2) “with the writing of a computer program that automates the collation of individual poems (though not their transcription from source documents), it became technologically feasible to collate all the surviving textual evidence, poem by poem.” Observes that “[s]ensing the scale of the task, earlier editors shied away from the editorial implications of such an abundance of the surviving manuscript evidence” (6). Points out that “Shakespeare’s shade still haunted” (7) the editorial practice of Helen Gardner and Wesley Milgate in their
Oxford English Texts editions of Donne as evidenced by their continuing to select printed texts as copy-texts.


Reviews Margaret Edson's play Wit and comments on her uses and misuses of Donne and the Holy Sonnets throughout the play. Maintains that Edson presents Donne primarily as “a wordsmith, a puzzlemaster, a man with nothing to say to a heart in pain,” and sees him as “confused, scared, overcomplicated, hidden behind his ‘wit,’ and, finally, a nihilist altogether—a man who knows his religious faith ‘doesn’t stand up to scrutiny,’” and so writes “these screwed up sonnets.”


In a discussion of the rejection of figurality in seventeenth-century poetry, comments on Noct, in which “metaphor is set aside as inadequate” but yet “verbal iconicity is employed and stands out against an iconoclastic trend.” Argues that “when images are rejected and visual representation is distrusted, poetry still tries to represent immaterial objects by resorting to iconicity, namely to a conceptual or verbal one” (214). Maintains that in Noct, “a poem whose object is the immaterialness of death, Donne explicitly rejects images and looks for a non-descriptive expression, which does not apply to the sense of sight nor appeal to the inner eye of imagination, and yet attempts to be iconic” (217). Discusses how Noct, “in its structure, reproduces two distinct movements interacting at the level of meaning: the circular motion of the stars and of human time, and the linear one of alchemical transformation” and that “[t]hese two dimensions, or semantic levels, also correspond to, or are revealed by, two neologisms present in the text” (220), namely “nocturnall” and “nothingness.” Shows how the poem “exemplifies how abstract and transcendent topics are iconoclastically rendered: how death, and God, and Nothing, belong to the realm of the Logos and of its expression as word, and are transubstantiatted into it, by progressively losing corporeity.” Concludes that to Donne “verbal iconicity can reproduce dematerialization and abstraction, but that no human image could ever lawfully and adequately represent either metaphysical objects or the material substance of a divine body” (224).


Maintains that in the seventeenth century the “Protestant intimacy with books is reflected by the many tropes that represent the heart as a small, personal, or portable text of some sort.” Points out how one of Donne's sermons “emphatically describes the individual’s heart as a small, portable volume,” perhaps referring specifically to the “small-format ‘pocket books’ carried on one’s person, or ‘bosom book’ carried near the heart, that were common at the time” (140). Notes that in the sermon Donne “innovatively pictures the heart as a printed book with handwritten annotations” (143). Suggests that Donne is “one of the first writers to exploit the possibilities of typography by dividing the ‘text’ of the inner books into script and print.” Observes that in Donne's metaphor “the typographical (‘imprinted’) text represents the universal laws of God uniformly marked on human hearts, while the handwritten (‘interlined’) text represents individual doubts and excuses that obscure this divine knowledge and that ‘choke’ or ‘perplex’ self-knowledge.” Notes that, thereby, Donne “aligns the printed word with truth and perspicuity, and handwriting with obscurity and even self-delusion” and suggests that “interlining” may even be a pejorative comment at medieval scholasticism, “the medieval biblical gloss in particular” (144). Maintains, in other words, that Donne “treats handwriting as a symbol
of ‘medieval’ error and obscurity, while equating the ‘modern’ printed word with truth and clarity” (144–45). Suggests, furthermore, that “Donne’s divided book of the heart may also reflect his own divided religious sensibility,” noting that in Pseudo-Martyr he describes his conversion to the Church of England in textual terms (144).


Claims that Donne “marks a new step in the genealogy of sex” and that, unlike some churchmen at the time who insisted that “sex was for procreation only and that pleasure was suspect if not downright sinful,” Donne in his early poetry claimed “sexual pleasure as a core value, going so far as to postulate” in Canon that it is “a criterion for sainthood” (185). Points out, however, that, on the other hand, marriage was recognized by Catholics as a sacrament and that, for many Catholics, sexual pleasure in marriage was seen as “a sign and source of divine grace, not a sin or shame.” Maintains that although in his early poems Donne “defiantly celebrated sexual pleasure,” in his relationship with his wife he, who was reared as a Catholic, “sometimes saw sexuality in sacramental terms” but that, after his conversion to Anglicanism, he “becomes more and more uncertain of this” (186). Proposes to reconsider sexual pleasure “in its setting in the Western cultural symbolic,” using Donne’s work to do so. Claims that “some of the aspects that emerge will be a basis for rethinking feminism’s reclamation of sexual pleasure” (187). Points out Donne’s attitude toward sex in his early poems, such as his prevalent identification of sexual pleasure with death; his sometimes “virulent misogyny” (189); his expression of the notion that orgasm shortens a man’s life; his sense of guilt and violence in sexual pleasure; his presenting sexual pleasure as colonization and possession; his focusing sexually on the self and self-gratification; and his fear of God’s punishment for enjoying sexual gratification. Maintains that Donne can be seen as helping to create the channel through which hedonism and narcissistic individualism would run to the present time. Argues that modern feminists perhaps have lost more than they have gained “in an unproblematized secularism in which sexual pleasure is no longer sacramental, no longer a means of grace and transformation” (202), and thinks that they should try to find “new ways to be canonized for love” (203).


Mentions Donne throughout this collection of 15 essays by individual authors; however, only the following essays that have an extensive discussion of Donne or his work are included in this bibliography: Heather Dubrow’s “Lyric Forms” (178–99); Anne Lake Prescott’s “The evolution of Tudor satire” (220–40); and Raymond Waddington’s “Rewriting the world; rewriting the body” (287–309).


Argues that Donne presents the reader “with a sounding of thought, with thought under the pressure of being thought out and felt through,” and that “the pressure, disruptive, smooth, or otherwise, is the movement of thought.” Maintains, therefore, that “if we are to make sense of the thought, we must listen to it in its inimitable, often conflicting moments of pressure.” Notes, for instance, that to read l. 1 of Canon as “a straight iambic line is not to have heard the possibly less even, idiocentric stresses of the living, colloquial voice, the pitch of the speaker’s voice asserting itself, through the assonantal stresses, at the height of desire frustrated by impatience” (115). Points out how
in the remaining lines of the first stanza of the poem “the punctuated urgency of the speaker’s condition is revealed, technically, in the meted rhythm, in the trochaic inversions, in how the feet and the individual syllables resist elision” (116). Maintains that Donne’s “sensitivity to the movement of thought in terms of what is being said and how the poet imagines the listener makes sense of what he is hearing also occurs in the rhythm of Donne’s prose,” citing as an example the famous passage about no man being an island from Devotions, in which “the rhythm in its slow quiet gathering force is so obviously the sense of thought, also aurally, that one need comment no further” (117). Believes that “effective in Donne’s rhythm is not only how a mind thinks but also his and no-one else’s thought.” Maintains that “the vexed rhythms—the stress-shifts in the middle of an iambic line through the repetition or association of words, the falling metre of a trochaic inversion rather than the rising metre of an iambic foot at the end of a line—these formal aspects of the verse” are “typical of a Donne poem,” “exacerbating his thought into truthfulness” (118). Maintains that “no other poetry in the period canvasses so acutely or variously not only the intimate joys and failures of love between men and women, or between God and the self,” nor “presents them with such inwardness and immediacy” (121). Concludes that Donne’s originality “lies in the stiff-necked individuality of his rhythm, where the ‘rough measures’ are ‘dark thoughts’ pressed back into authentic forms of living” and that “this is the specific achievement of the poetry and of the later prose, especially of the Devotions and the Sermons” (128).


Maintains that although dissimilar in style, rhetorical strategy, and poetic images, the Anniversaries, Tennyson’s In memoriam, and Eliot’s The Wasteland, all three poems deal with the progress of the soul from a state of desolation to a regained contemplative ardour. Points out how each draws its inspiration from different viewpoints of a common Christian tradition—Donne’s poem reflecting Ignatian spirituality, Tennyson’s poem shaped by Cistercian spirituality, and Eliot’s poem influenced by the renewed interest in mysticism at the end of the nineteenth century. Notes that although all three poems have lent themselves to various interpretations, there is a unity of meaning in all three. In particular, shows how the themes of poetry, of death, and of spirit exercise a reciprocal influence in each of the poems and, above all, identify poetry as the spirit’s victorious ally against capitulating to the destructive power of death.


Discusses his role in the New Criticism movement and how a select number of Donne’s poems had “a paradigmatic role bestowed upon them” by the so-called New Critics. Claims, in fact, that one can think of the method of New Criticism as “the canonization” of Canon, which “served as the master-text (or perhaps as the metatext) for at least two generations of New Critics.” Maintains that, for the New Critics, Canon “celebrated both the verbal distinction and the poetic collapse of the distinction between the sacred and profane, between the intelligible and the sensible, between paradox and logic, between poetic discourse and rational discourse.” Observes how Cleanth Brooks’s The Well-Wrought Urn (1947) “shaped the direction to be taken by the New Criticism” (217) and comments on how Brooks’s reading of Canon shaped his own reading of the poem.
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Proposes “to clear the decks for a fresh English-language study” of Huygens’s Dutch translations of 19 of Donne’s poems, noting that “[m]uch of the scholarship that has been devoted to the subject during the twentieth century is not accessible to those without Dutch” (288) and that much is flawed. Presents a brief description of four of Donne’s poems that Huygens translated in August 1630 and the remaining fifteen he translated between August and October 1633 along with “the available evidence for coterie readership of these translations in manuscript” and describes “under two separate headings the contents of the various printed versions of 1644 and 1657, and of 1658 and 1672, with a view of clearing up such misconceptions as exist.” Maintains that the intent is “to offer Anglophone scholarship a sound basis” for (1) “establishing the nature if not actual provenance of the manuscript copy that Huygens used … for every single one of the 19 translations” and (2) to produce “a facsimile transcript of Huygens’s 1630 and 1633 working manuscripts.” Maintains that the English manuscript copy of Donne’s poems, “apparently acquired piecemeal by Huygens during the 1620s” and described by P.C. Hooft in a letter translated by Grierson in his 1912 edition of Donne’s poems, “seems to have served (most likely in lost fair copy form or a copy thereof) as a basis for the translations that were in effect pirated in 1644 (twice) and 1657, printed without Huygens’s full control in 1658, and only finally corrected by him (though not flawlessly) in 1672.” States that what is described in this study is “the totality of what is known to exist at the time of writing” (290).


Maintains that throughout Devotions Donne expresses a fear that he “might be misrepresented” after his death (481), a fear that has its background “in the ongoing battle over whether John King, the Bishop of London, had converted to Catholicism on his deathbed” (482), a claim made by English Catholics abroad in at least three pamphlets published at Saint-

Omer. Outlines Donne’s close association with the King family and explains how in Devotions Donne wishes to take steps “to insure that he would not provide the Catholic polemics with what was obviously an ongoing and concerted attack on the English church” (482–83). Maintains that in Devotions Donne creates “a spiritual ‘autobiography’, which leaves no doubt that he lived and died a loyal member of the church of England.” Observes that in the conclusion of Devotions Donne “willingly submits to ritual confession administered by an orthodox minister of the English church,” thereby insuring that “no one can claim, as they did with John King, that he submitted to a ritual confession at the hands of a Catholic priest” (483).


In Chinese. Presents a brief general introduction to Donne and to his love poetry, noting, in particular, the originality and unconventionality of his conceits and citing examples from ValMourn, GoodM, and ValWeep. Maintains that the complexity of Donne’s poetry requires hardwork on the part of the reader in order to appreciate his images and conceits.


Discusses the “attitude of repulsion” that was “characteristic of the English view of circumcision as it was practiced among the Jews during the early modern period” (204) and cites Donne’s sermon preached at St. Dunstan’s on New Year’s Day of 1624 as an example. Maintains that although in the sermon Donne appeals to the spiritual nature of circumcision and to its “prefiguration of baptism” as a “means of elevating the ritual from the realm of the flesh to the realm of the spirit, the horror and repugnance associated with the cut as...
a carnal act are ever present in the sermon” (205). Points out that “no matter how much Donne interprets that which defies interpretation, the doubts and anxieties that crowd this sermon continue to trouble” and “the repugnance remains, the sense of the absurdity of it all persists, the dilemma of the unwarranted violence to so vulnerable and finally rebellious a part of the body is an ever-present part of the discourse” (205–06). Concludes that Donne, therefore, is “part of a milieu that suggests the disturbing presence of circumcision as both a biblical concept and a site of deep-seated anxieties in the early modern period” (206).

457. Lu, Hongling. [Pursuit of True Love: A Reading of Donne's Amorous Poetry]. *Foreign Literature Studies* 1: 77–80. In Chinese. Primarily focusing on *ElBed, Ecst*, and *ValMourn*, examines Donne’s views on the relationship between the body and the soul. Points out Donne’s multifarious views on carnal desire in the *Elegies* and views *Ecst* and *ValMourn* as examples of his affirmation that perfect love should be a combination of both body and soul, of sexual and spiritual love. Concludes that Donne’s attitude toward love was objective and realistic and that his poetry emphasizes the harmony between physical desire and spiritual yearning in a way that is different from Platonic and Petrarchan expressions of love.


Maintains that “[p]erhaps the most remarkable aspect of the critical elegy in the Renaissance” is the way Carew “took this Jonsonian poetic form—the critical elegy—and Jonson’s negative views of John Donne, and transformed them into an elegiac celebration of Donne” (272–73). Points out how Carew made “subtle but critical shifts in Jonson's argument, transforming Jonsonian censure into praise and notes how he “makes virtues out of Donne's elusiveness and out of his imperious wrenching of the English language to serve his poetic will.” Maintains that “the brilliance of Carew's characterization of Donne's verse is unlikely ever to be surpassed” (273). Comments on how in his elegy Carew’s imitation of Donne is “controlled and confined” and becomes a “valedictory imitation” that shows Donne’s influence “growing feeble by the poem's close.” Notes how at the end of the elegy, “true to Carew's own argument that Donne and Donne's influence will not survive, the Donnean voice has gone” (273).

459. Mannani, Manijeh. “The Sacred and Erotic Poetry of Jalai al-Din Rumi and John Donne: A Comparison.” *CRCL* 27, no. 4: 625–44. In a comparative study of the poetry of Donne and Jalai al-Din Rumi, discusses the similarities and differences in how the two poets combine the erotic and sacred in their poetry. Regards both poets as mystics and says that “[t]he common sexual imagery and the uncommon erotic language in the religious poetry of both poets are metaphors for the elucidation of the nature of the passionate relation of the lover of Truth and Truth.” Maintains that this kind of “allegorical treatment of love, mostly manifesting itself in the form of erotic imagery, is neither uncommon in Islamic mysticism nor in its Christian counterpart” and that “[t]his is the basic point of resemblance in the convergence of the erotic and the sacred in the works of both poets” (643). Points out, however, how the explicit eroticism in many of the poems in the *Songs and Sonnets* is unlike Rumi’s more mystical uses of eroticism. Claims that it is in the “convergence of the sacred and the erotic” in *ElBed* and in “the employment of eroticism in the service of mysticism” in certain of the *Holy Sonnets* and *Satyres* that Donne’s eroticism “comes closest to that of Rumi’s” (640). Suggests that “the unique character of the sacred and erotic poems of each individual poet” is determined by the fact that Rumi “belonged to the Malamati-ye school of mysticism,” while Donne “was obsessed with resolving the con-
Conflict inherent in Catholicism between the demands of the body and the soul in the love-relation between a man and a woman” (643).


Points out how the publication of the poems of Donne (1633), Herbert (1633), and Jonson (1616) “had a major impact on the status of lyric poetry in print, elevating the sociocultural status of the poet and installing lyric verse securely in print culture within the context of the establishment of the modern institution of literature” (264). Notes that following the publication of Donne and Herbert “new impetus was given to the production of printed collections of lyric verse” and that “a new market was created for both secular and religious lyrics that the enterprising royalist publisher Humphrey Moseley readily exploited. ” Observes that “[c]ertainly by the middle of the seventeenth century, collections of lyric verse were naturalized in print” and that “the old stigma associated with exposure in that democratizing medium was largely dispelled” (265).


Argues that in writing and publishing FirAn Donne was consciously and publicly contributing to the renewed interest at the time in the so-called “decay theory” debate rather than “writing a merely private meditation” on the death of Elizabeth Drury, whose role in the poem is “largely honorary, subordinate, and/or occasional.” Notes that the chief opponent of the theory in England was Francis Bacon and discusses how Donne’s poem has “pronounced anti-Baconian implications” (164) and is, in fact, “a thinly disguised assault on The Advancement of Learning” (174). Points out, for instance, how the structure of FirAn “precisely mimics Bacon’s procedure in Book II” (177) and shows how “[b]oth the poem’s specific details and its general principles … diametrically oppose those of Bacon’s treatise” (180). Concludes that Donne “reverses his adversary’s conclusion, ironically showing that true ‘advancement’ comes from heaven downward, not from earth heavenward, and that “[l]eaving behind the corruptible earth Bacon vainly seeks to restore, Donne instead directs his readers towards the transcendent hope of eternity where they will find their only real chance of repairing either the ‘ruine’ of Adam’s or our wit” (192).


Points out that Grierson sent to Yeats a copy of his 1912 edition of Donne’s poetry and discusses both Grierson, and through him, Donne’s influence on Yeats’s work. Notes that, having discovered Donne, Yeats’s work “underwent a shift of emphasis in which content was valued over the more obviously formal qualities of the earlier work” (129–30). Discusses how “tough-minded treatment of love and sensuality” in the Songs and Sonets and in the Elegies “clearly provided an example of a poet, who, like Yeats, was intent throughout upon establishing love and the private emotional life as sources for his art.” Notes that Yeats regarded Donne’s “sensuous thought” as “essentially masculine” and that he adopted “that masculinist aesthetic which resonates throughout modernism” (130). Notes that later on Yeats adopted “a much more fluid and improvisational sense of the integration possible within poetry than that suggested by Donne or by his own early emphasis upon a return to a unity of culture” (131).

Discusses Murray Krieger’s reading of *Canon* and sees it as the epitome of modernism. Points out that, for Krieger, “the poetic process is constitutive of a verbal structure organized by a central metaphor or complex of metaphors” and, therefore, his reading of *Canon* focuses primarily on the third stanza of the poem, “where the image of a ‘miraculous’ transformation appears in the poem’s complex metaphoric structure” (136). Notes that Krieger’s reading moves toward “closure, self-referentiality, and ‘contextualism’ in the sense of organic form” (137). (See Krieger’s essay above.) Contrasts modernism with post-modernism but observes that, “[i]n time, postmodernism revealed itself to be an extension of modernism, indeed, a valuable corrective” (138). Comments briefly on Donne’s influence on modern poetry.


Presents for students a brief general introduction to Donne’s life and times, noting in particular the expansion of science in the early seventeenth century (86–87). Contains a list of Donne’s major works (87) and parallel chronological lists of Donne’s life and world events (88). Reproduces *Fever*, *Bait*, *Lect*, *HSBatter*, *GoodM*, *SunRis*, *LovInf*, *SGo*, *Image*, and a selection from *Devotions*—with explanatory notes and study questions (89–102), followed by suggestions for various literary projects and exercises and for further reading and research (102–03).


In a survey of Renaissance pornography, mentions or briefly comments on Donne throughout. Points out, for instance, that “the metaphorical equivalence of the female body and landscape is a common trope in early modern English poetry” (21) and comments briefly on Donne’s use of the trope in *ElBed* and *ElProg*. Notes how in manuscript miscellanies erotic poems, including Donne’s, often appear alongside non-erotic texts and that often the compiler altered or changed poems in the process of transcription, citing as an example Margaret Bellasys’s “An Elegie,” which is a version of *Sappho* without anything “remotely sapphic” in it (59). Comments briefly on Donne’s presentation of Aretino in *Ignattius*, noting that “the English figure of Aretino” was “fundamentally contradictory: it offered an enormously attractive precedent for authorial power, which was at the same time marked as disorderly, effeminate, and sodomitical—qualities that were, in theory, antithetical to authorial power by their very nature.” Notes that the Elizabethans coined the adjective “aretine,” which “powerfully linked troubling notions of foreignness, erotic disorder, authorial power, and social mobility” (120). Points out Donne’s use of the term “dildoes” in *Satz* and *ElAnag*.


Discusses Joseph Brodsky’s initial acquaintance with Donne’s works (“officially” dated as 1964) and posits that the increasing complexity of Brodsky’s poetic stanzas results in part from Donne’s influence. Uses “Meditation 17” from *Devotions*, among others, to argue that Brodsky, in fact, must have been familiar with Donne as early as 1962 in order to have written “The Great Elegy to John Donne” (1963), in which the poet synthesizes intellectuality and Christianity. Concludes that the connection between Donne and Brodsky’s famous “apprenticeship” lies less in strophic construction or in the use of conceits but more so in his shift of compositional principles or textual organization. Maintains that, underlying the compositional methods of both poets, is the relationship between text (poetry) and context.
(the cultural *topoi* of the epoch) and that this common characteristic assisted Brodsky’s success in translating Donne into Russian.


Analyzes the theological perspective in *Annun* and relates Donne’s poem to earlier poems on the subject, especially the lapidary poem on the Ruthwell Cross and the *Dream* in the *Vercelli Book*. Notes that Donne, unlike his Anglo-Saxon predecessors, is “explicit about the paradoxes inherent in celebrating the incarnation liturgically during Lent” (370). Maintains that the “most likely source for the central conceits of Donne’s poem is the eucharistic rite [of the Church of England] which (by 1608) he fully accepted and with which he was by then long familiar.” Points out how *Annun* “recalls not only Cranmer’s collect for the Eucharist on 25 March, but also the Book of Common Prayer collect and epistle for Communion on the previous Sunday” (372). Observes how Donne “makes the coincidence on 25 March of the Passion and the first Advent of Christ (in the incarnation) at once into a vision of the unity of all human history, and a prophecy of the second coming” (374). Points out how in *Annun* he “gave new and memorable expression to one of the earliest surviving christologies (Philippians 1:5–11)” (377).


Analyzes “those things, those objects, which attract Donne’s attention as enclosed, self-con-
tained spaces representing a reality he seeks to perpetuate” (45), concentrating on images found in some of his most popular love poems. Discusses, in particular, the flea in *Flea*, graves and tombs in *Relic*, room and bed in *SunRis*, the tear and coin in *ValWeep*, the book in *ValBook*, and the sonnet in *Canon*. Concludes that “[d]efined, self-contained spaces are vital for Donne,” and that they are “primary elements of his poetic imagination” and “meeting points of the material and immaterial of the imagined world and the real one,” resolving “the tension between microcosmic/macrocosmic realities through the creation of these atmospheres, these spaces of transcendental materiality” (54–55).


Explores Donne’s “national and international interests,” focusing on “a cluster of Donne’s writings” from the early 1620s, in particular, *HSShow*, *Lam*, and “relevant sermons and letters of the period” (235). Argues that “when read collectively, these particular works present Donne’s concern for and emotional responses to the destruction of Protestantism in the Palatinate and Bohemia as a consequence of the Thirty Years’ War.” Maintains that Donne “responded to these traumatic events in several different modes of expression,” modes that “reflect not conflicting responses to the heart-wrenching events unfolding on the continent” but rather are “a unitary response reflecting different genres, audiences, and purposes” (236). Discusses how Donne’s letters and sermons during the early 1620s “reveal a keen awareness of contemporary events, both foreign and domestic” and also contain “subtle criticism” of James I for his inaction (246). Discusses how in both *HSShow* and *Lam* Donne found “an outlet for his grief” over these events “without being accused of opposing the King’s wishes” since “he was unable to speak openly in his sermons.” Concludes that all of the works discussed show that Donne “shared the general sense of despair of the English at the defeat of Frederick, the Elector of Palatine, at White
Mountain in 1620 and his subsequent 1622 defeat by Tilly which resulted in the fall of Heidelberg in September 1622 and the demise of Protestant power in Europe” (259).


Points out that in the seventeenth century “the evolution of biography as the rounded representation of an individual was a slow process” (314) since “early biographies were driven by the need to preserve the memory of men, and occasionally women, who had added distinction to the nation and especially to the reformed religion that was so closely allied to national identity” (315). Discusses how Walton’s Lives reflects this attempt “to project a mood of what has been called ‘pleasant piety’” (316). Notes that the “culmination of all Walton’s lives is the deathbed scene” and points out how he “excelled in the presentation of these terminal scenes” (318), citing his description of Donne’s death as an example.


Argues that an understanding of the context of Henry is “crucial to appreciating the work.” Proposes that the poem “at once fulfills a patronage obligation owed by Donne’s father-in-law Sir George More and also participates in the poet’s own quest for patronage; but that “neither separately nor taken together can they account for many of the poem’s peculiarities.” Maintains that “[w]hat needs to be added to them is an examination of the Prince Henry elegy specifically within the context of Donne’s other funereal poems” (205). Discusses, therefore, how many of the problematic aspects of the poem—“including its extended theological meditations, its hyperbolic idealization and distortion of the Prince’s political positions, and its evocation of the ‘Shee-intelligence’—are illuminated by placing the poem in the context of Donne’s other funereal poems,” especially of Donne’s “evolution as an elegist” (218–19). Suggests that “as a result of the demands he faced within the patronage system to commemorate individuals whom he did not know intimately, Donne created a new elegiac mode” and that he “solved the practical problem of mourning the deaths of remote subjects by transforming the traditional English elegy into a vehicle for theological and philosophical speculation.” Concludes that by “[a]dopting a symbolic mode, he wrote public poems that display his learning and virtuosity, in the process transcending his ostensible subjects and occasions” (219).


Presents “a preliminary study of the early censorship, both official and unofficial,” of the Elegies and of Sappho. Points out that during Donne’s lifetime a number of collectors of his verse “silently censored passages in the elegies, either by omitting lines or by rewriting them” and notes that 5 of the elegies “so offended the official licenser in 1632 that they were ‘excepted’ from the first edition” of 1633 and “achieved print only in later editions” (194). Describes the various tamperings with the text of the Elegies by collectors and by the publisher of the first edition, such as changing words, excising lines, omitting passages, truncating poems, repositioning lines, etc. Observes, however, that, “despite the lesbian and autoerotic character of Sappho, the poem ‘was allowed by the licensers and was printed in full in the 1633 volume.’ Points out, however, that one collector truncated the poem, thereby allowing it to be read as an expression of idealized friendship between two women.” Notes that this version “entered the stream of manuscript transmission and survives in seven known copies” (200). Concludes that the early manuscript and print treatment of the Elegies and Sappho suggests that although “Jack” Donne wrote “daring and erotic poems,” the later “John” Donne, his friends, and his early readers felt obliged “to censor and legitimate” them (201).

In an effort to date and find connections between various manuscripts of Donne's poems, describes the development of "a method of describing watermarks that is specific and computer-oriented," which is based on "a flexible grid pattern that is easy to memorize and use" (229). Contains 8 figures.


Points out that Ovid’s *Amores* (Elegy 13), Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde* (Bk. 3, ll. 1415–1527) and Donne’s *SunRis* “all feature the separation of two lovers by dawn” and that it is generally accepted that “both Chaucer and Donne were familiar with Ovid’s poem.” Proposes, however, that perhaps there is "a chain of influence running from Ovid's elegy through Troilus and Criseyde to Donne's lyric" (269). Maintaining that Chaucer's influence can be detected in *SunRis*, "highlights a few of the many particular features of this Chaucerian influence, especially its tendency to formulate itself as a meditation upon history and language" (272). Divides the argument into three parts: (1) a consideration of “the external, literary-historical evidence”; (2) “an examination of the internal evidence,” pointing out “specific similarities between Donne's poem and Chaucer's”; and (3) “a consideration of the possible critical implications that would follow our beginning to imagine Chaucer's text as 'intertext' between Ovid's and Donne's” (280). Maintains, in particular, that Donne's "rejection or radical reformulation of the Ovidian *adynaton*" can be seen as "a consequence" of his "reading Ovid through Chaucer's tragic vision" (286).


Comments briefly on Donne's *Satyres*, noting that they have “a satyr's roughness recalling the Romans as they were then read” and reflect, therefore, a “revival of classical methods.” Points out that “the poetry's bounce and obscurity also derive from the condensation and mental rapidity typical of Donne's wit, while the satirical personae, themselves not wholly in good moral health, are subtly imagined and not exempt from Donne's irony” (229). Summarizes the main satirical targets in the 5 poems.


Surveys C. S. Lewis's commentary on Donne, noting that Lewis wrote more on Donne than on any other seventeenth-century writer. Points out, however, that although Lewis "combed Donne's works" for quotations and illustrations and "awarded to Donne privileged places in his writings, his commentary reveals profoundly mixed feelings" (141). Discusses two stages in Lewis's assessment of Donne: "an early infatuation" (from about 1922–27), “followed by a cooler (and less favorable) reassessment” (142). Points out that Lewis pointed out many important features of Donne’s love poetry but that critical history has proven him wrong in his overall estimate of Donne's stature as a poet and in his belief that Donne's poetry would not endure.


Discusses the neo-Latin scholarship that informs *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Essays*. Says that a
bibliography of *Pseudo-Martyr* “might read like a Renaissance catalogue of neo-Latin works” and that “the prominence of neo-Latin is equally striking” in *Essays* (543). Maintains that this neo-Latin influence indicates that Donne was a humanist in the Renaissance sense, that neo-Latin works were “the literary terrain on which he came to solve his own deeply difficult philosophical and religious problems,” and that these works “made him a much more international figure in early seventeenth-century England than the emphasis of modern criticism on the Englishness of his wit and his verses has led us to believe” (544). Suggests that “a major characteristic of Donne’s humanism is his attempt to employ learning in the task of identifying the unchanging,” noting that Donne’s humanism is “much more private and speculative and much less idealistic and public than Milton’s” (545) but that “[t]he speculative character of Donne’s humanism…is tempered for him by the very existence of the neo-Latin works at his disposition” (546). Maintains that the relatively little impact that either work made when published may be attributed to the fact that in both “the reader is left with the impression that, though these are English compositions, Donne is not writing for him but rather, dialoguing with his neo-Latin sources” and disputing with “the intellectual milieu of his incipient ex-co-religionists” (550).


In the introduction (1–11), briefly discusses the nature of metaphysical poetry and its major characteristics and suggests that the title of this study should be perhaps “The Metaphysical Poets, Six Studies in Seventeenth-Century Interiority,” since it is “these poets’ interest in themselves that makes them matter to us” (2). In Chapter 1, “John Donne” (13–89), (1) presents a biographical sketch of the poet, commenting particularly on his religious background, development, and sensibility (13–29); (2) discusses some general characteristics of Donne’s poetry (29–39), such as the complexity of thought, the power of invention, the “flair for bizarre compounds” (31), the uses of wit and hyperbole, the play of mind, and metrical experimentation; (3) critically evaluates the *Satyres*, *Metem*, and verse letters to Wotton and Goodyer (39–49), in which Donne deals with alienation, from sardonic and self-ironizing fun to resolving on heroic individuality” (49); (4) surveys the *Elegies* and the *Songs and Sonets* (50–74), commenting on the dating of the poems, presenting a detailed analysis of *Air*, and citing examples of the complexity of both style and themes in Donne’s love poems; and (5) comments on Donne’s religious verse, including certain verse epistles, the *Anniversaries*, the *Holy Sonnets*, and hymns (74–88), showing how Donne’s special character of inwardness “finally took a form at once conventional and magnificently bizarre in the religious verse” (87).

Reviews:
- Anon. in *ContempR* 280 (2002): 188–89.


Points out that, for all his originality and the inventiveness in his imagery and diction, Donne wrote primarily in “the classical genres of epigram, verse-epistle, elegy, lyric, satire, epicede (commemorative poem), hymn and epithalamion, as well as a Renaissance form, the sonnet” and that classical writers “provided him some of the stock figures of his earlier poems,” e.g., the libertine woman in *ConfL* and the adunata (list of impossibilities) in *SGo* (420). Briefly comments on how Donne’s *Satyres* could have gotten him into trouble had they fallen into the wrong hands. Rejects the notion that Donne and Jonson were “conscious leaders of opposing poetic factions, innovators versus classicists” (424). Comments on Donne
as a coterie poet, surveys his friends and patrons, and maintains that, “[i]n reading his poems, whether sacred or secular, we may understand them better or at least not construct a false image of Donne, if we remember their status as fictions for particular readers” (427). Emphasizes that Donne’s poems are “dramatic portraits, ventriloquizing, posing as various personae, cynic, wit, seducer, lover, penitent and more” (428). Recognizes, however, that some of the love poems may have “arisen from real occasions” but that even those that did “may well have been written with the coterie reader in mind” (429). Comments on the verse epistles and poems written to or for specific persons, especially those addressed to the Countess of Bedford.


Maintains that although Donne as a preacher was greatly admired by his contemporaries, after his death his reputation faded and that in the eighteenth century, with only a few exceptions, “the sermons lost their former fame” and “were virtually forgotten” until the nineteenth century (151). Focuses on Coleridge’s appreciation of the sermons and his agreement with Donne’s views on the importance of the Anglican Church in the interpretation of the Bible and doctrine. Points out that, for Coleridge, Donne’s sermons “contained not only considerable amount of practical religious and moral knowledge, but, above all, the sufficient power to capture the audience’s curiosity and imagination.” Says that Coleridge was “especially charmed by Donne’s intellectual stringency and force of argument” (155). Notes the importance of Henry Alford’s The Works of John Donne (1839), which contained all but three of Donne’s then-known sermons, thereby making Donne accessible to the Victorians, and discusses how Alford’s approach to Donne was “deeply rooted in Coleridge’s criticism” (158). Comments more briefly on other nineteenth-century admirers of Donne, such as Richard Cattermole, H. Stebbing, R. A. Willmott, John Henry Newman, E. B. Pusey, and other Tractarians. Concludes that in the nineteenth century Donne’s sermons “became evaluated as interesting not only from the literary, but also from the theological point of view” and that “the appropriation was successful and helped to re-establish the foundations of the Church” (164).


In a discussion about the death of his grandmother and about certain similarities between the Talmud and the internet, comments on the passage in Meditation 17 of the Devotions in which Donne says that “When one dies, one chapter is not torn out of the book, but translated into better language; and every chapter must be so translated.” Discusses his locating the passage, only half-remembered from his college days, by means of the internet.


Presents a brief introduction to Donne’s life and works. Calls Donne “the most celebrated poet of his time, copied into commonplace books and circulated more frequently in manuscript collections than any other poet of the age.” Notes that “[s]elf-dramatization is an essential part of his literary persona, as preacher and as poet” (102). Presents modernized texts of 18 poems from the Songs and Sonets, 6 Elegies, Sat3, 12 Holy Sonnets, and 4 hymns, followed by excerpts from Devotions and the sermons—all with brief notes and glosses.

Explores the idea that the Lothian portrait was Donne’s “dark double, mirroring the changing moods of his soul, reflecting an attraction to the night that found its most perfect expression in religious devotion to Anglican Evensong” (20), which Cranmer crafted “to comfort and strengthen churchgoers as they prepared to face the tribulations waiting them in the world outside” (21). Surveys the controversy surrounding the source and meaning of the Latin inscription (“Illumina tenebras nostras Domina”) and notes that it comes from “the medieval Catholic office of Compline in the Sarum Breviarium, later translated into English by Cranmer to become the closing prayer of Evensong in the Book of Common Prayer,” which suggests “the interplay, rather than breach, between the religions present and past” (23). Shows how the inscription “was designed to make an impact, not only because of the ways it could be read, but [also] how it was intended to be seen—circling Donne’s head like nimbus” (26). Maintains that the Lothian portrait “depicts a young man who was only too familiar with mourning and melancholy, who fell back on the old mid-evening office of Compline that dignified his anticipation of lovemaking at night and release from depression in sleep, and who went on in his poetry to turn this darkness into an Evensong” (29) Comments especially on Canon, Noct, FirAn, and Father as examples.


Discusses the part played by Nicholas Ferrar and others in arranging for Donne to deliver a sermon to the Virginia Company in November 1622 in which Donne urged the members to propagate the gospel in the New World. Comments on “the connections that run from Ferrar to Donne through their mutual friend, George Herbert, against the background of the Virginia enterprise” (267). Points out that Donne’s presence on this occasion as Dean of St. Paul’s indicates the official involvement of the Church of England in the enterprise at the time. Comments on Donne’s interest in and connection with the Virginia Company. Notes that “[a]s early as 1609 he was said to be angling for the position of Secretary to the colony” and observes that over the years he “appears to have been well-informed about the affairs of the Company,” especially because “a number of his associates and friends were subscribers to the company” (272). Discusses the salient points in the 1622 sermon, noting that, in retrospect, it “marks the beginning of the end for the Virginia Company, which would in turn make the end of the period of the national consensus on the ideology of the New World mission” (275). Contrasts Donne’s views in his sermon with those of George Herbert in “The Church Militant” and of the Ferrars at Little Gidding, who were skeptical of the Company’s commitment to spreading the gospel and who satirized the greed of the colonists. Points out that in his sermon Donne, unlike them, presents “the profit motive … as part of the Divine Plan to bring all humankind into one universal community.” Observes that, considering the conflicts within the Virginia Company at the time, Donne’s sermon “may seem naively confident,” but maintains that “there is no reason to think that Donne underestimates the gravity of the Company’s situation or fails to recognize the forces of division within the Company.” Believes that the sermon should be seen “as a brave performance” (287).


Discusses the “haphazard arrangement” of Donne’s poems in the 1633 edition in relation to Thomas Browne’s “To the deceased Author,” which was “published for the first and only time in that same volume.” Argues that the arrangement “thematizes the readerly tendency to interpret this textual body in the light of ‘subjective’ notions of ‘proper’ desire.” Maintains that a close reading of Browne’s poem, with its “key
image of the bad reader as a ‘circumciser’” when seen in the light of the theological and medical discourses of the period on circumcision, shows that Browne’s “response to Donne’s text is at once instructively prescient—providing a useful allegory of reading for the contemporary critic—and also helpful in situating Donne at the cusp of a historical transformation between ‘medieval’ and ‘early modern’ conceptions of the sexual and the spiritual” (375).


Argues that Donne’s early verse epistles addressed to his male contemporaries are “worthy of closer critical attention than they have hitherto received” and also that “these poems, and their interpretive history (such as it is), can shed some light upon several issues central to current debates about the nature of early modern sexuality, including the status of the so-called ‘literature of friendship’” (114). Presents close readings of several of the early verse epistles, specially those addressed to Thomas Woodward and Rowland Woodward, in order to challenge both those critics who regard these poems as merely conventional and not reflecting Donne’s personal sexual feelings and those who see them as sincere, homoerotic, and unconventional personal expressions. Argues that these poems, in fact, present Donne’s highly idealized and complex conception of friendship and that they “bespeak the special affect of friendship—a socio-affective bond that relates to the literary and educative discourses of Renaissance humanism” as well as “to modern regimes of sexuality, in ways that our history and our literary criticism are only now beginning to explicate.” Maintains that “the range of social and interpretive effects of that affect—and any further conclusions that we might wish to draw about the structure of Donne’s own thinking on these matters—remain highly contestable” (124). Concludes that the early verse epistles “teach a lesson concerning both the necessity and the difficulty of attending to the historical and cultural contingencies of eroticism” (125).


Examines the anti-Catholic commentary in Donne’s sermons in order to discover “the character of Donne’s conformity” and in order “to understand how far Donne was willing to use his ability to ‘read’ contemporary Catholicism to advance the political and doctrinal aims of the Church of England” (137). Argues that “determining Donne’s attitude to Catholicism in his sermons is fraught with methodological problems” (139) and stresses, in particular, that “[e]stablishing an appropriate context within which to interpret sermons which deal with this matter … almost always requires avoiding fragmented ‘sound bytes’ culled indiscriminately from the sermons” and also requires “focusing in more detail, where possible, on sermons in their particular historical and cultural contexts” (140). Maintains that Donne’s conformity did not require him “to suppress or to wrench his identity, to proclaim hypocritically anyone’s propagandistic agenda” but rather required him “to examine the body of divinity currently controverted, and to decide to what extent he could use his unique placement as a baptised Catholic, an irenical and international intellect, and a royal chaplain to mitigate the consequences of destructive religious warfare while remaining committed to personal sanctity, political stability, and—above all—the process of making sound moral decisions.” Claims, in other words, that Donne “used his skill in language and his flexible intellect to find a place where he was a loyal subject to God and King, but no one’s slave” (141). Discusses how Donne “distinguishes clearly in his sermons between the true religion into which he was born and contemporary Catholicism characterised officially by the innovations of the Council of Trent, the Jesuit campaign to promote and establish Catholicism in England, and the political interventions of … the Pope.”
Points out that although Donne attacks what he sees as specific abuses and errors in Catholicism, his disagreements with the Catholic Church are fundamentally “innovations in doctrine, its reliance on the traditions of men (the Fathers, the Pope), its subversions of the authority of Scripture, its excessive claims to apostolic succession, and its political intervention in matters purely civil” (147). Maintains that “[e]ssentially Donne’s sermons argue that the error of the Roman Church is in insisting that disputable points be taken as articles of faith” (148). Discusses how Donne redefines terms so that “they lose their polemical baggage” (150). Comments in some detail on Donne’s sermon of 1622 preached at Lincoln’s Inn and his sermon of 1625 preached before Charles in order “to contextualise several key aspects of Donne’s use of anti-Catholic rhetoric” (151) and to show “how far it was possible to warn against religious polemic while still remaining within the world view acceptable to English Protestants.” Concludes that Donne’s anti-Catholicism “can be seen as his undertaking to catechise the Christians in his care about the abuses, both disciplinary and political, which occasioned the Reformation and made reconciliation with the post-Tridentine Church difficult, though not impossible” (162).


Briefly comments on the sexual attitudes expressed in ElBed (“one of domineering mastery”) (121) and in Sappho (“a male sexual fantasy of female homoeroticism” seen as “the narcissistic deployment of the libido”) (218). Maintains that in Donne’s texts, as in those of many other early modern poets, “simile is often transcoded with the desire of the like, and primarily with the desire of the like in the form of homoeroticism” (341).


Presents critical readings of HSDeath and HS-Batter to show that “a meditative strategy underlies these two holy sonnets; that it points to a creative act rather than an experiential one; and that such a creative act presents a poem that is not ‘personal’ in substance and thus not ‘biographical’ in a literal way.” Maintains that “[w]hile an inner struggle concerning self and the self’s relation to God and vocation probably did give rise to their content, and we may thus infer that Donne was considering his career around 1609 as well as his theological position, we should pay attention to the sonnets’ artistic ploys, rhetorical stance and tropes, rhythms and reader-effects.” Holds that these sonnets “may reveal Donne’s emotions and personal thoughts, his fears and sublimation of such fears, his uncertainties of what life is and who humankind is” but that “there is also an audience intended to be edified in such matters.” Concludes, therefore, that these sonnets are “not just ‘private’; though their style and genre are” and they are “not only ‘personal’ as that word might generally be defined” (96), but that they are also “vehicles for a reading public to ponder and for literary critics to evaluate as literature” (97).


Discusses the form, the genre, and mode of Renaissance verse satire and draws a distinction between “the genre verse satire and a poem that is satiric but not of the genre verse satire” (18). Hopes that the view on satire presented in this study will lead to “rereadings and revaluations” of such poems as Donne’s Sat2, a poem that is “not bifurcated into two topics”; Sat3, “which should not have the couplet concerning four people important to religious affairs in the sixteenth century pulled out of position to epitomize the whole”; and Sat4, which, “while long, is not disorganized.” Maintains, however, that “this differentiation of generic and modal” indicates that Coryat is “satiric but not a verse satire, even though it is written in heroic couplets” (28).

Discusses “the early modern theology of power on the assumption that it is a theology, an attempt to understand the nature of God and not a cloak for legitimating a certain regime” (115). Comments on how Donne “regularly deploys language associated with absolute monarchy in his treatment of the divine” and “stresses precisely that aspect of absolutism most alien to modern mentality: the configuration of ideal relations in terms of domination and submission.” Maintains that, in this respect, Donne is “representative of mainstream English Reformation thought,” that he “differs from those of his contemporaries primarily in the degree to which he stresses the analogy between God and kings,” and that in his references to kings, he frequently invokes “the main themes of Jacobean royalism.” Discusses how Donne “habitually describes divine-human relations in the language of seventeenth-century absolute monarchy” (117), how his “politicisation of the divine image leads to a spirituality based on awe and subjection” (118), and how his theology is absolutist “not by implication or interference but quite literally.” Discusses also how “[d]ivine power fascinates Donne largely in its destructive and catastrophic aspect” (119); how he “lays particular weight on man’s utter vulnerability, both physical and psychological, to divine aggression” (120); and how his view of the relationship between God and man and between married men and women thus “operates along the axis of power and submission” (122). Comments on how Donne “depicts sin politically—as rebellion against divine governance” and as “an escape from power into a secular, ‘sovereignless’ world” and maintains that he is “fascinated and horrified by the possibility of experiencing existence without reference to the absolute” (132). Notes that “although Donne lived in the last generation of full-blooded Augustinians and sacred monarchs, he did not know it” (133).


Comments on Ecst (l.7–8), noting that in these lines Donne “turns to theories of vision that describe sight in terms of ‘intramission’ and ‘extramission’ and that stress the veridicality of perceptual images.” Points out that “[a]ccording to one such view, passed down from the Greek atomists to the sixteenth century, objects throw off images—species, idola, picturae, and so on—that traveled through the air into the eye.” Notes that Donne’s “eye-beames” seem “to emanate from objects and to serve as vehicles for the transmission of little copies or reflections” (314). Briefly contrasts Donne and Aphra Behn in their use of optics.


In “The Idiom of Fragmentation: John Donne” (117–42), maintains that Donne’s writings “would appear to reflect the tensions of his actual life, and therefore their biographical context is unavoidable” and that he “had difficulties in drawing on the concept of the self as a literary device.” Suggests that in Donne the self “often appears ravaged” (117) and “[h]is circumstances riddled his self-awareness with emotional and spiritual problems, which find a tortured expression in his work” 117–18), especially his love poetry. Illustrates this view by discussing Sat3, Pseudo-Martyr, Storm, Triple, Ind, SunRis, Canon, Lect, Noct, Devotions, the Holy Sonnets, Father, prose letters, and sermons. Claims that Donne “did not value” the Songs and Sonets and that he “found in them as little worth as the passionate involvement of love itself, which he portrays as essentially self-deceptive” (130). Argues that finally “[t]he idiom of love for God” in the Holy Sonnets “re- stored his fragmented self, and made a whole of his stricken writing” (142). In “Beyond Love”
(161–70), maintains that Donne’s love poetry “shows indulgence in love as an example of the distortion of truth brought about by human egoism” and notes that Donne’s poetry often is “satiric, making of love the basis of a joke at man’s expense.” Discusses Para as an example that “pinpoints the essential contradictions in the lover’s outlook” (167). Observes that even poems written at the time of his wife’s death are “steeped in the misery which this loss caused him.” Cites as examples Noct, a poem in which the death of his beloved “has reduced him to a non-entity,” and HSShe, a sonnet in which Donne laments his wife’s death but shows “how the devastation of her loss is essentially salutary, since through it he is brought to recognize his need of God.” Concludes that Donne “rejected his early love poetry for its basis in fallacy” and yet “the maturity of his Holy Sonnets, which express his need of God’s love, is based on the self-knowledge which so ravaged him” (169).


A study guide for high school students containing background information on Donne; close analyses of ValMourn, SunRis, Relic, Goodf, Sickness, HSBatter, and HSScene; practice examination questions with guidelines; focus questions and answers; and sample examination essays. Contains also a glossary of literary terms and suggestions for further reading.


Based on an examination of the manuscript evidence, argues that the order of the Elegies in the Westmoreland manuscript (NY3) most likely reflects Donne’s intended ordering of twelve of the poems. Shows “the recurrence of that order in other artifacts that can be traced back to Donne’s holograph in independent lines of transmission” (176).


Points out that, although “the over 4,000 manuscript copies of Donne’s poems in over 250 surviving manuscripts form the bulk of the extant Donne literary remains,” up to the end of the twentieth century textual scholars considered the seven seventeenth-century editions and the scholarly editions derived from them as “the most important textual remainders of Donne’s corpus” (299). Discusses how the first edition (1633) has become “the official relic of Donne’s textual corpus, largely through its canonization by Sir H. J. C. Grierson in the first great twentieth-century edition” (1912) (300), but shows how the first edition is “not a very accurate representation of the canon of the text of Donne’s work, a fact recognized by Donne’s seventeenth-century editors as they attempted to complete Donne’s canon and to repair the ravages of censorship and folly in Donne’s texts.” Discusses the early editions and points out that, as a result of the work of the seventeenth-century editors, “a larger and considerable bawdier Donne” emerges in the last third of the century than in the first (301). Concludes that for more than 300 years “the remains of Donne’s racked corpus have provided editors with an ill anatomy upon which to work and scholars an equally grievous text to read” (307). Notes the attempts of the textual editors of The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne to reconstruct the textual history of Donne’s poems from manuscript sources.


Calls Isabella Whitney “the first Englishwoman known to have written original secular poetry in English for publication and reproduces two of her poems, “I. W. to Her Unconstant Lover” and “The Admonition by the Author to All
Young Gentlewomen and to All Other Maids Being in Love”—with glosses. Notes that Whitney experimented with various tones and voices and selects poems by Spenser, Campion, and Donne in which these male poets adopt female voices, noting, however, that Campion’s poem might be by a man to a boy. In a subsection, entitled “John Donne Imagines Being Sappho,” presents a brief introduction to Sappho, noting that it is “probably the first ‘lesbian’ poem in English” (73). Reproduces Donne’s poem with glosses.


Points out that Donne “often describes ecstatic religious experience with the same metaphors of earthly instability and material metamorphoses he uses to catalogue his melancholic self-destructive inclinations” and that he is “inclined to equate unhappiness with spiritual redemption” (81). Argues that Donne’s “scholarly melancholy—grief stimulated specifically by learned endeavor—forms an integral part of his religious melancholy” and that his “self-perceived, melancholic disposition thus manifests itself both in his approach to learning as well as in his articulations of his experiences as a Christian” (82). Maintains that “[t]he evidence provided by his poetry, devotional prose, letters, and sermons reveals how Donne—throughout his life—read his body, faith, and the world-at-large humorally.” Argues that Donne “resists a strictly religious understanding of his melancholy by continually testifying to the potentially strained—if always eventually reconcilable—relationship between the learned and the devout life” and that, in fact, “it is through his studies that Donne understands and conceptualizes his devotion” (84). Comments on how this “scholarly melancholy” manifests itself in Devotions, Essays, Lit, Biathanatos, the Satyres, the Holy Sonnets, his letters to friends, and his sermons and how he “attaches unhappiness to scholarly pursuits at the same time that he identifies such pursuits as the focal point of his own existence, thereby knowingly risking the onset of melancholy” (86–87). Concludes that Donne “sees his scholarly melancholy as an integral component of his religious faith, to be treasured and feared” (98).


Explores in Pseudo-Martyr Donne’s “desire to mediate between the state’s rigor and the obstinacy of papists, between the state’s enforcement of its oaths and the outward compliance with the state that safeguards both Catholic subjects and their faith” (51). Argues that Donne’s treatise “does not offer a thoroughgoing and unambiguous defense of obedience to James I” but rather it “reflects a conscience divided between the private memory relics of a religious inheritance and alertness to the contradictions of outward religious and political allegiance.” Maintains that Pseudo-Martyr “betrays the conviction that, poised between the two indeterminate circumstances of God’s remoteness and the political vagaries of the outward visible church, it is preferable to reclothe or change one’s outward habit to fit the times than to perish for a conviction” (51). Reviews the historical context of the 1606 Oath of Allegiance, examines several early poems that show “traces of Donne’s nostalgia for, and guilt for abandoning,” his Catholic faith, and argues that “rather than producing in Pseudo-Martyr a wholehearted repudiation of Catholicism, Donne provided Romanist dissenters with a casuistical accommodation of the Stuart regime calculated to meet the king and parliament’s immediate demand for a profession of loyalty” (51). Discusses how “[a]ttempting to reconcile two seemingly intransigent positions in a high stakes casuistical exercise, Pseudo-
Martyr examines the Oath from opposing perspectives, that of the state that tenders it and of the Catholic who at his own peril contemplates its refusal (64–65), underscoring “the need for outward profession of temporal allegiance to the king” (65), but at the same time proposing that the Oath “binds the individual conscience only in temporal, not spiritual matters” (74).


Comments generally on Donne’s views on suicide in Biathanatos and compares them with those of Shakespeare in Antony and Cleopatra. Points out that Donne argues that suicide is not always a sin, thereby challenging the arguments of those who hold such a view and cautioning “against totalizing judgments on the subject.” Notes that similarly Shakespeare’s treatment of Antony’s suicide “stresses ambiguity and uncertainty and thus delivers a similar caution” (162). Notes that although at first Donne describes suicide as “an affliction,” he quickly sees it as “a remedy” and points out that, as in Antony’s case, “the idea of suicide sustains a number of contradictory and culturally specific meanings,” meanings that “cancel each other out in order to leave only Donne’s desire for sovereignty” (163).


Maintains that publication by John Fowler of Thomas More’s Dialogue of Comfort Against Tribulation (1573) “provides a striking glimpse of the marginalized, illegal status of Elizabethan Catholicism—the very Catholicism inherited by the young Donne” and that the image of More in the book “provided a model for besieged recusants” and also “granted, ipso facto, saintly status to More while allowing Catholics to see, once again, the divine through the material” (1). Points out similarities between Donne and More, “similarities which help to illustrate, among other things, the production of a literary culture in the English Renaissance” (2). Discusses how English Catholics of the time “would recognize in Fowler’s 1573 edition the costly price paid for individual belief” and suggests that “[i]n the coming years, Donne himself would experience, in a profound and painful fashion, this same struggle with fidelity” (13).


In the Introduction (1–20), points out that the purpose of this study is “to show that Donne’s quest for a political career in the late Elizabethan and Jacobean regimes could produce poetic performances of subtlety and originality” and “to demonstrate that The Courtier constituted a paradigm structure within which Donne could retain his critical detachment, maintain the highest standards of poetic excellence, and at the same time write a poetry of ambition designed to advance his political interests” (2). Announces that “[e]ach of the central four chapters of this study focuses on a pattern in the dance at court—on a code or ‘move’ emerging from that social discourse which came to Donne authorized in the text of The Courtier by the regime which he sought to enter” (18). Maintains that these four courtly codes “belong as much to the aesthetic and rhetorical realms as to the social” and that they are “a reflection of Elizabethan culture’s calculated absorption of the social into the aesthetic and its consecration of The Courtier as a principal focus of such activity” (20). In Chapter 1, “The Satirical
Art of the Disabused” (21–59), points out that a distinguishing feature of Castiglione’s dialogue is “its participants’ tolerance of the dissonant in crucial areas of their experience, to the point where their tolerance becomes the mark of a disabused mentality.” Notes that Castiglione’s courtiers have “the discretion to recognize that their exchanges sometimes reach a point of impasse where to attempt even provisory resolutions would be to engage in self-deception.”

Argues that Donne’s *Satyres*, which are autobiographical in the tradition of Horace and Ariosto, depict Donne himself confronting impasses, resisting self-deception, becoming disabused. Maintains that “[t]his movement accounts for their difference from all other English formal satire of the period, and more importantly, organizes all five into a unified account of the social life of an aspirant to political prominence in late Elizabethan London” (18). In Chapter 2, “Aesthetic Play” (60–86), points out that “[p]eculiar to Castiglione’s courtiers is their preference (over serious debate) for provocative play that lures an interlocutor into drawing, not his own conclusions, but those which the courtiers have implanted in the course of a casual exchange.”

Argues that Donne’s poems “engage their readers in the same way, provoking them to complete the aesthetic experience by supplying settings, scenarios, and silent characters according to hints which the poems themselves implant.” Claims that “[t]his ‘imaginative expansion’ or ‘open form’ accounts for the dramatic immediacy of Donne’s best-known secular poems and leads, in Donne’s adaptation of Castiglione, to a version of the literary baroque” (18–19). In Chapter 3, “Sprezzatura or Transcendence: From Travesty to Palinode” (87–111), points out that “[b]y concealing the difficulty of their achievements and nonchalantly disparaging them, Castiglione’s courtiers hope to produce the illusion of transcending their human limitations.”

Notes that “[t]his is the notorious sprezzatura by which the adept evokes wonderment (meraviglia) in his superiors in order to obtain grace (grazia).” Argues that “[b]ecause of his low status and his society’s prejudices against poetry, Donne had to write excellent poetry and conceal, not only its difficulty, but [also] the seriousness of his commitment to it in the first place.”

Maintains that “[h]is effort to produce the impression of transcendent reality (of an ascriptive being akin to hereditary rank) beneath the veil of his poetic achievement led to self-parody” (e.g., ElBed) and “palinode” (e.g., Noct and ValBook) and to such “performances” as Canon (19). In Chapter 4, “Discerning Inscrutability” (112–44), points out that Castiglione’s courtiers make casuistry their business, dedicating much time (especially in Book III) to demonstrations that artifice in their case, whether in cultivating provocative repartee or a nonchalant demeanor, is the exception to the rule that dissimulation is evil.” Notes that “[t]hey (along with Donne and his speakers) demonstrate their sincerity by openly conceding that others might be at risk in dealing with them and that their talent for prevarication is dangerous” and that “[t]hey acknowledge and describe in detail the worst that can be expected of their calculated detachment—their disinvoltura.”

Claims that “[t]his accounts for contrasting pairs among the speakers of Donne’s lyrics” (e.g., Air, Flea, Ecst, and ElServe), in which “the cynical seducer appears in one poem, the principled lover in another.” Maintains that this also “accounts for that apparent dissonance within individual poems” (19). In the conclusion (145–51), discusses ValBook in the light of all the four codes of courtliness mentioned in the preceding chapters. Concludes with notes (153–69) and an index (171–74).

Reviews:

- Matthew Woodcock in *TLS* (8 March 2002):


Briefly comments on Donne’s references to Aretino in Ignatius. Mentions the “sinister combination of sexuality and physical exploitation” in ElBed (ll. 25–30), noting, however, that at the end of the poem “the woman commands the power of her sexuality, whether she decides to use or withhold it” (306).


Observes that Donne’s works and life “provide some fascinating instances of the two predominant aspects of early seventeenth-century devotional ‘recall’: the calling to mind (OED, ‘remember’ 1) and memorializing (OED, ‘remember’ 2), of the self.” Discusses how in Devotions Donne “analyses his own self, body as well as soul, as the text of his meditations.” Notes that Donne’s “devotional activity is characterized as self-anatomy, the careful dissection of his being,” and that “the writing of his Devotions is, then, a means of putting together or reconstituting that selfhood.” Points out that “[t]he process of remembering is, according to Donne’s metaphor, not only a calling to mind the subject, but also, in the literal sense of the word, a ‘re-membering’ after dissection or dismembering.” Maintains that just before his death Donne “reversed that sequence of events, attempting to remember himself before the disintegration brought about by mortality” by commissioning “a portrait of his wasted body lying in his funeral shroud so that he could be his own memento mori” and thereby consciously recognizing “his dying body as both self and other, familiar and estranged.” Notes that after his death this portrait was used to create his memorial in St. Paul’s Cathedral, “thus combining in one intriguing example the process of actively remembering oneself with that of being remembered by others” (25). Points out that in Goodf and especially in a sermon on Psalm 38.3 Donne stresses “the importance of memory for salvation,” urging his congregation “not to defer the business of remembering” (26). Discusses how “the conscious calling to memory of self is a necessary preliminary stage in devotion and redemption” (30); how “the devotional self remembers even as it is remembered, and is thereby in the fullest sense re-membered”; and how “the very act of asking to be remembered gives access to eternity” (33).


Discusses how Donne, Herbert, Mary Sidney, and Aemilia Lanyer “worked within, and beyond, the inherited gendered framework of devotional thought and writing,” how they “depict themselves in their religious texts,” and with what materials they “envisage and construct their relationship with God.” Asks if “the new canon of religious poetry, now including the work of women writers, [can] bring about changes in the way we interpret the familiar texts of devotion” (186). Maintains that “it is clearly a mistake to assume that there is no place for gender in spiritual experience or in devotional wit” and notes that “its possibilities are extremely flexible in Donne’s religious imagination.” Points out that “[t]he self in the poems can certainly adopt the role of a woman, but is more frequently divided between a male body and a receptive female soul” and that,
“[t]hough the preaching voice—often to be heard in both the secular and sacred poems of Donne—is consciously male, the priestly function as conveyer of Christ can be seen as female, or is merged, as in the case of Mr. Tilman, into a ‘blessed hermaphrodite’” (193). Illustrates this point by commenting on HS-Batter, HSShow, HSDue, Annun, Sickness, and Tilman. Argues that the four poets discussed perhaps “should be referred to as the school of Sidney, or perhaps, even, the tribe of Mary” (204) and challenges “the assumptions which guide and circumscribe our reading” (204), by presenting “new perceptions of the sequence of influence and authority” and by “opening up fundamental questions concerning the role of gender in religious poetry” (204–05).


Discusses how Donne’s position in Sat3 “on noncommitment, which may be characterized as a sort of stand, a state of suspension as if to enable a radically exterior position from which to choose positions, is articulated in terms of intention, or what Donne explicitly refers to as ‘will[ing]’” (13). Comments specifically on ll. 76–85 as reflecting “the philosophical tradition of practical reasoning descending from Aristotle” (14) and maintains that Donne’s “habits of reasoning” are informed “primarily by rhetorical—and therefore legal—thought.” Shows how Sat3 “both is and calls for an exercise in practical reasoning” and how Donne’s “emphasis in the poem is on the process, not the result, of considering critically the merit of particular doctrinal prescriptions” (13).


In Chinese. Discusses Donne’s use of round images in ValMourn in terms of Copernican cosmology and Donne’s idea of a circular life. Argues that the poem is a philosophical inquiry into man’s general identity against the background of cosmic reconstruction. Maintains that this study helps to explain the beauty of the images in the poem as well as Donne’s unique position in English literature.


In a discussion of how watermarks are helpful in dating and authenticating manuscripts, comments on a manuscript letter by Donne at the Folger Library dated 7 February 1611 O.S. [1612 N.S.] written to his brother-in-law, Robert More, from Amiens and on the manuscript copy of Carey at the Bodleian Library to show that “[t]he Bodleian verse letter is written on a single sheet of the same size paper as the Folger letter from Amiens,” that “[i]ts creases correspond to those of the Folger letter,” that “its edges are gilt,” and that “above all its watermark is similar, the lower half of a pair of twisted columns over ‘IRICHAR’” (81). Says that it seems as though Donne “used a pad of precut, (81) gilt-edged half-sheets of paper, wrote both the letter and the verse letter about the same time, folded them and sent them off together under the same cover, in the same packet” (88).


In Japanese. Argues that Donne’s attitude toward heresy and orthodoxy was colored by his skepticism. Explores the tensions between philosophy, religion, and law in his writings. Maintains that his early poems have an elegiac element in them as Donne reflects on the injustice of the law, civil as well as religious, that allowed his brother Henry to be arrested and put to death for harboring a Catholic priest. Sees in the Anniversaries Donne’s lament for the disruption of the traditional world view by recent developments in astronomy and physics and holds that Donne is skeptical of the existence of
eternal truth as he reflects on the deterioration of human beings both physically and mentally. Finds a similar skepticism and ambivalence in *Biathanatos*, in which Donne couples relativism and casuistry in defending suicide; in *Ignatius*, in which he mocks the Jesuits; and in *Pseudo-Martyr*, in which he advises English Catholics to take the Oath of Allegiance and to keep political allegiance and religious allegiance separate. Maintains, furthermore, that Donne's attitude toward death is also ambivalent, in that he fears death as a violent destroyer of life and yet, as seen in *Death's Duell*, he expresses his hope for eternal life. Concludes that Donne values skepticism and ambivalence as a means of giving himself a proper distance from the contradictory views of his time.


Presents “a comprehensive account of the literary and theological background to English devotional poetry of the seventeenth century,” challenging both the notion of Protestant poetics and the theories of postmodernist criticism. Argues that when read in the light of continental devotional literature, it becomes evident that English religious poetry of the seventeenth century was “not rigidly or exclusively Protestant in its doctrinal and liturgical orientation,” that “poetic genres and devices that have been ascribed to strict Reformation influence are equally prominent in the Catholic poetry of Spain and France,” and that “dogmatic stances often associated with Luther and Calvin are part of the broader Christian tradition reaffirmed by the Counter-Reformation.” Points out also that “postmodern anxiety about subjective identity and the capacity of language for signification is in fact a concern of such landmark Christian thinkers as Augustine and Aquinas, and appears in devotional poetry in the Christian tradition” (jacket). In Part 1, “The Presence of Grace in Seventeenth-Century Poetry” (1–80), argues that although the Holy Sonnets contain “explicitly Calvinistic terms, as well as passages that suggest a Calvinist theology of grace,” they should not be read as “a specifically Calvinist, or even Protestant, exposition of election and grace.” Maintains that in these sonnets the persona “seems to be trying out different versions of grace in order to arrive at a theologically moderate position” (8) and that further evidence of Donne's “ecumenical position” can also be found in *Essays* (9). Points out “many parallels to theological features” (13) between the Holy Sonnets and the devotional poetry and art of Catholic poets and artists of the time, especially in the work of Francisco de Quevedo, Jean de la Ceppède, and Diego Velázquez. Rejects the “voguish effort” to view the Holy Sonnets as “sublimated manifestations” of Donne’s “socio-economic frustration” (17). Discusses Donne's belief in the *via media* found in other religious poets of the time to show that his view is not just a manifestation of his “eccentric personal predilections” (32). In Part 2, “Meditation and Sacrament in Seventeenth-Century Poetry” (81–166), argues that “the effects of the structural principles of meditation can be seen not only in Donne's Holy Sonnets and Anniversaries, but also in his Songs and Sonets and even his Satyres" (82). In response to Barbara Lewalski and others, shows how Corona and Goodf are “deeply rooted in Catholic traditions of worship” (89) and how Donne “draws unhesitatingly from the Jesuit influence of his earliest education” (102), as seen in Sickness. Shows how Donne, as a devotional poet, “affirms the reality of God's being in the world” (106). In Part 3, “Biblical Poetics
in the Seventeenth Century” (167–219), rejects the notion that biblical poetics is exclusively Protestant, noting the pervasive influence of the Bible on continental Counter-Reformation poetry. Points out that Donne, like his Catholic contemporaries, insists that the Bible should be read “in the context of Church teaching and interpretation” (176). Argues that the self-dramatization Donne presents in Holy Sonnets draws on “a tradition of spiritual interpretation that goes back to Patristic times” (176) and maintains that “his invocation of biblical types in his poems, along with pervasive allusion to biblical passages and scenes, ground the individual experience of the persona in the corporate experience of the church embodied in Scripture.” Maintains that Donne practices biblical poetics “insofar as the spiritual drama of the individual is conceived in biblical terms” and that “in this regard his poems include features that are common among contemporaneous Catholic poets of the continent” (185). Concludes with a bibliography (221–33) and an index (235–41).

Reviews:


Points out that “occasional efforts in his sermons to refute or discredit Bellarmine’s arguments provide evidence that Donne knew the Controversies and studied them throughout his clerical career.” Maintains, however, that Donne “did not confine his reading of Bellarmine to his polemical works” (223) but was also familiar with Bellarmine’s commentary on the Psalms. Observes that both Donne and Bellarmine “approach the psalms with a similar reliance on the ancient Church Fathers, with a similarly Scholastic philosophical and theological orientation, and—above all—with a similar preoccupation with the moral and spiritual meaning of the scriptural text” (223–24). Argues that “[a] comparison between Donne and Bellarmine thus shows that they share important elements of a common Christian tradition despite the political and ecclesiastical disputes of the Reformation era” and that “the most significant elements of the religious revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries cannot always be confidently identified by the simple labels, ‘Catholic’ and ‘Protestant’” (224). Points out that although Donne was “never reluctant to attack Bellarmine and other Jesuits on contested points,” his conception of grace and justification was “similar to that of Bellarmine” and suggests that perhaps thereby Donne “was deliberately, if discreetly, distancing himself from Calvin’s rigorous double predestinarian theology.” Concludes that Donne’s “demurral in the face of some of the prominent features of Calvinist doctrine, and his acceptance—albeit equivocal—of a great deal of Catholic tradition—especially in its pre-Tridentine form—suggest that the Reformation was hardly monolithic or consistent, and that the via media was a reality two centuries before the Oxford Movement” (232).


Interprets Donne’s love poetry as “the ironic embodiment of a vision of love as a version of concordia discors” (253), the embodiment of “what is both admirable and delightful, reprehensible and mortifying, in human nature and conduct” (252). Maintains that “the stability of the love poem forged out of the clash of ironic tensions is the ultimate ironic comment on the realm of human experience that the poem evokes” (253). Discusses ElBrac,
SunRis, and Dream to show how “an historical individual named John Donne with all his individual quirks and personal experiences; literary conventions derived from ancient elegy, from Medieval Scholasticism, from courtly love lyric, from Renaissance Petrarchanism, and from many other sources; ideas about love of religious, philosophical, and social origin—all these elements converge in the love poetry of John Donne along with many more too numerous to list” and claims that “[w]hat holds them together and forges them into a unity is wit.” Maintains that the “literary result is irony: the perception of the incongruous and contradictory suspended together in a verbal matrix” and that “[l]iterature is thus fundamentally ironic insofar as it acknowledges the incongruousness of human existence.” Concludes that Donne’s love poetry is “‘a well-wrought urne’ precisely in recognizing its own heroic insufficiency against the temporal and material forces always threatening to overwhelm it” (270).

Observes that, except for the compass conceit in ValMourn, there are very few simile-conceits in metaphysical poetry that extend beyond four lines. Points out that the metaphysical poets characteristically employ “a particular vehicle only so long as it is useful to their argument” and that “[w]hen their argument shifts or develops, they quickly change vehicles.” Notes how in ElBed (ll. 34–45) Donne uses five different similes, “the fourth being, in the course of its development transformed into a metaphor.” Maintains that, “paradoxically, the sheer number of vehicles helps to foreground the tenor, for this multiplicity emphasizes their merely utilitarian and disposable nature.” Suggests that “the use of alternatives, ‘Like pictures, or like bookes;’ also works to undermine the vehicles’ solidity.” Maintains that “[h]olding the syntax of the passage in its tight coil and also operating as the similes’ tenor, the lover’s strenuous argument in favor of his mistress’s nakedness is kept well in the forefront of the reader’s consciousness here” (502). Concludes that “[t]he vehicles are so threaded into it that, despite their novelty and variety, they do not have much independent existence” (502–03) and that “each gives the reader that dualistic sensation, usually found in shorter similes, of making a virtual crossing over a boundary, of looking into a different world, while remaining in this one” (503).


Maintains that for poems “whose sense is in question, phonological analysis seeks to discover which sense the sounds are better able to echo.” Attempts, by means of phonological analysis, to determine whether the phonological components of Noct are “more supportive of a performance of the speaker’s utter despair or one in which the destruction he has experienced is accompanied by a hope of renewal.” Points out, therefore, “the ways the sounds support the depiction of devastation” (152) and looks closely at passages in the poem “wherein the sound patterns touch on the crucial question of the speaker’s personal hope or despair, especially as it arises out of the basic distinction he draws between himself and the rest of the universe” (152–53). Notes that Noct has “no shortage of phonological features that equip a performer to express the speaker’s desolation” (153). Argues that, “[j]udging by the sounds built into the lines,” Noct “works as a poem of utter despair to a degree that it cannot work as a poem of hope.” Recognizes, however, that the poem’s “content and structure seem in many ways designed to include the possibility” of the speaker’s regeneration. Maintains that “[a]ll those elements, however, are primarily cognitive rather than emotional in nature” and “are embedded in the structure of the lines or alluded to by the language chosen and, as such, are thoughts the speaker has deliberately placed in the poem, instead of being directly and immediately a function of his emotional state, as the sounds of his voice inevitably are.” Concludes, therefore, that the persona in Noct “has command of the intellectual trappings of faith and hope, but in his heart he suffers from the bleakest of disbelief and despair” (160).


Briefly comments on Sappho and suggests that in the poem Donne explores in detail “the utopian dynamics of female desire,” associates female same-sex love “with creativity,” and “articulates an eroticism of mutual passion by noting its absence in male-female connections” (47). Maintains that Sappho is “an entirely positive portrait of female same-sex erotic desire” and holds that in the poem Donne is “as interested in exploring the varieties of sexual experience, at least poetically, as he is in reshaping the poet-
ic conventions of the Ovidian heroical epistle” (48). Comments on the influence of Donne’s erotic poetry on the works of Katherine Philips, noting that her poetry is “the earliest printed example of a woman’s expression in English of intense same-sex love between women” (57). Suggests also that Donne perhaps had a homoerotic attraction toward Thomas Woodward, as evidenced in the verse letters the two young men exchanged.


Contains two previously published introductory essays: (1) “Qu’est-ce que la poésie <<métaphysique>>?” (9–49), first published in 1959, that explores major characteristics of metaphysical poetry, not limiting it to Donne, Herbert, Traherne, and other English poets of the seventeenth century but also finding it in French poets of the time and even in certain modern poets; and (2) “L’image <<métaphysique>>” (53–89), first published in 1964, that comments on the characteristics of the metaphysical image, citing in particular examples from Donne, noting the emblematic nature of his images. Stresses that the metaphysical image is not simply an ornament but is rather a vehicle of thought. In “Choix commenté de textes traduits” presents an introduction to the following translations (93–94) and also a biographical sketch of Donne, followed by French translations (with English texts on opposite pages) of Christ, Sickness, selections from Paradoxes and Problems, GoodM, SGo, SunRis, Triple, Anniv, ElPict, 4 selections from the Holy Sonnets, and Donne’s letter to Henry Goodyer dated September 1608 (95–141). Contains also an introduction to George Herbert (142–43) and a translation of “Easter Wings” (144–45); an introduction to Henry Vaughan (146–47) and a translation of “Day of Judgement” (148–51); and an introduction to Thomas Traherne (152–54) and translations from the Centuries, “The Salutation,” and “Wonder” (155–73). Concludes with a table of contents (175).


Presents a reading of the Holy Sonnets as an “emblem of the author” that focuses on Donne’s “poetics of credibility, which depends on the persona of the Pauline striver, a mask Donne adopts as he turns from secular to religious poetry” (156), a reading that “is nuanced by cultural as well as subjective factors” and that contributes to “the reconsideration of biography that other scholars have initiated in Donne studies” (157). Argues that because Donne “wrote for a circle familiar with his life and his achieved literary identity—with his masks—he was compelled [when he turned to religious poetry] to reconceive his poetic persona and to situate it in some relation to its predecessors.” Maintains that, “[s]prinkled with provocative references to the sensual amorist, the Holy Sonnets have as a major part of their project the creation of a plausible stance for the erstwhile lover, satirist, and elegist” and that “[t]he pressure of what Donne had previously circulated inspired a poetics of credibility consistent with his earlier self-representations” (172). Discusses how “[t]he continuities between Donne’s secular and sacred poems are such that no one could doubt that he was the author of the Holy Sonnets” (172–73). Shows how his “typical strategies and his unmistakable voice served to flesh out the new persona of the Pauline striver, a man whose questionable past is not entirely past, a hard case who requires energetic self-talk and the deliberate arousal of fear to inspire him to devotion.” Discusses how the mask of the Pauline striver “allows for moral inexactitude and a maximum of drama in the working out of salvation in fear and trembling” and points out that “a religion-oriented society preoccupied with spiritual development would have recognized this biblical persona and ap-
preciated Donne’s affirmation of powerful and transformative faith” (173).


Presents a critical analysis of HSRound. Comments on Donne’s theological views, as expressed in the poem, on doomsday, angels, resurrection of the body, repentance, salvation, etc., and discusses the effectiveness of the “bombastic, fortissimo summons” (180) of the angelic trumpets. Maintains that the octave of the sonnet has “a more public and much louder voice” by which Donne creates “the sights and sounds of Doomsday for his hearers,” while the sestet is “remarkably personal” (182), in which “his imaginative composition of Judgment Day awakens in him awareness of his own unpreparedness and moves him to seek his own salvation.” Sees Donne’s “sense of unworthiness,” as expressed in the sestet, “not as an obsessive, rigorous trait or as a character flaw but as a Christian virtue, a growth in humility” (188), and as a sign of his assurance of forgiveness through the blood of Christ. Concludes that “[if] one drop of Christ’s blood can redeem the ‘numberless infinities of soules’ who will be aroused by Doomsday trumpeters, one drop could surely seal John Donne’s pardon” (192).


Examines certain major characteristics of the works of St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Teresa of Avila, and St. John of the Cross, in particular, “the interiorization of religious experience, the eroticization of that experience culminating in a heightened physical and spiritual state of ‘ecstasy,’ and the idea of the mystical ‘marriage’ of the individual soul with God,” and then discusses their impact on Donne’s poetry, “particularly in his fascination with his own subjectivity and his use of conceit.” (27). Comments specifically on Witch, Ect, HSBatter, HSShow, Flea, and Res, citing similarities and parallels between the Spanish mystics and Donne. Maintains that Donne is not a mystical poet but suggests that “the influence of the Spanish mystics on Donne’s work runs deep,
merits more than Eliot's quick dismissal, and might explain why Donne does not fit so readily into Lewalski's 'Protestant paradigm’” (28). Maintains that Donne's poetry “offers evidence that during this intellectually conflicted age the rift between 'Protestant' and 'Catholic' culture was not as wide as modern scholars might assume” (35).


Although “acknowledging the playful wit of its logical, tonal, and imagistic reversals” as well as “the exuberance of its bravado and the humor of its hyperbole,” finds in *SunRis* a “desperation” in the speaker of the poem “who cannot utter his way out of fragmentation, differentiation, and alteration—and who therefore attempts to inoculate himself against their toxic effects by utterly absorbing them into his system.” Points out how the poem “proceeds by way of a series of contradictions and reversals” (289). Maintains that even if the poem is “in part about the failure to articulate or even to experience the claims for transcendence that it makes,” it is not “a failed poem” (291) but rather “the more sophistry, solipsis, and demiurgic swaggering we encounter, the more we revel in the parodic heroism of asserting a uniquely constructed ontology of unanimity out of the multaneity of language and experience” (291–92). Argues that *SunRis* is a poem that “celebrates both love and 'the alchemy of language'” and which “ends by welcoming the difference it earlier repudiated, professing to absorb it.” Maintains that “[i]n asserting its triumph over fragmentation, it makes a perilous claim for the strength of [its] incarnationist rhetoric” and also “invites us to participate in its verbal transvaluation of reality at the same time it invites our skepticism, our questioning whether such word-building magic is ever more than verbal shamanism.” Concludes that *SunRis* “demonstrates that if difference is constitutive, so is the word-magic of poetic language” (292).


Discusses the imagery in *ValMourn* to show "how each image contributes to the poem's overall meaning." Says that in addition to being "a beautiful love poem," *ValMourn" endures because it contains classic illustrations of the metaphysical conceit” (209) and claims that “of all the imagery in the poem, only one example does not represent the metaphysical conceit” (210). Explains how throughout the poem Donne builds “a complex, yet flowing and beautiful, argument for why the lovers should not be saddened or worried about their upcoming separation.” Concludes that *ValMourn* is “accessible precisely because of the array of interconnected images presented throughout” (211).


Examines Donne's complex attitude toward colonization and his views on native Americans and contrasts and compares his outlook with those of his contemporaries. Maintains that Donne was “one of a number of early modern writers who raised questions about the moral and legal status of the colonial enterprise, questions to which he provided, especially in his 1622 sermon to the Virginia Company, predictably sophisticated answers” (440). Discusses Donne's connection with the Virginia Company and those associated with it and surveys the varying attitudes of its members. Notes that Donne, unlike some others, “retained his sympathy for the native Americans in the face of a series of setbacks which culminated in the ‘massacre’ of 1622” (449), in which 350 settlers were killed. Examines in detail Donne's sermon to the Virginia Company and the influences on his thinking, observing how he “scarcely mentioned the events of 1622, dwelling instead on the limits and conditions of the Company's role in America, on
the paramount duty to convert the Indians, and on the latter’s common humanity with the English, with ‘all men’” (457). Says that Donne’s argument in the sermon about “the duty of all mankind to utilize the earth’s resources” was “a novel aspect of Donne’s sermon that must have been welcome to his audience” but that “[l]ess so would have been the equally lawyer-like discussion of the use of force against the native Americans” (469) and his warning about setting up a temporal kingdom in Virginia. Concludes that Donne insists that “[t]he overriding objective of the Company must be to take God to the native Virginians” (475).


Analyzes several of Donne’s love poems “based on the hypothesis that his peculiar treatment of love symbols derives from a global conception of the universe as a tight whole, the cohesion of which seems to rely on intense organic bonds, further defined as ‘bonds of love’” (44). Points out that in the Songs and Sonnets “love symbols become tokens of love which the lovers send to each other and which undergo the same alterations and deterioration as the relationship itself,” as if “these symbols partook of the lovers’ own flesh and became infused with their intense emotions and love attitudes.” Maintains that in most of Donne’s poems, “symbols—which should not be mistaken for conceits—take shape within the human body” and “provide the means whereby the lady can extend her occult power over men.” Calls these “organic symbols” and notes that “most of the time they are connected with the lover’s sense of death and annihilation” (45). Illustrates this concept by discussing, in some detail, the symbol of the heart in Leg and Broken, poems that reflect “the lover’s sense of annihilation as a result of the lady’s scornful attitude” (48), and in Witch, in which “the lover succeeds in freeing himself from the lady’s bewitching powers without too much damage to his personal integrity” (51). Suggests that in these poems the “interaction between mental and emotional phenomena” and “the symbols involved in the poetical expression of these emotions” are “very close to Paracelsus’s conception of images as the imagination’s vivid and immediate product” (49).


Discusses how “[t]he use by a male poet of constructs of female voice positions his texts in a long literary tradition, bringing his reader into confrontation with popular and medieval constructions of women’s voices, while at the same time maneuvering within the shifting discourse of contemporary gender politics.” Comments specifically on Thomas Campion’s “A secret love or two, I must confess,” Ben Jonson’s “In Defence of Their Inconstancy. A Song,” and Donne’s ConfL—“each emerging from a different mode of literary transmission” (225). Discusses how ConfL “unsets its by its strategy of delayed gender recognition” and comments on its “subtly and socially engineered” argument. Maintains that the poem is “doubly evasive as a female persona poem in that it is almost slyly so,” noting that “indeed not all readers hear it as so voiced.” Suggests Ovid’s Myrrha (Metamorphoses, 10.320–55) as a source or at least as the literary origin of Donne’s line of reasoning in the poem.


Argues that a comma after l. 5 of stanza 5 of Noct (as found in the 1633 edition) makes the poem “richer” and makes the punctuation “consistent with [other] poems, both amorous and divine, closely related to it in subject.” Maintains also that “[t]he more complex meaning renders the poem a bridge between the two kinds of love poetry” and that “[t]he comma is also more congruous with the practices of textual criticism” (27). Offers a reading of the poem, focusing on stanza 5, in which “Donne’s poetry of
amorous love passes into poetry of divine love.” Shows how the comma “illustrates this transition” (30).


Points out that, both in his poetry and prose, Donne made “a fruitful and innovative use of circle and circumference as interrelated images and emblems of perfection.” Maintains that these metaphors are “an essential part” of two later hymns, 
Father and Sickness, and analyzes “the deep relationship between the geometry and the theology” in them (5). Discusses how Goodf anticipates “aspects which will reappear in the final religious poems” and shows how “the geometry and theology of this text, which are relatively independent from each other, actually become fully integrated into each other in the final hymns” (6). Cites two major concerns in Goodf that anticipate the later hymns: “the figural concentration on the image of the sphere and on circular movement, and the notion of justification and its projection towards the future.” Discusses 
Father to show how “the figural rhetoric” is “based on the image of the circle” and how this circularity works “to reinforce the theological basis of the text” (8). Discusses how the “figural rhetoric” of Sickness is “based on the image of the earthly sphere” and how the poem enacts some “key themes” in Goodf (9). Concludes that both poems should be seen “not only (or not even especially) as a personal document of Donne’s spiritual uncertainties during his later years” (10) but rather should be seen as “displaying a daring form of expression of a specific form of adaptation of the Lutheran doctrine of justification, through the geometric figures of the circle and the sphere” (11).


Essentially a review of The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne, Volume 2: The Elegies (2000). Claims that “[a]fter the detail of these thousand pages, with their exhaustive bibliographical analyses, lists of textual variants, and summaries of critical opinion, we are left pretty much where we were in the first place in regard to Donne’s Elegies” (63). Complains that since the editors of the edition are “compilers rather than initiators of critical discussion, they have no independent answers to the most perplexing questions,” such as, “how confident can we be about the tone of any of these poems, and the degree of seriousness to be accorded them?” Comments on critical issues in individual elegies, especially the anti-Petrarchism of ElComp, the possible Shakespearan allusions in ElFatal, the justification of infidelity in ElChange and ElVar, the mockery in ElBrac and ElWar, the elusive tone in ElBed, and the praise of beauty in an older woman in ElAut. Calls ElAut “the only really great poem among the group.” Concludes that basically the Elegies are “experiments in rhetoric” and that “whilst for Donne as for Shakespeare, that does not automatically entail insincerity, it refuses to make sincerity the touchstone of excellence” (66).


Maintains that in the Anniversaries Donne portrays Elizabeth Drury as “a sacrament lost to mankind” and that the poems “evoke his concern with humanity’s alienation from and abuse of sacraments, including not only the ecclesiastical sacraments such as Baptism and Holy Communion, but also the Sacrament of Woman as Donne defines her.” Argues that Donne “seeks to cope with and compensate for that alienation and abuse through the practice of a sacramental poetics that depends upon the active participation of readers.” Sees FirAn as Donne’s “representation of women as conduits of grace, beings whose final cause is the good of man” (141). Maintains that woman “can realize her final cause as helpmeet by becoming the assisting efficient cause of a man’s movement toward a good end” but insists that she cannot be “the principal efficient cause of good in man” since “[h]e must be that for himself”
(143). Shows how in FirAn Donne associates Elizabeth Drury with a “legitimate version of sacramental transformation and purification” (146) and how by losing her “the world has lost the true sacramental alchemy that transmutes base material elements into spiritual gold”; thus “man can no longer grasp the Idea of a Woman, her unalloyed essence” (147). Concludes, however, that just as Christ becomes a living presence in the Eucharist, so Elizabeth Drury, though dead, is present through Donne’s poem and continues to purify “both the language of poetry and the metal of the human soul” of those who “devoutly receive” Donne’s tribute to her (150).


Rejects the notion that Donne and Jonson created “two quite distinct and easily recognizable schools of poetry in early seventeenth century England” and maintains that, in fact, their poetry is “often closer in style and subject matter than such generalizations might suggest” (68), noting that at times their contemporaries confused their work. Comments on the friendship between the two poets and maintains that Jonson’s comments to Drummond about Donne are not as unfriendly as some critics have believed nor do they “mark a serious division in poetic outlook” between the two poets (71). Surveys Drummond’s interest in the poetry of both Donne and Jonson and suggests that perhaps Jonson’s comments “may have been prompted by Drummond’s sceptical probings” during his visit to Hawthornden and by his “concern over Donne’s apparent indifference to a wide or future readership” (73). Surveys and explains Jonson’s admiration for Donne’s poems, especially Calm and ElBrac. Notes how both men retained throughout their lifetimes “a curious sense of doubleness and divided allegiance in matters of religion”; how both, “in different ways, had adopted strategies of survival”; and how “the similar pressures on their lives are evident in the work they preserved—as they are, more eloquently, in the work they thought fit at times to suppress” (81).


First French edition of Biathanatos. Contains an introduction ([7]–[34]), a note on the French edition (35–[37]), the letter of John Donne, Jr., to Lord Philip Harbert (41–[42]), preface (43–[49]), the French translation of the text (53–[241], and a table of contents ([243]). In the introduction presents a biographical sketch of Donne, discusses the paradoxical and even playful nature of Biathanatos, and surveys the classical view of suicide and the Christian concept of martyrdom as background for Donne’s understanding of suicide. Sees the work as radical thought in a traditional form and regards Biathanatos primarily as a theological treatise rather than a serious defense of suicide.


Contains a biographical note on Donne (v–viii); a table of contents (ix–xx); an introduction by Denis Donoghue that presents a general evaluation of Donne’s poetry and prose (xxi–xxxii), followed by the texts of Donne’s poems and prose selections from Coffin’s 1952 edition (1–589); notes by W. T. Chmielewski (591–681); an index of poetry titles (683–88); an index of poetry first lines (689–94); and a note on the text (695–97).


Translates into Hungarian 8 selections from the Elegies and 28 poems from the Songs and Sonets—without notes or commentary.


Reviews:


60 copies only. Reproduces the famous passage from *Devotions*.


Printed letterpress from handset type by Julie Seko of the poem.


Suggests the influence of *SunRis* and Alexandre Dumas’s *The Lady of the Camellias* on the prose epitaph in the chapter entitled “Anna Victrix” of D. H. Lawrence’s *The Rainbow*. Points out how both Donne and Lawrence “explore the overlapping of timeless and quotidian worlds, the spiritual dissolution of soul into soul offset by the unchanging business of human affairs,” noting, however, that Lawrence “goes further” than Donne “by tracking the descent from rapture into the world,” whereas *SunRis* “stalls in its beatific present” (12–13).


Argues that “rage” in *Canon* (l. 39) refers to “a future anger and heatedness, not a sublime version of the terrestrial love” that Donne “has already experienced” with Anne More (4). Points out that Donne believed that “the universe was running down” and that relationships “will have disintegrated even more for the future generations.” Maintains, therefore, that rather than harmony for future lovers, “there will be rage” and that “lovers to come will look back to St. John [Donne] and St. Ann [More] … as a pattern of that peace” (3), which they no longer have.


Reprinted as paperback, 2005.

In the preface (vii–x), explains that this study was not written for specialists but rather for the general reader. Presents a chronology of Donne’s life and works (xii–xiii) and a dedication ([ix]. In Chapter 1, “The questions” (3–33), discusses the widely varied interpretations of Donne’s life and works, challenging, in particular, post-structural or post-modern interpretations. Acknowledges that many of the questions and seeming contradictions asked about Donne’s life and motives simply cannot be known with certainty. Points out, for instance, that “[m]any readers have found it hard
to imagine why or how the Donne of the erotic poetry became first a self-torturing penitent and then an ardent churchman” (5) and, therefore, question his sincerity or see him simply as a witty exhibitionist. While recognizing Donne’s flaws and imperfections, maintains that fundamentally he was intellectually and spiritually honest. Argues that if we want to find the truth about Donne, “we must not try to cover his personality by one small and neat label,” for “[b]ehind all the clever words, and behind all the varying moods which the words express, there is a man whom we can meet and he is a living man with what belongs to humanity (including us): the complications, the limitations, the strengths.” Claims that Donne is “not simple,” but that he is “understandable” (21). Compares and contrasts Donne to George Herbert, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Ben Jonson, and Shakespeare. In Chapter 2, “At the dore” (34–62); Chapter 3, “Winter seeming” (63–97); and Chapter 4, “Thou hast done” (98–133), presents an evaluative survey of Donne’s life and works. In Chapter 5, “Thou hast not done” (137–57), challenges modern critics who exaggerate Donne’s saintliness or his sinfulness and evaluates selected biographies of Donne from Walton to R. C. Bald and Dennis Flynn and selected editions of his works from Jessopp to the modern variorum edition. In Chapter 6, “Deare honestie” (158–89), disagrees with the treatment of Donne’s religion in John Carey’s John Donne: Life, Mind and Art (1981) and in Paul Oliver’s Donne’s Religious Writings (1997). In Chapter 7, “Let my body raigne” (193–223), examines Donne’s views on sex, women, and love in his poetry; and in Chapter 9, “Admyring her” (244–98), focuses on Donne’s views on marriage in his sermons and poetry and examines his marriage to Anne More, suggesting that many poems may have been written to her. In Chapter 10, “The Trumpet” (299–350), examines Donne’s sermons and his skills as a preacher. Concludes with a list of suggested further readings (351–58), an index of Donne’s writings (359–61), and a general index (363–68). Reproduces 9 illustrations.

Reviews:


Points out that, although Donne’s life is “more fully documented than that of any other English poet before the eighteenth century,” none of the existing documents “can fully reveal the history of Donne’s religious allegiances, connections, and beliefs from the time of his Catholic childhood and youth to his ordination to the Anglican priesthood and beyond” (208). Surveys the often conflicting views on the complex question of Donne’s religious allegiance, noting that “the poem on which debate over Donne’s religious position has particularly centred” is HSShow (211). Discusses the textual history of this poem, the late date of its composition, and its absence from early printed editions and presents a critical analysis of it, challenging, in particular Helen Gardner’s reading as reflecting Donne as a contented Anglican. Points out that in his letters and other
poems Donne’s conflicted attitude toward the true Spouse of Christ is manifested. Concludes that HSShow is “a richer and more disturbed poem than it has been made out to be” and that it shows that “several years after his ordination, how complex and divided a person Donne remained” (225).


Surveys Donne’s fluctuating critical reputation and reception over the centuries and suggests possible reasons for this fluctuation. Comments on the appeal of Donne’s poetry. Maintains that Donne’s “most intense as well as most characteristic effects tend to come from a pure opposition or contradiction” (61) and that “[n]o-one less gifted than Donne could have left such intensity while ending every poem somewhere different, sometimes undeterminingly different, from where it began” (63). Calls Donne “a secret poet for social readers” (55), a poet who is “able to question in public terms the private truth of love-experience” (64). Comments also on Donne as a buyer, owner, and reader of books.


In a detailed discussion of Shakespeare’s The Phoenix and the Turtle, points out how the poem belongs to the so-called ecstasy tradition and suggests that Ecst may be indebted to Shakespeare’s poem. Maintains that, if this is true, it would date Donne’s poem after 1601. Suggests also that Lord Herbert of Cherbury’s “An Ode upon a question moved, Whether Love should continue for ever” “may take as much from Shakespeare as from Donne” and “may even take more.” Sees Shakespeare’s poem as “a vital Missing Link” between Sidney’s eighth song in Astrophil and Stella and the ecstasy poems of Donne and Lord Herbert (14).


Discusses the appearance of Donne’s poems in early anthologies of poetry. Notes that before the twentieth-century he “had consistently been given far less attention than Herrick” (121) and that in the first edition of Palgrave’s influential The Golden Treasury (1861) he was excluded entirely. Discusses how anthologists in the first third of the twentieth century “played a direct part in reordering the centuries-old hierarchy” of poets by including Donne in their collections, citing, in particular, Massingham’s A Treasury of Seventeenth Century Verse (1919) and Grierson’s Metaphysical Lyrics & Poems of The Seventeenth Century (1921). Discusses and challenges T. S. Eliot’s role in the Donne revival begun in the early twentieth century. Argues that in his 1921 review in TLS of Grierson’s anthology, Eliot appropriated the collection, making “it do the work” for him that “other poets, Yeats and Larkin above all, have done by designing an anthology that writes literary history so that it accommodates their sense of their own poems in it” (147). Argues also that “well before Grierson’s anthology gave him an occasion to announce it,” Eliot “had formulated his revision of literary history.” Maintains that the similarities between Grierson’s and Massingham’s “realignment of poetic tradition” make clear that “an interested audience was preparing for a revival of Donne” long before Eliot’s review appeared and also shows that anthologies “could both reflect and contribute importantly to such a development.” Maintains that this preparation “helps to explain the reception” of Eliot’s influential review (253).

Introduces Donne to readers unfamiliar with Donne and his works by presenting a biographical sketch of him, focusing primarily on Donne’s religious background and views, his conflicted personality, and his life as an Anglican priest. Discusses the essential elements of a metaphysical poem and of Donne’s unique style in particular and comments on such poems as *ValMourn*, *Canon*, *Flea*, and *HSBatter*, as well as the theme and style of *Biathanatos*, *Pseudo-Martyr*, and *Death’s Duell* and other sermons. Suggests that Donne perhaps is “the first poet in the history of the English language who realized that an intense sexual experience is intricately related to a religious one” and claims that “[n]o other poet, save Shakespeare, is so akin to the currents of the new millennium” (54).


Calls *Sat5*, in which he analyzes “the injustice and corruption of Queen Elizabeth’s Court and the legal courts it supervised,” Donne’s “most daring *Satyre*” and shows how Donne “incorporates” Thomas Egerton, to whom the poem is dedicated; Queen Elizabeth; and himself “in one shared, satiric enterprise” (107). Highlights “the daring quality” of the poem, its challenge to authority, by reviewing circumstances surrounding Egerton’s own appointment and his appointment of Donne to his secretariat” (108). Discusses Donne’s earlier writings on injustice and offers a close reading of *Sat5* in which Donne presents himself as a servant to Egerton and, “with disarming frankness,” addresses court corruption “directly to Egerton and to Queen Elizabeth,” exposing audaciously to both “the iniquitous organization and rational of their own government” (115). Discusses how Donne argues that the present “grotesque system is ever fuelled by its origin: the depredations set in motion by Tudor religious reform,” and “is replicated in the relations between the dominant political factions of the 1590s” (117). Notes that “Egerton, if he was ever shown this daring poem, cannot have escaped awareness of his targeting in it” and observes that “[o]ne doubts that Egerton ever showed it to the Queen” (119–20).


Discusses how both *NegLov* and *Noct* “give affirming status to a nothing in order to make distinct arguments regarding the status of an existing thing” and how both poems employ “this paradox to give a precise definition of the word nothing,” which “arises from two overlapping and intersecting discourses called paradox and negative theology” (99). Comments on Plato’s *Parmenides*, Pseudo-Dionysius’s *The Mystical Theology*, Nicolas of Cusa’s *De Docta Ignorantia*, and St. Augustine’s *De Doctrina Christiana* as works that provide insight into Donne’s paradoxical use of “nothing.” Observes that Donne’s “brilliant logical gymnastics in the *Songs and Sonets*, especially with regard to the paradox of nothing, his clever and rigorous use of a negative theology, are not necessarily consistent with the studious and serious theological metaphysics found in the sermons.” Notes that “[w]hile Donne the profane poet may cheerfully embrace the nothingness of language and existence, Donne the sermonizer must strive to overcome it” (103). Shows how *NegLove* and *Noct* rely upon an “affirmative use of the noun for their meaning” and that “nothing” is a noun that is a thing that is no thing.” Discusses how stanza 2 of *NegLov* “relies on both grammatical affirmation of the word nothing and on a philosophical proposition which asserts that perfection can be best articulated in negatives” (104) and how in *Noct* the word nothing “refers to and defines the speaker” and how it “remains infinitely determinate and infinitely indeterminate” (111).

549. **Fulton, Thomas.** “Hamlet’s Inky Cloak and Donne’s *Satyres.”* *JDJ* 20: 71–106.

Maintains that “[i]n its efforts to stand clear
of political pressures, Elizabethan satire became preoccupied with the problem of how the distorting pressures of political power shaped inquiry and representation itself” and that “[t]his introspection led, in Donne and Guilpin especially, to an examination of how knowledge—knowledge of the truth, or of ‘true religion’—was distorted by the conditions of power.” Argues that “Donne’s formulations develop in part through reflection and criticism of his friend’s work.” Explores in Sat3 and Sat4 “this generic preoccupation and the coterie exchange that gave it shape.” Examines also “the question of how this element of satiric expression migrates at the turn of the century—when formal satire is banned—into drama, and, in particular, Hamlet, which dramatizes the same epistemological problem of the satirist at court as Donne and his contemporaries” (74). Maintains that “[a]lthough the religious tension” in Sat3 “seems particularly suited” to his own personal, religious struggle, “it also reflects a struggle within English society to come to terms with the many philosophical untenabilities and social horrors of the last seventy years of religious history” (78). Argues that Sat3’s “aspiration toward intellectual freedom—the freedom to choose a religion regardless of the dictates of power—places it in the heart of the satiric mode of the 1590s” (80). Discusses also how Sat4 shows how Donne and Guilpin “were engaged in an inquiry of satire’s generic powers and limitations” and compares and contrasts their approaches.


An original poem in imitation of Donne.


Discusses the changing relationship between the body and geography during the Renaissance, noting, in particular, how body and map “stand in a new relation to each other.” Suggests that the Anniversaries “testify to the panic of a body unable to recognise an oikos (an answerable architecture) in the heavens” and points out that, on the other hand, in Sickness, Donne “attempts to anthropomorphize an Ortelian world map in the image of his own dying body—searching it for a navel, a sacred cord between this world and the next, but finding only disintegration or at best sonorous nostalgia for the placial hospitality of the old geography.” Briefly comments on Donne as an “erotic cartographer” in his poems (59).


Suggests that in FirAn Donne captured well “the growing sense of disorientation and the apprehension about the disintegration of stability” caused by the New Philosophy and points out that the trend toward subjectivity in English literature can best be seen in Donne’s poetry. Points out that “[i]n contrast to the love poems in which the lyrical ‘I’ insists on self-realization, the speaker of Donne’s devotional work takes himself back and deliberately places himself in a subordinate position.” Suggests, however, that “the considerable degree of determination and assertiveness that still surfaces in the speaker’s voice suggests otherwise and points to tensions existing within him: he is torn between the wish to express his individuality and the need to subject himself to the values of the traditional Christian framework.” Concludes, therefore, that Donne’s poetry “supplies evidence of the collision of two different concepts of the self as well as the presence of a conflict that points to the progressive constitution of the modern individual” (45). Notes that Donne’s “epistolary works best express the movement towards an internalization and spiritualization in letter-writing around the turn of the century” and observes that “[t]he development away from rigid rules and the overtly rhetorical character of the letter was continued in the seventeenth century” (216).

Discusses the influence of Robert Fludd on Donne, noting that many of Donne’s alchemical and astrological allusions are “distinctly Fluddean.” Examines in particular the homoerotic imagery in Donne’s poems “in order to justify a relationship, intentionally hidden perhaps, between Donne and Fludd” (13). Cites, in particular, examples of possible Fluddean ideas in *GoodM* and suggests that in the poem Donne perhaps is referring to a shared love between two men. Argues that it is time “to free” some of Donne’s poems from “heterosexual expectations—certain poems that allude to Fluddean thought” and discusses as an example *ValMourn* (17). Maintains that “[t]he underestimation of—if not outright bias against—the possibilities of Fluddean allusions or homoerotic intention has hampered the study of Donne’s poetry” (18).


Comments on the cycle of nine of Donne’s *Holy Sonnets* set to music by Benjamin Britten in 1945, written for the tenor Peter Pears. Maintains that “what emerges from Britten’s contemplations is faith in the love of God, in everlasting life” (194). Points out that “[t]he selection and placement of each poem is obviously unique” and notes how Britten turns away from those sonnets that “deal strongly with conscience, unworthiness, and death (1–5) to the personal melancholy of 6 … and to the idea of resurrection, which is continued to the end of the cycle.” Suggests that the conviction and faith found in the cycle comes in part out of Britten’s “hideous memory” of his visit to the Nazi concentration camp at Belsen in 1945 and to his recognition of “the collective guilt of mankind for such massive cruelty.” Discusses how voice and piano in the cycle “form an organic unity” (195) and comments on the settings of each of the individual poems. Observes that the settings are difficult—“both for performer and for listener—in technical, intellectual, and emotional ways” and that “if they are to be performed, they can only be done well, else all is lost.” Concludes that “[w]orking with highly individual, mannerist texts (with multiple perspectives and paradoxes), Britten rises to his challenge—literary, musical, and, ultimately, spiritual” and that “his wrestle, like Donne’s, is with the problem of faith in a tortured world with its death and misery, and in *The Holy Sonnets* both musician and poet find their resolution” (204). In an appendix, presents musical examples from the cycle.


Discusses Donne’s rejection of the doctrine of purgatory but notes that he can evoke the concept as a metaphor as in *ElServ* (l. 13). Notes that in *Devotions* Donne sees himself neither as perfect nor as condemned but does recognize that “he stands in need of purgation” (43). Points out that the tolling of the bell in *Devotions* does not suggest the traditional practice of praying for the dead but rather “gives unforgettable expression to the shared community of the living and dead” and “redirects the focus: the dead are no longer a special group imprisoned in a distant penal colony; they are ourselves.” Says that in his sermons Donne sees the world as “an enormous charnel house, where we await resurrection” (43). Notes that Donne observes that in the Old Testament “there is no precedent for Purgatory” and claims that “its foundation stone was laid by Plato, who is the patriarch of the pagan Greek church.” Further points out that Donne says, “The Latin Church had Patriarchs too for this doctrine … though not Philosophers, yet Poets” (46). Briefly also mentions Donne’s view of ghosts, who, according to him, did not return to beg for prayers.
but rather “to issue warnings, disclose hidden wrongs, or urge the restitution of ill-gotten gains” (41).


Comments on Donne’s religious development and sensibility and on his theology. Associates Donne with St. Augustine, “not so much in his life as in his theology,” and suggests that Donne, like Augustine, had “a radical distrust of himself and an equally radical reliance on God, who is his sole help.” Suggests that Donne distanced himself from his childhood Catholicism at first “by adopting a skeptical and humanist point of view and only gradually took seriously a loyalty to the Church of England” (163). Maintains that, “[h]owever we try to settle the hard questions that attach to his religious development, the outward circumstances of his life betray his secular hopes” (162–63). Insists that “to argue that Donne saw ordination as a way of gaining preferment is by no means to deny that he also saw it as a way to serve and as a genuinely religious vocation” (163). Claims that Donne “accepts Protestant doctrines without seeking to pry too deeply into them” and that he “places equal emphasis on the church and the sacraments as the ordinary context and means by which God justifies and sanctifies his own” (168). Suggests that “human sin and divine mercy are the very heart of Donne’s religion” and that “in this way he articulates Augustine’s basic religious sensibility” (169). Observes that Donne is not a systematic theologian and that “his writings do not expound doctrines so much as they represent reflections on what those doctrines mean for the religious life.” Says that his sermons are “designed more to move the heart than to instruct the mind” (171). Examines a number of Christian doctrines as they are reflected in Donne’s poetry and prose, such as original sin, justification, grace, repentance, death, etc. and concludes that “Donne’s theological position, at least in its main lines, is perfectly in accord with the views we find in the Articles of Religion and in Hooker’s writings” (203).


Argues that “Donne’s commitment to Arminianism powerfully shapes his sermons from 1624 on” and that although he “may have been a Calvinist—or at least voiced Calvinist positions—in the earlier years of his ministry, by June 1624 he was sharply moving away from the conclusions of Dort.” Maintains that “from this point on, Donne’s sermons link him with the Arminian position of Laud and especially Richard Montagu” (414). Argues, furthermore, that Donne’s position “allowed him to be a loyal member of the Reformed, established Church of England and yet retain a connection with the Catholicism of his childhood, and with his Catholic ancestors” and that thus, for Donne, embracing “an Arminian position made sense psychologically and personally” (415). Cites examples from Donne’s sermons to support his moving away from Calvinist thinking and toward Arminianism and discusses also his defense of ceremonial worship and festivals. Points out that “[b]eyond the evidence from Donne’s sermons, there is also evidence of his ties to Montagu and the Laudian Arminians” (437). Concludes that in the Arminian movement Donne perhaps “found a church that was in many ways, as the Arminian critics charged, closer to the Catholic Church, a spiritual and institutional home that could give him more comforting assurance of not only his own salvation but that of his Catholic ancestors and community” (439).


In “John Donne (1572–1631)” (53–58), presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and works. Notes that Donne is “now regarded as
one of the most important English Renaissance poets” and is “among the most frequently read,” pointing out, however, that his reputation was not always so high (53). Observes that although Donne is best known for the Songs and Sonets, “[t]he fame of these poems should not be allowed to obscure Donne’s manifold and varied achievements” in other kinds of poems and in his prose works (56). Says Donne’s poetry is “remarkable for the egotistical voice of the speaker and the challenge to established conventions through use of far-fetched (‘metaphysical’) imagery and rhythms, which appear to represent ordinary speech” (56–57). Maintains that Donne’s writings are “often concerned with the problem of knowledge and the need to establish truth, even when he appears at his most flippant, irreverent or trivial” (57). In “John Donne, Songs and Sonnets and Divine Poems” (192–97), maintains that in both his love poems and his religious poems “the same voice is evident,” thus questioning attempts to separate “Jack” from “John” Donne. Discusses SunRis as an example of Donne’s “writing strategies,” noting his colloquial style, his focus “entirely on the male speaker,” his use of clever and elaborate conceits, and his reference to “the current state of political organization.” Cites Ecst as an example of Donne’s “irreverent use of philosophical ideas” and of “the distance he could maintain between the narrator and himself” (194). Calls the poem “an elaborate joke.” Cites Canon, Relic, and Noct as “less cynical poems that appear to celebrate heterosexual love far more openly and straightforwardly” (195). Maintains that “the same fears and concerns” that inform the love poems can be seen in the divine poems (196), citing examples primarily from the Holy Sonnets. Mentions Donne in passing throughout the volume.


Points out that although SunRis is at present often associated with Donne’s poems on marital love, Charles Eliot Norton in his 1905 edition of the Song and Sonnets omitted it, along with Fare, Curse, Confl., Commun, Ind, LovUsury, and Flea, poems that “have a history of being thought rather nasty” (282). Suggests that Norton excluded SunRis because he thought its “impudent playfulness” might threaten “to compromise the kind of authority as a spokesman for married love” that he and others wished to ascribe to Donne. Points out that since SunRis “carries through its impudence to the very end,” it was “an uneasy fit for the dominant biographical narrative in relation to which Donne’s erotic poetry was to be read.” Observes that “[f]or well over a century now the principal strategy for domesticating the love poetry in particular has been to locate it within the poet’s own household.” Notes that present-day students, however, often comment on the note of “male domination” in SunRis and “[a]rmed with feminist and new histori-cist perspectives, they are susceptible to interpretations that hear underneath a brash tone the desperate exaggerations of someone eager to secure a place in a man’s world” (284–85). Proposes that “in this particular climate and in order to encourage readings that begin to match the poet’s imaginative boldness,” SunRis, as well as Flea and Appar, “might be deployed … to facilitate entrance into Donne’s poetry” and that they might serve as “a useful antidote to the attempts of Norton and others to make Donne a spokesman for a secular variation on the religious transcendence in which they had ceased to believe.” Maintains that SunRis “can serve in introducing Donne’s poetry today because, at the same time that it makes Donne’s characteristic demands upon readers, it is a kind of comic routine, done in good fun” (285).


Maintains that Donne “conceives of monetary value as inauthentic and illusory” and that “it is precisely the loss of authenticity, exemplified by the imposition of exchange value on use value, and by the more general displacement of phusis
by nomos, which provokes the epistemological and emotional crises that play such predominant roles in the intellectual dramas of Donne’s verse” (144). Points out that Donne “frequently chooses to describe these crises in the language of alchemy.” Notes how during the seventeenth century “a tension developed between the Aristotelian precepts of alchemy and the Baconian method of the new science” and shows how “this tension operates” in Donne’s poetry and “delineates its influence on his ideas about linguistic and financial representation” (145). Argues that Donne “found in the ancient art of alchemy a discourse through which he could simultaneously consider developments in the area we call ‘economic’ and conflicts in the fields we refer to as ‘psychology’ and ‘religion’” (147). Discusses how his poetry manipulates alchemical images and concepts “to reflect the passing of the Aristotelian world view of which alchemy was a vital theoretical manifestation” (159). Maintains that, for Donne, alchemy “becomes a synecdoche for the entire scholastic world picture, which is presented as threatened by encroaching skepticism” (160–61). Comments particularly on Donne’s uses of alchemy in the verse letters, LovAlch, ElProg, ElBrac, and the Anniversaries.


In a discussion on contextualizing Donne’s poems, focuses primarily on “questions of reception,” i.e., on who read his poems, under what circumstances were they read, and “how were they read” (47). Examines GoodM to show how the poem, which is addressed to “an educated audience which appreciates its cleverness,” is an “accomplished, witty, yet serious verse” and is not a “sentimental, even mawkish, adolescent lyric written in a passionate outburst to an actual lover.” Points out that “in a poem which registers the way language is trying to evade humanity’s condition (death’s inevitability) precisely at the moment it is trying to celebrate human potentials in love, or which gestures towards incorporeal ideals of perfect mutuality (‘good morrow to our waking soules’) while grounding the lovers’ exchanges in the bodily, it is appropriate that Donne further exploits this lyric’s controlled confusion by making even the sex of the lovers debatable.” Maintains that Donne “relishes precisely this insecurity that language both generates and reveals about our desires” (52).


While not denying the “deep satiric strain” in Metem or “its mock epic or parodic elements,” argues that the poem is “a finished work, not a fragment.” Maintains that there are “firm textual links that join with thematic parallels to give a striking coherence” to Metem “as an approach” to Corona and the Holy Sonnets, which follow it in the first edition. Holds that “through these different links” Donne “initiates the redefinition of his poetic vocation and effects a transfer from profane to sacred poetic.” Argues that “in transforming the text” of Metem, Donne “makes his profane progress the beginning of a spiritual triumph that carries his reader through the ‘Holy Sonnets’ and the rest of the volume” (125). Examines Metem in the light of the literature of metempsychosis and shows how it becomes “a major literary palinode” in which Donne “writes himself as poet out of existence” (128) and “concedes the incomprehensibility of our experience in the material world and the inadequacies of profane art” (129). Examines “the specific threads” (134) that connect Metem to Corona. Maintains that Metem poses a metaphysical problem, of the immortal soul in a mortal body, but confined to the ontology of a satiric secular realism” (135) and that “it simply gives up, wills itself out of its impasse”
(135–36), whereas the sonnets in Corona “pick up the same question from the perspective of the poetic of salvation” and reply “very specifically to the questions” posed in Metem (136). Argues that each of the Corona sonnets “addresses aspects of the problem of the incarnate soul and answers them, not with the Pythagorean response of metempsychosis or transmigration, but with the answer of transcendence and salvation” (137). Maintains, therefore, that Donne juxtaposes “his classical and secular learning—his Pythagorean view of the human condition—with his triumphal and Christian one” and insists that “the two poems provide two perspectives on human experience: the one profane, seen in terms of the secular year, its fifty-two weeks and the ages of man, and the other seen in the salvational framework of the Christiad and the holy week.” Concludes that “the two sequences are two kinds of progress—the secular progress and the spiritual triumph” and are “pendent poems, or dependent ones in that we only understand the inconclusiveness of the one from the conclusiveness of the other” (138).


Comments on the pervasive interest of twentieth-century artists and poets in Donne and cites “the multiple uses to which he has been put, the way he turns up as name, allusion, cultural reference, or simply turn of simile, in undertakings that may or may not resemble his” (42). Cites examples from Stanley Spencer’s painting “John Donne Arriving in Heaven” in 1911 to the adaptations by Doug Beardsley and Al Purdy in 2000, including such writers as Rupert Brooke, Edgell Rickword, Lytton Strachey, Hart Crane, E. B. White, Herbert Read, William Empson, Joseph Brodsky, Yehuda Amichai, Virginia Woolf, John Updike, Wallace Shawn, Margaret Edson, Emily Dickinson, and many others. Concludes that Donne “remains a multiple, unresolvable provocation” and that “[a]s the allusions accumulate, there is always another sighting to record or encounter to assess” (54).


In an historical survey of contrasting perspectives on eschatology in the seventeenth century, points out that Donne’s “wide-ranging theological reflections illustrate the ambivalent perception of nature characteristic of the Jacobean period, and even more importantly, they offer a foretaste of the slow and gradual assimilation of the new science into the world perspective of the later seventeenth century.” Maintains that Donne’s treatment of eschatological themes in his funeral sermons offers “evidence of a keen awareness of wider philosophical issues, including natural philosophy” (4). Discusses briefly the influences of the “new science” on Donne’s poetic imagination and on his theological thought, showing how he can draw on both the “new science” and Aristotelianism with equal ease for his metaphors. Maintains, however, that “it is clear that in the last analysis what animates both his sermons and his poetry is not his scientific interpretation of the world, but rather the spiritual progress of the human soul” (5).


Maintains that often in Donne’s love poems the power accorded the lady “emerges as a consolatory maleness rather than as a recognition of genuine feminine alterity.” Points out, for example, that in Anniv Donne calls both lovers “kings,” thus the woman is “impowered by being masculinized,” and similarly in Val-Mourn the compass conceit presents an “ithyphallic mistress” whose “firmnes makes [the poet’s] circle just” when they are apart and who “growes erect” on his return. Argues, therefore, that in many of Donne’s love poems “desire is frequently manifested as a fearsome demand to possess and dominate, to extend sovereignty of the ego over the Other” and that “[s]uch power as there is in the relationship is figured in terms of a hierarchy and logic of domination.” Sug-
suggests that "[r]hetorically this can be accounted for as the familiar monological deployment of the lyric voice as that which occludes the Other even as it valorizes her." Cites Flea as an example, a poem in which "the female voice is marginalized to the extent that it is rendered inaudible" and acts "only as an unvoiced punctuation to the wholly intelligible words of the militantly single-minded seducer" (305). Contrasts Donne and Herrick as love poets.


Mentions Donne throughout this study of how certain texts by Donne, Edward Herbert, Marvell, Crashaw, and Aemilia Lanyer "ingeniously disturb and estrange fictions of 'natural' perception, desire, and identity that continue to inform Western culture" (1). Discusses Donne primarily in Chapter 5, "Conscience and Hagiology in Early Stuart England" (106–48), showing how his treatment of hagiology problematizes "definitions of 'real' and 'pseudo' spiritual issues." Maintains that, for Donne, hagiology is "more than a vehicle with which to explore issues of personal and national commitment" (107) and claims that it provided him with "a potentially oppositional discourse that negotiated subjects' liberty of conscience, desire, and identity in socially stratified and ideologically constrained situations" (107–08). Discusses Pseudo-Martyr as a defense of the liberty of conscience and shows how it "diverges from conservative ideology and inspects the inward modalities of the conscience in ways that still resonate with current Western commitments to the value of independent judgement and the sceptical inspection of received customs and beliefs" (116). Maintains that Donne's treatment of hagiography in both his prose and poetry "add to our understanding of the roles liberty of conscience and personal integrity played in the formation of a modern sense of individual selfhood" (122). Points out how in Relic Donne scoffs at the notion of canonization of saints but how in Canon his use of the concept is an "ironic deployment of hagiology" that "both denaturalizes Jacobean allotments of prestige and status and recasts such public inscription as the means of securing his own authority over the conscience's inviolable private domain" (124). Points out that, "[u]nforeseen by Donne, his denaturalizing of hagiological discourse eventually contributed to the destruction of a social order that he had struggled to serve and defend" (143). Discusses Donne's own "post-mortem canonization" which "demonstrates the mingling of authorial or personal intention and self-fashioning with subsequent cultural manipulation" and comments on how "the canonization" of Donne and his texts "clearly reveals the role 'social status' played in forging his posthumous reputation" (144). Mentions Donne and discusses him less extensively in the following chapters: In Chapter 1, "Strangeness and Desire" (19–43), contrasts the critical positions of William Empson and Rosemond Tuve and suggests that their divergence of opinion about the Anniversaries "illuminates the impact that their differing interpretative orientations have [had] on literary study" (32); in Chapter 2, "Edward Herbert: Handsome, Chivalrous, and Strange" (44–68), discusses the poetic exchanges between Donne and Lord Herbert; in Chapter 3, "Green Desires: Andrew Marvell and the Pursuit of Pleasure" (69–88), compares Donne and Marvell, noting in particular how in Sappho and in Marvell's "Upon Appleton House" techniques of cultural denaturalization draw attention to the coercive limitations of conventional gender and sexuality paradigms" (69); and in Chapter 4, "Rich Chains of Love: Desire and Community in Aemilia Lanyer's Salve Deus Judaeorum" (89–105), briefly compares Donne and Lanyer in their depiction of female-female love. In "Afterword: Saints and Sinners for a New Millennium" (149–56), concludes that Donne and the other metaphysical poets included in this study "introduced marvellous strangeness into multiple fields of cultural reproduction" and that "their modes of seeing provide us with an interpretative legacy that continues to be meaningful in the context of our own encounters with customary nature and its attendant
politics” (149). Concludes with notes (157–80), bibliography (181–98), and an index (199–204).


Suggests that Bunyan’s treatment of Christian’s temptation to suicide in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* may be “an overturning of Donne’s metaphor” of “a master key” in *Biathanatos* and may have been intended as an “antidote” to Donne’s justification of suicide. Argues that, “whether or not Bunyan was consciously responding to Donne,” the comparison of Bunyan’s spokesman Hopeful’s “reasoning for the absolute sinfulness of suicide with Donne’s case for its relative sinfulness” gives one “a clearer understanding of the distinctive arguments made by these two Calvinistic writers living at opposite ends of the Puritan revolution” (47). Believes it is “highly unlikely” that Bunyan would have been unaware of the debates over suicide that occurred at the time of his call to the ministry and thinks that it is “certainly possible” that the Doubting Castle episode in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* “constituted his own contribution to them” (49). Discusses “a number of personal and theological qualities” that Donne and Bunyan shared and shows how these “only draw further attention to the two men’s opinions on what the ‘key’ is to unlocking despair” (51). Notes also that Donne’s sermons suggest that his ideas on suicide evolved and changed in his later years.


Maintains that the image of the ideal physician helping a mortally ill patient in *Sickness* is “one manifestation of Paracelsian medical doctrine” in Donne’s poetry (155). Points out that “the cosmography of the physicians” in stanza 2 “represents not only the search for correspondences between the human body and the universe, but also the need for a practical knowledge of the patient’s environment in order to treat him/her effectively.” Notes that the poem suggests “an association between illness and remedy that is rendered in terms of geography, thus revealing the functional role of location in the treatment of disease,” citing stanzas 4 and 5 as examples in which Donne “creates a synthesis of sickness and remedy that is represented topographically” (155). In addition, observes that “the passion that Donne attributes to his physicians has a precedent in Paracelsus’s medical theory” as does his emphasis on “the necessary spirituality of the effective physician” (156) and on the physician’s truthfulness in revealing his patient’s fate. Points out how “the fever that the speaker regards as his deliverance is consistent with Paracelsus’s criterion for effective medicals,” noting how in *Sickness* death is paradoxically “the final purgation that the ailing patient seeks, and his surrender to the ravages of fever is the event that will deliver him from all human suffering” (157).


Maintains that *FirAn* “presents less a precise example of elegy than a fascinating exploration of generic motivations, consequences, and contamination” (50) and that it “registers the indiscrete relation between lyric praise and the public theatricalism implied by an audience of ‘lookers on’” (51). Discusses how Donne’s “anxious fascination with the limits of discretion arises from the potentially indiscrete relation between devotion and ‘mis-devotion’ that troubles Spenser as it troubled Skelton” and notes how *FirAn* “met with the censure of contemporary readers troubled by the poem’s failures of categorization, by its startling mixture of religious and secular praise” (53). Points out how the poem’s “disproportion between occasion and rhetoric continues to provoke anxious debate.” Maintains that Donne’s “essentially fanciful claims for Elizabeth Drury, so obviously ungrounded in reality, should be seen, in dramatic terms, as an enactment of the
concern which is central to the *Anatomy* as a whole, the gap between the object and wit.” Argues that “by this argument, the *Anatomy*’s essential indecorum—the ‘desperate fictions’ and ‘obtrusive ingenuity’ that give its language its distinctly violent energy—reflects on both the epistemological disease of the world, and the epistemological exploitation performed by the poem” (54). Maintains, therefore, that in *FirAn* we see “the disharmonious union of satire and encomium: praising Elizabeth Drury before the world becomes a morally dubious enterprise for the very reason that the poem defines its audience—the world—as violently misinterpretative” (61). Discusses also briefly how in *Holy Sonnets* “the rhetoric of erotic violence competes with sanctified devotionalism” (57).


Argues that *Biathanatos* clarifies “an essentially paradoxical element” in Donne’s “views on assimilation and rebellion in the political realm.” Maintains that although the work is “ostensibly a traditional mock encomium” on suicide, it contains “a number of historical anecdotes” that “disclose something contradictory about the structure of political institutions.” Argues that “[b]y positing a natural ‘desire of death’—a desire that allegedly affects everybody, as he attempts to show—the author in turn suggests a fundamental conflict between what he designates as natural and civil laws.” Maintains that Donne claims that “[i]n order for political institutions to survive … it becomes essential to rewrite these ostensibly natural desires as a form of madness, and thus to effectively estrange its citizens from themselves.” Holds that “[a]lthough Donne officially adopted a conservative public persona during his years as preacher and Dean, his paradoxical treatise reminds us of this sense of lingering estrangement, even if it did lie somewhere beyond his official beliefs” (1).


Argues that four sermons that Donne preached on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul (25 January) in 1625, 1628, 1629, and 1630 constitute his “most coherent account of the subject of conversion” and that in these sermons he “developed what he calls a *via Pauli* that intersects both with humanism’s rhetorically-oriented *via diversa*, which posited manifold individual paths to truth, and with the English church’s *via media*, which sought to avoid the extremes of puritanism and papistry.” Maintains that in the last three sermons, in particular, Donne shows that St. Paul “exploited the various identities—whether metaphorical, mistaken, or legalistic—made available to him during the course of his apostolic ministry.” Shows that in the four sermons Donne “exhibits an attitude toward his ministry and his congregation that is more accommodating than a Jacobean absolutist’s, more worldly than a Platonic dialectician’s, and more tendentious than a diffident Ciceronian.” Maintains also that Donne “grounds his defense of the English church’s liturgical structure in the rhetorical practices of Paul’s ministry, thereby collapsing the (increasingly popular) distinctions between a preaching-based and a ceremony-based church and between his role as preaching pastor and custodian of order” (225). Believes that the four sermons ultimately “force us to reframe the scholarly debate over Donne’s own conversion and more broadly about the psychological traumas of rhetorical self-fashioning in post-Reformation England.” Points out that Donne “insists that ‘occasional’ conversions—conversions like his own that eloquently and prudently respond to changing historical circumstances—do not taint a genuine spiritual calling, but necessarily accompany it” (226).


Revised and reprinted in *Divine Subjection: The Rhetoric of Sacramental Devotion in Mod-

Argues that in Devotions Donne “takes the body’s fluids and organs as the occasion for devotional meditation” and “in seeking to locate Christ’s presence in and through the apparently incomprehensible structure of the body,” he shows “the extent to which the humoral body retains its capacity to inscribe—as the Neoplatonists would have it ‘unfold’—God’s ongoing presence in time.” Maintains, therefore, that “although Donne registers the body’s structural incomprehensibility, he nonetheless sustains language’s potentially sacramental or hieratic signifying power, a power that for Donne is based upon the contiguity between the spiritual and the corporeal” (15).


In Korean. Comments on the breakdown of old certitudes during the seventeenth century. Observes, in particular, that the notion of natural law, which for centuries “assured mankind of a common ground and assured him that his natural powers of reason, aided by grace, were sufficient to direct his life toward eternal happiness,” was challenged by Montaigne, who claimed that “[n]o set of dogmas can certainly claim our loyalty” (92) and who urged that “one must be skeptical, detached, and aloof” (92–93). Points out similarities between Montaigne and Donne, maintaining that the characteristics of Donne’s poetry are “similar to those of Montaigne’s style,” such as “experimentation with the syntax,” “emphasis on satire and realism,” interest in the “personal psychology of men,” and “a sense of the tragedy and sorrow that are part of life.” Suggests that the kind of lyric poetry Donne wrote “met with the same type of criticism in its day that modern poetry often meets in our day: unintelligible, daring, and unpoetic” (93). (English abstract)


Analyzes ValMourn as a “portrait of the mature spiritual connection” between Donne and Anne More (207). Notes how the “mature tone” of the poem stands “in sharp contrast to some of Donne’s other works, written presumably in his younger days” (209).


In Chinese. Studies Donne’s poetry in terms of Victor Shklovsky’s theory of defamiliarization. In the introduction (1–11), discusses how Shklovsky’s term describes the unconventionality of Donne’s poetry and announces that the purpose of the study is to show how Donne “achieves defamiliarisation in modes of thinking, imagery, and form” (9). In Chapter 1, “Defamiliarisation in Modes of Thinking” (12–69), focuses on ways Donne defamiliarizes himself in his thinking by his “unification of the secular and the divine” and by “his unique way of combining thought and feeling.” In Chapter 2, “Defamiliarisation in Imagery” (72–136), studies Donne’s use of images, “focusing on how he defamiliarises poetic convention by employing images drawn from science for the illustration of love and his religious ideas” (10). Discusses also how Donne defamiliarizes conventional images used by Petrarch and other earlier poets. In Chapter 3, “Defamiliarisation in Form” (137–89), discusses how Donne defamiliarizes “poetic convention by using colloquialism and impeded movement rendered by irregular punctuation and indentation, by means of which the perception is prolonged to leave more than enough time for the reader to think about what the poems convey” (10–11). Comments also on how Donne departs from poetic convention by inventing new stanzaic forms, especially in the Songs and Sonets, and discusses the dramatic technique of Donne’s poetry, calling Donne “a dramatist in the realm of lyric poetry.” In the Epilogue (190–96), reevaluates Shklovsky’s theory, pointing out its merits and
weaknesses; presents a general assessment of Donne's poetry, concluding that Donne is “a down-to-earth realist” (11); and comments briefly on Donne’s influence on later poets and suggests possible future studies of Donne. Concludes with notes (197–238), a selected bibliography (239–45), and acknowledgments (246). (English abstract)


In Chinese. Comments on the general characteristics of Donne’s poetry and presents a critical analysis of *GoodM*.


A religious comic strip with quotations from Donne. Artwork by Jonathan Liu; concept by Nate Barksdale “with apologies to Chris Ware.”


Points out that in Latin love poetry, especially in Ovid’s poetry, the wax tablet upon which the poet writes “can assume considerable importance as its properties reflect the emotional dynamics of the poem (and vice versa).” Discusses “[w]hat happens, in the Ovidian poems of Marlowe and Donne, when the wax arrives in a culture of ink and paper” (191). Maintains that in Donne’s love poems it is “the corporeal associations of wax, rather than a cultural graphology, which come to the fore.” Observes various Ovidian features in Donne’s love poetry, such as the importance of “signs and non-verbal codes” (198), but notes also how Donne differs from Ovid, pointing out the influence of other classical elegists, especially Tibullus and Propertius. Comments on images of wax in Donne’s poetry, especially in *ElNat*, *Val-Name*, *ElServe*, *ElPart*, and *Sappho*, and how he “shares an interest in the experience of the surface of writing with classical elegists, with Ovid to the fore” (201).


Argues that *ElComp* “builds to a surprise, humorous ending in which what had previously seemed to be two different mistresses is revealed to be in fact a single woman” (71–72) and that “the very point of the poem is to compel in readers a belated recognition that the speaker and the addressee love the same woman.” Maintains that when the speaker of the poem believes that the lady “is involved with him exclusively, she seems ideal” but that when “he considers that she is also involved with his addressee, he finds her loathsome” (72). Maintains that when the poem is seen in this manner, it becomes “more than just an exercise in contrasting hyperbole: it becomes a psychological study of the effects of faithfulness on desirability” (73).


In “Introduction” (1–17), outlines the purpose and approach of this study. Maintains that “[i]n addressing Donne’s supposedly radical idiosyncrasies, commentators have sometimes underplayed or omitted discussion of the ambiguities inherent in the art and literature of early modern English culture itself” and suggests that “[t]he tensile, even contradictory qualities of Donne’s writings may have reflected as much the paradoxical textures of the artistic and literary society around him as they did the tumult of his own psyche.” Argues that these cultural features can be found reflected most evidently in the emblem books and the iconography of the time and maintains that Donne’s prose and poetry profoundly reflect the influence of both.
Defines emblems as “moral pictures in books” and icons as “religious images in churches,” noting, however, that at times “the differentiation appears questionable” (4). Proposes to consider five topoi or visual themes that are central to Donne’s work: “memento mori iconographies; life-in-death emblems; representations of heaven, hell, and purgatory; depictions of love/death conjunctions; and images of Fortuna.” Indicates that this study “combines cultural studies [and] historicism with semiotic analysis of period iconography, focusing on the details and implications of the various topoi” and that by means of close readings of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century “signs and sign systems, coupled with a cogent attention to historical context,” the study “seeks to demonstrate the quality and intention of some of Donne’s literary designs” (5). Surveys previous scholarly work on the subject. In Chapter 1, “Memento Mori” (19–39), explores the topoi of contemplating death and the Dance of Death in emblem books and iconography and discusses Donne’s use of the memento mori theme in selected poems from the Songs and Sonets, ElAut, several of the Holy Sonnets, Devotions, and the sermons. Maintains that Donne’s use of the topoi “reflected an awareness of the diversities and the contradictions of artistic traditions of death” (34). In Chapter 2, “The Spirit and the Flesh” (41–63), comments on the influence of life-in-death emblems in a number of poems in the Songs and Sonets, Metem, Christ, Goodf, Eclog, several of the Holy Sonnets, and the sermons, especially “Death’s Duell.” Shows how Donne develops the ideas of life-in-death and death-in-life found in emblem books and funereal iconography, allowing the motif “to serve both his pious and religious preoccupations” (59). In Chapter 3, “In the Light of Heaven, and in the Darkness of Hell” (65–84), discusses how Donne assimilated into his work the iconographies of heaven, hell, and purgatory found in English churches and cathedrals. Cites examples primarily from Devotions, LovExch, Ignatius, the Satyres, and the Elegies, noting how Donne “preferred to avoid artistic delineation of the detail of heaven and hell, opting to leave unilluminated that which the mortal mind simply could not imagine” (80). In Chapter 4, “Vis Amoris” (85–105), discusses how Donne’s imagery of love and death “reveals wide iconic variations” and draws on very diverse traditions, such as “classical cosmology, anatomy, and alchemy” (87), citing examples primarily from the Songs and Sonets. Concludes that “[i]n his struggle to make sense of the world, and to find value and permanence within it,” Donne “drew on the idea of union implicit in the processes of alchemy, conceiving of lovers’ souls purifying and harmonizing—or, indeed, frustrated in their attempts to purify and harmonize—within a mortal sphere” (100). In Chapter 5, “Fortune (If There Be Such as Thing as Shee)” (107–23), discusses the topoi of Fortuna as well as the association between “the female personas of some of the poetry and the Goddess Fortuna,” primarily in the Songs and Sonets, ElPart, and HWVenice. Maintains that Donne “duels with fortune in differing ways,” most often seeing fortune as “a calculating and spiteful enemy who is dedicated to the destruction of human happiness—and must be resisted at all cost” (118). In “Conclusion” (125–29), presents a brief commentary on the five preceding topoi. Reproduces 38 illustrations (131–69) and concludes with a bibliography (171–85) and an index (187–209).

Reviews:


Discusses Donne throughout this study of Walton’s contribution to early modern biography, showing how Walton took the genre of the exemplary biographical preface and developed it into “something new” (ix). Focuses specifically on Walton’s biography of Donne in “Walton’s Lives of Donne and Herbert” (168–226), observing that Walton’s main purpose in the biography is to present those aspects of Donne which he considered would most edify his readers. Stresses that Walton wrote as “his subject’s personal friend” and that “the reasons he
gives for his efforts owe a great deal to this fact.” Observes that the *Life* is “animated by the demands of the truth of love” and acknowledges that Walton “allowed these demands to affect his presentation of factual details, or ‘love of truth.’” Sees Walton’s “extensive but somewhat free use of Donne’s own writings” as “an attempt to reconcile these two imperatives,” pointing out that “the result may not always be accurate, but it does show Walton developing the conventions available to him with skill and subtlety, and according to consistent principles.” Maintains that this “very consistency shows Walton to have, on his own terms, a sense of historical responsibility” (203).


Argues that in his sermons, both early and late, Donne sets forth “a deliberate, careful, reasoned attack on the dominant Calvinism of the older generation” (20), especially Calvinist doctrines of reprobation and irresistible grace and their condemnation of the use of images and pictures in worship. Maintains that Donne “declares every human being’s access to salvation, every human being’s possession of the indestructible Image of God, the interior trinity of Augustine, represented in the three powers of the soul, Memory, Understanding, and Will” (20–21). Points out that Donne strongly believed in free will, a view latent in *Sat3* and repeatedly expressed in the sermons. Maintains that Donne “did not become the most famous preacher in the London of his day because he spoke what a firmly Calvinist audience wished to hear” but rather “his sermons seem to recognize a widespread need to be free of Calvinist dominance among the clergy, to be free of the fears of reprobation.” Sees in Donne “the gradual passing away of the dominant power of strict Calvinism” and support for “a broader protestantism than Calvin could offer—a church closer to Lutheranism in many ways” (24).


Primarily an introduction to English literature for Indian students. In Chapter 1, “Metaphysical Poetry: An Introduction” (1–6), briefly discusses the origin of the term and major characteristics of metaphysical poetry, such as the combination of intellectual ratiocination and feeling and the use of conceits, wit, paradox, abrupt openings, colloquial style, humor, and often religious subject matter. Cites poems by Donne to illustrate paradox and abrupt openings. In Chapter 2, “‘Death Be Not Proud’: John Donne (1572–1631)” (7–9), presents a critical appreciation of *HSDeath*, commenting on the complex passion and ratiocination of the poem, its rhetorical argument and motifs, and its uses of paradox.


Reproduces *SunR* and offers a paraphrase and a brief commentary on the poem (10–11). Maintains that the poem illustrates the hallmarks of Donne’s style: “wit, paradox, allusion, boldness, sophistication, passion”—and points out that his language is “sharp, argumentative, intellectual” (11). Reproduces, without notes or comment, *Expir*, *ValMourn*, *Relic*, *HSRound*, and *SGo*.

Mentions that in an early manuscript of Sat4 ll. 215–17 read “Topcliff e” for “pursevant,” “al-luding to the licensed informer and torturer dreaded by the Recusant community into which Donne was born.” Points out that “[h]ad the satire been published, ‘pursevant’ would certainly have been used” but that the substitution indicates the ease with which generalized statements might encode particular allusions. Observes that in Sat4 Donne is “careful to attribute the worst accusations against prominent persons not to the first-person narrator” but rather “to an unidentified scandal-monger.” Says that although Donne borrows the general situation in the poem from Horace, “the acute sense of danger is original to Donne” (82). Maintains that “[w]hat Donne represents himself as feeling is precisely what anyone who came into possession of a covertly circulated manuscript” would feel, namely that “[t]his is dangerous matter not because it involves obscenity per se” but rather “because it uses obscenity as a satiric device.” Holds that the main theme of Sat4 is “satire itself, and as such it constitutes perhaps the best contemporary commentary upon the atmosphere of suspicion and apprehension in which the genre developed.” Notes that “[t]he relationship between Elizabethan satire and Elizabethan censorship is disturbingly symbiotic” (83). Points out also that one reader glossed the vague reference in Sat4 to “two reverend men/ Of our two Academies” (ll. 57–58) as John Reynolds and Lancelot Andrewes, which is another example of how readers of the period tended to identify general allusions with particular persons.


Suggests that Donne “frequently depicts self-other dynamics in ways that extend beyond the familiar accounts of his encounters with women (e.g., pleading or arguing with them, curiosity and fear about their difference—or similarity to him, worry that he will never fully know them) toward a more radical gesture of testing the boundaries of gendered identity” (577–78). Maintains that “[o]verlapping realms of self and other, male and female, appear throughout the Songs and Sonnets, in ways that suggest less a rhetorical (and ultimately aggressive) exchange of positions than an eager dissolution of outline” and holds that Donne “transforms the distance between them as polarized, gendered selves into a continuum of connectedness, uncovering the paradox of a separation that is also a form of union.” Notes that when he “preserves a sense of self in relation to women without feeling annihilated by proximity to another’s psyche, the connection is articulated through metaphors of sovereignty that describe both speaker and mistress” (578). “Contrary to the notion of gender play as a carnival of transgressions that always, ultimately, reaffirms power hierarchies,” argues that Donne’s “courting of liminal experience often registers a disruption in discursively enforced gender identity and thus offers the possibility of both identification with women and a recognition of their separateness.” Believes that “[b]y blueprinting Donne’s play within the space-between, such familiar tropes as teardrops, maps and globes, windowpanes, and the compass bring into view this ability to resist the static constraints of the pairs (self-other, attachment-loss, male-female) that they themselves contain, as well as the poet’s fascination with destabilizing gendered identity in a pleasurable, rather than a strictly policing, manner” (580). Argues that Donne’s playfulness serves “less as a public display of his clever intellect, or as a defense against social upheaval, than as a way of rethinking the possibilities of gender and erotic connection” (583). Discusses as examples Flea, GoodM, ValName, ValWeep, ValMourn, and SunRis to show that “the genderedness of Donne’s imagination is not as emphatically, certainly not consistently, ‘masculine,’ or masculinist, as has so often
been claimed.” Concludes that it is untenable “to maintain that Donne’s identifications with women serve unequivocally, or univocally, to suppress them and to reassert the primacy of his own masculine identity” because “[t]hrough the conceptual metaphors of play and liminal space, Donne liberates his speakers from anxieties about gender by exploiting the very notions that tend to produce anxiety in the first place, maximizing rather than reductively denying the ambiguity of gendered identity” (603).


Review essay of John Christianson’s On Tycho’s Island: Tycho Brahe and His Assistants, 1570–1601 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), which, despite the title, has no discussion of Donne.


Comments briefly on Donne’s spirituality, calling him “one of the most significant figures in the Anglican tradition of the seventeenth century” and praising his literary style as “one of the glories of English literature and the Anglican spirit.” Notes Donne’s ecumenical spirit; the influence of St. Augustine and Calvin on his thought; his “positive view of the created universe”; his “gregarious, almost donnish, view of society as rooted in the life of the trinity”; and his “realistic view of human nature” (254). Comments also briefly on “the importance of contrition in Donne’s spirituality”; his “sense of the reality of tragedy and evil in the world,” which “gives to much of his work a hint of melancholy”; and his belief that in suffering there is “a higher kind of joy which we experience precisely in suffering” (255). Points out also the importance of the Church in Donne’s spirituality and his use of secular language to express his religious concepts.


Discusses the life, poetry, and prose of William Austin (1587–1633/34) as representative of a deeply devout member of the Church of England who was neither a Puritan nor an anti-Calvinist and points out similarities between his and Donne’s religious sensibilities and attitudes. Notes how both men emphasized a “proper balance and valuation of preaching, private devotion, and public prayer” (146). Compares Austin and Donne to show that Donne, “while remarkable, was perhaps not so singular in his piety as he is often represented” (148). Finds similarities between the poetry and prose of Austin and Donne, especially notable in the Devotions, the Holy Sonnets, FirAn, and several of the Divine Poems. Contends that this study demonstrates that “among early Stuart English Protestants there was a third alternative to puritan conformity and avant garde conformity, a conformity committed to the faith and worship of the Established church that can be called Anglican” (163).


In Chinese. Analyzes metaphors of love in Donne’s poems based on Seale’s theory of metaphors and Young’s theory of prototype and then “employs the theory of prototype of love to make a comparison between Donne’s metaphors and the prototype of love depicted in the mythology of ancient Greece,” thereby “proving the elegance of Donne’s employment of metaphors in his poems” (46). Discusses ValMourn, Flea, ValWeep, and Ect. (English abstract)

Compares *Lam* to the prose translation and anonymous verse translation of the Lamentations in Christopher Fetherstone’s *The Lamentations of Jeremi … (1587)* to show that “where Donne’s version differs from Tremellius’ text [his acknowledged source] in word choice and phrasing, it almost always does so in the direction of the verse translation presented by Fetherstone in the second half of his book” and that, “throughout, but especially in the problematic brief verses that make up chapter 3, Donne’s poem is a virtual patchwork of phrasings taken alternately from both Tremellius and the verse translation included in Fetherstone’s book” (85). Maintains that the verse translation, possibly done by a woman, was not based on Tremellius but rather on the Geneva Bible. Concludes that Fetherstone’s book “clarifies several issues raised by Donne’s twentieth-century editors and critics”: (1) it “reaffirms the claim of the poem’s heading, that Donne’s versification is ‘for the most part according to Tremellis’” and “allows us to see how often Donne chose the same English terms that Fetherstone had used to translate Tremellius’ Latin”; (2) “the versification by Fetherstone’s friend both accounts for and qualifies the influence of the Geneva bible on Donne’s poem, showing that particular translation to be filtered through her poetical rendering of it” and allows us to see that, “when she deviated from the text she was versifying, Donne occasionally followed her lead”; and (3) knowledge of both parts of Fetherstone’s book “allows us to dispute the putative influence of the Authorized Version on Donne’s poem” and that, “with 1611 removed as the *terminus ad quo* for the composition of Donne’s poem, the way is left open for those who would argue that ‘Lamentations’ is an early work, though the influence of Fetherstone’s 1587 book in no way precludes a later date of composition” (92). In an appendix, cites specific examples of Donne’s reliance on the Fetherstone volume by comparing individual lines from Donne’s *Lam* to lines from Tremellius, the Fetherstone translation, and the Geneva Bible.


In an informal essay containing personal reflections on such matters as native American culture, Christianity, racism, myths, colonialism, academia, cultural studies, and the literary canon, comments briefly on Donne and on his poetry and prose. Says that although Donne “may be white, male, and (as Dean of St. Paul’s) Christian, a member of the exclusive Patriarch’s Club (on Lusty Mews, just off discrete Bond Street),” he is “also thoroughly modern” and that he “bridges the gap between a world of faith and a world in which faith is thought and felt, a world that is losing God, and possibly a world in which even John Donne himself has had his thinking doubts” (126). Maintains that “[n]ot only does Donne represent philosophical Christianity, but his dialectical ability to question his own valuations and thereby open his attentive reader to entertain and consider, not just the opposites, but also the modifications, which are not so much oppositions but finenesses of perception, makes him interesting” (127). Comments on the compass image in *ValMourn* and says that the image as “the condition of the lovers themselves becomes, in the end—and perhaps for me alone—a metaphor not of connection but of separation” (130).


First of a two-part study that presents “new images” and “new information about the vicissitudes” of Donne’s effigy in St. Paul’s Cathedral, “erected in late 1632 or early 1633” (1). Surveys
known information on how the monument came into being, its survival of the great fire of 1666 and restoration, and its movement from one place to another in the cathedral at different times as well as various descriptions and portraits or engravings of the effigy throughout the centuries. Notes how “myth often nudges aside fact in histories of the monument” (8). Points out that for 207 years—from 1666–1873—the effigy was in the crypt of the cathedral. Includes 24 illustrations.


Discusses Donne’s uses of metaphysical wit and simile in ValMourn. Says that Donne uses wit "to develop not just one but a series of arguments to console his wife on the eve of his departure" and maintains that, in each case, the similes he uses "force the reader to see the logic behind comparisons that may at first seem unlikely or far-fetched" (213).


Includes SGo (21), noting only that despite Donne’s religious calling, his poetry is “notable for its eroticism and sometimes cynical worldview, as well as its striking imagery” (21).


presents a detailed reading of ElProg, focusing primarily on “the monetary tropes” in the poem that link “value to love or desire.” Points out that from the very beginning of ElProg “the sexual is defined in relation to commercial realities” (137). Argues that “a felt transformation in what constitutes the nature of (economic) value permeates Donne’s erotic poetry” and “provides the matrix” within which ElProg in particular “locates gender and colonialism in relationship to one another” (144). Maintains that “[i]n its distinctive and ‘outrageous’ inter-relating of money, colonial voyaging, and sexuality,” ElProg “investigates valuation as itself problematic” and suggests that, “like gold, all things (including love) have their price” (162). Observes also how in other poems, especially ElBrac, ElBed, BedfRef, and Image, Donne uses monetary and/or colonial tropes to explore love and sexual desire.


Maintains that Donne’s sermons, “in which the enigma of Christ is used as a frequent metaphor, become performances of the paradoxes inherent in Christianity and demonstrate for his congregation the real difficulty involved in the Christian beliefs they take for granted” (2). Points out how, in preaching, Donne found “a home for his metaphysical wit and a use for his broad education” (4). Notes that his sermons “often describe Christ’s personality and his struggles with his dual nature” and suggests that by recognizing “personal oppositions at play within the course of his own life, Donne was able to realize for his congregation the complexities of Christianity and was unwilling in his sermons to let any neat and easy conclusions be drawn.” Presents a detailed analysis of “Death’s Duell” as an example of Donne’s use of dialectic argumentation, showing how he “consistently argues one thing, then its opposite, and eventually condenses both extremes in the example of Christ, while maintaining the oppositions” (5).


Argues that Flea is “less about seduction than the obstacle to seduction of male-centered constructions of honor” (40). Shows how in the poem Donne “creates a tautology by starting
with a conclusion and then working backward to justify its premises,” which results in “a paradox, a rhetorical game in which at least one of the propositions is false because the conclusion is one of the premises.” Discusses how the “playful argument” in the poem “opposes the female respondent’s opening conclusion that honor appropriately defines her body.” Points out that although “the goal is seduction, the poem seems to concern itself more with the problem of undermining honor as a counter in the seduction exchange.” Shows how Flea “refers the interpretive burden of the poem to its audience” and how, “by parodying seduction within a frame the female respondent has not questioned, it also forces a reconsideration of her opening conclusion that honor is linked to the female body” (41). Comments on how Donne’s “self-consciously specious line of reasoning allows him both to argue for a seduction and to reconcile the paradox that women’s bodies are simultaneously desired and sinful” (43). Maintains that Donne wants the lady “to see that her argument for keeping her honor is just as specious as his argument for her to surrender it” (46) and that he “sells the female respondent the falseness of her position through a demonstration of its having been imposed on her” (51).


Discusses the complexity, ambiguity, and prevalence of contradiction in Donne’s poetry that allows for multiple possible interpretations of meaning. Stresses Donne’s break with literary tradition and/or his manipulation of it for his own purposes. Sees the heterogenetic dimension of Donne’s style as manneristic and briefly compares Donne to Pontormo, Salviati, and El Greco. Maintains that Donne challenges humanistic ideological models and Petrarchan idealism and deconstructs the structural space of Renaissance writers by abolishing their linear perspectives. Comments on how Donne’s poetry does not attempt to resolve tensions but rather leads to manneristic fantasy and paradox.


Points out a number of early allusions to Donne that have not been noted in previous compilations. Identifies Samuel Wesley, author of the satirical poem “To the Laud and Praise of a Shock Bitch” published in Maggots or Poems on Several Subjects Diversely Handled (1685) as “the correct source of a derogatory reference to Donne and Cowley that was attributed to John Dunton by Geoffrey Keynes” (219). Notes that Dunton published the poem in The Athenian Sport (1707) without attributing it to Wesley. Points out that, when recognized in its proper context, Wesley becomes “the first in a line of Restoration critics who wrote derisively about Donne and the Metaphysical poets whereas, when the poem is dated 1707, it is simply one more bit of abuse reflecting the taste of the early eighteenth century” (222). Sees the references cited as important for the light they cast on Donne’s reputation in the century after his death and maintains that the discovery of these allusions indicates that there is a need for a more “systematic reconsideration of Donne’s reputation during the Restoration and the Age of Reason” that might show that “the long- presumed view” of his reception during this period is “erroneous” (228).


Discusses the use of metaphors of the circle and the line in Devotions as “keys” to Donne’s thinking and as reflecting “deep spiritual deliberation and a serious religious quest” as he struggled with his near-death experience during his illness in 1623 (201). Maintains that the
“display of Augustinian expression and religious self-portrayal” in *Devotions* is “a declaration of a spiritual change,” a “turning-point in his relationship with God,” and that “this change can be seen on the linguistic level in his sermons” both before and after 1623. Shows, in particular, how this change can be seen “in the very text” of *Devotions* and maintains that the change is “nothing less than Donne’s final conversion from Catholicism to Protestantism” (202). Maintains that “there seems to be a clear change in the character of the divine presence in the text of the *Devotions*” and that “this change is especially apparent in the metaphorical language of the text.” Believes that “the fact that the imagery first reflects the medieval world-order, then disrupts through metaphors involving the new sciences, and is finally re-established in images including the apparently reformational direct contact from man to God (and back) is significant” and that “[t]his development in the metaphorical framework clearly suggests an actual shift in Donne’s emotional, or intellectual (although obviously not official), church allegiance” (208).


In Finnish. Discusses the conceptual changes imposed upon language, especially the religious language of the Reformers, by the Copernican revolution and shows how Donne makes use both of medieval and early modern views in order to create a metaphoric framework in which to illustrate the workings of God in a changing world. Surveys attitudes toward language during the Reformation, explaining how the reformers’ views about form and function of biblical language differed from those of their predecessors. Discusses the concept of the Word, the *opus operatum* principle, and the Christian applications of the art of rhetoric and comments on the dual nature of language (literal vs. metaphoric), with examples drawn from the Bible and its interpreters and also from Donne’s sermons. Shows how the perception of the universe as an image, and of the new science within this image, is elaborated upon through examples drawn from Donne’s sermons and from *Devotions*. Shows how the new world order challenged language and how the images created by it helped writers, specifically Donne, make sense of the changing world view. Maintains, in other words, that the Reformation effected a transformation of rhetorical concepts and a re-formation of the language in which man speaks to or about God.


In Japanese. Maintains a pervading tension in Donne’s poetry between belief and realistic observation. In Chapter 1, “Mosaic-patterned World,” presents a reading of *Metem*, suggesting that the poem is not personal but rather an accumulation of little stories about living things like mosaic-patterned space. In Chapters 2 and 3, “New Philosophy,” explores the uneasiness of Donne’s mind about the New Philosophy. Sees the *Anniversaries* as a mixed genre in which Donne expresses collective and sometimes contradictory views of the world. Says that Donne believed in the invisible, supernatural world and was, at the same time, attracted to scientific knowledge. In Chapter 4, “Poet of Mannerism,” calls Donne a mannerist and maintains that he, like the mannerists, mixes realism and fantasy and belief and reason. In Chapters 5 and 6, “Poetry, Secular and Religious,” discusses the relationship of eroticism and pure love in Donne’s poetry and argues that, after Anne More’s death, these two kinds of love become united. Compares Donne with Crashaw. In Chapter 7, “Paradise Lost and the New Philosophy,” comments on Milton’s concern with the New Philosophy, showing how in *Paradise Lost*, Milton places traditional *sapientia* by the side of *scientia*.


Points out that as Donne in Goodf “deliberately rides away from the east, the scene of sacrifice, so does Protestant lyric devotion in seventeenth-century England move away from identification with the spectacularly gruesome suffering of the crucified Christ toward the apprehension of the extravagant mercy ensuing from Jesus’ victory over sin and death on the cross.” Attributes this change to “a renewed emphasis in Reformed religion on the Davidic and Pauline notions that the only sacrifice God desires occurs neither in sanctified architectural space nor in explicit corporeal suffering but rather in the interior spaces of the believer” (561). Maintains that Donne's poem is not so much a vivid dramatization of Christ's sacrifice as it is a performance of “the enormous difficulty of apprehending” what Donne calls a “spectacle of too much weight for mee” and that Donne asks “how the immense suffering of the Christian sacrifice can be represented in poetry, free of the inevitable anesthesia of memory and the distorting fictions of the imagination.” Claims that Donne records “not just the immense spiritual benefits that ensue from the sacrifice of the suffering Jesus but also the prodigious psychological costs of that beneficent sacrifice for the mortal worshipper” and offers “a way of engaging the Passion that is not so much a poetry of meditation as it is a poetry of immolation” (562). Analyzes Goodf to show how the poem is “a marvelous example of the difficulty that Donne experienced in coming to terms with the sacrifice, as well as the corollary difficulty that readers have had in coming to terms with Donne’s abiding interest in corporeal suffering” (566) and how at the poem’s end “[h]eartfelt supplication supplants meditative rationalization” (568) and how longed for “corporeal punishment compensates for the innate misdirections of the body” (569). Sees how in Goodf “an emphasis on how Christ suffered for humanity precipitates a devotional mode in which humanity longs to suffer for God” (571). Comments on how Donne “saunters away” from the scene at Golgotha, how Herbert “stammers his inability to deal with it,” and how Milton “incompletely circles it before turning his attention to other matters” (581).


In “Interlude: Magdalen Herbert and John Donne” (69–72), comments briefly on Donne’s relationship with Mrs. Herbert. Reproduces MHMary, a 1607 letter to her from Donne, and passages from Donne’s funeral sermon honoring her. In “John Donne” (75–97), gives a brief biographical sketch of Donne and presents personal reflections on Donne's poetry and prose, especially the Holy Sonnets, Christ, several hymns, and “Death’s Duell.” Points out the centrality of the theme of death in Donne’s works and in his life.


Maintains that in his poetry and prose the body that Donne “invokes—explicitly and knowledgeably—is a humoral body” and discusses how humoralism offered him “a radically different model of physical selfhood than we are accustomed to—particularly, a different sense of the relationship between the body and the external world” (149). Suggests that Donne’s sense of selfhood “has the same structure… as the Bakhtinian grotesque—a structure that enmeshes and incorporates the self with the body and the body with the rest of the world.” Maintains, therefore, that Donne’s humoralism “makes his physical imagery not the means of self-involvement or self-assertion” but rather is “a way of representing the self’s connection and even subjection to other bodies and minds.” Points out that Donne’s “conscious engagement with the paradigms and practices of humoral medicine is part of a wider ethical debate over changing conventions of selfhood in his time” and observes how “[t]he language
of humors figures prominently in that debate.” Therefore, examines “some of that discourse in order to suggest how varied and contested such ideas were” but primarily focuses on “its persistent presence in Donne’s texts, which render some vivid analyses of what humoral selfhood could mean.” Argues that Donne’s humoral imagery “not only challenges the widespread view of his own ‘individualism,’ but also complicates recent critical discussions of Renaissance selfhood in general” (150). Observes that critics recognize “the principle of fluidity” as “central to Donne’s representations of selfhood” but that “they often fail to connect this principle with the humoral body.” Maintains that Donne’s “emphasis on the fluid body figures not just change but exchange—not just personal flux, but interpersonal flux” (157) and shows how he “embraces the anxieties of interdependence” in both his love poetry and his religious works, “in which the powerful need for connection with God is so often figured physically.” Discusses as an example HSVex in which “the speaker uses the humoral body as a metaphor for his spiritual condition” (159). Maintaining that Donne’s physical imagery is “clearly grotesque,” discusses as an example his grotesque realism in Devotions, showing how it shapes his “representation of selfhood” (164). Concludes that Donne “is committed to a radically interpersonal selfhood—a sense that the root or cause or locus of one’s self lies in others” and that it is “this intense responsiveness of selfhood to its contexts—spiritual, sexual, social, political—that Donne registers in his exquisitely physical imagery” (168).


Surveys shifting and conflicting views of Donne’s religion, noting how in recent times “the particular trajectory of Donne scholarship has paralleled the broader developments of modern revisionist and post-revisionist historiography” (84–85). Suggests, however, that “some exciting new work is addressing the precise nature of Donne’s religion—and specifically, of his Catholicism” (87). Discusses in particular recent scholarship on Donne’s sacramental theology and poetics. Looks at Donne’s religious discourse, “however metamorphosed into devotional poems or sermons or satires or love lyrics, as not merely reflecting but constructing the terms in which he understood and articulated his beliefs and desires.” Maintains that in Donne’s time “flux in religion was the norm rather than the exception in religious experience, actually expected rather than regarded with astonishment” and supports this view by discussing two undated sermons on the Reformation delivered at Whitehall and a Paul’s Cross sermon delivered on 6 May 1627. Observes how in the Whitehall sermons Donne is “heavily invested in explaining his apostasy as Reformation, and the Reformation as a paring, or ‘circumcision,’ of the Church rather than a ‘concision,’ or rending the fabric of religion,” whereas the Paul’s Cross sermon “reveals the continuities with Catholicism, particularly its ceremonies and devotions, that mark Donne’s personal religious settlement, and only less precariously that of the official articles of religion of the English Church” (90). Suggests ways in which the anti- and pro-Catholic perspectives in these sermons can be reconciled and points out the “uncertainty of religious identity in Donne’s time.” Argues that “looking for consistency is misguided, because it supposes uniformity” (93). Maintains that “[j]ust as his poetry recognizes no single authority and engages in no servile imitation, but grafts the best of the old onto the new, so Donne is the slave to no interpretive authority” but rather sees the English Church as “a community of believers, as well as a public, national, uniquely Reformed institution, still working out the terms of its doctrine, discipline, and devotion” (94).

608. Siemens, R. G. “‘I have often such a sickly inclination’: Biography and the Critical Interpretation of Donne’s Suicide Tract, Biathanatos,” in Wrestling with God: Literature and Theology in the English Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Grant Stanwood, ed. Mary Ellen Henley & W. Speed Hill, with the assistance of R. G. Siemens, 139–53. Vancouver: Hen-

Points out various reasons that critics have given to dissociate Donne's personal situation from his comments on suicide in *Biathanatos* but argues that by divorcing the work "from Donne's own experience at the time of its writing, we ignore what is its chief shaping element: the deep melancholy that pervaded the period of Donne's life in which he wrote it." Reviews, therefore, "the evidence of that melancholic condition" and "approaches that condition as evinced (and as perceived by others to have been evinced) therein in terms that relate to the intimate nature of *Biathanatos*, with specific reference to the implications of Donne's practice of casuistry and, further, to the distinct and personal image of Christ that the reader finds put forward as the model of the perfect suicide" (140). Argues that *Biathanatos* is not solely "an intellectual exercise" (145) but regards it as "a vehicle in which Donne can situate his private thoughts for his small group of intended readers in a large, more public context" (147). Believes that the treatise is "very much a defence of suicide," but that, "in the form that it is, acts also very much as an assertion of the Protestant casuist doctrine that 'each person is responsible for judging the relation of general laws to particular circumstances according to the dictates of conscience and reason.'" Maintains that in *Biathanatos* Donne "argues against those laws—natural, civil, and, especially, divine—that deny him control of that aspect of his life (his death) over which he might most easily exercise such control" (148). Discusses how Donne saw in Christ "the ultimate example of the proper suicide, one who satisfies the very particular circumstances in which such action is tolerable" (150) and points out how he "manipulates the perception of Christ's experience to fit with his own concerns" (151). Points out, however, that, as expressed in *Biathanatos*, Christ's death "glorifies the power and control He demonstrates in yielding up His life, the very control that Donne lacks—both over his life and in his life." Concludes that Donne's ideas in the treatise "very much reflect the thoughts of his life at the time in which it was written" and captures that "sense of personal nothingness that Donne so clearly felt" at the time (151).


Pointing out that Renaissance readers were encouraged to view notes, glosses, and marginalia in a work "as fully integrated parts of what he or she was reading" (1), discusses *Biathanatos* to show that the annotations in it were "an integral part of Donne's plan from the start and a feature of the work that he expanded on more than one occasion" (82). Suggests that Donne may have "used annotation as a means to recommend to his readers the need to consult other, more fully nuanced arguments in the process of inspecting their own consciences regarding the question of suicide" or that perhaps he felt that *Biathanatos* was "too controversial to stand on its own and needed the bolstering and buttressing from sources covering the full span of his Christian learning and conviction." Believes, however, that Donne "was using his margins as he used other aspects of the rhetorical structures he erected, that is, to create the figure of a conscientious reader in the act of reading." Maintains that "the reader who emerges from Donne's fully marginated *Biathanatos* is troubled yet rational, decisive yet inquiring, deliberate yet not 'precise' or 'scrupulous' (in the negative casuistical sense of these terms), alive to theological dispute yet open to a compelling confluence of the most probable opinions in a case of life or death" (83). Discusses also Donne's use of glosses in his sermons, observing that "[w]ith a clear view of both Roman Catholic and Puritan excesses in the area of contentious biblical commentary in the latter half of the sixteenth century, Donne chooses to minimize the marginal apparatus
of his sermons and set a kind of standard for the genre” (35).


Describes a seventeenth-century “index” compiled by an anonymous reader, found in a first edition of Donne’s poems in the Folger Shakespeare Library, that “records one reader’s response” to Donne’s poems (165). Points out that although the index “exhibits some of the characteristics normally associated with alphabetical lists of words—it is neatly compiled in two ruled columns of words and short phrases followed by page numbers on the recto and verso of the last leaf of the book—in truth it bares only a formal resemblance to our present-day notions about documentation” (165–66). Notes that the index “makes no attempt to be systematic or comprehensive” but that it gives us some idea of how Donne was “read, interpreted, and used by his near-contemporaries” (166). Suggests that the motivation of the reader, perhaps a clergyman, was to find expressions that could be used in sermons or on other religious occasions. Points out that he not only examined Donne’s religious poems but also “searched the secular poems for religious analogies useful in explaining the paradoxical mysteries of Christian faith” (167), noting, however, that he “appears more attentive to the poems’ sacred subjects than to their worldly, often provocative situations” (168). Maintains that, “[b]ased on the index compiler’s marginal comments and the preponderance of recorded religious images,” it appears that he approached Donne’s poetry “with what St. Augustine would have called ‘charity,’ selecting Donne’s images more for their spiritual value and meaning than for their literal, situational context” (182). Dates the index around 1650 on the basis of the handwriting and reproduces a photocopy of the index with a transcription of it.


Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne (xiii), a general introduction to Donne’s *Corona* and the *Holy Sonnets* (64–68), and a brief bibliographical note (108). Discusses how *Corona* forms a corona-sequence, noting that the form, popular in France, is “almost nonexistent in Britain” (64). Says that some of the *Holy Sonnets* are “the finest religious sonnets in English” (65) and maintains that they do not form a sequence. Comments on the form of the *Holy Sonnets*, on how Donne uses “violent disturbances of rhythm, syntax, and word order to create a persona beating his way through thickets of doubt,” and on how “[c]onstant enjambment, hyperabation (abnormal syntactical order), and ellipsis (omission of words) flourish in lines that have only the most tenuous connection with normal iambic pentameters” (65). Contrasts *HSWilt* with Shakespeare’s “Sonnet 58” to illustrate how Donne “actually altered the form [of the sonnet], by destroying almost all its regularities other than those of rhyme scheme and length” (68).


Finds similarities between the “language strategies” found in judicial opinions and in poems (272). Compares Benjamin N. Cardoza’s opinion in *Palko v. Connecticut* and *ValMourn* to show how each uses “passive/active voice, sentence/verse structure, and metaphor in order to create a specific experience for the reader meant to lead her to an equally specific accord with the author” (273).


Argues that “the doctrinal, liturgical, and spiritual components” in *Corona* indicate Donne’s “persistent Catholicism rather than a nascent
Protestantism” (121) and discusses how “[t]he medieval, Italianate, Counter-Reformation components” of the sonnet sequence, “intensified by combination, are a theological and cultural provocation to reformed Christianity” (123). Considers the rosary as the principal source of the poem and argues that in his praise of the Virgin Mary, Donne “indulges a Mariolatry outrageous to reformed divinity” (126) and that to argue that in Corona Donne adapted the rosary “to a reformed focus on Christ is a futile Procrusteanism” (128), noting how the sequence is, in fact, “less Christocentric in the subjects of its petitions than the Rosary itself” (124). Discusses Donne’s theological views and his devotional sensibility as reflected in Corona. Concludes that the poem “expresses Donne’s theology, synthesizing objective patterns and designs of belief and prayer, with the distinctive personal note of his spirituality and some doctrinal emphases obviously attributable to the faith of his fathers, never entirely blotted out.” Maintains, however, that “[t]his combination and balance speaks of the reasonable divinity of the English Church and its tolerance of a degree of doctrinal and liturgical diversity” (139).


Discusses “the recent rise of the nation as a subject of literary study and the somewhat belated apprehension of its positives” as a prelude to showing that when the views of John Carey and Dennis Flynn concerning Donne’s Catholicism “are refracted through our increasingly revised understanding of the nation, their perceptions may not appear to be so violently antithetical after all” (56). Contrasts Donne and Milton to show that “[t]here are substantial reasons why Donne can never quite be a nationalist like Milton” since, proud of his heritage, he “continues to think warmly of the old religion” (70). Maintains that “what makes Donne so interesting is precisely the conflictedness of his relation to the political and cultural consequences of the emergence of the modern nation state” (61). Examines, in particular, Pseudo-Martyr to show how Donne’s treatise is “a nationalist text—the centerpiece of its argument is the independence of England, that Papacy has no temporal jurisdiction over the nation” (65), and that by demanding blind obedience has created false martyrs and made Catholics enemies of the state. Observes that in Pseudo-Martyr the liberation of England from the temporal jurisdiction of the Pope serves as an allegory of Donne’s own “liberation from the Roman religion” (66). In attempting to reconcile the views of Carey and Flynn, argues that “once we re-state Carey’s ambition in less personal terms, both he and Flynn are right” and that “[t]heir arguments about Donne’s Catholicism glance at two different aspects of the same phenomenon.” Maintains that Donne “is caught at a point where the cultural changes that produced the modern nation state drive him in contradictory directions”: “[b]ecause of his Catholic background the old ties have an immediacy” for Donne and yet, “at the same time, because of his class background and his consciousness of that talent which is death to hide Donne seeks out a local situation in his own life where the direct access and individual agency Milton would associate with the newly awakened nation might be realized” (70).


Designed to assist candidates who are preparing to take the Agrégation Examination in English. Notes that the examination will focus on the Songs and Sonets, ElPict, ElAut, ElFatal, ElBed, Sat3, Metem, FirAn, an excerpt from SecAn, and the Divine Poems. In Chapter 1, “La poétique de Donne” (1–16), presents a general introduction to the major characteristics of Donne’s poetry and its critical reception. In Chapter 2, “Thèmes et variations” (17–60), comments on Donne’s treatment in his poetry of love, eroticism, religious thought, death, the body and the soul, cynicism and subversion, and joy and melancholy. In Chapter 3, “Langue et style” (61–78), comments on Donne’s uses of diction, rhetoric, metaphors, and conceits. In Chapter


Maintains that, in discussing Donne’s prosody, it is important “to draw a clear technical distinction between meter and rhythm,” which are “often confused or given vague and over-inclusive acceptations” and also to pay attention to “the stanza designs and the interplay of rimes and enjambments” when scanning the lines. Argues “then his compositions prove ingenious and not devoid of virtuosity.” Acknowledges that Donne’s poetic lines are “not easily scanned according to preconceived patterns” but claims that “this results from their inventiveness and originality” (401).


Based on the collation of 35 of the 42 seventeenth-century manuscripts and editions that contain full texts in English of SunRis, discusses the textual history of the poem, noting that “the most unusual thing” about its textual history is “its consistency with what we know of other poems—there are no surprises, though there are quite a few variants.” Discusses the textual variants that “pose interpretive problems” (276).


Comments on the bibliographical and critical studies of Donne by John R. Roberts.


Argues that Shakespeare’s “only elegiac poem—if A Funeral Elegy is indeed Shakespeare’s—is a work probably indebted to Donne’s mourning poems, yet, more certainly it is one that rejects those very qualities of expansive symbolism and abstraction that the later plays share with the Anniversaries” (53). Examines the major characteristics of four of Donne’s early elegiac poems occasioned by the death of Lady Markham and Cecilia Bulstrode and the Anniversaries, including FunEl, to show how Donne created a new form of the English elegy by adapting the elegy as “a vehicle to explore large philosophical and religious issues,” while at the time “fulfilling the epideictic obligations of the elegaic mode” (54). Shows how the funeral elegy by W. S. “betrays evidence of having been influenced” by Donne and maintains that “there can be little doubt that W. S. knew at least the first of Donne’s Anniversary volumes,” first published in 1611. Compares and contrasts W. S’s elegy with the Anniversaries to show how W. S. “decisively rejects the new Donnean elegaic mode.” Points out that both poets “faced roughly analogous problems in composing mourning verse for individuals who...
were not themselves well known or exceptionally accomplished and whom they probably did not know intimately” (57). Observes that in the Anniversaries Donne, however, “solved this problem by translating Elizabeth Drury into an idea and a pretext” and, “[a]dopting a symbolic mode, he wrote public poems that display his learning and virtuosity, in the process transforming the traditional English elegy into a vehicle for theological and philosophical speculation.” Maintains that W. S. “may well have learned from Donne that one way of commemorating someone who had not achieved fame by virtue of great deeds is to make the deceased a pattern of goodness rather than of greatness” but that “in other respects he rejected the Donnanean moment as inappropriate for mourning the untimely and violent death of William Peter.” Points out that “[e]schewing Donne’s rhetoric of communal mourning, he adopted a rhetoric of personal bereavement” and thus his expression of grief “is neither symbolic nor philosophical nor witty nor hyperbolic nor remote” (65).


Comments on Donne’s endorsement of public prayer over private prayer, noting that, for him, “the public space of the church is the site for achieving selfhood, for maintaining personal wholeness, for realizing the individual ‘I’ not in spite of, but precisely because of, a collective act of prayer” (53). Notes that in a 1625 sermon, defending the superiority of liturgical prayer, Donne “challenges the familiar Puritan notion that personal prayer can be generated through only original and extempore worship” and suggests that spontaneous prayer “not only severs the worshiper’s ties to the church, but jeopardizes their chances for salvation” (88). Discusses Sidney in which Donne “explores the role that the Sidney-Pembroke Psalms might play in reforming public devotion,” lamenting “the poor quality of the Psalter used in the established Church of England” and claiming that “the liturgical efficacy of the Sidney-Pembroke Psalter lies in the power of its poetic forms” (86). Suggests that the modern preference for the Holy Sonnets as private and original poems over the more formal, liturgical poems, such as Corona, “mirrors Puritan attacks upon common prayer in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries” (87). Observes that, for Donne, “the project of writing devotional verse that reflects a simultaneously individual and collective voice never seems to have materialized.” Maintains that “[n]either the impersonal and detached speaker” in Corona nor “the personal and often anguished voice” in the Holy Sonnets “offers a devotional paradigm for common expression.” Points out that similarly neither Goodf nor Lit could be “assimilated to the language of public worship” (92). Observes that although he praised the Sidney-Psalms “for their potential efficacy in transforming church devotion,” Donne attempted “no similarly ambitious feats of his own” and that, once he became a famous preacher, “he more or less abandoned the project of writing devotional verse” (94).

621. ––––. “Poets in Print: The Case of Herbert’s Temple.” W&I 17, nos. 1 & 2: 140–52.

Maintains that although the first edition of Donne’s poems and Herbert’s The Temple appeared in the same year (1633), “the two books were by no means marked by a common strategy in presenting poets to the world.” Believes that “[t]he timely coincidence of their publication has no doubt helped to conceal the important discrepancies between Donne and Herbert’s respective presentations, discrepancies that speak directly to the ways in which seventeenth-century readers would have approached and received these poems.” Examines in detail the seventeenth-century editions of both poets to show “how powerfully habits of interpretation were bound up with, if not shaped by, the material decisions that constitute the printed text” (140). Maintains that since neither poet supervised the publication of his poems, it was the printers and publishers of their works that rendered them “such different figures as literary commodities.” Points
out that John Marriot, Donne’s publisher, was a London printer interested primarily in “transforming private, coterie texts into public commodities” and thus surrounded the volumes of poems he published with “letters to patrons, dedicatory sonnets, and commendatory verses” (143), whereas Herbert’s poems were published by printers at Cambridge University, who saw The Temple not primarily as a literary work but rather as “a private companion to the liturgical titles that Cambridge had recently won the right to print” (146). Observes that “[f]orty years after his poems were first published, in the very different climate of the English Restoration, Herbert’s poems are reframed in the manner that Donne’s had been from the start” (151) as a book of poems “written by a particular author with a particular history (versus a book of poems, akin to prayers or meditations, whose particularity or individuality is underplayed in order to emphasize its more general devotional application)” (150).


In a study of the symbolic uses of the image of King Solomon, both positive and negative, discusses Donne’s sermon preached at Denmark House in April 1625, a month after King James’s death, to illustrate that “Solomon-likeness” was not always “complimentary” (25). Discusses how Donne’s sermon “emphasizes the contrast between the ideal Solomon, Christ, and the dead King James” (26), pointing out that although the sermon “depends on the association of King James with King Solomon, Donne only actually mentions James because, ultimately, he is not like the Solomonic Christ” (27). Observes that, in spite of the king’s failings, Donne praises James’s faith and offers it to his audience as the “only true permanence” (31). Contrasts Donne’s sermon with the synopshantical sermon preached by Bishop Williams at James’s funeral in May 1625. Observes, however, that earlier, in his dedication of *Pseudo-Martyr* and in a sermon in March 1617, Donne “portrays James as the quintessential Protestant Solomon” (126). Discusses also Donne’s first sermon before King Charles I in which he “affirms Charles’s Solomonic role, invoking Solomon’s establishment of the Temple as a figure for the firm establishment of the Church of England” (220).


An introduction to *ValMourn* for students that contains the following parts: a general introduction to the poem; a biographical sketch of Donne; the text of the poem followed by commentary on individual lines; brief discussions of themes in the poem (death, love, religious faith, science), its style, and its historical context (King James I, metaphysical poetry, the baroque, science and the age of discovery); and a critical overview of the poem followed by short essays on *ValMourn* by Caroline M. Levchuck, Jennifer Bussey, and John Pipkin (each of which has been entered separately in this bibliography). Concludes with sources and suggestions for further reading.


Presents “a preparatory exercise in the establishment of the Donne Variorum text of *Goodf*” by surveying “the poem’s major substantive scribal variants” and by making “some attempt in the present state of knowledge to contribute to a preliminary filiation of the existing artifacts.” Confinces the study to “variants such as omissions and changes in wording which are of purely bibliographical significance.” Maintains that the study should be regarded as “no more than spadework undertaken in the conviction that the process of filiation and stemmatology can make genuine contributions to” what has been called “the culture and commerce’ of the
entire social matrix within which seventeenth-century texts were transmitted in both manuscript and print” (202). Concludes that the study “leads to two conclusions”: (1) “a group 2 artifact (probably, as it turns out, DT1) will prove to be the most admissible copytext of the lost original holograph” of Goodf and (2) “the Group 1 stemma for this poem is more complicated than can be illustrated on the basis of the Elegies.” Notes also that editing the copytext “will involve a painful choice between the readings of ‘turne’ and ‘tune’ at line 22” (211).


Argues that meditative poetry has “the ability to reproduce aspects of the meditative experience” and points out “the cognitive processes involved.” Focuses on the use of “composition of place” in Jesuit meditation and maintains that “three main abilities associated with ‘the composition of place’ are responsible for the meditative quality detected in poetic meditative verse”: (1) “The text’s ability to evoke an orientation process”; (2) its “ability to support diffuse perception and encourage divergent ways of processing”; and (3) its “ability to generate the mental set required for this experience, the absence of purpose, and to supply the conditions that enable such a mental set to exist over time” (203). Illustrates the theoretical discussion by a close reading of HSRound. Points out how ll. 1 and 2 of the sonnet “present a paradoxical visual image that suggests conflicting world pictures in a form that the imagination can encompass in a single intuition” and thus “evokes an exceptionally strong sense of wit and bafflement” but, at the same time, also “offers a space for orientation” (234). Compares Donne’s sonnet with a meditative Spanish sonnet, entitled “O Cristo Crucificado,” by an anonymous sixteenth-century poet.


An original poem based on Donne.


Translates into German (with English on the opposite pages) 18 selections from the Songs and Sonets, 3 of the Elegies, Corona, 5 selections from the Holy Sonnets, Goodf, Christ, Father, and Sickness—without notes or commentary (10–71). Includes a German translation of T. S. Eliot’s “The Metaphysical Poets” from Selected Essays (1921) by Wolfgang Kaussen (221–39) and an epilogue by Wolfgang Kaussen (241–64), in which he comments on the twentieth-century rediscovery of seventeenth-century metaphysical poetry and discusses the role of T. S. Eliot in the revival. Suggests that the theological, philosophical, and cultural upheavals reflected in metaphysical poetry perhaps better reflects similar tensions and concerns of our time than does the poetry of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Discusses briefly major characteristics of Donne’s poetry and notes that the familiar tone of Donne’s poems allows the contemporary reader to understand them without necessarily realizing their complex theological and philosophical underpinnings. Suggests Donne’s possible influence on or, at least, similarity to certain modern German poets. Contains also a brief biographical sketch of Donne.


Explores the “poetry of ideas, often of philosophical thought, and of thinking about philosophical thought, of science, and even of ‘consequent reasoning’” and examines “the character of knowledge and the reading experience” when a poem deals with “explicit ideas and arguments” (10). Considers FirAn to show
how Donne uses “the rhetorical resources of verse to expound ‘the new philosophy’” and, even more importantly, shows how in the poem “the turbulence of the verse movement and increasingly the choice of words embodies the ontological anxiety—anxiety about the place of his own being in the whole scheme of things—that follows from the perceptions.” Maintains that FirAn “involves new ideas about the universe, the power of those ideas, the rejection of those ideas and the subjective experience of those ideas” and concludes that it is “the peculiar space and resources of the poem,” in particular “the disturbed character of Donne’s lines which enables this” (11).


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and times, noting in particular the religious turmoil both in England at the time and in Donne’s life. Comments briefly on characteristics of Elizabethan love poetry and on the importance of the court and literary patronage. Surveys the general characteristics of the Songs and Sonnets, noting that “[r]ather than focusing simply on sexual love’s physical and aesthetic pleasures, or even its emotional qualities,” most of the poems “explore as well its deeper intellectual, psychological, and moral ambiguities” (429). Comments specifically on Val-Mourn, ValWeep, Noct, and GoodM, pointing out how these poems show how “anxiety over a lover’s fidelity is the main issue in Donne’s love poetry, even if it is often obscured by the poet’s subtlety and the range of the voices he adopts” (432).


Original poem on Donne’s effigy in St. Paul’s Cathedral.


Discusses Devotions and Martha Moulsworth’s Memorandum of Martha Moulsworth (1632) to highlight “a number of telling contrasts between modes of self-contemplation at a crucial transitional moment in the evolution of individual identity—or more accurately, in the evolving consciousness of identity—in early modern England” (167). Maintains that “although only eight years separate Donne’s text from Moulsworth’s, the effect of setting their conclusions side by side is to reveal the wide gap between their fundamental assumptions about themselves.” Points out that “[w]hile Donne hovers between the medieval exemplum and early modern individuality, Moulsworth seems to have merged the religious and practical into her personal and gender-conscious account of her life” and that “[s]piritual and metaphoric modes of thought, which dominate in Donne’s sense of himself, give place in Moulsworth’s text to actuality and the social framework as definers of individuality” (171). Maintains that this “movement from the spiritual context in Donne to the mixture of sacred and secular assumptions in Moulsworth, from the eternal perspective to the historically specific, from metaphoric to realistic modes of self-composition, from type to individual, and from a neutrally male to a gendered selfhood—all may be seen to epitomise the developments in autobiography which were to continue and intensify during the seventeenth century” (171–72).


Discusses Donne’s use of conceits in *Flea* to show that part of Donne’s wit comes from his showing how “very unlike things have something in common: things like a flea and a ‘marriage bed,’ or worse, a ‘marriage temple’” (38) or how a flea-bite can be compared to sexual intercourse. Claims that Donne cultivates “outrageousness” and explains why the “most provocative comparison of all” (39) in *Flea* is calling the lady’s threatened killing of the flea murder, suicide, and finally sacrilege. Discusses *HSRound* as an example of how Donne reworks elements of the traditional love sonnet, converting them into the service of religious poetry and, thus, instead of addressing a lady “with persuasive wit,” as he does in *Flea*, in *HSRound* “the wit is brought into the service of address to God, in renunciation, humility, and devotion” (67).


Maintains that “the most important structural fact” about the *Songs and Sonnets* is that “many of them interweave pentameter lines with iambic lines of other lengths to form stanzas of complex design.” Points out that “[f]ew such stanzas were written in English before Donne” and suggests, therefore, that Donne is “the first English poet to see the expressive possibilities of combining iambic pentameter with shorter and longer iambic lines to form strophic units notable at once for their lyric flow and intellectual density” (123). Maintains that “[t]he constant movement that we sense in most of Donne’s lyrics proceeds not only from his lively syntax and vigorously prosecuted images and arguments, but also from the mixture of lines that in their very lengths convey feelings, and even attitudes toward experience, of very different sorts.” Points out that “the shorter lines tend to emphasize the quick, light, fast-moving, and relatively uncomplicated, even comic, exploration of a subject,” whereas “the long ones tend to deepen, intensify, and complicate it, to slow it down and make it more serious, more problematical” (124). Cites as examples numerous lines and passages from the *Songs and Sonnets*, noting also some exceptions to his observation, but maintaining that “the usual song or sonnet of Donne” is “a poem that requires quick shifts in tone and feeling, a lively and changeable speaking voice, and, even in poems of deep gloom … a playful, even mercurial treatment of love, life, meter, mood, and feeling” (133).


In Chinese. Discusses the complex interaction between divinity and secularity, tradition and creativity, and life and art in Donne’s poetry. Comments on *Lect, Ecst, ElBed, Twick*, and *ConfL* to show how religious elements appear in Donne’s love poems and discusses *HSShow* and *Father* to illustrate how secular passion is skillfully incorporated in religious poems. Holds that the interaction between tradition and creativity and between religion and secularity challenges the old notion of a Jack and John Donne. In the interaction of the sacred and the profane, sees a combination of three elements: use of conceit, cosmic awareness of humanity, and the tradition of dream literature. Illustrates this idea by citing *SunRis, Canon, Air, Ecst, Anniv, Metem, LovExch, Noct, LovAlch*, and *ValWeep*. Considering the interaction of life and art, cites examples from *ElWar, Fever, Relic, FunEl*, and *Leg*. Calls interaction the “unique spell” of Donne’s works.

In Chinese. Discusses Donne's attempts to reconcile the old and new philosophy and maintains that such an attempt shows itself in three basic paradoxes and the poet's awareness of a cosmological individualism. Concludes that Donne is a distant father of modern poetry.


In the introduction (1–8), points out that, for the most part, Donne still awaits discovery in China and hopes that the present study will help readers understand Donne in particular, metaphysical poetry in general, and English literature as a whole. In Part I, “Love Poetry” (9–213), discusses the major stylistic and thematic characteristics of Donne's love poems. Argues that by exploring such themes as woman's unfaithfulness, man's fickleness, and love as the unification of body and soul, Donne conducts a dialectical search for truth. Shows how Donne uses an orderly past and chaotic present interactively to reveal the nature of man in a world of political, religious, and social conflict. Maintains that Donne's image of death in his poems shows how he has a sense of belonging to both of the two conflicting worlds. Holds that the pleasure of reading Donne's poetry comes from the vitality of his mind and from his elaborate uses of dramatic elements, paradox, and conceit. In Part II, “Divine Poetry” (215–70), focuses on Donne's desire to be united with God and on the archetypal journey in his religious poems. Sees Donne's divine poems as a record of his personal struggle to appropriate divine revelation to himself, to intensify his sense of moral obligation, and as an appeal to Christ as both lover and savior. Maintains that the religious poetry is motivated by a passion as strong as anything in his love poems and reveals his vigorous search for truth. In Part III, “The Sermons” (271–96), explores Donne's role as a poet-priest and his search for divine truth as seen in his sermons. Points out striking similarities and differences between his sermons and his poetry, claiming that his sermons are, in fact, poetry without rhyme. In the conclusion (297–315), maintains that Donne's works show a sevenfold interaction between content and form, convention and originality, life and art, literature and ideology, poetry and prose, mirror and lamp. Contains a bibliography (316–19), an index of works by Donne (320–22), and an index of names (323–24).


An imaginary letter addressed to Donne by a young poet.


In Chinese. Maintains that male chauvinism and colonialism are closely related in Donne's poetry and discusses ElBed as an example. Comments on how Donne's view was shaped by his life and by contemporary society.
2002


Discusses “the problem of divine imagery” in the seventeenth century and Donne’s attitude toward it. Surveys, in particular, Donne’s religious poetry, especially Cross, Corona, Christ, Annun, Goodf, HSShow, and HSWhat, to determine his attitude toward the debate that was waged over iconoclasm. Argues that although Donne “admits the power and importance of holy images as spiritual and intellectual aids,” his poems “consistently eschew physical, public icons, preferring to locate images mentally, within the individual, rather than in an actual church.” Maintains that “this position, which values the icon yet transfers it to the domain of private experience, shows Donne advocating a moderate Calvinist outlook between the two extremes associated with the ‘idolatrous’ Laudians and the ‘irreverent’ Puritans.”


Argues that Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli engaged “tropology as substance or content and not merely as form” and that “their assertions and affirmations inform the culture in which Donne thinks and writes” (13). Points out how Donne’s treatment of angels in Air, for instance, makes clear that the poem “is informed by the theological issues of his time and especially by those that bear on Christology, on the Eucharist, and more generally on religious representation and its effectual working” (16). Examines the tropological landscape of the time by focusing on the rhetoric in the debate among Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin on the Eucharist. Illustrates the point by analyzing “Station XII” of the Devotions in which “the distinction between metaphor and metonymy effectually disappears, thereby, as in Zwingli and Calvin challenging theories that assume its necessity” (26).


In Chinese. Argues that Donne’s poems are the product of his philosophical insights into the nature of love, religion, death, and the cosmos and that they reflect both his subtle emotions and the historical period.


Discusses English Protestant culture during the reign of Charles I. Examines sermons and theological treatises “to argue that Caroline religious culture comprised a rich and extensive stocktaking of the conditions in which Protestantism was celebrated, undercut, and experienced.” Maintains, furthermore, that “this stocktaking was also carried out in unusual and sometimes quite secular contexts; in the masques, plays and poetry of the era as well as
in scientific works and diaries” (jacket). Mentions Donne throughout. Comments, for instance, on Donne’s skepticism, as seen in Sat3, and on Lucius Cary’s praise of it in his elegy in the 1633 edition. Examines briefly also Donne’s complex regard of persons and the relationship between the theater and the pulpit. Observes also that “[t]hroughout his career, Donne sustains no consistent attitude toward the ‘new philosophy,’” but that in Devotions “he struggles to interweave a theory of natural plenism and holism with his belief in the ceremonial unity of the church.” Notes also that “[t]his fusion is meant to counter the frightening possibility that community and correspondence can no longer protect the witty self from isolation and singularity” and thus he argues against “those compelling models of the mind and of nature that threaten to destroy his argument for holism, plenism, and plurality” (210).


Reviews Dryden’s objections to Donne’s love poetry. Points out that Donne and others were fascinated with “the possibilities and limits of knowing” and cites Ecst as an example. Observes that the poem “takes on a double consciousness: it is both an attempt to assign a specific meaning to love and a retrospective description of the experimental procedure designed to achieve that meaning.” Maintains that the ecstasy is “not simply an event recounted in the poem” but rather is “precisely that which is being reported in a form (the narration of a hypothetical dialogue) that translates the signs of the body into a legible script of love’s meaning.” Maintains that Donne’s poem “recounts, in short, the procedure whereby a privately held notion is tested against the physical reality from which it claims to derive” and that “[t]he poem’s narrative stands finally as the experimental report that others must verify in terms of their own experience” (133). Points out that Ecst “presents the question of love precisely as an intellectual question (a problem of knowledge) rather than as one of affectionate, playful entertainment (Dryden) or of moral sentiment (Johnson)” (136). Compares and contrasts Donne’s poem with Marvell’s “The Definition of Love.”


Discusses how most writers of the early seventeenth century were dependent on patronage and how literature “became the unofficial currency of the patronage system.” Mentions Donne’s indebtedness to the Countess of Bedford “to help pay his debts” (346) and notes his anti-court Sat4.


Observes that Donne is “clearly the most striking instance of a major Tudor-Stuart poet who flourished in the context of a manuscript culture” and notes that “the sheer quantity of manuscript copies of poems by him which still survive (4,000-odd texts in upwards of 260 manuscripts)—and which must be only a fraction of the number once in existence—indicates beyond doubt that Donne was the most popular English poet from the 1590s until at least the middle of the seventeenth century” (122). Examines Donne’s negative views on publishing his poems and discusses their manuscript circulation. Suggests that Donne’s love poems and satires were the most popular, “with a reasonably receptive ‘market’ for
his miscellaneous elegies, verse epistles, etc., whereas “his ostensibly more serious, religious poems tended to be gathered only in later, more formal collections” (124). Notes that “by the 1620s large manuscript collections of his poems were being prepared, and recopied, and these proliferated well into the 1630s and beyond” (124–25). Points out that, even after the publication of the first edition (1633), Donne's poems continued “to thrive in a manuscript culture” (125). Surveys also the publication of Donne's prose works as well as their circulation in manuscript during his lifetime. Concludes that “[d]espite the huge industry employed in the past few decades in editing Donne, the study of his texts and of their transmission remains a field as wide-open as ever” (126).


Argues that the Songs and Sonets “are, above all, sports, jeux d’esprit, performances” and that “[n]ot belief, but vigor and astonishment are their metals, their content... [n]ot solutions, but sovereign emotion.” Maintains that Donne is “sovereign in the modern sense: sovereign inside, not over others; sovereign absolutely—if also, for poetic purposes, absolutely playfully” and that his sovereignty takes two forms: “a soul’s amorous identification with another soul, and imagination’s play,” with imagination being “the greater of the two” (110). Discusses this “sovereign play” in Flea, Canon, GoodM, SunRis, Annv, ValWeep, ValBook, ValMourn, Air, and Ecst—“with particular emphasis on the sovereign playfulness of his metaphors” (111). Maintains that in his love poetry Donne “celebrates the capacity for a sovereign joy, free of the destructiveness that Lacan detects in the wilder reaches of jouissance” (133).


Maintains that Donne is “very much alive in the twenty-first century” (263) and proposes to demonstrate his genius by commenting briefly on Donne’s life and on three poems: SGo (a poem of “libertine irony”), Ecst (a “superb erotic meditation” whose “sophistication touches upon sanctification”), and Sickness (a “devotional masterpiece”) (263–66). Maintains that there is “no great divide between the fervor and wit” of Donne’s early poetry and his later sermons (266). Concludes that the “extreme personalism, that never left Donne, can be regarded as the particular mark of his genius.” Notes that “[h]is voice still lingers, permanently unmistakable” (267).


Notes that in his Christmas sermon of 1621 Donne “praised human reason” for having invented guns. Suggests Donne’s source about guns is William Camden’s Remains Concerning Britain (1605), in which Camden expresses his view that “guns make life safer.” Points out that apparently Donne thought that “improved weapons meant less danger” and that “[f]ar from increasing carnage, artillery actually reduces it: a blessing due to man’s unfallen reason.”


Points out that although most readers read Donne’s religious writings composed in the decade before his ordination as “part of the process that led to it,” there is “no evidence that Donne saw it that way.” Maintains rather that “[t]he religious poems that Donne began to write circa 1608 reflect his involvement with a circle of courtly friends” and that “[h]is verse letters to Lady Bedford imply that he turned to religious poetry in response to changing court tastes” (88). Discusses Corona to show that the
sequence is “a charming, clever, but inconclusive poem” and that rewards for reading it are “more aesthetic than religious,” its purpose “to arouse delight and admiration among well-educated readers who would appreciate the range of its material (drawn from both Catholic and Protestant sources) and admire its author’s unsectarian willingness to refrain from drawing hard conclusions or pressing unfashionable enthusiasms” (92). Discusses the first twelve of the Holy Sonnets (according to Helen Gardner’s ordering) as essentially exercises in wit and says that one “should be wary of assuming that the sonnets are a variety of autobiography.” Argues that many of the characteristics of the Holy Sonnets that may seem “out of place in poetic meditation (ambiguous theology, bravado, readiness to surprise and shock)” will seem less so if one remembers that they were composed “by a freethinking wit for male readers.” Notes that “[t]he best of them are remarkably clever, accomplished poems” and that their “style and mode of self-presentation reveal the influence of the theater” (94).


Reproduces HSDeath, SGo, Anniv, Dream, and Ecst—without notes or commentary.


Discusses Donne’s view of angels by comparing and contrasting his treatment of them in Air, Dream, ElBed, HSWilt, and HSRound with the views of Sophia de Mello, Breyner Andresen, and Rainer Maria Rilke as expressed in their poems. Maintains that Donne captures the “mystical nature of angels, creatures living in one’s inner being” (30). Notes also that sometimes Donne’s angels are “creative self-projections of unconscious images” although “attached to the mystical vision of angels” (33). Suggests that Donne’s poetic vision of angels “opens channels to self-fulfillment through recognition of one’s sins” (60).


In Korean. Focusing primarily on ElNat, ValName, and EName, explores Donne’s attitude toward women. Rejects the notion that Donne is antifeminist and argues that his views on women and gender are more complex than many critics allow. Points out that, “[d]espite the male libertinism, the poems reveal anxieties arising from the male fear of the possibility of losing their traditional dominance over women.” Maintains that “these anxieties emerge most strongly through the problem of language and of cross-dressing” but “mostly through his [Donne’s] intricate manipulation of the male speakers of the poems.” Notes that the speakers’ attempts “to gain mastery and control” remain, however, “incomplete or frustrated.” Concludes that the woman in Donne’s poems “emerges not as an object of the male speaker’s desire” but rather as one “who threatens to subvert the patriarchal ideology” and thus “[t]he complexities and instabilities in Donne’s attitude to woman exposes the fictitious nature of the patriarchal discourses of gender which are manipulated to justify and rationalize male dominance” (104). (English abstract)


Discusses his appreciation of Donne and his career as a Donne scholar. Recalls his visit with fellow Donne-lover Jorge Luis Borges in Buenos Aires in 1966–67 and their later meet-
ings and cites Helen C. White as a scholar who “never lost her first love” (6), i.e., her love for the metaphysical poets.


Discusses Margaret Edson’s use of Holy Sonnets in her play Wit. Maintains that, for Donne, “wit often articulates the fierce, irresistible romance between torture and joy” and that Edson’s play “appropriates this kind of paradoxical violence in interesting and disturbing ways.” Observes, however, that in Wit there is “none of the probing, with the cunning tool of wit, the interplay of body, soul, and mind that informs so strongly the impassioned violence of Donne” (28). Maintains that the play “effectively strips wit of its complexity—its metaphysical obsessions, its craving for transcendence, its lust for God” and, instead, “adopts a reading of wit that suits its mistrust of intellect and apparent smoothing-over of spiritual conflict.” Believes that Wit is “not about engagement with life—the mind’s battle with both its epic capacities and limitations, the tension between human reach and grasp”—but rather “is about fleeing life: a flight conceived in pop-psychological terms as fear of emotion and a consequent retreat into intellect” (29).


Surveys “the role of secular literary forms in producing and maintaining an image of early modern London” but notes that “[a] more frequent presence in the cultural lives of its citizens than either plays or literary prose … were the sermons that made up the dominant discursive experience of Sundays and holidays” (560). Calls Donne “a preacher of exceptional style and power” and points out that his sermons given at St. Paul’s Cross are “some of his most politically engaged and ideologically careful,” citing as an example, his sermon preached on 15 September 1622, in which he defends King James’s decree “Directions concerning Preachers” (561) and acknowledges “the limitations and imperatives of self-censorship for clergy close to the court and dependent on its patronage” (562).


Introduces this collection of 9 essays by divers hands (each of which has been separately entered in this bibliography) observing that “this is the first book to study Donne’s writings in verse and prose chiefly in relation to ‘the resources of kind,’” i.e., genre theory. Points out that the contributors, though historicists, not formalists, are “various in theoretical affiliation and emphasis”; that “no one mode of historicist criticism” has been favored in planning this study; and that there has been “no attempt to discuss all Donne’s texts and their multifarious relations to kinds.” Comments on ElBed, SunRis, and HS Batter in order to suggest “some ways in which study of their relations to resources, and likewise problems, of kind may illuminate their interpretation.” Thereafter discusses how the contributors, by “focusing on genre, have shed new light on the interpretation of the Donne canon” (9).


Collection of 9 original essays by divers hands, each of which has been separately entered into this bibliography.

Reviews:


Examines Donne’s conversion from Catholicism to Anglicanism and suggests that “in the convoluted history of the English Reformation it is more symptomatic than it might appear.” Maintains that Donne’s writing “forms a summary and archetype of English religion in its most difficult century” (366). Argues that in the early seventeenth century “religious identities in England are not constructed around fixed points of doctrine” and that Donne, “like any intellectual interested in divinity, has to fashion his religion by means of a bewildering process of interpretation” (369). Maintains that “[t]o ascribe to Donne a cynical motive [for his change of religion] is as perilous as to ascribe a pious one, a false conversion as a true one” (383), and warns that his conversion “should not be confused with simple ambition, still less to agnosticism.” States that Donne “may not have been an English Augustine in the manner of his conversion, as Walton enthusiastically claimed,” but that “in the engagement of his religion in the dark matter of language he might still justly be called Augustinian.” Points out that Pseudo-Martyr and Holy Sonnets were written about the same time and represent “two kinds of writing seemingly diametrically opposed: public and controverted as against private and introverted” (385). Maintains that Donne’s sermons on the conversion of St. Paul reflect “a theological reticence, almost by a refusal to comment” (389) and that the grammar of his religious poems “projects a bewildering confusion of theological accents, which refuse to conform to a a rigid doctrinal pattern” (397) and which “try out faith and faithlessness by turns” (406). Discusses how Donne’s writings illustrate “the paradox of religion and literary culture in the wake of the Reformation” (417).


Textbook for college students. Contains a brief biographical sketch of Donne, a brief introduction to Devotions, the text of Meditation 17, and suggested topics for writing essays.


Previously published as The Works of John Donne (1994) without the introduction, notes, etc. In the introduction ([iii]–xx), comments on the characteristics of Donne’s poetry and the critical reception of his poems. Maintains that “[a] good Donne poem is like a coin flipped in the air: its attitudes are for or against, positive or negative, heads or tails; and in the transient blurred sphere before Donne arrests its fall, a three-dimensional richness of nuance is suggested.” Maintains that “[t]he pleasure of reading Donne should involve recognition of this unpredictability” (vi). Presents a chronology of Donne’s life and writings. Reproduces the Songs and Sonets, the Epigrams, the Elegies, Sappho, EpEliz, EpLin, the verse epistles, the Anniversaries, the Epicedes and Obsequies, Metem, and the Divine Poems, followed by notes, a bibliography, a glossary, an index of poem titles, and an index of first lines.


In “Introduction” (vii–xxi), presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and works, particularly his prose letters. Suggests that the letters are valuable because of the insights they offer into Donne’s personality, insights that cannot be obtained from his poetry and sermons because of their “overarching rhetorical purposes” (xii). Maintains also that the letters are valuable because they give us access to Donne’s thinking at different critical times in his life (xiv). Points out that the letters also contain Donne’s
own views on letter-writing and notes that, for the most part, there is very little in them about his poems, although they “give us an abundant sense of the personality and personal context from which his poems issued” (xx). In “Note on the Text” (xxii), points out that all the letters “have been transcribed from seventeenth-century printed texts or from old-spelling transcriptions; that the spelling has been modernized and the punctuation has been emended; that paragraphing has been supplied; and that obvious misprints have been corrected; that occasionally missing words have been supplied but when more than one word is missing no attempt has been made to supply the omission; and that contracted names have been expanded.” In “The Chronology of the Letters” (xxiii), points out that the letters cannot be accurately dated, partly because in printing Letters to Several Persons of Honour Donne’s son “was not concerned with providing a chronological sequence” and also because he “readdressed a large number of the letters and withheld dates from some.” Notes that, therefore, the letters in this collection “are arranged in order of composition as far as it is possible to ascertain this” and when only the probable year of a letter’s date, it is added “at the end of the chronological run for that year, after the precisely dated or datable letters, except when this would make nonsense of what is written in them, where a chronological sequence has been attempted” (xxiii). Reproduces 95 of the letters in their entirety (3–122). Concludes with “Appendix A: A Glossary of Names” (123–28); “Appendix B: Further Reading” (129); “Appendix C: Sources of the Letters” (130); and an index (131–33).

Reviews:


Discusses how ElAut, ElAnag, and ElComp are “in some respects catalogues of the characteristics of the ugly beauty tradition,” although ElComp “deviates significantly from it in not actually praising its unappetizing heroine.” Points out also how Donne’s elegies diverge from the tradition because of their “emphasis on male rivalry,” which is “latent” in ElAnag but “explicit, even emphatic,” in ElComp. Maintains, therefore, that these poems “help us further to understand both the conventions in question and Donne’s own status as resident alien in the discourse of Petrarchism.” Discusses how in ElAut Donne’s praise of the beauty of an older woman, “like his approach to the ugly beauty tradition as a whole, remains idiosyncratic and unsettling” (59). Comments on how in ElAnag, as in the other two elegies, Donne “plays on the paradox” (61) and how the poem “is impelled by anxieties about both literal disease and decay and the moral decay that Donne genders female.” Finds ElComp “the most interesting” of the three poems, noting how this elegy, which “twists Petrarchan tropes,” at first “appears to be a familiar version of the ugly beauty tradition,” only later “to slide into the misogynistic satire that is the road not taken in that tradi-
tion, its dark underside” (63). Discusses also the important role of the attacked rival in the poem. Maintains that Donne, “who was both resident and alien in so many areas of his life,” was naturally drawn to a “literary tradition that is at once inside and outside the norms of love poetry” (69).

666. Eads, Martha Greene. “Unwitting Redemption in Margaret Edson’s Wit.” C&L 51, no. 2: 241–54. Discusses how Margaret Edson’s play *Wit* “reflects the author’s unusual personal struggle to come to terms with both academia and orthodoxy.” Points out how in the play Donne “serves to symbolize both the intellectual life and Christian faith” and claims that *Wit* “ultimately affirms both Christian faith and serious scholarship,” although “[t]he affirmation may be subtle” (242). Notes that Edson apparently “regards Donne as more of a decoy than a role model” but that the power of his poetry “shines through” (251). Concludes that “[u]nwilling or unable to recognize the degree to which her play celebrates Donne’s work and literary scholarship, Edson also seems not to notice that “a distinctive Christian understanding of irresistible grace” informs *Wit*, even if the play is not “overtly Christian” (252).

667. Evans, Robert C. “Lyric Grief in Donne and Jonson,” in *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture: Shakespeare to Milton*, ed. Margo Swiss and David A. Kent, 42–68. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. Maintains that although the *Anniversaries* have received extensive critical commentary, the poems in *Epicleses and Obsequies* “have mostly been either neglected or rejected” (42). Argues that “these poems are more successful as poems—and particularly as poems of grief and mourning—than has been commonly assumed” (43). Presents a critical discussion of *Mark* as a “representative example” (43), arguing that the poem is “far more effective than has sometimes been claimed” (44) and showing how it reflects a “subtle, assured craftsmanship” as well as “intellectual wit and theological subtlety” (54). States that Donne’s poems of mourning “might seem more effective—both as poems and consolations—if we could only recall that they appeal less to mere emotion than to the mind, and that in doing so they seek deliberately to master passion by controlling and redirecting thought.” Concludes, therefore, that Donne’s “intellectual maneuvers” in *Mark* are “not cold or self-indulgent” but rather are “attempts to engage, stimulate, and thus reorient the thinking” of those persons pained by the loss of Lady Markham (55).

668. Faust, Joan. “Donne on Love: Sometimes the End Just Doesn’t Justify the Means,” in *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, 170–86. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press. Surveys various, often conflicting interpretations of Donne’s attitude toward women and sexual love in his poetry. Argues, however, that “the indisputable fact remains that Donne does express in many of his writings a disdain and even fear of physical love,” noting, however, that Donne “is not alone in articulating postcoital regret.” Surveys ancient and medieval views on sexuality that held that orgasm threatened male health and longevity and observes that often for early modern man, Donne not excluded, intercourse was, therefore, a “serious and fearful” act (172). Points out that since Donne was well-read in the medical and moral theories about male sexuality, he would have been aware of the risks involved in intercourse that such works promulgated. Notes also that “[j]ust as classical theories of the physical dangers of intercourse led to moral judgment,” so likewise Christian moralists “used medical and scientific theories” to support their condemnation of sex (179–80). Cites examples in Donne’s poetry of his “attempts to thwart his libido” and of his awareness of the so-called “remedies of love” (182). Maintains that “[t]he fact that not only Donne’s obvious cynical rejections of love but also his proclamations of true commitment can evidence apprehension of carnal love presents a challenge to Donne scholars” and insists
that “these disagreements and controversies concerning Donne's attitude toward love can only be refined and redefined in the context of the history of sexuality.” Concludes that “[e]choes of classical and early modern medical, ecclesiastical, and philosophical apprehensions of physical consummation in Donne's writings are too strong to ignore” (186).


Maintains that in *FirAn* Donne is “certainly indebted to the final, grief-stricken sequence” of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, “not merely for its approach to the world, but also for a specific image of loss—the ring of the world—that Donne borrows from Sonnet 338” (327). Discusses how Donne’s “manipulation of Petrarch's image of the ring of the world for darker poetic effect suggests the deeper scepticism at the heart of Donne's poem” (329).


Agrees with Karl R. Popper (*The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, 1968) that “knowledge cannot advance without conjecture” and that “on the other hand (but not paradoxically), the best use of any conjecture is to refute it” because “[o]nly through the refutation of conjectures can knowledge be advanced” (50). Points out also Popper’s distinction between “probability and verisimilitude in conjectures” and argues that “[w]hat makes a conjecture valuable is the degree to which its fact content enables refutation” (52). Challenges the conjectures in R. C. Bald's *John Donne: A Life* (1970), claiming that “it embodies the kind of conjecture that appeals to subjective prejudice about the value of probability” (52–53) and, for the most part, relies on Walton's *Life* (1640), “a work of religious propaganda that, intentionally or unintentionally falsifies its subject,” as a pattern (53). Says that Bald's biography is “one that, while departing marginally from Walton’s account, does not risk much chance of refutation and does not envision much factual content.”

Contrasts Bald's biography with Augustus Jessopp's biographical conjectures (1897), a work that is "bold and risky in comparison to Bald's" (58) and which “prompted searches for, and could be refuted by, particular discoveries of new facts” (59). Considers John Carey's *John Donne: Life, Mind and Art* (1981) as "a more recent example of risky and therefore comparatively valuable conjecture," a work that “invites and even prompts refutation” (60). Cites also the work of Paul Sellin in the 1970s and 1980s on Donne's role as chaplain for the 1619–1620 embassy of James Hay and Ilona Bell's 1986 essay on Donne's love letters to Anne More as further examples of works of conjecture that have not been refuted. Concludes with a "modest proposal … that we cease privileging the merely probable conjecture when the more informative, improbable conjecture is available for refutation" (61).


Essentially a review of Peter DeSa Wiggins's *Donne, Castiglione, and the Poetry of Courtliness* (2000).


Maintains that Donne's favorable reference to Aretino's letters in one of his early letters to Henry Wotton is “a possible clue to his early development as a letter writer.” Points out that it is clear that Donne was “also familiar with the rest of Aretino's works” (28). Explores Donne's interest in Aretino, “beginning with some critically recognized features of Donne's letters that have relation to Aretino's letters, and continuing to discuss other points of relation between Donne and Aretino” (30). Maintains
that Donne’s “early interest in Aretino’s letters probably focused on their style of artful self-presentation, including their interest in portraiture; on their satirical attitude toward Courts and courtiers; on their presentation of the art and culture of Venice, in particular of the portraits and other paintings of Titian; and on their generally Erasmian tone, especially in religious matters.” Concludes that “[t]hese are all areas in which Donne showed particular interest throughout his life, interest that to some extent may well have been shaped by his early reading of Aretino” (43).


Points out that Donne constantly courts death as he does women— “with the eye of the enlightened connoisseur” (4)— and that he seems to say that it would be a real pity if one were “to die without first having been seduced by one’s own death and flirted with it in order to grasp its peculiar beauty.” Maintains that “[i]f such a struggle with death is to take place, it is tempting to think that for a writer like Donne, it was first and foremost to be a verbal one.” Argues, therefore, that “[r]ather than the object of theoretical discourse or (Christian) philosophical inquiry death may have been primarily for Donne a question of writing” and that the “manifold representations of death” in Donne’s works seem to articulate what could be called a “Donnean thanatopraxis of writing” (4). Comments particularly on Noct, ValName, Mark, FirAn, Devotions, Biathanatos, and the sermons to show the “unsettling presence of Donne’s ‘writing death’” and “its textual modes of composition” (5). Points out that “we never really die, Donne seems to say, or, and what amounts to the same thing, we never really stop dying under the weight of sin and of the torments of this life” (12). Concludes that “[i]n the light of such a profusion of daily and intimate representations of death it is hardly surprising that Donne’s work should appropriate death not so much as a theoretical object as a model for its own genesis and (de/re) composition” (12–13).


In a detailed discussion of Carew’s “Fancy,” comments on echoes of Donne in the poem.


Maintains that a “considerable number of Donne’s poems clearly belong to the logic of exchange, give and take, debit and credit, within a well-identified coterie or circle of patrons in and around the Inns of Court” and that “[w]hether as answer-poems, or as poems of compliment, whether written to order or in the tradition of amorous verse, they operate as presentation pieces, structured around the use of the present tense” (15). Points out that “give” and “take” are among the most recurring verbs in Donne’s poems and maintains that, for him, “[p]oems are pawns in the world of literary transactions” (16). Suggests that one could “sum up” Donne’s life and works “in crude monetary terms, by reformulating the two most prominent moments of his career as cash-related operations: in the professional sphere, he sold his Catholic soul for a position in the Anglican church; in the private one, he married someone called ‘more,’ of all names” (17). Concludes that Donne’s poems are “gifts in the paradoxical sense Derrida has defined, at once given and soon forgotten, made present and absent in the same gesture, written as
presents or gifts, in the past or in the future tense,” and that “one could conclude and not conclude by saying that Donne’s avoidance of the gift takes effect in the form of a series of poetic suppressions, suicides and betrayals, second thoughts, or misgivings” (21).


Contains essays on 29 alphabetically arranged themes considered “representative of the major concerns of British poets over seven centuries” (viii). Briefly comments in individual essays on the following works by Donne: *HSDeath*, calling it “probably the most famous poem ever written on the triumph of Christ’s resurrection over death” (54); *ElBed*, noting its “witty eroticism” (122); *GoodM*, *ValMourn*, and *Canon*, commenting on how each reflects the theme of mature or true love and, thus, rejects the posturing of Petrarchan poets (134–36); and *HS-Batter* and *Father*, pointing out how Donne’s sacred poems are “as startling and unconventional as his love poetry” and how he often uses “highly physical, even erotic terms” in his religious poetry (230).


Surveys examples of recent genre criticism, both explicit and implicit, of Donne’s poetry, noting that genre has been “central to Donne controversies” as well as to “the interpretations of some of his most perceptive critics, even if not always acknowledged as such” (139). Comments in some detail on Barbara Estrin’s *Laura: Uncovering Gender and Genre in Wyatt, Donne and Marvell* (1994); Richard Halpern’s “The Lyric in the Field of Information: Autopoiesis and History in Donne’s *Songs and Sonnets*,” in *Critical Essays on John Donne*, ed. Arthur F. Marrotti (1994), pp. 49–76; essays of Camille Wells Slights, Paul Sellin, and M. Thomas Hester on *Sat* in *JDJ* (1991): 79–102; Heather Dubrow’s “Tradition and the Individualist Talent,” in *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (1986), pp. 106–11; and Heather Dubrow’s “The Sun in Water: Donne’s Somerset Epitaphium and the Poetics of Patronage,” in *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (1988), pp. 197–219. “That genres are compendia of resources,” he maintains, “does not mean that they are static” since “they may be used well or ill, not only by authors but by their readers and critics.” Suggests furthermore that “[a]t their most powerful, they are not present to the consciousness” (143). Points out that “[p]ressed too hard, genre criticism can go the way of Marxist theory, so that every text and the analysis of it offers the opportunity to recapitulate a particular ideology.” Maintains that “[r]enunciation of genre as the universal key to unlock the complexities of Donne’s works should not imply that it has nothing to disclose,” nor “should the variety of plausible disclosures scandalize the meta-critic into believing that genre has nothing to say about false readings.” Concludes that genre “remains a discriminator amongst readings” (144).


Discusses how, among Catholics in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-centuries, the Shroud of Turin “played no small part in helping to maintain the exalted status of painted images” (201). Believes that Donne’s religious poems reflect “his uneasy, perhaps even incomplete transition from Roman Catholicism to the Anglican Church” (201–02). Maintains
that ll. 13–14 of *HSDeath* contains a conceit very similar to one in Tasso and says that “[w]hat makes the comparison between the two sonnets truly engaging, however, is the possibility of connecting them to a phenomenon such as the Ostension of the Shroud of Turin in 1578, the event that may have inspired Tasso’s work” (202–03). Suggests that the “death-thou-shalt-die” theme found in Donne’s sermons “can also be connected to the phenomenon of Christ’s shroud and specifically to the Shroud of Turin” (203). Notes that Donne knew Alfonso Paleotti’s book on the Shroud as well as Daniele Mallonio’s amplified edition of the work and that he mentions the Shroud in *Pseudo-Martyr* and in his Easter sermon of 1630. Comments on Donne’s own shrouded portrait and the resultant funereal monument designed by Nicholas Stone and suggests that Donne’s sentiments about the Shroud are similar to those expressed by St. Francis de Sales.


Discusses the neglect generally given *Lit* in the past, surveys the critical commentary on the poem, and suggests why recently the poem has attracted “more attention than ever before,” at least among “those who have made some kind of investment in Donne” (65). Maintains that although *Lit* “has begun to garner an unprecedented amount of attention, it cannot have much of a future unless a more thoroughgoing discontinuity with its critical history can be wrought” (52).


Examines two nineteenth-century American editions of Donne’s poems and suggests that such a study reveals that “the need for a variorum text [of Donne’s poems] was glimpsed in New England as early as the 1890s.” Discusses, in particular, how the 1855 Boston edition, edited by James Russell Lowell, and the 1895 Grolier Club edition, edited by Lowell and revised with notes by Charles Eliot Norton, were “of critical importance for the impact” they had on both Grierson’s edition of 1912 and “in quite different ways,” on T. S. Eliot’s criticism of the 1920s (170). Reconstructs “the process by which these two editions were created,” outlines “their principal contributions to the history of editing Donne’s poetry,” and brings to light “some decisive discoveries made by Lowell’s daughter that help to account for Grierson’s disconcerted recognition that the edition he had originally planned was going to be largely redundant” (171). Observes that Lowell in the early 1850s was “the first modern editor to make substantial use of the two earliest editions of Donne’s poetry (1633 and 1635) and to begin the critique of the modern editorial tradition that descended from the 1669 edition” but that he did not effect “a radical break from the modern editorial tradition that descended from the eighteenth century.”
Points out that Norton was “the first editor to return as a matter of informed principle to the earliest printed editions for the verbal text” and that Mabel Lowell Burnett, his daughter, “by urging that the variant readings from all the seventeenth century editions be reported, began the process of relocating the prerogatives of eclectic editing in the power of Donne’s readers.” Maintains that “[t]he joint labors of Lowell, Burnett, and Norton bore fruit in the Grolier edition.” Observes that “[s]eeing that the Grolier Club edition had effectively anticipated his plan to anchor the editorial process in the 1633 edition, “Grierson “drew inspiration from Norton’s study of the manuscripts when he made far and away the most extensive study of the manuscript evidence undertaken by any editor” prior to the editors of the current variorum edition. Points out that “[s]ubsequent editors have tended to work within the framework established by Grierson and to exercise more or less eclecticism in printing editions based on information about the manuscripts uncovered largely by Grierson” (206). Points out the textual editors of the variorum edition are “now attempting to reconstruct the textual history of every surviving poem by Donne and then, on the basis of information gleaned from every seventeenth-century artifact, to choose for each poem its most appropriate textual incarnation to serve as a copy-text.” Concludes that, in this way, the variorum edition “has begun to demonstrate that the editorial work of James Russell Lowell, Mabel Lowell Burnett, and Charles Eliot Norton was far more integral to the textual history of Donne’s poetry than probably anyone, with the notable exception of Herbert Grierson, had previously suspected” (207).


Comments on the influence of Donne on Edward Taylor. Notes, for example, that Taylor’s “When let by Rain” is “a pure imitation of Donne,” having a “Donne-like stanza, with lines of irregular length and an invented rhyme scheme” as well as “Donne’s colloquial diction, his abruptness of entry, and his subject, ambivalence about departure” (179). Points out, however, that Taylor “does not do what Donne so often does, marshall the metaphors into a surprising argument,” which suggests that “he took from Donne a racy freedom of diction and the use of the conceit, but he was not tempted by, or up to, or persuaded by the ingenuity of Donne’s intellectual force.” Notes that Taylor’s “Upon a Spider Catching a Fly” might remind one of Flea but that “its style, the short-lined, knotty stanza, is much closer to Herbert” (280).


Points out Donne’s “unease about the self” (77) and maintains that Donne “discovers his own being or existence only when the ‘I’ as a unique and distinct thing has disappeared, when it repaired with his creator” (78). Observes that in Donne’s secular poetry “the narrator is the active controller of events” and “rarely doubts his mastery of the discourse, even when he deliberately reveals himself as ridiculous,” but that in his devotional poetry he “reveals attempts to gain narrative mastery as dubious” and “shows himself as passive” and “unable to act for himself” (80). Maintains that Donne “continuously questions what he can know” and “[h]is conclusion is that to know he must believe, that credo must confirm his identity, because identity rests with its ultimate creator God.” Wonders, however, if Donne really believes. Points out that Donne’s “arguing, reasoning, exclaiming and doubting in his poems may be the performance of belief rather than the possession of belief” and that these performances “may create a character called Donne, who is acting
a series of roles to cover what is absent, namely himself” (82). Notes that the editorial ordering of Donne's poems has led to assumptions about Donne's growth from doubt to belief that may be false.


Argues that in *Sat* 3 (ll. 103–10) Donne shifts his focus from religion to politics and commerce. Maintains that in the poem Donne satirizes “greed and self acquisitiveness” and shows that “self-centered, self-indulgent, and self-seeking motives are not limited to the sphere of religion.” Points out that, for Donne, “[g]reed is a vice linked to power, no matter which sphere it operates in.” Notes that the final lines of *Sat* 3 “situate power in streams populated with ‘mills, and rockes, and woods’” and discusses how “[d]eciphering these symbols is the key to deciphering Donne's final warning” (144), which is, “the perils the individual encounters navigating through religious, political, and commercial power.” Concludes that “[t]he conflict between the search for salvation and the pursuit of power is clear” (195).


Examines Donne's sermon of 25 January 1628 (1629 N.S.) on the conversion of St. Paul, not only its subtle and intricate argument but also its “formal elements,” i.e., its “structure, voice, and (perhaps most importantly) emblem” (120) to show how Donne, by manipulating an intricate pattern of allusions, challenges Charles I's theory of divine right. Explains, in particular, how in his sermon, “using the New Testament wisdom of serpents, Donne provokes in his congregation the thought of Charles's hypothrophied sense of the royal prerogative,” “playing the auditor like a fish on a line, giving a bit, withdrawing a bit” (130). Notes that Donne's family emblem was a sheaf of snakes and suggests, therefore, that he “inscribed his personal emblem on the text” of the sermon, “shaped it in his image, leaving us (his auditors and readers) to admire the caniness of John Donne the Statesman.” Maintains that “[d]ealing with the hot events of the moment, playing with fire—Donne operates with the aplomb of a snake handler” and suggests that perhaps when Donne gave the sermon his “apprehension was overcome by confidence in the apostolically protected (and emblematically represented) exercise at hand” (134).
the imagined stage, in terms of active incongruity, what the page preserves in the passive mode, as incompatibility.” Maintains that the “tendency to laughter” is “to dissolve, if not resolve, tension” (93). Discusses the dramatic in Donne's poetry and its “comic negotiation between high and low eroticism in Neoplatonic terms” (97). Points out that, even in a poem like Ecst, “there is a comic sense that the sexual urge is interrupting philosophy, demanding attention in a way that requires the rationalizing services of wit” (98).


Maintaining that rhetorical figures do not function automatically to produce a “particular effect” but are rather “polyvant” and must be seen “in relation to the context in which the figure is used,” examines the rhetorical figures in the Satyres. Points out how in Sat1 and Sat4 there is an “extensive use of figures in the service of a narrative situation” and that “the context is internal to the poem” (251), whereas in Sat3 and Sat5 “the context in which the figures can be seen goes beyond the bounds of the literary text and relates to the larger context in which the texts themselves were produced” (251–52). Discusses, in particular, the uses of asyndeton in Sat1 and the uses of various figures of repetition in Sat4. Comments on the overall rhetorical strategy of Sat3 rather than on one dominant figure, noting how “[t]his strategy relates both to the internal context of the poem itself and the broader context of the background against which it was written” (256). Maintains that, unlike Sat3, which “straddles the interface between the private and the institutional,” Sat5 is “firmly set in the public domain” (258). Contrasts Sat2 and Sat4 with Pope's versions, thereby throwing into relief the subtlety of Donne’s uses of particular rhetorical figures. Concludes that “[b]y examining the local literary context, we can discover the ways in which figures are used to achieve specific effects, including the way in which the same figure can be used for different effects” and that “extending the context beyond the bounds of the literary texts opens our eyes to the role which literary rhetoric can play within a broader social, intellectual and institutional setting.” Notes that, in the Satyres, “the role can be as diverse as recommending oneself for employment, or finding a safe path through the minefield of religious controversy” (262).


Discusses Donne's rejection of the Socinian heresy in three of his sermons—the first Prebend Sermon, the funeral sermon for Sir William Cockayne, and the two-part sermon on Gen. 1:26. Notes that in each Donne “unequivocally condemns the Socinians as heretics and warns of their growth” but points out that his condemnation of them involved not only his rejection of their antitrinitarianism but also their position regarding “the prominence of human reason in interpreting the Scriptures.” Maintains, therefore, that “what was at stake for Donne, far more than censuring a given heretical sect, was the conviction of his own idealism that Church schisms could be rectified by carefully maintaining the doctrinal foundations regarding biblical interpretation” (131). Observes that Donne “rejected the Roman Catholic position that provides the writings of the church fathers equal authority with the Scriptures” and yet, at the same time, “sought to mediate the subsequent problem raised by certain Protestant inclinations to elevate the authoritative role of reason once the authority of tradition has been undercut or removed.” Maintains that Donne's theology “really was neither Roman Catholic nor fully Protestant” but that “[h]is own idiosyncratic via media rested purposefully, though uneasily, on a tectonics in which even the slightest theological shifts of the three plates of the Word, tradition, and reason, registered the seismic effects of heresy and religious
persecution." Concludes that "[t]he especially delicate balance Donne sought was a measure not only of the breadth and subtlety of his theological reflection, but also of his frustration as an idealist who believed that the divisiveness of the Church could all be otherwise" (139).


Collection of 33 stories in which a character, Samuel Goldberg, a Jewish English writer at the turn of the eighteenth century, reads to a country gentlemen in order to put him to sleep. In Chapter 16, “The Challenge” (111–25), Goldberg reads and explicates for the king Noct, which is followed by a retraction of his explication.


Reports on an experiment in teaching students to read and write poetry designed by five 12th-grade teachers at Maria Carrillo High School in Santa Rosa, CA. Donne's ValMourn was among the 39 selections studied. One student wrote that he particularly liked the view of love expressed by Donne in ValMourn: “He wrote that love doesn’t have to be tangible … [It] is in the mind and heart” (66).


Maintains that “[d]eclining the lyrical mode advertised by their heading,” the lyrics of the Songs and Sonets “are characterized instead by generic resistance and subversion: their relationship to songs and sonnets is ironic and parodic.” Points out that “[w]ith neither his texts, nor his readers, nor the women whom he ostensibly addresses does Donne establish the relationship expected of a sixteenth-century lyricist” and notes that he “very rarely adopts a straightforwardly lyrical measure and never shows any appreciation of songs or singing” (73). Maintains that, in fact, the “indecorous colloquiality of Donne’s poems, the cacophonies,” and “the extravagantly modulated meters” seem to be “a determined rebuttal of the lyrical and the songlike” (74). Points out that “[f]or the received lyrical genres Donne substituted a metrical and stanzaic variety unprecedented in any collection of English love poetry” and that his poems “delivered a resounding generic rebuff to the lyrical and sonneteering tradition of the Renaissance, one that proved fatal” (75). Comments on Donne's flouting of Renaissance poetic conventions, such as “the formal and didactic seriousness of poetry,” the “generic hierarchy and the notion of generic decorum” (77), respect for social superiors and for “what as a rule most overawed Renaissance love poetry: his mistress” (78), Petrarchan and Neoplatonic posturing and pastoralism (79), and the public exposure of a personal love. Concludes that the Songs and Sonets “anticipate not the subjectivity which was to become the lyrical standard of the romantics” but rather “the monologues of Browning, which Browning himself designated dramatic rather than lyrical” (82).


Essentially a reprint of John Donne in the Writers and Their Works Series, no. 86 (London: Longmans, Green, 1957)—with an updated selective bibliography. See Roberts 1.


In Korean. Argues that the idea of courtly love “can illuminate the political and cultural ideologies hidden” in Donne's poetry. Examines “the discursive process of the knowledge system of woman’s beauty and love at the end of
the eleventh century, which is the beginning of the medieval period," and investigates "the relationship of knights, or courtiers, to their lord and the role of religion." Concludes by showing how the courtly love tradition "is transformed and recreated in Donne's poetry." Focuses primarily on the Songs and Sonnets (92). (English abstract)


Points out how Donne in his sermons urges his congregants to distinguish between "a legitimate sorrow for sins committed and the false grief kindled by melancholic humours" (69–70). Examines Donne's own melancholic temperament and "some of the era's received medical knowledge" about melancholy, especially religious melancholy, and traces "some of the more important developments in interpreting melancholy, particularly as readings of the discourse affected the soul." Comments on Burton's The Anatomy of Melancholy and discusses especially "religious melancholy's influence on the seventeenth century English soul, politically, personally, and provisionally" (74). Shows that "[a]lthough very different in many respects, Donne and Burton run on parallel tracks in their understanding of religious melancholy" and that "[e]ach of Donne's many applications of the term echoes or resonates with Burton, and thus with the tradition he capped" (86). Shows how "[h]aving positioned himself as a melancholy man from the outset, Donne employs melancholy as a recurring, stabilizing and focusing theme" (87) in his writings. Discusses, in particular, his treatment of melancholy in Devotions and in his commemorative sermon on Magdalen Herbert, as well as in other sermons. Concludes that Donne represents "the culmination of the tradition of melancholy as it was expressed in the English Renaissance" (97).


In Korean. Compares Donne and Montaigne and explains how both were "engrossed in exploring the subjective region of the mind, the Self" (30). Explores the relationship between imagination and poetry and argues that "poetic creation is both unconscious and conscious" and that poetry, "whether lyric or dramatic, is both subjective and objective." Discusses dramatic poetry as "a special poetic mode" and claims that "drama can only emerge when the imagination functions in a quite special way, showing sympathy for all the innumerable and conflicting aspects of human character." Maintains that "the dramatic imagination evolves its own unique form, integrating the essentials of poetry with the essentials of drama and bringing the two together" (31). Notes that the dramatic imagination is manifested, therefore, not only in formal drama but also in lyrical poetry. (English abstract)


Discusses Donne's indebtedness to patrons, especially to the Countess of Bedford, and says that, for some time, he was "virtually her laureate" (617). Comments on Donne's various domestic arrangements following his marriage to Anne More and suggests that several of the Songs and Sonnets and several of the Holy Sonnets were written during his difficult early married life while living at Mitcham, near London. Notes that, while residing at Mitcham, Donne was a frequent guest at Twickenham, the Countess's residence, that he exchanged verses with her, and wrote letters and poems to entertain and compliment her and her friends. Comments also on the Anniversaries and how the poems gained for Donne the patronage of Sir Robert Drury, who provided Donne with a house in Drury Lane, his residence for a num-
ber of years before he became Dean of St. Paul’s (620).


Collection of 26 essays by divers hands. Those discussing Donne (rather than simply mentioning him) have been separately entered into this bibliography.


Points out that, except for the Anniversaries, very few of Donne’s poems were published during his lifetime but that they were circulated among his friends and patrons in manuscript, which was the “preferred medium for most gentlemen authors.” Discusses Donne as a coterie poet and says that he was “the poet who was most widely disseminated in manuscript in the seventeenth century” (69). Notes that “[m]ost of the surviving manuscript remains of the broad circulation of Donne’s poems date from about 1620”; thus “the full impact of work he wrote much earlier was considerably delayed, reaching its widest audience only with the 1633 and subsequent printed editions” (70).


In Chinese. Briefly examines the fluctuating critical reputation of Donne from the seventeenth to the twentieth century and suggests that since the criteria of criticism changes with the spirit of the times, it is natural that Donne’s reputation “will change accordingly.” (English abstract)


Maintains that in his erotic poems Donne openly defied “decrees of convention” by rejecting Petrarchism and by choosing rather to follow the lead of Ovid. Briefly contrasts Donne with Shakespeare, who, in Othello, “skillfully always succeeds in giving the impression that he was conforming to the precepts that ruled the expression of sexual desire in his epoch.” Points out that among Donne’s erotic poems ElBed “stands out as the one in which eroticism is the everpresent prevalent feature” but notes that the language and style of the poem, however, are “elegant and the play on words is done in good taste.” Maintains that “[e]ven the many suggestive allusions are never improper or rude” and that there is “definitely no intention to shock.” Briefly comments on the eroticism in the poem, calling ll. 5–24 a “breathtaking ‘striptease’” and a “dazzling erotic scene” (200) and observing how in ll. 25–32 “touch becomes all important” (201).


Comments on the unique nature of Donne’s worldview, characterized by an internal and external religious, political, and literary struggle. Argues that Donne’s spiritual search includes both philosophy and aesthetics, as evident in his poetics. Provides brief biographical and historical information before addressing Donne’s use of the image of mystical unity, which leads into a discussion of Canon, Relic, and Fun. Concludes that religious feeling takes various forms in Donne’s works but at their heart lies a striving for true spiritual freedom and Christian love. Maintains that Donne’s search for the ideal was not only entwined in his soul, but was also grounded in a rational
process that supported the idea of the unity of all human existence in this search.


Discusses how at the end of the sixteenth century the culture of London “provided an important stimulus for experiments in a variety of classically inspired verse forms, which challenged the preeminence of Elizabethan courtly norms and laid the basis for neo-classical poetry in the following two centuries.” Notes that “these experiments in elegy, epistle, epigram and satire … defined a new kind of laureate ambition, which was based on the assertion of classical pedigree, a sharpened critical spirit and an implicit rejection of both courtly and popular literary kinds” (422). Comments briefly on Donne’s satires and his innovative love poetry.


Maintains that “[i]n the poetry of his secular years Donne registered the impact of his Catholic upbringing and of his reactions against it,” especially in Pseudo-Martyr and Ignatius, but that “his attitudes toward Catholicism found their most complex expression in his sermons” (358). Discusses two kinds of anti-Catholicism found in the sermons: (1) “a controversial or polemical anti-Catholicism —a theological or religious arguing with Catholic religious doctrines and practices” and (2) “a political or religiopolitical” anti-Catholicism (359). Notes, however, that “[f]or ecumenical, prudentially political reasons—and in order to distinguish his and the first two Stuart kings’ more irenic stance from the rabidly anti-Catholic rhetoric of the Protestant left—Donne tried to reduce controversy to a minimum” (360); “defended the English church’s via media against the extremes of Roman Catholicism and radical Protestantism”; and attempted to find “a continuity between the religion of his youth and the church he served in his maturity” (361). Points out that there were limits, however, to Donne’s ecumenism: “Religious separatism was unacceptable and toleration of Roman Catholicism impossible in a polity in which church and state were fused” (364). Shows how his “political anti-Catholicism is more aggressively polemical, most strongly directed at Counter-Reformation militancy, especially inflated claims of papal authority and at the new articles of faith proclaimed by the Council of Trent” (365). Observes that at times Donne “strained to support royal religiopolitical foreign policy” and was “sometimes ill at ease with the role of official apologist, both before and after his appointment as dean of St. Paul’s” (369). Claims that Donne’s “most vehement” anti-Catholic rhetoric was directed toward the Jesuits and explains his “doctrinal, political, and personal” hostility toward them (373–74), noting that for Donne the Jesuits became “an object of paranoid fantasizing” (376). Points out that in his later years Donne believed that internal, non-conforming Puritanism was a greater threat to the Church of England than was external, foreign Catholicism (378).


Presents a very detailed stylistic analysis of WomCon and praises Donne’s technical competence and virtuosity. Offers a detailed presentation of the contents of the poem, its uses of figures of speech, of sound, of diction, and of syntax. Compares different ways of reading the poem, highlighting its complexity. Discusses the contrapunctual construction and elements in the poem, its dramatic strategy, and surprise ending. Calls WomCon an example of the poetics of instability, noting how the illusion of
love is reinforced by the poem’s style. Calls the poem’s style baroque and/or mannerist because of its persistent tension and says that in the poem Donne’s aim is to deconstruct traditional prosody and aesthetics. Calls WomCon a minor poem on a major theme.


Discusses Donne’s use of numbers in his poetry. Points out the paradoxical play of numbers and the “syntactical deftness” and “economy” in Pry and comments on how in Triple he “turns the meaning of numbers into a number of meanings” (42) and creatively employs oxymoron and “rhythmic disfiguring.” Discusses how in Expir and ElComp Donne amuses the reader with “amorous math” and how in HSBatter he uses paradox and oxymoron to bring together the “usually antithetical realms of carnal and spiritual passion.” Claims that in “The Trinity” in Lit Donne’s yoking of opposites and his audacity “can compel and shock us, even out of postmodernism’s natural indifference to god and absolutes.” Suggests that Donne’s “spunky capacity to free poetic numbers from their merely quantitative senses represents an abiding mortal need” (45).


An original poem


Discusses Donne’s poetry in terms of the “dialectic between decorum and truth, the terms of which would have been more recognizable to Donne and his readers than some other concerns” (24). Shows how Donne “violates old decorums to reveal new truths—and new decorums” (28) and how he “identifies the disparities between the claims of decorum and truth, both within and between differing spheres.” Maintains that poets before Donne “had so socialized the world of private experience that their understanding was ripe for a radical review of its heavily decorous ornament by a poet who would insist on the standard of truth” (31) and who “often established the separate, inner private experience as the locus of value” (32). Points out that “[t]he energy necessary to expose false decorum, the power to reveal truth, derives from a naysaying that is variously manifested but that can most simply be named satire,” which “includes wit, conceits, surprise, inversions, and sudden shifts or transpositions” (33). Maintains that when “satire diminishes,” as in some of the religious poems, or “is weakened,” as, for example, in SGo, and Donne “accepts the truth of ordinary decorums of poetry, whether of love, religion, or praise,” then the poems lack the kind of power one finds in such a poem as HSBatter (35). Holds that Donne’s “attempts at longer narrative vary somewhat in nature” but that “none match his lyrics in success” (36). Concludes that since Donne “can sustain satire and praise in lyrics,” it is no wonder that “it was as a lyric poet that Donne performed his miracles of handling the most difficult feats straining decorum and putting truth to the test” (38).


Points out that in the Anniversaries Elizabeth Drury is “so unimportant as to never be mentioned by name” (107) but that “as vehicle for an anatomy or reflection about the world and human activity” she is “vitally important”
Argues that Donne takes Elizabeth’s death “as a means for an unfolding of everything he is capable of saying” about the “frivolity and insubstantiality of the world,” in a way that “explicitly relegates her to occasion rather than subject” (108). Maintains that Elizabeth becomes “the means by which the meaning of others is constructed precisely through ceasing to have physical meaning herself” (109). Discusses how “[w]ithin the poems the idea of anatomy is used in a variety of ways that can be linked with the dual aims of dissecting—coming to an understanding through a detailed examination—and constructing, this time of the poetic voice.” Maintains that “[b]oth of these functions are variously and contradictorily inflected in relation to gender” (110), with the feminine seen “generally stereotypically negative” (111). Shows how the FirAn, a poem that was “occasioned by the death of a young stranger, and nominally concerns the state of the world, ends up by being an affirmation of the rights and responsibilities of the poet” (112). Holds that the Anniversaries can be seen as “a series of exercises in writing,” illustrating how “flexible” Donne can be “within the framework of elegy and anniversary” and warns that one should not “underestimate the humor, as well as the wit, in the poems” (117). Concludes, therefore, that the Anniversaries “take Elizabeth Drury, the elegy, and the anniversary as material for the exercise of poetry and for exploring the idea of John Donne, poet” (118).


Points out that since the 1990s “a divide remains between people for whom it matters whether John Donne was Anglo-Catholic or Calviniist—or avant-garde conformist or hypothetical universalist—and people for whom the real question is whether his religious behavior reveals an anxious negotiation with absolutism or a homoerotic Christ, that is, between those who look at religion as propositional belief and those for whom it is a cultural system imbricated in structures of power, gender, ritual, sexuality, and so forth” (111). Examines recent scholarly work on the seventeenth-century religious lyric, “exploring characteristic limitations in each approach,” and then offers “a possible bridge between the two approaches by offering a third way” (112). Examines in particular Richard Rambuss’s Closet Devotions (1998), Achsah Guibbory’s Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton (1998), and Debora Shuger’s Renaissance Bible (1994).

Maintains that, although she has no argument with “the details of the way these works analyze particular texts and make particular connections,” she does question their tendency “to generalize that analysis to early modern religious culture as a whole,” i.e., “the tendency toward large claims that reduce a complex cultural phenomenon like religion to a purported essence (religion is felt on the body) or to binaries: humanist versus Calvinist, ceremonialist versus Puritan” (120). Emphasizes the importance of understanding theological discourse in the cultural study of religious texts so that “we can see why texts make particular connections or use particular language, or what rhetorical or therapeutic role a text may play, or which of the range of competing discourses the text employs.” Proceeds by sketching “some of the problems raised by references to religious affects in devotional writing” and by pointing out “some of the sorts of clarification that might come from knowing the discourse within which these texts operate” (122). Maintains that since “devotional texts existed within a literary culture thoroughly informed by theological suppositions about psychology and the working of language on the heart” and
“were intended to do a particular sort of cultural work,” it is “only by taking seriously what writers report about their inner structures and how the texts are to work on them can we see that expressions of anxiety or of holy passion might record a desired affect, an affect that the text is intended to produce, rather than a direct inscription of religious experience.” Holds that literary scholars “should not read religious literature as confessional statement, isolating the dimension of propositional belief from the dimension of experience.” Concludes that “the experiential dimension cannot come fully into focus without some attention to the way theological discourses of the period provided the terms in which experience was understood” and thus “the fault line between methods that attend to theology and those that attend to culture not only can but must be bridged” (129).


Contains a brief introduction to Donne’s life and poetry and calls Donne “the greatest of the metaphysical poets” (1), followed by 31 poems from the Songs and Sonets, 2 epigrams, 6 elegies, 2 satires, 3 verse epistles, Corona, 19 selections from Holy Sonnets, and 4 hymns—without notes or commentary.


Discusses how in the seventeenth century “urban space, newly configured in part by early forms of capital accumulation, produced forms of cultural capital and articulated certain discursive figures, modes of subjectivity and enunciation usually claimed exclusively for modernity” and argues that “the productive relations among city, subject, and text claimed for the nineteenth century are already at work in early modern London and Paris” (205). Cites Sat1 as “a compelling demonstration” of her argument about “walking city space” (207) and observes that for most critics “the specificity of the capital city and its seductive forms of cultural capital are ignored or relegated to the editorial apparatus, barely accorded the dignity of literary history.” Argues that, in fact, Sat1 “illustrates the impact of an emergent metropolitan market society on both the authorizing tropes of classical satire and the received terms of humanist discourse.” Shows how the poem “contrasts different kinds of cultural capital—books and reading, religious, philosophical, historical, and poetic, that is, the consolations of the study—with the luxuries of the capital and a developing world market: fashion and sartorial variety, perfume, tobacco, exotic animals, French and Italian manners, the theater, and sex” (210). Presents a reading of Sat1, showing how “the speaker’s street encounters are negotiated and mediated by the humorist and by means of trope and poetic figure” (215).


In Japanese. In Chapter 1, considers Hans Holbein the younger and the tradition of the God of Death. In Chapter 2, offers a biographical sketch of Donne’s life as a preacher. In Chapter 3, discusses ValName from the viewpoint of discursive meditation. In Chapter 4, surveys the Holy Sonnets, commenting in detail on HSRound. In Chapter 5, discusses Devotions as Donne’s spiritual diagnosis of the several stages in his illness. Comments on the “passing bell” in three of the meditations and discusses Donne’s characteristic view of the use and significance of church bells. In Chapter 6, comments on how in Devotions Donne employs meditation to overcome his fear of the plague and the “damp.” In Chapter 7, discusses Appar as a comic satire that belongs to the tradition of songs of threat and cursing. In Chapter 8, reviews Donne’s last years and comments on his last sermon. In Chapter 9, discusses Jo-
Joseph Hall. In Chapter 10, reminisces about his visit to an Amish town in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and how he had in mind Sat3. In Chapter 11, surveys the customs and conventions of English village life before and after 1600. In Chapter 12, compares Charles Dickens and T. S. Eliot in terms of tenebrism and briefly mentions Noct, Fare, and ElAut. In Chapter 13, notes the relationship between English literature and religion.


Translated into Dutch by Harry Naus as De rituele moorden (Aartselaar; [Oosterhout]: Orega, 2003).

A mystery novel in which the motive for murder lies in Donne’s poetry.


Points out that six of the Holy Sonnets deal with two aspects of love: HSSpit, HSWhy, and HSWWhat “are concerned with the Atonement and the Creator’s love for His creatures” while HSBBatter, HSWilt, and HSPart focus on “man’s love for God.” Sees these latter three as sublimations of Donne’s love for women and notes how in his sacred poems he employs sensual love “to illustrate his faith in God’s mercy” (219). Maintains that to understand Donne’s sacred poems one must first understand his secular love poems; therefore, surveys Donne’s attitude toward sexual love by examining selected love poems. Holds that Donne’s view of love changed after his marriage from purely sensual love to a kind of spiritual love. Notes that in HSSShe Donne makes it clear that his love for his wife led him to his love of God. Comments on Donne’s view of God’s love in HSSpit, HSWhat, HSWhy. Concludes that Donne’s love as expressed in the Holy Sonnets emphasizes the need for a “dynamic relationship” between God and man (237).


In Korean. Compares and contrasts Donne and Herbert as religious poets. Points out how Herbert portrays his inner conflicts to help other Christians face and resolve their similar conflicts whereas Donne’s poetry is “a stage on which he performs his Christian drama with sin, guilt, death, and resurrection as major features of his religious experience.” Says that for Donne poetry is “a more powerful sermon than sermons preached in the pulpit” (34). Observes, however, that the theological positions of Donne and Herbert are as different as their lives, differences that become clear in their poetry. Proceeds to contrast the two poets by analyzing from a theological point of view selected poems, noting in particular their different views on predestination and grace. Maintains that, unlike Herbert’s poems, Donne’s religious poems reflect the influence of Arminianism and are anti-Calvinistic. Maintains that the theological perspectives of both poets are based on Augustinianism “but in quite a different way” (36). (English abstract)


In discussing James I’s patronage of writers, says that his “most valuable service to literature was to encourage John Donne to take holy orders” (329) and briefly traces, as a result of the king’s patronage, Donne’s advancement in the Church. Maintains that the king’s patronage not only “secured the livelihood of one of the most adventurous literary intelligences of the age,” but also it “was incidentally responsible for one of the glories of the religious arts in England—the sermons Donne preached in the last fifteen years of his life.” Points out that Donne “designed his writings to cut a figure to impress and attract the attention of men or
women of authority who might offer him employment,” noting, however, that “[t]his is not to underrate the literary value of Donne’s poetry, but rather to indicate its important social dimension.” Observes that although Donne had “brief successes” with Sir Thomas Egerton; Lucy, Countess of Bedford; and Magdalen Herbert, King James “was his salvation, finally responding to the accumulated evidence of Donne’s mastery of language and ideas” (130).


Discusses “the role of the visual arts in consoling, consolidating, and even creating English Catholic communities” (112), especially portraiture, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Maintains that Catholics of this period “learned to use the portrait as a partial substitute for other icons supportive of their belief” (113). Briefly comments on Donne’s Catholic heritage and his interest in portraits and notes that “throughout his life he seems to have been irresistibly drawn to the world of sacred images, and by the end of his career he had, at least in relation to the issue of iconoclasm, swerved back dramatically into the community from which, whether from strategic reasons or genuine conviction or both, he had in Pseudo-Martyr publicly cut himself off” (116).

721. ———. “A Man is to Himself a Dioclesian: Donne’s Rectified Litany.” JDJ 21: 35–49.

Observes that Lit is “an absurdly neglected poem” and that, for the most part, it has been “relegated to the back burner of Donne studies, if not altogether ignored” (35). Finds such neglect strange since the poem, she claims, is “one of the most cerebral exercises in devotional poetry of the period” and also “contains more personal revelations about Donne himself than any other poem.” Suggests that Lit was written for “the anxious community of Donne and his friends, wracked by, yet energized by, indecision about confessional choice” (46) and that the poem tells us “more about the compromises he made with himself about leaving the old religion” (47). Points out, for example, that in Lit, “by writing stanzas in which the ‘I’ and the ‘we’ enter and depart,” Donne challenged “the basic distinction between clergy and laity, between minister and congregation, that is so emphatically displayed in the antiphonal structure of the Catholic litany, and preserved in the Protestant one” (46–47) and that he exchanged “the mindlessness of simple repetition” for “thoughtful interrogations of all the different types of prayer, and the predications from which prayer might be thought to extricate us, as well as the predicaments it, and thought, themselves create” (47). Concludes that “as we continue our communal struggle to understand John Donne and his endlessly shifting middle position, we cannot afford to ignore A Litany” (48).


Comments on the influence of Donne on Elizabeth Bishop’s poetry. Cites, as examples, “The Weed” and “Sonnet.” Notes that “Donnean echoes are strongest … in the small number of privately imagined, first-person plural scenes of Bishop’s amatory verse,” citing as examples the never published poem “It is marvelous to wake up together” and in “Roosters.” Suggests, however, that even in late poems like “The End of March” and “The Moose,” there are also Donnean overtones (107).


Discusses references to the body—“carnality, the flesh, the corporeal”—in Donne’s poetry, those moments “where seduction takes place
litterally (or is about to take place literally, as an event) in the hope of providing a "provisional answer" to the question: "how does eroticism (the erotic in/of the poetic text) come up against its limits, i.e., pornography and death?" (35). Offers readings of ElBed, Flea, and HSBat
ter. Maintains that Donne's texts are "texts of desire in the sense that the instability of the text is always at work: puns, wit, circumvoluted conceits" and that his poems are "poems of seduction, poems that are trying to seduce the addressee, the mistress, to bring her to yield." Concludes that it is "ultimately in the textual deployment of ingenuity, in the tours de force, in the trouvailles, in the intellectual prowess that the poetics seduce, that the sensual—the grain of the text, the grain of the skin—is linked to (and not divorced from) the abstract" (44).


Contains the following 10 original essays, each of which has been separately entered in this bibliography: (1) Guillaume Fourcarde, "'A Copy to learne by': John Donne's 'Writing Death'" (3–14); Marie-Dominique Garnier, "if thou canst give it, then thou never gavest it': John Donne's Dunning Letters" (15–22); Michael Schoenfeldt, "Thinking Through the Body: Corporeality and Interiority in Donne" (25–35); Claudine Raynaud, "Naked Words: Figures of Seduction in Donne's Poetry" (37–45); Gilles Mathis, "Woman's Constancy' de Donne: Une approche stylistique" (47–73); Thomas Healy, "Credo Ergo Sum: Donne and Belief" (75–84); Peter Vernon, "John Donne, New Philosophy and Doubt" (85–92); Richard Hillman, "The High, the Low and the Comic in Donne" (93–101); Richard Todd, "In What Sense Is John Donne the Author of the Songs and Sonnets?" (105–17); and Helen Wilcox, "Miracles of Love and Wit: John Donne's 'The Relic'" (119–37).

725. Roebuck, Graham. "John Donne and 'All the World.'" RenP, pp. 77–89.

Discusses "the question of Donne's attitude to the popular theatre of the day," observing that some modern critics and scholars maintain that Donne was "so intimately familiar with the popular theatre of the day that explication and criticism of his poetry should proceed with the theatre as a principal context" while others argue that Donne's view of the theater was cool and even hostile, "as evidenced by the meager references in his poetry to the stage" and by "the evident antagonism of his references to it in his sermons" (71). Suggests, however, that Donne's play with the words "world, flesh, and devil" in ll. 13–14 of HSScene echoes Shakespeare's "extended descant on the theme in I Henry IV, Act II, scene iv (the play-acting scene)" (86). Points out that Donne could have seen the play on stage in 1597, although there is no evidence to support such a claim. Concludes that, even if HSScene was "in some way occasioned by a specific experience of the theater," it does not solve the question of Donne's "attitude to the theater" (89).


Argues that the rhetorical strategy of Donne's poetry reflects the skepticism and uncertainty of his time that was brought about by the breakdown of traditional authority and of generally accepted verities and by the rise of new scientific discoveries and intense theological controversies. Sees Donne's doubting conscience and his questioning of authority in his uses of paradoxes and conceits in his poetry as he challenges the authority of literary imitation and mimesis. Points out how Donne sees authority as an endless process of questioning and correcting one's intellectual assumptions and sensual data. Discusses how each of Donne's poems is a demanding self-consuming artifact and how his wit is intended to foster a search for truth.

In a literary and cultural history of England in the year 1621, observes that sermons “make up almost half the total number of 1621 texts which survive,” noting that “there are about 95 examples extant, though of course many more sermons were preached than have survived in print” (32). Comments on Donne’s sermons preached in 1621, noting how “they can be approached both as examples of a self under examination and as events with a political context” (33). Discusses, as an example, Donne’s sermon of 7 January to the Countess of Bedford; his 8 April sermon preached at Whitehall for its “particularly startling anatomical image of self-examination in the context of a sermon” (35); and his Christmas Day sermon preached at St. Paul’s for its brilliant meditation on the paradox of light. Concludes that these three sermons give us “an exemplary form of spiritual biography, if not autobiography,” as Donne “places his own identity under examination for the edification of his audience, and of himself.” Notes how each of the sermons “is aimed at a particular audience and preached in a particularly resonant political context, while each is also focused inwards upon the speaker” (41). Contrasts Donne’s sermon style with that of Lancelot Andrewes. Comments also on publication of the 1621 edition of the *Anniversaries*. Points out that Donne had no hand in the publication of the edition but that Thomas Dew, the publisher, likely “saw an opportunity to reprint poems by someone in the public eye” (135). Suggests that for readers in 1621, eleven years after Elizabeth Drury’s death, probably “the poems’ more abstract and meditative features would have stood out” (137).


Presents a brief introduction to Donne’s life and works for doctors. Quotes ll. 109–17 of *Lit* as reflecting Donne’s view of doctors.


Discusses how in the seventeenth century mirrors and microscopes “generated a new visuality which had an enormous impact on philosophical and poetic discourse.” Maintains that “[o]ptical media as prostheses for the eye effectuated an empirical widening of the world and at the same time caused a separation between the subject of cognition and the scientific object.” Argues that “[t]his paradox sensitized poets and philosophers to the infinitesimal” and that “[a]s a consequence, Baroque philosophy counters empiricism with a speculative theory about the relation between macro- and microcosm.” Points out that “[i]n this discourse, media become metaphors, and “the hall of mirrors the architectonic allegory of the cosmos” (1). Discusses this concept as reflected in *Canon, GoodM, ValWeep*, and *Witch*, comparing Donne’s use of mirror and reflection imagery with that of Marvell.


Says that Donne is “almost certainly the most anthologized author in Anglican history.” Points out that although Donne wrote often about death, he is not “a depressing, morose author” (48). Comments briefly on Donne’s life and religious development, his early secular and later sacred poems, *Devotions*, and the sermons. Presents selections from *Essays*, the sermons, *HSRound, HSDeath, HS Batter, Father*, and *Devotions*, followed by questions for reflection and discussion.

731. **Schneider, Ulrike.** *Kosmographie in der englischen Dichtung 1600–1660.* (Europäische Hoch-
Surveys cosmological images, references, and influences in early seventeenth-century English poetry in three chapters—one on heavenly bodies (27–129), a second on world concepts (131–250), and a third on geography (251–327), preceded by an introduction (13–26) and followed by final considerations (329–36) and a bibliography (327–60). Discusses Donne throughout, noting, in particular his multifaceted uses of the concept of the macrocosm-microcosm and comparing him with other poets of his day, especially Cowley. Maintains that Donne better understood the significance of the New Philosophy brought about by the Copernican Revolution than did most of the writers and thinkers of his time and shows that from the new discoveries, especially those in cartography and voyages of discovery, Donne developed new metaphors. Comments in detail on Donne’s use of cosmic images in both his secular and religious poetry.


Examines “the complex relationship” of the soul to the body in Donne’s poetry (25) and investigates “the way that Donne thinks and feels through the body, anchoring his ineradicable fears, desires, hopes, and persuasions in a decidedly corporeal language” (26). Points out that “[w]hat emerges from such an exploration of Donne is not a consistent vision of the soul-body relationship, but rather a consistently rigorous investigation of the ontological and lyric possibilities of their various models of contiguity.” Maintains that “much of what we value in Donne emerges from his aggressive participation in the various possible permutations of soul-body dispositions” and that his “investigations of soul-body relations emerge from within a physiology that imagined souls and bodies as far more closely connected than we post-Cartesians tend to allow” (26). Suggests that “one of the signature genres and gestures of Donne’s poetry, the valediction, takes on such profound meaning for him because of his deep investment in the embodied nature of self.” Observes that, if, as Donne believes, “one’s core being is constituted not only within but also by one’s body, separation from that which one loves becomes a kind of death in a sense far deeper than metaphor can approach” (28). Discusses the theme of embodiment in both selected profane and sacred poems in order to show how Donne “explores in his poems a complex and intricate linkage of thought, feeling, and corporeality” (32).


Comments on Katherine Philips’s appropriation of Donne’s poetry and notes how she “reworks Donnean tropes for her gynocentric focus” (774).


Discusses the changes in seventeenth-century studies over the past several decades, noting, in particular, that “the study of the texts and lives of early modern women is one of the most important and fastest-growing areas of scholarship in our time.” Considers “how these women writers disappeared so completely as to make us think they never existed” and asks “what difference it makes, in our reading and thinking, that so many texts by women authors now happily co-exist with those by male authors” (160), such as Donne, Jonson, and others. Notes that Katherine Philips was “one of the rare survivors of this oblivion” (160) but observes that, for the most part, women writers were seen “as members of an exclusive category” and “were not by and large included in anthologies more generally” (164). Points out that if women writers “disappeared under the category of ‘women writers,’ as an oddity, a social category, a marginal group, they were to reappear a few decades later in the same guise; in anthologies composed exclusively of women writers (166). Observes, however, that these early collections “paved the way for far more detailed and scholarly attention” (166–67)—“for single editions of women writers, numerous anthologies, treatments of women’s lives, and work by cultural and literary historians and critics, for work so extensive that it must be encompassed in bibliographies rather than in citations of individual texts.” Maintains that the emergence of women writers corrects “a historical mistake” and makes clear that there were women writers, “in quite significant numbers, among the nobility and even among the working classes” (167). Points out that “[b]esides performing the work of discovery, recent work on women writers increasingly takes them seriously” (168). Concludes that it is evident that “[t]he poetic landscape of early modern England is now indisputably of mixed gender” (169).


Discusses traits of mannerist art in Donne’s verse epistles and Elegies. Maintains that “[a]ll Donne’s complimentary verse letters function with the aesthetic ecosystem of Mannerism: they are poems of devoted praise, self-abasement, and ingenious display passing to and fro between friends” (42). Supports this claim by commenting in detail on Storm and Calm, maintaining that the poems, Donne’s “skeptical diptych miniature history,” are “really a history that becomes a skeptical miniature self-portrait, and not just a portrait of him but also, by extension, of his reader.” Maintains that “in their intellectual and emotive acuteness and poetic confidence the verse epistles may well be, in the end, letters of friendship and encouragement not to another, but to oneself” (46) and that they are “designed largely, many purely, as effortless and novel displays of art” with “very little or no substantial content base aside from their own artfulness” (47). Argues furthermore that the Elegies “share this mode of showing art, but, while still polished, they speak in a more rebellious, sexualized, and anti-mores voice appropriate to their neo-Ovidian genre.” Notes also that, unlike the verse epistles, the Elegies are “reliantly focused on the physical, sexualized, and female body, though there are a number of male (self) portraits throughout the collection” (48). Suggests that Donne in the Elegies “reveals his awareness of the Mannerist obsession with ‘showing art’ and the central role of the nude in this project” (49). Surveys several of the elegies but presents a more detailed critique of ElFatal.


Mentions Donne’s views on friendship. Briefly comments on HWKiss as reflecting “[t]he sense of friendship as a social form set in opposition to everyday life and real politics” (44) and notes how in the poem friendship “entails an act of self-erasure that can only magnify the
self and improve its strengths: it disposes of a self but to that self’s advantage” (45). Discusses briefly BedfShe as “involving a degree of cross-gender identification through friendship” and points out how the poem “goes outside the paradigmatic friendship terms of Donne’s literary-philosophical context, representing one of the few idealized friendships gendered female in Renaissance literature up to the midseventeenth century” (86). Points out how in the poem “[t]he spectacularly effective vision of friendship, gendered female, appears as exemplary to the male gaze instead of serving as an object of its desire in an erotic sense” (88–89). Comments briefly on Donne’s view of lesbian eroticism as seen in Sappho.


Comments on how in his criticism Louis Martz is “sensitive to the similarities and the differences” between the meditative poetry of Donne and his contemporaries and the work of modern poets, such as Theodore Roethke (136). Notes the influence of Donne on Roethke, especially in the first seven poems of his group of poems entitled “Sometimes Metaphysical” (142). Concludes that, “[l]ike Martz the critic, Roethke the poet was at home in both the seventeenth and the twentieth centuries” (149).


A play about Donne.


Presents a general biographical sketch of Donne’s life and works and comments on his influence on the work of other poets.


Rejecting the view of literature as “artfully crafted, smooth discourse” and challenging “Romantic and New Critical readings of prophetic language,” argues that “prophetic language is better understood as baroque.” Maintains that “there is something about the prophets that is ‘dark,’ ‘stammering,’ ‘secretive,’ ‘shadowy,’ ‘bizarre,’ and ‘colossal.’” Notes how prophetic word “describes itself as fire, metal or sword” and “has more in common with the strange disjunctive images of an ‘anti-literary’ figure like John Donne.” Argues that prophecy, like Donne’s poems and sermons, “creates heterogeneous, counter-intuitive linkages and makes itself felt through the skin and through the flesh.” Maintains that Donne and the prophets have in common “the desire to split and disrupt language—a desire that, in prophecy, represents the speech of God as a mind-bending, wor(l)d-bending force” (47). Discusses Donne as “an icon of the baroque and the anti-literary” (58), finding many similarities between Donne and the prophets in their uses of language.


Discusses briefly Donne’s role as a religious poet, devotional writer, polemicist, and preacher in the religious life of his time. Observes that when Donne preached at St. Paul’s, “[s]ervices took place in the choir, divided by only a screen from the infamous nave, where London merchants, lawyers, gallants and riff-raff met for otium and negotium alike” (517). Also points out that although Donne showed “virtually all his writings to a handful of close friends, the divine poems seem not to have circulated more widely; in sharp contrast to the Satires and Elegies, they leave almost no trace
in the verse miscellanies of the period,” noting that the “late sonnets, including the one on his wife’s death, are preserved in a single manuscript” (518).


Discusses briefly how the Satyres comment on “the sociolinguistic situation of the early 1590s.” Points out that “[b]oth poetry and nonaesthetic discourse are said to exhibit similarly marked heteroglot tendencies” and discusses how Sat2 and Sat4, in particular, comment on “a trend toward pronounced heteroglot form.” Comments on how in Sat4 (ll. 35–44) “[t]he all-inclusive speech of the satirized figure more offends the speaker than any specialized jargon of soldiering, pharmacy, or law, its pretentious eclecticism surpassing pedantry’s ‘motley tongue’ for offensiveness” (67). Points out that in Sat2 the speaker, although he hates poets, “turns his wrath from them because their futile pursuits ‘punish themselves’” and in ll. 43–58 focuses his hatred on Coscus, “who combines the linguistic attributes of poet with those of lover and lawyer” (68). Says that in Sat2 Donne “mocks a contemporary polyglot aesthetic by embodying its style in a concrete situation” (69).


Discusses Donne from a postcolonial perspective, going beyond just familiar references in his poetry “to consider all of Donne’s writing, together with his more explicit links to colonial enterprise and imperial endeavor” (1). Claims that “Donne’s many references to conquest and discovery constitute a veritable colonial discourse, a consistent rhetoric of appropriation that is ultimately inseparable from the erotic charge of his poetry” (1–2). Comments on how Donne’s poetry is “thoroughly imbued with his colonial discourse” (2), citing examples from the *Elegies*, *Epigrams*, *Satyres*, verse epistles, *Songs and Sonets*, and the *Divine Poems*, as well as the sermon to the Virginia Company (1622). Surveys also Donne’s “direct involvement—marginal in the case of Ireland, more concrete in that of Virginia—in the early history of colonization and discovery” (3). Suggests that Donne’s ecclesiastical career may be seen as “a form of compensation” for his “colonial aspirations” (13). Insists that Donne’s “potent blend of erotic, religious and colonial imagery does not exist in an ideological vacuum” (14). Concludes that, although interest in Donne seems to be fading these days, “the light thrown by historicist, feminist and postcolonial approaches on Donne’s rhetoric of erotic and colonial appropriation could perhaps help to reverse this trend” (16).


Discusses the death of Stephanie Potter Orton in A. S. Byatt’s 1985 novel *Still Life* and maintains that Donne’s view of death in *HSDeath* helps to clarify the scene and to make it more acceptable to readers.


Compares and contrasts the funeral sermons of Donne and Jeremy Taylor, maintaining that “[b]y placing the funeral sermons of Donne and Taylor in conjunction, one may see textual explication, celebration, and, above all, the means for dealing with public mourning being worked out over the period of two generations during the golden age of English pulpit oratory.” Points out that seventeenth-century preachers “fashioned much of their panegyric and funerary sermonic mode from richly suggestive patristic homilies” (200), especially
the works of St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzus. Notes that Donne mentions or quotes St. Basil “over 100 times in his 160 surviving sermons, referring to a wide range of his works” (201). Observes that only five of Donne’s surviving sermons are “directly related to funeral occasions” and comments in detail on only two, his sermon for Sir William Cokayne (12 December 1626) and his sermon for Magdalen Herbert (1 July 1627). Maintains that Donne typically eulogizes the dead person “within, or most commonly following, a lengthy meditation on divine order” and that he offers “small consolation to the bereaved” since his main purpose is “to gather sorrow into the contemplation of grief, of misery and of the death that leads to resurrection” (198). Points out that “[t]he balancing between two states, between decay and revival, between wretchedness and glory, and between the visible and invisible worlds” is characteristic of “much of Donne’s homiletic oratory—and above all, his funeral orations” (204).


Contrasts Donne and Herbert to demonstrate how each of them “develops a particular doctrinal aspect or devotional concern in four pairs of sonnets,” sonnets that “describe attitudes toward Vocation, the Atonement, Prayer, and Repentance.” Maintains that the sonnets “display differing sensibilities and ‘visions’ of the self and of the self’s relationship with God” and that they “explore and broadly define the work both of Donne and Herbert” (90). Contrasts Donne’s attitude toward his vocation in HSVex with Herbert’s view in “The Sinner,” Donne’s thinking on atonement in HSWilt with Herbert’s view in “Redemption,” Donne’s attitude toward prayer in HWhat with Herbert’s concept in “Prayer (I),” and Donne’s attitude toward repentance in HSRound and Herbert’s view in “Antiphon (I). Concludes that in his sonnets Herbert “does indeed ‘dance and pirouette, with music and joy,’” whereas Donne in his sonnets “tries to devour ‘the entire universe of controverted divinity’” (99–100) but that “both poets—both to be equally valued—seek a vision of God, not now as we may know Him, but face to face” (100).

In a discussion of the uses of taste and smell in Renaissance poems, observes that almost always in such poems there is an element of eroticism, “even when they express what might be called an erotic sense of repulsion” and usually display an anti-Petrarchan attitude. Comments on *ElComp,* maintaining that in this poem “repulsion, in its elaborate detail, borders on fascination.” Points out that in the elegy “[a] kind of trompe d’œil effect is created wherein what seem to be fixed visual images melt into decay, releasing odors before our very eyes if not our very noses.” Suggests that “[s]uch an effect is a verbal analogue for the vanitas motif of the insistently skull that plays such an important role … in Renaissance painting.” Discusses also *ElPerf,* calling it “a kind of bawdy detective story that ends darkly with this vanitas theme” (28). Points out that Donne’s erotic poems are “often brilliant plays on the voyeuristic inclinations and absent presence of his readers,” citing *ElBed* as an example and calling the poem an “elaborate striptease.” Notes that “[i]t is not surprising that the satirical poetry of the ‘lower senses’ thrives in the period when scribal publication is still flourishing” (29) and points out how Donne’s “use of erotic triangulation is well served by the palpability of scribal texts—they bear the presence of a human hand tracing a human voice and can be read by a third party in an atmosphere of intimate proximity,” as seen, for instance, in *Canon* (30). Observes also that Donne is the first English poet to use the term “nocturnall” (in *Noct*) “as a genre designation” and notes that he borrowed the term “from the night office of the Roman Catholic canonical hours to create an elegy on the winter solstice, a ‘study’ in absence, darkness, death, things that are not” (257).


Maintains that a thorough investigation of existing manuscripts containing the Holy Sonnets by the editors of *The Variorum Edition of John Donne Poetry* shows “not only that Donne intended his Holy Sonnets as a sequence—an idea carrying important interpretive implications—but also that his conception of the sequence changed over time, leading him to revise the texts of individual poems and to effect a major restructuring of the overall argument.” Presents the bibliographical evidence that validates such a claim and that clarifies “the confused history of the Holy Sonnets from the early seventeenth century onward” (127). Explains, in particular, that it is clear that at different times Donne “intended both the early, Group-III arrangement [of the *Holy Sonnets*] and the later, Groups-I and-II sequence” and announces that the variorum edition, therefore, “will present both.” Believes that this information will generate “a great deal of new criticism not only on the previously unprinted early sequence, but also on the later arrangement—which though it has sometimes been treated as a sequence, has never been so explicated in a reading grounded in solid bibliographical fact” (132). Concludes with a consideration of “the problem of distinguishing authorial from second-party changes in scribal manuscripts” (127). Argues that abundant manuscript evidence shows that Donne was “an artist who very much cared about his poems and who continued to fine-tune or revise individual items, sometimes in multiple stages, even after distributing the original versions” (133). Explains four criteria for evaluating the authenticity of any variant’s claim, discusses “the applicability of these criteria” to a number of revisions, and examines *HSMin* to show “the limitations of their usefulness” (135). Appends 9 figures that illustrate past sequential arrangements of the *Holy Sonnets.*


Revised lecture for students in their final year of study. Presents a biographical sketch of Donne and a brief survey of his poetry. Maintains that “[w]hat we see in Donne’s poetry is
an attempt to reconcile the paradoxes of his life, and the human condition: the need for physical/emotional fulfillment, the desire for spiritual love, the need for purging and cleansing guilt and striving towards a state of spiritual purity.” Stresses that both his love poems and religious poems are “concerned with the same issues” (85). Points out major characteristics of Donne’s poetry, such as the use of conceits, hyperbole, recurrent metaphysical images, argumentive tone and structure, colloquial language, playfulness, and unconventional syntax. Comments briefly on these elements in SunRis, Appar, Flea, ValMourn, and several of the Holy Sonnets.


Outlines the vicissitudes that plagued the Virginia Company in November 1622 when Donne preached to the Company what some have called “the first missionary sermon in English” (92) and comments on how “this venue placed unique demands on Donne’s ability to preach effectively without alienating his audience or offending his own conscience” (93). Points out that Donne “was compelled to fulfill his pastoral obligations without disaffectioning his audience, but also to determine how far he would go in helping the Company shed the religious commitments it no longer wished to uphold” (94). Considers in particular Donne’s complex and ambiguous uses of Thomistic examples in the sermon and shows how he challenges his audience “by citing identical examples in conflicting ways within a single context to argue consistent ends.” Discusses how Donne “always argues that evangelism should be the Company’s primary concern” but that “in making that argument he treats as ambiguous virtually every example he cites—refusing to cast any as consistently noble or corrupt”: thus “the character of each example is often as confused and indifferent as that of the Virginia Company to whom the sermon was preached” (96). Points out, furthermore, how Donne compels his audience “to consider all the possible implications of the fluid typological relationship he outlines” from scripture and how he urges it “to act upon the self-knowledge that results” (101). Discusses how Donne compels his auditors “to determine whether his designation of the Company as an ‘Apostolic’ body should be regarded more as a compliment or as an indictment” (103). Concludes that when the Virginia Company published the sermon it “confirmed Donne’s success in having turned a missionary sermon preached to a relatively exclusive congregation into a uniquely Thomistic and widely appealing commentary on the conflicting motives behind England’s exploits in the New World” (106).


Discusses Donne’s “oscillation between colonial excitement and colonial anxiety” and “his success in at least provisionally fusing these two opposed responses.” Focusses primarily on “the evangelical aims” of the sermon he delivered before the Virginia Company in 1622 but notes that Donne’s attitudes toward America “retained an underlying continuity, though poured into different moulds in different historical and biographical circumstances” (217). Discusses four major aspects of the Virginia Company sermon: (1) Donne’s reliance on Aristotelian rhetoric and logic; (2) his “abstracting and spiritualising of the colony’s past, present and future states”; (3) his “indirect recognition of America as a concrete, novel, and ambiguous physical entity”; and (4) his “evident fusion of the New World’s empirical reality with its projected scriptural role.” Argues that “in achieving this, Donne in fact incorporates and even emphasises the strangeness and liminality of America, rather than simply suppressing or evading it” (221). Comments on Donne’s interest in and involvement with the Virginia Com-
pany and his abiding interest in Christianizing the New World.


Comments on the history of the title *Songs and Sonnets*, examines what the canon has contained at various times, and elaborates on this examination “by means of discussion of some features of the only two verse miscellanies so far published in modern facsimile edition that contain a substantial number of Donne’s amatory lyrics: the two Dalhousie manuscripts.” Discusses also the question of titles of individual poems and concludes by comparing A. J. Smith’s edition (1971) of *Appar* “with versions from two of the manuscripts close to those evidently known to, or indeed used elsewhere by, Donne’s first printer, John Marriot” (105). Observes that Donne’s love poems “may have once been intended, or viewed, as a collection” but they “did not enter the world as one” and that the title *Songs and Sonnets* is “most unlikely to be Donne’s” and more likely to be “that of Marriot or one of his assistants,” who gave the poems this name in the 1635 edition. Notes also that “it was not until nearly twenty years after Donne’s death that all the poems now canonically accepted as *Songs and Sonnets* had been included in printed versions of that generic collection” (107). Points out that “the process of dissemination, from authorial holograph versions that are now lost, led to a complex manuscript tradition” from which Marriot “chose freely but (in the absence of an authorial text) often intel-

ligently, to provide an eclectic text in 1633, revising its order in 1635, a text and an order that Grierson followed in 1912, and that forms the basis for all later twentieth-century editions.” Concludes that, “[p]roviding we are prepared to accept the complexity of its implications, we can fairly say that it is in this sense that Donne is the ‘author’ of the ‘Songs and Sonnets’” (115).


Argues that Huygens’s copy for the four translations he made of Donne’s poems in August of 1630 was “as his letter to P. C. Hooft of 17 August 1630 suggests,” came from “a variety of sources.” Maintains that palaeographical evidence shows that “in all four cases we are dealing with very early scribal manuscript copy, copy in all likelihood dating from the 1620s, if not earlier.” Points out also that Huygens’s letter to Hooft confirms H. R. Woodhuysen’s view that Donne’s poems “circulated extraordinarily widely in manuscript during his lifetime, principally in the 1620s,” and that the poems were “mainly sought after in handwritten copies from about 1615 or 1620” (176). Proposes various manuscript sources from which Huygens made his translations of *SunRis*, *ElAnag*, *ElServe*, and *ValMourn*.


Observes that in early modern England there was “a renaissance of representation of female homoerotic desire” (7). Surveys the critical debate surrounding *Sappho* to show that the status of the poem “as a ‘lesbian love poem’ is contested on the basis of contradictory readings of its masculine signature, its feminine persona, its intertextual erotics, and critics’ presuppositions about the meaning of lesbian

Reviews the historical context of the Oath of Allegiance. Examines in some of Donne’s early poems his “nostalgia for, and guilt for” abandoning the Catholicism of his ancestors and maintains that rather than wholeheartedly rejecting Catholicism in Pseudo-Martyr, he offered to English Catholics “a casuistical accommodation for the Stuart regime calculated to meet the immediate demand for a profession of loyalty as well as the subject’s will to self-preservation.” Shows how Pseudo-Martyr is “[a]n exercise in negotiating internal, private belief and external coercion” and how it “betrays the conviction that, poised between the two indeterminate circumstances of God’s remoteness and the political vagaries of the outward visible church, it is preferable to mudar the self, to change one’s outward habits to fit the times, than to perish for a conviction.” Sees Donne’s treatise as “a particularly complex and revealing document in Donne’s early stance toward religion and monarchical power.” Rejects the views of those who see Pseudo-Martyr simply as “absolutist propaganda” or as “ironical” and maintains that “[n]either of these positions recognizes the argument’s serious engagement of the crisis of conscience with which Donne sympathized to a point—but not to the point of condoning martyrdom.” Also rejects the notion that Pseudo-Martyr was simply “a rhetorical ploy” in Donne’s seeking advancement (40) as well as the view that regards the text as reflecting his skepticism of both sides of the controversy. Maintains rather that Donne saw that the “best way of participating in the current doctrinal war” was not to get caught in it and that in Pseudo-Martyr he instructs others “how to avoid the crossfire” (41). Discusses how when “confronted with persecution, Donne opts for and recommends creating a divided realm within the self.” Shows how “in the course of defending the king’s temporal and spiritual jurisdiction in England, Donne betrays his own ethical self-division regarding a confirmed Catholic’s obligation to take the Oath of Allegiance.” Observes that Donne, by means of casuistical argumentation, “concludes rather blandly that faced with the prospect of coercion, the subject should seek neither flight nor fight” (76) and that “[to] cleave obstinately to a code of honor” is “an inexcusable breach of ‘the reasons and rules of nature’” (76–77).


Reviews Edson’s Wit and maintains that the play seems to owe more to Shakespeare than to Donne. Examines, however, the references to the Holy Sonnets in the play. Argues that the representation of cancer in Wit “distorts the experience of having cancer in potentially harmful ways,” that it “devalues the possibility of effective medical treatment” (405), and that, although “the negative portrayal of English professors is harmless, its similar treatment of medical personnel is irresponsible” (406).


Examines the pervading nature and causes for doubt in Donne’s poetry—“[w]hether this be on the nature of true religion, whether his latest girl will remain faithful to him, or even more urgently who or what he is” (85). Com-
ments specifically on Sat3, Father, and Para. Maintains that Donne’s doubt “derives from certitude; that his subject is himself” and that Donne “is utilising the verse as a hinge in the constant debate and argument between his own subjective experience and the world about him.” Concludes that “[i]n so concentrating on the medium, and in constantly undercutting its stability, he seems to have an extraordinary modern sensibility” (91). Uses Wittgenstein’s insights in *De la Certitude* to suggest how Donne seems to predict this twentieth-century philosopher and to emphasize how modern Donne actually is.


Briefly points out that in a sermon on Colossians 1:14 Donne clearly locates the soul in the blood, a view that stems from “the traditional faculty psychology of the three souls—vegetative, sensitive (or organic), and intellectual.” Notes that Donne “concisely summarizes this doctrine of an infinitely refined intermediary between body and soul in ll. 61–64 of *Ecst* (80).


In the prologue ([xi]–xxi), proposes to examine “the role of sacrament in early modern understandings of the relationship between the sacred and the profane, and the Eucharist in particular as the institutional convergence of ceremonial and psychological dimensions of religious experience,” noting that “[f]undamental to both concerns is that most scandalous of doctrinal notions, the Incarnation” ([xi]–xii). Argues for a “sacramental puritanism” as “an important aspect of the complex devotional literature and confessional identity of the early Stuart church” (xii), focusing primarily on how “sacramental puritanism” played a central role in Donne’s and Herbert’s “contribution to the pre-Civil War via media” (xiii). Hopes that this study will “restore to sacrament the attention it deserves in the critical literature surrounding two of the seventeenth century’s most celebrated poets.” Proposes also to elucidate “a sacramental poetics” (xx) and to contextualize it “amid both theological debate and the broader theological tension between ostensibly non-corporeal and corporeal dimensions of religious life: private piety and ceremonial form, differentiated ego and community, soul and body, devotion and art, sacred and secular” (xx–xxi). Maintains that eucharistic topos became for Donne and Herbert “powerful tools with which to explore both the intersection of the somatic with the psychological domains and their respective claims to Christianity.” Insists that sacrament in early modern culture “played a crucial role in the formation of religious subjectivity and in imaginative understandings of the sacred and profane as intersecting spheres of human experience” (xxi). In the introduction, “The Eucharist and the English Reformation” (3–21), surveys the controversy over the precise nature of the Eucharist in Reformation theology and the resultant contention over sacramental practices. In Chapter 1, “Secular Verse of the Religious Man: Donne and Sacrament of Play” (22–60), discusses Donne’s “unique and very often surprising application of sacrament to ostensibly secular concerns” in order to show that his “capacity for discerning the resemblances and analogies that permeate his myriad world is of particular poignancy with respect to eucharistic topos” and that “the resulting conceits test both the limits of an incarnational poetics and its ability to recall a pre-Reformation sacramentality” (21). By means of discussing individual poems shows how sacrament “permeates” both Donne’s “perception and poetic experience” and how it “suggested [to him] an appropriate topos though which to exercise his uniquely alchemical intellect, that penetrating capacity to discern among the world’s constituents an intricate web of correspondences” (59). In Chapter 2, “Sacrament and Grace” (61–82), argues that Donne’s sacred poetry “marks his confessional identification with the doctrinally Calvinist mainstream of the English church”
(61) and shows how his “fascination with the sacramental relationship between the sacred and profane yields in the religious verse to a preoccupation with the inner workings of the spirit and with the predestinarian aspects of English Calvinism.” Argues, however, that “the sacred poetry never jettisons entirely Donne’s Roman Catholic heritage nor the affectivity a sensual understanding of sacrament allowed him to indulge” and that “[t]he relationship between sacramental and devotional impulses in the sacred verse is thus one of both complementarity and conflict, evident in Donne’s various veiled, reluctant, confident, and desperate gestures toward sacramental means of grace as escape from the Calvinist interiority he otherwise so effectively cultivates” (62). Surveys individual poems to show that “[t]he relationship between devotion and the external means of grace—whether these latter be sacramental proper or the poetic utterances that incarnate and ceremonialize devotional experience—is a central feature of Donne's sacred verse” (82). In Chapter 3, “Eating the Word: Donne’s 1626 Christmas Sermon” (83–109), shows how this sermon contains both Donne’s “most explicit treatment of sacramental doctrine” and reflects his “sustained attempt to reconcile the potentially conflicting ceremonial and predestinarian imperatives of English Protestant divinity” (84). Calls the sermon “a telling example of Donne’s effort to negotiate contrary visions of the church and thereby to advance his own unique version of that most elusive of religious ideals, the English via media” (85–86). Discusses how in the sermon Donne “sought to combine reverence for sacrament and the ceremonial marks of religious authority with an inward-looking Reform piety,” an attempt to promote “ceremonial law and order while careful to maintain that election is finally a private matter” (109). In Chapter 4, “Herbert’s Altar: Herbert and Presence” (110–26); Chapter 5, “Sacramental Puritanism: Herbert’s English via media” (127–48); and Chapter 6, “Poetry and Self: The Eucharistic Art of Devotion” (149–67), discusses Herbert’s “sacramental puritanism” and maintains that he was more successful than Donne in “combining con-

trary imperatives of ceremony and devotion, not only in a harmonization of these modes of religious experience but also in the drama resulting from the ideological conflict the poems trace” (xix). Explores Herbert’s “sacramental conception of artistic identity and agency” (xx). In the conclusion, “Sacramental Poetics” (168–77), considers Crashaw and Vaughan as “representative of opposite edges of the periphery circumscribing the via media that Donne and Herbert sought to formulate and expound” (169). Concludes with notes (179–97), a list of works cited (199–207), and an index (209–16).

Reviews:

- Douglas Trevor in RenQ 57 (2004): 757–59


Presents a detailed reading of Relic, calling it “an exemplary poem in that it is motivated by virtually all the driving forces of Donne’s poetic art: playful argument, fascination with religion, the love of women, satirical intellect, an interest in contemporary politics and learning, the appeal of the material world and the search for spiritual profundity” (119). Points out that “to read a poem by Donne can be to follow a winding and difficult path, through puzzle-

ment, fascination, frustration and delight in almost equal measure” and shows how “we build up meanings through reading text to intext
and context,” how “we move between discrete words and the accumulated whole,” and how “we follow the flux and counter-tensions of the argument.” Believes, however, that “this voyage of discovery through Donne’s mind, world, soul and wit can, ultimately, be deeply satisfying for the reader” (134). Claims that Relic “points out the limitations of language and yet pushes in fine and witty language against those very boundaries of the inexpressible” (135). Concludes that the poem is “the ‘relic’ we still possess, which in its exploration of love achieves for the reader what relics are supposed to do: it works a kind of miracle of wit” (136).


Comments on Donne’s historical consciousness and views on memory. Observes that, unlike modern or postmodern writers, Donne had “no difficulty in remembering the past and making the past present” and notes that his “faith in the regenerative, salvational, or redemptive powers of memory was still founded on an inclusive sense of history—moreover, on an ontological and firm belief in those forms or vehicles in which the reality of things past is maintained” (32). Points out that Donne viewed historical space as “linear, teleological and providential, beginning with creation and ending with the Last Judgment” but that, “[s]omewhat contradictory, the historical process was also thought to take a cyclical course.” Suggests that “[t]he logical bridge between the two concepts of history and the mnemonic crux of the whole matter was typology” and points out how in early Protestant England typology was “extended to all affairs, secular and individual” (33). Maintains that, for Donne, “[b]iblical revelation, analogical exegesis with respect to all kinds of present secular realms, and especially typology, made the recurrence of events plausible, even within linear-teleological history” and thus, for him, “the present and future included the past of both the individual and the collective” (34). Comments on Donne’s uses of memory in Goodf, noting how for him “memory cancels the hiatus between current historical time and salvational history” and how in the poem “the Passion is truly, spatially and temporally, made present.” Points out that, for Donne, “to know still means ‘to remember,’” for “the perception of the present is always already imbued with the past” and that “the knowledge of Christ becomes immediately his very own knowledge” (45).


Discusses money as a literary theme and suggests that Donne in his poems “not only observes his own sensuous relationship with money, but also the metaphysical attraction it has obtained for modern man.” Maintains, therefore, that he “shows much more insight into the function of money than most of his contemporaries in the merchant trade” (148). Comments specifically on ElBrac, showing how in the poem gold coins for Donne acquire “a transempircally symbolic” and “meta-physical or unifying meaning” that suggests “the identification of money with the platonic idea of formal oneness (=soul) and also the principle of unity in Christian dogma” (150).


Says in the introduction (1–11) that Donne “may have waited until the early twentieth century for recognition because he was so uncompromisingly original that no one knew quite how to evaluate him—not just in his ideas but in his experiments with poetic form.” Maintains that Donne, unlike the sonneteers that
preceded him, “is known best for his love lyrics that look back not to Petrarch but to classical writers such as Martial and Juvenal” and that “[t]ypically the voice he speaks in his poems is that of the sceptic.” Discusses briefly Donne’s ability to dramatize love-relationships and notes that many of his poems “open abruptly, like speeches from a play” (4). Reproduces modernized texts of selected poems from the Songs and Sonets, Holy Sonnets, and the hymns (56–78)—without notes or commentary.

767. Xiong, Yunfu. [On John Donne’s Fanciful and Ingenious Expression of His Sentiments in the Form of Conceit.] Journal of Sichuan International Studies University no. 4: 30–32.

In Chinese. Discusses four stylistic aspects of Donne’s poetry—the use of conceits, radical imagery, syllogisms, and paradox. Praises Donne as an intellectual poet and as a representative of the late Elizabethan period.


Briefly comments on Pseudo-Martyr. Maintains that Donne’s “arguments in urging Catholics to take the oath of allegiance were essentially the same as the arguments for outward conformity advanced by Catholics like Alban Langdale, Robert Pursglove, and the apostate Thomas Bell” but notes that, unlike the others, Donne “trod a much more moderate path.” Maintains that Donne’s “entire career as an Anglican minister and preacher was premised, not on a rejection of Catholicism but a perpetuation of it in some form” (23). Argues that Donne and others “who best exemplify the Protestant literary tradition also reflect to a striking extent aspects of Catholic literature,” noting that “[i]t is not a question of ‘claiming’ them for one side or the other, but of recognising how much common ground they cover” (56).


In Chinese. Reads Metem, FirAn, and SecAn as Donne’s trilogy of the soul, focusing on the themes of self, life, and love as they appear in the three poems.


Comments on the contribution of Louis L. Martz’s The Poetry of Meditation (1954) to the study of devotional literature, noting how it “provided a means of thinking about devotional poetry in the same aesthetic terms as other genres of poetry without ignoring its particular subject” and that “[b]y discovering in the formal, rational method of prayer called meditation a motive as well as a structure for the poetry of devotion, Martz was able to show that religion could be as vibrant and engaging a subject for literary representation as any other facet of human experience” (1). Maintains that Martz’s study “provided a model of academic literary inquiry for the next three decades” (1–2) and that it “staked out a wide area for further scholarly research and discussion and furnished a demonstration of how such scholarship might best be carried out by invoking the best elements of the available critical methods.” Notes also that Martz’s study also constructed “a bridge not only to contemporaneous secular poetry, but also to a broadly meditative poetry of later centuries” (2). Surveys also Martz’s later publications on the meditative poem, in particular, The Meditative Poem (1963), which later became volume 1 of The Anchor Anthology of Seventeenth Century Verse (1969). Maintains that “the great merit” (7) of The Poetry of Meditation is “the subtlety and discretion with which it maintains the crucial balance between text and context, thus highlighting the paradoxi-
cal nature of poetry, which is both the creature of its age and voice of the ages” (8). Thereafter introduces the essays in Vol. 21 of *JDJ*, which are tributes to the memory of Martz and also surveys briefly Martz’s academic career.


Comments on Donne’s rejection of Catholicism and its effect on his poetry and contrasts Donne with Crashaw, who rejected the Church of England and became a Catholic. Discusses how some of Donne’s poems suggest that he was not completely at ease over his change of religion and proposes that he “helped to devise the Anglican via media in order to accommodate his own uncertainties.” Sees Donne’s religious poetry as dramatizing “anxiety about the poetic speaker’s sinfulness and his longing for grace,” whereas Crashaw’s poems are marked by “self-abandonment to mystical rapture.” Concludes that although Donne is “undoubtedly the greater poet,” and although “his intensely dramatic, anxiously fearful religious poetry probably speaks more directly to the spiritual experience of most of us than the paradoxical tranquility of Crashaw’s passionate rapture,” yet one can “more readily envy the profound serenity lying behind Crashaw’s poetry than the melancholy anguish that motivated Donne.”


Presents a biographical sketch of Donne and a general overview of his poetry and prose. Briefly analyzes Donne’s complex treatment of love as reflected in such poems as *ValMourn, Ecst, Flea, SunRis, Broken, Para, Noct, Leg, ValName, Sappho*, and others. Notes that, for Donne, “there was no more provocative site of contentious synthesis and paired dissensions—hence no more suitable space for restless examination—than his own self” (93). Comments briefly also on the verse epistles, *FirAn, Metem, Essays, Ignatius, Holy Sonnets, Biathanatos, Paradoxes, Devotions, Divine Poems*, and the sermons. Contains a selected bibliography (98–99).


Points out how in *Noct* Donne figures forth “Christian spiritual resurrection in terms of alchemical transformation.” Argues that in the poem “the state of complete spiritual non-being in which the speaker lies following his beloved’s death is not only a subjective state of despair but also an objective state of ontological privation: the endpoint of a sin-initiated process of decline from immutable being, identified with God, into the change or non-being of this world.” Observes, however, that “[t]his state of complete non-being or death is also the point at which the process can be redeemed through resurrection—that is, restoration to full being through an act of re-creation,” conditioned however, upon one’s willingnessness to “forsake one’s attachments to this world of non-being.” Points out that the death of a beloved “conventionally prepares one to do this by making obvious the transitory and ultimately painful nature of such attachments” but that in the poem the speaker’s continuing devotion to his beloved “makes him unwilling to forsake this world for the next, or human for divine love.” Maintains, therefore, that in *Noct* the speaker “responds to his beloved’s death by spiritually re-creating himself on the basis of this world of non-being and becomes its ‘Epitaph,’ in which role he commemorates life amidst death and love amidst loss” (554). Maintains, in other words, that in *Noct* the speaker does not undergo “Christian spiritual resurrection” (561) but rather “spiritually recreates himself” as the voice of one who affirms … man’s existence in this world, in all its darkness and non-being” (562).

Discusses how during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries “habits of reading created a field of expectations in which literature was imagined and into which texts were issued.” Comments on a letter Donne wrote to Henry Goodyer in 1614 asking for help in collecting scattered manuscript copies of his poems in order to publish them. Points out how the letter “touches on both the production and consumption of literature” at the turn of the century (170) and how it “invites us to imagine literary history from a different perspective, one conceived, at least in part, from the point of view of consumption rather than production: a history that allows us to see how verse letters, for example, are composed not only within and against the norms of demonstrative rhetoric and traditions of epideictic poetry, but also with an individual reader and with a class of sophisticated courtly consumers in mind” (172–73). Maintains that “the study of literary consumption invites us to contemplate a broad range of negotiations between reading and writing, to imagine writing not only as a complex formal and social practice, but also a field of gestures within and through which authors might anticipate the reception, circulation and reproduction of their words and work.” Notes, for example, that Donne’s verse letters to the Countess of Bedford “bespeak ways of writing that spring not only from convention but also from a particular and self-conscious knowledge of the character and habits of a specific reader and more broadly of a circle of friends for whom and to whom Donne wrote poetry” (173).
2003


Points out that in the early 1620s there was much debate, both in the church and state, about English foreign policy toward the Bohemia-Palatinate dispute and observes how Donne in his preaching during this time “faced the rhetorical task of adjudicating between competing factional claims, moral and political.” Discusses how “early modern judicial concepts and practices played a significant part in shaping the accommodating nature of Donne’s sermon elocutio.” Points out “specific aspects of such juridical influence,” such as “the civil lawyer’s discriminating application of natural law in cases where positive laws conflict; the late sixteenth-century legal Year Book focus on the validity of judicial inaction; and the continuing shift in the early seventeenth century from oral to written priority in legal proceedings” (344).


Discusses Donne’s treatment of the Holy Spirit in the ten extant Whitsunday sermons he preached from 1618–1630. Maintains that the sermons provide not only insight into Donne’s “theological understanding” of the Holy Spirit but also show his “oratorical imitation of Scriptural eloquence, the rhetorical ‘style’ of the Holy Ghost.” Holds that, “[t]his imitation, in turn, derives from the persistent and explicit analogy made by Donne between the office, action, and purpose of the Holy Ghost and those of the Christian preacher.” Explores, therefore, “the rhetorical and theological aspects of that analogy” (204), an analogy “characterized as a form of mimetic incarnation” similar to “the exegetical manner of Augustine’s animarum aedification.” Concludes by discussing Donne’s “syllogistic appeal to reason” (220) in understanding “the revelation of God’s will in the Scriptures” (220–21) and by commenting on his “theory of res et verba” (225).


Discusses how Donne by beginning his university course at the age of 12 was able, like other Catholic boys, to avoid taking the Oath of Supremacy, which was at the time required only of those who reached the age of 16. Comments on Antonio de Corro, who was the “lector cathechismi” for Hart Hall while Donne was there. Surveys briefly the Catholic background of Donne’s family and his pre-Oxford intellectual training. Suggests that Donne may be the model for Moth in Love’s Labour Lost, noting that, when the play was written, Donne’s “daring satires and elegies were of considerable topical interest” and that “there are points where the play actually appears to refer to them.” Points out that in ElServe Donne compares the “lure of worldly advancement, which forces Catholics into oaths that betray their religion,” to a moth being beckoned by the flame of a candle. Notes that ElServe, “which includes a vivid passage describing the Reformation in terms of a flash flood that bursts and overflows the river banks, leaving the dry bed behind, is notable for its nervous, original style and daring content.” Concludes that “if these poems were as celebrated as scholars believe, the name of Donne would have been associated at the time with the unusual image of the recusant fly, or moth, attracted to the worldly candle.” Points out further that the Donne family crest was “a sheaf of snakes” (89) and that in his play Shakespeare “goes to great lengths to associate Moth with this heraldic device” (90). Suggests also that the description of Mirreus, Crantz, and Graius in Sat3 are graphic images of “the way dissidents saw the new religion” (94) and
points out resemblances between characters in Shakespeare's play and Donne's metaphorical creations.


Suggests the influence of Keats on Eliot's concept of the unification of sensibility that Eliot praised in Donne and his successors.


Maintains that the “dissonant elements” in *GoodM*, especially the ending, “make much better sense, emotionally, historically, and generically” when the poem is read “as a poem of courtship.” Argues that the poem “re-enacts the three basic stages of a clandestine betrothal: 1. a pledging of troth; 2. a forsaking of all others; 3. a liminal state which looks forward to the time, when, in the words of the marriage ceremony, ‘thei two shalbe one flesh.’” Notes that such a reading “depends upon the assumption” that *GoodM*, like *Curse* and *Flea*, “contains a private subtext which has eluded modern readers and critics but would have been accessible to Donne’s original female audience,” i.e., Anne More (23).


Presents a general introduction to the *Holy Sonnets*. Discusses the possible dating and ordering of the poems, their circulation in manuscript to a select coterie, possible Calvinistic and Lutheran resonances in them, their sonnet structure and meditative mode, and their influence on later devotional poets. Arguing that because the poems “were designed to entertain a variety of readers, no particular interpretive scheme can account for all plausible meanings” of them, analyzes individual sonnets to show how they can be read as “theatrical monologues creating the image of a complex persona, a worshipping sonneteer, torn between the conflicting impulses of self-assertion and self-denial” (147). Maintains that Donne’s “stagings of a soul’s struggle for salvation” were intended to “elicit empathy” and “to foster compassion and intimacy among human readers” (155).


Collection of 10 essays by various hands, four of which discuss Donne: Louis L. Martz, “Donne’s Anniversaries: The Powers of the Soul” (78–89); Albert C. Labriola, “The Donne Angelicata of Donne’s ‘Aire and Angels’” (90–108); Anne Lake Prescott, “Male Lesbian Voices: Ronsard, Tyard and Donne Play Sappho” (109–29); and Stanley Stewart, “Reading Donne: Old and New His- and Her-storicisms” (130–52). Each of these essays has been entered separately in this bibliography.


Deals with the problem of interlinguistic performance, that is, examines the various problems translators confront in translating poetic texts from a foreign language. To illustrate how the same text can be translated in various ways, compares Italian translations of *GoodM* by Roberto Sanesi, Giorgio Melchiori, Armanda
Guiducci, and Patrizia Valduga; the last stanza of *SGo* by Sanesi, Alessandro Serpieri, Melchiori, Guiducci, and Valduga; and the last stanza of *Canon* by Sanesi, Melchiori, Guiducci, and Valduga.


Reads Carew’s “A Rapture” not as “an encomium on an erotic love that is wild and free” but rather as “a satire against the libertine lover and his philosophy of unrestricted love.” Maintains that “the lover who satirizes honor all through the poem in the end makes himself the object of satire” (229). Argues that a consideration of some of Donne’s paradoxical poems and essays provides “a model for elucidating the structure of the thematic inversion that operates in ‘A Rapture’” (237). Discusses, in particular, how the “dialectical argument” of Carew’s poem “closely parallels the thematic structural movement” of *ElVar*, “moving from the paradoxical thesis on the delights of diversity and unrestrained love to its antithesis, a satire on free love.” Maintains also that the “amoral stance” of the speaker in Donne’s poem provides “a fertile analogy” for the study of the speaker in Carew’s poem (239). Shows how in the final lines of *ElVar* Donne inverts his poem “from an encomium on diversity to a panegyric of true love.” Recognizes, however, that the “thematic inversion” in “A Rapture” is “far more dramatic than the philosophical abstract tone of the inversion” in *ElVar* (240).


Maintains that when Donne refers to Edward Tilman as a “blest Hermaphrodite” in *Tilm*an, he is comparing Tilman to Adam, “whom many of Donne’s contemporaries took as the supreme ‘blest Hermaphrodite’” (250) and thus is paying Tilman “a striking compliment.” Says that Donne implies that Tilman as a priest “will have the blessings and powerful understanding of Adam new-made” and that “another Adam in his earliest existence, Tilman is blessed, sinless, and most exalted of men—and women.” Points out that in Sidney Donne “contrasts the achievements of the Sidneys to the feeble translations used by the Church of England” (251) and that perhaps in ll. 40–44 he is referring to an Anglican version of the psalms in Welsh by Edmund Prys entitled *Llyfr y Psalmau Wedi eu cyfieithu, a’i cyfansoddi ar fesur cerdd, yn Gymraeg*, which “appeared in London (where Donne lived) in 1621, the year the Countess of Pembroke’s death prompted his poem” (253).


Maintains that although repetition is recognized as an essential feature of poetry, it should also be seen as important in prose, especially in sermons in which it serves as a rhetorical structuring principle. Claims that, in fact, repetition is at the very heart of preaching. Analyzes the rhetoric of repetition in Donne’s sermon preached at Whitehall on 12 February 1618. Shows how repetition supports the pedagogical purposes of the sermon and how the repetition of key words, phrases, allusions, and biblical quotations is employed for emphasis and for holding the attention of the congregation.


Maintains that Donne’s remark in the title of this essay “may be taken with a later self-definition as emblematic of his characteristic sermonic practice” and notes the “rich tradition of Augustinian biblicism” in Donne’s sermons (335). Focusing on three concepts—liturgy, ecclesiology, and justification—discusses Donne’s sermon on Matthew 4:18–40, a sermon first
given at The Hague in 1619 and later expanded into two sermons in 1630. Maintains that the double sermon “illustratively and his other sermons collectively” clearly support “Protestant moderation in a time of increasingly radical Calvinist sectarianism and Roman Catholic defense of the papacy as the foundation of the church” (337). Comments in detail on the issue of calling and community in the sermons and also on the preacher’s obligation to foster a personal relationship between Christ and the believer. Observes that Donne’s “salvific theology,” which is at the heart of the sermons, is “graciously and hermeneutically sequential and re-circulatory rather than what he evidently adjudged the more simplistic logical stasis of extreme Calvinism or the legalism of Rome” (351). Concludes that Donne “understood that at Christianity’s core lay neither harsh predetermination nor reductive explanation, but mysteries of love and transcendence” (352).


Discusses Donne’s 1623 Encaenia sermon preached at the consecration of the chapel at Lincoln’s Inn and reprinted three times in the next three years. Argues that Donne’s aim in the sermon “was not so much to rout Catholic superstition, but to address issues that were contentious within the Church of England,” in particular, “the validity of church-ordained festivals” and “the ceremony of Dedication.” Notes that he also deals with the “importance of common prayer in worship” and “the need for both mental and bodily reverence in God’s house.” Maintains that “the controversy given most extended consideration in the Encaenia sermon is that over the extent and origin of church sacrality” (208) and surveys the then raging debate in the Church of England concerning “whether a church was a sacred place, and to what its holiness could be ascribed” (209). Comments on how in the sermon Donne was able “to create bridges between the moderate and Laudian camps on this issue” (213), by including “the more moderate opinion in his formulation of church sacrality” and, at the same time, tempering “the Laudian position” (214).


Argues that because Donne’s critics “have not elaborated on the nature of godly fear in relation to the Pauline distinction between justification and sanctification,” they have failed to situate the Holy Sonnets “in their proper theological context.” Argues that in sonnets 1, 6, and 19 (in the 1635 order) the speaker is “not in doubt about the means of justification” but rather is “in doubt about his ability to maintain the status of his sanctification that has followed from his justification.” Notes how the speaker “often exploits the ambiguous nature of the differences between the two interfused stages of the ordo salutis.” Maintains that the speaker is “concerned not with the proper means to attain the ‘new man,’ but rather with the extent to which he has successfully abandoned the ‘old man’ and grown in sanctified holiness.” Observes that “[s]ince the circumstances leading to the ‘death’ of the old man are routinely described by early modern theologians in terms similar to the death of the body as such,” Donne’s speaker in the Holy Sonnets “is able to provocatively blur distinctions between his impending physical death and the metaphorical death of his corrupt nature” (72). Argues that Donne “follows Calvin in emphasizing an intimate causal link between godly fear, defined broadly as reverence for God, and sanctification” (85) and that for him, as for most Calvinists of his day, “fear enters most prominently
into the order of salvation after the sinner has been deemed righteous by God.” Maintains that those sonnets that “seem to be overtly about the fear of damnation and the difficulty of deathbed repentance should be interpreted as metaphorical accounts of the speaker’s conversion experience.” Holds that in these sonnets the speaker’s anxieties “reflect his concern with the possibilities of either further perfecting his holiness or backsliding from his election.” Concludes that Donne “ultimately views godly fear as a virtue that is put to use by the moral agent, a virtue that should not be construed as a habit or settled disposition” (86).

790. Centerwall, Brandon S. “‘Loe her’s a Man, worthy indeede to travell’: Donne’s Panegryric upon Coryats Crudities.” JDJ 22: 77–94.

Argues that, in addition to Coryat and Macarone, the poem “Loe her’s a Man” in Thomas Coryate’s Coryats Crudities (1611) is by Donne. Traces “the curious circumstances under which this poem was lost to the Donne canon—mislaid, in effect,” and addresses “those arguments that have been made against its authenticity” (81).


In Korean. Explores the politics of desire in the Songs and Sonnets. Claims that the poems contain Donne’s “most complicated exploration of love” and shows how they “embrace the various fields of philosophy, astronomy, law, medicine, sexology, and theology.” Discusses, in particular, how Donne’s poems reflect the new philosophy and “the new relations of time and space” that resulted from the Copernican revolution. Calls Donne’s poems “a manifestation in writing of the revolutionary principles of the post-Copernican philosophy” (348). (English abstract)

792. Choi, Sung-hee. “[‘My New Found Lande’: Body Politics and Imperialism in John Donne’s Ele-}
gies].” MES 11, no. 1: 151–75.

In Korean. Discusses Donne’s views on Elizabethan “body politics” and imperialism, focusing primarily on ElBed and ElProg. Maintains that “[b]y conflating the discourses of imperialism and capitalism with that of patriarchism, Donne shows that male domination over woman’s body provides the basic paradigm and justification for England’s geographical extension and economic exploitation of other cultures.” Shows in particular “how the iconographic extension of the queen’s body, that covers both England and its overseas domains, underpinned a discursive reversal of the erotic relationship between English ‘discoverers’ and their queen.” Points out that “[a]s the maritime courtiers described and mapped the New World by associating it with Queen Elizabeth, her body came to be constructed as a passive instrument in man’s struggle for power over the New World.” Maintains that Donne also parodies “the contemporaneous textual celebrations of the English explorers” primarily by “his intricate manipulation of the male speakers in the poems.” Concludes that “[t]he endeavors of Donne’s male speakers to gain mastery and control are shown to remain either incomplete or frustrated, and contrary to the widely held view, Donne’s queen emerges not as an object of the male speakers’ desire, but as a subject who threatens to subvert the patriarchal ideology” and that “[t]his exposes the fictitious nature of the patriarchal discourses of gender, which are manipulated to justify and rationalize male dominance and English imperialism” (151). (English abstract)


Points out the flourishing of Italian critical studies of Donne during the late twentieth cen-
tury, commenting briefly on the work of Marcello Paginini, Alessandro Serpieri, and Elsa Linguanti. Discusses, in particular, the Holy Sonnets, seeing in them an unresolved tension between carnality and spirituality, between sin and salvation, and between baroque fluidity and restraint. Comments on Donne’s innovative contributions to the poetic language of his day and how he liberated poetry from traditional Petrarchism and from the melodic smoothness of the Elizabethan lyric. Examines the profound influence of the Bible on Donne’s Holy Sonnets. Points out in Donne’s poems the co-existence of theological serenity and seventeenth-century relativism and finds in them a kind of unconstrained eclecticism, all of which reflects both Donne’s own spiritual condition and his culture. Compares and contrasts Donne with Montaigne, especially their views of death.


Discusses Appar as a poem that exemplifies “hatred as expressed through eroticism (robbing it of generosity and joy, and reducing it at the conscious level to an obsessive awareness of bodily appetites and revulsions)” (129). Suggests that in the poem Donne “pushes so far with the jealousy, mortification, malice, and luridity of his persona, that he seems to be teasing the reader: should he carry on sharing the speaker’s perspective as his guide to the three characters and the situation depicted [in the poem], or yield to feelings of scorn and revulsion against him?” (130). Shows how in the poem “the extremities of love and hate seem in this instance to be constantly discovering themselves inside each other” (131).


Introduces the 12 essays in this collection, pointing out that the volume shows how Donne “moulded his identity as a professional intellectual with the languages that were at hand.” Claims that the collection “offers a revisionist interpretation of Donne’s career and makes a polemical case for studying the full range of his writings” (jacket).


Reviews:

• Alex Davis in MLR 100, no. 1 (2005): 199–200.

An original poem.


Argues that in Devotions Donne’s autobiographical “reticence is in fact the most important part of his self-disclosure.” Maintains that although Donne “continually forces us to read between the lines, he does so, … less because of any temperamental or cultural aversion to self-display than because what he wants most to talk about is precisely what he feels he must keep hidden.” Points out that “[a]part from the specifics of his illness, nearly the only life event that Donne mentions in the Devotions is his ordination” but that his “relationship with both the royal family and the Church of England are constant preoccupations in the work” (147). Maintains, therefore, that in Devotions Donne seems “anxious to present himself as an unfailingly orthodox member of the English Church.” Discusses how he “constantly reasserts his orthodoxy in order to counter the religious doubts that appear to have assailed him on what he expected would be his deathbed” (147). Cites the 23rd devotion as “[t]he closest Donne comes to articulating such sentiments” (148). Holds that Devotions is “a simultaneously public and private profession of faith” and that Donne’s “demonstration of his allegiance to the Church of England and his confession of his sins are done publicly, on the printed page, but the reasons for these declarations are buried deep within the text, probably intended to be fully legible only to Donne and his God” (150).


Through an analysis of 40 manuscript versions and 7 seventeenth-century printed versions of GoodM, presents a new text of the poem and defends the textual choices she makes. Argues that the Dolau Cothi manuscript text of the poem is likely the last authorial version of the text. (For a correction, see JDJ 23 [2004]: 371–72.)


Reproduces Jorge Cuesta’s Spanish translation of Father (123)—without notes or commentary.


Discusses how Donne “often deftly and sometimes awkwardly negotiated the profession of friendship” in his verse letters to aristocratic women, in particular in his letters to the Countesses of Huntingdon, Salisbury, and Bedford, and how “the perspective and the vocabulary of professionalism can shed light on those of Donne’s writings that seem in some ways least professional and that have often seemed resistant to interpretation” (10). Discusses how the verse letters flatter these ladies “for their ability to disdain the tropes of tired poetic fashion” (98) and how they “suggest an image of the female courtier which was to become satirically conspicuous in Jacobean literature and court life” (98–99). Shows how Donne attempts “to restore a credibility to the poetry of compliment” (100), commenting on “the liberal and confining quality of Donne’s praise” in his “amorous” verse letters (103).

Discusses Donne's friendship with Henry Wotton. Notes that both men were with Essex in 1596 and 1597 during the Cadiz and Azores expeditions, although they "had little opportunity to meet" (65). Comments briefly on Storm and on Donne's letters (in prose and in verse) to Wotton and Wotton's letters to Donne, noting that "[a]lmost everything we know about Wotton's relationship with Donne is derived from this correspondence" (64). Observes that although the letters contain personal and confidential information, they suggest that Donne's friendship was "more intense" than Wotton's (66). Discusses Donne's interest in the New Philosophy and briefly comments on Ignatius, pointing out how Donne "used the new astronomy to beat the Jesuits" (157). Suggests that possibly Wotton may have sent Donne a copy of Galileo's *Messenger of the Stars* and claims that *Ignatius* contains "the first references to what Galileo saw through his telescope in any widely read piece of English literature" (155).


Calls Donne, as well as Emily Dickinson and Gerard Manley Hopkins, "oddballs," whose poetry is too hard to paraphrase and too hard to scan and maintains that "[n]either of these qualities is "ipso facto virtues in poetry." Complains that theirs is "the kind of poetry that almost all contemporary poets try to write" (28). Proposes, therefore, that we should put Donne and Hopkins "out to grass for a while, as invoked poetic forebears." Says that "[t]his is not to deny their immense talent (especially Donne's), just to suggest that the kind of poetry their examples have encouraged has had a very long innings indeed" and that "it has incidentally lost poetry's lay audience in the process" (30).


Discusses Donne's sermons as reflecting the irenic movement of the time, the aim of which was "to promote peace and reconcile the warring [religious] confessions" (293). Focuses on sermons in which Donne comments on baptism since they provide a "perfect guide" in tracing Donne "through this dogmatic maze" (294). Compares and contrasts Donne's views on ierenicism with those of Hugo Grotius and maintains that in his sermons Donne "seems to be in a constant dialogue with the Protestant reformers about baptism" (199). Analyzes Donne's irenic view of baptism in several of his sermons, in particular his "Heidelberg sermon" of 1619. Shows how "[c]oming after the Protestant Reformation had reformed the ritual of baptism, Donne and other like-minded thinkers argued for an irenic reformation of baptism, tracing the ritual back to its cultic origins in the early Christian church" (312).


Original poem.


A novel that makes several references to and comments on several of Donne's poems. Begins each chapter with a quotation from one of the *Songs and Sonnets*. Thanks John Carey for his assistance and calls Carey's *John Donne: Life, Mind, and Art* (1981) "the last word" on Donne's life.


Argues that in his sermons and other late prose writings Donne "identifies in his own way with the conformist Calvinist piety that prevailed in the leadership of the Jacobean Church of England" and that "this helps to account for some distinctive elements in what he preached and
wrote.” Argues specifically that “Donne’s position within the spectrum of his church profoundly affects his approach toward his task as preacher, influencing not only the nature of his polemics but even his purposeful avoidance of some kinds of polemics” (12). Examines in some detail Donne’s moderate view on predestination and other tenets of Calvinism and comments on his rejection of Catholicism. Observes that, “[u]nlike the Laudians, Donne reserved his polemics for people outside the Church of England—Rome and the separatists—and exercised pastoral care in his sermons for those within the church who differed from his understandings of what the church should be like.” Concludes that Donne’s “affinities” lay with the “conformist (and even conforming puritans)” in the Church of England (27).


In the prologue (5–8), presents a general introduction to Donne’s prose works, especially Devotions, primarily commenting on the artistic features of Donne’s prose style. Maintains that the same qualities that inform Donne’s poetry (passion, intensity, intellectual play, etc.) can be found in his prose works. Thereafter follows Spanish translations of the “Meditations” from the Devotions ([9]–141) and an index (143–44).


In the “Introduction” (9–13), calls Donne “el rey del virtuosismo poético” (9) and briefly comments on major characteristics of his poetry and his critical reception, followed by translations into Spanish (with English texts on opposite pages) of the Songs and Sonets (16–217), 12 of the Elegies (220–79), 11 of the Epigrams (283–303), 11 of the Holy Sonnets (306–327), 8 selections from Lit (328–43), Christ, Sickness, and Father (344–52). In “Una Vida Barroca” (357–79), presents a biographical sketch of Donne and a brief history of editions of his poems, noting in particular previous translations into Spanish. Concludes with notes (383–89) and an index of poems (unpaginated).


First edition, 1963. This volume is the second paperback printing (See Roberts 1).


Points out that in GoodM (ll. 12–14) Donne borrows and adapts the trope of the heroic mental journey found in Lucretius’s De Rerum Natura (1. 74) and later in Horace’s Odes (1.28). Observes that “[w]hereas Horace’s ode serves chiefly to contrast Archytas’s mental journey with his confinement in the grave, Donne uses physical contraction to offset the daring of the
mental flights for which 'one little room' is the locus." Notes also that “what had been heroic solo performances in Lucretius and Horace” become in Donne “a communal activity” in which “[t]he lovers simultaneously discover their Platonic Urwelt in each other” (25).


Briefly compares Shakespeare’s concept of time as seen in his sonnets to Donne’s view of time in the Songs and Sonets.


Cites examples that are “reminiscent of Donne’s poetry” (253) in Emily Dickinson’s poems. In particular, sees resemblances and differences in “Bring me the sunset in a cup” and SGô, in “To fill a Gap” and ValMourn, and in “They put us far apart” and “The heart is the capital of the mind” and SunRis and GoodM. Maintains that the comparisons between Dickinson and Donne “do not necessarily imply that she echoes his poetry consciously” (256).


Calls Coryat possibly Donne’s “most occasional” poem and maintains that it “demands that, in order to grasp Donne’s allusions one must actually read the entire of Coryate’s enormous book, a task that, paradoxically, Donne’s poem asserts is impossible.” Holds that the poem, nevertheless, “provides insight into Donne’s understanding of wit and proves a significant variation upon the all/nothing paradox that entertained Donne throughout his career” and, “most importantly, it illuminates Donne’s frustrations, at the most troubled moment in his career, with the would-be courtier’s strategy for advancement” (211). Discusses how Donne’s satire is directed primarily at Coryate’s “love of superlatives” (215) and his “love of coined—particularly Latinate—words” (217). Maintains that of all the mock-encomia and comic defamations directed at Crudities Donne’s poem “stands out for the vehemence and ill-nature of its satire” (219–20) and suggests that Donne’s “virulent dismissal” of Coryate stems from “their conflicting modes of self-fashioning or competing self-presentations.” Points out that Coryate “sought to advance himself by publicly playing the buffoon, Donne by wittily disdaining the very notion of advancement.” Opines that Coryate’s “mad attempt to ingratiate himself through his wit to Prince Henry’s circle could only remind Donne of his own failure to do more subtly the same” (220).


Argues that SecAn “posits a Reformed alternative” to Dante’s Paradiso. Observes that “while both poems model themselves upon the prophecy of vision enacted in the Revelation of Saint John the Divine, Dante fashioned himself as the passive witness to a divine drama, whereas Donne emphasizes that his prophetic vision occurs in his mind’s eye, the result of his devotional meditation,” thereby, positing “a new authority for the devotional poet as visionary prophet” (113). Discusses how SecAn “posits a Reformed fiction of the poet’s spiritual authority, one designed specifically to undercut Marian ‘mis-devotion’ and put that ‘pert’ Italian Dante in his place.” Maintains that Donne replaces in SecAn Dante’s Virgin and saints as “the primary source of spiritual authority” with “the devout Christian’s meditative activity.” Points out that “while Dante’s vision depends upon saintly assistance, Donne’s poem models how the soul can achieve a progress independent of some mediating agency through one’s own meditative powers” (114). Discusses also the trumpet motif at the end of SecAn, show-
ing how it places Donne’s poem “within a Protestant tradition of admonition and sermonizing that spans the Tudor and Stuart eras” (133). Concludes that the Anniversaries “suggest a great deal about Donne’s evolving devotional intentions, about his recognition of how his meditation may inspire others in an expanding circle of praise and prayer,” and claims that the poems “aim at the re-formation of community after he anatomizes it, at the restoring or remembering of the body of the world” (133–34).


In a comparative study of theories of repetition by Jacques Derrida and Gilles Deleuze, examines as an example the elaborate patterns of repetition in Relic, commenting in particular on possible levels of interpretation of l. 6 of the poem (“A bracelet of bright haire about the bone”).


Discusses (1) how the study of Donne’s understanding of the Old Testament “must include an investigation into the complex Jewish exegetical tradition as well as into its direct and indirect Christian transmission”; (2) how “any discussion of Donne’s biblical hermeneutics must also encounter the textual and religious polemic—both Catholic versus Protestant and Jewish versus Christian—involved in biblical exegesis”; and (3) how “a flexible understanding of exegetical connections should be maintained, reflecting the intertwined and resolutely dialogic character of both the Jewish and Christian exegetical projects” (223). In order to illustrate these “complicated exegetical interconnections,” focuses on Donne’s treatment of “the semantic and christological implications of God’s ineffable name” (227) and on his “iconic and theological transformation of the Hebrew letter ‘tav’ into the Cross,” thereby showing Donne’s “reading of the biblical text among Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant interpretations and between the literal and the figurative” (233).


Presents a reading of Bait using I. A. Richard’s theory of metaphor and a Gestalt-interaction theory of metaphor. Suggests that in
Bait Donne "first presents fishing in terms of courtship, then portrays courtship in terms of fishing, and then fuses both semantic fields in an act of narcissism (i.e., a woman can be her own bait if she is in love with herself)." Maintains, therefore, that the poem "can be read as an imploation for love and to be loved, cast as a seductive and metaphorical act of fishing," which is "contrasted simultaneously with the literal act of fishing," finally culminating in a plea for "reciprocity and mutual sexuality in human love," that is "free of the deceit that so characterizes the narcissism of 'courtly' behavior" (218). Finds in this "bidirectional reading" at least "three alternative readings: courtship discussed in terms of fishing, fishing discussed in terms of courtship, and a more interactive reading," in which "the semantic fields of fishing and courtship become more and more entwined (and perhaps) fused" (218–19).


In Hungarian. Discusses Donne's views about medicine, disease, the spiritual and psychological components of illness, and the role of the physician in curing patients as found in Devotions. Suggests the possible physiological and psychological nature of Donne's illness as revealed in his devotional work. Sees in Devotions Donne's general ambivalence toward science and its unsettling influence on his faith.


Explores images of discovery, conquest, and mapping in Donne's poetry. Points out that there is a "recurring parallel" in his poems "between the riches of the expanding world and the sensual beauty of the woman's body who waits to surrender her autonomy to her discoverer," which is "a standard element of colonial allegory." Maintains that, "[a]t the same time, the discourse of colonialism appropriates the biblical narrative of origins, recalls the moment of the Fall, and looks up to the promise of Salvation.” Argues that this “narrative framework” in Donne's poems forces us to assign a double role to the woman-figure, since “woman's role in Paradise has been defined in the Book of Genesis, where Eve is a dangerous seductress who brings death on mankind.” Observes that “[t]his ambivalence is also reflected in the cartographic metaphors of Donne’s poetry, where the European dominion over the newly discovered territories is constantly threatened by the silent presence of the female element: the hostile Other, who defies all attempts to map, possess, and control the unknown world” (272).


Discusses how Donne in Twick re-creates and re-fashion the Bedford estate “in accordance with the mood of the [poem’s] speaker.” Notes that in his account, “the place is a theme park: the poet chooses only those elements which can be read as emblems of his grief.” Points out that the garden becomes “itself a poem: its flower beds, fountains, and trees do not simply please the eye” but, more importantly, “they signify.” Maintains, therefore, that “the text privileges an intensely subjective point of view when we are told that the presence of the subject changes the Garden of Eden… into a garden of poisonous plants” and that “[t]he harbinger of this change (though not an agent) is the poetic persona of Donne’s poem” (49). Shows how the argument of Twick is “designed in such a way that in the end the lover’s complaint finally takes precedence over the patroness’s domain and her authority outside the poem.” Observes that “[t]he colour, shape and smell of the plants are not mentioned” and that “we know nothing about the design of the flowerbeds, scented borders or bay edges, joyful sunshine and soothing shade.” Maintains that “[t]he interpretive activity of the poetic persona thus disrupts the integrity of the Countess’s domain: her garden is not described in its entirety, but reduced to a
series of personal imprese, designed by a melancholy lover” (52).


Introduces “Establishing a ‘fitter’ Text of Donne’s ‘The Good Morrowe’” by Lara M. Crowley; “Betrothal: ‘The good-morrow’” by Ilona Bell; and “‘The Good Morrow’ and the Modern Aubade: Some Impressions” by Jonathan F. S. Post, essays that appear in *JDJ* 22: 5–21, 23–30, 31–45. These essays were originally presented in a panel at the John Donne Society Conference held in Gulfport, MS, February 2003. Each of the essays has been entered separately in this bibliography.


Comments on the Augustinianism and Pauline theology in Donne’s sermons and finds similarities between Donne and Hooker. Observes that although the word “inordinate” is Donne’s “characteristic pejorative,” he himself is often inordinate (65). Discusses the “shocking spiritual” oxymoron or “wild” pun “Everlasting night” in *Christ* (l. 28) (66).


Outlines briefly the history and variety of epithalamia and discusses Katherine Philips’s “To my dear sister Mrs. C. P. on her Nuptitalls” as a direct reply to Donne’s *EpLin*, a poem in which she “abandons virtually all of the elements of the epithalamic tradition” and demonstrates “resistance to the conventions of marriage in her culture, both literary and social” (127). Comments on Donne’s uses and exploitation of the conventions of the genre in *EpLin*, focusing primarily on its satirical elements. Noting how the tone of *EpLin* is “alternately laudatory and mocking,” explores “the complex web of gendered eroticism and parody in the poem” and comments on its “juxtaposition of bridal sexuality with mockery, parody and grotesque violence” (123). Maintains that *EpLin* is “ambiguous in its views of the wife, her role in marriage, and indeed, the functions of marriage itself” and that its “inherent instability, then, lies in the speaker’s shifting relationship to the event itself, sometimes resisting and sometimes claiming its power, especially as designated by the sexual and economic power of the groom over the bride.” Contrasts *EpLin* with Herrick’s “A Nuptial Song, or Epithalamie, on Sir Clipseby Crew and His Lady,” noting how Herrick’s poem is “far less satirical than Donne’s” (125).


Points out that although Donne’s poems are not usually considered examples of didactic literature, a copy of the first edition of his poems (1633) in the Folger Shakespeare Library (STC 7042, copy 2) “seems to have held particular didactic appeal for at least one seventeenth-century reader,” who, at the end of the volume, composed an idiosyncratic index of alphabetized topics, thereby attempting “to impose an order on the collection that will allow the reader to find useful phrases quickly to incorporate into the reader’s own writing or speech” (66). Observes that the compiler of the index not only culls expressions from Donne’s book but also “restores controversial lines” omitted in the 1633 edition, such as ll. 73–74 of *Sat2* (70). Maintains that the index “marks the permeable boundary between ‘didactic literature’ and ‘literature’ in mid-seventeenth century England, demonstrating how the characteristics that make a book authoritatively literary could also open the book to practical use” (71) and showing how “early modern reading practices
trouble the neat separation of ‘didactic literature’ and ‘literature’” (72).


Discusses the tension between the visual (seeing) and the verbal (hearing) in seventeenth-century religious poetry as a means of discovering the divine. Comments on the dramatic elements, the play of words and play on words, and the ambiguity in Donne’s Divine Poems, especially Holy Sonnets, Cross, and Goodf, as well as in Noct. Comments also on how the iconoclastic views of Protestants affected sacred poetry of the period.


An original poem entitled “John Donne in Hollywood.”


Discusses Donne’s portrait of Paolo Sarpi, their meeting in Venice (probably in February 1605), and Sarpi’s possible influence on Donne. Maintains that although both men criticized the Council of Trent, they arrived “at some similar conclusions from profoundly distinct philosophical and theological foundations.” Examines, therefore, both their similarities as “interpreters” of the Council and also the differences “in their renderings of the council and its rulings.” Maintains that although both Donne and Sarpi endorse religious reform, “neither pursues a Reformation that can be strictly identified as either Protestant or Catholic/Counter” and stresses how “each seeks, in his own way, a reformation of a more fundamental nature that transcends the bounds of sectarian allegiance” (91). Argues that “clarification of the thought of Donne and Scarpi provides a lens through which to gauge the complexity of responses to the Council of Trent and the religious controversies it sparked” (91–92). Comments on how Donne and Scarpi agree in their criticism of the Council of Trent, “especially concerning the papal self-interest that governed the council and which, they believed, established the Counter-Reformation by thwarting the possibilities for conciliarism.” Suggests, however, that “their distinct aims and ideals” and “their respective epistemological and theological differences are most clearly seen in their views of the Church” (97). Illustrates these differences by examining three sermons Donne gave in early spring and summer of 1626. Maintains that “the profoundly different views of grace held by Donne and Scarpi result in profoundly different views of the Church and of the type of conciliarism that each believes necessary to unify the Church” (108).

832. -----. “‘One, four, and infinite’: John Donne, Thomas Harriot, and Essays in Divinity.” JDJ 23: 109–43.

Maintains that Essays reveals Donne’s “development of a hermeneutic of the center” and also “exposes just how profoundly Donne understands the implications of the new philosophy, including the problems of the infinite.” Points out that “[a]s Donne seems to indicate, the difficulty of manifesting, from the standpoint of practical theology, how humanity apprehends divinity is the same difficulty as calculating, from the standpoint of the new philosophy, how the finite expression of numbers and geometry articulates the infinite.” Observes that at the time Thomas Harriot “was immersed in the problems of expressing the infinite and infinitesimal as mathematic and spatial continuums” and argues that parallels between Essays and Harriot’s manuscript notes “demonstrate the depth of Donne’s familiarity with the new philosophy and, more importantly, illuminate
the extent to which Harriot’s materialism influences not only Donne’s understanding of natural law, but also, by extension, the principles of his practical theology, especially with respect to his hermeneutic practice and his ecclesiology” (113). Suggests that Donne “relies on the astronomy and materialism of Thomas Harriot because he knows that sound theology requires sound natural philosophy” and holds that “what Donne is promoting” in Essays is “what might be described as a theological atomism, in which the progression of finite activities… establish[es] a continuum that finally culminates in the infiniteness of God.” Concludes that although Donne “accepts significant elements of Harriot’s natural philosophy, neither Donne nor Harriot adopts these new concepts at the expense of completely rejecting Aristotelian thought and older configurations of the universe.” Maintains that, in fact, both men “strain in their writings to synthesize the new with the old” (143).


Compares and contrasts the Holy Sonnets with those of the Polish poet Mikolaj Sep Szarvenski (1550–1581), showing how each builds “a philosophical conception of man’s place in the universe while employing a dramatic, personal, highly innovative style” (1). Says that a fundamental difference between the two is that Donne “accepts his humanity, whereas Sep cries out in despair against it” and that, whereas Sep desires “to leave the body,” Donne sublimates desire in his “eroticization of divine union” (20).


Discusses Donne’s career as secretary to Sir Thomas Egerton and his relations with the Egerton family. Examines “the culture and the working of the environment of York House, the extended Egerton family and its coterie, and the legal and political cultures and structures of the age” (37). Argues that Donne’s “work and association in the household of the Lord Keeper contributed to shape his political and religious choices and may have proved instrumental in the attitudes and positions that coalesced in his last years as Dean of St. Paul’s” (38). Discusses Donne’s family and background, his early connections with and training in the legal profession, and his travels abroad. Presents a detailed sketch of the religious, political, and legal culture of the Egerton household. Comments on Donne’s marriage and his dismissal from York House and his quests for a livelihood thereafter, which culminated in his ordination as a priest of the Church of England.


Calls Donne “[o]ne of the most prominent literary figures of the early seventeenth century” but notes that he has “engendered widely differing views regarding the merits of his work” (1). Presents a biographical sketch of Donne, a general introduction to his major works and a brief survey of his critical reception, followed by a listing of his principal works (1–3). Reprints Achsah Guibbory’s “Oh, let mee not serve so’: The Politics of Love in Donne’s Elegies” ELH 57 (1990): 811–33 (3–14); Maureen Sabine’s “No Marriage in Heaven: John Donne, Anne Donne, and the Kingdom Come,” in John Donne’s “desire of more”: The Subject of Anne More Donne in His Poetry, ed. M. Thomas Hester (Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated Presses), pp. 228–55 (14–28); Lisa Gorton’s “John Donne’s Use of Space” EMLS 4.2 (1998): 1–27 (28–36); H. L. Meakin’s “Donne Writes Back: His Dialogue With Ovid and Sappho,” in John Donne’s Articulation of

Maintains that in Air Donne “wittily transubstantiates the Thomistic angel, a philosophical and theological creation of the ‘angelic doctor’, into a ‘Donna angelica’ or ‘Donna Angelicata’, a real presence and a firsthand experience.” Explains that Donne “accomplishes this transformation by ascribing to the beloved in the poem the very angelic presence that women manifested in their interactions with him and other men.” Argues that “[t]his angelic presence results, of course, when a woman assumes the ‘air of an angel’, i.e., when “a woman becomes redolent with, and emits, the ‘air’ (the fragrance and aroma) of ‘angelica’, a family of plants whose roots, stalks, leaves, flowers, and fruits were, and are even today, used to add flavor to food and drink, to create herbal and medicinal potions and oils, to make candied victuals, and, of prime importance, to produce perfume” (94). Points out that “[b]y extracting the ‘essences’ from this family of plants and using them in any one or more of the ways stated above, a woman could and did exercise potent influence over a man at his intake of food and drink, in his reaction to herbal potions and oils, and during his response to a fragrance that she exudes” (94–95). Maintains that “[w]hereas the Thomistic angel assumes air, perhaps even ether, and condenses and illuminates it when appearing to humankind, women affect men by (par) and through (per) the fume that they emit.” Holds that in Air “the speaker reacts to the ‘air’ of a woman perfumed with angelica.” Proceeds by presenting “a brief Neoplatonic and Paracelsian overview of herbal and floral essences and fragrances, with emphasis on angelica and its properties,” and by surveying herbal fragrances in Herrick’s poems. In the light of this information, offers an analysis of Air, arguing that the woman in the poem becomes a Donna Angelicata, “who will neither be tainted by nor yield to the bodily impulses of the speaker, who seeks to refashion her more materialistically” but who finally “is compelled to rarefy his love by accommodation to angelic purity” (107).


Explicates ll. 11–14 of HSSpit based on iconographic and typological renditions of Jacob’s trickery in Genesis 27, 6–29, in particular those appearing in The Bible of the Poor. Also suggests how these lines “not only bear on other poems that Donne wrote but also anticipate the very manner in which he prepared himself for death” (48). Notes that Donne in HSSpit develops “a typological contrast with the self-serving Jacob and self-sacrificing Jesus,” who “‘clothed himself in vile mans flesh’ in order that ‘he might be weak enough to suffer woe’” (50–51) on behalf of all mankind. Maintains, therefore, that in HSSpit Donne “applies the
word ‘vile,’ whose synonyms are ‘base,’ ‘lowly,’ and ‘mean,’ to Jacob and Jesus because both figures degrade themselves.” Points out that “[a]s a corollary to this typological analysis, Rebecca foreshadows the role of the Virgin Mary, who invests the Son with his human nature” and that “Isaac’s blindness may be compared to God the Father’s seeming lack of sight.” Suggests that “[b]y punishing Jesus, the innocent victim, in place of the miscreant Adam, God the Father appears to have judged blindly” but, “[i]ronically, Jesus, in adopting the form and nature of humankind, may be construed as having deceived and tricked the Father, who, like Isaac, mismatches the legacy with the heir.” In other words, the Father “bestows a legacy of bitterness, justly belonging to Adam and his progeny on Jesus and humankind receives, in turn, the merciful bequest of redemption” (51). Comments on other poems in which Donne develops a similar viewpoint, “with explicit reference to attire and with implicit allusion to the story of Jacob,” such as Goodf and Father. Suggests that the funeral shroud that Donne donned in his last days signifies “both the garment of Jesus at the Passion and his bloodied humanity” (55); thus, Donne, like Jacob, wishes to “impersonate” Jesus and “deceive” the Father, as Jacob deceived Isaac (56–57).


An original poem in imitation of Donne.


 Discusses how Donne in Devotions “takes an anti-polemistic position in order to renew and revitalize ‘true Religion’ in England.” Maintains that Donne “counters an emerging polemicism in the church, evident in the increase of inflammatory pamphlets and sermons in the 1620s, in order to conserve what he sees as the founda-

tion of its Reformation heritage” (273), urging “his church audience to focus on their shared Reformation heritage rather than on what he defines as less important and potentially divisive religious concerns.” Focuses on the conclusion of the Devotions “to demonstrate that Donne is committed to broadly conceived principles of the English Reformation” and to illustrate that, although he uses the rhetoric of “a militant Protestant,” he does so “in a characteristically anti-polemicist way” (275), underlining “those exclusionary categories erected by the polemics of his day” (286). Maintains that in multiple ways Donne “seeks to break down the barriers that divided the church of his day” and “revels in imagining the moment of the final consummation as one that breaks down all the walls currently maintained and erected in the church by strident polemics” (287).


Argues that the recent focus of critics of Katherine Philips’s Donnean poems of love and friendship on “her presumably royalist politics, lesbian sexuality, and alternately transparent or screened poetry—has made it almost impossible to understand or appreciate her work as it deserves.” Maintains that “[r]egarding her poetry as autobiographical code, readers reduce it to its alleged political or sexual content and respond to it with perplexing ideological passion” (60). Insists that Donne was for Philips “an inspirational but limited forebear whom she moved beyond as she developed her own poetics” (61). Points out that Philips’s marriage poems show that she “uses Donne to posit an intimate relationship, but that she drops him both when she transforms his notion of private relationship into her ideal of sealed ‘Union,’ and when she dismisses his poetry of elaborate comparison in favor of what is in these poems a mysteriously ‘unitary’ or specular poetics” (61–62). Maintains that in her sapphic poetry, Philips “picks up” where Donne’s Sappho “leaves off, taking the specular discourse that
his elegy vainly seeks and that her marriage poems keep mainly to themselves, and revealing it to be a fully developed sapphic poetics brilliantly adequate to the expressive demands of (female) union.” Calls Philips “Donne’s last and best heir and innovator” and “a major poet in her own right.” Exploring Philips’s Donnean poems of love and friendship, suggests some reasons why her poetry has been misrepresented and ignored, such as “the occluded nature of sapphic discourse within masculinist rhetorical tradition; the possibility that in sealing up Donne for 200 years, Walton sealed up the Donnean Philips for 300; and Philips’s status as ‘the English Sappho,’ a complex and fluid designation that may or may not identify her as a poet, leader, wanton, or lesbian, and that was at her death undergoing a semantic shift that still colors our response to her poetry” (62).


Analyzes Flea and SunRis to illustrate certain key concepts presented by Paul Watzlawick, Janet Beavin Bavelas, and Don D. Jackson in Pragmatics of Human Communication (1967), “first and foremost the fundamental axiom ‘one cannot not communicate’” (57). Maintains that the speaker of Flea “succeeds at scoring a rhetorical-digital victory in the face of pragmatic-analogic defeat: the addressee retains authority over her body, and he remains in control of the communication.” Points out that “[a]t the same time, as long as the interchange follows the pattern of symmetric escalation, the demonstration of his superior wit is actually counterproductive to both possible resolutions, one being compliance, and the second his acquiescence in rejection.” Concludes, therefore, that the poem is “not the record of an attempted seduction, but of such pathological communication as ensues when seduction has failed.” Notes that “[i]f you want to turn someone on, you do not talk of death and decomposition, nor of fleas and cloister either.” Discusses also author/reader communication in Flea, in which “there are likewise two levels and two aspects present, digital/analogic and content/relationship” (61). Points out that one must “recognize the ingenuity and subtlety of the rhetorical exercise” and also “realize that the speaker’s rhetoric undercuts itself through its metacommunicational aspect.” Notes that “[w]hat emerges on the analogic level is the self-definition of the author who at the same time asserts and denies his own authority and the validity of poetic rhetoric” (62). Analyzes also SunRis, observing that in it “[t]he ostensible addressee, the sun, functions as a stage prop in a miniature three-act one-man drama performed for the benefit of the lady, who is the audience as well as a minor character with a mute role.” Maintains that in SunRis the speaker’s message to the lady is “initially a consequence of the abovementioned fact that one cannot not communicate, especially not when waking up together after a night of amorous activity, when silence would be a disconfirmation of the relationship, unless it went hand in hand with the analogic communication of continued lovemaking” (66).


Argues that “the aesthetic instability of the Holy Sonnets and Anniversaries reflects the reckless competition for psychic and social assurance prevalent throughout a ‘culture of anxiety,’” which in Donne’s case “was greatly aggravated by the competition between rival theological models of salvation” (193). Points out that in Sat3, for instance, “doctrinal conflict among Protestants so severely pits them against one another that some are driven back to the dubious ‘embrace’ of ‘mother’ Rome, a reversion most Protestants considered equivalent to atheism.” Finds similar irresolution and conflict in the Holy Sonnets. Says that Donne’s purpose in creating “conflicting perspectives” in the Holy Sonnets, as well as in Anniversaries and his sermons, “is not resolution but irresolution, a tactic that keeps him at the perpetu-
ally unstable apex of the sacrificial crisis they dramatize” (194). While admitting that this view has some merit, maintains that “it ultimately overlooks the alternate pole of Donne’s dialectic,” namely his “attempt to forge a viable via media” between the conflicting religious positions of the time. Comments on the melancholy and “angst-ridden” spirituality of the time (195) and on the Protestant “re-creation of sacramental symbols” (195), once transubstantiation is rejected. Points out that in FirAn Donne “associates sacramental loss not just with the elimination of holy acts, images, sanctuaries and relics” but also with “the loss of the ritual power of language” and sees the poems as “quintessentially baroque in supplementing the lost sacramental potency of art with a displaced aesthetic substitute” (196). Regards the Holy Sonnets as a triangulation between “Calvinist iconoclasm and Counter-Reformation neosacramentalism” (197), poems that show believers “hopelessly torn between confessing their defective faith and blaming the deity for permitting the conflicting claims that asked them as no previous generation to make such temporally and eternally life-threatening choices” (199). Shows how Donne gives voice to the spiritual and psychological conflicts of his time.


Discusses how Walton’s biography of Donne follows the conventions of a “clerical biographical preface” that required “the subservience of secular portrayal to clerical exemplarity” (251). Comments on how Walton uses and transforms Donne’s language and images, especially from the sermons, to achieve his goal of portraying Donne as a new St. Augustine.


Praises Edward Tayler’s Donne’s Idea of a Woman: Structure and Meaning in “The Anniversaries” (1991) and in the light of this study revises his earlier charting of the structure of the Anniversaries in The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century (1954). Points out that he had labeled the divisions of each section of FirAn as “Meditation,” “Eulogy,” and “Refrain and Moral” and the later sections of SecAn as “Meditation” and “Eulogy.” Maintains that “one should not limit the term ‘Meditation’ only to the first part of the second” because “[t]he whole threefold sequence of every section is a meditation by the three powers of the soul, while the whole five-part or seven-part sequence constitutes a complete meditation,” with FirAn “clearing the ground for the ‘Progress’ envisaged in the sequel” (87). Presents then a revised charting of the progress in SecAn.


Argues that Donne’s “intellectual interest in English law has been underestimated” as has “the degree to which it continued to help structure his thought in his later years as a clergyman” (20). Points out the prevalence of references to law (civil and canon) and legal practice in Donne’s secular and religious poetry and in his prose works. Discusses how these works reflect his keen interest in and knowledge of the law and of legal language. Presents a detailed reading of HSPart as an example of a poem that echoes Donne the lawyer and suggests how the sonnet, “not disinterestedly, offers its own version of legal aid” (27) and hinges on the “invisible pun on the word ‘testament.’” Maintains that HSPart “reveals the way in which English common law, even though Donne no longer practised it in 1609–10, cuts right
across the general civilian terms of the Continental theologians and participates in debates on ownership and possession very present in those years” (34). Concludes that Donne’s achievement in _HSPart_ is that “he makes Gospel, Law” but “does so not in the angry denunciations of the Puritan lecturer, but by pleading as eloquently as he can the impossible claims of humanity before a divine judge” (36).


Argues that Donne and Lancelot Andrewes are “in so many crucial ways—generation, churchmanship, prose style—so different as to be compared perhaps only insofar as the proverbial apple and orange” and suggests that “much more productive work on similarities should be carried out” by comparing Donne to Hugh Latimer, Hooker, Hall, or John King and Henry King (165). Examines, however, the tradition of comparing Donne and Andrewes by surveying “the factual biographical grounds for considering the two together,” examines “the bibliographical politics of the 1620’s and ’30’s that began to force them into an unnatural proximity” (165), and lastly looks at “the perhaps much more productive use of the two in the recent, but long overdue work of assessing Donne’s churchmanship, with particular reference to the relative places in it of preaching and the eucharist as conduits of divine grace” (165–66).


Examines “the details of when, where, and why Donne preached at the courts of James I and Charles I.” Points out that such an examination “raises questions about the canon of Donne’s sermons” and that “attention to matters of text, place, auditory, and dating of Donne’s court sermons” shows that “the court’ itself is a social space much more complex than usually allowed in literary study.” Maintains that Donne’s sermons “(like all others) are fundamentally, although never simplistically, occasional pieces of writing.” Warns that scholars “must not wade into Donne's sermons looking for evidence of his theological or other views without much more carefully considering the place, time, and occasion of the individual sermon” (179). Reviews “the surviving evidence of Donne’s appearance as a preacher at court—from his ordination in January 1615, to his last sermon, before Charles I in February 1631,” and then uses Donne’s “attendance as preacher at Charles’s court as a smaller case study of the way more rigorous bibliographical and historical scholarship can inform our interpretation of Donne's political and literary craftsmanship in the pulpit.” Maintains that “[t]his in turn yields valuable new evidence about Donne's always vexed relationship with courts, and about the emergence of Laudianism before the Personal Rule” (180). In an appendix (203–04), presents a chronological chart of Donne’s sermons preached at court.


Discusses Donne’s sermons preached at Paul’s Cross, examining, in particular, how these sermons “allowed him to make public statements on political subjects without diverging from a strict definition of his role as preacher of the Gospel” (159). Maintains that an analysis of “how Donne explicated and then applied the texts on which he preached provides us with an historically sensitive method for investigating his use of Scripture to engage with current affairs.” Discusses three of Donne’s Jacobean Paul’s Cross sermons to show how in each Donne’s “description of the subject’s duties and the monarch’s responsibilities are carefully placed within the larger context of Christian
doctrine” and points out how Donne “exercises a stronger sense of rhetorical decorum than many other Paul’s Cross preachers, as he takes care to treat his texts in ways that provide advice for those present, James’s subjects, without dictating precepts for, or defining, the duties of the king” (161). Points out that the three sermons illustrate Donne’s “particular skill in using all of the resources of the preacher, from the choice of text, the method of division, the explication and the choice of points for application, in the development of the argument” (177–78). Maintains that Donne’s “use of techniques that silently pass over or separate matters of controversy shows the subtlety of his method as a political preacher” (179).


Presents a general, appreciative survey of Donne’s life and work. Argues that great poetry “is founded in genuine experience, in the struggles of everyday life” and that the events of Donne’s “tumultuous life” provide the substance of his poetry. Warns, however, that the poems are not strictly autobiographical. Maintains that Donne’s life was governed by two major passions—his love for his wife and his love of God (244). In a biographical sketch, comments, in particular, on Donne’s religious background and development and his marriage to Anne More. Stresses that in both Donne’s secular and sacred verse the reader finds a blend of brilliant intellectual play and intense passion.


Contains a foreword (xi–xii) by Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury, who praises Donne for showing how “a mercurial personality and a wildly extravagant and often dark imagination can be made the vehicles for Christian orthodoxy” (xii); a preface by the editor (xiii–xv), who points out that the intent of the anthology is to present “a comprehensive overview” of Donne that, “drawing in large measure upon his sermons, provides the general reader with an introduction of his thought” (xiii); and three introductory essays: “The Man and His Meaning” (3–16), “Poet, Propagandist, Preacher” (17–46), and “Deane of Paules” (47–59). Thereafter (67–316) follows more than 1000 quotations from Donne, 800 of which are drawn from the sermons, intended to provide “ample illustration of Donne’s observance of life, his wit, his awareness of God, his affirmations of faith, the wealth of imagery he employed, his tricks of style and his rhetoric” (xiv). Concludes with notes (317–52).

Reviews:

• Gerald Bray in Sobornost 27, no. 2 (2005): 98.
• Matthew Kelty in CSQ 40 (2005): 105–06.


Examines the use of tense in lyric poetry and points out that Donne’s “self-expressive” poems “frequently have the tendency to absorb the past into the present” (43). Brief reference to Noct.


Discusses the theme of suffering in Donne’s devotional poetry. Maintains that his understanding of suffering came not only from religious meditation and aesthetic analysis but also from his own personal experience. Suggests that Donne often puts himself in the po-
sition of the psalmist and that much of his inspiration on the theme of suffering comes from the psalms. Compares and contrasts Donne's images of suffering with conventional images of suffering. Maintains that through the power of poetry he was able to reconcile his inner tensions and doubts concerning his salvation.


Points out several Platonic features of *GoodM* and discusses in particular how “Plato’s cave allegory and his World of Ideas are integral to a full understanding of this highly complex poem.” Suggests that in l. 4 Donne alludes not only to the seven Christian sleepers but also to Plato’s cave dwellers and notes that the line is “immediately followed by a Platonic reference to the lady as the Idea of Beauty.” Points out that in stanza 1 of *GoodM* both the speaker and his beloved are “in darkness” but that, in stanza 2, they emerge “into the sunlight, awakened from the dream that they previously considered to be reality” (20). Observes that whereas “Plato’s freed cave-dwellers discover God,” Donne and his mistress “find each other” (20–21), thus making *GoodM* “a very clever reworking of Plato’s cave allegory, in which Donne and his beloved “establish a perfect love relationship and become themselves part of the World of Ideas” and, “[t]ogether, they constitute a complete and perfect world.” Maintains that in ll. 19–21 of *GoodM* Donne presents “the possibility of a perfect eternal love relationship, such as one would expect to find only in Plato’s World of Ideas.” Discusses how Donne and his lady “emerge from the dreamlike unreality and darkness of the cave and immediately discover that henceforth it is they who are the Platonic Idea of sexual love.” Concludes that “[a]lternately, one can argue that Donne (or his poetic voice) experiences a transient relationship in this poem that may or may not develop into a Platonic Idea” but that, even so, the speaker “has learned a great deal and become capable, as a consequence, of achieving the Platonic Idea of sexual love in a possibly new, deathless encounter that is ‘mixed equally’” (21).


Argues that the placement of *Sat3* in the middle of the five *Satyres* was “designed as a symbolic solution to the problem of career and the threat of moral pollution in situations where individual conscience comes into conflict with social demands and political exigencies, a concern that Donne similarly addresses again some years later in the sermons.” Discusses how *Sat3* “aims to involve its audience in a symbolic reorientation of the motives dramatized in the surrounding narrative.” Believes that, to achieve this end, Donne “employs a baptized mode of courtship that turns the logic of worldly pursuits of desire toward a pursuit of a higher end” (6). Discusses how the central image of the “hill of truth” in the central poem of the five poems serves “a symbolic function with respect to the rest of the *Satyres* and the problem they elaborate.” Maintains that this image “enacts a ritual of purification, enabling the satirist and the audience whom he counsels to continue seeking a public career in precarious circumstances by subordinating this pursuit to a larger project of seeking truth”; thus “[c]areer is made to be an element in a larger courtship that envisions as its end truth in religion and, ultimately, God” (8).


Discusses how in *Devotions*, as in the sermons, Donne uses the “strategies of pathopoeia, the arousing of the emotions,” and specifically “hypotyposis, or vivid depictions of emotionally charged circumstances, to incite the passions of his audience and motivate them in devotion” (247). Maintains, furthermore, that “[t]hese circumstances typically bear a formal pattern of fall and redemption, a distinctively Protestant emphasis in devotional experience,
which aims to move the congregant or reader to feel profoundly his or her complete dependence on God’s grace and to respond with faith in Christ” (247–48). Argues that “as a pastor-preacher,” Donne’s intention “was not simply to convey personal experience or even to teach by example” but rather “to move his audience to greater devotion” (249). Examines “the Protestant pathopoeic form” of the Devotions and shows how Donne “uses this form to stimulate and move his audience toward greater devotion” (251).


In Chinese. Discusses the development of the sonnet in England, noting how both Donne and Milton broke with tradition and brought the sonnet to its maturity. Discusses HSMin, HSSpit, HSBatter, and Milton’s “Methought I Saw My Late Espoused Saint.” Says that Donne broadened the theme of the sonnet by introducing religious experience, new science, new knowledge, and new ideas, thereby opening up the sonnet for future poets.


Points out how Donne in LovAlch “problematizes the healing potential of the dead female body” and in Devotions “plays on the complex paradoxes of mummy and the body of Christ in the eucharist,” noting how he intellectualizes “the physician’s use of human flesh as medicine for his ailing body” (687). Maintains that “[i]n his hypothesis of the pharmacological and spiritual relationship between the eater and the eaten, Donne explains the superior curative value of ingesting dead human flesh” (687–88). Says that, for Donne, “the remedy is simple: the homeopathic power to restore his own body to health lies within the corpse of another” (688).


Comments on Donne as a coterie poet, noting how the coterie culture that flourished from Wyatt to Donne “made anonymity into an evocative symbol of elite values and made coterie poetry some of the most collectible of the period” (161). Discusses in detail the two Dalhousie manuscripts now housed in the Texas Tech University Library, which “offer an opportunity to explore inconspicuous anonymity, its elusive agency, and the connections between inconspicuousness and seventeenth-century coterie culture” (194). Observes that although Donne is “the primary author in the manuscripts, poems by Thomas Overbury, John Davies, John Roe, Sir John Harington, and others both divide and connect the Donne clusters to one another, suggesting that one cannot have a Donne anthology without the vital network of individuals who also wrote within his circle and who read and transmitted his works” (199). Comments on Donne’s letter to Goodyer in 1614 in which he suggests collecting his poems but points out that because his poems circulated within his social network and because he does not have copies of all of them, he must ask the members of his coterie for copies. Maintains that the letter shows that Donne “clearly does not consider himself the owner of his poems, even though he views himself as the author”; in other words, “[h]e does not have unlimited use of the products of his imagination” because “[p]ropriety and the realities of the coterie transmission have set limits on his manipulation of his work.” Discusses also how the publication history of Donne’s letters “illustrates how important his coteries were to the compilation of his works” (200). Comments on three poems in Dalhousie I—ElAnag, Curse, and Triple—that “make coterie anonymity an implicit subject” and that show Donne “manipulating the meanings of discretion and social authorship” (201). Maintains that coterie anonymity is “based on the transfer of author information to a target audience with their values in mind and on the sub-
sequent consequences when that information does or does not reach the next reader” (204).


Compares the treatment of love in the poetry of Donne and Emily Dickinson, both of whom see love as an entrance into an unknown, fascinating world of spiritual and intellectual discovery and rebirth. Calls love “the cosmology of the heart.” Presents a detailed analysis of SunRis in which love is seen as order and harmony and the bedroom viewed as a private, privileged space that the lovers inhabit, thereby shutting out the crass outside world.


Comments on portraits of Donne, on the manuscript circulation of his poetry, and on the early printed copies of his works. Points out that the 1635 edition of his poems contains an “engraved frontispiece by William Marshall, after the miniature of Donne at eighteen, the presumed Hilliard portrait that has now disappeared” and that “the same frontispiece continued to adorn editions of the poems until the 1650’s.” Suggests that, by using this engraving rather than others that were available, the publisher of the poems obviously wanted to present Donne as “a romantic youth, Donne the courtier-lover at the age of eighteen, wide-eyed, earringed, his fist clutching the hilt of his sword, which looks as if it is about to explode with excitement.” Maintains that the portraits of Donne, “or at least the iconographic assumptions embodied in them,” are an important part of literary history (10).

861. Pando Canteli, María J. “… an oft en Absences/Withdrew our Soules and made us Carcasses”: The Destructive Power of the Female Figure in Donne’s Nocturnall and Quevedo’s Love Poetry.” SEDERI 13: 155–62.

Argues that the poetry of Donne and of Francisco de Quevedo “come together neither under the powerful presence of the metaphysical wit, nor due to their concern with love and death” but rather “converge in the unavoidable presence in their poetry of a powerful poetic subject, pervading all themes and all poetic sub-genres, from the religious and the moral, to the erotic and satirical, which is invariably expressed through strikingly powerful material, bodily images.” Believes that “[t]his self-centred concern” comes from the Petrarchan tradition, “from which Donne and Quevedo somehow recover but also discover this ‘subjective’ quality, intensifying and purifying it.” Discusses, as examples, “the destructive power of a female figure in absentia in the landscape of the lyric I’s physical identity” in Noct and Quevedo’s “Canta Sola a List” and “Amore me ocupa el seso y los sentidos.” Maintains that, in this light, the love poetry of both poets “exhibits interesting affinities with their religious and occasional poetry.” Argues that “[t]he singular treatment of the subject’s body and its vulnerable stability in both Donne’s and Quevedo’s texts may work as a point of departure to discuss the problematic concept of subjectivity in early seventeenth-century poetry” and also “the role of the female figure in the construction of such an identity”—and “may also lead to reassess the significance of Petrarchan conventions in the formation of the poetic experience” (155).


Discusses the influence of St. Augustine on Donne, in particular, Augustine’s later predestinarian theology, “with its emphasis on original sin, election, perseverance, and grace” and maintains that it represents “a continuation of—not a break from—the underlying
theology of the *Confessions*” (67). Argues that “[a]wareness of this connection between the *Confessions*, late Augustine, and the Reformation will enable us to define more fully an important backdrop for interpreting the emotions Donne displays throughout his divine poetry and in such works as De *votions Upon Emergent Occasions*,” emotions that “place Donne squarely in the theological mainstream of the Church of England” (68–69). Discusses passages from Donne’s sermons to show that he “turned to Augustine’s *Confessions* as far more than simply a pattern for his own life”; “[r]ather the *Confessions* enabled Donne to do nothing less than define man’s nature and his relationship to God” (76). Discusses also the importance of Augustinianism in the divine poems, especially the *Holy Sonnets*, in which Donne “presents speakers who embody Augustine’s view of sinful man yearning for the grace that only God can give” (80). Concludes that, “[i]n short, Donne can be considered a ‘second S. Augustine’ not simply because his life, in Walton’s eyes, followed an Augustinian pattern, but, more importantly, because he put into poetry as powerful as that of Augustine’s own *Confessions* the emotions behind the predestinarian theology that was Augustine’s legacy to the English Church” (83–84).


Collection of 13 original essays by divers hands, each of which has been entered separately in this bibliography. Contains an introduction by the editor (1–11) that outlines the purpose of the collection—to explore the impact of the Reformation on Donne’s life, theology, prose, and poetry; presents an introduction to Donne’s biography in the light of the historical and religious contexts in which he lived; and comments on the essays that follow that show Donne as “one deeply committed both to the Reformation heritage of the Church of England and as a preacher deeply committed to effective pastoral care of his flock” (5). Includes the following essays: Dan Doerksen’s “Polemist or Pastor? Donne and Moderate Calvinist Conformity” (12–34); Jeanne Shami’s “Speaking Openly and Speaking First: John Donne, the Synod of Dort, and the Early Stuart Church” (35–65); Mary Arshagouni Papazian’s “The Augustinian Donne: How a ‘Second S. Augustine?’” (66–89); Jeffrey Johnson’s “John Donne and Paolo Sarpi” (90–112); Raymond-Jean Frontain’s “Donne’s Protestant *Paradiso*: The Johannine Vision of the Second Anniversary” (113–42); Paul R. Sellin’s “‘Souldiers of one Army’: John Donne and the Army of the States General as an International Protestant Crossroads” (143–92); Catherine Gimelli Martin’s “‘Unmeete Contraryes: The Reformed Subject and the Triangulation of Religious Desire in Donne’s *Anniversaries* and *Holy Sonnets*” (193–220); Chanita Goodblatt’s “‘From ‘Tav’ to the Cross: John Donne’s Protestant Exegesis and Polemics” (221–46); Brent Nelson’s “*Pathopoiesia* and the Protestant Form of Donne’s *De* votions Upon Emergent Occasions” (247–72); Elena Levy-Navarro’s “Breaking Down the Walls That Divide: Anti-Polemicism in the *De* votions Upon Emergent Occasions” (273–92); Annette Deschner’s “Reforming Baptism: John Donne and Continental Irenicism” (293–313); Maria Salenius’s “True Purification: Donne’s Art of Rhetoric in Two Candlemas Sermons” (314–34); and Gale H. Carrithers, Jr., and James D. Hardy, Jr.’s “‘Not upon a Lecture, but upon a Sermon’: Devotional Dynamics of the Don- nean Fisher of Men” (335–59). Concludes with a biographical sketch of the contributors (361–65) and an index (365–85).

Reviews:

- Kate Gartner Frost in *RenQ* 57 (2004): 1168–70.

Presents a brief introduction to Donne's life, poetry, and the Devotions (896–97) that includes a paraphrase of Air, followed by 39 poems from the Songs and Sonnets, 5 elegies, FirAn, 9 selections from the Holy Sonnets, 2 hymns, and the meditation and expostulation No. 17 from Devotions—with brief explanatory notes.


Discusses how the “deliberate intrication of sickness, self-scrutiny, scriptural wrangling, and semiotics typifies the Devotions.” Observes that “[a]lthough, like most devotional writers, Donne's purpose is broadly ethical, the Devotions is intimate rather than merely didactic, 'experiential' rather than proscriptive.” Calls Devotions “a spiritual autobiography” (216). Maintains that although the “structure, typology, numerology, and place in English and European meditative traditions” of Devotions “have been interrogated thoroughly” and although “it has been mined for Donne's views of sickness, rarely has the Devotions been examined for Donne's attitude toward medical thought,” even though “his knowledge of medicine was profound” (217). Shows that Devotions reveals that Donne's medical thought “encompassed clinical practice, therapeutics, anatomy, surgery, and hygiene” and that he had “an acute sense of the work necessary to the maintenance of the human body” (218). Places the Devotions “in the context of the early modern discourse of affliction,” noting that, “like other devotional writers and theologians, Donne conceived sickness as an emblem of sin.” Also examines the ways in which Donne “enlists medicine in general and medical semiotics in particular” in order “to explore the relationship between rhetoric and reason, knowledge and inference, reading and rectitude.” Observes that, for Donne, “mapping the contours of the soul as they are manifest in the body depends upon the ability to reason prudently from symptoms to syndromes, from signs to intentions, from bodies to souls” (219).


Notes that beginning with Grierson's edition (1912) until the 7th edition of The Norton Anthology of English Literature (2000), GoodM occupied “pride of place” by being placed first in editions of and selections from the Songs and Sonnets (31) and considers “some consequences” that stem from the poem’s “long reign” as an “inaugural poem” (32). Explains how “the prominence” of GoodM in the twentieth century raises “some issues unique to this poem” and also heightens “a particular view of Donne that left its mark on some important poetry written in the century” (32–33). Discusses GoodM as an aubade and notes that many aubades “suspiciously Donnean” start appearing “by the middle of the twentieth century” (36), citing examples from Robert Lowell, W. D. Snodgrass, Richard Wilbur, W. H. Auden, Anthony Hecht, Philip Larkin, and especially Elizabeth Bishop.


Discusses Sappho as a lesbian poem and notes that, although Donne “was not the first Renaissance male poet to imagine love from a lesbian perspective,” he is, however, the first “to do so sensuously and [probably] to make his lesbian speaker Sappho herself.” Points out two poems by Ronsard and one by Pontus de Tyard in which the poets “adopt the voice of a female speaker who yearns erotically, or at least pas-
sionately, for another woman” but notes that “[n]one mentions Sappho” (112). Compares and contrasts Donne’s poem with these three French precedents and maintains that the French poems “can help us more accurately to disentangle what is unique and what merely unusual in Donne’s poems, to set his elegy in one more literary and cultural context.” Suggests that Donne may have wanted “to show his friends that an English wit could rival, overgo, imitate or otherwise equal the risqué French” and that “[t]he map of his social world included the Continental literary scene as well as that of ancient Rome, and more faintly drawn, Sappho’s Lesbos” (127). Concludes that “whatever their moments of misogyny, of accusatory cynicism, Ronsard, Tyard and Donne could also imagine, or try to imagine, or think they were imagining, a sexual subjectivity other than their own and to do so with what strikes some readers as real if limited sympathy” (128).


Discusses the difficulty, even the impossibility, of translating perfectly a poetic text from one language to another, a translation that fully represents not only the technical aspects of the poem but also its emotional effects. Points out that no Italian translation of Donne’s poetry has been able to capture its uniqueness. Notes how Donne’s poetry, which replicates the rhythmic cadences of spoken English, cannot be adequately rendered into Italian. Observes also the difficulty of translating successfully into Italian the sweet, melodic rhythms of Carew’s poems. Concludes that at best only transliterations are possible.


Points out that the speaker’s initial description of his beloved and himself in Seamus Heaney’s “Glanmore Sonnet X” from Field World (1979) reminds one of the opening lines of Ecst. Notes, however, that unlike “the transcendent union of spirit” between the two lovers in Donne’s poem, Heaney’s lovers “seem to transcend their separateness only momentarily” and find only a “respite’ from isolation and the world around them.” Believes that Heaney “intends that the reader recognize this allusion” (256), thereby underscoring “our awareness of the less idealistic point of view in his poem” (257).


Argues that Browning’s “Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day” (1850) “owes much to the model provided him by the young John Donne, both as an individual seeking truth in the midst of difficult choices affecting his spiritual life, and as a Christian satirist” (50). Maintains that Browning, like Donne, “discovered in the conventions and techniques of formal verse satire a viable method of examining, however, obliquely, questions relating to his Christian faith.” Examines Browning’s “life-long fascination with Donne’s poetry” (51). Discusses the similarities and differences between Browning’s poem and Donne’s Satyres and concludes that whatever contrasting features there are between the poems, “such differences as exist are far outweighed by the similarities based on the methods and techniques of formal satire; nor do these differences take away from the overwhelming evidence of Browning’s attachment to John Donne” (67).
Argues that in order to understand Donne’s religious disposition and evolution in his sermons one should shift “the main attention away from the actual doctrinal contents to the presentation thereof, to look at Donne’s rhetoric of presenting his theology rather than at the details of this theology.” Using Thomas Wilson’s Art of Rhetoric as a guide, discusses Donne’s two Candlemas sermons (1624 and 1627) in order “to trace his true faith and to show its realization in and with rhetorical device.” Comments on how Donne “uses rhetorical conventions to discuss his topic from a Protestant viewpoint” and how he “uses a Protestant rhetoric to define his originally medieval and Catholic themes.” Also maintains that “beyond Donne’s references and implications there is a deep and strongly convincing rhetoric conveying his Protestant disposition and reaching out to his audience in a powerful way” (315). Concludes that an examination of the linguistic and rhetorical aspects of the two sermons, “as opposed to the purely theological details, reveals an element of communication that can easily go undefined but that has strong impact on the final text and its intended effect on the audience” (329–30).

873. Schall, James V. “Unlike the Spider in the Window: ‘To Chuse, is to Do.’” University Bookman 43, nos. 3–4: 63–64.

Comments on Donne’s views on letter-writing as reflected in four of his letters to Goodyer, written between 1604 and 1608. Notes that Donne says that “[t]he frequent letter conveys better than anything else both knowledge and love” (63). Observes that although Donne refers to Pliny, Seneca, St. Paul, the Jesuits, Martial, and Montaigne among others, he thinks that “the prize goes for letter-writing, perhaps with some irony, to the Italians” (64).


Maintains that “[t]hroughout the course of Donne’s adult life English military involvement in the Low Countries wars deeply impinged on him and his” and is reflected in his poetry and prose. Examines in detail “the religious, political, and cultural milieu in which British military personnel abroad found themselves in the Netherlands” (144), noting that “the list of officers commanding Scottish and English units during the first quarter of the seventeenth century reads like a military honor roll of Protestant chivalry involving the first families governing England and the Dutch republic” (144–45). Traces Donne’s active military service and discusses his accompanying Doncaster to The Hague in 1619–1620. Comments on Donne’s keen interest in the military operations abroad after his own active service concluded and discusses his personal connections with many of the military officers of the time. Points out that there is an “astonishing” amount of “detailed information that regularly turns up in Donne’s letters regarding military and political affairs in the Low Countries” (153).


In Chapter 1, “‘Discreet or Religious Preachers’: John Donne and the Late Jacobean Public Sphere” (1–35), indicates that the purpose of this study is to examine the late Jacobean pulpit, especially Donne’s sermons, “as an index of ‘conformity’ and its expression in the years immediately preceding and including the transi-
tion from the Jacobean to the Caroline monarchy (1621–5)” (1). Proposes to place Donne's sermons in the context of the “historical circumstances affecting pulpit discourse” and in the context of Donne's “personal circumstances and vocational responsibilities during these years.” Maintains that Donne's “crucial role” in the events surrounding the Directions to Preachers in 1622 to the death of James and Charles's accession “make him the ideal barometer” of the various “political and religious crises” of the time and can be seen as “a test case for responding to historical claims about the Jacobean sermon.” Maintains that Donne's sermons “articulate these crises in their most complex forms and expose fault lines in the late Jacobean English church that produced their most profound effects only after Donne's death.” Stresses that Donne's “vision for the Church of England meant that he resisted the pressure to radicalize, although his sermons bear all the marks of the tension to stay whole” (2). Surveys the importance of sermons in the political and religious life of the time and examines problems related to studying and interpreting late Jacobean sermons. Discusses the effects of the Directions to Preachers on Jacobean preaching, noting, in particular, how it prompted some preachers, such as Donne, “to greater efforts of moderation and negotiation between hard-line extremes” and to a “greater commitment to shared values.” Proposes to show in the following chapters how Donne's “experience as a public figure in the 1620s expresses in all its complexity the religious conflicts of the age” (35). In Chapter 2, “The Indiscretion of that Foole: John Knight and the Jacobean Pulpit, 1620–2” (36–74), discusses the censorship of pulpit oratory and reprimands given to transgressors of the Directions and its aftermath. Discusses how during this period “[t]he intertwined discourses of polemical religion, official pronouncement, anti-rhetorics,” each of which struggled for “interpretive control of biblical authority,” can be found in both the sermons delivered and those published (74). In Chapter 3, “The Fishing of Whales: John Donne's Sermons, 1620–2” (75–101), surveys Donne's sermons of 1620–22, especially their casuistical rhetoric, and focuses, in particular, on his sermon of 15 September 1622 in which he defended James's Directions. Stresses how Donne's sermons during this period show “his sensitivity to controversial doctrinal and political issues” (100) and express “the pressure exerted on his conscience to edify his congregations, to conform to established doctrines of the Church of England, to satisfy his own beliefs and principles, and to communicate with Christians not only within England but internationally as well.” Shows how the sermons contributed significantly to “a discourse of Reformed Christianity in the Church of England that articulates the conflicts, the compromises, but also the consensus of its institutional identity” (101). In Chapter 4, “Faire Interpretation: The Directions and the Crisis of Censorship” (103–138), surveys in more detail circumstances leading up to the issuance of Directions and the aftermath effects it had and suggests why James chose Donne to defend his proclamation. Points out that “the last months of 1622 mark the limits of Donne's professional ambitions,” and, therefore, “challenge the modern image of Donne as royal spokesman” (138). In Chapter 5, “Wise as Serpents, and Innocent as Doves: Zeal and Discretion in the Pulpit, 1623–5” (139–65), discusses how sermons following the Directions “bear all the marks of anxiety, tension and pressure that the Directions had identified” (139). Surveys late Jacobean sermons “in preparation for a methodological shift” in the following chapters of this study to five “moments of crisis” in the English church. Maintains that each of these events provides “a lens for viewing the battle for the public sphere conducted in the pulpit” and shows “the degree to which controversial questions of doctrine moved outward from the private sphere of conscience into a public institutional domain” (139). Points out that during this time Donne preached “substantially fewer” sermons, partly because of his ill-health and partly because of his dislike of controversy. Observes, however, that “extant materials from the last years of the Jacobean reign show Donne handling some of the most important political and religious issues of his day, culminating in his first sermon
preached before Charles” (140). In Chapter 6, “Jesus Wept: The Journey to Spain and the Pulpit Lamentation” (166–82), discusses those sermons, including those by Donne, following the departure of Prince Charles and Buckingham for Spain in 1623 to negotiate a marital match with the Spanish Infanta and comments on James's steps to prevent public commentary on the event. Notes that the mood of these sermons was lamentation and tearfulness and observes how they focus on anti-Catholicism and on the Church of England as “the means to salvation.” Discusses how Donne’s sermons of the time focus on “national centrist solidarity against separatist threats” (182). In Chapter 7, “Blinde Buzzards in the Choise of a Wife: Sermons and the Moral Marketplace” (183–211), discusses those sermons delivered following Prince Charles’s return from Spain unwed, sermons that mostly in oblique ways commented on the anxieties surrounding the possible marriage. Comments on the subtle political advice to Prince Charles expressed in Devotions by which Donne challenges the prince “to consider the public significance of his private actions, to accept the responsibility to govern openly and honestly, and to accept the counsel” of those who “were authorized to help him” (205). In Chapter 8, “The Lovesick Spouse: Parliament, Patriots, and the Public Sphere” (212–233), discusses those sermons preached in the early months of 1624, sermons that “express renewed anti-papist energy, renewed public concern for the duties of magistrates and ministers, and increasing anxiety about the religious constancy of those in authority.” Points out that Donne's sermons at this time once more articulate “his pastoral responsibilities and his even-handed targeting of opponents at the margins of the religious spectrum” and that, “most significantly, these months show Donne's continued professional interest in the role of ministers within the Church of England, a role that he defined most clearly as 'to stand inquiring right’” (233). In Chapter 9, “Church-Quakes: Post-Parliamentary Faultlines” (234–55), discusses those sermons preached following the Parliament session of 1624, sermons characterized by “militant and apocalyptic calls to arms,” on the one hand, and “calls for peace, order, and unity” on the other. Observes that Donne's sermons at this time “stand out for the inclusiveness of their theological and political reach, and for their discreet defusing of polemic,” thereby distinguishing him from the “avant-garde conformists” (255). In Chapter 10, “If the Foundations Be Destroyed: Rules of Engagement” (256–69), discusses sermons preached following the completion of the negotiations for the match between Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria of France and the death of James. Comments in detail on Donne's sermon of 3 April 1625 which provided him “with an opportunity to establish clearly, at the outset of the new reign, his religious and political principles.” Maintains that this sermon’s “style and its content characterize Donne at his most effective as a preacher” (269). In Chapter 11, “Blessed Sobriety: John Donne, the Public Sphere, and Caroline Conformity” (272–83), comments on Donne’s role in the post-Jacobean church, noting how his sermons contributed to “the construction of a set of principles governing public religious discourse established to counter the effect of personal revilings and provocative absolutist rhetoric” so prevalent “in the preaching and polemic of his contemporaries” (273). Concludes that Donne’s “public religious identity as constructed in his sermons, his role as prolocutor, and his charitable service with the Charterhouse express how completely discreet service in the public sphere was for him the ethical and rhetorical embodiment of religious community that marks him as one of the foundational voices of the Reformed English Church” (283). Contains a list of works cited (284–95), a general index (297–312), an index of Donne references (313–16), and an index of Donne’s sermons (317–18).

Reviews:

• James S. Baumlin in RenQ 57 (2004): 1530–32.
• Annabel Patterson in JDJ 23 (2004): 363–70.


---


Observes that in Donne studies today, “the desire to label Donne has become acute, leading to a dizzying profusion of Donnes and an equally muddled scholarly discourse” (135). Examines “how Donne used the sensitive, controversial vocabulary of religion in his sermons of the 1620s” and “how recent scholars have interpreted the public religious identity he constructed from this vocabulary” (136). Articulates “some of the problems of definition that Donne’s religion has raised” and suggests “alternatives to this ‘over-precise’ language within the profession.” Identifies “several potentially misleading practices by which religious positions have been established in modern scholarly discourses,” such as “a practice of selective quotation” or “the politics of quotation”; “a practice of creative ‘pairing’” or “‘sounds-like’ argument”; and “the problematic use of an unexamined biographical narrative (from apostasy to ambition) to establish Donne’s network of religious allegiances” (139). In response to these scholarly practices, recommends certain “foundational principles that can help to interpret these fragments and narratives,” such as “Donne’s discretion” (143), which is shown primarily in his “interpretative middle way, in his respect for due process in religious debate, and in his essentially practical divinity formulated by long years of immersion in casuistical habits of thought and discourse.” Maintains that Donne in his sermons “seeks to avoid controversy by creating the climate for constructive religious debate, and the conditions for inclusion.” Argues that Donne’s “rejection of controversial labels distinguishes his sermons throughout his career” (144) and that his “rhetoric of moderation was tactically inclusive rather than exclusive,” and that “his goal was to expand rather than to limit the grounds of conformity to the Church of England.” Maintains, therefore, that Donne “sympathised with the goal of ‘public tranquility’ which the various Protestant churches attempted at Dort [in 1618]” (145). Discusses how Donne’s late Jacobean sermons “clearly express an emerging and self-conscious awareness of the impact of public discourse on the expression of religious orthodoxy, and the importance of establishing principles governing this discourse” (146). Maintains that Donne sermons, unlike works of controversy, “focus on revising the terms of the debate and stressing the interpretative possibilities rather than the absolute meanings of words.” Points out, for instance, how Donne redefines controversial terms “so that they lose their current polemical baggage and become available for more inclusive spiritual purposes” (147). Concludes by explaining why the more recent attempt to label Donne an “Arminian” is “unhelpful” by examining briefly a sermon Donne preached in 1626, which illustrates Donne’s “rhetoric of inclusivity” (157).

---


Argues that Donne’s “election by the lower clergy as their prolocutor in 1626 signals his importance and reputation as a middle voice on matters of religious controversy” and that his Latin oration on 8 February 1626 to the full Convention “betrays his anxieties about speaking publicly” in what was a very “controversial atmosphere” (36). Points out that “[n]onetheless, comments in his oration and in sermons of the first half of 1626 reveal Donne’s conviction that these public, conciliar processes are the best means for handling controversial matters” (36–37). Argues further that “the doctri-
nal positions Donne articulates for the Church of England in these sermons are very similar to those of the English delegates to the Synod of Dort (1618–19).” Maintains that “the middle way that Donne articulates for the Church of England is located in these sermons more in their processes of inquiry than in dogmatic pronouncements” (37). Discusses how the sermons of this period “articulate a fairly coherent set of principles for governing public religious debate” (41) and that his “model of temperate discussion and consultation on contentious doctrinal matter was provided, most likely, by the Synod of Dort” (43). Concludes that Donne’s “religious identity as constructed in his sermons, his role as prolocutor, and his charitable service with the Charterhouse express how completely discreet service was for him the politics, the rhetoric, and most importantly, the ethics of his vocation as one of the foundational voices of the Church of England in the 1620s” (59).


Maintains that Donne was “an intellectual associate” of Sir Edward Hoby and “may have helped him with some of his writings.” Does not attempt to ascertain Donnés possible “contributions to specific parts of Hoby’s oeuvre” but rather invites the reader “to consider the accusations of ghost-writing and self-interested intellectual patronage levelled at Hoby by his religious opposites, Hoby’s response to these accusations, and the nature of the collaboration which may in fact have taken place” (121). In particular, cites allusions to Donne as Hoby’s collaborator in a controversial pamphlet by a Jesuit, John Floyd, entitled Purgatories triumph over hell (1613) to which Hoby replied in A curry-combe for a coxe-combe … (1615). Notes that Hoby does not deny Donnés collaboration but repudiates as a fiction Floyd’s anecdote in his pamphlet about Donnés “blasphemous worship of his mistress” (129).


Suggests that the language of Donnés poetry and sermons seems “to echo the language” of pamphlets on foreign exchange written by Gerard de Malynes and notes that “their economic philosophies seem to overlap” (61). Points out how in FirAn Donnés shows “an awareness” of the economic problems of his day: “As he dissects the world, he notes problems not only in spiritual or cosmic matters, but also in the personal, and especially financial relations between individual citizens, and on a larger level, between nations” (64). Acknowledges that “this topic is not the central concern” of FirAn, but believes that “a working knowledge of the metaphors derived from the economic environment is central to a complete understanding of the poem.” Maintains that the economic instability that Donnés addresses is “yet another symptom of the decaying world, but one that has been largely ignored” (65). Cites examples to show how Donnés in both Anniversaries comments on economic matters. Shows, in particular, how FirAn “not only reflects the general anxiety provoked by debate over economic policy, but also provides an example of Donnés reaction to new economic conditions” (75).


Observes that recent literary scholars have done “some remarkable work” on Donnés religious and political ideas, “employing close textual analysis, and psychoanalytic techniques, to re-appraise his thinking.” Points out, in particular, how recent literary critics have challenged the
notion that Donne was “an establishment figure, who took much of the same line as James I himself on religious and political questions,” and have presented “an altogether more ambivalent and subversive Donne” (73). Challenges, however, this newer view and argues that “the historical evidence supports the older rather than the new interpretation.” Divides the essay into four parts: (1) surveys “what critics say to show that Donne was an apostate from Catholicism, and that his betrayal of his faith scarred him for life, leaving its mark on most of his literary productions”; (2) “describes the arguments of those who claim that Donne was not an advocate of royal absolutism but an opportunist, or at least no more than a lukewarm supporter of the king’s policies”; (3) “turns to Donne’s texts and contexts, examines his attitude to royal power, and responds to modern interpretations that portray him as a subversive”; and (4) “discusses the contexts of Pseudo-Martyr” to show that Donne’s primary aim was “to persuade Catholics to accept the oath by using arguments derived largely from Catholic sources.” Argues that Donne “remained sympathetic to his former co-religionists” and that in Pseudo-Martyr he “employed his learning to undeceive them from ill-grounded principles liable to lead them to false martyrdom” (76). Maintains that the goal of Pseudo-Martyr was not only to save Catholics from a pointless martyrdom, but also “to secure the state by discouraging doctrines permitting the use of violence for religious ends” and also “to clear the path to truth by exposing forgeries, corruptions, and misinterpretations—of medleys of superstition and assertion” (95).


Challenges the assumptions of “new historicists,” calling them “New Empsonians” (132). Maintains that “[l]iterary history drawn on sources that Donne or Herbert had read or could have read exert different claims to relevance in discussions of their works than do those that draw on the writings of Marx, Althusser, Foucault, Freud, Derrida, Lacan, Irigaray, and Empson” (133–34). Discusses Edward Tayler’s Donne’s Idea of a Woman: Structure and Meaning in ‘The Anniversaries’ (1991) as an example of the “old” historicism, noting how “[i]n his efforts to frame Donne’s expression in terms of Renaissance ways of thinking and doing such things, Tayler posits a contextual claim of relevance for the various literary and cultural practices encompassed in his argument” (135). Discusses as examples of “new” historicism: (1) Ronald Corthell’s Ideology and Desire in Renaissance Poetry: The Subject of Donne (1997), in which Corthell offers a psychoanalytic reading of Donne, supporting his position by referring to “a host of writings by Freud and Freudsians” (137); and (2) Thomas Docherty’s John Donne, UnDonne (1986), particularly Docherty’s reading of Canon. Maintains that “no matter how it is trussed up with pseudoscientific vocabulary imported from the social sciences, these New ‘His’ and ‘Her- storicisms’ are in fact thinly disguised forms of social preachment” (147) and, “while pretending to adhere scrupulously to the true sense of the scientific nomenclature cribbed from sociology and anthropology, New Historicism routinely end up hectoring colleagues, students, neighbors, business, labor, politicians and society as a whole with moral preachments” (148). Holds that for many “new” historicists “it is an offense to suggest that literary quality exists at all, for such a term does little more than hypostatize oppressive standards of the elite, dominant, white, male, heterosexual, European, hegemonist culture” (149).


A slightly revised version of an essay entitled “What We Know Now about Donne’s Texts That We Did Not Know Before” that appears in Text 17 (2005): 187–96.

In Chinese. Finds similarities between the poetry of Donne and Li Shangyin, a Tang Dynasty poet. Points out that both poets lived in a society of tense political pressures and impending revolution that made their fate uncertain; that both visited places that influenced their poetry; that their marriages impacted their literary work; and that their writing techniques and uses of metaphor were similar. Compares ValWeep and ValMourn with Li Shangyin’s “Jinse.” Notes also that both poets use stream of consciousness techniques and unusual allusions, citing, as examples, Break and SGo and Li Shangyin’s “The Milky Way.”


Maintains that “[f]or reasons internal and external to Margaret Edson’s play Wit, it is easy to miss the serious dialogue with John Donne’s poetry to be found in it.” Comments on how “audiences and reviewers seem resistant to two stark Augustinian themes sounded by the play: the recalcitrance of human pride and the utter graciousness of the Resurrection.” Argues that, “far from rejecting Donne, the play grapples with these theological issues in terms largely set by Donne’s divine poems.” Maintains that Wit should be regarded as an expression of what Karl Rahner called anonymous Christianity, or even more precisely, as one of Karl Barth’s parables of the Kingdom.” Observes that although the leading character “makes no explicit connection between the Christian orthodoxy of the Holy Sonnets and her own crisis, we are invited to see her in that light.” Shows how the poetical texts within the play “supply that context.” Concludes that “if we are willing to grant that the triune God is at work extra muros ecclesiae, we are free to let Edson’s character bear witness not to the strength of the human spirit, but to the healing power of Easter.”


Explores various strategies of dealing with religious and mystical experience in poetry, using a “conceptual system involving cognitive, linguistic, and stylistic terms, to describe the interaction of verbal structures with their contents in a poem,” thereby accounting, “systematically, for the perceived subjective quality regularly associated with such interactions between contents and verbal structures” (8). In particular, focuses on how religious ideas “are turned into verbal imitations of religious experience by poetic structure,” how “poets attempt to express the ineffable by using words,” and how certain meditative poems, in particular, attempt to convey a “nonconceptual state of mind by using conceptual language” (7). Only those chapters that contain discussion of Donne’s poetry have been annotated. In Chapter 1, “Introduction: Means, Effects, and Assumptions” (11–37), presents “an overview of attempts to define varieties of religious and meditative experiences,” noting that there is “a religious and secular variety of mystic poetry.” Discusses problems of converting “perceived qualities from reality to some semiotic system, or from one semiotic system to another,” an issue introduced by a study of onomatopoeia. Also comments on the “problem of ineffability.” In Chapter 2, “Poem, Prayer and Meditation” (39–54), distinguishes between a devotional poem as poem, as prayer, or as meditation, all of which have “logical, semantic, and structural differences.” Shows how HSBatter “can be read as a poem, a prayer, or a meditation at different times” (11). In Chapter 4, “Composition of Place; Experimental Set, and the Meditative Poem” (87–118), discusses various aspects of Jesuit meditative techniques and what Louis Martz (1954) calls the poetry of meditation, noting that some secular poems are more meditative than some religious poems. Comments on HSRound as a meditative poem. In Chapter 5, “Mystic Poetry—Metaphysical, Baroque and Romantic” (119–39), contrasts Platonic poetry and meta-
physical poetry—with only a minor reference to Donne. In Chapter 6, “The Sublime and the Absolute Limit” (141–65), discusses the notion of the “sublime” as “a means for rendering the ultimate limit apprehensible” in biblical, metaphysical, and romantic poetry. Comments on how in *HSLittle* Donne “sabotages” the sublime by shifting “the locus of religious experience from the beyond to the inner self” and how he “accomplishes this shift through an exemplary use of the metaphysical conceit based on the images of water and fire” (165). In Chapter 11, “Let There be Light and the Emanation of Light—The Act of Creation in Ibn Gabirol and Milton” (287–315), contrasts Donne to Milton, noting that whereas Milton in describing creation in *Paradise Lost* arouses “wonder and admiration in the fact of what is beyond understanding,” Donne, as seen in *HSLittle*, presents “two world pictures side by side, sharpening their conflict as much as possible” in order “to achieve metaphysical wit” (294). Also contrasts the use of the compass in *Paradise Lost* and in *ValMourn*, maintaining that in Milton the image is sublime, whereas in Donne it is witty. Says that in *ValMourn* the compass is only “a simile, speaking of the spiritual in terms of the ‘domestic,’” whereas in Milton’s poem the compasses are “no ‘mere’ figure of speech” but rather “part of a sustained mythical image, really existing in the context of the possible world of an architect creating a universe” (298). Also compares the “hierarchical organization” in Gabirol’s Hebrew mystical poem and Donne’s poem, noting how in both “the primary objects of description are shapeless qualities” and how “definite shapes are introduced as subsidiary discordant elements” (304). In Chapter 12, “Light, Fire, Prison: A Cognitive Analysis of Religious Imagery in Poetry” (317–48), examines “the cognitive foundations and the literary applications of spatial imagery.” Discusses “two stylistic modes, ‘Metaphysical’ and ‘Mystic-Romantic,’” and maintains that “the metaphysical mode seeks to yield an insight into matters of religious significance in a flash, through a sudden transition from complexity to unity,” whereas “the ‘Romantic’ or ‘Mystic’ mode seeks to achieve the verbal imitation of some experiential contact, of an intuitive rather than conceptual nature, with some reality that lies beyond the absolute limit of our experience.” Discusses the use of “images of light, fire and prison” in several poets, including Donne (17), in particular, comparing and contrasting the use of fire imagery in Donne and T. S. Eliot. In Chapter 13, “The Asymmetry of Sacred, Sexual and Filial Love in Figurative Language” (349–57), discusses how Donne achieves witty effects by speaking of sexual love in terms of sacred love and also by speaking of sacred love in terms of sexual love. Concludes with references (359–68) and an index (369–80).


Reviews the historical context of the Oath of Allegiance controversy and examines Donne’s early poetry for traces of his “nostalgia for, and guilt about” his rejecting his Catholic heritage. Argues that in *Pseudo-Martyr* Donne does not “wholeheartedly repudiate Catholicism,” but rather provided English Catholics “with a casuistical accommodation for the Stuart regime calculated to meet the immediate demand for a profession of loyalty as well as the subject’s will to self-preservation.” Sees *Pseudo-Martyr*, therefore, as “an exercise in negotiating internal, private belief and external coercion” and says that Donne’s treatise “betrays the conviction that, poised between the two indeterminate circumstances of God’s remoteness and the political vagaries of the outward visible church, it is preferable to mudar the self, to change one’s outward habit to fit the times, than to perish for a conviction.” Maintains that *Pseudo-Martyr* is neither absolutist propaganda nor irony nor “a rhetorical ploy” in Donne’s quest for advancement (40). Argues that Donne considered that the “best way of participating in the current doctrinal war involved not getting caught in, and instructing others in how to avoid, the crossfire” (41). Maintains
that in *Pseudo-Martyr*, as well as in his poetry, when “confronted with persecution,” Donne “opts for and recommends creating a divided realm within the self” and claims that “in the course of defending the king’s temporal and spiritual jurisdiction in England, Donne betrays his own ethical self-division regarding a confirmed Catholic’s obligation to take the Oath of Allegiance” (76).


Explores the “mysticism” in the religious poems of Donne, Herbert, Crashaw, Vaughan, Mary Mollineaux, Ann Collins, Gertrude More, and Traherne from “an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural perspective” (439), using the insights drawn from the empirical psychology of consciousness, Christian mystical theology, the history of eastern and western spirituality, and modern theoretical studies on mysticism and the philosophy of mysticism. Focuses on three central aspects of mystical experience. First, explores “the initial stage of spiritual prayer preparing the contemplative for the mystical encounter by the practice of ‘active contemplation’ and/or ‘affective devotion,’” noting how the theme of spiritual combat or struggle is “central” in the poems of Donne, Herbert, and Vaughan, but “only minor” in Crashaw and Traherne, and “only marginally addressed” by Mollineaux and Collins. Argues that Donne in the *Holy Sonnets*, unlike Herbert and Vaughan, who sometimes “overcome the tribulations of the spiritual combat,” was not able “to overcome the initial stage of purification” and thus “[h]is struggle proves to be abortive” as he “flounders in his endeavour to achieve inner peace and loving communion with God” (440). Presents a detailed analysis of the theological and spiritual aspects of *HSBachelor* to show how the sonnet is not a mystical poem but rather a meditative poem in which the speaker struggles and suffers in a kind of spiritual warfare. Secondly, explores “the phenomenology of spiritual desire,” pointing out how Crashaw, More, Traherne, and Mollineaux describe “different degrees of ‘infused desire’ including the ardent desire for the union with God transporting the speaker into ecstasies of bliss,” whereas for Herbert and Vaughan “the frustrated desire for God’s immanence is sometimes accompanied by the explicit desire for death,” a death that is “eschatologically motivated and perfectly consonant with the phenomenological pattern of the penultimate state of the mystical ascent.” Thirdly, explores the “pivotal phenomenon of theistic mysticism, the sense of Presence,” commenting on “[s]everal varieties of mystical encounters and modes of mystical union” in the poems of Crashaw, Herbert, Vaughan, More, Collins, and Traherne. Maintains that this study “dismisses critical views that deny Herbert, Crashaw, Vaughan and Traherne a place amongst the mystics merely on the grounds that there is allegedly no evidence for them ever to have experienced ‘mystical union’” (441),


Discusses Donne’s poetry as representing poetically the transition that occurred between faiths during the Reformation, noting that Donne’s writing “often incorporates Catholic discourses even as it attempts to challenge them” (45). Comments on Donne’s shift from writing erotic love poetry to composing devotional poetry and sermons and analyzes *HSRound* as an example of this shift, noting how in the sonnet Donne transforms Petrarchan discourse into spiritual discourse. Comments also on *Pseudo-Martyr*, noting how Donne “explicitly denies the interpretation of martyrdom [by Catholics] as an allowable form of suicide, while simultaneously using the text as a proclamation of his own Protestant faith” (48).

In Chinese. Argues that *ValMourn* “abounds in round images, physical, spiritual, and structural, of which the first two are encircled within the third.” Maintains that these round images are “symbolic of a perfect love and a harmonious universe” and that the poem “works as a promise to true love, a hope for universal exploration, and a speculation on the relationship between man and nature, body and soul, contradiction and harmony, all identical with the round images that are the fruit of a strong sensibility and the emblem of eternal love.”


In Chinese. Discusses the unity of reason and emotion and the co-existence of passion and philosophy in Donne’s poems. Comments on *HSBlack, ValWeep, Fun*, and *Sat3*.

892. ———. [Original Connection of Icons in Conceits and Tension of Metaphor.] *Foreign Language Teaching and Translation* no. 4: 12–14.

In Chinese. Discusses the original icons and tension of metaphor with the theory of symbolization, giving readers another way to enjoy the beauty of Donne’s poetry.
2004


Discusses Donne’s subtle use of theological alchemy in *HSBlack* and *HSWilt*, each of which deals with “the theme of ‘money’ or ‘coining falsely,’ of alchemical chicanery which pretends to make gold.” Shows how the two sonnets are “the obverse and reverse of the same coin” with each side informing the other. Explains how in *HSBlack*, Donne “depicts a speaker intent upon paying his own way to heaven with counterfeit gold,” whereas in *HSWilt* he “depicts a speaker who has learned that Christ is the great Adept, the only one capable of making gold sufficiently pure to buy back his ‘stolne stuffe.’” Points out how both sonnets use “alchemical signs” and “coded language,” such as “death, prison, grace, wash, still, make/made” as well as “color imagery black/white/red” (2). Maintains that as “correspondents,” these two sonnets “prove Donne’s mastery of the sonnet to be greater than heretofore supposed” (8).


Discusses so-called “(im)possible punning” in Donne’s poems, i.e., “counterlogical and paralogical puns that from one point of view defy rational context, whether syntactical, commonsensical, philosophical, or all three” but that “from another point of view have a strange appropriateness” (60). Comments on the pun on “die” at the end of *GoodM* as an example and sees it as a sexual pun as well as referring to ceasing to live. Shows how the pun “conveys more than a spiritual transcendence of mortality, the primary sense of the line, and more than merely a secondary sense, although it carries both these meanings” (64). Discusses “(im)possible puns” also in *SunRis*, such as “lie here” (l.18), “all here” (l.20), “nothing” (l.22), and “shine’ (l.29). Concludes that in the “simultaneity” of Donne’s “(im)possible punning,” “the crossing of boundaries, disruption of the everyday, and doubling of reference actually trans-figure the world that we know, rather than merely reflecting, refusing, or rising above it” (68).


Maintains that Donne’s “religious leanings cannot be equivocally assigned to any one persuasion” and holds that “as he matured he developed a syncretic theology that allowed him to reconcile the tensions we might expect in an Anglican divine who was also a lapsed Catholic,” “ecumenically synthesizing confessional traditions into a theological amalgam” (113). Argues that in the famous “no-man-is-an-island” passage in *Devotions* Donne “is giving voice to a premise that animated the theology of James I,” i.e., that under certain circumstances there might be a truly Catholic faith that could include both the Church of England and the Catholic Church (115). Claims, in other words, that *Devotions* is an ecumenical work inspired by the king’s commitment to religious unity and peace. Maintains that Donne could never forget the faith of his youth, but that in that remembering, he did not remain “a tacit adherent to it.” Holds rather that “in his oeuvre he reworked the distinction between Catholicism and Anglicanism, neither of which he could have forgotten or remembered without the other” and that “[i]t was in this dialectical fashion, perhaps, that the claims of Donne’s Catholic heritage and his Anglican loyalties were, if not altogether rectified, then ‘almost’ (120). Shows how in *Devotions*, therefore, “forgetting calls up memory, and memory forgetting” and how “the workings of both are contingent and relative to one another” (121).

Discusses how Donne inverts neoplatonism and “brings to sexuality the language of philosophical transcendence, giving back to the physical embrace a component of high intellect even unto mysticism,” as seen most vividly in Ecst and Canon. Points out that Donne “looked upon the retrograde interest in cognitivizing sex as the stuff of outlandish poetic conceits” (5). Maintains that Donne “borrowed from the language of neoplatonic love to play upon the margins between the tantra of the spiritualized embrace and the libertine invitation to sex” (7).


Compares the uses of rhetoric in Donne’s Corona and in Lady Mary Wroth’s “crowne of Sonettis” in Pamphilia to Amphilanthus to show how “rhetoric can be used toward expressive ends that are as different as they are similar” (153). Points out that both poets make clear that “what is sacred and what is secular are not always diametrically opposed” and that, in fact, “the sacred and the secular are equally important to the poetic expression of devotion” (154). Maintains that “[a]s much as Donne can be seen to ‘activate the corporeal as an expressive mechanism of devotion’ in Corona, so Wroth ‘can be seen to activate the devotional as an expressive mechanism of earthly, and sometimes erotic love’ in her ‘crown’ and that both ‘suggest that thought and word are not separable, but are as interdependent as all of the other binaries their respective coronas bring together’” (160). Cites a major important difference, however, between the two works: the “Christian certainty” in Corona contrasts with “the sustained ambivalence” of Wroth’s sonnets (160–61). Discusses also how Donne’s poem is “more overtly rhetorical” while Wroth’s is “more subdued” (162).


Discusses the complexities of translation and examines various “schools” of translation. Briefly mentions ElBed, calling it one of the most beautiful of love poems and noting how in a seminar at the Collèe International de Philosophie in 1989 he commented on the poem and examined the translations of it by Yves Denis, Phillipppe de Rothschild, and Octavia Praz. Decided that these remarks should be published as a book on the criticism of translation and at the same time a study of Donne and his translators.


Discusses how “the related ideologies of antisemitism and antifeminism, which stand behind the stereotype of the effeminate Jewish male, emerged in the Renaissance but did not fully take shape and gain dominance within the culture until as late as the nineteenth century.” Comments on the “back-story” for the image of the effeminate Jew “by identifying its origins in an earlier dominant antisemitic vision that associates Judaism with a demonized form of hypermasculinity” (1). Discusses specifically how “early modern notions of gender and sexuality are grounded in theological discourse.” Working from Donne’s “deployment of the sanctioned language of Christian prayer to produce a defining example of homodevo- tion,” i.e., “ecstatic discourse offered by a male to a male deity,” argues that Milton’s devotional
verse “grapples with the fact that the body of Christ, as male, cannot be the poet's object of erotic cathexis.” Maintains that Milton “promotes a sensibility that reconciles the need to cathect erotically with a body that is both female and sacred.” Holds that “[t]his conflation of the religious and erotic inverts the culturally sanctioned fantasies of male-male devotional verse and transgressively directs them toward the female,” thus “toward the non-Christian.” Maintains that “[t]his examination of sexuality and Christianity yields the conclusion that the construction of modern heterosexuality corroded the linkage between Judaism and masculinity, thus largely erasing the figure of the Jew-Devil” by “impeding men's intense identification with Christ, an alteration that also muted the culture's violent demonization of the Jew.” Maintains, therefore, that the Jew-Devil “was erased because its continued existence as the Christian man's alter ego would only have served to highlight the manifold ways in which modern masculinity fell short of the previous ideal of Greco-Roman martial masculinity” (5). Discusses Donne's “devotional eroticism,” his “hypermasculizing” of Christian devotion (75), and his “form of martial Christianity” that was appealing to “the stridently masculine culture of early modern England” (76). Sees in Donne's work “an effort to supplant the established association of Christianity with femininity with an alternative masculine theology that blends individualism, action, and passion” (75). Notes also that Donne's “characterization of creativity, in all its manifest forms—commercial, sexual, theological, and poetic—strongly reflects both his hypermasculinity and his antifeminism” (76). Sees Donne as “executing a monopolistic act, pushing the Christian man further into masculinity, to reconstitute him as hypermasculine and thus immortal, because man will then be transmuted into being one with God the Father” (77).

900. Blevins, Jacob. “Catullan Oaths and John Donne's Fractured Subjectivity,” in Catullan Consciousness and the Early Modern Lyric in England: From Wyatt to Donne, 97–123. Aldershot, Hampshire [Eng.] and Burlington, VT: Ashgate. Argues that although Donne is not thought of as an imitator of the classics, his love poetry “represents the full spectrum of Catullus' poetry in terms of style, versatility, and the ability to use a variety of voices in his work.” Maintains that “[t]hese same characteristics ultimately make Donne's work furthest removed from Petrarchan love poetry.” Observes that “[i]n many of the idealistic poems, Donne's speakers rely heavily on neoplatonic love—although they do often alter the neoplatonism of Castiglione and give physical love more importance as in the original neoplatonic philosophy of Plotinus.” Compares and contrasts the love poetry of Donne and Catullus, noting that Donne is “very different from Catullus in his neoplatonic poems” (16) but that when he “depicts lovers having to deal realistically with the objects of their affection, there are affinities with Catullus’ lover and the idea of broken oaths” (16–17). Points out that Donne “actually shares some of the same imagery with Catullus, particularly those images found in Carmen 5: the rising and setting sun, the perpetual night that waits for all lovers, the counting of kisses, which serves as an example of the intensity of present love, and the shunning of those who speak against love” (101). Discusses Donne's creative use of the imagery of Carmen 5 in Anniv, ValMourn, and Canon, noting that Donne “has more in common with Catullus when he depicts speakers having difficulty obtaining an ideal love than when he shows them achieving the ideal” (107). Observes how both Donne and Catullus in their cynical love poems focus on the idea of the breakdown of lovers' oaths or contracts, citing examples from WomCon, SGo, LovInf, and Jet. Finds the closest thematic parallels between the two poets in the Elegies. Acknowledges that Donne and Catullus are “certainly not identical in their portrayal of the lyric subject” but claims that Donne is “much more Catullan than the seventeenth-century neoclassicists who more directly imitate Catullus” (114). Supports this position by surveying seventeenth-century poets who imitated Catullus, such as Jonson, Herrick, Crashaw, and Lovelace. Concludes, therefore, that Donne
“remains the most ‘Catullan’ of the seventeenth-century poets” and that he differs most from Catullus by his “emphasis on the spiritual union of the lovers in some of his poems, the variety of voices (or personas) in the poems, and the complete disjointedness of a narrative structure.” Recognizes also that Donne’s “sometimes mystical, always metaphysical, and witty style is contrary to the more direct expression of love in Catullus” but maintains that “when it comes to the conception of their subject, the intratextual nature of the poems, the conception of love and what love poetry should do, Donne is connected to Catullus much more than any other Renaissance love poet” (123).


Presents a brief critical introduction to Donne’s poetry, commenting primarily on Donne’s ironical wit and maintaining that there is “no authentic divide between his libertine and his divine poetry” (139). Reproduces SGo, Noct, Ecst, Sickness, and Father—with no additional notes or commentary.


Discusses parallels between Eliot’s “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” and SGo and maintains that a “remarkable likeness in the method of narration employed by Donne and Eliot undergirds the similarity in situation and theme in the two poems.” Concludes that the parallels are “so close” that “rather than simply an allusion used for contrast,” SGo “may be a source” for Eliot’s poem (109).


Discusses evidences of homoeroticism in Donne’s poetry, primarily in Sappho. Notes that, although there are “incidental slurs” (338) about prostitute boys and sodomy in the Satyres and although Donne forbids his mistress in Elfatal to dress as a page because she might attract foreign male lovers, Donne’s youthful verse letters to T. W. seem homophile. Points out that Donne’s principal model for Sappho is Ovid’s “Sappho to Phaon,” which he “refashions.” Observes that, “[a]lthough recent queer-positive reactions have been divided,” Sappho “documents the cultural possibilities, circa 1600, of favorably conceiving such love, advocating it, and hypothesizing a correlative sapphic sexual subjectivity” (337).


Argues that a “pivotal element” in Elfatal is Donne’s “use of the page-disguise motif” in the poem (37), in which the speaker “uses his powers of persuasion to convince his mistress that to dress as a page and follow him in his travels would be a foolish course of action” (38). Presents a “brief overview of the general principles underlying the device of disguise,” a “critical exploration of possible sources of inspiration,” and “the rationale of Donne’s individual approach as modulated by his attitude towards certainty and authority, all with a view of elucidating its precise function and ramifications.” Discusses how “easily and meaningfully” Donne departs from the conventional use of the disguise motif and comments on how a study of Donne’s poem also sheds light on the conventional use of the disguise theme in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama. Shows how “[i]n his unmasking of appearances, fallacies, and idealisations, Donne avails himself of the classical tradition along with the carnivalesque ambivalence of laughter, physicality, and grotesque realism,” all of which “contribute to the creation of a realistic impression of life more harmoniously proportioned to his commanding temperament, to which they ultimately revert” (45).

Maintains that Donne “very probably believed that Jesuit machinations had indirectly brought about his brother’s death” in 1593 and that “his anger, grief and sense of betrayal find expression in a number of early poems,” especially ElBrac (25). Presents a biographical reading of the poem that accounts for “the intrusion of powerful, apparently incongruous religious discourse into the ‘exercise of wit,’ and the disproportionate intensity with which the apparently trivial subject is invested.” Maintains that “[f]or all its witty surface, this is a poem which resonates with rage, and appears to acknowledge the speaker’s own guilt and anger in a transaction more serious than the loss of a bracelet” (27). Recalls the details of nineteen-year-old Henry Donne’s arrest, imprisonment and death and the politico-religious tensions of the times. Maintains that if Donne did believe that his brother had been betrayed by the Jesuits, “it would explain his rejection of Roman Catholicism in its new, post-Tridentine form” and also “his later preoccupation with the issue of loyalty, an issue to which he was to return in Pseudo-Martyr” and, thereby “would certainly counter the charge of time-serving apostasy” (38) often levelled against Donne. Shows how in 1593 “Roman Catholicism, martyrdom, betrayal, loss, judgement and gold converge powerfully” both in Donne’s life and in ElBrac (41). Insists that the poem is “not a systematic allegory on Henry’s death” (43) but rather is a poem in which Donne’s feelings “are handled obliquely, in language that is loaded with implications that are never worked out, and which are therefore impossible to refer explicitly to a larger scheme in the way that a systematic allegory would be.” Discusses how “the witty surface and the implied plot of the dramatic monologue hold the poem together, while one image apparently leads to another in association rather than by preconceived plan” (44). Suggests that Jonson may have admired the poem, not so much for its witty play on angels but rather “because he recognised beneath its wit a profound anger at the personal consequences of religious persecution” (57).


Discusses ElProg, SGo, WomCon, and SunRis as examples of Donne’s various responses to human love, showing how he combines thought and feeling and logic and passion, characteristic of his inimitable style.


An expanded version of “Godly Fear, Sanctification, and Calvinist Theology in the Sermons and ‘Holy Sonnets’ of John Donne.” SP 100 (2003): 71–86.

Argues that Donne “subjects the standard early modern distinction between filial and servile fear to one of the most exhaustive analyses of his time.” Points out that, for Donne, “[f]ilial fear ordinarily describes the fear of defecting from election,” whereas “servile fear describes a slavish fear of punishment and damnation.” Notes that Donne the theologian “accepts the Calvinist distinction,” but that Donne the poet, “acknowledges the extent to which his awareness of his decaying, fallible body inspires servile fear in spite of his sense of election.” Maintains, therefore, that in Donne’s poetry and prose we find “neither an endorsement or critique of Reformed theories of morality, but rather an unresolved play between dogmatic theology and bodily praxis.” Says that, for Donne, “the consolations of theology continually bump up against his fearsome, damnable body in pain” and that, “[i]n his inimitable way, Donne posits his anatomy as a fundamental source of normativity” (10).

Discusses Donne’s sense of loss that resulted from his rejection of the Catholic faith as it appears in the Holy Sonnets, specifically in HSBatter. Says that in the sonnet Donne “depicts the agony of a man who has lost the once-cherished physical contact with his lover and instead of humbling himself, is using manipulative passive-aggressive behavior.” Maintains that the speaker is “so desperate to regain the sensation that he longs for the touch to be violent and masculine and even painful” and wants it “to convince him beyond a doubt that he is in contact with his beloved.” Sees the speaker as “begging for the return of something he once had” and thinks the loss he feels results from his relinquishing “one very specific church doctrine for another: namely the Catholic doctrine of ‘true substance’ for the Anglican doctrine of the ‘real presence’ in the sacramental Eucharist” (3). Analyzes HSBatter in this light and maintains that Donne’s intention was that “the mimesis of the sonnet” would do “what the consecration of the bread in an Anglican mass does: to offer, symbolically, the ‘real presence’ of God” and that, in this way, the poem “can function as equal partner to the sacramental Eucharist, which is exactly what Donne is after: a divinely inspired revelation, or the divine gift of grace, but in a purely personal format.” Maintains, however, that, “no matter how you look at it, there is still no physical being”; there is “simply no body!” Thinks, therefore, that Donne’s “loss is destined to remain a loss” (8).


In Korean. Explores Donne’s view of lesbianism as seen in Sappho and maintains that in the poem Donne “critiques heterosexuality inherent in English patriarchy” and “constructs a detailed argument for the superiority of lesbian love.” Shows how Donne alters Ovid’s representation of Sappho “to represent the female body and desire which challenge the lesbian sexuality constructed through literary exchanges between men.” Maintains that Donne depicts the relationship between Sappho and Philaenis as “essentially non-hierarchical and unrelated to marriage and motherhood,” a relationship in which “both refuse to become the object and property to be exchanged between father and husband.” Claims that Donne questions the “gender hierarchies of patriarchy” by showing how Sappho “inverts and transcends gender differences.” Concludes that in Sappho Donne “exposes the fictitious nature of patriarchal discourses of heterosexuality and rejects the largely male-authored discourses on lesbianism that continue to privilege the phallus as the primary sexual signifier” (248). (English abstract)


Argues that the speakers in the Satyres “are implicated into the subject they satirize to such a degree that they virtually empty the poems of a normative presence (at least in the person of the satirist), and that they complicate the seemingly simple relationship between those who judge and those who are judged” (13). Discusses how “[t]he unreliability of the satiric personas” in these poems “can be effectively demonstrated by examining them in relation to the qualities traditionally associated with the satiric persona and the assumptions concerning reader expectations” (13–14). Holds that satire “can function in many different ways” and that “the reception of satirical texts will be determined not only by what exists in the text alone, or by the satirist’s intention, but [also] by the way those texts ‘fall’ on the ears of their recipients” (14); in other words, the text’s meaning must be “unraveled according to what that text means to the reader.” Suggests that “[m]anuscript evidence of the circulation and reception of Donne’s poetry during the early seventeenth century indicates the prevalence of this ahistorical and reader-centered mode of interpretation” and claims that “the empowered role these attitudes accord readers is not far removed from the one articulated by some twentieth-century reader-response theories” (21). Analyzes the Satyres in this light, showing
how the reader “cannot depend on a coherent, stable moral point of reference provided by the persona” (25) and demonstrating how “[t]he same poem, received by a different audience, is capable of yielding a set of insights with a different interpretive inflection” (27). Maintains that the “reformative powers” of Donne’s Satyres are not effected “by the text alone” but rather “experienced as a validation, or a re-affirmation of a moral and ethical outlook already in place in the readers’ mind” (29). Insists that “by arousing in readers affective responses,” Donne’s satires call for their “participation in the text, either in an attempt to identify with the speaker by filling the ‘gaps’ necessary to complete that process, or in the attempt to reject the unpleasant totality of the subject by reverting to immediate detachment and casting him or her self in the position of the dispassionate, superior observer” (43). Concludes, therefore, that the Satyres “challenge the traditional notion that satire begins with a perception of definite difference” and that, “in turn, they challenge the secure position of the reader,” who “cannot be either only the judge or only the judged” but rather “must continuously try to negotiate between two contentious voices,” neither of which the reader “can entirely identify with or reject” (45).


Discusses how the religious conflicts of his time affected Donne’s “treatment of anguish and his ability to resolve it through depicting an encounter with God.” Points out that Donne took “a far more individualistic approach to anguish than the poets who preceded him” (112) and that he agonized “not over the common fate of Everyman, but over his own fate,” thereby making “the human dilemma more personal, particular, and powerful.” Maintains, therefore, that in Donne’s poems, “both reader and persona are able to confront the anguishes of death, psychic disintegration, history, sin, and doubt with a renewed intensity” (113). Argues that “although Donne’s syntax constructs a God as absent, his diction, with its reliance on the Biblical imagery of salvation history, makes God a powerful presence in his poems” and that he “collapses all the anguishes into one angushed question: ‘When I die, will the God who has saved the historical world forgive my sins and save me?’” Oberves how this question “underlies” Sat3, the Holy Sonnets, Goodf, and, to some extent, the hymns and claims that the fact that “God is never depicted as answering the question is the very thing that ensures the poems’ urgency, as Donne explores the tension between his longing for a loving God, and his fear that this God may not be accessible to him.” Belives that “[t]he anguish of psychic disintegration is perhaps strongest in some of Donne’s love lyrics, where he displaces religious imagery on his treatment of love” (115), citing, as examples, Flea, Canon, and ValMourn. Discusses how in the Divine Poems “anguish is never actually, but only potentially resolved” and that what draws all his anguishes together is “the anguish of doubt—doubt not as to God’s goodness, but as to the sinner’s right, after death, to claim that goodness for himself” (147).


Presents a detailed sketch of Donne’s life and writings, followed by a brief survey of his reputation as a poet and preacher from the seventeenth century to the present. Concludes that “[a]t present, his reputation is secure as one of the most significant writers of the English Renaissance” (544). Contains a list of sources and information on portraits of Donne. Adds a note indicating that, according to R. C. Bald (1970), Donne was worth between 3,000 and 4,000 pounds at the time of his death in 1631.

913. Cotterill, Anne. “The ‘Motion of Corruption’ of Donne’s Anniversaries,” in Digressive Voices in Early
Comments on the various, often contradictory, critical evaluations of the *Anniversaries* and argues that the poems are “aggressive and deliberately digressive” and that, in fact, Donne makes “digressive progress his subject” (56) in them. Argues that the “digressive voice of the narrator” in the poems is “a literary mode of resistance to the act and vision of both physical dissection and the literary genre of anatomy; to the breakdown and isolation of bodies and subjects into parts.” Maintains that “[t]he literary movement of digression—of stepping aside, around, away—is here above all a movement to forestall speechlessness, to step around death,” and that, “[m]eanwhile, the speechless Elizabeth Drury,” who needs Donne’s voice, “becomes a fit vehicle for absorbing, reversing, and transforming feelings of vulnerability, unfulfilled promise, and transcendent visionary capacities into a marketable self” (60). Reviews the relationships “among physical anatomy, the body, and the female” in *FirAn* “in the context of Donne’s complex relation to women who dissolve and ‘kill us,’ and to the Countess of Bedford, in particular” (60–61). In the context of Donne’s Catholic background, examines “the relation between his deep interest in themes of marginality and the criminal, on the one hand, and the social, religious, and aesthetic politics of anatomy on the other.” Holds that *Biathanatos, Ignatius, and Pseudo-Martyr* are Donne’s “attempts to approach privately and then distance himself from the history of imprisonment, execution, and martyrdom of his recusant maternal relations” while, at the same time, the *Anniversaries* “incorporate Roman Catholic and High Church elements of theology and stylistics.” Concludes that “the digressive movements of the narrator lead him out of the eerie life-in-death of the images that open both *The First* and *The Second Anniversary* to an image of the explosion of swollen aristocratic pride and an announcement from commanding moral heights, of a visionary voice that silences anatomists.” Believes that the narrator’s “sharp swerves of tone, from digressive story telling to satire to fantastic hyperbole, parody and defy the anatomist’s blade and mode of knowledge by scrutiny of parts, which are equated in *The First Anniversary* with a suffocating, literal-mined, and inexorable feminine rule over the anatomical state.” Maintains that Donne’s “exaggerated elevation of Elizabeth, on the one hand, and his tales of ‘poor’ distracted mothers and recital of creation myths, on the other, slip this stealthy ‘slow-pa’d starre’ (l. 117) around and out from under the female hold: not only on the fallen physical body but on the masculine, poetic promise that struggles between birth and death” (61).


Argues that the “crudities” in Thomas Coryat’s *Coryats Crudities* (1611) “resist ideals of humanist pedagogy,” in which “rhetorical digestio involved the proper organization and assimilation of knowledge.” Discusses how Coryat and his fifty-nine mock panegyrists, including Donne, “explore connections between writing and intemperance” and discuss “the painful effects of pleasurable reading experiences on the bodies of aristocratic men.” Claims that, “in so doing, they coin a new generic position for Crudities as a travelogue that resists truth telling but is nevertheless not quite a traveler’s tall tale” (abstract). Shows how Donne in *Coryat* and the other mock panegyrists “collude with Coryat’s metaphor of crudity by recording their responses to the text in startling corporeal terms” (78). Maintains that “the crudeness of Crudities provides a vocabulary to trace the connections in the early modern imagination between food, desire, and intemperance, and to explore the consequences on a male, courtly readership of a reading experience designed to bring pleasure” (78–79).


Comments on the “plurality of effects” in the *Songs and Sonets*. Maintains that in “their metrical versatility” the lines of Donne’s poems
“enact the conditions of diversity and changefulness that so many of the Songs and Sonets study as the element of selfhood.” Argues that “[i]n appearance, the Songs and Sonets may practise the structuring principle intrinsic to the ideas of variatio that, for the three hundred or so years from the publication of Petrarch’s poems, informed the design of Continental Canzoniere” but that “in the manner which the collection’s formal discontinuity coheres with the attempt of individual poems to conceive of dissipations of selfhood suggests a principle of design as close to that of Montaigne’s Essais as to that of Petrarchan variatio.” Points out that in his essays Montaigne produces “exercises and studies of selfhood” but resists “the continuities of narrative coherence, the progression of one instance of the self into another.” Suggests, therefore, that “[t]hinking about the poems of the Songs and Sonets in a similar way affords an understanding of how Donne’s prosodic craft accords with the impression of variety achieved by his lyrics as a collection.” Maintains that “[m]ade up of poems that repeat and vary their images of impending crisis, the Songs and Sonets allows its individual lyric’s measure of time’s imminence to be experienced, across the collection, within a different temporal logic of artistic recurrence” (21–22). Notes that repeatedly “instances of mortality, lovers’ parting, and passion’s abatement are felt in their immediacy and then felt to return differently as another poem.” Says that “those lyrics that figure, with the insistence of repetition, the vicissitudes of selfhood, present the intricacy of their introspection as compatible with the design of a collection in which each ‘I’ is both distinct and a constituent in a fragmentary poetic identity” but notes that “each ‘I’ can also be the plenitude of selves sounded in the versatility of lines open to numerous, if not infinitely, extensible emphases” (22). Illustrates this concept by a detailed critical analysis of Break and SunRis.


Points out that “[t]he idea that pain can be a useful spiritual tool, and a source of mystical insight and self-transformation, is part of a long tradition of Christian conceptions of pain” (78) and that the notion that “the suffering of Christ can be shared and re-enacted on a lesser plane, by humans, plays a crucial role especially in medieval Christianity” (78–79). Observes that Reformation theologians, however, “voiced strikingly different attitudes towards the spiritual meaning of pain” (79) and points out that this shift “can be seen in later representations of the Crucifixion by Lucas Cranach” (80). Observes that Donne “repeatedly addressed questions of pain and salvation in his sermons, prose works and poetry” and discusses, as an example, Donne’s Lenten sermon preached at Whitehall on 20 February 1617, in which he addresses the issue of the theological meaning of suffering. Maintains that the sermon is “clearly informed” by Calvin’s thinking that Christ’s suffering “can only be meditated on, not imitated, by humans” (81). Claims that Donne’s view, however, is somewhat ambivalent, as evidenced in the opening of HSSpit, in which he expresses a desire to suffer with Christ. Comments also on how in HSBatter Donne confronts “the two opposing theological models of pain … with particular intensity” (82) and maintains that although Protestantism “denied the validity of pain as an inherently meaningful religious experience, and emphasised man’s passivity in the face of God’s decrees,” in HSBatter “this results only in a spiritual doubt that borders on despair.” Notes that “the unresolved question” in the sonnet is “how religious experience can offer certainty if it is stripped of the conclusiveness of bodily sensations.” Concludes, therefore, that Donne “felt drawn to both Catholic and Protestant models of pain, but was also sensitive to what he saw as the shortcomings of both” (84).

917. DiPasquale, Theresa M. “The Feminine Trinity in ‘Upon the Annunciation and Passion.’” JDJ 23:
Maintains that in *Annun* Donne "finds a created reflection of the triune deity in three feminine figures: the cogitating Christian soul, the woman upon whom her mind’s eye gazes (the Blessed Virgin), and her guide (the Church)" and that "[e]ach member of this triad has a distinct identity," although "all are—in another sense—united as one ‘Shee’: she who ‘sees,’ she who is ‘seen,’ and she who ‘hath shown’ how a Christian ought to respond to the triune God" (124). Discusses how Donne’s "construction of this three-fold figure is grounded in his use of the word ‘she(e)’ as the prevailing nominative pronoun throughout the poem" (124–25), noting how the soul (the *anima*) has traditionally been seen both grammatically and theologically as feminine and how the Church has been traditionally called Christ’s spouse. Shows how the poem has "a tripartite form established by the speaker’s movement through these three figures, each of whom is defined in visual language as seeing, being seen, or showing" (125). Discusses also how this "feminine ideal" envisioned in *Annun* "reflects the theological goal" that Donne would later on pursue as a priest (136). Concludes that *Annun* confirms Donne’s view that the soul, when joined with Mary and with “a feminine rather than patriarchal version” of the Church, can evade “masculine authority and open herself to the infinite goodness of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost” (138).


Explores how Donne’s responses to God in *Devotions* “reflect a view of the communication between God and man, a view befitting a conformist member of the Jacobean Calvinist consensus” (148). Pays particular attention to how Donne regards God “as speaking to people, whether in the Scriptures (verbally) or through the experience of life (nonverbally)” and how he “goes about hearing or detecting God’s voice” (148–49). Maintains that “a main concern in the *Devotions* is with distinguishing God’s ways in the individual’s life, hearing God’s voice, seeing God’s hand, and responding appropriately” and that Donne’s “attitude to his church and to ‘mankind’ expressed in *Devotions* arises from his own and his church’s scripturalism” (149). Believes that, for the most part, the “role of the Scriptures for the mature Donne of the *Sermons* and *Devotions* has been underrated” (150). Maintains that “[t]o understand the *Devotions* properly one must realize that the writer is regarding himself in biblical fashion, like Hezekiah, like the Psalmist, as a representative human being” (151). Explores Donne’s approach to and response to scripture and how his biblical theology is reflected in *Devotions*, a work in which God speaks to him “through the various stages of his illness and recovery” (158). Points out how *Devotions* makes it clear that Donne is “clearly a conformist, though not of the avant-garde or Laudian variety” (160), and discusses how he “wrote his scripture-filled *Devotions* in a mode favored by the ‘contented conformists’” (167).


Collection of 14 original essays by divers hands, four of which focus on Donne: Raymond-Jean Frontaini’s, “‘The man which have afflication seene’: Donne, Jeremiah, and the Fashioning of Lamentation” (127–47); Daniel W. Doerksen’s, “Discerning God’s Voice, God’s Hand: Scripturalist Moderation in Donne’s *Devotions*” (148–72); Jeanne Shami’s, “Squint-Eyed, Left-Handed, Half-Deaf: *Imperfect Senses* and John Donne’s Interpretive Middle Way” (173–92); and Robert Whalen’s, “Sacramentalizing the Word: Donne’s 1626 Christmas Sermon” (193–223). Each of these essays has been entered separately in this bibliography. In the introduction
(13–27), the editors point out that the various essays in the collection support the notion that “the word-centeredness” of the English church “had both powerful and subtle effects on the literature produced in and immediately after Elizabethan and Jacobean times” (18). Presents a brief summary of each essay and explains the terms “Calvinist,” “Arminian,” “Laudian,” “avant garde conformist,” and “conformist.”

Reviews:


Prints EpEliz without notes or commentary, accompanied by photographs by Rosalie Winard.


Limited to 250 copies. A letterpress printed broadsheet. Reproduces Sickness and, on a separate sheet, a commentary by Jude Leimer in which he notes that David Woodward, co-founder and editor of the History of Cartography, was particularly impressed by Sickness because of its use of maps and scientific allusions. Reproduces a passage from Woodward’s study of the poem in which he proposes that Donne had in mind “the double hemisphere stereographic projection, one of the most popular world map types of the late sixteenth century.” Maintains that Donne would have undoubtedly been familiar with this kind of map published by J. Hondius in 1595 (the so-called “Drake Broadside Map”) to commemorate Drake’s and Cavendish’s circumnavigations.


Contains an introduction to the series by David Scott ([ix]–xi), acknowledgments ([xiii]), an excerpt from Virginia Woolf on Donne ([xv]), and an introduction ([1]−[9]) by Mark Oakley in which he comments on his appreciation of Donne and the importance of Donne in his spiritual development, outlines Donne’s life, and briefly discusses Donne as poet, preacher, and theologian. Reproduces 12 selections from the Songs and Sonnets, Corona, Res, the Holy Sonnets, Tilman, Father, Sickness, Gaz, Lit, 2 verse epistles, 1 paradox, 1 problem, 2 selections from Devotions, and 25 excerpts from the sermons (11–107). Concludes with a select bibliography ([109]–[10]).


Special edition limited to 26 copies; main edition limited to 190 copies. Prints 28 poems from the Songs and Sonnets and 3 of the Elegies—without notes or commentary (7–73), followed by a table of contents and a brief description of the volume.


Translates into Russian Devotions (21−320) and “Death’s Duell” (321−96). Contains an introduction (5−20) and a critical afterword on images (397−419) by Anton Viktorovich Nesterov and ends with a chronology of Donne’s life (421−25) and a table of contents (427−30).

Analyzes various types of language Donne uses in his work: the language of reflection, as evident in Sat4 and Dissol; secretive/hiding language as seen in Under; metaphysical language prevalent in Storm and Calm; the language of preaching found throughout the sermons; and the language of wit and metaphor that pervades numerous works. Concludes that Donne believed in the power of language to save souls and saw language as the instrument of the Holy Spirit for expressing truth.


Based on John Carey’s text (1990). Notes that all contracted forms have been excluded and full forms used and that the number of times a word appears is shown with each word. Explains the abbreviations of individual poems used (3–8) and presents an index of rhymes (981–1027).

Example of entries:

AMAZED (2)
S4,129 who boys, and who goats. I more amazed than Circe’s prisoners, when they
SS45,19 soonest break: This (which I am amazed that I can speak) This death hath
S4=Sat4; 129=line 129 of the satire. SS45=Dissol; 19=line 19 of the poem.


Includes Brian Parker’s translation of Amic and a preface and translation of the poem by Marcia Karp (368–71). Discusses the friendship between Donne and Ben Jonson and says that what most stands out in Amic is “how much Donne admired Jonson’s daring as a writer.” Comments, in particular, on Jonson’s daring in Volpone and the risk he took in “telling truth about, and to, the English government.” Notes that Donne considered Jonson as a writer “to be comparable in daring to such ancient poets as Horace and Ovid, or to such a playwright as Aristophanes, or to such a satirist as Lucan, all of whom challenged the public figures of their own day” (374). Suggests that Donne, who returned to England from Venice in 1601, may be one source of Jonson’s portrayal of the city in Volpone and that Donne’s information about Henry Wotton, the English ambassador in Venice, and his hatred of the anti-Catholic Robert Cecil and Edward Coke may have contributed to Jonson’s portrayal of Sir Politic-Would-be in the play. Also points out parallels between the portrayal of the court in Sat4 and Sat5 and Jonson’s play. Speculates, therefore, that not only Sir Politic-Would-be but also characters in the subplot of Volpone “may have grown not only from Jonson’s reading of Donne but from what Donne told Jonson about his trip to Venice.” Sees Volpone, “as among other things, a daring design on early Jacobean government, not necessarily in the form of a set of precise parallels to Sir Henry Wotton or others, but in the same vein as Donne’s Satyres generalizing and incorporating truthful and dangerous criticisms” (386). Points out that during this period of persecution following the Gunpowder Plot, when Jonson wrote Volpone and Donne his Satyres, both poets daringly criticized the Jacobean government for its intolerance and injustice toward Catholics. In an afterward, praises Marcia Karp’s translation of Amic (388–89).


Discusses Donne’s “self-fashioning” of himself as Jeremiah, “his self-presentation as ‘the man which have affliction seen’” in Lam, “one of the more difficult paradoxes and problems of Donne’s poetic canon” (128). Argues that Donne’s self-fashioning and his translation of Lam are “imaginative gestures by which he sacramentalizes grief—grief that despoils paradise and threatens to trap him in the profane world.”
(129). Shows how the lamentations of Jeremy offered Donne “the hope that his own disturbing profane world can yet be sanctified” (139). Maintains that although Donne may have undertaken Lam as “a spiritual exercise following his wife’s death” or perhaps as an expression of his sympathy with the Protestants suffering in the Palatine at this time, it is more likely that Lam “had a much deeper, far less occasional, resonance for Donne—or deeper because responding to multiple occasions, both personal and political.” Holds that “[b]y imagining himself as ‘the man which have affliction seene’—that is, by presenting himself as the emblematic person of grief, by positioning himself at the very center of loss—Donne hopes as well to experience the redemption known to biblical Jeremiah.” Claims that “[n]othing so powered Donne’s imagination as his haunting, devastating sense of marginalization from the sacred” and that “the linguistic gestures that define his poetry, he learned early on, were his primary means of projecting himself from the realm of the profane to that of the sacred.” Concludes that biblical Lamentations taught Donne “how powerful a tool poetic language can be when fashioned to elicit a divine response” (140).


Lists 11 web sites for information on Donne, 7 biographical and/or critical works, 1 index and 1 concordance, 1 journal (JDJ), and 3 bibliographies.


 Discusses how Donne, Milton, and Dryden in their poetry “present us with a ‘symbol’ of transubstantiation.” Points out that although “the first two rejected the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation,” each of them “deliberately used this term and attached a different meaning to it” in order to explain his “own idea of communion” (16). Observes that, although in his fourth Prebend Sermon Donne, agreeing with Hooker, uses the word transubstantiation “to mean an internal alteration happening after communion,” i.e., “a completely interiorized experience” (17), he remained somewhat ambivalent about transubstantiation throughout his life, perhaps as a result of his Catholic upbringing. Shows how Goodf, “written not long before he was ordained in the Church of England, is a symbol of Donne’s belief that a purely spiritual encounter with the real presence, one that leaves the body aside, is enough to transubstantiate one into the image of Christ” (18). Discusses how in the poem Donne “tells of a private journey that leads to an encounter with the real presence, followed by a substantial interior conversion.” (21). Maintains that Goodf is, in fact, “a symbol of his belief in the real presence and in an interior transubstantiation.” Shows how “[n]one of what he writes contradicts what he learned in his Catholic youth, though it reduces it by half.” Explains how in Goodf Donne “abridged and interiorized the Catholic Eucharist” (25) and “showed his belief in Christ’s Presence to the soul at the moment of communion, as well as in an ensuing ‘transubstantiation’ in the receiver into Christ” (39).


Presents a biographical sketch of Donne’s life, an introductory survey of his works, a discussion of his critical reception, a bibliography of Donne’s works, and a selected list of studies of Donne. Observes that in all his works Donne “brings the same kind of rigorous examination, delight in extension of intellectual thought, and vivid imagery” and that “[i]ntensity and passion, wit, and often humor characterize his writing” (113).

In a survey of poems occasioned by the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and Frederick V, Elector of the Palatine, in February 1613, comments briefly on Donne’s EpEliz. Points out the bird imagery in the poem, especially Donne’s symbolic use of the phoenix.


Suggests the possible influence of one of Donne’s sermons and ValMourn on Emily Dickinson’s “I heard a Fly buzz” and briefly comments on the enthusiasm about Donne among nineteenth-century New Englanders, especially Emerson, Henry James, Lowell, and Longfellow. Points out that Donne’s “greatest advocate in America” was Robert Browning (116) and suggests that Dickinson may have come to read Donne through Browning’s influence.


Presents a sketch of the life and works of Donne’s son and literary executor, John Donne the Younger. Comments on his role in the publication of his father’s works, in particular his letters and Biathanatos.


Discusses the “typical movement of Donne’s early lyrics, their inner drama of trope, voice, and gesture, their composition of opposing perspectives.” Points out that the poems in the Songs and Sonets typically begin “by making us conscious of a background situation of threat or danger; they open strikingly, with some awareness of intrusion, blockage, or loss that sets at risk a present or wished-for state of possession or unity (usually but not exclusively erotic).” Maintains that in these poems the speaker “confronts some judgmental, accusatory, or slanderous agency beyond his control, or else faces some more impersonal power of chance and change—even though one often gets a sense that the danger reflects equally the poet’s doubt of his own powers, and the very conflicted shape of his own desire.” Argues that the “crucial point is that the poem itself, the unfolding sequence of speculations, fictions, arguments, challenges, prayers, analogies, and hyperboles emerge out of the speaker’s desire to master the situation of threat purely by his words.” Notes that, therefore, he “deploys his lyric tropes to answer the intrusion, to shape some figure of reparation or possession that might control or rationalize the threat.” Observes furthermore that “[t]his struggle for mastery is at once emotional, conceptual, and metaphysical.” Notes that “the attempts at mastery is liable, in any given poem, to fail or show an inescapable flaw” and “some shadow of the initial menace will remain, or some new threat will suddenly arise to take its place” (375). Notes also that “each failure begets additional and often more desperate attempts at mastery: each produces further sequences of increasingly baroque and wire-drawn conceits, conceits that will on the one hand acknowledge the fact of failure itself and on the other attempt to overcome that fact and its implications” (375–76). Maintains, in other words, that “the poems continually generate figures of mastery in which the reality principle and the pleasure principle seek satisfaction at the same moment” (376). Illustrates the point by a discussion of ValName, Flea, Canon, ValMourn, and Appar, poems that “thrust their speakers sharply into the present tense of argument and speculation, seduction and evasion,” and “speak from a place in time where past and future (both real and fantastic pasts and futures) are caught up in a particularly volatile mixture” (390). Presents also a detailed discussion of Relic, showing how the poem “unfolds against the background of a true love lost, spent, and obscured, an affair conveyed to us through
misleading, forgotten, or misread signs” (395). Points out how the poem’s “final refusal of an answer” challenges us to consider “how the sacred and secular interanimate each other, and about the shifts we are put to in the face of our failure to find certainties about either category” (395–96). Stresses that “the ironic gap” in Relic “locates itself not simply, as dramatic irony does, between the situation of the speaker and the truths of his utterance, but also between the poem and its reader,” finally suspending him in “poignant doubt” and “skeptical suspension” (396). Claims that Donne’s love poems attempt “to inhabit and map a polymorphous realm of thought that muddles purifying dichotomies between the sacred and the profane, between true worship and idolatry” (397).


Discusses the stanzaic form in Metem, which, like the Spenserian stanza, consists of rhyming pentameters with a closing hexameter, but which, unlike the Spenserian stanza, contains 10, not 9, lines, rhyming aabccbbddd. Maintains that Donne’s form, by adding an additional line, ruins “the subtle mathematics of Spenser’s form” and that its rhyme pattern “makes of Spenser’s flowing, interwoven harmonies something more abrupt and disjunctive in structure.” Says that Donne’s form produces “a pattern that piles rhymes up together rather than allowing them subtly to reach across space.” Holds, therefore, that Donne’s stanzaic form “embeds in itself his poem’s broader challenge to a Spenserian metaphysic” and that Donne “exacts from his altered form a darker, even an antithetical vitality.” Suggests that Donne, like other poets of the time, “must have been in awe of The Faerie Queene” since “[h]is very need to wrench Spenser’s vision so violently shows the quality of its force for him” (33). Maintains, furthermore, that Donne’s verses, “in this strange combination of homage and parody, also remind us of just how delicate and how contingent a contrivance the Spenserian stanza is, how much of desire and will are wrapped up in the power of that form to keep at bay the disjunctions of time, and also how subtly the form lets Spenser hug the coast of chaos.” Concludes, therefore, that Metem “shows us something of that vision of time that the Spenserian stanza helps its inventor to critique and against which his poem offers a defense” (34).


Points out that “a striking feature of much English poetry of the 1590s is the use of sacred imagery in erotic poetry and erotic imagery in sacred poetry, in ways that seem arresting and unsettling to the modern reader” and that the sacred imagery in erotic poetry is “often drawn specifically from Catholic practices and doctrines.” Cites Donne as the most “notorious” example but points out that two of his contemporaries, Barnabe Barnes and Henry Constable, also “cross the boundaries between the erotic and sacred” and “use Catholic terms in erotic verse” (27). Discusses the religious biographies of all three poets and how Catholic imagery “becomes a standard convention of love poetry” in the seventeenth century (28). Suggests that in all three poets “sexuality is invoked for its dangerous and thrilling potency” but that “the force of its combination with Catholic language differs widely between each case.” Points out that for Barnes “Catholicism at once connotes the culturally forbidden, and something which is nothing to do with him”; for Constable it “comes to be the very means of defining himself”; but for Donne “Catholicism is simultaneously an innate part of himself and something forcefully repudiated, forbidden not just by culture and law, but [also] by a profound and anguished personal choice” (48). Maintains that Donne’s use of Catholic terms is marked “by various kinds of indeterminacy,” which is “itself a strong and perhaps self-conscious ingredient in the unsettling effect of his use of Catholic terms” (49). Maintains that Donne’s innovation in poetic language can be “convincingly explained in terms
of his unusual biography.” Observes that “a few decades later, his unconventionality had itself become the convention.” Says that “it was left to Catholics to object specifically to the appropriation of their forms of worship by erotic poets. Notes that Edward Thimelby in the 1650s “deplores the fact that what to him as a Catholic is blasphemy—indeed what Donne perhaps deployed precisely because it felt blasphemous and dangerous to him—has now, in the wide culture, become merely commonplace” (50).


Discusses Donne’s appreciation of the psalms, noting how for him, as for others of his time, the psalms were “the preeminent ancient poetry upon which they believed the later Greco-Roman tradition to be modeled” and that David, having been a poet, provided them with “a crucial precedent and justification for their own poetic vocation” (14). Comments on the influence of the Sidney Psalter on Donne and his tribute to the translators in *Sidney*.


Compares and contrasts Donne with his Welsh contemporary John Owen, the Latin epigrammatist. Notes the Catholic background of both men and their rejection of that faith, suggests they may have met as students at Oxford, and points out that they had many friends and patrons in common.


Examines the “sacramental rhetoric” in *GHerb* and in Herbert’s “In Sacram Anchoram Piscatoris” to show how the two poets “cross wits in these poems and, as true wits of the cross, dramatize the action of grace in language in a way that out-wits or cross-wits both Protestant and post-modernist readings” (70). Explains “sacramental rhetoric” by analyzing “the witty exchange” between the two poets, by explaining “the rhetorical figure chiasmus and its significance,” by showing how “chiasmus relates to the cross and crucifixion,” by explaining how “the cosmos is informed by chiasmus and the cross,” and finally by showing how an understanding of the Platonic tradition is “necessary for understanding sacramental reality (how one thing can be two things at once) and how this pertains to wit” (71). Shows how Donne and Herbert “communicate a sacramental view of nature, a priestly dignity of man, and the paradoxes of Christian belief by using a rhetoric whose imagery and logic are informed by liturgy.” Concludes, therefore, that the sacred poems of Donne and Herbert embody “a sacramental theory of language where the real presence of the signified evinces itself through its signifiers by virtue of their reciprocity” (83).


Examines Luce Irigaray’s gendered ethics and shows how, by means of “an analysis that moves between her critique of philosophy and science” and Donne’s “engagement with erotic poetry, elemental philosophy, and medicine, Irigaray’s theoretical roots join her to an early modern culture to which she is indebted and on which, given her professed desire to be read in rigorously philosophical rather than literary terms, she is a surprisingly articulate commentator.” Notes that Donne’s “interest in physic and physics was matched by his fascination with metaphysics” (67) and suggests that Irigaray’s “desire to uncover the affective infrastructures of science and philosophy has an affinity with Donne’s emotional responses to the epistemological and scientific change he witnessed” and that “[h]is conception of seventeenth-century medicine and science, particularly with respect to the elements, can help us to excavate the physic in metaphysical and pon-
der its relationship to the passions” (68). Says that in SecAn (ll. 263–68) Donne “encapsulates the seventeenth-century epistemological and medical crisis surrounding the elements” (70), in which Paracelsian theory challenged the older Galenic theory of the elements. Shows how Donne’s response to metaphysical anguish is “Irigarayan, articulated, even in its vistas of heaven, from the perspective of a gendered corporeality” (74). Discusses how the eroticism in Donne’s poetry, his “mixture of intellect and passion, his metaphorization of the elements, and his constant preoccupation with corporeality as a condition shared by the sexes, anticipate some features of Irigaray’s radical reconceptualization of sexual relations” (75). Comments on Donne’s preoccupation with the relationship between the body and the soul and the “intricate suturing of body and soul through the operation of the passions” (76), citing, as examples, passages from Ecst, HSLittle, Dissol, the Anniversaries, and Air. Maintains that although in his poems Donne “stages the controversy between the sexes and between spiritual and carnal love, his practice demonstrates that he, like Irigaray, sees transcendence as taking place through—not in spite of—the body and its fleshly passions” (81).


Surveys briefly the origins, sources, narrative stylistics, and structure of the homiletic exemplum and argues that Flea is a parody of this traditional genre. Maintains that Donne’s use of the exemplum “adds further ironic dimensions” to the poem’s “conventional generic status as a seduction poem, since the traditional goal of an exemplum was to persuade man to repent, to lead a virtuous life, and to embrace God’s grace” (13–14). Observes that, “[l]ike the function of traditional animal exempla in sermons, the witty use of the flea exemplum has an overt and intrinsic entertainment value” but that Flea “subverts the usual or traditional moral thrust of the paradigm, which is used here instead to urge the silent intra-textual listener to relinquish her virginity.” Concludes that Donne’s use of the homiletic tradition “underscores the complex religious subtexts and thematic underpinnings of his profane poetry, as well as the enduring power of exempla to engage and entertain an audience” (16).


Discusses a manuscript in Lincoln Inn Archives entitled “Latin liturgy and English prayers” that is bound with a printed copy of Donne’s sermon that he preached on 22 May 1623 at the consecration of the newly rebuilt chapel at Lincoln’s Inn. Discusses how the manuscript “calls attention to the reformation of the rite of consecration in the Church of England during the early years of King James’ reign, shedding light not only on the liturgical controversies that flared up in the Jacobean church over just this type of ecclesiastical practice, but also on the shifting influences and fluid compilation of these forms.” Comments on how the manuscript also “demonstrates the English bishops’ imposition of liturgical expression as a means for promoting ecclesiastical reform” and also provides “the most complete liturgical setting for any of Donne’s extant sermons.” Maintains that the manuscript provides a detailed context for evaluating Donne’s knowledge of the consecratory forms and, thus, for confronting Donne’s irenicist impulse as he articulates the thorny problems regarding feast day and holy day celebrations and the implications for a theological understanding of the church in relation to the appropriateness of visible signs of worship” (140). Discusses the liturgical details outlined in the manuscript and relates them to comments in Donne’s sermon.


Reviews both the play and the HBO special presentation of Margaret Edson’s Wit. Suggests that the play shows “how language and
honor can help deal with tragedy, even our own impending death” (40). Discusses the main character’s devotion to Donne’s poetry and comments on how her work on Donne “has exercised her mind so that she is able to see and to explain some of the paradoxes in her current life—and to see the humor in the situation” (43).


Argues that “the elusive interlocutor” in *Satyr 1* “can be imagined at certain moments in the poem to be Donne’s penis.” Maintains that such an interpretation, rather than consigning the poem “to the ranks of juvenile bawdry,” can make it “a more rather than less serious poem” when it is considered in the light of “the closure of the Anglo-American common law tradition” (83). Holds that, like Horace, St. Augustine, and Montaigne before him, Donne in *Satyr 1* “reflects on whether law commands desire, ethics, and imagination—all comically embedded, as it were, in his penis—or whether they command it” (83–84). Says that Donne “renews this debate in order to address the place of desire, ethics, and imagination in the studying, teaching, and reproducing of early modern English law” (84). Comments on parallels between Donne’s poem and Horace’s *Satire 1.2* and *1.9*, St. Augustine’s discussion of Edenic sexuality and impotence, and Montaigne’s essay “Of the Force of Imagination” to show how together these three “offer three possible views of the relationship between desire and law, or, put more narrowly, three possible understandings of whether or not law in its various forms can control where, when, and with whom men’s penises go” (93). Notes that *Satyr 1*, therefore, “shows Donne characteristically mingling classical ethics, Christian spirituality, and Renaissance scepticism” and also evokes his “more immediate historical context, namely, the culture of the Inns of Court in the 1590s” (94). Places *Satyr 1* “within an institutional history of English common law in which the roles of desire, ethics, and imagination were being increasingly diminished or even repressed” (98).


Translates into German (with English texts on opposite pages without notes or commentary) the *Songs and Sonets* (6–165), 5 selections from the *Elegies* (168–95), 3 hymns (196–205), *Metem* (208–41), the *Epigrams* (244–49), the *Holy Sonnets* (252–71), and Sidney (272–75). In the introduction (279–333) presents a general overview of Donne’s poetry. In particular, comments on the philosophical, theological, and metrical complexity of Donne’s poetry as well as his uses of and transformation of traditional Elizabethan poetry. Discusses the difficulties and challenges of translating Donne, or any poet, into a foreign language. Surveys briefly the history of Donne’s critical reception. Concludes with an index of the titles of the poems (334–38).


Discusses Donne’s friendship with Thomas Myriell, Rector of St. Stephen’s, Walbrook, and dedicated music lover, whom Donne chose to deliver in his place the Candlemas sermon at St. Paul’s in 1622/23, based on the recovery of Myriell’s sermon. Points out that, although Donne may have been acquainted with Myriell before becoming Dean of St. Paul’s, his acquaintance with him “undoubtedly deepened through the musical friendships enjoyed by musicians serving in his cathedral” (230). Says that at St. Paul’s Donne encountered “a talented group of musicians with whom he constantly worked closely on behalf of cathedral services, many of whom possessed strong connections with Myriell,” noting, for instance, that Donne’s organist was “one of Myriell’s closest friends.” Argues that “[t]he details of Myriell’s life thus make it clear that in making his choice [of one to preach the Candlemas sermon of 1622/23] Donne chose a man experienced with preaching on important civic occasions, and a man known to him whom he could personally trust.” Suggests that the discovery of Myriell’s sermon “opens a number of new dimensions”
in Donne studies: (1) it “calls for a reconsideration of Donne's Candlemas sermons as a whole” (235); (2) it “leads us to a deeper consideration of Donne's relations with musicians” and his awareness of “musical forms” (236) and life-long interest in music; and (3) it “affords glimpses into features of Donne's professional and social life neglected by Bald” (244).


In Chinese. Notes that although Donne studies began late in China, there has been a resurgence of interest since the 1980s. Reviews recent studies and notes that a number of academic programs have been established to explore Donne's works. Notes that the importation of theoretical and critical ideas from abroad has led to a significant increase in methodological sophistication in Chinese criticism.


Maintains that although the Holy Sonnets are “pervasively Catholic in method,” they are at the same time “deeply influenced by Calvinism in their doubts and anxieties” (96). Suggests that at the time they were written Donne “seems to be neither Jesuit nor Presbyterian, but lost somewhere in between the two” (97). Discusses, as a typical instance of this paradox, HSBlack to show how in the octave Donne employs Ignatian meditative techniques but that in the sestet “[t]he expected sequence of spiritual progress,” characteristic of Ignatian meditation, “fails to take place, despite the speaker's strenuous efforts” (98). Believes that the absence of the sacrament of auricular confession is “central to understanding what is going on in the Holy Sonnets” (103). Analyzes HSbatter to show how it combines Ignatian meditation with Calvinism and maintains that Donne's “despairing fall” into Calvinistic thought arises from “his despair of availing himself of any external means to free himself from sin, specifically the sacraments of confession and communion, which are so far distant from his thoughts that no hint of them ever enters the sequence” (112). Concludes, therefore, that “the peculiar mixture of Catholic method and Calvinist despair that informs the Holy Sonnets must be due to the unavailability of the sacraments—either Catholic or Anglican—at that period in Donne's life” (112–13).


Discusses Donne's uses of the “rhetoric of discretion” in his sermons during his years of seeking secular and ecclesiastical patronage, showing how as he “negotiates multiple demands of seventeenth-century court life, he combines fulsome praise with honest commentary and mixes necessary obedience with specific criticism.” Points out that Donne willingly criticizes his patrons and even the king but that he “presents his criticism in a manner he believes most likely to receive a positive reception and a listening ear.” Notes that Donne “sometimes uses praise as a method of giving advice”; sometimes he “presents an ideal which is aligned—for the most part—to a patron's ideals, voicing his own stance by adding to the patron's model something outside the patron's ideal”; and frequently he “incorporates brief critiques within the framework of an acceptable sermon topic, not dwelling on a critique once he makes it, but quickly changing course to return to a less dangerous topic” (98). Discusses how Donne “explicitly approached the issue of royal absolutism: to what extent he was an absolutist and what boundaries he set on absolutism.” Argues that an understanding of discretion provides one with “a historically useful way of thinking about Donne's enactment of his principled loyalty.” Discusses Donne's sermon at Whitehall on 3 March 1619/20 as an example in which Donne “talks of discreet preaching even as he demonstrates discretion in preaching” and examines also his sermon preached to Queen Anne in 1617 in which he “broaches many sensitive issues.”
Offers “a response to some of the questions raised about Donne’s clash with Laud and King Charles in 1627.” Maintains that the purpose of the essay is to paint a portrait of Donne as “a careful, thoughtful—yet questioning—supporter of monarchy: a principled loyalist,” a man who “envisions a close connection between a person’s service to God and his secular service to the king” (100). Discusses how, for Donne, “the concept of discretion defines a mean between rash and cowardly behavior” (105). Maintains that “[t]hroughout his career, Donne experimented with how he could voice criticism of his earthly patrons without losing their support” and that he also “pushed the limits of how he could support royal policy and still be true to his responsibilities to God.” Concludes that Donne’s “radicalism was discreet and his discretion radical as he struggled to serve both God and king” (115).


Provides a brief contextualization of early seventeenth-century English poetry and asserts that Donne attempts to restore the unity found in Sidney’s view of the poet in order to overcome the advancing ontological crisis. Suggests that the first part of Goodf deals with the interconnection between the earthly and heavenly spheres; and the second, with an astronomical identity through the narrative about Good Friday. Discusses the influence of Ignatian meditation on the poem. Concludes that Goodf is a combination of theological discourse, mathematical and astronomical tracts, sermons, biblical texts, lamentation, and prayer, all of which are intended to bring the contemplative individual to Christ.

952. Martin, Catherine Gimelli. “The Erotology of Donne’s ‘Extasie’ and the Secret History of Volup-

Discusses the future of manuscript studies in Renaissance poetry. Observes that until recently editors of Renaissance poets “selected manuscripts as copy texts with great reluctance if at all.” Points out that for most of the twentieth century the editorial principles established for Donne's poetry by Grierson (1912) “held the field” and that Gardner in 1965 “affirmed and amplified Grierson’s judgment,” noting that her “final verdict on the value of Donne manuscripts was definitive: ‘For an editor they are, in my experience, worthless’” (57). Observes that the editors of the new \textit{Variorium Edition of the Poetry of John Donne} reflect a “revolutionary shift in editorial attitudes toward manuscript texts” and support Peter Beal’s view that Donne's manuscripts have “more textual value than previous scholars had acknowledged.” Notes that in the variorum edition of the \textit{Elegies} (2000), “manuscripts supply the copy texts for every elegy in the volume” (58). Maintains that the study of poetic miscellanies of the period “yield a broad range of aesthetic and cultural discoveries,” noting that “[t]he stemmata for Donne's poems established to date by the variorum editors provide a substantial foundation for reconstructing the scribal communities that produced these seventeenth century miscellanies” (60). Concludes that “no area of study of English literature offers more promise of ongoing, genuine discoveries than manuscript research” (61).


Discusses how Margaret Edson’s play \textit{W};t “mis-introduces the Holy Sonnets—and by extension, John Donne—to audiences who might not have been familiar with them” (161). Points out how the play “caricatures what it means to be a Donne scholar in our current age; it oversimplifies the gestures of the Holy Sonnets it quotes; and it dismisses the content of several of the sonnets in an effort to parallel Bearing's [the main character] situation with that of Donne’s poetic speakers.” Observes also that the play “addresses the problem of pain from a perspective that Donne and his original readers would have considered—in theory, at least—quite alien” and “presents, in effect, different poems from the ones Donne's original readers knew of from the ones we read in many a classroom today” (162).


In Chinese. Compares \textit{ValMourn} and the Tang Dynasty poet Du Fu’s “Bidding Farewell Immediately After Marriage,” concluding that although both poems have “the same theme of parting from the beloved,” they differ greatly in their “artistic approaches” to the subject as a result of the differences in Western and Chinese culture and value systems (128). (English abstract)


Surveys the epidemic spread of syphilis in England in the late 1500s, which “appeared in the eyes of certain Elizabethans to be something very like a sign of imminent apocalypse” (598). Focusing primarily on Spenser’s use of the disease in \textit{The Faerie Queene}, comments on Donne’s allegorical use of disease and its cure in \textit{Devotions}. Observes how in \textit{Devotions} “[e]very detail of Donne’s illness is chronicled simultaneously as an event in the saga of his soul” and points out how Donne “understands his pathology to be connected to sinfulness.” Points out how, for Donne, “disease is an index of his spirituality”; how “his pains are themselves symbols of his soul’s guilt” (624); and how his recovery is “a consequence of recovering his holiness” (625).
An original poem based on Donne's *Noct*.


Contends that Donne's sermons “delivered before and about James contained complex advice for and occasional criticism of James” and believes that Donne “felt secure enough in his relationship to James to feel certain that the king would appreciate his eclectic religious and political ideas, clothed as they were in Donne's witty and paradoxical style.” Holds that, although “generally supportive” of the king, Donne “offered substantial if guarded criticisms of the lifestyle of James and [of] his approval of the proposed Spanish match between Prince Charles and the Infanta of Spain” and that he offered at best only “lukewarm” support for James's *Directions to Preachers*. Discusses the development of Donne's relationship with the king “by surveying several of the sermons preached to or about James on a variety of occasions from the Anglican church calendar” and comments briefly on “the differences between Donne and a few of his contemporary preachers in their attitudes toward James and Charles.” Maintains that Donne “shows genuine affection” for James but that his relationship with Charles I was “much more wary and tentative.” Points out that James was particularly fond of Donne’s “famous wit” (37) and saw his “witty sermon style as an attractive adornment to the most visible pulpit in the Church of England.” Suggests, however, that Donne’s “occasional criticisms of the king may have kept James from ever appointing him to the bishopric that everyone expected for him.” Concludes that Donne “was the king’s good servant, but he was God’s first” (48).

Defends the spirituality of *HSBatter* in the light of objections made in a sermon by A. K. M. Adam, an Episcopal priest, who sees Donne's God in the sonnet as “Superman in theological white robes,” “a spiritual jailer,” “a conquering general,” who comes “to release us once and for all from our frailties so that we no longer have to exercise those tedious virtues of patience, perseverance, and constancy” (85). Presents a reading of the poem in order to answer the objections of those who hold that the sonnet lacks sexual, political, and even theological correctness.

An original poem.


Surveys the reaction of Protestant and Catholic poets of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to the rosary and sees *Corona* as Donne's attempt to produce a reformed verse rosary or corona so that the rosary “might survive the bans and stigmas that had been laid upon it.” Sees, in other words, Donne “engaged in a work of salvage, as well as salvation” (79). Surveys Donne’s possible sources, especially Thomas Worthington’s *The Rosarie of our Ladie. Otherwise called our Ladies Psalter* (1600). Maintains that Donne’s task was to create a verse corona that included “only those moments of the life of Christ and his mother that were compatible with Protestant devotion” (80). Shows how in *Corona* Donne highlights “the notion that the life of Christ is what the believer should dwell on, first and last” (87). Reproduces 5 figures from Worthington's book.


From an eco-scientific and ecofeminist point of view describes “how and why the earth and women are closely associated in many, if not all, cultures” (49). Comments on ElBed as an example of how both nature and women were downgraded in the late sixteenth century, thus justifying the domination of both. Points out that in the poem the mistress is described as land, specifically colonized land, which is passive, while the speaker is portrayed as male and actively dominating. Notes ways in which the poem, therefore, endorses “sexual exploitation and even violence” of women as it also condones the exploitation and looting of the colonies. Comments also on SunRis in which the mistress is also imaged as “colonized and exploited land” (51) and on ElComp in which one finds “some of the most unpleasantly misogynistic language ever written” (52).


Discusses the subtext in two of the Problems in which Donne criticizes James I for abusing the arcana imperii privilege. Examines the “Venus … Shadow” Problem to show how it “reveals a conflict between Parliament and the crown, a conflict in which King James promises to speak with eloquence” but that, in fact, his eloquence is “so manipulative, murky, and opaque that it is not only duplicitous” but also “resembles the kind of discourse that attends King James’s handling of the arcana imperii.” Discusses also the “Statesmen” Problem, which has “considerably more to say about politics and the arcana imperii” and that “critiques the doctrine and discourse of the arcana imperii” in a “more roundabout way,” demonstrating that a corrupt monarch can debase, cheapen, sell, prostitute, and eventually trample underfoot the arcana imperii to such an extent that they devolve to nothing more than a complete sham” (336). Argues that key terms in the king’s discourse are “so ambiguous that their ambiguity enables Donne to craft a double-voiced message,” i.e., he “creates a superficially innocuous message” but that the ambiguity of the king’s key terms “enables him to plant subtexts that carry a much less innocuous message.” Notes that although this essay “focuses primarily on Donne’s subtext criticizing King James’s abuse of the arcana imperii privilege,” the Problems “contain other messages than this” (355). Points out that the political content of Problems apparently was recognized at the time, which would explain why some were not published in the earlier editions and why Sir Henry Herbert, the original licenser, was brought before the Star Chamber to explain why he allowed them to be published.


Surveys various critical opinions on Donne’s uses of gender and colonialism in the Elegies and widens the discussion to include the monetary tropes in these poems that “link value and desire.” Comments primarily on ElProg and ElBrac, poems in which “the sexual is defined in relation to commercial realities” (33) and in which there is a “re-conceptualisation of value” (38). Shows how “gold or money provides the metaphoric frame or structure” that these poems draw on and reiterate in their “treatment of gender and colonial discovery” (40). Maintains that the poems suggest that “love, like gold, has its price” (43).


Discusses the 80 scribal copies of private letters in the Burley MS and suggests that possibly the copies were made at some point between when the letters were written and their receipt, and that “this was done as a consequence of some
policy or instruction that correspondence originating from, or destined for, those appearing on some list of names, was to be intercepted and copied (251). Maintains that the authorities had reason to be interested in the correspondence of both Wotton and Donne, “the one an adherent of the volatile and dangerous Earl of Essex and the other a known Catholic sympathizer.” Speculates that the most likely person behind the surveillance was either Lord Burghley or his son, Robert Cecil. Maintains that “[t]he strength of the theory that the Burghley correspondence results from surreptitious interception is that it accounts for features in the collection that are otherwise puzzling” but, at the same time, recognizes that the weakness of the theory is that “we lack anything in the way of corroboration” (253). An addendum follows on William Parkhurst, one of the copiers.


Discusses Donne’s Encaenia sermon of 1623 in which he is drawn into the debate over kneeling that arose, in part, as a result of James I’s attempt to enforce liturgical and episcopal conformity by demanding kneeling in church. Shows how Donne’s “contribution is marked by a slightly ironic distance” and observes that although “[u]ndoubtedly Donne accepted the serious implications of outward conformity,” he, like some others in his Lincoln’s Inn congregation, seems also “to have been able to enjoy a perspective on the more absurd aside of the debate” (186). Surveys both sides of the debate and points out how “[a]s ecclesiastical tempers warmed, bent knees came to be seen as an indication of a popish revival at court, an ominous foretaste of what was to come if James succeeded in marrying his son to a Catholic princess” (198–99). Comments on Donne’s reference to kneeling towards the end of his 1623 sermon, noting how “[b]y focusing on the exceptions to the rules for ceremonial worship” for the infirm and weak, Donne “places the whole debate in a larger context” and “effectively unravels” the “uncompromising rhetoric” of both sides of the controversy. Points outs that Donne’s interest “lies less in dictating when his congregation should kneel, than in framing the rule in such a way that they can decide for themselves when it is, and when it is not, relevant” (204). Emphasizes how Donne handles the issue in a witty and humorous way that his Lincoln Inn audience would appreciate. Concludes that, for Donne, “the relationship between the believer and Christ becomes the central hinge of Christianity, rather than the more tangible knee joint” (213).


Reviews:

Surveys Donne studies from the 1980s to the present. Discusses how Donne “continues to engage and fascinate an ever-increasing number of scholars and critics and is very much alive in academic criticism” (6), pointing out that today “more essays and books are being written on Donne than at any period in the past” (7–8). Maintains that Donne studies produced during the past quarter century “have made major contributions to our understanding and knowledge not only of Donne but of the seventeenth century, of metaphysical poets and poetry as a whole, and even of the very nature of poetry itself” (8). Observes that although Donne’s poetry “has been run through all the various critical sieves devised by recent critics and has been explored and exploited in the light of each new literary fad that has emerged in the academic world” (8), his poetry refuses “to lie down quietly on their prefabricated Procrustean beds; and so the stream of criticism surges on year after year” (9). Concludes that “because of its complexity and subtlety, Donne’s poetry is not likely ever to generate a highly harmonious chorus of uniformly held conclusions about the meaning of his poems and his ways of achieving that meaning” (23) and that “[e]ach generation of critics, with its own insights, concerns, sensitivities, newly acquired and unrecognized biases and prejudices, will continue to provide us with fresh, controversial, and perhaps even profound insights” (24).


Calls Octavio Paz’s translation of Donne “one of the most striking examples of the modern creation of originals through translation and silent imitation.” Points out that Paz insists that “all poetry derives from an irretrievable ur-text, and that translator-poets do not simply translate; they appropriate, cannibalize, and often radically transform the source text.” Discusses, in particular, Paz’s appropriation of *ElBed*, showing how it is “a willful misreading” of Donne’s poem.


Examines reasons behind Empson’s “lifelong adherence to a very iconoclastic reading” of Donne’s love poetry (146). Points out that Empson’s Donne was a Donne of his own making, a Donne who was very similar to Empson in his Cambridge days in the 1920s. Observes that “Empson’s Donne combines scientific knowledge with independent, often defiant thinking” and “a repudiation of the orthodoxies of religion that offers a replacement religion of love.” Points out that Empson’s notion of “a plurality of worlds was a way of questioning the authority of the supreme Christian God, and the ‘torture’ of the Incarnation, and asserting the development of an enlightened individualism” (153). Notes that Empson’s “love and wonder for Donne” is directed towards a poet who, according to Empson, challenged “the authority of his world by setting up a metaphorical alternative to its religious and political structures.” Notes that Empson “would go to extraordinary lengths to defend this idea of Donne as a figure of integrity and moral plurality” (154). Discusses Empson’s long battle with other critics, especially Helen Gardner and John Carey, over the reading of *ElBed* (l.46). Concludes that Empson’s readings of Donne “produced a strange mixture of brilliant insights and a critical position of adamantine fixity, though taken on the whole, their lasting impression is passion and rancor” and that his love for Donne and his disdain for orthodoxy “produced both the valuable and the untenable.” Notes that Empson “remained true to his ideals, even when it meant courting absurdity” (161).


Shows how “imaginative interaction with an authorial birthplace represents the legacy of an earlier tradition of literary tourism” and traces
that tradition in an early site—John Milton’s birthplace in Bread Street—in order to illuminate the changing nature of our relationship with the literary author” (378). Surveys the history and prevalence of literary tourism. Briefly points out that Donne, like Milton, was born in Bread Street and describes the neighborhood in the sixteenth century.

973. Scott, Alison V. “Celebrating the Somerset Wedding: Donne, Patronage, the Problem of Gift.” *EIRC* 30, no. 2: 261–90.

Argues that *Eclog*, Donne’s somewhat belated gift to the king and his favorite on the occasion of the controversial marriage of Robert Carr to Frances Howard, is “framed by a common debate about gift-giving, choice, and self-interest” and that “[t]hough the giver has chosen to give and thus exercises a free choice, his choice is shaped by the social politics of circumstance and occasion.” Discusses how through “the divided consciousness” of Idios and Allophanes, the speakers in the poem, the epitaphiamon “plays on the antithesis between the voluntary gift and the gift demanded by court and king, between the denial of self-interest and the desire of reward, and between the attempt to withdraw from a morally dubious occasion and the political implications of being seen not to celebrate it.” Maintains that “if we refuse to acknowledge the contradictions and aberrations revealed and negotiated in the epitaphiamon, particularly the tensions between individual choice and social obligation, then we fail to comprehend the political and rhetorical complexity of the gift” (262). Argues that “[c]onflicts between obligation and choice and between giving altruistically and giving out of self-interest are pivotal to the effectiveness of the poem as a gift, effectively received by many more influential people than it was ostensibly given to” (263). Through an analysis of the poem shows how “[c]haracteristically, Donne has it both ways: the poem expresses the required sentiment yet is simultaneously censored”; he “praises his subject but is also seen to answer the charge of failing to honor him with sufficient vigor” (278). Suggests that Donne’s strategy in the poem is such that “the recipient could have accepted its praise in the same manner with which he had received every other extravagant testimony to his power as royal favorite,” while, at the same time, “other readers might have recognized ambiguous undercurrents in the poem’s presentation of a reluctant and apologetic speaker” (281).


Discusses Donne’s sermon addressed to the Virginia Company in November 1622 and argues that Donne’s “rhetorical motives in this sermon are profoundly Christian, humane, and personal, and centre on his efforts to engage his audience in practices of conscientious interpretation.” Maintains that, “[i]n so doing, Donne’s sermon posits the active expansion of ‘desire’ into ‘love,’ and the loving commitment to bear witness, as the only fruitful examples of ‘propagation’ for his audience to consider” (90). Says that some post-colonial readings of the sermon are “inherently problematic because they place the motive of the colonial enterprise exclusively in power and domination, things that Donne rejects as forms of idolatry.” Holds that Donne’s “substitution of the loving power of ‘bearing witness’ for the temporal power of earthly kingdoms radically alters the colonial impetus of this sermon and calls into question the legitimacy of ‘power’ as an explanatory category in interpreting it” (87). Shows how a rhetorical analysis of the sermon “pinpoints just how loving—and just—is the educational imperative of this sermon” (105).


Argues that Donne’s “interpretive middle way
in his sermons is a practice grounded in his understanding of the Church of England as a locus of Christian ‘mediocrity’ that enables the handling of sensitive, controversial matter in the pulpit.” Points out that it is “a principle of exegesis developed in response to the extremes of Roman Catholicism on the one hand and separatism on the other” that marks, for Donne, “the rhetorical, spiritual, and ecclesiastical boundaries” of the Church of England (173). Maintains that in the sermons Donne “cultivates an eccentric but highly principled personal middle way, the way of conscience, which is the final arbiter of all his moral choices.” Points out how “[t]his personal middle way is adjudicated by conscience and determined casuistically” and how it “finds its professional counterpart in a rhetorical style enabled by Donne’s movement between extremes of interpretation in his sermons.” Holds that Donne is “a moderate conformist to the published, consensually interpreted doctrines of the Church of England” but that “even this professional middle way alters with historical occasion, developing in his sermons between Jacobean and Caroline emphases and between continental religious controversies both pre- and post-Dort.” Maintains that in “both exegesis and application,” Donne shows “leadership by taking interpretive initiative in the interest of a broadly conceived and inclusive spirituality” and that “by modeling this interpretive process for his congregation, Donne’s interpretive initiative is tested particularly in moments of crisis.” Argues that “an understanding of his typical approach to issues of interpretation can illuminate the textual strategies and the spiritual focus of all of his sermons” (175). Illustrates Donne’s approach by analyzing several sermons and stresses how Donne’s middle way “redefines what it means to be Christian in the fragmented aftermath of the Reformation.” Observes how Donne “imagines and articulates a specifically English institution in which interpretations of doctrine and the experience of salvation are mediated equally through thoroughly integrated sacramental and homiletic means” and that “in that middle way Donne hopes to build (or edify) Christians who hear with both ears, see with both eyes, and hold with both hands the verities of a religion founded on Scripture, but established in the consciences and the communities of his hearers” (188).


Discusses the multiple meanings of “nocturnal” in Noct, including a navigational device for telling time by night. Points out that by means of this image the bereaved speaker in Noct “can equate himself with the nocturnal so that his body becomes the instrument by which the year’s midnight and the day’s can be objectively reckoned” (180). Points out several sources from which Donne may have derived his image and suggests that possibly he actually handled a nocturnal. Notes that “[t]he complexity of the poem shows the various conceits, posited on the diverse meanings of nocturnal, leading inexorably to the same conclusion.” Maintains that “[a]s nocturnal, the lover marks the heart of darkness” but that Donne “takes the image further by rendering the instrument useless” because “with the death of his lover, the extinction of light, all is lost, and as the nocturnal is effective only when the Pole Star is visible, the ghostly image of the figure in the night sky loses even its shadowy substance” (181).


Discusses Donne’s marriage letters now housed in The Folger Shakespeare Library. Comments on the circumstances surrounding Donne’s secret marriage to Anne More and the disapproval of her father, George More. Comments on Donne’s letters to his father-in-law as well as to his former employer, Thomas Egerton. Reproduces a photocopy of Donne’s first autograph letter to George More (Folger
MS L.b.526), written on 2 February 1601/02, in which Donne announces to George More the news of his marriage, followed by a transcription. Lists additional manuscript letters by Donne in The Folger Shakespeare Library and notes that all of the Donne marriage letters have been fully transcribed and annotated in John Donne’s Marriage Letters, ed. M. Thomas Hester, Robert Parker Sorlien, and Dennis Flynn (Washington, D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 2005).


Discusses problems of filiation of existing manuscripts in editing Donne’s Elegies for the variorum edition of his poetry. Comments in detail on ElBrac, which “exhibits perhaps the single most complicated history of transmission,” sketching in “that history, with particular reference to the technical and evaluative procedures employed in bringing it to light” (16).


Examines Donne’s “ambivalent relationship with the newly dynamic realm of medical anatomy, a sphere made impressively visible in late Tudor and early Stuart England by public dissections and illustrated textbooks.” Maintains that Donne was “strongly attracted to metaphors of interiority which help him assert a witty iconoclasm, or to embody the vigour of the human self.” Points out that “[e]lsewhere, however, he registers unease at the newly revealed complexities of anatomy and its potential religious implications” (1). Observes how in his love poetry Donne “playfully experiments with anatomy as something whose physical and imaginative spaces are sympathetic to an expanding and newly assertive selfhood” (3). Points out also how discussions of resurrection in the sermons, “though superficially asserting God’s comprehensive control and manipulation of scattered and reconstituted bodily materials, are often interspersed with, or all but hemmed in by, images of vivid material particularity” (7). Maintains that, “[a]s Donne’s literary output shifted, then, from poems to sermons, his attention to anatomy remained undiminished” and that “while the images of self-hood certainly changed (often being heavily overshadowed by an insistence on death, decay, and sin) what we might call a certain restless energy of self endured, seemingly undiminished in its potency” (9).

Tian, Ye. [Donne the Great Writer of Conceits.] Journal of Northeast China Institute of Electric Power Engineering no. 3: 42–44.

In Chinese. Discusses how Donne in his poems uses the motifs of the Petrarchan conceit but not its manner. Says that Donne’s wit is pervaded with analogy, argument, and brevity and cites Flea as an example. Finds Donne’s poetry abstract and overly subtle and notes how the metaphysical poets began a new fashion in poetry.


Surveys the history of Constantijn Huygens’s seventeenth-century translations into Dutch of 19 of Donne’s poems, commenting especially on the last four translations, which were made at Visé on 6–7 October 1633. Points out that “although the 1633 translations were made in the year the poems were first printed, there is little or no sense of sequence in Huygens’s translations that matches the 1633 print” (288). Believes that eventually it will be possible to show that the first edition (published in 1633 by John
Marriot) “was not Huygens’s source at any time while he was engaged on these translations” (289). Believes that both Huygens’s source and Marriot’s source “have a common ancestor.” Draws attention to “some striking features of physical contiguity in the manuscript tradition, features that suggest that while working in Visé, Huygens used two single sheets, each with a verso and a recto poem, and that each sheet represents a different manuscript tradition” (290).


In part, a reprint of “John Donne and Scholarly Melancholy” in SEL 40, no. 1 (2000): 81–102. Prefaces a discussion of Donne’s “own self-conception of melancholy” by commenting on “his connections—familial and polemical—with early modern medicine” and notes how Donne espoused Galenic theories rather than those of Paracelsus (88), whom he lumped together with St. Ignatius and Lucifer in Hell in Ignatius. Argues that Donne “believes his scholarly melancholy—depression stimulated specifically by learned endeavor—to form an integral part of his religious melancholy” and that his self-perceived, melancholic disposition thus manifests itself both in his approach to learning as well as his articulations of his experiences as a Christian” (90). Maintains that “[t]he evidence provided by his poetry, devotional prose, letters and sermons reveals how Donne—throughout his life—read his body, faith, and the world at large humorally.” Argues that Donne “resists a strictly religious understanding of his melancholy by continually testifying to the potentially strained—if always eventually reconciled—relationship between the learned and the devout life” and that, in fact, “it is through his studies that Donne understands and conceptualizes his devotion” and “comes to read himself as he does his books, with insight, persistence, and considerable anguish—anguish that he sees saturating the world around him, and on which he continually draws regardless of the genre in which he writes” (92). Comments on how this scholarly melancholy manifests itself in Devotions, Essays, Lit, Biathanatos, Satyres, Holy Sonnets, letters to his friends, and his sermons and how he “attaches unhappiness to scholarly pursuits at the same time that he identifies such pursuits as the focal point of his own existence, thereby knowingly risking the onset of melancholy” (94). Concludes thus that Donne “sees his scholarly melancholy as an integral component of his religious faith, to be both treasured and feared” (105). Adds onto the original essay a discussion of Biathanatos. Argues that “[e]ven as Donne proclaims powerlessness in the face of his despair, Biathanatos—and in particular its textual apparatus—demonstrates the fascinating circularity of scholarly melancholy: while the author purports no cure, and hence no responsibility, for his mindset, he also seeks out a respite from his suffering.” Maintains that Donne’s studying and compiling notes for Biathanatos “function as cause and antidote for his anguish, and the path to both health and illness revealed as one and the same.” Maintains that Donne’s sidenotes in Biathanatos “insulate their compiler’s seemingly iconoclastic ruminations on suicide within a seemingly impressive tradition of learned opinion” (109).

Reviews:


Challenges the usual understanding of Donne’s anti-Catholicism and anti-Jesuitism in Ignatius and Pseudo-Martyr by examining each work in the context of the debate over the Oath of Allegiance. Argues that a careful reading of these two books provides “new elements for understanding the relationship between religion and politics in early Jacobean England and the value and significance of some important topoi in English religio-political culture as well as
in English propaganda” (1309). Maintains that Donne's anti-Jesuitism and anti-Catholicism “were not synonymous” (1313) and that his “bitter condemnation” of the Jesuits, therefore, was not “a bitter condemnation” of Catholicism. Argues that “what Donne opposes is the mixture of religion and politics” (1315). Points out how Donne regards Machiavelli as “one who separated religion and politics” and thus emphasizes “the positive aspect of the Florentine’s doctrine,” whereas he condemns Ignatius for mixing religion and politics “to the point of making them indistinguishable.” Shows how Donne's treatment of Machiavelli in his two treatises is different, therefore, from the understanding of him and his views held by most English readers at the time. Concludes, therefore, that Donne's two treatises are “far from being only satirical pamphlet[s] based on well established commonplace[s] and scurrilous episodes” (1320) but rather are works from which one can “gather precious and profound insights into the religio-political and cultural world of early Jacobean England” (1321).


Maintains that Document D/Dbg 1/27 in the Public Records Office in Chelmsford in the county of Essex in East Anglia “reveals hitherto unrecognized dimensions of John Donne's career after he became Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in 1621.” Notes that this document constitutes the only known example in which Donne's “legal training was of direct use in his career subsequent to his loss of his job as secretary to Sir Thomas Egerton” (255). Discusses how the document “provides a link between Donne's earlier studies at Lincoln's Inn, his service to Sir Thomas Egerton, and his career as a priest of the Church” (257–58) and how it also “gives us one more example of Donne's contact with the English Catholic community even while he held one of the central administrative posts of the Church of England.” Points out that furthermore “[t]he physical details of the document, especially the seal that Donne used to secure his signature on this occasion, also helps us understand more fully both Donne's use of seals and the iconography of Donne's funeral monument erected in St. Paul's Cathedral after his death in 1631” (258). Gives a detailed description of the document, which secured legal standing for Sir Anthony Browne’s grammar school at Brentwood, and Donne's seal. Points out how the document fills in “some details of Donne's activities in the summer of 1622,” indicates his “continued interest in the affairs of the Court of Chancery some years after his career as Sir Thomas Egerton's secretary,” suggests “some of the possible complexities of English institutional history during this period,” indicates Donne's continuing “connections to the English recusant community” (295), shows him “functioning as a church official,” and suggests “the range of activities in which such an official in Donne's day might find himself involved.” Concludes that the document provides “a fuller understanding of Donne's skills and talents and gives us a sample of Donne using a voice different from his poetic or homiletic or devotional voices” (296).


In Chinese. Argues that in ValMourn Donne is optimistic about meeting his beloved again whereas Quin Jia in his valedictory poem is pessimistic, a contrast that reflects the difference between the two cultures in which the poems were written. Points out also how the poems differ in style, meter, rhythm, and rhyme scheme and notes that in Donne's poem the sentence structure is complete whereas in Quin Jia's poem it is vague. Holds that history, culture, and language work to determine the different styles of the two poems even though they share the same genre.

Comments on Joseph Brodsky’s translations of Donne. Gives, as an example, a word-for-word rendering back into English of Brodsky’s translation of Appar and points out how Brodsky in his version “regularized the rhyming, retaining the abba pattern, and ending with two couplets rather than with Donne’s triplet” and how his “basically tetrametric version is more accent-ed, more symmetrical” than Donne’s original. Notes also that, although Donne’s “tone is rather more conversational,” Brodsky’s language, “oddly enough, is simpler, more direct” (160). Points out that Brodsky’s rendering of “A verier ghost than I” “struggles to hold on to the sense” and that he apparently misunderstood “And then poor aspen wretch,” thinking that “aspen” referred to an asp. Notes that the translation is an early effort and lacks “the flexibility, litheness, brio” (161) that characterize Brodsky’s later Russian and English poetry but suggests that “[t]he greater symmetry of the Brodsky version allows it to accommodate the dramatic pauses, as the narrator steps to the front of the stage” (161–62).


Discusses Donne’s Christmas sermon of 1626 that contains “both his most explicit treatment of sacramental doctrine and a sustained attempt to reconcile the potentially conflicting ceremonial and predestinarian imperatives of English Protestant divinity” (193). Shows how in the sermon Donne attempts “to fuse the ceremonial and sacramental impulses of the Old Religion with the introspective, word-centered, and predestinarian pieties of English Calvinism” at a time when “such issues had become once again problematic for Donne’s contemporaries.” Comments on how Donne “deftly traces a way between the perceived idolatrous excesses of Roman and Lutheran sacramentalism on the one hand and pious disregard for ceremony on the other.” Observes, however, that in the sermon Donne’s view of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist “differs little from that of his supposedly idolatrous foes, even while accompanied by customary dismissals of Roman Catholic doctrine and practice” and that “[s]imilarly, whereas he scathingly dismisses predestinarian extremists for rendering Holy Communion a lottery, Donne’s sacramental piety nevertheless includes the exhortation that his auditory contemplate their status vis-a-vis the community of the elect” (194). Discusses, in other words, how Donne’s sermon “combines a carnal sacramental position with predestinarian sympathies” (195). Observes that by invoking the Eucharist in his Christmas sermon “as analogous to homily,” Donne “sacramentalizes the word and thus reifies the effects of pulpit oratory” in the hope that “[h]is method would reconcile a potentially divisive Calvinism with the sacramental orientation of the religious establishment—the inward spirituality of a scripture- and preaching-centered Puritanism with the ceremonial enthusiasm of Donne’s avant-garde contemporaries” (217).


Maintains that although most Donne scholars have accepted Sir Geoffrey Keynes’s account of the disposal of Donne’s library at the time of his death, a 1734 catalogue by Charles Worsely “offers us an opportunity to challenge that account.” Notes that although there has been “no serious analysis” of this catalogue, it “allows us to access with reasonable accuracy the actual content of Robert Ashley’s bequest of 1741.” Points out that, “[s]ince 1948, there has been a suspicion” that, at Donne’s death in 1631, Ashley “acquired part of Donne’s library.” Claims that the catalogue “allows a larger inference, namely that Ashley actually acquired a very substantial part of Donne’s library” (153). Gives a description of the catalogue and suggests further investigations that need to be carried out by scholars “to resolve such key outstanding questions as: did Ashley acquire the greatest
part of Donne's Library; and if so, why has this fact passed unnoticed for nearly four hundred years?” (172).


Announces the sale of the Halstead B. Vander Poel Collection of English Literature by Christie’s on 3 March 2004. Among the items is an autograph letter by Donne to Lady Kingsmill on the occasion of the death of her husband in 1624, which Vander Poel bought for $900 in 1948. Notes that Christie’s estimates that the letter will be sold for between 80,000 and 100,000 pounds.


Comments on I. A. Shapiro’s collection of rare books by Donne and his contemporaries that Sotheby’s will sell on 16 December 2004. Notes that Sotheby’s estimates that Shapiro’s copy of the first edition of Donne’s poetry will likely sell for 12,000 pounds. Mentions Shapiro’s work on an edition of Donne’s letters that was never published but notes that his extensive collection of materials for the edition are now deposited in the library at the University of Birmingham.


Maintains that in Dylan Thomas’s early poetry “Donne’s presence is felt principally in Thomas’s use of ideas drawn from the Paracelsian system,” noting that although none of Thomas’s poems present a full exposition of Paracelsian philosophy, there are “repeated images garnered from Paracelsus’s concepts of cosmogony and alchemy” (190). Comments on both poets’ use of “the Paracelsian concepts of microcosm-macrocosm; of balm; of the alchemical doctrine that a combination of mercury, sulphur and salt was the origin of all bodies” (194); of the notion that “metals had the power to support or maintain life” and that “at a high temperature, two solids could penetrate one another through a chemical process of ‘cementation’” (195). Comments briefly on Donne’s use of these ideas in Devotions, Noct, Ecst, and ElComp.


In Chinese. Maintains that in Donne’s love poetry there is a conflict between Christian theology and Renaissance humanism. Points out how Donne, on the one hand, affirms worldly sexual love but, on the other hand, influenced by his Christian theology, how he regards men as superior to women, a view that leads him to scorn women in his love poems. States that Donne’s conflicting attitude towards love and women reflects the attitude of the society of his time.
Discusses the relationship between prosodic stress and emotional stress and argues that the existence of the spondee depends both on the text and on the reader. Illustrates how a particular intonation of a line affects its interpretation. Comments on l. 2 of *HSBatter* ("As yet but knocke, breathe, shine, and seeke to mend"), pointing out that "a good grammatical case can be made" for reading the third foot of the line as a spondee because "knocke," "breathe," and "shine" are "members of a catalogue, a relationship that foists equivalence upon even the most incongruous items." Points out also the significance of all three words being finite verbs since "stress tends to fall on 'lexical words' or the parts of speech that are important to both sentence structure and semantics." Observes also "the wholly semantic issue of the later words' unexpectedness as part of a list starting with 'knock.'" Maintains that "the crucial element" is the word "breathe" because of "its metrical position" and because the word surprises us and "surprise attracts stress" (154). Concludes that "[t]o intone Donne's line as regularly iambic is to downplay the shock effect of his imagery" (155).


Calls Donne “the Cole Porter of his day, a writer of subtle popular songs rather than just the author of cerebral poetry, according to new research.” Notes that Jonathan Holmes, while working on a play about Donne for The Globe Theatre, found “among piles of unidentified manuscripts in the British Library and the Bodleian in Oxford” four musical scores by various seventeenth-century composers that “reveal that Donne intended some of his words to be sung rather than read.” Reports that Holmes claims that “the music is an immediate aid” in understanding Donne’s poems and that the “first performance in 400 years of text and music together will take place on 9 June [2006] at St. Paul’s Cathedral” with Emma Kirby and Carolyn Sampson, early music specialists, as performers, accompanied by The Sixteen with Harry Christophers and the lutenist Matthew Wadsworth. Notes that the recital “will be interspersed with performances of Donne’s sermons, letters and poetry read by actors Mark Rylance, Alan Rickman, Juliet Stevenson and Harriet Walter.”


Examines *Dissol* in the light of “the philosophies of certain pre-Socratic Greeks and those Medieval and Renaissance alchemists whose theories were based upon them” as well as “certain scientific theories that, though not nor-
mally considered hermetic, nevertheless influenced Donne’s poem” (96). Comments on the possible influence of Heraclitus, Hippocrates, Paracelsus, Nicolas Flamel, Michael Maier, Johann Friedrich Helvetius, and Johannes Pharamundus Rhumelius. Discusses how the title of the poem is “an alchemical code” and maintains that “in order to understand the argument, we must read the poem within that context” (98). Comments on a wide range of alchemical ideas and images as well as the image of the phoenix in the poem. Rejects the notion that the poem is about impotency and sees it rather as a “celebration of successful and successive deaths” (i.e., sexual orgasms), noting how the phoenix image “embodies this miracle’ of multiple deaths and resurrections” (106).


Examines (1) “the Hermetic-cabalist alliance formed in the fifteenth century and how it influenced Donne; (2) the ar combinatoria of Ramon Lull and how it influenced both Donne and his readers; and (3) the religious controversies of the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline eras and how these affected the way Donne wrote.” Discusses these three subjects as venues in which a single phenomenon, the presence of Mary in his texts, can be investigated,” noting that “[t]he evidence argues that we have underestimated the power of her image in his thought.” Observes that the main concern of the study is “Mary as alchemical code and how ideas associated with this code helped Donne confront the problem of residual Catholicism in post-Reformation England. Maintains that during this period “[r]eaders belonged to specific interpretive communities” and that “these determined the ideological context for what meanings they made of the text.” Argues that Donne addresses specifically “those readers who had acquired a taste for alchemical discourse, and especially those influenced by pseudo-Lullian mnemotechnics” (11). In “Introduction: Theological Alchemy” (19–56), discusses the residual Catholic view of Mary in Donne’s works and his interest in alchemy and alchemical theory. Maintains that during the Elizabethan-Jacobean eras “the national memory rebelled against numerous attempts to eradicate iconography of the Virgin” and holds that Donne used poetry and alchemical language “to heal the rifts made by religious and political upheaval” (23). Says that Donne “dredged up images from the past, images held dear by some of his readers but images to which others were blind”; thus “[f]or these latter the images were dormant” and “posed no threat,” whereas others “recognized certain codes and, moreover reinvented the text according to their own understanding of them.” Claims that Donne appreciated Hermetic discourse “not only its literary potential but also the freedom it gave him to express potentially dangerous truths with impunity” (24). As background preparation for the study, reviews traditional Marian iconography, Hermetic alchemy and codes, and concepts of memory. In Chapter 1, “Emblems of Making” (57–77), points out that Donne generally “avoided overt statements concerning Mary” but sometimes “did venture statements from the pulpit concerning the Virgin’s role in the process of salvation” (57), although these remarks were made by means of alchemical codes, such as the phoenix, the alembic, the egg, the mint, the hen, and the pelican. In Chapter 2, “Donne’s Doctrine of Mary” (78–93), discusses how Donne’s doctrinal view of Mary and the alchemical codes by which he expressed it emerged from his Catholic background. Points out how alchemical language and theological alchemy “allowed him to perpetuate some of the great traditions of English culture, including its Catholic past, which necessarily included the Virgin” (80). Comments on how Ramon Lull, “either directly or via Bruno, Pico, and Dee, influenced Donne’s own art of memory” (85). In Chapter 3, “Mnemotechnics in the Sermons and Poems” (94–133), observes that Donne’s attitude toward Mary is “difficult to trace in the sermons because it is not consistent” (94), noting how “[t]he Mary Donne makes is not easily recognizable because he manages to universalize her, incor-
porating her attributes into the Trinity” (95). Illustrates this point by discussing *Annun*, a poem that “studies Donne's vision of the Trinity and specifically Mary’s relationship with it” (99). Also comments on Donne’s uses of metonymy and synecdoche, noting, in particular, how he uses the metaphor of the book and the brooding hen obliquely in presenting Mary to his audience. Discusses his sermon preached at Heidelberg in June 1619 and the *Anniversaries* to illustrate how “codes from alchemy mingle with codes from medieval iconography” (113) in Donne’s works. In Chapter 4, “*Ars Sacra Poetica*” (134–57), discusses the presence of Mary in Donne’s religious poems. Presents a detailed reading of *Corona*, highlighting the alchemical and Lullian elements in the cycle, and comments on alchemical symbolism in *Lit and Tilman*. In “Conclusion: Shekhina” (158–80), points out that Donne dealt with the issue of residual Catholicism in early modern England by “writing England’s pre-Reformation culture into his sermons and poems” by means of his “alchemical discourse” (158). Presents final illustrations of Donne’s method by an analysis of *HSShow* and by commenting on the subject of Christ’s spouse in *Essays*. Concludes by reviewing the general thesis of the study. Contains notes (181–226), a glossary of alchemical terms (227–32), a selected bibliography (233–49), and an index (251–59).

Reviews:


Discusses how *FirAn* reflects the anxiety brought about by the introduction of the Copernican view of the universe, in which the world is seen as “a lonely planet wandering through an indifferent universe whose order does not conform to anthropocentric demands.” Calls the poem “fascinating because it stages this history of ideas at the level of the individual: natural philosophy becomes emotive raw material, invoked in order to evoke psychological states” (10). Maintains that in the poem the new cosmology is “foreshadowing” and is, for Donne, “a cause for mourning, which he connects to the death of an individual even as the network of relations binding the two sets of phenomenon unravels” (12).


Discusses a cycle of poems entitled “The Circle” by Hester Pulter (1596–1678) that employs terms, images, and conceits drawn from alchemy and points out similarities between her alchemical images and those of Donne.


Argues that rather than revealing Donne as “an active heterosexual man, as a heterosexual avant la lettre, or as a proponent of a new system that would become heterosexuality,” his poetry and prose “reveal him as a man living within an ideological system opposed to all the major tenets of what would become heterosexuality—a system wedded to the principles that women are naturally inferior to men and, therefore, naturally more sexually desirous (and unfaithful); that a man’s relationship with God is primary, that his relationships with men are secondary, and that any sexual engagement with women runs a distant third; and that sexual desire is sinful, a worldly result of the origi-
nal sin of our first parents.” Maintains that, “despite the fact that Donne’s sexual practices and the way he represents sex resemble modern sexual practices and the way sex might be represented today, his ways of understanding and representing sexual practices differentiate him utterly from modern heterosexuality” (263). Discusses how Donne’s works “show him as understanding the relationships between men and between men and women in ways that are quite foreign to a Freudian or Lacanian or psychiatric world” (265) and show that he is “much closer to Aquinas’s ‘moral’ understanding of lust than he is to a modern understanding” (266). Stresses that in his later works Donne “rails against man’s sinful nature and excoriates his own forays into sin” and prays that “by confessing his earlier sinful relations with women he will save his soul” (267). Discusses Donne’s misogyny and maintains that he was “absolutely uncritical of a social system that rests on women’s fundamental inequality” (277–78). Claims that, rather than sexual pleasure with women, “the world of men, of patronage and male friendship, was central to Donne throughout his life” (279) and notes that it is “men with whom Donne can most easily imagine equality and love” (280). Concludes that Donne’s sexual world was “a world in which a man’s sexual pursuit of women left him open to the charge of effeminacy—a world in which having inordinate sexual desire made one like a woman, since women were assumed to have inordinate sexual desire” and that Donne would not have categorized those who sought sexual pleasure from women or from males as heterosexuals or homosexuals but as “sinners” (282).


Maintains that Metem is a poem of “radical nonconformity, both in its remarkable combination of identifiable genres and their appearance in only partial or revised application” (12). Argues that by examining the “generic features” of the poem and by appreciating “what is accomplished by Donne’s revisionary application of each,” the reader “may discover the multiple levels of satire in the work and how they are related” (13). Discusses Donne’s uses and exploitation in Metem of the epic, beast fable, and satire. Discusses how Donne’s “satiric play” on The Faerie Queene is “perhaps the first generic adaptation” that the reader notices, but that “the advantage of beast fable, whether Spenser’s Mother Hubbards Tale specifically or the larger fable tradition, points us toward the poetic and political targets of the poem” (20). Presents also a brief tribute to John T. Shawcross (12).


Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne and a highly selected list of modern editions of his poems, followed by selections (with notes) from the Satyres (2), Elegies (4), and Songs and Sonets (23). Briefly introduces each of the genres preceding the selections.


Argues for a history of reading “centered on the traces left by merchants and maidens, gentlewomen and servants, adolescents and matrons” that intends to displace “both the singular ‘ideal’ reader of literary theory and the elite male reader of literary history” (jacket). Points out that Lady Anne Clifford and Frances (Stanley) Egerton, Countess of Bridgewater, had books by Donne in their libraries. Notes in the Appendix (258–81) that the Countess of Bridgewater had in her London library copies of Donne’s sermons, Lam, and Devotions.

An original poem based on Donne.


Views Donne as “a microcosm of the tension between faith and reason” (61) in the seventeenth century. Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne and a brief survey of his works. Maintains that his “prolific recourse to scientific images from geography, cosmology, and astronomy might suggest at first glance that he relishes the new knowledge that science and exploration were providing” but that, in fact, his “use of scientific imagery is always subservient to a deeper poetic purpose.” Notes that “[o]ne gets the feeling that Donne is not overawed by new discoveries” and observes that often he is “even factually inconsistent in his references” (63). Points out, however, that Donne “kept abreast of developments in natural philosophy” and notes that he read the works of Galileo, Jerome Cardan, and Kepler. Comments on the *Anniversaries* and finds Donne’s references in the poems to new scientific discoveries “deeply conservative, pessimistic, and quasi-medieval.” Points out Donne’s interest in “the revival of atomism” (65). Observes that Donne believed that “it was not just the new science that called all in doubt but that the very use of reason to solve nature’s puzzles was deeply problematic” (66). Says that, “clearly, Donne is no modernist” and finds his poems “deeply infused with a medieval sense of the futility of human endeavor.” Concludes that “Renaissance skepticism had shown that human reason was a limited tool” and claims that “Donne’s response was to abandon scientific rationality altogether and take refuge in faith, something that remained immune to his skeptical mind” (67).


Argues that the argument of *HSMin* is s pecious but “that speciousness is only recognized (by the speaker and the reader) at the point the speaker chastises himself and weeps in repentance.” Maintains that the argument of the poem has “a *prima facie* reasonableness” and that “the unrepentant reader is initially led to believe that it is entirely reasonable until the argument of the octet is questioned by the speaker in the lines that follow it.” Says that at this point the reader, “now aware of his or her own sinfulness (as exemplified in the reading of the poem), is brought to repentance in the same way as the speaker” (42). Discusses how Donne’s rhetorical strategy in the poem is based on St. Paul’s epistle to the Romans (9:14–18). Presents a detailed reading of the poem to show how it is “formed after a pattern or pedagogy of Scripture with the purpose of reforming its unreformed readers” (53).


Discusses how Donne, like other preachers of his day, had to walk “a tightrope between frankness and flattery” (93) in his court sermons so as not to alienate his auditors. Examines how in his court sermons Donne skillfully “balances his conflicting obligations to maintain the dignity of the pulpit and the supremacy of the king” and how he typically “emphasizes the importance of mediocritas, or finding a middle way between extremes” (95). Points out how Donne’s court sermons accord, therefore, with “the general drift of court sermons in the reigns of both James and Charles, which continued an Elizabethan strategy of using flattery and panegyric to counsel the monarch” (96). Comments in some detail on Donne’s sermon in response to James’s *Directions to Preachers* and on his sermon at Whitehall before Charles
on the text “So speak ye, and so do, as they that be judged by the law of liberty,” showing how Donne “finds a way of avoiding either silencing himself through excessive diplomacy or being silenced for excessive volubility” (101). Comments also briefly on Donne’s views of libeling.


A study guide for high school seniors. Briefly comments on major characteristics of metaphysical poetry and claims that, in contrast to the other metaphysical poets, Donne’s poetry is “more emphatic, rougher, focussed on particular experience, sometimes pornographic, sometimes outrageously witty, startling and shocking” (i). Discusses and proposes questions about the dramatic nature of Donne’s poetry and presents a brief summary of Donne’s life, maintaining that Donne’s life “is of relevance in understanding his poems” (5). Comments on recurring themes in the Songs and Sonets, such as the rejection of, and or manipulation of the medieval concept of “the religion of love,” of Petrarchism, of popular conventional conceptions about women, and of Platonism. Briefly comments on GoodM, ValMourn, SunRis, HSRound, Father, and Sickness.


Argues that the “textual/sexual ethos” of Metem is “most evident in Donne’s use of rhetorical strategies and mnemonic devices to engage the reader.” Discusses how the poem is “about sex, poetry and ethics” and “incorporates notions of both spiritual transcendence and immanence.” Maintains that “[t]he strategies of reading Donne inscribed” in Metem “encourage the ideal (male) reader to recognize the soul’s appetitive bodily exploits as part of his own bestial heritage.” Holds that “[t]his recognition, which depends on the reader’s acceptance of the interdependence of body and soul in the formation of self, has salvationist possibilities.” Observes, however, that “Donne’s depiction of the soul’s physical adventures manifests a deep, if ambivalent commitment to the sexual body that challenges, but does not obliterate, the spiritual ethos of his poem.” Shows how Donne in Metem explores “the origins of the conflict between the transient body and the eternal soul, life and death, in the myth of Genesis, which he depicts in overtly sexual terms” (191). Maintains that the poem “cannot claim access to any absolute Truth” but rather it “appeals only to the reflective ethical judgement of the reader, who, it is assumed, shares a belief in a larger theological system” (205). Briefly surveys and challenges past criticism of the poem, which often sees Metem as incoherent and incomplete and focuses too exclusively on its satirical elements.


An original poem that does not mention Donne or Anne More.


In the introduction (viii–x), presents a general introduction to Donne’s poetry, especially his concept and expression of love in both his secular and religious poetry. In a subsection of the introduction entitled “John Donne e la poesia metafisica” (xi–xxvi), discusses the general characteristics of metaphysical poetry, comments on Donne’s epoch, and briefly surveys his critical reputation. In a second subsection of the introduction entitled “Le liriche d’amore e i sonetti sacri” (xxviii–lx), discusses the textual history of the poems, including the
manuscripts, the first edition, the canon, and the probable dates of composition, followed by a discussion of the tradition of love poetry in English in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Donne’s original contribution to the tradition, his poetical language and style, his uses of argument and dramatic techniques, and his innovative uses of prosody and metrics. Presents also an introduction to the major characteristics of Donne’s religious poems, noting, in particular his use of discursive meditation. Also presents a sketch of Donne’s life (lxxxi–lxxxix), lists important studies of Donne (xc–ciii), notes that this is the first complete edition in Italian of the *Songs and Sonnets* and the *Holy Sonnets*, and explains the textual choices and decisions of the editor (civ–cv). Thereafter appear, with notes, the *Songs and Sonnets* (with English and Italian translations on facing pages) (1–184), followed by the *Holy Sonnets* (with English and Italian translations on facing pages) (185–206). Concludes with notes on the texts (207–38) and an index of the poems (239–43).


Maintains that, although Donne is often depicted as rejecting the Catholic faith of his ancestors and conforming to the Church of England, “recent revisionist scholarship” indicates that Donne, like most Englishmen of his time, “did not conform or convert” to the Reformed Church, but rather he and they “gradually adapted to the evolving religious environment in which they found themselves.” Holds that Donne was “not a reformer” nor did he “strictly conform” but rather he adapted. Explores, therefore, his adaptation, focusing primarily on the *Holy Sonnets*, *Corona*, *Lit*, and *Cross*. Maintains that in Donne’s poetry “one can see evidence of the process by which Donne blended old habits and new practices and brought together Catholic beliefs and practices with their Protestant expression,” thereby “creating his own way of being an English Christian” (89). Discusses the Catholic elements in Donne’s religious poetry, especially elements of Ignatian spirituality, discursive meditation, and the rosary, as well as the Protestant elements, especially the centrality of Scripture, Pauline theology, and “devotional conservatism” (113).


Maintains that those who preach the psalms well must learn “how to think with the psalm from the inside, and even to feel what the psalmist feels” (20), must “take seriously the fact that they are poems” (23), and must “treat the psalms within the context of the larger scriptural story” (28). Cites Donne’s second Prebend sermon on Psalm 63:7, preached at St. Paul’s on 29 January 1626, as an example of a sermon that “evidences with maximal effectiveness all three characteristics.” Analyzes the sermon to show how Donne “relates the psalm first, to the larger story of Scripture, and second, to his own life and the lives of his hearers,” noting that “the crucial thing to note is that order is important” (29). Reproduces the sermon with explanatory notes (33–61).


Observes that the printer and publisher of the first edition of Donne’s poems (1633) uses blank spaces “as part of a larger strategy to create an intimate text, evoking a manuscript miscellany, while suggesting at the same time that they have produced a definitive collected edition.” Maintains that “the book’s bifocal perspective allows readers to see the author as both aloof and personal, directly involved although already deceased” (119). Discusses how “[t]he author’s presence—the impression that Donne oversaw this collection and was communicating directly with readers—emerged from a collaborative process that ironically required his
Maintains that “[t]he volume’s other omissions, in apparently unfinished and partially censored poems, paradoxically reinforce Donne’s authorial presence while highlighting the demands put on early modern readers.” Points out that “[b]y examining these incomplete works, we see how Donne’s collection, like Sidney’s *Arcadia* and Jonson’s 1616 Folio, represents a transitional volume” and “anticipates a notion of autonomous authorship while still embodying the interactive practices of Renaissance reading” (120). Discusses how the inclusion of incomplete verses in the first edition “invites readers to participate in authorizing the poet” and “represents another manifestation of his absence—parts of these poems are literally missing—but the book’s layout encourages readers to pursue the remaining fragments as evidence that Donne deserves such a commemorative volume” (133). Comments specifically on *Metem*, *Res*, *BedfDead*, *Sat1*, and *Sat4*. Observes how these imperfect verses “recall the mutability of scribal publication, while their specific presentation still depended on the stationers who designed and printed the book” and that, “[in] like manner, the censor’s interventions foreground the author’s lack of control in the process of material production.” Maintains that the “overall design” of the first edition—“reflecting not only this shift from manuscript to print, but also, perhaps, a deliberate marketing strategy—repeatedly presents readers with these near paradoxes.” Concludes that “[t]heir cumulative effect preserves the absent J. D. as a manuscript poet still writing for an exclusive group of understanders, while the evocations of his ongoing presence ironically cast him as a Jonsonian author, overseeing this collection and speaking to us personally through his printed book” (149).


Contains a preface (5–6); introduction (7–[16]); introduction to the 1633 edition ([18]–[20]); translations into Russian of 11 *Elegies*, 4 *Satyres*, *Coryat*, *Macaron*, *Metem*, 46 selections from the *Songs and Sonets*, “Stay, O sweet, and do not rise,” *EpLin*, *EpEliz*, 19 selections from the *Verse Letters*, *Har*, *GHerb*, and *HSDeath* (24–223); commentary on the poems ([225]–[82]); an essay entitled “Zhitie prepodobnogod-ra Donna, nastoiatelia obora Sviatogo Pavia” [The Life of the Venerable Dr. Donne, Priest of St. Paul’s Cathedral] (285–99); Kruzhkov’s 1997 essay “‘Aromat’: Dzhon Donn i niukh lorda Berli” [“Perfume”: John Donne and Lord Burleigh’s Sense of Smell] (299–312); an essay entitled “Posviashchaetsia vechnosti” (313–20), a discussion of *Metem*; an original poem by Kruzhkov (321); a chronology of Donne’s life (322–29); bibliography of recent Russian publications on Donne ([30]); table of contents (331–34); and bibliographical description of this volume ([335]).


In the Introduction by Andrew Motion (xv–xix), offers a biographical sketch of Donne and a general introduction to his poems that emphasizes how they reflect Donne’s conflicted personality. Says that “[t]he energy of Donne’s disputatiousness is unique in English-language poetry” and that his “principle interest” is “himself” and “his own feeling mind.” Calls Donne “an egoist whose challenges to the self were projected with such force and variety that all his listeners and readers can share in them” (xix). Presents a chronology (xxi–xxvii), a note on the text (xxix–xxxi), and a note on meter (xxxiii–xxxviii) from the 1971 edition of Smith’s *The Complete English Poems*, thereafter follows the text of the English poems according to the 1996 printing of Smith’s edition (1–361) with revised notes (363–418). Concludes with a corrected and revised Further Reading section by John Tobin (1996) (419–27) and an index of titles and first lines (428–38).

Translates into Spanish the *Songs and Sonets* (9–100), followed by the English texts (103–80) and an index (181–84). No notes or commentary.


In the introduction (10–32), observes that the letters and documents in the edition “tell most of what we know” about Donne’s clandestine marriage to Anne More and thus “provide critical evidence for reasonable conjecture” about the marriage (11). Presents a biographical sketch of Anne More and of the young Donne and comments on the events leading up to the secret marriage and its after effects. Surveys and discusses critically the contents of the letters, which show Donne’s enduring love for his wife and his final reconciliation with his father-in-law. In “A Note on the Transcriptions, Reproductions, and Donne’s Heraldic Seal” (33), explains the editorial principles governing the transcriptions and the reproduction of the original documents and describes the heraldic seals Donne used to seal his letters. Contains transcriptions with explanatory notes from 18 letters and documents at The Folger Shakespeare Library (FSL MSS L.b.526–543), 15 of which are in Donne’s hand, dealing with Donne’s marriage (33–65), followed by reproductions of the original documents (66–106). Includes 11 items concerned with Anne More’s wedding, 8 letters written in early 1602 by Donne (4 to Sir George More, his father-in-law, and 4 to Lord Keeper Egerton), 1 letter of 1602 to Egerton by Christopher Brooke, the 27 April 1602 decree by Richard Swale of the Court of Audience in Canterbury validating the marriage, a 1602 receipt sent to Egerton by Donne acknowledging paying of a legacy left to Anne by Lady Egerton, 4 letters written by Donne in 1612 and 1614, 3 letters to Anne’s brother Robert, 1 letter to Anne’s father, Donne’s epistaph for Anne on the occasion of her death, a 1625 letter to Sir Henry Wotton, and a 1629 letter to his father-in-law. Concludes with an afterword by Heather Wolfe, Curator of Manuscripts (109–10), explaining how The Folger Shakespeare Library obtained the letters.


Presents a newly edited critical text of the *Holy Sonnets* based on an exhaustive study of the manuscript and print history of the poems as well as a chronological summary of critical commentary on the poems from Donne’s time through 1995. In discussing the history of the transmission of the poems among seventeenth-century manuscripts and printed editions, the editors “identify and print both an earlier and a revised authorial sequence of the sonnets, as well as presenting the scribal collection—which contains unique authorial versions of several of the sonnets—inscribed by Donne’s friend Rowland Woodward in the Westmoreland manuscript.” This study “also casts new light on the question of dating” of the sonnets and also “reexamines their traditional associations” with such poems as *Corona* and *ED* (jacket). Contains acknowledgments (xiv–xviii); short forms of reference for Donne’s works (xviii–xxiv); abbreviations used in the commentary (xxv–xxxii); sigla for textual sources (xxxii–xliii); symbols and abbreviations used in the textual apparatus (xliv); general introduction (xliv–lix); introduction to volume 7.1 (l–cvii); texts and apparatuses ([i]–112), which includes the original sequence of the *Holy Sonnets*, a revised sequence, copytexts for the three sequences and lists of emen-
ations, textual introductions and apparatuses for individual Holy Sonnets, the 1635 sequence of the poems, and a note on identifying authorial revisions among manuscript variants. Thereafter follows the general commentary on the Holy Sonnets (116–220), with subsections on the dating and order of the poems; the poet/persona; genre and traditions; language and style; prosody; sacred and profane themes; and Holy Sonnets and other works, followed by commentary on individual sonnets with notes and glosses on individual lines (221–554). Concludes with works cited (555–87); an index of authors cited in the commentary (588–96); an index of writers and historical figures cited in the commentary (597–99); an index of other poems and works of Donne cited in the commentary (600–01); an index of titles (602–03); an index of first lines (604); and biographical sketches of the editors (605–06).

Reviews:


Examines the Songs and Sonets in order to show the ways in which Donne uses “his culture’s widely accepted alchemical discourses to negotiate with religious, political, economic and gendered ideologies, conflicts and anxieties in the early modern period.” Draws on “cultural materialist scholarship that attends to the patronage system in which Donne wrote and circulated his poetry” and discusses recent scholarship on textual transmission and editorial history “in order to demonstrate the ways in which Donne’s alchemical discourses have been marginalized by post romantic paradigms of subjectivity” (196). Comments on how Donne uses alchemical images, motifs, and apparatus in the Songs and Sonets “in equal measure for both spiritual and secular (political, amorous and patronage) purposes” (213), noting his references to such alchemical concepts as healing balm, the philosopher’s stone, the curative power of gold, the limbeck, and quintessence. Maintains that the fact that Donne “could employ alchemical images and processes to represent such a wide range of subjects indicates that his readers were comfortable thinking of alchemy as a significant body of theory and practices” (219). Maintains also that Donne’s use of “alchemical language alongside discourses of the new astronomy” indicates that “these two methods of observing nature were not seen as mutually exclusive or contradictory in the early modern period” (220).


Explores very briefly Donne’s concept of doubting wisely in Sat3.


Maintains that although FirArt has become “a favorite example of the traumatic effect of the new science” (1), Donne, in fact, in the poem “idealizes the discovery of the compass” and, by envisioning Elizabeth Drury as “a magnetic power that sustained the living earth, . . . aligns himself with a major work of the new philoso-
phy: William Gilbert’s *De Magnete* (1600) (2). In particular, explores the importance of Gilbert's work on Donne’s view of grace. Maintains that Donne's describing Elizabeth Drury as “a magnetic world-soul that moves the mariners needle reveals that he shared Gilbert’s willingness to see the immaterial at work in the achievements of the experimental sciences.” Argues that Donne was “particularly interested in *De Magnete* because its empirical observations aided his efforts to revive an ancient theology of grace that had been obscured by the recent wrangling between Catholics and Calvinists over the role of human agency in salvation.” Discusses, therefore, how Donne uses Gilbert's theory of magnetism “to illustrate the Augustinian notion of grace as a sudden awakening” and how he uses “new philosophy to justify old faith” (3). Holds that, “[f]or all the poet’s despair at the extent of the world’s corruption, he remains optimistic that Drury’s passing can prepare the way for a new time of paradise” and that “although the world has lost its ‘sense of memory,’” still there remains “those who can make use of the knowledge gained by its demise” (9). Argues, therefore, that Donne does not use “the new science to replace old belief” but rather sees in *De Magnete* “a way to renew awareness of a theological perspective that was in danger of being forgotten amidst metaphysical disputes over the significance of the human will.” Concludes that employing the “fresh insights of *De Magnete*,” Donne hoped to generate a “sense of epiphany, awakening his readers to a new sense of life by reminding them of their original” (17).


Maintains that “[a]lmost as much as religion, friendship has become a scandal, a stumbling block, a site of occlusion, in the reading and study of early modern literature.” Observes that “[a] fundamentally secular age elides the spiritual presuppositions of early modern life, while a simultaneously embarrassed and prudent age fixated by corporeal sexuality fails to register the presence of a constitutive way of life whose practices, sustained by classical and biblical precedents and ruminations, provided a bulwark of well-being in the face of vicissitudinously fragile and brief mundane existence—friendship.” Points out that “[t]he early modern tradition of friendship looked to the writings of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero to articulate and valorize its practices.” Notes that celebrations of friendship by Sidney, Shakespeare, Jonson, and Donne were “a way of life.” Argues against reading early modern male-to-male expressions of friendship out of context.


Points out that in *HSShe* Donne “describes God’s love in a clever combination of the Old Testament picture of a jealous God and the New Testament picture of a God of love and self-sacrifice,” noting that “the image is of a tenderly jealous lover willing to give everything for the one he loves but fearful that in the end he may lose out to a rival (the world, flesh or devil)” (141). Comments on how in Donne’s poetry “the sense often flows back and forth between the sexual and the spiritual, the human and the divine in a multi-directional way.” Notes, as an example, that in *ValWeep* Donne suggests that “when he weeps, it is the reflection of his mistress’s face in his tears which gives them worth,” just as in *HSMrin* it is “the reflection of God’s mercy which gives worth to his tears of repentance.” Comments on how “[r]eflection is [a] deep conceptual metaphor much loved of Donne,” noting that women are
often presented as “a mirror in which the male poet sees himself reflected” or as “an empty space which acquires meaning through the projection of the speaker’s masculinity into her, just as the church acquires meaning through the action of her bridegroom, Christ.” Suggests that the kind of merging seen in ValName is similarly “the goal of the spiritual life” and that in Air “just as human love needs to ‘put on’ corporeality in order to express itself,” likewise “God’s love needs to ‘take a body too’ if it is to be understood and experienced.” Concludes that for Donne “the physical world is more than a symbol of the spiritual world, and sexual relationships are more than symbols of spiritual relationships: incarnation—the embodied world—is the only way in which the spiritual dimension to life can be understood” (142).


Discusses how Donne viewed the Sidney Psalms as a “literary model” and notes that his “most characteristic stylistic elements are also found in the Sidney Psalms, including dramatically abrupt openings, argumentative structure, and vivid imagery.” Points out that there are also a “few verbal parallels” (34), citing phraseology in HSDeath as an example. Comments also briefly on Donne’s praise of Psalms in Sidney.


Examines “some of the relation between Renaissance lyric and history, investigating shared cultural preoccupations in both historiography and lyric poetry in England from the mid-sixteenth to the later seventeenth-centuries.” Observes that “[d]istinctions between public and private spheres were different for this period than for later cultural models, chiefly because the supernatural and natural were imagined as much more intimately linked.” Points out that “[t]he principle of correspondence between natural and supernatural was culturally dominant and . . . this configured ideas surrounding individual identity and social identity differently from those constructed by Romanticism and its legacies.” Examines “aspects about truth and the self, history and lyric around the issue of forging identity” (66). Comments specifically on Donne’s skepticism about the benefits of the “new science,” in particular, its nurturing of “the ‘ego,’ the ‘I’ as a distinct, self-creating and self-supporting entity” (73). Points out that in his works Donne usually sees his identity “controlled by a power external to him” and thinks that “even his most fundamental part, his soul, may not actually belong to ‘him’” (74). Maintains that Donne “discovers identity only when wrapped up in another” and that “he believes in his being or existence only when the ‘I’ as a unique and distinct thing has disappeared, when it is re-paired with his creator” (75). Cites as examples Ecst, GoodM, Lit, HS-Batter, and Goodf. Says that Donne substitutes “Credo ergo sum” for Descartes’ “Cogito ergo sum.” Maintains, however, that “[t]he arguing, reasoning, exclaiming and doubting” that takes place in Donne’s devotional poetry “may be a performance of belief rather than the possession of belief” (77).


Examines Donne’s poems “to determine the difference between the significations of the sun” before and after his “articulation of the Copernican shock” in ll. 205–08 of FirAn (102). Examines “some of the relation between Renaissance lyric and history, investigating shared cultural preoccupations in both historiography and lyric poetry in England from the mid-sixteenth to the later seventeenth-centuries.” Observes that “[d]istinctions between public and private spheres were different for this period than for later cultural models, chiefly because the supernatural and natural were imagined as much more intimately linked.” Points out that “[t]he principle of correspondence between natural and supernatural was culturally dominant and . . . this configured ideas surrounding individual identity and social identity differently from those constructed by Romanticism and its legacies.” Examines “aspects about truth and the self, history and lyric around the issue of forging identity” (66). Comments specifically on Donne’s skepticism about the benefits of the “new science,” in particular, its nurturing of “the ‘ego,’ the ‘I’ as a distinct, self-creating and self-supporting entity” (73). Points out that in his works Donne usually sees his identity “controlled by a power external to him” and thinks that “even his most fundamental part, his soul, may not actually belong to ‘him’” (74). Maintains that Donne “discovers identity only when wrapped up in another” and that “he believes in his being or existence only when the ‘I’ as a unique and distinct thing has disappeared, when it is re-paired with his creator” (75). Cites as examples Ecst, GoodM, Lit, HS-Batter, and Goodf. Says that Donne substitutes “Credo ergo sum” for Descartes’ “Cogito ergo sum.” Maintains, however, that “[t]he arguing, reasoning, exclaiming and doubting” that takes place in Donne’s devotional poetry “may be a performance of belief rather than the possession of belief” (77).
leo’s treatise “one of the most influential eyewitness testimonies against the principles of the geocentric system” (102–03) and points out how FirAn reflects Donne’s “apprehension of the meaning of Galileo’s discoveries.” Cautions, however, that Donne’s allusions to the sun mostly appear in “the metaphors, conceits and emblems of his poetry,” not as scientific statements (103). Discusses how “[t]he contradiction between the way in which Donne sees the sun as an old, familiar acquaintance” in SunRis and “the confusion that blurs his perception of the sun” in FirAn arises out of “the rivalry of two incongruous world pictures” (107). Points out how in both SecAn and EclAlg one finds not a “total abandonment of old ideas concerning the sun” but rather “a gradual transition” that appears in “the incorporation of new ideas in the familiar framework” of the two poems. Claims that in EclAlg “there seems to be a reconciliation between the old philosophers’ concepts concerning the sun and those of the new, the difference between the two being bridged on the one hand by explanation whenever the former are touched upon, on the other by evading any declaration of certainty whenever the latter are introduced” (129).


Discusses Donne as a “performance poet equipped with a sophisticated arsenal of various performative strategies, themselves predicated on a complex understanding of Neo-Platonic mimesis.” Defines “performance poet” as “a writer of performative identities, according to the terminology of speech-act theory,” and also, more simply, as “a poet writing for performance, in this case musical performance.” Explores “the ways in which these varying resonances operate” in Donne’s poetry and places them “within a broader understanding of the relationship of poetry to the world of the English Renaissance.” In other words, investigates Donne’s work “through the concept of mime-

sis” (183). Examines primarily Donne’s poems that were published as lyrics accompanying musical scores by Alfonso Ferrabosco, John Dowland, William Corkine, Orlando Gibbons, Henry Lawes, Giovanni Coperario, John Hilton, and John Wilson. Notes also that “there is evidence that between fourteen and eighteen of the Songs and Sonets were set to music in Donne’s lifetime” (186). Points out that Break “received the most attention from composers” (187) and that Expir was “among the most popular lyrics of the period” (188). Notes that the principal audience of the lyrics was musicians and women. Comments on Donne’s interest in and knowledge of music as well as his connection with contemporary musicians and maintains that “[f]ollowing ancient and contemporary theological, musical, and scientific thought, Donne’s was emphatically an aural universe.” Argues that, for Donne, “the most literal mimesis is neither linguistic nor pictorial but musical” since he regarded music as “a direct and actual representation of the mind of God and the workings of the universe.” Maintains that this perspective “leads to the predominance of voice, speech and music in his work, whether poetry, prose, correspondence or sermon” (199). Maintains that “although Donne was a sparing publisher of any of his work in any genre, the fact that the number of his songs—with music—printed in his lifetime outnumbers any other form of publication, and is equalled only by the later publication of his sermons, is telling” (203).


In Chapter 1, the discussion of the Lothian portrait first appeared in “More Foolery from More? John Donne’s Lothian Portrait as a Clue to His Politics,” in So Rich a Tapestry: The Sister Arts and Cultural Studies, ed. Ann Hurley and Kate Greenspan (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1995), 72–87 (See Roberts 3). In Chapter 2, the section on the nature of inter-

In the preface (13–28), states that the thesis of this study is that “elements of John Donne’s poetic practices were conditioned by the early modern visual culture of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.” Notes that Donne’s poetry is “not typically thought of as visual in the conventional sense: it does not tempt us to construct imagined scenes, nor does it allude directly to specific paintings, pieces of sculpture, or similar artifacts from the visual arts.” Maintains, however, that Donne “offers us an intriguing instance of a poet operating under the influence of the visual aspects of his culture,” a man “who was quite sophisticated in both his awareness and in his responses, even modifications, of that influence” (13). Points out that this study attempts “to recapture those aspects of late Renaissance, early seventeenth-century visual culture that were particularly formative for the creative individuals who actively participated in that culture,” particularly as seen in Donne’s poetry. In Chapter 1, “Donne and Painting: The Early Politics” (29–60), analyzes the Lothian portrait “as a clue to Donne’s early religious affiliations.” In Chapter 2, “Donne and Festival: The Structure of the Lyrics” (61–96), discusses Donne’s “participation in the Inns of Court festivals of the late 1590s as constitutive of one of the most distinctive structural elements of his verse.” In Chapter 3, “Donne and London: Representing Representations, from Spec-tacle to Poetic Discourse” (97–132), examines London in the early seventeenth century “as a spectacular text, which trained the eye in patterns of consumption, commodification, class, and gender that resurface, sometimes directly, sometimes displaced, in Donne’s poetry.” In Chapter 4, “Donne and the Crisis in the Image: The Internal Made Visible” (133–59), discusses “that visual context which is more frequently associated with Donne the preacher than with Donne the poet, the iconophilic/iconophobic crisis in the image” (23). In Chapter 5, “Donne and Collecting: Moving Away from Patronage” (160–203), discusses “paintings, as these circulate through the upper middle class, composed of gentlemen who, like Donne and his friends Christopher Brooke and Henry Wotton, were collectors of art yet not of the influential nobility and thus not patrons” (23–24). Maintains that “[t]his cleavage between the usually inseparable categories of patronage and collecting casts a telling retrospective over Donne’s poetry and provides a coda of sorts to the study as a whole.” Points out that each chapter “begins with a specific contemporary document,” followed by a discussion of “a particular facet of seventeenth-century visual culture that is then applied to a reading of a selective number of Donne’s poems.” Stresses the distinction between visual arts and visual culture and comments on how the approach of this study both “builds on and departs from” those engaged in the study of visual culture (24). In the conclusion (204–06), summarizes the thesis of the study. Notes that the sequence of chapters are “roughly chronological,” thus “suggesting a maturing complexity” in Donne’s responses to his visual culture (204). Maintains that when read in this light, Donne’s “verbal practices emerge as more dynamic, layered, and publicly influenced and influencing than an approach solely restricted to verbal contexts” (206). Concludes with notes (207–28), a bibliography (229–37), and an index (239–48).

Reviews:


In a discussion of the close connection between erotic and sacred love in Western Christian mystical tradition, comments briefly on how Donne so easily slips “from the sacred to the profane and back again” (73) in his erotic lyrics.


Maintains that the three Holy Sonnets in the Westmoreland MS “record inconstancy as a spiritual condition” and “propose in aggregate that the ideal state of the soul is not unwavering devotion, but rather faithlessness.” Discusses how “[i]n their treatment of devotional infidelity as a form of sexual inconstancy,” the three sonnets “build upon a trope familiar from scripture, in which the human propensity for spiritual deviance is encoded as adultery.” Observes, however, that “in his appropriation of canonical infidelity metaphors to represent the relational dynamic between the soul and God, Donne transposes the spiritual value of adultery, rewriting the terms of the trope so that the adulteress becomes, paradoxically, a figure for piety.” Maintains that Donne’s “prolonged engagement with the adultery trope” in the Westmoreland sonnets “reveals his tremendous spiritual stake in the role of the adulteress, whose faithlessness holds out, for Donne, the promise of faith” (28). Shows how “[in] the figure of the adulterous Bride, Donne’s spiritual uncertainty is redefined as a spiritual asset, a quality to flaunt because it provokes God to the ‘tender jealousy’ of husbandly devotion” (41).


Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne, focusing on the intriguing complexities and seeming paradoxes of both his life and poetry. Comments on the role of John Donne Junior in the publication of his father’s works. Points out...
that Metem remains incomplete and speculates on who would have been the final recipient of the soul of wickedness, strongly suggesting that it would likely have been Elizabeth I.


Points out that both cultural historians and narratologists find interesting the treatment of love in Canon. Observes that the cultural historian “is struck by the fact that a poem of this date can contain such a clear statement of a modern concept of love as something autonomous and unaffected by other aspects of society,” whereas the narratologist “notes the originality of the way in which this form of love is developed on the level of the story: the combination of love with a religious script and the relocation of certain sequence elements in the future make it possible to live the ideal despite the obstacles facing it.” Discusses how in the poem “the relationship between speech act and story alternates between simultaneity, retrospection, and prospection” (36). Shows how Donne playfully presents sexual love as religious activity in order to convince his detractor that he should approve his kind of love. Maintains that “the obviously playful way” in which Donne “turns to the future canonization and recording of his love allows him to succeed for the present in empowering himself in his role as a lover who can show his love and act accordingly” (43).


Examines Donne’s uses of paradox as a fundamental structural device in his sermons. Shows how Donne “invents highly individual paradoxes while wrestling with the unavoidable paradoxes of human history” (101). Points out how the paradoxical mode of Donne’s religious works is consistent with and reflects the paradoxes of Christian theology and how it is intended to challenge the habits of thought held by his readers or listeners. Maintains that in Donne’s “poetico-religious and homiletic writings, the paradoxical mode encourages intellectual endeavour and thus is an active process
leading to reconciliation of reason and faith” (107).


An original poem.


Argues that “[t]he range of views about women and love in Donne’s poems implies that, in each, he is working out a position rather than presenting his own opinion.” Claims, for instance, that his poems on mutual love “verge on orthodox church doctrine, one position within the debate about women, rather than any revelation of personal feeling.” Maintains that Donne’s poems, which “range from misogyny to mutual love to reverence,” reflect “positions within the contemporary controversy about women” and that his version of the debate stems from “the rhetorical education in the schools, which trained students to argue on both sides of a question” (93). Cites Paradoxes as Donne’s “most explicit use of the controversy,” works that are “wittily and maliciously misogynous but never fully serious” (94) and that are intended primarly to show off his inventiveness and wit. Points out how the controversy about women appears in his love poetry and even in his sermons on marriage, all of which are “rhetorical performances that consciously fashion the median point between the extreme views of women as goddesses or devils” (98). Points out that Donne’s poems on mutual love “enact in verse what Protestants formulated in their sermons on marriage: the doctrine of mutual help” (99). Notes, however, that in a few poems Donne seems to “break away from the orthodoxy of the sermons to construct something new in gender relations,” i.e., equality (101). Presents critical analyses of ValBook and ValName, calling them “the work of Donne at his most insightful about early modern gender dynamics” (109). Shows how in each of the poems, as well as in his sermons, the purpose of Donne’s moderation is primarily “to establish mastery” (110).


Argues that the speaker in ValMourn may be “a woman who attempts to seduce her male partner into consenting to her roaming freely away from him,” noting that there is “no linguistic evidence whatsoever in the text to determine the gender of the addresser and the addressee.” Maintains that such a reading “proves that Donne adopts a positive attitude toward women in spite of the general consensus among his scholars of misogyny” (19). Points out that although Donne “makes his female speaker consent to endow her male partner with virility, firmness, and control,” her presentation of him “is not without cynicism and mockery of masculinity” (22).


Presents biographical sketches of Luis Cernuda and Donne and discusses similarities between
Cernuda’s complex and ultimately metaphysical concept of love and Donne's view of love. Comments on how both poets, in their lives and poetry, move from an unsatisfying search for purely sexual fulfillment to a recognition that true love is transcendent and spiritual. Finds also similarities in the poetics of both poets.


In the Introduction (vii–xiv), points out that, “[u]nlike modern thinkers who understand the body as a purely material phenomenon or postmodern critics who see it as a text produced by culture, Donne understands the body as a sacred text written by God.” Offers “a comprehensive interpretation of Donne’s reading of the body.” Proposes to explore, in particular, the intimate “interrelationship between Donne’s representations of the human body and his theological imagination” (ix) and to show how, for Donne, the body “becomes a vehicle of God’s presence and grace” (x). Combines “close literary-critical readings of Donne’s works” with an “historical analysis of the cultural and theological context in which those work were written” and thus interprets his representations of the body “through categories intrinsic to the material itself: books, sacred texts, sacraments, and the teleological process that moves through the stages of creation, fall, redemption, and eschatological fulfillment” (xi). Observes that, although Donne “gains in power, maturity, and theological insight after his ordination, he uses many of the same themes and images when he speaks of the human body throughout his career” (xii) and that when his early and later writings are read “against each other . . . a relatively coherent and significant picture emerges” (xiv). In Chapter 1, “The Created Body” (1–26), explores “the created body in Donne’s pre-ordination writings through two interrelated themes: the human being as microcosm and the Edenic body.” Discusses, in particular, Donne’s “exploration of the idea of the body as the book of creatures” in Essays and how he deals with the body in his sermons. In Chapter 2, “The Fallen Body” (27–56), discusses Donne’s habit in his early work “of weaving together images and concepts from Hellenistic and Christian traditions to speak about the human person” and comments on “some of the images that are integral to Donne’s depiction of the fallen body in his preordination writings: images of death, decay, fragmentation, and dissection” (28). Then brings “many of the same ideas and images from Donne’s early work into the context of the sermons: microcosm, hierarchy, disease, decay, death, and fragmentation” (41). In Chapter 3, “Bodies Redeemed and Redemptive” (57–82), discusses how Donne “portrays the human body as both redeemed and redemptive throughout his writings” and how he “explores the body’s role in the salvation and restoration of the human race to God.” Points out that Donne “portrays the body that, despite the fall, retains some of its Edenic gifts”; that he “represents the human body as the necessary instrument of the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ, which then works (at least potentially) to redeem all human bodies”; that he “presents a human body that can actively participate in Christ’s redeemed body through its own sacrifice and suffering”; and that he “reads the body as a sign and sacrament of redemption, grounding that reading in his own theology of the sacraments” (57). In Chapter 4, “The Eschatological Body” (83–103), discusses how for Donne “[t]he only eschatological event that really captures his imagination is the general, bodily resurrection of the dead” and points out how he turns repeatedly “to the themes of the death, fragmentation, bodily resurrection, and glorification of the body as a microcosm of the last things” (85). In Chapter 5, “Reading the Trajectory of Salvation in the Book of the Body” (105–26), discusses “the themes of creation, fall, redemption, and eschatological salvation as Donne represents them through the figure of the body,” focusing primarily on the Anniversaries and Devotions. Maintains that these two works, one early and one late, “represent explicitly what Donne was implicitly doing with the body throughout his career: lifting it from the realm of the created into the
realm of sign and sacrament” (105). In “Appendix A: Literature Review: The Body in the Context of Donne Scholarship” (127–32), surveys and evaluates past scholarship on Donne's theology and his views on the body. In “Appendix B: Donne's Representations of the Body in Their Historical Context” (133–60), discusses “the history of philosophical and theological thinking about the human body,” commenting on “some themes and particular authors within that history that are of particular relevance for an understanding of Donne's representations of the body” (133). Concludes with a list of works cited (161–68) and an index (169–76).


An original poem.


Traces Donne's Catholic heritage. Points out his relationship to Thomas More through his mother, Elizabeth Heywood, who was the daughter of Joan Rastell, More's niece, who had married John Heywood. Notes that More's sister, Elizabeth, was Donne's maternal grandmother. Comments on Donne's connection with members of the Heywood family and other noble Catholic families of the time. Discusses Donne's struggle with his Catholic faith, his illegal marriage, and his final conformity to the Church of England. Briefly comments on Pseudo-Martyr and Ignatius, on Donne's conflict over his anti-Catholicism as it appears in his sermons, and on how his satires and sonnets are informed by his Catholic background. Concludes that Donne was “clearly rooted in the Catholic legacy of his great-grand-uncle, whose good name he invokes in Pseudo-Martyr, that 'Sir Thomas More, of whose firmness to the integrity of the Roman faith, that Church need not be ashamed’” (104).


Describes an ink-smeared manuscript of ElBed in a verse miscellany in the Rosenbach Museum and Library in Philadelphia (MS 239/22). Suggests that the poem was covered over “for the sake of the reader's modesty or the censor's prudery—or for the poem's being deemed pornographic” (91). Using a technology called infrared reflectography, discovered that the ink-smeared pages could be partially read although there were many indecipherable gaps. Presents two versions of the censored poem: (1) a “kind of Swiss-cheese” version with the gaps, and (2) a version that attempts to fill in the gaps with “restrained conjecture,” based on other manuscript versions (97). Questions a number of the conclusions made by the editors of the Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne, Vol. 2 (2000) of the transmission of the text of ElBed, maintaining that “[a] primary value to the exercise of trying to fill in the gaps of the Rosenbach Manuscript is that it challenges the Variorum tree, or trees” (117). Acknowledges that his method of supplying gaps in the manuscript from the family of manuscripts to which the Variorum editors assigned it “has much to recommend it” but that it is “inevitably insufficient” (122). Thereafter follows the conjectural text with detailed notes. Concludes that this essay “demonstrates a new and useful tool, infrared reflectography, to all those trying to read obliterated texts” and that it shows, “with qualifications, the usefulness of the highly elaborated tree of transmission proposed by the Variorum edition of Donne's elegies.” Observes that the recovered censored text “offers three unprecedented readings” for ElBed (133).

Argues that many of the characteristics of Donne’s poetic style and imagery, religious philosophy, and poetic form have “much in common with the natural and mathematical systems described so well by recent chaos theory,” in that, his poetry is “dynamic, nonlinear, complex, adaptive, and turbulent.” Summarizes for the nonspecialist the basic elements of chaos theory and fractal geometry, such as “sensitive dependence on initial conditions, strange attractors, self-similarity across scale, and phase transitions.” Shows how each of these elements “applies to Donne’s poetry and prose to the extent that chaos theory can pull together many otherwise disconnected strands of Donne’s art and thought” (14). Summarizes ways for applying chaos theory to Donne’s work by commenting in detail on Devotions, a work in which Donne describes how his illness “creates a chaos in his individual life that nevertheless falls into stable patterns of fractal correspondence between the microcosm of self and the macrocosms of the entire human family and the ‘body’ of Christ” (168). Maintains that chaos theory offers an effective methodology for exploring the complexity of the oppositional dialectics in Donne’s poetry. Points out that Donne “fought against the irrationality of chaos by ironically turning to nonrational intuitive faith” (174).


Examines Shakespeare’s possible influence on Donne, concluding that, although there are no direct references to Shakespeare in Donne’s works, they were “kindred spirits” (27) who shared a Catholic intellectual and religious background. Focuses primarily on the dramatic quality of Donne’s poems and cites various possible parallels between Donne’s poems and the poems and plays of Shakespeare.


Examines the role of martyrdom in Donne’s religious poetry and prose and states that Robert Southwell’s Epistle of Comfort and Donne’s Pseudo-Martyr are “arguably the two most important English-language tracts in ongoing controversies over whether English Catholics’ suffering was meritorious.” Contrasts Donne and Southwell in their very different approaches to martyrological arguments. Comments on how both writers “explore the relationships between salvational confidence, suffering, and the criteria for true martyrdom, while the dynamics of suffering and reward which animated contemporary discussions of martyrdom also shape their poetic explorations of pain and consolation.” Discusses how Donne “questions martyrrological assumptions, arguments, and rhetoric” and how his poems explore “the psychological effects of the notion that suffering could confer religious confidence, while his sermons postulate alternative, spiritualized forms of agonistic struggle that both honor intense spiritual quests and confer the benefits of religious confidence without the actual shedding of blood” (118). Points out that Donne “characterizes martyrdom in less exalted terms than those his contemporaries typically used” (131–32) and observes that he “fiercely attacks Jesuit ideas about martyrdom, exhibits subtle misgivings about Protestant constructions and uses of martyrdom, and claims that martyrdom draws as much on human weakness as divine inspiration.” Discusses Biathanatos, Pseudo-Martyr, and Ignatius to show how Donne attempted “to formulate a moderate response to the powerful contemporary martyr-complex linking suffering with religious confidence” (132). Examines also Donne’s wrestling with the notion of suffering in his religious poems, commenting in particular on HSSpit, HSbatter, HSLittle, Goofy, and Lit, and also in his sermons, in which he “offers internalized, spiritualized versions of martyrdom” and deemphasizes “literal, physical martyrdom.” Sees in the sermons “a logical extension of arguments about martyrdom that Donne had been formulating for a long time, across many genres” (146). Concludes that Donne “recon-
ceptualizes common arguments about martyrdom and religious certainty" and “attempts to displace the drama of martyrdom into bloodless contexts and ultimately, in the sermons, to render martyrdom’s rewards of confidence and spiritual serenity widely available in this world” (149–50).


Proposes to play “somewhat fast and loose with the concept of transubstantiation, by using the concept in the context of love, literature and cultural criticism, rather than religion.” Chooses to discuss Donne because he “uses transubstantiation in quite specific ways” and because “his poetry and prose invite the use of terms, such as alchemy, metamorphosis, transformation, translation and so forth, which, while they may be linked to the religious concept of transubstantiation, can be independently deployed.” Intends also “to show how the concept of transubstantiation, understood in a broad sense which admittedly appropriates it from its original context, implies two models of literature which have in recent years been in danger of splitting apart.” Notes that “[o]ne model is driven, ‘in the manner of the Eucharist,’ by a rhetoric of presence and revelation, while the other is driven by a rhetoric of mutation and displacement.” Observes that the “two models roughly correspond to old and new critical paradigms, literature-as-revelation being the traditional model which has been largely supplanted by cultural materialist approaches which operate… a system of displacement” (56). Maintains that “the displacement of private onto public, the amatory onto the socio-economic, repeats some of the operations” found in Donne’s poetry since his poetry is itself “a poetry of displacement.” Notes how Donne’s “use of language notoriously subjects the world and its already existing significance to alchemical transformation” (57). Argues that “[i]f experiences, things and concepts never cease to be recreated in Donne’s linguistically mobile universe,” then modern critics “can give themselves permission to rewrite love poems as poems about Donne’s enforced exile from the court.” Cites SunRis as a love poem that “can be understood as an attempt to compensate for exile from the public world, by constructing commonwealths into bedrooms, and recreating the macrocosm from which Donne had been excluded within the microcosmic world of the lovers.” Says that “the flamboyance and self-consciousness” of Donne’s word-play also invites critics “to examine the process and consequences of translation,” citing HS Bater as an example, a poem in which God is “mediated through a typically diverse variety of conceits and metaphors” (58). Discusses how Donne’s “preoccupation with alchemy, mutability and the transformative power of language” is related to transubstantiation. Holds that “[w]here the other forms of transformation practised in Donne’s poetry ceaselessly bring into question the process, motives and consequences of transformation, as well as the extent to which a transformed object is a negation of, or an improvement upon, its ‘original,’ the literal understanding of the Eucharist imagines a moment of perfect conversion, in which divine truth is unequivocally revealed.” Cites Dream as a poem that “allows the language of love to develop its own complex register” (60) and that encourages the reader “to treat love as a language that requires special attention” (61). Maintains, therefore, that Donne should be seen as “contributing to the partial autonomisation of a discourse which, in at least some of the poems, has a texture and a density which resists easy appropriation on behalf of one or another ideology” (61–62). The author concludes that, although he remains a cultural materialist, there is “a part” of him that “seeks not to translate everything into its idiom” (62).

In Chinese. Notes that Donne is known for his “startling” images, “strong sense of reality in poetry,” “delicate conceits, colloquial language, and profound understanding of man’s inner world.” Argues that Donne’s “thoughts and ideas, to a certain extent, happen to coincide with those of T. S. Eliot.” Analyzes the presentation of “nothingness” in *Noct*, as seen in the “implication and casualness of the images” and “the complication of the narration” to show “the modernity contained in Donne’s poetry” (30). (English abstract)


In the introduction ([1]–[26]), announces that the aim of this study is “to provide some insight into Donne’s effectiveness as a composer of sermons, focusing on his resourcefulness, particularly his ability to derive from his own culture diverse material that he could use in persuading his congregation toward a life of religious devotion” (1). Employing the theories of Kenneth Burke, argues, in particular, that Donne “found in courtship effective means for structuring and guiding his audience’s thoughts and feelings about their life in this world and its relation to the next.” In Chapter 1, “The Courtship Topos” (27–70), introduces “the cultural commonplace of courtship and draws out a number of features or sub-topoi of this broader *topos* from several sites that would have been widely accessible to much of Donne’s audience” in order to show “the riches that were available to Donne in this cultural resource and the relevance of the same to his congregation’s experience.” In Chapter 2, “Like an Angel from a cloud: Donne and Courtship as a Topic of Inventio” (71–115), employs this cultural frame of reference “to show how Donne finds and selects his material along courtship lines in drawing on such related social discourses as law, commerce, and patronage.” In Chapter 3, “Courtship and the Dispositio of Form” (119–63), having described Donne’s “method of *inventio* with respect to courtship,” shows how “this principle of invention also determines the manner in which he arranges his material, both conceptually and materially, in the *dispositio* of his sermons.” Introduces also “Burkeian notions that are relevant to courtship: his notions of form and ‘temporizing essence,’” features that are “central to the curative function Donne so commonly attributes to his sermons.” In each of the remaining three chapters, presents close readings of single sermons, “further developing these Burkeian ideas to demonstrate how courtship strategies can apply to such diverse material as the social discourse of prodigality (chap. 4) and death (chaps. 5 and 6)” and to show how “they can account for a great deal of the rhetorical activity in a whole sermon” (26). In Chapter 4, “Courtship and the Discourse of Prodigality in Donne’s Sermon on Isaiah 52:7” (165–95), discusses how “the courtship *topos* in this sermon provides a prime example of the centrality of arrangement in his *inventio* and amplification of his argument” (166). In Chapter 5, “Courting Death: Symbolic Purification in Donne’s Sermon ‘Preached to the Lords on Easter-day, 1619’” (197–222), discusses how in this sermon Donne uses “death as a courtship *topos*, as a means of evoking conditions for ‘estrangement’ that can be used to move his audience toward identification with God” (198) and how he “invests commonplace treatments of death with courtship motives” (199). In Chapter 6, “Form as Proof in Deaths Duell” (223–56), discusses Donne’s “rhetorical treatment of death-as-courtship” in his last sermon and in *Sermons 2:9* (223) and deals with “the question of decorum in Donne’s handling of death in these two sermons” (250). In “Conclusion” (255–56), summarizes the thesis of this study and maintains that “the force of Donne’s sermons is largely attributable to his ability to infuse his audience’s consideration of spiritual matters with their experience of desire in the workaday world of affairs and to draw on these socially inscribed desires to induce a similar motivation to ‘court’ the divine” (26). Concludes with a glossary of rhetorical terms (257–58), a bibliography (259–82), and an index (283–306).
Reviews:


Discusses techniques for introducing students at St. John’s Rigby Sixth Form College in Wigan to Donne, Herbert, and Vaughan. Notes that paintings were used to present Donne’s personality and that each student was asked to list the outstanding features of selected poems for each poet. For Donne, they noted (1) the strong emotional content of his poems, (2) his use of first person pronouns, and (3) his Calvinistic attitude toward God, as seen in his use of the language of sin and retribution. Given untitled poems by the three poets, students were then able to identify the authors based on the stylistic profiles they had created.


Examines *Annun*, commenting on how the poem “explicitly discusses some of the theological issues implied, centuries before, by the Old English Crucifixion narratives” (9). Observes that Donne’s poem is “discursive, not narrative in form”; notes that it “explicitly refers to the liturgical problems posed by celebrating the Incarnation during Lent, as well as the theological importance of seeing the Incarnation and Passion in a single perspective” (362); and explores the uses of navigational and cloud images in the poem. Shows how “[t]he differences of technique and atmosphere between Donne’s poem and the three surviving Anglo-Saxon poems on the Cross, while important, serve to emphasize an underlying continuity” (367). Suggests that Donne may have written *Annun* for Magdalen Herbert and points out how he built his poem on the “Gratiam tuam” collect found in Latin in the Sarum Missal and later in English in the Book of Common Prayer (368).

1057. Ou, Rong. [Similar Valedictory Poems with Different Tones: on Donne’s *A Valediction: Forbid- ding Mourning* and Liu Yong’s *Yue Ling Ling*] *Journal of Zhejiang Wanli University* no. 1: 80–85.

In Chinese. Maintains that, although both Donne’s *ValMourn* and the Northern Song Dynasty poet Liu Yong’s *Yue Ling Ling* are valedictory love poems, the tones of the two poems are quite different. Analyzes both poems “from the perspectives of the poets’ life experience, the cultural values embodied in the poems, and the poets’ writing techniques.” Maintains that Donne’s poem is famous for its abrupt rhythm, ingenious thinking, and unique imagery, whereas Liu Yong’s poem mirrors the influence of Confucianism and the provincialism of Chinese poetry. (English abstract)


Contains critical essays intended for a general audience on three of Donne’s poems. In “The Flea” (20–25), calls the poem “one of the oddest love poems ever written” and cites it as a prime example of the “effrontery, incongruities, and ostentatious use of conceits” found in metaphysical poetry in general. Says that in the poem Donne “satirizes his own sexual desperation,” that its three stanzas are “like scenes from a play,” and that it is based “not on romantic emotion but on logic” (22). Maintains that “[t]he poem’s self-conscious artificiality captures the fragility of the complex rituals
with which society has always tried to contain and control sexual energy.” Says that the poem’s “arch absurdity… resembles Surrealist art” and has “the grandiloquence and sexual explicitness of Salvador Dali’s dream paintings.” Suggests that, like Dali, Donne in *Flea* portrays himself as “a showy phallic swordsman baffled and bemused by a forceful, alluring woman, who brushes him away like a pesky fly” (25). In “Holy Sonnet 1” (26–29), sees *HSMade* as “a drama of mankind’s struggles that transcends the Christian frame of reference.” Says that in the sonnet Donne “treats God like a superintendent responsible for maintenance and upkeep” (27). Maintains that in the sonnet there is “a slow, steady sinking into gloom, interrupted two-thirds of the way through by a winged savior, who bears the heart skyward” and that Donne’s “impure heart, having shed its envelope of ‘feeble flesh,’ is drawn toward God’s adamantine touch, which turns iron into spiritual gold” (29). In “Holy Sonnet XIV” (30–33), says that the Petrarchan sonnet was “rarely as sexually explicit” as *HSBatter*, in which Donne “portrays himself—or rather his heart—as a kidnapped virgin crying out for a virile liberator” (31). Points out that “[b]y projecting himself into female anguish, victimization and bondage,” Donne “is playing with transsexual and homoerotic effects.” Acknowledges, however, that most of his contemporaries “would probably have understood the poem as simply a provocative fantasy on the popular Renaissance theme of sacred and profane love” (33). Observes that in *HSBatter* Donne sees that “[s]piritual victory strangely requires defeat by God, since man is too weak to achieve redemption on his own” and thus “[a] higher self must be forged from the wreckage of his old identity” (32).


Explores “the meaning of the secular experience within the religious context” in Donne’s *Devotions* and in T.S. Eliot’s *Ash-Wednesday*, maintaining that both draw upon “a shared metaphysical dialectic.” Focusing primarily on Eliot’s poem, sees a similarity between the progress of Donne’s illness as “reflected in the meditative structure of his *Devotions*” and the various sections of *Ash-Wednesday*. Observes that “[w]hile conceiving their experience through similar images, T. S. Eliot’s search for God mirrors John Donne’s search for the Physician” (123). Points out also similarities between Donne’s and Eliot’s personal situation at the time that they composed these works. Maintains that both works “follow a similar pattern, since each Devotion and each part of *Ash-Wednesday* are complete, even if isolated, and constitute an independent devotional and meditative exercise.” Discusses how in *Devotions* “the power of divine love seems to transform Donne’s illness” into physical and spiritual health and how in his poem Eliot “becomes witness of divine love through the contemplation of nature” (136) and his weakness seems to be transformed through “the interaction” of secular and divine love. Observes that in both poems “[t]he search for God and man’s conscious ‘turning away’ from Him create both desire and acceptance, an intense self-scrutiny, and the intermingling of spirituality and sensuality” (123).


Presents a biographical sketch of the Countess of Bedford, calling her “an important friend and patroness” of Donne and noting that Donne was introduced to her in 1608 by Henry Goodyer. Points out that after 1613, perhaps because of the influence of her puritan chaplain and physician, John Burgess, the Countess’s friendship with Donne “cooled” (183).


Presents a biographical sketch of Donne and a brief survey of his works. Comments on Donne’s relationship with Ben Jonson and compares and contrasts them as poets. Points out that
although Jonson admired Donne, he was also at times critical of his poetry and feared that Donne's poetry "for not being understood, would perish." Observes that although Jonson's fear "seemed to come true by the nineteenth century, the twentieth century has seen a remarkable turn in Donne's fortunes, and now he is secure in his place as one of the greatest and most innovative English poets of his day" (186).

In a discussion of anatomy and dissection in the Renaissance, observes how the discourse of anatomy embodied "variegated ways of knowing," noting, for example, that although Donne's conceit about dissection in Damp (ll. 1–2) "is rooted in post-mortem practice," it also points to the commonplace notion that "dissection is a revelation of knowledge" (226). Observes how "[f]igurative dissection was particularly useful to early modern writers who wished, as Donne did, for an 'anatomiz[ation] of our soule;' and who frequently occupied the role of the physician-anatomist for various purposes" (226–27). Maintains that "while the anatomical theatre provided an ensemble of resplendent metaphors for a diverse array of early modern writers, it was around the living body, and thus around medical semiotics and hygiene, broadly configured, that most early modern thought about interiority revolved" (228), as seen in Devotions, in which both Donne and his physician have "similar, conjectural tasks: reading mute, somatic signs, sifting and adjusting the non-natural—air, exercise and rest, sleep and waking, excretion and retention, food and drink, and the passions of the soul—in order to either determine states of illness or preserve the 'neutrality' of health." Notes that "[b]oth engage in probable sign-inference, both reason from signs and symptoms to causes, and both... could be very eloquent indeed about disease and suffering" (229).

Argues that Francis Godwin's The Man in the Moone (1638), the "first piece of English science-fiction," was not based on a prepublication manuscript of Kepler's Somnium but "drew from more eclectic and hitherto unnoticed or neglected sources" and thus "arose from a process of generic hybridization, not via an imitation of an already fictional work" (189). Maintains that the major source of the work was Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy and that Godwin was also influenced by Gilbert's De Magnete, Kepler's Dissertation, Samuel Purchas's Purchas his Pilgrims and Purchas his Pilgrimage, and works of other writers of voyage literature. Rejects the claim that Donne read Somnium in manuscript and that he used Kepler's work as a basis for Ignatius. Argues that "the English dissemination of the Somnium appears to rest entirely on the printed text," first published on the continent in 1634 (191).

In an attempt to "yoke together" Carew and Milton, "whom custom has nearly always kept asunder" (76), comments briefly on the two versions of Carew's elegy on Donne's death and on Milton's possible response to Carew in his early poems, especially in Lycidas.

Surveys the on-going critical debate about whether Donne was indebted to the Catholic or to the Protestant meditative tradition. Maintaining that arguments based on theological or on structural bases are inconclusive, argues that, based on the literary aspects of his work, "there exists in Donne's Protestant writing a profound indebtedness to the Catholic tradition, a rich mingling of two seemingly contra-
dictory elements—that although he was consciously advocating the Protestant cause and preaching to members of his adopted church, the quality of his writing was deeply indebted to the Catholic manuals of devotion on which he was reared” (48). Because of Donne’s Jesuit upbringing, sees the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola as the most likely influence on Donne’s works. Points out that a striking difference between Catholic and Protestant manuals of meditation is that the Catholic manuals “were intended not merely as exercises in spiritual discipline but as exercises in *withdrawal* or *sequestration* from the realities of mortal existence” in order for the one who meditates “to experience in such isolation from the mundane world a strengthening of spiritual commitment,” whereas in Protestant manuals this notion of withdrawal “is not only missing but replaced by a contrary recommendation, namely to move outside into the heart of nature” (50). Observes that “delight in nature is absent from Donne’s prayers and meditations” and that nature, the physical world, and even logic are seen as “deplorable distraction[s] as the mind struggles to free itself from actuality and focus on the celestial” (53). Notes how Donne’s “focus upon the incongruities of the natural world becomes a principle in his writing, employed as a means of undermining confidence in empirical reasoning and thereby justifying faith in transcendental experience” (54). Maintains that, “above all, the optimism characterizing Protestant manuals is not only absent from Donne’s meditations” but also is “grimly rejected in line with the Catholic tradition.” Concludes, therefore, that doctrinally Donne “conformed, after his conversion, to the tenets of the Anglican church, eschewing controversial elements,” but that “stylistically” and in “the intensity of his personal vision,” Donne “remained distinguished from his Protestant peers.” Points out that ironically it was “his affinity to the manuals of a Church he had come to reject that was ultimately responsible for endowing his Anglican sermons and meditations with their extraordinary effectiveness, the tension between those contrasting aspects constituting a primary source of their literary power” (66).

Points out that English-language readers “expect a verb to follow fairly swiftly after its grammatical subject” but that “poems often separate the two for prolonged stretches.” Notes that “[s]uch interrupted syntax does not, as in enjambment, continue in the next line” but rather often “suspends itself over several intervening lines before it resumes.” Maintains that “recognizing and understanding the phenomenon of subject-verb hiatus can help to clarify cryptic lines of poetry” and that the hiatus often embodies “the emotional or intellectual distance that is the subject matter of the lines in which they occur” (abstract). Cites as an example Val-Mourn (ll. 17–20) and suggests that the hiatus here supports the notion that the lovers “endure not yet/ A breach, but an expansion,/ Like gold to ayery thinnesse beate” (ll. 22–24) (149).

In an essay on the phenomenon of autotranslation during the past millennium, points out that Donne translated *Ignatius* into Latin.

Throughout this study, briefly comments on and quotes from Donne’s letters. Points out that the letters “often employ the language of orality and physical presence” and express his desire “to talk” with his correspondent by means of his letter. Notes that although Donne “commonly employs the affective intimate rhetoric of orality and immediacy, other letters betray his anxiety about the temporal and affective disjunctions of letter exchange” (118). Observes
that although his letters were not intended for publication, they exhibit “an aesthetic, even a literary self-consciousness” (142). Notes that when John Donne, Jr., published his father’s letters in 1651, he recognized “the increasing prestige of posthumous letters as adjuncts to literary immortality” (242). Notes that the inclusion of several letters in the first edition of Donne’s poems is “an early instance of the recognition of letters as adjuncts to a writer’s literary fame” (266).

1069. Scodel, Joshua. “‘None’s Slave’: Some Versions of Liberty in Donne’s Satires 1 and 4.” *ELH* 72, no 2: 363–85.

While not denying that the young Donne had a strong desire for worldly position and prestige, “reasserts (following William Empson) that a desire for freedom of thought and action is the central impulse in Donne’s early poetry.” Maintains that Donne’s “skeptical, exploratory temperament inspires not only a search for freedom but also, as its inseparable correlative, an inquiry into its meaning and worth.” Observes that “in his elegies and lyrics, Donne explores different ways to remain ‘free’ in love and sexual relations.” Focuses primarily on *Sat1* and *Sat4*, in which Donne “explores different modes asserting his freedom against a corrupt court, an oppressive legal system, and potentially enslaving social bonds.” Points out that Donne’s “poetic representations of freedom were galvanized by his engagement with influential but diverging treatments of freedom in ancient poetry and moral philosophy concerning liberty as ‘doing what one pleases’ and the value and limits of free speech” (363). Shows how in *Sat1* and *Sat4*, both of which are modeled on Horace’s Satire 1.9, Donne explores various conflicting concepts of freedom “in response to the oppressiveness of his social and political world.” Discusses how in *Sat1* he “dramatizes the inadequacies of liberty conceived as doing as one wishes, both in its negative sense and in its Stoic reconceptualization” and shows how in this satire he “powerfully depicts the satirist’s longing for freedom and his uncertainty where to find it” (364). Maintains that *Sat1* expresses his “intense sense of unfreedom, his belief that true freedom is vitally worth seeking, and his dissatisfaction with two unsatisfactory modes of pseudo-liberty” (360), claiming that “[n]either retreat to a contemplative prison, which involves denying one’s desires for participation in the social world, nor mobile immersion in the changing urban scene, which subjects one to others’ whims and desires, brings freedom” (369–70). Discusses how in *Sat4*, by contrast, he “articulates an ideal of positive freedom, here reconceived as self-realization through fearless commitment to truth-telling, even as he vividly portrays his inability to maintain the fearlessness upon which such freedom depends” (364). Observes how in his sermons Donne the preacher “tempers the bold freedom of Donne the satirist” (377) and rejects his “youthful defense of bold free speech” (378). Concludes that although Donne “partially retains his belief, based partially upon his reading of classical texts, that liberty is both a birthright and an achievement,” he “found a place for limited freedom within a larger order to which he has become a devoted—and by his own accounting ‘free’—servant” (379).


States that the purpose of the study is “to describe and confront the historical difference of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts, in order to point the way to more fruitful and pleasurable ways of engaging with them.” Selects Donne as an example and discusses attempts “to refashion him as an artist who fits neatly with our modern sense of what an artist should be.” Argues that “[b]y understanding the limitations of the ‘modernizing’ approach, we will begin to see what a less anachronistic reading of early modern literature might look like” (3). To illustrate his point, disagrees with the critical approaches of Cleanth Brooks and John Carey to *Canon*, maintaining that the poem should not be seen as only “words on a page” or as “the auto-therapy of the tormented proto-romantic artist” but rather as “performance.” Comments
briefly also on Carey’s “psychologizing” comments on the Holy Sonnets and Devotions. Stresses Donne’s wit and irony, his awareness of audience and rhetorical strategies, and his uses of paradox. Maintains that Donne’s poems should be viewed as “virtuosic entertainments” and as “pocket theatricals” (10). Discusses also Sat4, noting its “powerful expression of anti-court sentiment” (59) and regards the satire as “an extravagant exercise in wit; with tongue in cheek . . . mocking an institution that drew him [Donne] with a force like that of gravity” (60). Comments briefly on Donne’s description of so-called “universal alienation” in FirAn (ll. 213–18) and maintains that, “in its context, Donne’s pronouncement is neither a statement of fact nor a fantasy” but rather is “at once a nightmare and a joke.” For Donne, he says, “[t]he end of hierarchy and relationship… sends a shiver down the spine: the end of the world is nigh” (237) but that “the comical image” of the phoenix “assuages any apocalyptic anxieties, assuring us that none of this is to be taken entirely seriously” (237–38). Maintains that, for Donne, “[a]lienated, particulate self-hood is a bugbear, invoked to create anxious humour, and condemned as tending towards sin” (238).


Discusses the way in which the cultural worlds of John Donne and John Milton impinged upon each other, permitting ‘other’ perceptions for each through rereading them, as it were, together” (16). Points out that likely Milton, during his formative years and later, heard some of Donne’s sermons in St. Paul’s Cathedral or at Paul’s Cross and suggests how certain of Milton’s poems “have affinities with Donne” (17). Maintains that both poets “write out of a common background and in good part a common attitude supported by similar educational influences” and that “the two authors’ intersection of concern and precept allows us to understand one through the other, arriving at some readings overlooked perhaps by seeking out only ‘influence’ and ‘imitation’” (22).


Argues that Donne’s “ambivalent attitude” toward Spain “springs from his anguished relation to Catholicism.” Points out how Donne’s “spirit of skeptical inquiry informing his long and learned wrestling with his religious beliefs and allegiances spilled over into his complex feelings about the Spanish.” Maintains, however, that “[e]ven after he became a pillar of the English religious establishment, Donne retained his quirky, argumentative and vital interest in Spain” (71). Comments on Donne’s participation in the Cadiz and Azores expeditions as seen in several of his epigrams and verse epistles, especially Storm and Calm. Discusses Donne’s knowledge of and appreciation of Spanish literature, especially theological works, many of which he probably read in Latin. Says that Donne “seems to have been recognized by his peers as a fount of information about Spanish history and foreign policy” (76) and notes that he “kept not only abreast of Spanish politics, philosophy and theology” but also was “enamored” with Spanish literature (77). Observes, however, that in his poetry Spain “usually figures as a rhetorical trope of hyperbole,” citing several examples from the Elegies, Satyres, and the Anniversaries.


In an informal essay, discusses his reading of FirAn as a sophomore at Yale, as a graduate student at Columbia, and, later on, as a teacher at Bennington, where he “was startled to discover how much the poem had changed” or how much his “understanding of it had changed”
Evaluates several scholarly approaches to the poem, especially those by Marjorie Hope Nicolson and Louis Martz. Presents a general, overall reading of the *FirAn*. Observes that “[v]ery few undergraduates have the kind of experience to bring to their reading that would let them know how accurate an enactment the poem is of the ache of bereavement and the soul-sickness that can attend upon a loss” (58). Finds *SecAn* less meaningful because he has “never achieved that reintegration of faith and hope and that healing of spirit the second poem describes and, by implication, prescribes” (62). Concludes that, for him, *FirAn* is “one of the great comforts in literature—offering reassurance and solace in the depths of the abyss, or at least demonstrating, as it does so well, that others have been there, that others have felt this bitter despair” (63).


Believes that Rembrandt’s conception of love in his two etchings, *The Three Trees* (1643) and *The Omval* (1645), was influenced and shaped by contemporary metaphysical poetry, specifically Donne’s love poetry. Notes also a parallel between ll. 8–9 in *Ind* and Rembrandt’s parody in *The Flute Player* (1642) and points out other similarities between Rembrandt’s works and metaphysical poetry, especially the juxtaposing of opposites and prevalence of paradox. Comments on Rembrandt’s personal acquaintance with several contemporary Dutch metaphysical poets, in particular his friendship with Constantijn Huygens, who translated Donne into Dutch and whose own style is often similar to Donne’s, and with other poets in the literary circle called The Muiderkring. Discusses Huygens’s relationship with Donne and Huygens’s translations of Donne’s poems. Discusses, in particular, *SunRis* as “a good model for the themes and the oppositions that Rembrandt explores in *The Three Trees* and *The Omval*” (11). Maintains that Donne’s poetry was important in helping Rembrandt to move from “the primary descriptive character of his early work toward a style that is itself more abstractly dialogical in its oppositions and, for that very reason, more compellingly experiential” (16).


Points out that Donne was introduced to Slovene readers through Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, which was translated by Janez Gradišnik in 1950, and which appeared in five additional editions during the next half century. Notes that Donne’s poetry “became better known toward the end of the century.” Observes, however, that “it has so far never been presented in a separate book” but has appeared only in “various journals and anthologies.” Says that “[t]hanks to the reputation and skill of three learned and inventive translators (Janez Menart [1929–2004]), Veno Taufer (1933) and Marjan Strojan (1949), each of whom approached Donne’s poetry in a specific way, the impact of their translations went well beyond expectations.” Points out that Marjan Strojan included selections from Donne’s poems in her *Anthology of English Poetry* (*Antologija angleške poezije*) (1996) and that two of Donne’s poems appeared in B. A. Novak’s *Sonet* (2004). Observes that the most popular of Donne’s poems in Slovene seems to be *HS-Death*, translated by Veno Taufer and later by Milan Jesih (74). (English abstract)

1076. Stirling, Kirsten. “‘Imagined corners’: space, time, and iconoclasm in John Donne’s Last Judgement Holy Sonnets.” *W&I* 21, no. 3: 244–51.

Discusses how *HSRound* “produces many temporal and spatial effects similar to the structure of traditional painted Last Judgements.” Observes, however, that the poem is “far more than a simple ekphrastic representation of the vision of Judgement,” noting that Donne’s “ambivalence about Judgement itself, and about the use of images as devotional objects, effectively destroys from the inside the image created in
the sonnet.” Claims, therefore, that the poem “functions both as an image and as an act of iconoclasm” (244). Presents a detailed reading of the sonnet and shows how the sestet “functions as a form of iconoclasm” and “shatters the version of Judgement imagined as iconic, limited and rigidly mapped and replaces it with a personal judgement of the individual” (250).


Argues that critics “should restrict talk about personae to cases where the speaker has clearly specifiable differences from the historical author” and that “the application of scholarly knowledge to poems needs to be controlled by a very strict sense of contextual relevance and by a non-totalizing sense of what a ‘tradition’ or an ‘episteme’ is.” Maintains that the criticism on Goodf has too long been dominated by both “dubious practices” and, in this case, “are tightly linked to one another” (14). Surveys and challenges the criticism on the poem from 1961 to 2001. Reads Goodf “as truly being what it purports to be, a re-creation of an ‘occasional meditation’ performed or begun while Donne was actually ‘riding westward’; possibly to Sir Edward Herbert’s, in 1613.” Argues that the poem should be seen as “reflecting the actual spiritual condition” of Donne at that time, a man who is “still struggling with his conscience in matters of faith” (19). Maintains that in the poem Donne is “feeling guilty about not going to church on Good Friday” and that the opening lines “present a correct view of his situation,” of his “spiritual situation that he needs to be redeemed from, not his view of it, or even his way of viewing it” (20). Holds that in the conclusion of the poem Donne “will not face Christ, will not allow himself to be known by Christ, until he can be known as perfect” (24).


Considers some of the discoveries made by the textual editors of The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne that “raise important bibliographical and critical issues concerning the way we think about and read Donne’s verse.” Discusses the following textual discoveries: (1) that there was “a lot more Donne primary material than anyone had suspected” (188); (2) that both the manuscripts and printed artifacts “violated the theoretical paradigms established not only by previous Donne bibliographers, but also those subscribed to by bibliographers in general” (189); (3) that the manuscripts were not “monoscripts” but rather “compounds,” which validated the editors’ decision “to sort out the textual history of each individual poem in all its artifacts rather than by treating all poem texts in any given manuscript as having an identical textual genesis”; (4) that the early collected editions also were “compounds” (200); and (5) that “two manuscript transmissions can occupy the same manuscript or print text at the same time,” thus obviating “the universal assumption that a scribe or compositor copied one text from another.” Points out that “the discoveries most likely to affect critical readings of Donne’s verse” (192) are the lists of verbal variants for each of the poems that show that Donne was a “conscious artist” who revised and rethought his poems and that he “created his poems and intended that they be read as sequences rather than as individual poems” (193). Observes that often the texts are “so different,” in fact, that the editors have decided in some cases to print different versions of texts and sequences (194). Cites, as an example, the Holy Sonnets, noting that most modern criticism has been based on a “nonauthorial order” and on “eclectic texts.” Summarizes as follows: the editors now know that “the Donne universe is expanding”; that “the artifacts and poems in the Donne manuscript and print textual tree are far more genetically diverse than hitherto assumed”; and that “the fact that Donne com-

posed the Elegies, Epigrams, and Holy Sonnets as sequences and modified their texts when he rearranged sequences means that they can no longer be treated simply as stand alone units” (196).


In Chinese. Discusses the style of and themes in Donne’s love poems, commenting, in particular, on his use of conceits and complicated reasoning and examining his complex, often contradictory, views on love expressed in his poems. Comments on the conceits in *ValMourn* and *ValWeep* and the complex reasoning in *ValMourn* and *SGo*.


Says that Donne was “an artist who, over the course of a long and troubled life, sought to use his art for the glory of God” (152) and claims that “he, perhaps more than any other major Western writer, gave himself over, in both his life and his work, to exploring the varied ways God and humans interact” (153). Reviews Donne’s life from a young, oversexed playboy to a middle-aged, happily married, impoverished man to finally the “preacher to kings and the intimate friend of God” (155). Reviews Donne’s life and work, exploring the varied ways God and humans interact (155) and comments briefly on *ElBed*, *Ecst*, *GoodM*, *Devotions*, *Goodf*, and the sermons.


In Japanese. Compares *Bait* to Marlowe’s “The Passionate Shepherd to His Love” to show how Donne transfers the setting from a pastoral to a piscatorial setting. Points out Donne’s frequent use of words that have a political and/or religious implication, such as “betray,” “traitor,” and “deceit.” Says that in his poem Donne expresses his sympathy for persecuted Catholics and makes clear his deep hatred for a “state of shepherds” with the Queen as its sovereign. Suggests that Donne composed *Bait* in opposition to such a state, i.e., a Protestant state.


Discusses how textual variants of *Goodf* in existing scribal copies in English and how Huygens’s draft holograph translation (31 August 1633) of the poem cast light on “our knowledge of how this poem was disseminated in its early years” (135). Surveys all 24 existing scribal copies in English, taking into account the 7 printed editions of the poem from 1633 to 1669, as well as Huygens’s translation. Observes that previously there has been “no systematic study of the various forms in which the poem exists, and as a result, no investigation into the various ways in which the poem was read by a variety of recipients, both identified and anonymous, during the first half-century of its existence” (136). From this detailed bibliographical study, concludes (1) that “a group 2 artifact (probably, as it turns out, DT1 [Trinity College Library, MS 877]) will prove to be the most admissible copytext of the lost original holograph” and that “[e]diting this copytext will involve a painful choice between the readings ‘turne’ and ‘tune’ at line 22”; (2) that “the group 1 stemma for this poem is more complicated than can be illustrated on the basis of the Ele-
gies”; (3) that Huygens “used a (now presumably lost) group 2 artifact for his translation of this poem, and not a printed source”; and (4) that “there is some evidence that Huygens, at least, was troubled by aspects of the poem’s confessional position, and felt that he could offer creatively ambivalent and indeed elegant solutions to what troubled him” (149).


Maintains that in Sickness Donne’s image of a holy room and reference to a choir of saints are grounded “in a reference to a specific place and a specific practice in Donne’s professional life—the Choir area of St. Paul’s Cathedral, the space where the very human band of Canons, Petty Canons, Vicars Choral, and Choristers on the staff of the cathedral gathered twice daily at 10 and 3 to sing the Daily Office of Morning and Evening Prayer as well as other rites, when appointed, of the Book of Common Prayer” (63–64). Sees in Sickness, therefore, Donne’s “taking the sung services of the Daily Offices into his own imaginative understanding of the process of mediation between God and humanity” (64). Considers in some detail the architecture, the liturgical celebrations, music, vestments, and staff of the cathedral in Donne’s time.


In Chinese. Analyzes and compares Flea and Marvell’s “To His Coy Mistress” as seduction poems. Comments on the social conditions of the time that inspired such poems.


Argues that Donne’s “preoccupation with love and the religion of love . . . carried him so far that he became a member of the Family of Love, a religious sect that had numerous adherents in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England” (31–32). Discusses possible elements of Familism in such poems as Relic, MHMary, and HSShow as well as in Biathanatos and the sermons. Points out that the similarities between Donne and the Familists “does not mean, of course, that Donne when he was a clergyman in the Church of England was a member of the Family of Love” (53) but holds that, “for all his relative orthodoxy, Donne stood outside the boundaries of conventional Anglicanism, Calvinism, and indeed Catholicism—so far outside that . . . only Familism can explain his peculiar beliefs” (54). Maintains that it is in the sermon Donne preached at the memorial service for Magdalen Herbert that “we hear most clearly the language that Donne would have liked always to employ when he spoke about his God” (58), the language of the Familists.


In Chinese. Reads Metem, FirAn, and SecAn as an epic trilogy on how the Soul of the World has experienced a circular life experience by its adventurous journey from Eden to Earth and finally to Heaven. In the preface (1–14), surveys past Donnean criticism, rejects the old Jack-John Donne dichotomy, and sees the trilogy, written in Donne’s middle years, as a bridge between his secular love poetry and his divine poems. In Chapter 1, “A Song of the Soul: A Chronological Study” (15–80), discusses how Donne creates his view of the Soul of the World, a view that reflects the fall-rise pattern prevalent in Renaissance thought. Argues that this view allows him to see the journey of the Soul of the World as reflecting his own spiritual progress. Points out that all three poems contain an invocation, a body, and a conclusion and that the body of each contains eight sections, which suggests that the three
poems share a similar design, which is further reenforced by numerous repetitions of similar words and ideas. Maintains that Donne's presentation in the trilogy of life by death, of beauty by ugliness, and of truth by deception reflects his theological perspective. In Chapter 2, “Humanistic Concerns: A Synchronic Study” (81–138), focuses on four essential themes found throughout the trilogy: self, life, love, and change. Maintains that the theme of self is seen best in the invocations of the three poems, where the *anima mundi* and “I” are intermixed, dialectically creating out of the “deathlesse soule” an eternal self symbolic of the macrocosm and microcosm. Sees the trilogy as a song both of the individual soul and of the soul of human beings in general. Says that the theme of life pivots in *Metem* on the metempsychosis of the *anima mundi*, in *FirAn* on the frailty and decay of the world, and in *SecAn* on the exaltation of the soul into the world from which it came. Notes that the theme of love pervades all three poems but that its focus shifts from secular love to divine love, a shift that enriches the concept of love. Claims that in the trilogy change is combined with constancy, working both as a theme and as background: as theme it acts as a foil to support the notion of the soul's eternal life in *Metem* and to support the concept of the beauty and divinity of the heavenly world in the two *Anniversaries*; as background, it brings together the other themes and builds up part of Donne's cosmological philosophy. In Chapter 3, “Cosmological Life: A Background Study” (139–211), explores Donne's cosmological philosophy in terms of his poetic reconstruction of the cosmos, one that ponders on Pythagorean harmony and order and that was called forth by the Copernican revolution and one that centers on the redemption of the soul. Concludes that this reconstruction shapes Donne's philosophy of life that is embodied in the four essential themes, giving rise to his uses of paradox and wit and defining the trilogy as a psalm of life. Contains a conclusion (212–18), an index of names (219–25), a list of works cited (226–35), a chronology of Donne's life (236–38), and a postscript (239–40).


In Chinese. Presents a semiotic study of Donne's conceits in *Noct*, *Appar*, *Sickness*, and other poems to demonstrate “how semiotics can help illustrate the dynamic flow of thought in Donne's works.


In Chinese. Calls Donne the most original of the metaphysical poets, notable for his use of conceits, wit, and novelty, and comments on his influence on English and American poets who followed him. Discusses the uses of tension in Donne's poetry.


In Chinese. Discusses the inner tension in Donne’s poetry that reflects the cultural milieu of his time as well as his own inner conflicts and comments on “his invariable pursuit of Love and Soul.” Cites *Lect* and *HSShow* as examples. (English abstract)


Discusses the Christian typology traditionally associated with March 25 (Feast of the Annunciation) and especially when Good Friday also falls on that day. Comments on Donne’s *Annun*, calling it “an exercise in christological poetics, a wedding of the old biblical typologies to newer allegorical conceits” (33). Notes that the next occurrence of the alignment of the two holy days will occur in 2016.
2006


Reports that, following a public appeal for funds, the Lothian portrait of Donne will remain at the National Portrait Gallery in London. Notes that in the spring of 2007 the portrait will undergo a program of conservation before returning to the permanent display.


Lists the 10 most expensive books sold by the Canadian company Advanced Book Exchange in its first 10 years. Lists a copy of the first edition of Donne’s poetry (1633), which sold for $60,000.


A study guide for students. In “Context” (30–32), presents a general introduction to Donne’s life, poetry, and critical reputation. In “Themes, Motifs, & Symbols” (33–37), comments on Donne’s view of the human body as a microcosm, his uses of Neoplatonism, his relating religious ecstasy to sexual ecstasy, his searching for religious truth, his fascination with spheres, his uses of voyages of discovery and conquest in his love poems, and his uses of tears and eyes as reflectors of love. Comments also on Donne’s use of angels, the compass, and blood as symbols in his poems. In “Summary & Analysis” (38–51), presents paraphrases and brief critical analyses of *Flea*, *GoodMourn*, and *HSBatter*.


In Japanese. Compares *HSDeath* to Shakespeare’s Sonnet 73. Maintains that Donne, who is interested in discursive meditation, thinks that faith is achieved not through blind devotion to God but rather through a logical, step-by-step spiritual progression. Points out how both poets express the passing of time in their sonnets. Concludes that, for Donne, time passes as if to make the God of death resound, whereas in Shakespeare time passes slowly and calmly as if to fulfill the poet’s wish to live as long as possible.


 Discusses briefly Donne’s theology of Atone ment. Points out that Donne in his theology of the cross expresses “the reformed theology of his day, the doctrines of Anselm, the early church, and the Bible” and that he regards Christ as “both God and man, who won salvation, by his death.” Notes also that, according to Donne, “we need to be saved not only because of the sins we commit, but also because of our original sin.” Observes that Donne was “fascinated by death” but that, for him, “physical death carried with it the themes of God’s judgement on human sinfulness and human sin” but that Christ’s death atoned for all of man’s sinfulness (10).


Maintains that although Donne “did not identify with the Puritans, his theology of the gospel and his commitment to preaching reflected the triumph of Reformed and Puritan ideals within the Church of England” (1). Notes, however, that Donne “distanced himself from any movement that imposed repressive liturgical practices as if they had divine authority” (2) and also “distanced himself from separat ists, from extreme Reformed doctrines of predestination and the incapacity of the human will, from Puritan preaching that focussed too closely on words within texts and missed their significance in their context, and from
illiterate and unprepared extemporary preaching” (2–3). Claims, in other words, that Donne was not a Puritan but that he was “a true servant of a Reformed Church.” Discusses “four foundations and ingredients of Donne’s evangelistic preaching”—“the Bible, the Gospel of Jesus Christ and his atoning death, Preaching, and more especially, Effective Preaching” (7). Analyzes, as an example of Donne’s evangelistic preaching, the sermon on 1 Timothy 1:15 preached at Whitehall on 19 April 1618. Concludes with a brief bibliography.


Argues that Donne should not always be labelled a misogynist and that even in such seduction poems as *Flea* and *ElBed* “it is obvious that Donne thought women honorable and intelligent,” honorable since the speaker in both poems “is forced to use a grand amount of convincing to get the addressed woman to even consider granting his requests” and intelligent “primarily because they play along with and rebuke the male narrator, thus implying they are smart enough to understand the complex wit of the arguments made by the narrator.” Notes that several very powerful and highly intelligent women were “part of Donne’s readership” and that obviously they did not find his view of women objectionable (1). Maintains that in *Flea* Donne actually flatters the woman addressed in the poem by depicting how she guards her honor, how she resists the speaker’s witty argument, and how at the end of the poem she is victorious and does not submit to the speaker’s desires, allowing only the flea to mingle their blood. Maintains that similarly *ElBed* is flattering to the woman being addressed because it “highlights the woman’s power” over the would-be seducer (3). Concludes that although the women in both poems do not speak, they are “a mighty presence” and “steer the action of the poems—they both have power—and this power was assigned them by the poet” (8).

1098. Ahmadzadeh, Shideh. “Violation of Petrarchism in Donne’s *Songs and Sonnets*.” Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji (Journal of the Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Tehran) No. 27 (Special Issue. English): 71–82.

Traces the history of the development and influence of Petrarchism in love poetry from the thirteenth century to the seventeenth century. Cites as central to Petrarchism “the idealized images of the beloved, the theme of sublimation, and a tone of lamentation” and discusses how Donne in the *Songs and Sonnets* uses these elements “either in a mocking tone to question the purity of love or with a serious attitude to reflect the paradoxical nature of love” (71). Distinguishes two different tones in Donne’s love poems by which he attempts to violate and subvert traditional Petrarchan conventions: an idealistic tone and a pessimistic or mocking tone. Briefly surveys examples to show “how intricately Donne used or rather misused” Petrarchism “for his own purposes” (82).


Explicates two of Donne’s churching sermons in the light of Llullian mnemotechnics. Explains how Donne’s “public audience (composed of radical Calvinists, Arminians, and Roman sympathizers) and his private audience (composed of members and friends of the Bridgewater family) were predisposed to respond to his text.” Using Ramon Llull’s “triadic and correlative principles” as well as “Llullian concepts of grammar,” shows how Donne’s audience “understood the signs diffused throughout the sermons.” Maintains that Donne employed “the alchemico-Llullian signs, knowing that his congregation would match the nouns (which Llull defined as ‘the nature of things’) with the verbs (which Llull defined as ‘how things exist or operate’) in order to construct their own sentences.” Argues, therefore, that each listener “was able to compose a statement of his or her own values.” Discusses, in particular, three
“recurring signs—the ark, the rainbow, and rest” that illustrate how these “pseudo-Llullian mnemotechnics” function. Observes how all three “translate into some version of the title promised them the Land.” Concludes that these sermons offered “peace to religious and political antagonists and consolation to those who, for various reasons, seem to have lost all hope of their ‘Rest’” (9).


Regards Donne as a baroque poet and contrasts both his love poetry and sacred verse with traditional Petrarchism. Surveys briefly Donne’s intellectual and religious complexity and his fluctuating critical reception since the seventeenth century. Comments on the development of the sonnet in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and on Donne’s place in it. Discusses major characteristics of both Donne’s love poems and religious verse, noting such non-Petrarchan elements as the explicitly sexual imagery, the prevalence of scientific images and concepts, the excessive wit, the lack of musicality, and the blending of the erotic and spiritual. Analyzes as examples Appar, ValMourn, Goodf, and HSBatter.


In Turkish. Translates into Turkish selections from Alvarez’s The School of Donne (1961).


Comments on Donne’s praise of the Sidneys’ translation of the psalms in Sidney and on his critique of the state of the psalter in the England of his time. Notes how Donne’s commen-

datory poem “is dominated by a commingled sense of music as metaphor, word as music, and music as heard sound.” Points out that the poem also “serves as a reminder that his church and culture were fragmented by disagreements over the performative limits of even the holiest of words made musical” (207). States that “[c]ritical not only of the official translation of the psalms in use in every parish of the land but of the circumstances that limited musical expression more extremely in church than in private chamber,” Donne in Sidney “offers a rare practical contribution to an ongoing debate about music that ranged from the purely esoteric to the prescriptive” (208).


In Turkish. Compares Donne to the contemporary Turkish poet Cevdet Karal (1967—).


Points out that valuations of the Lothian portrait of Donne bought by the National Portrait Gallery in May 2006 ranged from 500,000 pounds to 3 million pounds and that the National Portrait Gallery paid 2 million pounds (1.4 million pounds with tax relief).


Reports the appeal of the National Portrait Gallery for 1.6 million pounds to purchase the Lothian portrait of Donne. Suggests the portrait was painted “for a lover of Donne” and comments on the rediscovery of the painting in 1959.

1106. ———. “Seller of John Donne Portrait Reduces Price by 15 [Per Cent] after Independent Assessments Suggest It Was Overevaluated.” Art Newspaper
Notes that questions posed by the National Heritage Fund about the pricing of the Lothian portrait of Donne resulted in the price paid by the National Portrait Gallery being negotiated downward from 2.36 million pounds to 2 million pounds. Points out that the price reduction followed from seeking advice from 3 independent valuers, who provided figures ranging from 2 million pounds to just 500,000 pounds. Notes also that earlier the National Portrait Gallery had been given evaluations of between 2 million pounds and 2.5 million pounds and asks why the gallery had not tried to negotiate a better price from the outset.


Discusses the “resurgence” of the Hermetic arts at the end of the sixteenth century and comments on “how it was manifested in English culture, and particularly in the literary and poetic works of the time” (77). Comments briefly on Donne’s uses of alchemical images, particularly in *ElComp* and *LovAlch*, and calls Donne “a discriminating student of alchemy.” Notes that Donne was “highly skeptical of Paracelsus, calling him the leader of the ‘legion of homicide physicians’ and a candidate for the ‘principle place right next of Lucifer’s own throne’” (85).

1108. Baumlin, James S. “Reading Donne’s *Communitie*.” *EIRC* 32, no. 1: 50–75.

Surveys critical commentary on *Commun* and presents a detailed contextualized reading of the poem based on John T. Shawcross’s theory in *Intentionality and the New Traditionalism* (1991) that the author’s presence continues in his or her work. Proposes “to multiply the contexts informing the poem’s three ‘vantage points,’ as Professor Shawcross describes them: that is, ‘the text, the reader’s text, and the author’s text,’ whose various ‘discrepancies’ make for divergent readings of Donne’s lyric.” Notes that, particularly interesting, is “the context supplied by Donne’s other writings, the sermons especially” (53). Maintains that while certain critics read *Commun* simply as a libertine poem and others interpret it as an ironic attack on libertinism and atheism, the poem “complicates our choice [between the two readings] by pitting the author’s text against the verbal text, which the libertine speaker claims as his unique possession and province.” Concludes that it is “a mark of Donne’s craftsmanship that he endows his speaker with such power and independence, even apparently at the author’s own expense” (70).


Presents a biographical sketch of Donne, focusing primarily on his religious background and development, and briefly surveys his works, both secular and sacred. Argues that Donne “perceived everything . . . through the medium of a Catholic sensibility he could not lose simply by defecting from the hidden Church of his forebears” (278). Cites as examples of this prevailing Catholic sensibility *Sat3, Lit, Corona, Annun*, and certain sermons. Notes the great influence of St. Augustine on Donne.


Points out that, for Donne, “gender matters, deeply, passionately, disturbingly,” and that he is “constantly writing about women and gender roles, both explicitly and indirectly through analogy and metaphor.” Maintains, however, that Donne’s prose and poetry “contain such a wide variety of genres, viewpoints, and personae, his language is so enigmatic and metaphorical, his attitudes towards women shift so quickly, sometimes within a single
poem or line, that it is difficult to say exactly what Donne himself thought, all but impossible to identify an abiding or systematic view of women or gender” (101). Surveys Donne’s treatment of women and gender in a number of poems, especially in the *Élegies* and the *Songs and Sonets*, to show that Donne’s “attitude towards women, sexuality, and gender becomes more multi-faceted, more complicated, and less predictable than it might at first seem.” Concludes that “the interanimation or cross-pollination of sacred and profane, the refusal to simplify or suppress thoughts or feelings for the sake of clarity or consistency, the readiness to challenge orthodoxy and to shock the reader into a more open, inquiring, unconventional point of view—these impulses continue to disturb and unsettle any position Donne might take on love, women, and gender” (213).


Calls the funerary elegy “one of the most common and distinguished poetic genres of the early modern period.” Discusses how these highly conventional poems allowed poets “to negotiate with the laws of mourning, religious and social expectation, and political constraints.” Examines the funerary elegy in the light of prevailing “rituals of rhetoric and mourning,” drawing on anthropology “to analyze transitional rites, charisma, and the performance of grief.” Also “recontextualizes elegies commemorating heraldic funerals and public executions” in order to show how poets “asserted their independence and unique status by manipulating the rituals designed to affirm consensus and the power of the state” (abstract). Mentions Donne throughout, comparing his treatment of death and elegiac consolation with those of his contemporaries, especially Ben Jonson, in both his poetry and prose. Discusses, in particular, the sublety of his praise of Elizabeth Drury in the *Anniversaries*. Comments in some detail on the elegies written on Donne by his contemporaries, pointing out how the sexual explicitness of Donne’s early lyrics and elegies and the “elegiac triumph” of the *Anniversaries* presented particular challenges to elegists trained in praising through imitation” (148).


In the introduction ([xix]–xliv), discusses the debate over the term “metaphysical poetry” and defines it as “a fairly loose group of poems with family resemblances, all of which in one way or another imitate the work of Donne” (xxiv); presents a short history of metaphysical poetry; and discusses major characteristics of Donne’s poetry and its influence. Reproduces selections from the *Songs and Sonets*, ElBed and ElPict, selections from the *Holy Sonnets*, Goodf, Christ, Father, and Sickness (4–38) with textual and explanatory notes (261–63, 272–82).


Rethinks Eliot’s notion that Donne “feels his thought.” Maintains that Donne “does feel his thought” but that “what he feels—and makes us his readers feel—is the peculiar excitement and pleasure of mental activity itself”; in other words, we do not “smell the rose” but we are aware and delighted by “the electrical and chemical impulses that connect and reconnect neurones in our brains.” Argues that “the pleasure Donne offers our bodies is the pleasure of extreme activity of the brain.” Maintains that Donne is “characteristically concerned with the schemas we have constructed to map our
mental activities—geometry, complex grammatical constructions, physiology, definitions”: he is “thinking about thinking”—and also “about smelling roses, but he is not immediately inducing us to smell any in our imagination” (248). Illustrates this neuroscientific view by discussing briefly Air, ValMourn, LovGrow, LovInf, ElBed, and especially Cross.


An edited version of the preceding entry. For a reply, see Raymond Tallis’s “License my roving hands: Does neuroscience really have anything to teach us about the pleasures of reading John Donne?” in TLS 5480 (11 Apr. 2008): 13–15.


Maintains that Donne is “much less a time-server than some have adverted, less of a subtle dissident than others would like him to have been.” Points out that “[c]riticism of the monarchy is found at the beginning and the end of his political life” and that “the conflict between integrity, proto-liberalism, and an acceptance of Jacobean absolutism is more apparent than real, and is largely a result of applying anachronistic political values to the period” (83). Argues that in order to understand Donne’s politics one must turn to contemporary Christianity since politics and religion were inseparable in this period. Observes that, for Donne, “God as king and father presided over a patriarchal structure which was by definition hierarchic” and that “[t]he imperfect postlapsarian hierarchies of earth were conceived in its image,” which meant that “the king held power from God, with those at other levels having their assigned political parts” and that monarchical power functioned through “the system of patronage (from the same root as patriarchy)” (84). Maintains also that one must see Donne’s politics “in the light of events which had shaped his England,” especially the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century and the resultant problems created by his own and his family’s recusancy. Maintains that “[n]o where is the interpenetration of religion and politics which shaped Donne’s life more clear than in the central argument of Pseudo-Martyr,” in which he maintained that English Catholics “could and should subscribe to the Oath of Allegiance to the king demanded after the Gunpowder Plot.” Claims, in fact, that “Donne’s whole life was a preparation for the argument of Pseudo-Martyr” and that ”he had been working toward it for some years” (91). Discusses how Donne’s views on the monarchy shifted at different times in his life and how in his last years he ”returned to the critical stance toward the monarchy that he had held in the 1590s” (98).


Maintains that in writing Biathanatos Donne “feared social censure for his statement that suicide may not actually be a grave sin—a theory that directly contradicted dominant Christian theology of the day,” which accounts for Biathanatos not being published in his lifetime. Observes that throughout his treatise Donne argues “from the point of view of a Christian rather than relying on Greek and Roman thought, which made his ideas all the more audacious.” Reproduces a selection from Biathanatos in which Donne “examines the arguments surrounding the prohibition of suicide and concludes that the sin is not so great after all.” Points out that Donne maintains that suicide “does not run contrary to the laws of nature because reason, which allows humans to decide to kill themselves, is natural” (72).


Argues from internal and external evidence that “An Epitaph upon Shakespeare” attributed to William Basse and first published in the first edition of Donne’s poems (1633) is, in fact, by Donne. Reviews the critical debate on the authorship of the poem, from which emerges “an implication for a connection” between the poem and the Stratford monument in Holy Trinity Church in Stratford-upon-Avon. Further argues that the elegy was “integral to the creation of the Stratford monument” and that Donne actually “composed its inscription.” Attempts also “to restore the wording” of the elegy “to reflect Donne’s original intention” (270).


Discusses similarities between Donne and D. H. Lawrence. Points out how both writers “experienced the breaking-up of the old order of things, the disturbing progress of scientific discovery, the growth of scepticism, persecution and intolerance, and the apprehension of death” (191). Observes also how both were “deeply obsessed by a sense of failure, both wrote poems on love and friendship, and reserved a special place for the sun in their works” (191–92). Notes especially how both “underwent a lifelong religious crisis” (192). Suggests possible Donnean echoes in Lawrence’s “The Ship of Death,” The Man Who Died, “The Ladybird,” Etruscan Places, and The Woman Who Rode Away. Explains how “the most striking aspect of the kinship between Donne and Lawrence is the impulse toward the primeval and the irrational” (203). Concludes that “it may be said with some conviction that issues which preoccupied Donne several centuries earlier . . . find their way subtly, but nevertheless repeatedly, into both Lawrence’s prose and poems, to the point that it might be argued that the resounding voice of John Donne echoes throughout the work of D. H. Lawrence” (204–05).


Discusses the pervasiveness of casuistry in ethical reasoning in the seventeenth century. Points out that, for Donne, casuistry “provided a poetic as well as a moral motif.” Observes that Biothanatos is “perhaps the most extensive and brilliant example of his grappling with presumptive casuistry” (182). Also examines the casuistical argument in SunRis.


In “Silent ‘Oratory’: Portrait Painting in England Around 1600” (33–43) and in “Poets and Playwrights: Shakespeare’s Contemporaries” (174–91), comments on the Lothian portrait of Donne and presents a survey of his life. Calls the portrait “dramatic” and notes that in it Donne is “playing the role of a melancholic lover.” Points out that the portrait is “one of the earliest surviving examples of an Elizabethan author portrait” (175). Reproduces a copy of the portrait (176).


Discusses the first and last stanzas of EdHerb in the light of four paintings by Arcimboldo (Earth, Autumn, Summer, and The Librarian) and of an anonymous portrait (perhaps by Isaac Oliver) of Sir Edward Herbert. Argues that Donne used these works as well as other paintings by Arcimboldo as “inspiration for his conceits in the poem” and shows how his language “reproduces in an ekphrastic way the main elements of Arcimboldo’s composite heads, as well as their metaphoric, excessive, mannerist, grotesque quality.” Maintains
that Donne "grounds his wit both on the appropriation of these images to symbolise other concepts than those they originally represent and on the linguistic reproduction of the paradoxical visual tensions between integration and separation of the constituent elements of the whole, the inside and outside, the container and the contained elements, and the metaphor and concepts of incorporation and assimilation." Shows how Donne uses "the animal and human head of Earth as the starting point in his reflection on foolishness, on the instability of human self-consciousness, on reason and knowledge" and shows how Donne argues that, if undeveloped, reason "reduces humans to animals, beasts, and its own devils that make them suffer because of self-inflicted evil" and, if overdeveloped, reason "chaws" (i.e., chews) the whole world, and therefore is informed by its integration and incorporation, but, at the same time, is deformed and made infirm and ill, because of sheer excess." Points out how, "[a]fter the expression of these notions by chained conceits based on the juxtaposition of Arcimboldo's paintings, Donne addresses Sir Edward Herbert in an equally unstable form of eulogium that in fact must be read as a grotesque, satirical criticism or, at best, a friendly warning." Points out that Donne "unmistakably models this mock praise on Arcimboldo's 'The Librarian' that he uses in connection and comparison to the rest of Arcimboldo's composite heads and to Sir Edward Herbert's very portrait in order to express the latter's far too bookish knowledge and lack of true, balanced self-consciousness and assessment of others" as well as "the gossip that these limitations and the errors they provoke elicit among his friends" (61).


An original poem about reading Donne and death.


Points out that a major characteristic of the metaphysical poets is "a particularly complex use of symbols and a tendency to put the greatest possible distance between a symbol and its literal meaning" (200). Briefly discusses HSLittle and HSBatter as examples, explaining the paradoxical uses of biblical allusions in both sonnets. Says that "[t]he general idea of metaphysical poetry is not less is more; more is more" and that these poems are "both a revelation of truths about the human condition and a test of the reader's ability to understand that revelation" (203).


Discusses “the commonality of thought” that links Donne and St. Augustine (99). Points out that in his sermons Donne “relied on Augustine as an authority more than he does any other nonbiblical author” and that, “[s]econd to Augustine as an authority for Donne was Bernard, that great medieval writer whose master in theology was Augustine.” Observes that “[i]t is therefore not surprising to find in Donne those objects of affective piety—the atonement, the cross, the suffering of Christ—which figure so prominently in medieval Augustinian spirituality.” Maintains that in Donne's poetry “[t]he clues which point to Augustinian influence are many in number, but often subtle in form” (102), citing as examples selections from the Holy Sonnets. Maintains that Donne's similarity to Augustine is “both biographical and intellectual,” noting how, like Augustine, Donne’s “own turn from a life of sensuality to a pursuit of holiness involved a reordering of a powerfully erotic spirit.” Concludes that, like Augustine's Confessions, Donne's poems, secu-
lar and then sacred, “display eros, first in its natural power and then transformed by grace into something more perfect” (105).


Discusses the cultural, literary, and theological interest in the moon in seventeenth-century England, which included various speculations about the plurality of worlds and the possibility of travel to the moon. Surveys a variety of literary works of the period, some serious and some playful, that consider lunar exploration and adventures. Points out briefly that in Ignatius Donne satirically imagines Lucifer and the Jesuits creating a church on the moon in imitation of the Catholic Church on earth.


Discusses how “[i]n the classical and Petrarchan lyrics’ depiction of the relationship between the desiring lover and his normatively scornful beloved, early modern poets discovered a vehicle for exploring the English social and political order as well as the boundaries between tradition and innovation” (366). Points out that, in contrast to Petrarchan poets, the hallmark of Donne’s poetry is “urbane wit rather than courtly imitation” and that even in his “most Petrarchan poems,” there is “a wry irreverence toward the polite language of praise and submission” typical of Petrarchism. Notes that the speaker in most of Donne’s love poems “adopts an aggressively masculine mode of self-assertion free from the compunction to mystify lust as transcendent love.” Observes that “[a]lthough Donne frequently makes explicitly anti-Petrarchan gestures which respond to the Canzoniere’s mediated version of Ovid, he also restores components of the Amores purged by his Italian predecessor and asserts his direct allegiance to his classical rather than Renaissance source.” Points out how “the Ovidian desultor Amoris returns in Donne with a vengeance, openly (if not always contentedly) acknowledging male as well as female inconstancy” and “freely admitting in bald innuendo the purely sexual nature of the speaker’s motives.” Claims that “[t]o the extent that Donne’s love lyrics mirror the patron-client relations of early modern England, they reveal the intrinsically mercantile dynamic inhering in the class system.” Maintains that “by repudiating the unattainable and idealized beloved of the Petrarchan mode and replacing her with a lustier and more accessible Ovidian one, Donne imaginatively triumphs over his economic disadvantages and thereby frees himself, at least for a time, from the courtly model of the ceaselessly frustrated suitor who must politely obfuscate his real desires by cloaking them behind the language of Petrarchan fin’Amors” (370).


Observing that Donne’s poetry “weds the sensual with the spiritual, the sexual with the intellectual, and the human with the divine,” discusses how in HSBatter Donne “uses sexual imagery to further a spiritual end.” Notes how in Donne’s time “[i]t was assumed that the analogue between immanence and transcendence, between a purely human love and a love that we could call divine, was an actual reality, a given of experience” (15). “Within the spiritual and erotic contours of such an understanding of love, divine and human,” explores “the problem of resistance and blockage” in HSBatter to “divine penetration of the soul” (16). Analyzes the argument of HSBatter by commenting on the biblical concepts and imagery of betrothal, loss of maidenhead, and circumcision that inform the sonnet and that allow Donne’s speaker to overcome the blockage and resistance to divine penetration.

1129. Deane, John F. “Preaching a Sermon to Myself,” in In Dogged Loyalty: The Religion of Poetry:
Surveys Donne’s life and work and maintains that his sermons and poems “are addressed to himself as well as, and as much as to an audience” (71) and that “this sense of being a watcher and a hearer rather than the one addressed, takes the reader unawares and wins assent the more readily” (72). In particular, comments on how in his poetry Donne moves from human, erotic love to love of God. Discusses how this shift to religious poetry “is indeed so delicate that the sensual imagery that gave zest to the early poetry, turns into the imagery of the joy of the Lord” and notes how Donne developed “a spirituality that is deeply involved with the natural man, aware of lust and of sickness, of wars and natural disasters,” a “down-to-earth spirituality that still touches us deeply today” (74). Comments especially on Donne’s awareness of witty and joyful uses of paradox.


States that “[o]f all the writers who alluded to the historicist-cosmological problems of the early seventeenth century,” Donne is “possibly the most renowned for his poetic rendering” in *FirAn* “of the ugly, corrupt irregularities of the newly-discovered globe, irregularities resulting from a depicted breakdown in the spiritual correspondence between heaven and earth” (51–52). Observes, however, that Donne, “who used both the old and new learning for his poetic effects, is at his most witty and revealing in his shorter verse in lightly capturing the tipsy nature of the new cosmological history.” Notes, for instance, how Donne plays with both the old and new cartography and cosmology in *Goodf, Annun, GoodM, SunRis, SGo,* and *ElBed.* Contrasts Donne and Bacon, pointing out how Donne “regularly treated empirical findings and literally-interpreted biblical passages as co-equal forms of knowledge” and, in some cases, saw the two “in radical conflict” (67). Compares Donne to Samuel Purchas, author of *Purchas his pilgrimage* (1613), noting similarities and differences in *Pseudo-Martyr, Metem,* and *SecAn.*


In a discussion of the preaching style of John Tillotson (1630–1694), one time Dean of St. Paul’s and later Archbishop of Canterbury, and of its influence on pulpit oratory in the Church of England, compares and contrasts Tillotson’s homiletical style to that of Donne. Comments, in particular, on how Tillotson rejected “the pedantry and over-ornamentation of metaphysical preaching” as well as “the intellectual sloppiness” of Puritan preachers (372), noting, however, that it was the imitators of Donne and Andrewes that were most often found objectionable.


Discusses teaching Margaret Edson’s *Wit* both as a play and as a film. Compares and contrasts the two versions, especially the quite different endings, and suggests that such comparisons “can lead to useful discussion of the virtues of each medium” (148). Examines three related scenes from the film in order to “explore Edson’s use of Donne, as well as the relationship between the film and play,” followed by questions for classroom analysis (149). Maintains that examining the differences between the two versions gives one “an opportunity to explore how theater works, how film differs from it, how belief and ideology inform the artistic choices we make, and how Donne’s views of death and redemption may be articulated and explored in a contemporary play” (158).

Presents a brief introduction to the *Elegies* (9–11), followed by Spanish translations (with English texts on opposite pages) of the *Elegies* (14–109), including “Julia” and *Sorrow*—with no notes or commentary. Concludes with an index (111–12).


First edition: 1993

Contains a biographical sketch of the translator [4]; a prologue to the *Elegies* (5–14) that includes a general introduction to metaphysical poetry, to the works of Donne, and to the *Elegies*; an introduction to the translation; and a brief survey of Donne’s life. Presents Spanish translations (with English texts on opposite pages) of the *Elegies*, including “Julia” and “A Tale of a Citizen and His Wife” (16–76); *Sappho* (76–80); and *Will* (80–83), followed by notes (84–92), an index (95), and a list of publications by the press (96–99).


Paperback edition


Translates into German (with English texts on the opposite page) the *Songs and Sonnets* ([7]-153), followed by Wolfgang Breitwieser’s 1994 afterword, which briefly surveys Donne’s life and works (155–[77]; notes (179–[84]); and a table of contents ([186]-[89]).


As a preface, translates into French Virginia Woolf’s 1932 essay, “Donne after Three Centuries,” from *The Second Common Reader* with notes (7-[36]), followed by French translations of selections from the *Songs and Sonnets* (40–107); *ElBed* (108–11); *SecAn* (114–49); the *Holy Sonnets* (152–89); *Cross* (190–95); *Christ* (196–99); and *Sickness* (200–03), (with Grier son’s English texts on opposite pages)—without notes or glosses.


Paperback ed.: 2012.

Following acknowledgments ([xiii]-xiv), presents a chronology ([xv]-xvii), a general introduction ([xix]-xxxvi), a list of further readings ([xxxvii]-xl), a note on the text ([xl]-xlvi), followed by selected poems ([1]-199), notes on individual poems ([201]-81), an index of titles ([282]-86), and an index of first lines ([287]-90). In the introduction, briefly surveys Donne’s critical reception, comments on the major characteristics of his poetry, and presents a biographical sketch of the poet. Points out that this edition contains Donne’s “most important and widely read poems, as well as a substantial selection of poems from every genre: all the Songs and Sonnets, Epigrams, Epithalamions, Holy Sonnets and Hymns” but omits “several long poems (“The Litany,” ‘Metempsychosis,’ ‘Satyre IV,’ a number of Funeral Elegies)” (xii). Notes that this edition “uses the first published seventeenth-century edition of each poem as its copy-text” and that “[o]nly when a poem was not published by 1669 has a manuscript been used as a copy-text” (xili). Notes that all emendations in the text are listed in the notes, that spelling and punctuation have been modernized “very delicately,” and that the poems appear (with minor exceptions) according to the order of the 1635 edition (xliii). and that poems not included in the 1635 edition “are added to the appropriate genre” (xliv).
In the introduction (5–33), discusses the life of Magdalen Herbert; Donne’s relationship with her; and, in particular, the commemorative sermon he preached not long after her death, which he had printed in 1627, the year of her death. Notes that it is one of only 6 of his surviving sermons that appeared in print during Donne’s lifetime and that George Herbert was “so comforted” by the sermon that he attached to it his Memoriae Matris Sacrum, 19 Latin and Greek poems in honor of his mother (5). Comments in detail on the themes, rhetorical structure, and imagery of the sermon, pointing out how Donne “moves from the general instruction on the comforts of the Christian theology—especially the ultimate union of all in Christ—to the remembering of Lady Danvers’ particular image of death and resurrection.” Observes that, typical of the funeral sermon of the time, Donne does not focus on Mrs. Herbert but rather presents her as a “representative of saintly virtue,” emphasizing the “universal virtues” she reflected but also including “the more particular ones of her own unique personality and of her sex” (29). Maintains that the sermon “illustrates what persons in England knew to be Aristotle’s highest ideal for friendship: not the usefulness of a friend, not even the shared experience, but the love of virtue in the friend” and that “[o]n a deeper level yet, the sermon projects a great vision of heavenly comfort that includes Lady Danvers’ particular image of death and resurrection.”

In Chinese. Contains a preface (1–21) in which the translator comments on the difficulty of translating poetry from one language into another; notes the twentieth-century revival of interest in Donne and the rather late attention given him by Chinese critics and scholars; comments on several major characteristics of seventeenth-century English metaphysical poetry; and points out the major stylistic and thematic features of Donne’s poetry. Translates into Chinese (with brief notes) the Songs and Sonnets (22–133); the Epigrams (134–54); the Elegies (155–218); and the Divine Poems (219–68), including ED, MHHmary, Corona, the Holy Sonnets, Lit, Christ, Sickness, and Father. Concludes with a chronology of Donne’s life (269–79); two previously published essays by Fu Hao—“John Donne’s Holy Sonnets” (280–83) and “The Echoes of St. Paul’s Cathedral” (284–86); a table of contents in English (287–92); and a postscript (293).

In a discussion of the cooperative interaction of narrative and lyric, cites SunRis as an example of how “the invasion of the sun” in the poem “represents the apparent victory of narrativity,” which, however, is “subsequently contested by the battalions of lyric” (260). Maintains that “not only does the poem in effect tell stories about the sun and the speaker’s changing responses” but also “the sun’s entrance carries with it the preconditions for narrative, the assumption of a before and an after, in this case the unchanging world of consummated love and the subsequent time when it has been threatened” (260–61). Concludes, therefore, that it is “telling that both the challenges of the sun’s power and the closural assertion that such challenges have triumphed banish the grammar of action verbs and substitute the stillness of predication” (261). Cites also Fun as an example of how “lyric meditation propels narrative action” (262), and comments on Ap-
par as an example of how, “[t]hrough anticipatory amalgams, lyric poems can offer a type of power analogous to that of the signature verbal tense of lyric, the so-called lyric present” (266). Concludes that the “anticipatory amalgam” is “an extremely but revealing case of the admixtures of lyric and narrative” as well as “of an interaction between them tellingly different from a winner-take-all paradigm” (268).


Observing how early seventeenth-century compilers of verse miscellany manuscripts often juxtaposed “canonical poems and libellous verses on affairs of state alongside one another” (47), comments on the “recontextualization” of Donne’s anti-Petrarchan poems that were intermingled in manuscript verse miscellanies with verse libels that had to do with the Thomas Overbury affair, the court scandal that surrounded the divorce in 1613 of Frances Howard from Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex; her hasty remarriage to Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset; and their conviction in 1616 for conspiring to murder Thomas Overbury, who had opposed their marriage (48). Points out Donne’s personal relationship with Carr, his celebration of Carr’s marriage in Eclog, his willingness to write a defense in support of Frances Howard’s divorce, and his intention (never realized) to dedicate an edition of his poems to Carr. Maintains, therefore, that Donne could hardly have been pleased to see his Ovidian love poems used against his friend and patron. Concludes that the miscellany compilers ironically “assimilated poems that originally registered irreverent detachment from the court of a Protestant monarch who persecuted Catholics to libels that attacked a woman from a powerful Catholic noble family that . . . had begun to look like a formidable crypto-Catholic faction that would promote pro-Spanish policy at court” (86), thereby giving Donne’s anti-Petrarchan poems unintended political and religious meanings.


Argues that the misdating of Donne’s aphorism in “Newes from the very Country” has caused critics to fail to recognize its topical allusion. Claims that Donne wrote the aphorism in 1603, not between 1605 and 1610, as previously thought, and that it is a response to the reprieve by James I in 1603 of those implicated in the Bye and Main Plots. Maintains that Donne wrote his aphorism while living in Surrey at the home of Francis Wolley, where he resided from 1603–05.

1144. Feng, Mei and Min Ji. [The conceits in John Donne’s prose works—A case study of “The world is like the sea”]. Foreign Languages and Their Teaching Issue 11: 44–46.

In Chinese. Points out that, like his poems, Donne’s prose works contain many metaphysical conceits. Discusses, in particular, Donne’s uses in his prose works of the conceit in which he compares the world to the sea.


An original celebratory three-stanza marriage

Discusses Donne's “compulsive need to draw upon the magical or oracular power inherent in the oral tradition of poetic language in order to translate himself from a profane to a sacred realm—or, if one prefers to consider the matter in emotional rather than spiritual terms, from a diminished to an enlarged existence—and, thus, to 'make something happen.'” Maintains that Donne's “desire to provoke a specific response from, if not actually control the behavior of, a poem's addressee is not evidence, as it is often taken to be, of a chauvinist's hubris—that is, of the outrageous determination of a university wit well trained in rhetoric, or of a Jesuit-educated casuist, to overwhelm an opponent, whether that antagonist be a much desired yet coy mistress, or an omnipotent yet seemingly inscrutable deity” but rather it is “most often the attempt of a frantic and insecure petitioner to tap the oracular power of non-print language to ensure the outcome of a salvation drama that can be either sexual or spiritual.” Holds that “the primary model for the operations adopted by Donne was the 'metaphorical' God of the Bible who created the world, revived inanimate flesh, and cured the sin weakened soul through the all-powerful agency of language.” As an example, presents a detailed reading of Goodf, in which Donne “attempts—like the Centurion—to engage the deity on his own behalf, using poetic language to make something salvic happen” (77). Comments on how the poem “betrays a shift from the written to the oral performance mode” (87) and is “an attempt to conjure God, to elicit a word or action from the only being who has the power to save the speaker's soul” (88). Argues that Donne was “increasingly engaged by the dynamic of oral performance as he aged, eschewing publication and eventually giving himself over to the oral delivery of sermons as his primary means of effecting the spiritual transformation of himself and his audience” (89). Compares the closing lines of Goodf and ElBed to show that, despite dissimilarities, the two poems are “remarkably similar, however, in that the speaker of each, painfully conscious of his inability to act on his own behalf to achieve a much hoped for transcendence, entreats a superior person to grant him salvation of a sexual and/or spiritual sort” (90–91). Maintains that in each of the poems “the imperative mode functions as it might in a petition or prayer” and that both speakers “depend upon the gift of 'imputed grace' to make them worthy of the consummation that they fully understand they cannot achieve on their own” (91). Concludes, therefore, that Donne's poems “aim to 'make something happen'” (94).


Contrasts Donne, a “poet of inwardness,” with Aemilia Lanyer, his contemporary, “who emphasized relationships” (471). Argues that “[w]hereas Lanyer's poetry celebrates relationships, Donne returns again and again to the problems of dependency and vulnerability that inhere in relationships” and that while Lanyer's poetry “is animated by the conviction that affective bonds and interactions inspire us to emulate models, Donne's sense of the rewards gained through union is tempered by his awareness of the troubles we encounter when we try to overcome distance and difference.” Maintains that “[i]nformed by different concerns, grappling with different problems, these poets correspond nevertheless in their sense that writing—poetry itself—serves both as a forum for discussing and as a means of enacting relationships” (472). Holds that Lanyer's poetry “was structured by the question of how we impel ourselves to overcome the difference and distance that separates human beings from each other and from God,” whereas “Donne's problem was how to overcome the tension between singularity and unity—between the appeal and necessity of self-sufficiency and the
desire for a self-transcendent unity” (480). Points out that in both his love poems and religious poems, Donne “alternately celebrated and feared unity” but that, for him, “writing seems to offer a partial solution, because the condensed structure and symbolic language of poetry enabled him to explore relations at a remove from the intensity of personal encounters,” thereby affirming “singularity even as he imagined unity” (481). Maintains that Donne’s “poetic claims that love creates the only true reality are interlaced with claims that the unity it promises cannot be achieved” (482).


Considers the general characteristics of English metaphysical poetry “in relation to the general cultural attitude of the European Baroque” (137). Maintains that baroque poetry is “not a definite style but a group of styles, one of which is Metaphysical” (138). Calls Donne “the most famous metaphysical poet” (141) and presents a brief survey of his life and works. Discusses GoodM, Canon, SGa, ValMourn, HSLittle, and HSBatter as examples of metaphysical poetry and suggests that the complexity of Donne’s style anticipates modern poetry (147).


Reproduces and comments on three anecdotes associated with Donne: (1) the epitaph “John Donne, Ann Donne, Undone” and says it was still visible on a pane of glass at Losley in 1749, as reported by James Prior in 1860; (2) Walton’s account of Donne’s vision of his wife with a dead child in her arms while he was traveling on the Continent with Sir Robert Drury in 1611; and (3) Walton’s account of Donne having his portrait drawn in his shroud shortly before his death.


Collection of 16 original essays. In the preface (ix-xi), explains that these essays offer “new perspectives” on Donne by assimilating and adding to “the rich tradition” of Donne criticism and that although they “incorporate contributions from other disciplines (e.g., linguistics or history) that can illuminate and contextualize Donne’s writings,” their primary concern is to help the reader “better to understand Donne’s texts” (ix). Points out that although each essay is written “to stand on its own,” all are “interconnected, and even more powerful as a whole” (x). Includes abbreviations (xii-xiii); a chronology (xiv-xviii); and the following essays, each of which has been entered separately in this bibliography: Jonathan F. S. Post’s “Donne’s life: a sketch,” Ted-Larry Pebworth’s “The text of Donne’s writings,” Arthur F. Marotti’s “The social context and nature of Donne’s writing: occasional verse and letters,” Andrew Hadfield’s “Literary contexts: predecessors and contemporaries,” Alison Shell’s and Arnold Hunt’s “Donne’s religious world,” Tom Cain’s “Donne’s political world,” Judith Scherer Herz’s “Reading and rereading Donne’s poetry,” Annabel Patterson’s “Satirical writing: Donne in shadows,” Achsah Guibbory’s “Erotic Poetry,” Helen Wilcox’s “Devotional writing,” Peter McCullough’s “Donne as preacher,” Lynne Magnuson’s “Donne’s language: the conditions of communication,” Ilona Bell’s “Gender matters: the women in Donne’s poems,” Ramie Targoff’s “Facing death,” Dayton Haskin’s “Donne’s afterlife,” and A. S. Byatt’s “Feeling thought: Donne and the embodied mind.” Concludes with L. E.
Semler’s “Select bibliography” and an index.

Reviews:

- Alex Davis in MLR 103, no. 4 (2008): 1116.
- Sean McEvoy in English Drama Media Issue 10 (Feb. 1, 2008).


Discusses Donne's views on love and sexual desire in the Elegies and the Songs and Sonnets, noting how Donne's perspective is “distinctly male” (133). Points out that “[w]hereas Petrarchan poetry idealized women and spiritualized desire, Donne's Ovidian Elegies flaunt the speaker's sexuality as he describes his escapades” and observes that, “[m]ocking notions of constancy and faithfulness, these poems are irreverent, and their anti-authoritarian stance creates ripples beyond the poems” (135). Believes that the “misogynous wit” in the Elegies “expresses frustration about the difficulty of controlling women, even as these speakers seek control,” and suggests that his expression of the desire for male power “may also have sociopolitical significance, obliquely articulating discomfort with serving a woman monarch in a patriarchal society.” Discusses ways in which the Songs and Sonnets “express a more diverse range of attitudes towards women and the experience of love,” noting how Donne “tries on various roles, expressing the mutability of the world and the instability of desire even as he seeks permanence and stability” (136). Comments on several Elegies to show how Donne “explores the relation between the private experience of love and the public, outer world,” noting that these poems, although ostensibly about love and desire, are “often also about politics” (138). Discusses how the Songs and Sonnets “voice ideas that have become so powerful in our modern world that we must remind ourselves how bold and revolutionary they were in Donne’s time.” Notes, for instance, that “[s]ome of his most memorable lyrics argue that personal fulfillment can only be found in love, and that the realm of sexuality is autonomous, private, self-sufficient” (140). Maintains that although he “overturned conventional pieties with his witty libertinism,” Donne's “boldest intervention was representing erotic love as a spiritual experience that provides fulfillment [that] the public world, and even its religious institutions, cannot.” Discusses how in his love poetry he “flirts with blasphemy, connecting sexual, consummated love with spiritual matters” (142) and makes “love 'sacramental' during a period when the sacraments were contested” (143). Claims that in celebrating sexuality as a spiritual experience, he defies the traditional Christian association of sexuality with sin but notes that in his later sermons and in some of his religious poetry he seems “to recant his earlier celebration of erotic love” (145).


Discusses the nature and extent of the influence of the ancient Roman satirists and elegists, especially Juvenal and Ovid, on Donne's poetry. Comments on the complex and ambivalent reaction Donne had to Petrarchism, noting that, for the most part, he rejects the prevailing Petrarchan conventions and represents women “at times as equals, at others as despicable creatures” (57). Suggests that Donne's
“best poetry is adept at relating the superficial to the profound, connecting the demotic and the philosophical” (60). Discusses how in *Ecst* Donne combines tone and substance and how the poem is both ironic and “a serious work of erotic literature.” Says that although Donne’s poems “can appear cynical and dismissive reflections on the nature of love, this would be a superficial reaction to them.” Maintains that Donne “makes use of a series of precursors, styles, types, and literary examples, often treating the material at his command in a sardonic or ironic way.” Concludes that “[i]t does not follow that he refuses to take the literature of love seriously” but that, “[o]n the contrary, *Songs and Sonets* is often an extremely serious volume, putting all previous love poetry in its place and suggesting that the earthly love of John and Anne Donne was one of the few constants in a chaotic and changeable world” (63).


Surveys and evaluates Empson’s writings on Donne from 1930 to 1981 and seeks to understand “why they have been patronized as divertissements, more or less irrelevant to the proper business of Donne scholarship” (574). Points out how in his criticism Empson “sought to credit Donne with being purposefully provocative, slicing through convention, with his imagery being not incidental but integrative.” Discusses how *ElBed* became for Empson “a crucial measure of Donne’s outrageousness” (577) as well as Donne’s “heterodoxy” (578). Comments on Empson’s “long campaign to prove the courageously heretical character of Donne’s poetry” and “to defend the poet from pietistic detractors” (580–81). Surveys Empson’s disagreements with other critics, especially J. B. Leishman, Frank Kermode, Helen Gardner, and John Carey.


Discusses “the prodigious range of ideas, activities, and interests” (xlxi) that Empson explored in his numerous letters, noting that “[h]e wrote letters for two primary and proper purposes: for conversation and for literary-critical controversy” (xvi). Reproduces numerous letters that comment on Donne and on individual poems by Donne addressed to such important critics as A. Alvarez, Helen Gardner, Frank Kermode, Mark Roberts, Philip Hobsbaum, John Sparrow, Alan Rudrum, and others.


Describes a copy of the first edition of Donne’s poems in the Rylands University Library (Manchester) that has 7 engraved portraits (three of Donne—by William Marshall, Martin Droeshout, and Pierre Lombart) interpolated throughout its pages. Notes that the others are “heads” of Wotton, the Countess of Bedford, Shakespeare, and Prince Henry. Maintains that each of the engravings has been “judiciously added to the text of the Rylands copy either facing or amongst those poems which relate most closely to them,” thereby “creating a dynamic relationship between text and image” (13). Points out how the practice of interspersing extraneous illustrations in standard editions became a popular practice in the eighteenth century.


Discusses “the shifting cultural meanings” (42) of gelatin or “jelly” from the sixteenth century to present day jell-o. Points out that in his sermons and poems Donne “narrates how a person was originally formed out of ‘excremental jelly’ (another word for semen) at conception,
lived a life experiencing passions that correlate with the body being more and less soluble, and then turned back to this viscous substance at death” (46). Notes two references to “jelly” or semen in *Metem* (50).


Comments on Donne’s religious background and spiritual development and the influence of both on his secular and sacred poetry and on his sermons. States that although Donne’s position as “one of the greatest of English poets is unquestioned,” there is “much ambivalence about his religious and spiritual commitments,” noting that “[c]ontroversy remains as to whether he was simply a fair-weather convert to Anglicanism and whether he was really as tolerant of religious diversity in later life as some of his published sermons suggest” (124). Maintains that both Donne’s love poems and religious poems “combine the same intellectual insight, emotional intensity, and spiritual significance” but that “they tend also to be arrogant and self-absorbed.” Concludes that “[t]he physical world in all its diversity is for Donne a mirror that reflects an image of spiritual reality” (125).


Arguing that “[a]nalyzing women’s imaginative literature is especially important because canonical, male-authored literary works—when considered in isolation from contemporary legal and historical documents and female-authored texts—can leave today’s reader with the strong impression that women simply were men’s property in Renaissance England,” cites *ElBed* (ll. 27–30) as an example of the objectification of women as property “by using a particularly expansive image of the female beloved as real estate.” Points out that in the poem the beloved is viewed as “a newly conquered, possessed territory, and her body’s riches . . . underwrite a fantasy of vast political power to spice up the speaker’s sexual imaginings: she is the empire that makes him an emperor.”


Discusses the vagaries of Donne’s critical reception from his own time to the present, noting that although Donne’s poetry was “popular in his own century,” it took him “much longer” than Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Jonson, and others “to be accorded prominence in accounts of literary history” (233). Discusses three “principal carriers” by which Donne’s “afterlife” can be defined: “(1) the documents in manuscript and print that preserve, imperfectly, what he wrote; (2) the accumulating pronouncements by which he has been dismissed or praised, resisted or tamed, and sometimes appreciatively understood; and (3) the reinvention of creative deployment of his writings . . . in artful works that evince a continuing power of fecundation” (234). After surveying critical trends of the past four centuries, concludes that “[s]o various are the results of industrious scholarship of the last century, and so weighed down with them has the reading of Donne become, that the challenge now is to try to construct a larger, more inviting picture that, while it can never deliver a full understanding of this complex figure and his works, will help future readers to long for one” (245).


Examines a number of poems to show “the difficulty of fixing meanings to Donne’s poems” (103). Points out that typically a poem
by Donne is “flooded with feeling”; contains “internal contradictions” and “shifts in voice”; and refuses “to make itself add up, to become the organic whole claimed as the mark of success by nineteenth-century Romantic poets and twentieth-century New Critics.” Maintains that, “[p]ositioned as spectator at some exciting game, the reader wonders how, indeed whether, the writer is going to pull it off, get it all together, keep those balls, those flashing figures, spinning from hand to hand without dropping them” and that “[a]t the same time, the reader is inside the poem as the lines are getting made, anticipating them, working them out, making his/her own meanings” (112–13). Concludes that the endings of Donne’s poems “require us to rebegin, both those poems where endings do not seem particularly troubling and those that send us, off balance, back to the start, wondering how we got from there to here and back again, and those where the endings flummox us entirely” (113).


Response to Katherine Duncan-Jones’s review of John Stubbs’s Donne: The Reformed Soul in TLS 5399 (22 Sept.): 3–4. Points out that M. Thomas Hester; Ernest W. Sullivan, II; and Dennis Flynn, who are completing their edition of Donne’s letters, have assumed I. A. Shapiro’s agreement with Oxford University Press to publish the letters and “have been granted permission by his estate to incorporate materials among his posthumous papers.”


Discusses Pseudo-Martyr “in the context of the polemical strategies of the controversy over the new Oath of Allegiance following the Gunpowder Plot, drawing on recent findings on his [Donne’s] career as lawyer and preacher.” Argues that “[i]n view of his private views on the Oath (as expressed in a letter to Sir Henry Goodyer) and his minimal reference of Robert Persons, the chief English Jesuit adversary,” Pseudo-Martyr is “neither a careeerist pamphlet nor a piece of controversial prentice-work” but rather is “an ingenious exposition of the defensibility of taking the Oath, in the interests of religious conciliation.” Maintains that “[w]ith lawyerly finesse” Donne “re-negotiates the categories of mortal sin and heresy” and “uses various satirical devices to expose what he sees as Rome’s betrayal of the Catholic faith.” Thinks that, for Donne, paradox “may have seemed the only way of bridging the chasm between royal and papal jurisdiction: the state’s need for security and the Pope’s right to depose an errant monarch.” Maintains that in Donne’s “own spiritual journey, the witty, conceited style of argument anticipates the later shift to a fully committed reformed churchmanship” (474).


In Chinese. Maintains that in most of his poems Donne regards women as inferior to men and believes that they should be, therefore, subordinate to men. Cites several poems as examples, in particular, Flea.


Presents 7 brief chapters on Donne’s spiritual life and religious/theological views, containing selections drawn from his sermons, Devotions, and the Holy Sonnets and followed by a prayer. Each chapter is intended to serve as a daily meditation for the fifth week of Lent. Concludes with suggestions for implementing the meditations into one’s daily life.

Calls Donne “the quintessential metaphysical poet” and comments on major characteristics of his poetry, especially his use of conceits. Citing ValWeep as an example, opines that to call Donne’s conceits “far-fetched” is “too mild a description” and says that repeatedly in his poems Donne “starts with some cliché about love and reasons from it to a fantastic and outrageous conclusion, which, nevertheless, appears to be a genuine insight into the nature of love—if often a forced, awkward, or brittle insight” (87). Maintains that Donne’s love poetry is “endlessly fascinating” but that “his religious writings are even better” (88). Comments on Donne’s religious background and development as reflected in the Holy Sonnets and in Goodf. Maintains that Donne’s religious poetry has “enormous force—such great power, in fact, that it appeals to readers not at all in sympathy with the religious beliefs it expresses,” citing the “atheist” Camille Paglia as an example (90). Says that the themes of Donne’s religious poetry are “themselves even larger and deeper than the mysteries of sexual love that he explored in his erotic poetry” and that, in God, Donne “found material that was big enough not to be overwhelmed by the elaborate intellectual machinery of his poetic technique” (91). States that what professors of English “don’t want you to learn” from Donne is that “God is even more exciting (and important) than sex” (88).


Comments briefly on “A Sermon Preached at Lincoln’s Inn” (1620) in which Donne echoes the stock theme of polemists of the period against “painted” women; namely, that women “paint” in order to entrap men sexually. Also discusses briefly Paradox 2, “That Women Ought to Paint Themselves,” in which Donne asks “what is the difference between a painted face and a painted wall or canvas.” Points out that Donne links Catholic dissimulations and idolatry with the use of cosmetics and suggests that Paradox 2 is “not only an attempt to hide ‘subversive subtexts’” but that it “also raises questions about art and highlights the contemporary distinction between acceptable and unacceptable deception” (47).


In Japanese. Discusses Donne’s religious attitude in Sat3 and also in Pseudo-Martyr toward the various conflicting Christian sects and concludes that he does not fully accept any of them but rather commits himself to seeking the truth wherever it may be found. Points out that this point of view was very radical in Donne’s time.


Maintains that throughout Donne’s life melancholy “consistently remains both the physical manifestation and metaphorical expression of rebellion against established institutional norms.” Observes how often Donne employs the analogy between disease and rebellion in his sermons and discusses, in particular, how he develops it even more extensively in Devotions, in which he indicates that “the same forces that contribute to illness also are at work in political situations.” Reads the Devotions,
therefore, as “a study of the ways in which states and bodies alike are agents of their own ruin” (107). Maintains that “the illness Donne writes about in Devotions serves as a vehicle for exploring questions—and additionally for exposing anxieties—regarding agency and authority within a public arena” and that the work “foregrounds a deep anxiety over the absence of any devices that might regulate the circulation, and the meaning, of language.” Notes how Donne’s anxiety takes the form of criticizing the “widespread obsession with gossip and rumor” (110). Discusses how the “relationship between physical illness and political vulnerability is most fully developed” in “Meditation 12” of Devotions in which Donne “turns explicitly to the question of what constitutes the biggest threat to both body and state” (116). Concludes that Donne’s examination of disease “enabled him to challenge the legitimacy of state authority even during the very moments when he would end up publicly defending it” (121).


Provides a prose translation of and line-by-line commentary on Amic. In particular, comments on the Latinity of the poem and challenges the translation made by Brian Parker in his edition of Volpone (1999). Calls Amic “perhaps one of Donne’s very greatest poems,” claiming that “it is wittier, more paradoxical, and more syntactically complex—in a word, more metaphysical—than recent discussion has allowed” (568).


Discusses “the seemingly incongruent yoking of poetry with polemic in the literary culture of early seventeenth century England” by examining Pseudo-Martyr and the Anniversaries, “two apparently disparate texts.” Maintains that the two works point to “the cultural affinity between poetry and polemic, to the ways in which both endeavors are animated by similar concerns.” Says, however, that his interest in Donne as an author “remains subordinate” to the main argument of the study, which is “the shaping influence of print technology and religious controversy on the literary culture of early modern England” (145). Shows how Pseudo-Martyr reveals Donne’s eagerness “to exploit the technology of print to make a public argument” and “provides evidence for an engagement with print and a religious animus that are rarely noticed.” Discusses how the Anniversaries also provide “additional evidence in an interest in the uses of print” although “it appears studiously unpolemical” (159). Claims that the poem’s “refusal of explicit polemical engagement helps to explain the mixed reception it received in a world shaped, in good part, by religious controversy” (163). Argues that the notion of “a print-phobic Donne” should be abandoned “in the light of his foray into print in the years 1610–12” (178) and claims that “Donne’s case is especially interesting because he straddles not only the divide between print and manuscript but also that between poetry and polemic” (179).


Presents a detailed analysis of the argument in Pseudo-Martyr, showing how Donne “marshals historical and scriptural support for James I’s Oath of Allegiance.” Notes that many modern literary scholars have “frequently characterized Donne’s arguments as absolutist.” Points out, however, how Donne in his treatise “expressed sympathy for his Catholic readers and discouraged blind submission to either James or the pope, modifying James’s claim to absolute authority by insisting on the sovereignty of one’s own conscience” (112). Shows how Donne “attempts to recast the controversy surrounding the oath as an issue of obedience rather
than faith” (125) and holds that Donne’s treatise “ultimately proves much more nuanced than a mere act of submission” (125–26). Argues that Donne, in fact, “produces an argument potentially against his own purposes since he paradoxically articulates the right of conscience in the midst of an argument upholding the king’s policy,” thus resulting in “a polemic rife with twisted logic, overlapping and at times contradictory images, and overly determined vocabulary” (135). Concludes that Donne “surprisingly forges, in the midst of his vigorous defense of the oath, a space for the spiritual and temporal liberty of the English subject” (136). Discusses also the various responses of Catholics to Pope Paul V’s breves of September 1606 and August 1607 forbidding Catholics to take the oath, and comments on James’s position (and its inconsistencies), whereby he attempts to establish his sovereignty over papal authority.


Contains a biographical and critical introduction (1260–62), followed by selections from Donne’s poems (1261–1302), Biathanatos (1303), Devotions (1303–08), and “Death’s Duell” (1308–09). Comments on how Donne’s poems and prose works “display an astonishing variety of attitudes, viewpoints, and feelings on the great subjects of love and religion” but maintains that “this variety cannot be fully explained in biographical terms.” Dismisses, therefore, the old Jack-John dichotomy. Points out that the Songs and Sonnets have always been “the cornerstone” of Donne’s critical reputation. Notes that Donne is usually classified as a “metaphysical poet” but points out that there was “no formal ‘school’ of Metaphysical poetry” although “the characteristics ascribed to it by later critics pertain chiefly to Donne.” Says that although Donne had a great influence on later poets, he “remains a singularity” (1262).


Reprint of an 1895 essay by J. B. Lightfoot (1828–1889), who was for 10 years Bishop of Durham and later Canon of St. Paul’s and Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Comments on Donne’s monument in St. Paul’s and surveys Donne’s life. Concerning Donne as a poet, says that “[n]o quaintness of conception and no recklessness of style and no harshness of metre can hide the true poetic genius which flashes out from his nobler pieces” (225) but laments that “unhappily” Donne’s “shame is written across his extant poems in letters of fire,” which leads one to the conclusion that “they reflect—at least to some extent—the sensuality of the man himself” (227). Praises Donne’s conversion to the Church of England, compares him to St. Augustine, and commends his religious verse and, in particular, acknowledges him as a great preacher.

1175. Lynch, Matthew T. “‘Conquered nations mean nothing in love’: Political Dissent in Propertius’s Elegy II.7 and Donne’s ‘Love’s Warre.’” RenP, pp. 77–89.

Presents a close reading of Propertius’s Elegy II.7 and ElWar to show “how two poets separated by almost two millennia” employ the classical elegy’s “sexually mischievous language to undermine the might of their respective authoritarian states” (80). Discusses how, like the speaker in Propertius’s elegy, Donne’s speaker in ElWar is “indifferent to the glories of battle, preferring instead the company of his mistress” (84). Points out, however, that “[w]hereas Propertius’s speaker is defiant, Donne’s speaker is ironic” in that “clearly he does not want to breed children who will die overseas,” but “is willing to say so in order to keep from going himself.” Notes that although both poets “use wit in different ways,” they are “strikingly similar in their rejection of major global events.” Observes that no matter how
treacherous their elegies may sound, they could absolve themselves of any guilt, claiming that their poems are “simply about love” and that “any further reading is ridiculous.” Concludes that “in rejecting the public realm and withdrawing into the private one, the poets stoically realign themselves with the virtue that only comes from something intimate like love” (89).


Points out that *Mark* is “notably restrained in its grief” and “offers a strangely muted commendation of the young lady’s mortality, ultimately declining to name her virtues.” Says this all seems strange since Donne obviously knew that Lady Marckham’s sister, the Countess of Bedford, would carefully scrutinize his poem and that he also knew that she was “not at all disinclined to require rewritings of poetry she disliked,” e.g., her request that Donne rewrite his elegy on Cecilia Bulstrode. Suggests that perhaps Donne was reticent to celebrate the life of Lady Marckham since he only remotely knew her and felt that, if he did so, his patroness, the Countess, would have recognized such “disingenuousness.” Calls Donne’s solution “ingenious,” which was to celebrate “the beauties” of Lady Marckham’s life “after death” rather than “the beauties of her life before death” (66). Discusses how Donne describes the lady’s tomb as a “transforming alembic” (67) and argues how “her body in the grave was destined for beauteous physical perfection” (69). Notes Donne’s use of this notion of the physical refinement in the grave appears also in *Death’s Duell* as well as in *Noct.*


Argues that Donne “used his gift with language as equipment for poetry and as equipment for living.” Employs “methods of close reading that engage the complexities of Donne’s practical, non-literary language with something of the same care and energy that has been traditionally reserved for the poetry.” Maintains that “[a]nalysis of the linguistic preoccupations in Donne’s religious prose and his practical correspondence can cross-fertilize analysis of the poetry” (184). Discusses Donne’s sermon “Preached to the Nobility” on Luke 23:34 and two letters he wrote to George More, his father-in-law, to show how “two competing types of interaction theorized in the sermon, one of direct reasoning and the other of courtly negotiation, actually played out in his practical affairs.” Also following a brief examination of some general features of Donne’s poetic diction and grammar, comments on *LovInf* “to illustrate how the two patterns of interaction figure in a poem” (185). Observes that a “close reading of linguistic detail in Donne’s sermon and letters suggests that the knowledge/power antithesis is strongly evident in his use of grammatical modality and especially in the modal auxiliaries that are also extremely prominent in his poems” (196). Discusses how in *LovInf* Donne “sets in motion a whole train of modal auxiliaries” and maintains that “this grammatical poem, with its competition between early modern dialogue scripts for reasoning and social negotiation, takes us to the heart of important qualities of Donne’s poetic language” (197). Concludes that Donne’s language “across many genres wrestles with and plays upon an ambiguous relation between the discourse of knowledge and the discourse of power” (198).


Compares Donne to the Persian Sufi poet, Jalal al-Din Rumi (1212–1273), calling both poets “mystics” and claiming that in both “the poetic and mystical intuitions develop simultaneously to levels of refinement rarely found in other renowned mystic poets” (139). Notes, however,
that, unlike Rumi, Donne has no pantheistic references in his poems and that his poetry is “of an intense philosophical nature” (146) and presents “the struggle between the older and the new science” (149). Concludes, however, that in spite of their religious and cultural differences, the metaphysical poems of Rumi and Donne have basic similarities.


Argues that in the first stanza of Flea Donne “is identifying with women rather than asserting a superior sense of masculinity” and that he “presents a potent illustration” of his “sporting with gender.” Observes that in Flea “it appears that the seducing male and the seduced female unite and become one after being sucked by the flea” (7). Maintains, furthermore, that the male speaker “assumes the position of the woman seduced rather than that of the invading flea” and that “the ‘mingled’ blood that signifies loss of virginity through heterosexual copulation equates the male seducer with the female seduced as he shares in her vaginal bleeding and loss.” Claims that, as much as the speaker “desires to penetrate and suck, he desires to be ‘pampered,’ and be sucked, with the insinuation of being both nursed and ‘fucked.’”

Notes that “[a]s the act of sucking takes place prior to seduction and erection, it accentuates the attainment of gratification before the more overtly and traditionally male patterns of sexual stimulation.” Shows how “through the intricacy of a single sophisticated conceit, Donne subconsciously associates himself both with the female body and with a kind of hermaphroditic erogenous pleasure, revealing his deeply hidden sense of identity and gender” (8).


Offers a brief history of the history of science “as it impacts the study of early modern literature and culture” (344). Argues that this history has had two general phases: the first of which began “in earnest” (344) in the 1930s and lasted well into the 1980s and was concerned primarily with showing “the influence of science on literary texts in the early modern English tradition” (e.g., Marjorie Hope Nicolson’s work on Donne); the second of which emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, focused on “the multi-disciplinary study of science as both a socially and an historically embedded set of practices and habits of thought” (e.g., the work of Elaine Scarry on the body). Maintains that “the most significant consequence” of this more recent trend is “a new understanding of the ways in which both the scientific and the literary are equally (though, of course, differently) engaged in the production of knowledge.” Discusses Devotions as a “case study of ‘subjective writing’ (a term meant to encompass both work in science and in literature) dedicated to the transformation of personal experience into knowledge” (345). Argues that Donne’s prose work “participates in the widely varied textual and discursive practices of what will become identifiable autobiography in the early modern period” (355) and is “an especially compelling text” in which “we can trace the contour lines of confrontation between the older, essentially scholastic, systems of correspondences that determined meaning in the world and the new epistemological system of induction and experiment that created meaning in the world” (357). Maintains that Donne treats his near fatal illness in Devotions as an experiment, writing his account “after the fact,” and “can only do so once he has already transformed (transliterated) his experience—and himself—into artifacts of interpretive—and, perhaps especially, written—discourse.” Concludes, therefore, that “what is crucial to understanding Devotions as scientific and autobiographical is the operational identity of the observed and observing self” (360).

Discusses how the verse epistles and prose letters reflect Donne’s “deeply held beliefs about interpersonal communication and about the social functions of writing, even as they engage in intense forms of self-scrutiny.” Maintains that from these works “we can develop a sense of the social networks in which Donne and his work were enmeshed and of the social and political contexts of his writing.” Distinguishes between “poems addressed to social equals or friends and poems written to social superiors, usually patronesses,” noting that “[i]n the first case, the rhetorical decorum is that of the humanist familiar letter” and “in the second, Donne renegotiated the terms of the rhetoric of compliment to turn the occasion of addressing a social superior person into one in which he could assume a moral and cultural authority and an independence that, strictly speaking, clashed with the subservient stance he adopted.” Points out that the verse epistle was “one of the new poetic forms Donne attempted in the 1590s” (36) and surveys those written to his male friends, noting that, for the most part, there is a “dearth of topical allusions, gossip, and ephemeral detail in Donne’s epistolary writings” and that only occasionally does he allow himself “to write about personal matters” (41). Points out that in both his prose letters and verse letters to his male friends one finds some of Donne’s “most reflective and philosophical pieces of writing” and observes that in his letters to his female patronesses one finds “the same intellectual intensity.” Surveys the verse epistles written to his lady patronesses, noting that they are “at their worst when Donne’s relationship with a patroness was tenuous or deteriorating, and at their best when, as in the early pieces to Lady Bedford, they are occasions for the kind of virtuoso intellectual moves Donne makes on a grand scale in the two Anniversaries.” Concludes that the Anniversaries “make clear what is implicit in Donne’s other ecomiastic verse, that such writing was used by him to do what he did in all his poetry and prose: to engage in self-conscious, philosophically and religiously reflective, critical examinations of the self and the world in a style of language and complex thinking he found most congenial” (46).


Comments on Donne’s struggle with time and death in his secular and sacred poems. Compares and contrasts HSDeath and SunRis to show that there is “no real division of poetic sensibility” between Donne’s secular and sacred poetry (14). Finds in both poems a love of argument, use of passionate language and a speaking voice, audacious hyperbole, and drama and tension. Maintains, however, that in HSDeath the argument is “less appropriate,” that the “showy metaphorical ingenuity is out of place” (16), and that the sonnet form curbs “the effusiveness, flattening out the voice and depriving it of much of its expressive intonation, so that the sense of intellectual and emotional passion so central to Donne collapses into a forced march to a foregone conclusion” (16–17). Concludes that HSDeath shows that “the mysteries of religious love will not be conjured with words” (17).


Points out that at the time of his death Donne was “popularly famous not as a poet, but as a preacher” and that in the seventeenth-century mind there was little doubt that “eloquence used for preaching was infinitely superior to penning ephemera like poems.” Observes how “modern taste has inverted these early modern priorities” and that nowadays Donne’s sermons are used “primarily either as convenient thematic glosses on the poetry, or for biographical evidence about Donne’s theology, politics, and personality.” Maintains that “[t]o appreciate properly Donne’s sermons requires students
first to acquaint themselves with what they are formally and generically” (167). Presents an overview of “the salient formal characteristics of Donne’s sermons and the conventions associated with their composition and delivery, followed by a brief close reading of one representative sermon [given on the first Friday of Lent 1623] to illustrate the importance of form to meaning in the sermons” (168).


Original poem on Donne’s effigy in St. Paul’s Cathedral.


Discusses Donne’s “extraordinary ability to convey a variety of male voices in his poems, through which he exposes and explores the very notion of masculinity.” Says that one of his “best-known personae” in the Songs and Sonets is that of “the swaggering, sexually confident young man-about-town” who shows “his disdain for those unfortunate enough to have to work for a living, rather than lounge about in bed” (2), dazzling a mistress with “his wit and intelligence.” As examples, comments briefly on SunRis and Flea. Sees the speaker of ElBed as “a young man of great charm, confidence and charisma” who “makes clear his perception of himself as superior to the woman” and who focuses primarily on “his sexual possession of her” and “mastery over her.” Finds in such poems as LovAlch, SGo, and Twick a “more cynical persona” who “has found that relationships with women are not just about sex, after all” (3) and who expresses “bitterness, disappointment and defeat.” Calls LovGrow “a gorgeous meditation on love” and maintains that the persona here is “an emotionally mature man who has found the almost inexpressible contentment of a relationship that combines both physical and spiritual elements of love” (4). Says this persona is found also in Air, Anniv, and especially Ecst.


In the preface ([vii]-x), Steve Esca Smith, Director of the Cushing Memorial Library and Archives, comments on the library’s growing collection of early editions of Donne since the 1980’s to the present. In the introduction ([3]-9), Gary A. Stringer, General Editor of the Variorum Edition of Donne’s poetry, discusses the steps taken in acquiring editions of Donne’s works as well as sixteenth- and seventeenth-century books that Donne alludes to, quotes, or was known to have read that were in the library of I. A. Shapiro and that were auctioned for sale at Sotheby’s in 2004 and later. Notes that these various acquisitions make the Cushing Library “a noteworthy place among the world’s repositories of primary Donne editions and contemporaneous materials.” Points out that currently underway is a project to digitalize these newly acquired volumes, making images of them available on the internet, “together with tools that will ensure that users the world over will have easy access to this truly remarkable resource” (9). Thereafter follows the descriptive catalogue of the seventeenth-century editions of Donne in the collection (13–26) and the descriptive catalogue of the acquired books that Donne was known to have read (though not actual copies that Donne owned) that were in the Shapiro collection ([27]-48).


Discusses the pervasiveness of Arctic and Antarctic imagery in English poetry. Points out that Donne “was intrigued by the theoretical possibilities of the poles as the still points of the turning world” (201) and that one of his “favorite examples of the difficulty of metaphor is the language used to describe the North Pole.” Notes that, for Donne, Antarctica “existed only
in theory” (202). Discusses Donne’s use of polar imagery in Eclog, in which he says that “the true test of passion is whether it could melt the North Pole” (203) and in Sat3 in which he says “the capacity to thaw the polar ice is the test of emotional strength.” Points out that in the Divine Poems Donne uses the Arctic “in a completely different and much more theoretical way” (204) as seen in Annun, in which “the need for navigation to substitute the Pole Star for the Pole itself” is used as “a metaphor for a Christian’s need to substitute the Church’s interpretation of Christ’s life for God himself” (205).


Presents a general introduction to Donne and his times and comments on major characteristics of his secular and religious poetry. Points out that “Donne’s characteristic poetic voice consists in developing subtle, witty arguments in support of his theme, introducing unusual images and figures of speech (or ‘conceits’ as they are called), imagining dramatic situations, and employing colloquial language that was rarely chosen for its beauty or musicality.” Offers critical readings of the following poems as examples of Donne’s art: SGo, Flea, SunRis, Val-Mourn, HSDeath, and Father. Concludes that Donne is “both original and traditional, using older forms and creating new ones, employing different voices over time with different tones and inflections, and displaying a mind that challenges, teases, surprises, and persuades us to various points of view and emotional responses” (36).


Maintains that “the recurrent cartographic motif” in Donne’s poetry reflects “the preoccupations of a revolutionary period in the history of Western cartography” (abstract). Discusses, for example, how Sickness is informed by the old medieval T-in-O shaped map as well as by recently discovered territories. Maintains, however, that, although in the poem Donne draws extensively on the medieval tradition and on modern cartographic discoveries, here as well as in other poems, he “does not seem so much interested in geographic exploration as in an exploration of the Self, with its fear of death and hopes of salvation.” Emphasizes that in Sickness, as well as elsewhere, Donne does not “take sides in a scientific debate on the old and the new” but rather uses “both sides for a reflection on the Self.” Notes that, for Donne, “the macrocosm or larger universe appears mostly interesting as a source of imagery to convey ideas on the microcosm or the lesser universe of human body and mind” (47). Comments also on cartographic imagery and its possible sources in HSRound, ValWeep, ElBed, Sat3, Noct, SunRis, and FirAn. Concludes that although, “[a]ll in all, Donne’s poetry denotes an undeniable familiarity with the scientific discoveries and debates of the time and “participates in a general mood of exploration by adopting and adapting scientific references,” his poetry “is not a celebratory one chanting scientific progress, exploration and the discovery of the world” (52).


 Discusses the comical political poem “The Parliament Fart,” a witty parody composed by a group of lawyer-wits who were members of the House of Commons and friends of Donne, namely Richard Martin, John Hoskyns, and Christopher Brooke. Suggests that Donne “may have participated” in the composition of the poem. Notes that a couplet in the poem “closely resembles” his entry on Sir Roger Manwood in The Courtier’s Library (129). Also comments briefly on Donne’s distinction between “witty and sharp” and railing libels.

Examines Donne’s trinitarian theology as reflected in *HSBatter*, *Father*, and *Lit*. Maintains that although Donne “was not remarkable for spiritual gifts and graces that went beyond the experience of the majority of human beings,” he excelled primarily “in his capacity to express in memorable ways and through natural speech common Christian beliefs and common human experience.” Maintains that Donne’s “true subject was the human heart in its relationship to the tripersonal God, to whom and about whom he spoke with an intensity of religious feeling that few poets have surpassed or even rivaled” (201). In support of this claim, discusses in some detail the language, rhetorical paradoxes, imagery, and theology in three poems. Discusses how in *HSBatter*, “[i]n his struggle with his weakness and sin, Donne found the ‘three-personed God’ highly relevant” and saw the Trinity as the “only hope of salvation.” Maintains that the language and content of *Father* is “even more personal” and “more passionate” than that of *HSBatter* (204) and observes that although *Father* is “not fully trinitarian” in that the Holy Spirit is not specifically mentioned, we can see in this poem “how passionately intense Donne’s faith in God is and what he begs from God: the forgiveness of his sins and final deliverance from death.” Claims that *Lit* reflects “how faith in the ‘three-personed God’ was a vital doctrine for Donne, a matter of life and death” (206). Concludes by comparing and contrasting Donne’s trinitarian theology with that of the present-day theologian Jürgen Moltman. Observes that although Donne, unlike Moltman, “never thinks of drawing from the three divine persons-in-relation a fundamental social doctrine for the ordering of Christian and human life,” both men “write about the Trinity with an intense conviction that nothing matters more than the Trinity in the distinctively Christian adventure to which they both witness” (210).


States that the purpose of this essay is “to revise the expression of subjectivity in the poetry of John Donne and Francisco de Quevedo—closely connected to their quality as post-Petrarchan writers—and also to explore two important effects of this singular construction of subjectivity: the complex and ubiquitous relationship with the physical world and the anxiety of permanence” (89). Maintains that both poets “have wrought a mode of subjectivity that announces emergent forms of individual modernity” (91) and argues that their poetry “operates as a kind of synecdochial expression of the construction of subjectivity in early modern poetry, both in England and Spain” (91–92). Maintains that if the two poets “can be regarded as modern poets it is inasmuch as they inherit, and retrieve, that modernity from earlier poetic forms—that is, from Petrarch and his Augustinian ontology of the self—and recreate it in their own way.” Regards Donne and Quevedo as “unique examples of the emergent formation of a self (halfway between an Augustinian inner awareness and a Cartesian supreme expression of individuality) that strives through contradictions and conflict to assert its own identity, often expressed through physical metaphors and the creation of inner spaces in Donne’s and Quevedo’s poetry, beyond other forms of subjectivity in contemporary England and Spain” (94). Terms Donne’s and Quevedo’s stance a “poetics of solipsism” (101) and discusses several of Donne’s love poems as examples, in particular, *Dissol* and *Canon*. Maintains that “[p]oetics in Donne’s and Quevedo’s texts are governed by a solipsistic shift and an unavoidable materialization of experience in imaginary spaces and bodies” (109–10) and that “[t]heir subjective stance, so shockingly modern for many readers, is constructed upon these two dynamics.” Further states that “[a]ll subject matter in their poetry is submitted to this centripetal force, controlled by a subject that strives to affirm its identity within the verbal boundaries of the
poems,” an identity that is “often contradictory and almost always problematic” but that “re-veals a vigorous process of conformation that is also taking place beyond the verbal limits of the text” (110).


Points out that during the 1620s and 1630s there was a rise in private ownership of religious paintings. Comments on Donne’s collection while he was Dean of St. Paul’s. Notes that the paintings were of “a semi-devotional character” and “hung in various places of his London house,” noting that Donne’s will “lists them, and their location.” Finds it strange that although Donne had paintings of the Virgin Mary, Adam and Eve, and St. Mary Magdalen in various rooms, “he did not have a painting of the Crucifixion in his house.” Notes that the “prize of the collection” was a painting by Titian, which Donne gave to the Earl of Carlisle, who, in turn, gave it to Charles I. Points out also that the painting of St. Mary Magdalen was given to Donne by Christopher Brooke and that Donne bequeathed it to George Garrard in 1631. Suggests that the purpose of these paintings was “to keep religious thoughts steadily in mind in daily life” (106).


Presents a general overview of Donne’s life and works. Surveys general characteristics of his secular and devotional poetry, noting how, as a poet, Donne departs from tradition both thematically and stylistically. Notes, for instance, Donne’s uses of anti-Petrarchism; hyperbole, conceits, and far-fetched images; dramatic personae; paradoxes; and metrical roughness and prosodic innovation. Endorses T. S. Eliot’s view that Donne’s poetry synthesizes emotion and thought. Praises also Donne’s sermons as “the best in sermon literature” (61). Notes how “theological language abounds in his love poetry, and daringly erotic images occur in his religious verse.” Calls Donne “the chief influence on English poetry until the onset of neoclassical poetry in England” and notes how Eliot “rehabilitated” Donne in the twentieth century as “one of the greatest English poets ever admired” (62).


Maintains that Donne was “all his life a repressed satirist” (117) but focuses on his formal verse satires. Dates the *Satyres* and maintains that “[t]hough written at different moments over a five- or six-year period, they retroactively create a master narrative: a story of increasing social knowledge and analytic power, of increasing disillusionment, followed by compromise” (120). Comments on the first three satires, “noting in particular how Donne signals their differences from each other by his opening definitions of tone” (121). Maintains that in *Sat5* Donne abandons the genre of formal satire, noting how “[a]s satire it is weaker; as sociopolitical analysis it is stronger and more coherent” (125). Points out that after *Sat5* Donne diverts his satirical instincts into “new, less immediately recognizable forms” (127), citing as examples, *Metem* and parts of *Pseudo-Martyr*. Notes that his letters, however, indicate a continuing interest in “the social function” of satire (128). Observes that, in his later life, Donne spoke of satire as “a negative state of mind which was bad for both Church and State” and alludes to satire in his sermons as “something to be shunned.” Maintains, however, that “even to mention satire in a sermon is to give it a certain negative presence, a shadow in the background, a force still to be reckoned with” (129).

Points out that “[t]he most important fact to keep in mind when considering the texts of John Donne’s writings is that Donne preferred manuscript circulation to print publication for both his prose and his poetry” and that “that preference has significant consequences for the study of his texts.” Explains why Donne “considered the offering of his poetry and prose to the masses under his name a violation of his dignity and gravity as a gentleman” and why he “found the idea of being considered a professional writer offensive” (23). Observes that Donne also avoided print publications because he realized that certain of his poems and prose works “might be found objectionable on moral, political, or theological grounds by current or prospective patrons, up to and including the monarch” (25). Notes that Donne also “valued manuscript publication for aesthetic reasons, for its social cachet, and for the enjoyment he obviously found in personally circulating his works to specific friends and patrons” (26–27). Discusses the complexities of textual transmission in a manuscript culture and discusses the early editions of Donne’s poems and prose. Maintains that, because of the many variant readings found in the early manuscripts, modern readers, when reading Donne, “must readjust their thinking about what constitutes a ‘work;’ not invariably conceiving of it as a single text (and successive revisions of it therefore as merely strivings toward that ultimate text), but instead conceiving of a ‘work’ as a series of authorial texts in which changes have been made either simply for the sake of change or as ongoing adaptations to the expectations of specific readers” (33).


Discusses early modern low opinion of and ingr-ectives against medical theory and practice. Points out that for Donne “one of the central, and increasingly controversial aspects of medical practice—astrology—stands in for the uncertainty of the art as a whole” (10).


Explores Donne’s “uniquely rhetorical approach to scripture.” Observes that, for Donne, “what delights most in scripture is its eloquence, which is not, ultimately, what makes scripture worthwhile” since “its ultimate worth is to be found in its message or truth.” For Donne “[p]leasing and delightful style are accidents of the Truth of scripture” and that “as accidents are to be used, not enjoyed, by readers” (120). Discusses how “[t]he theme of the rhetorical efficiency of interpretation and right use of spiritual things” as well as “the corresponding spatial and narrative metaphors, run throughout Donne’s sermons” and how “[d]espite their metaphoric language and rhetorical sophistication Donne’s sermons always remain centered on the literal level of interpretation” (121). Notes that “[p]ower, both secular and religious, has a privileged place in Donne’s sermons” and that one of his primary goals is “the development of rhetorical language which would allow for the discussion of God, a conception of language (or a logology) which took into consideration God’s creative power and ‘ineffability.’” In other words, maintains that Donne regarded “the study of the divine as in some way a study of language” (122). Maintains that Donne’s “metaphorical exegetical style was performative, meant to embellish his lesson, not to render it more obscure” (123). Discusses Donne’s uses of typology in his sermons.


Introduces a special issue of the JDJ devoted to
literature and music edited by Peterson. Points out that “[m]usic was a force to be reckoned with in the age of Donne” and that the essays in this collection “view music of the period from a number of perspectives, offering provocative glimpses of how Donne’s contemporaries felt about music as well as how Renaissance music made itself felt in its own day and even in the postmodern period down to the present” (1).


In Russian. In a discussion of the nature of baroque wit, contrasts the major characteristics of the emblem and the conceit and contrasts how Donne and Herbert employed both in their poetry. Comments on how Donne developed elements of the emblematic image into intellectual and logical conceits.


Comments on Joseph Brodsky’s “The Great Elegy to John Donne,” written in 1963, “at a time when Brodsky knew very little of Donne and when his English was still at a rather ‘rudimentary’ stage.” Maintains, therefore, that the poem “tells us more about Brodsky than it does about Donne.” Claims, however, that the elegy is “probably Brodsky’s finest poem” (95). Points out how in the elegy Brodsky draws an analogy between himself and Donne as poets. Traces in Brodsky’s poetry “the diminishing curve of his poetic inspiration over time, a progressive decline in emotional power” (109).


Surveys Donne’s life and works and comments on existing portraits of him. Says that Donne was “the first poet in English whose life was regarded as both sufficiently extraordinary and usefully emblematic to be made into a biography” and that his life, “if disputable in the particular, remains, in the aggregate, more vividly imaginable than that of almost any other writer in early modern England” (1).


Explains how “joy and joylessness were of peculiar interest to early Protestant theology and the literature it produced” and offers “an explanation of why this is so.” Observes that for Protestants “joy serves as a countervailing, centripetal force, a sign and surety of adhesion to God and neighbor,” i.e., joy is a sign of the soul’s salvation and is “a proof or ‘earnest’ of its sanctification by the Holy Spirit” (45). Points out that, “[c]onversely, joylessness came to be seen as a sign of the Spirit’s absence from the life of the individual believer and from the corporate Church” (44). Observes that Donne “devotes five full sermons, and parts of several others, to the duty and prospect of joy” (56), noting how his sermons on joy “aimed not only to save the English from a general cheerlessness but also to keep them, more particularly, from theological bickering over God’s relation to man.” Discusses Donne’s late sermon on 1 Thessalonians 5:16 as the “clearest formulation” of his theology of joy (57) and emphasizes that he considers joy as “the consolidating force” in a unified Church of England (59). Compares Donne’s views on joy with those of Spenser.


Comments on the reasons for Donne’s praise of the translation of the psalms by Philip and Mary Sidney in Sidney and on his understanding of psalms as seen in his poems and sermons. Discusses three Renaissance assumptions about David and the psalms that surely
influenced Donne: (1) that David was closely associated with Orpheus and other ancient musicians “whose harmonies produced astonishing ‘effects’”; (2) that “according to a number of authorities, these effects can be both spiritual and physical”; and (3) that “the most famous example of David’s musical prowess was his ability to harp away King Saul’s melancholy.” Shows how each of these topics is “relevant” to Donne and “helps further explain his praise of the Sidneys” (7). For instance, points out how Donne would have agreed with many medieval authorities who thought that music “both represents and helps organize concord in the individual body, among embodied persons, and in Christ’s own body, the Church” (25). Observes that although Donne does not specifically mention in Sidney David’s “most celebrated musical effect,” he, like other early modern poets, was well-aware that the psalmist by his music had cured King Saul (25). Notes that although by the time he wrote Sidney, Donne “did not, probably, seriously think of James as a Saul,” it would be “strange if the thought had never crossed his mind” (34). Concludes that “loving music, informed about Renaissance medicine, conscious of the ties between body and soul/spirit, and returning to the psalms over and over in his sermons, “ Donne “could hardly have failed to warm to the image of the psalmist harping away a demon by means of harmonies, that if rediscovered by modern poets or musicians, might establish a less corrupt and more iredic Christendom” (35).


Discusses how the English refused until 1752 to adopt the Gregorian calendar first promulgated in 1582 and how for many years “the gap between the two calendars produced complaints about confusion in chronology,” how “wits used the two calendars for clever conceits,” and how Protestants “made sarcastic comments” on Pope Gregory’s reform (abstract). Comments briefly on how Donne makes witty use of the two calendars and the confusion of dates in Ignatius, the sermons, Noct, and Annun. Says that Donne “plays the Gregorian calendar for laughs” (7).


Comments on the Courtier’s Library as an example of the curiosity spoof, in this instance, a “sort of bluffer’s guide to erudition” (97). Discusses how many of the items in the work are “purely amusing” but that others are “far from comic.” Points out that “[t]his learned spoof is tartly acidulated with exact and vengeful scorn against the named authors of various religious and political outrages, and especially Protestant enforcers and informers” (98). Suggests that “[t]his library of bad memories, regrets, stupidities, insults and horrors ultimately makes melancholy and uncomfortable reading” (99). Contrasts the Courtier’s Library with Thomas Browne’s Musaeum Clausum.


In Chinese. Points out that the major feature of Donne’s poetry is the unification of thought and feeling, i.e., the union of philosophy and passion. Discusses very briefly the emotional tension in Donne’s early love poetry and his uses of metaphysical conceits.


Discusses the interaction between satire and science in Donne’s poetry. Points out that although Donne was essentially skeptical of the new science and often denounced it, most notably in FirAn and Ignatius, he often borrowed scientific images from medicine, geometry, astronomy, and even alchemy. Shows how “[t]he
Satirical treatment is all the more subtle in the poems as Donne subverts the scientific image and turns it into a satirical tool.” Argues that, “[c]onversely, satire itself can be considered as a mirroring tool in the representational process.” Notes, for instance, how the conceit is “most illustrative as it works as a magnifying glass.” Observes how Donne “explains that it is impossible to know the world by means of reason, imagination being the only way to grasp it” (abstract).


Presents a brief, general introduction to Donne and his poetry. Points out that Donne’s poems are “both intellectual and sensual, celebrating love both human and divine with ironic ingenuity” and that most of his poems “radiate joy in the potential of the English language” (27). Selects, as examples, SGo, SunRis, Anniv, ValMourn, Lect, HSDeath, and a passage from “Meditation 17” in Devotions—without notes or commentary.


Maintains that Margaret Edson’s play Wit has “a macrostructure that is itself conceitlike.” Shows how the play “establishes contrasts, similarities, contrasts within similarities, and further similarities within the contrasts,” thereby “both dramatizing and interrogating wit and its instrument, conceit.” Analyzes “the operation of this complex configuration in the relations between the two main physical-institutional spaces of the play (the hospital and the university); between both and the world of language, with its manifestation in two opposed yet parallel intertexts; and in the self-reflexive dramatization of the theatre\life analogy.” Maintains that “[t]he effect of these conceitlike techniques is to bridge the gulf between oppo-

sites, transforming ‘insuperable barriers’ into thresholds” (abstract).


Presents a chronology of Donne’s life (21–22), followed by selections from the Songs and Sonnets (23–44), the Elegies and Sappho (45–53), Sat3 (53–55), several verse letters (56–63), lines from FirAn (63–69), selections from the Holy Sonnets (69–75), and Goodf with three hymns (75–79)—with explanatory notes and glosses on the individual poems. Presents also textual notes (690–91) and in the “Criticism” section (721–979), presents selections from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century as well as more recent criticism on seventeenth-century poetry in general as well as several selections specifically on Donne. Concludes with a selected bibliography (971–79) and an index (981–999).


A commemorative sermon honoring a Norwegian pietist, Hans Nielsen Hauge (1771–1824), in which Hauge is compared and contrasted with Donne. Maintains that both men are similar in their ability “to communicate,” “to be successful within their own secular trades,” and “in their love of God and life” but that they differ “in the expression of their faith” and in “their use of mood and words” (144). Concludes that Hauge and Donne “followed their own piety”: Hauge “used prose and a passion for souls” while Donne “spoke in poetry and with a passion for relationship” (145–46).


In “Introduction: The Desire of Criticism and the Criticism of Desire (Part I)” (1–37), explains that the purpose of this study is “to shed
light not only on the specific nature of Donnean desire but also on the role played by readerly desire within interpretive practice” and to explicate “the intellectual principles that unify the disparate materials” in the following chapters. Points out that the argument of the book can be reduced to three basic positions: (1) “Literary desire is shaped as much by desire as by historical, cultural, and institutional contexts” (2); (2) “Donne’s poetry and the responses it has inspired together provide a uniquely appropriate site for such investigation”; and (3) “[t]he unique challenges of the Donnean text also demonstrate the necessity of formulating a critical practice self-conscious about the destabilizing effects of its own desire, which at the same time refuses to subsume aesthetic questions entirely into the categories of the social and historical.” Maintains, therefore, that “problems raised by Donne and Donne criticism can help us to understand the function and value of literary criticism in a poststructuralist universe” (3). In Chapter 1, “Donne’s ‘Fore-Skinne’: Desire and the Seventeenth-Century Reader” (38–58), discusses “some of the ways in which Donne was produced as an object of interpretive desire for seventeenth-century readers” (38). Comments on the arrangement of the poems in the 1633 and 1635 editions and discusses in detail Thomas Browne’s elegy on Donne that appeared only in the first edition, which praises the contiguity of Donne’s erotic and sacred poems in the edition. Suggests that “[b]y forcing us to confront distant and distinctly different notions of devotional eroticism, and by forcing us to acknowledge the readerly capacity to take an eroticized devotional pleasure in the text, Browne also invites us to take a fresh delight in Donne’s most familiar disorder” (58). In Chapter 2, “Donne’s ‘Friendship’: Desire, Convention, and Transgression” (59–91), develops “questions of literary interpretation, devotional eroticism, and historical change” by “focusing on the conflicting interpretive desires of twentieth-century readers and particularly on the desire to reproduce Donne as a ‘transgressive’ figure.” Challenges this position, especially as seen by some recent critics of Donne’s early verse letters “by means of some recent scholarly analyses of the early modern slippage between the classically inspired discourse of male friendship and the theological/legal discourses of sodomy.” Shows how the early verse letters “can inform our understanding of some more canonically familiar and putatively ‘transgressive’ works,” such as the Holy Sonnets (59). In Chapter 3, “Donne’s ‘Irregularity’: Desire’s Measure” (90–112), discusses “historical transformations in the literary-critical practice of prosodic evaluation, retheorizing the concept of meter in order to make some proposals about the long-standing interpretive desire for a ‘regular’ Donne” (92). In Chapter 4, “Difference and Indifference: Fantasies of Gender” (113–46), considers Donne’s “response to the ‘facts’ of sexual difference” and explores “his variously inflected expressions of both female desire and desire for the female.” Argues that Donne “collapses distinctions based on sexual difference at least as often as he reinscribes those distinctions,” and suggests “some speculative conclusions, both historical and psychological in character, as to why this might be so” (114). In Chapter 5, “All or Nothing: The Possibility of Love” (147–84), considers Donne’s “poetic attempts to theorize desire through and against the work” of Lacan to demonstrate how Donne’s “theorizations of desire are at least as sophisticated as those of the twentieth century” (147). Reads Donne alongside Lacan “rather than simply through him” (148). Argues that Donne is “not only as intellectually sophisticated but also less prescriptive than Lacan in providing an understanding of the dialectic of subject-other relations, particularly as the dialectic emerges in the emotional condition that we give the name of ‘love’” (178–79). In “Conclusion: The Desire of Criticism and the Criticism of Desire (Part II)” (185–206), explores “in greater depth some of the implications that emerge from acknowledging the centrality of desire to interpretive practice” (186) and maintains that “the history of literary criticism can be productively reread as an unfolding story about a changing relationship between intellectual inquiry and desire,” i.e., “as a story about the effects of a gradual ‘recognition of desire’ (in the Lacanian sense)
on those who produce literary knowledge” (187). In “Postscript: Never Donne” (205–206), comments on why the “critic’s work is never done” (205) and expresses a hope that he will never “be done desiring Donne” and says that “criticism is the given name of a structure of fantasy” ensuring that he will “never have to be” (206). Concludes with notes (209–44) and an index ([245]-48).

Reviews:


Discusses how in Eclog, through “the divided consciousness” of Idios and Allophanes, Donne “plays on the antithesis between the voluntary gift and the gift demanded by court and king, between the denial of self-interest and the desire for reward, and between the attempt to withdraw from a morally dubious occasion and the implication in that immorality that celebrating it brings” (159). Maintains that if we fail to recognize “the contradictions and aberrations revealed and negotiated in the epithalamion—particularly the tensions between individual choice and social obligation—then we fail to comprehend the political and rhetorical complexity of Donne’s gift” (159–60). Argues that in Eclog Donne “fashioned his gift ‘for the . . . purpose of doing what ought to be done,’ within the context of Jacobean patronage” and maintains that “[t]he difficulties and demands of exchanging gifts within that context, and particularly upon this controversial and morally precarious occasion, accentuate the conflict within the Epithalamium.” Observes how “[c]onflicts between obligation and choice, between giving altruistically and giving out of self-interest, are pivotal to the potency of the poem as a gift effectively received by many more influential people than it was ostensibly given to.” Points out how in the poem Donne meets “the challenge of giving (praise) correctly to a subject who was widely derided and, on an occasion, nothing short of scandalous” (160). Shows how “the expression of the poet’s inability to escape the duty of participating in the ‘common joy’ of the occasion,” echoed throughout the poem, “detaches Donne somewhat from the subject he addresses,” while still allowing the poem “to maintain the appearance of a gift of praise” (161). Discusses also how Donne, who perhaps hoped that his poem would win him a court office from the king or by means of Somerset’s intervention, was aware of the danger of alienating his other patrons if his praise of the marriage were not subtle and ambiguous; thus he presents himself in the poem as “a passive rather than aggressive pursuer of Carr’s sponsorship, guarding against anticipated criticism by emphasizing his subjection of the king” and by stressing how “his own offering pales into insignificance once the grand scale of general praise and celebration is considered” (163). Surveys also other literary gifts for the Somerset wedding by Chapman, Campion, Bacon, and Jonson, comparing and contrasting their poems with Eclog.


Maintains that the “explosion of interest” in the metaphysical poets and other seventeenth-century poets has not received the scholarly attention it deserves. Therefore, surveys “the background of the revival: the cultural and religious politics that shape mid-century commentary on the metaphysicals.” Examines, in particular, Coleridge’s marginalia, “which rehabilitate the poets, especially Donne.” Then presents an overview of the criticism of such critics as Gosse, Symons, Meynell, Thompson, and Johnson, “tracing similarities and differences among aesthetic and decadent visions of the seventeenth century.” Concludes by suggesting several areas of the fin-de-siècle metaphysical revival that need further investigation (abstract).

Lists editions and texts of Donne's works; bibliographies and a concordance; biographies of Donne; selected monographs on Donne; collections of critical essays on Donne; other monographs and collections featuring Donne; books and essays on Donne and metaphysical poetry; background studies of religion and politics and of philosophy and the new science; studies of language, logic, genre (and Petrarchism) in Donne's works; discussions of Donne and the visual arts; studies in gender, sexuality, and subjectivity; discussions of coteries, audience, and manuscript studies; works on Donne's influence and afterlife, as well as comparative author studies; critical studies of individual works (*Anniversaries*, *Divine Poems*, *Elegies*, *Epigrams*, *Epithalamions*, *Epicedes*, and *Obsequies*, prose works, *Songs and Sonnets*, and verse letters); and journals and electronic resources for the study of Donne.


Discusses Donne's comments on Jews and Judaism, particularly as these are developed in his sermons. Suggests that possibly in his sermon on the churching of the Countess of Bridgewater Donne was responding to Sir Henry Finch's *The World's Great Restauration*, or, *The Calling of the Jews* (March 1621), which, among other things, argued for a restoration of the land of Israel to the Jews. Comments on how Finch's book caused "a polemical focus on Jews and their restoration in London in the spring and summer of 1621" (37). Points out, however, that Donne's "interest in the topic of restoration of the Jews to a temporal homeland subsequent to their conversion is evident already in several sermons published earlier in the year" (41), sermons in which he rejects the visionary notion of Zionism. Discusses how Donne's sermons often show him to be "conflicted in his attitudes" toward Jews (46) and warns that it is "unwise to generalize broadly about early modern attitudes to Jews or to Judaism expressed in sermons" (49). Calls Donne "a Christian Hebraist and ceremoniologist" and points out how often his sermons employed Jewish knowledge and traditions (50).


Maintains that, "[f]or Donne, as for his contemporaries, Christianity held an absolute monopoly of religious truth" and was not "merely part of religion, but the whole" (65). Investigates "what sort of Christian" Donne was, assesses "the nature of the journey he undertook from Catholicism to conformity," and traces his "developing views on ecclesiology, the Christian religion as outwardly expressed in the Church" (69). Discusses Donne, therefore, both as a Catholic and as a Protestant and maintains that "from the very beginning of his career in the Church of England, Donne was part of a group of divines who were trying to adopt a more moderate and irenic approach towards the Church of Rome" (76). Discusses Donne's complex response to the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, a major tenet of the Reformed Church, and comments on how he was a "moderate infralapsarian, uncomfortable with the high Calvinist emphasis on reprobation and the accompanying doctrine of limited atonement." Points out that Donne's "emotionally charged interest in finding common ground between the denominations comes out, perhaps, most strongly in all his letters and verse" (78). Discusses, in particular, how Donne's religious verse and his verse about religion "employ polemical female personifications of the Church," noting how in place of "the apprehension that religious choice may lead to dam-
nation” in Sat3, we are left in HSShow “with the image of religious inclusiveness as sexual indiscriminancy.” Concludes that “[p]erhaps no English poet has ever been so conscious of the dark side of religion” (80).


Points out that Grierson in his 1912 edition of Donne's poems follows the Dowden manuscript rather than nearly all the early printed editions in rendering the last two lines of Canon “Countries, Townes, Courts: Beg from above/ A patterne of your love,” rather than “our love,” noting that most major editors of Donne since 1912 have accepted Grierson's reading. Argues, however, that “Grierson's reading of the poem, and the grammatical construction that enables it, ignores not only crucial textual elements throughout the poem, but also a major thematic impetus throughout the corpus of Donne's amatory poetry” (160), i.e., “the intimate relation between politics and love.” Following a “straightforward” reading of the first four stanzas of Canon, considers “the two possible constructions of the final stanza in the light of this context, highlighting the political dimension of the poem Grierson's construction overlooks” (161). Maintains that such a reading has “the benefit of accounting for the tension between an idealistic rejection of court and the pragmatic ambitions for courtly advancement that so obviously characterized Donne's life and art” (164).


Surveys the fluctuating critical approach to Donne sermons and maintains that in recent years there has been a shift to an emphasis on Donne's ethos in the sermon, a shift that involves “examining Donne's sermonizing role not so much for its bearing on biography as for its efficacy in making an argument cogent and persuasive to an audience” (191). Argues that Donne's “sermonizing ethos” is, in fact, “a masterful creation” that incorporates “his individuality as poet and priest into a large identity consonant with his interpretation of Christian doctrine.” Maintains that this role is “also consistent with a dense and complicated style that has both troubled and fascinated readers through the centuries.” In particular, argues that “Donne's ethos, while reflecting a penitential stance that has misled some readers, could have been fashioned to reveal his priestly view of Christ, whose image as 'Delegate of the Trinity' extends beyond the Gospel into the whole of Scripture and catholic tradition” (187).


Praises Donne as “a marvel with language,” “a heavenly magician with the pen,” and a writer with the ability “to put to paper what most of humanity can only feel somewhere deep within but not express.” Discusses HSBatter and HSDeath as offering “the divine view of suffering, pain, and ultimate purpose” (33). Points out how in HSBatter Donne maintains that “God's radical and disastrous acts on our behalf become the very means of our salvation” (36) and how in HSDeath he makes clear that death “does not have the last word” (37). Relates the themes of both poems to the suffering caused in 2005 by Hurricane Katrina on the Gulf Coast and encourages his readers to have courage and hope.


Finds possible echoes of the fourteenth-century Carmelite Richard Maidstone's Penitential Psalms in Goodf. Maintains that “the drama Maidstone suggests between human consciousness and divine acknowledgement seems to resonate in the anguished voice of the traveler” in Goodf (116). Notes also that Donne
preached three sets of sermons on the penitential psalms.


Calls ElPerf a “literary work that is a cornucopia of images and ideas associated with the imaginary of perfume.” Discusses briefly how in the poem perfume functions as a symbol for the lady and as a metaphor for the speaker’s “erotic relationship with her, a surrogate he can much more easily and safely criticize than the flesh-and-blood woman it encompasses.” Explains how the perfume, “once friend but now enemy” (48), betrays the speaker to the woman’s father. Observes that the image of perfume in ElPerf “has many features and aspects that in future centuries would continue to be expressed and represented in poetry, fiction, painting, glass design, advertising, and the collective imagination of European culture in general.” Points out how perfume in Donne’s poem “signifies love and sexual union; it embodies illusion, treachery, betrayal, and subterfuge; it is base, materialist, and even excremental; it is a medium of communication; and, finally, it is both a reality and the mere semblance of a reality, a substance without substance” (49).


Observes that Donne “revised some of his poems over the course of time, some of them more than once” and that “these revised versions circulated side by side with the originals, begetting strains of authentic variation within the surrounding sea of error” (299). For example, shows how an “analysis of the artifactual record” of Sat3 “yielded a fascinating multi-stage picture in which Donne could be seen to have revisited the poem repeatedly as he adjusted the text for aesthetic, theological, and (perhaps) political reasons” (302). Discusses evidence for and reasoning behind claiming Donne’s revisions in other poems, such as Eclog, ElBrac, ElPerf, ElJea, ElAut, Sappho, and the Holy Sonnets. From this study, concludes that Donne “changes individual words (sometimes a great many of them, as in, ‘Satire III’) in order to adjust a concept or an image; or that he rearranges a sequence (as with the epigrams and the Holy Sonnets), investing individual poems with different shades of meaning that arise from their altered position within the sequence” (313).


Presents a biographical study of Donne that is divided into three main chronological sections—1572–1602, 1603–1616, and 1617–1631, preceded by an introduction (xiii–xxvi) and followed by an afterword (475–78), notes (476–528), suggestions for further readings (529–34), acknowledgements (535–36), and an index (537–63). Argues that Donne’s life and writings “provide us with an almost uniquely articulate commentary on the social, moral and intellectual dilemmas of his age” (476). Emphasizes Donne’s Catholic background, his progressive moving away from the faith of his fathers, and his embracing of the reformed church. Calls Donne “one of the most sophisticated but also most genuine defenders of the English Reformation” (xxiv). Says that Donne ultimately regarded “the established Protestant Church with the English monarch at its head” as “the true Catholic Church.” Stresses that “Donne’s interpretation of the English Reformation is simultaneously a defence of his personal Reformation, his ongoing conversion to Protestantism” (xxv). Reads much of Donne’s poetry and prose for autobiographical insights.

Reviews:

• Anon. in Economist (Sept. 9, 2006): 80.
John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1996–2012


Argues that medicinal cannibalism was “closely integrated with many underlying medical theories in the modern period” and that “the phenomenon sheds valuable light on the authority of learned medicine, attitudes to cannibalism and to the often emphatically spiritual basis of Paracelsian medicine.” Shows that, although “widely accepted by patients and practitioners, corpse medicine was legitimised by a mixture of potentially incompatible factors, including rarity, spiritual virtue, learned authority and commercial normalisation” and that “[a]s circumstances changed, these factors would ultimately undermine a once mainstream medical treatment” (225). Points out that Donne refers to mummy in his poems and sermons “without any trace of unease” (227). Observes, however, that although Donne’s “apparent belief in mummy is complicated slightly by his Catholic origins, we know that he had a strong, albeit ambivalent, interest in Paracelsian ideas” (231).


In Japanese. Discusses Donne’s sermon on the Gunpowder Plot, observing how he accuses the perpetrators of the plot and defends James I by means of typology. Shows how Donne regards the king as an antitype of Josiah, the “anointed of the Lord,” and the plot itself as an antitype of the “pit” in Lamentations iv: 20. Points out that Donne claims that, as the kingdom of Israel recovered, so similarly the monarchy of James I will flourish in spite of the rebellion.


Discusses Donne’s obsession with death and why it was “so powerful an imaginative tool” in his works (217). Points out that Donne “does not long to perpetuate his life on earth so much as to ensure his redemption after death” and, therefore, death was for him both “a dreadful prospect and an essential phase in his path to eternal salvation” (218). Comments on Donne’s views on death in his letters, Biathanatos, Christ, several of the Songs and Sonets, Devotions, and the sermons, especially “Death’s Duell.” Maintains that what Donne dreads most of all about death is “the period that the corpse spends in the grave” and “the process of dissolution and putrefaction to which the body will be subjected.” Says that “the depth of his concerns can be traced to his worries over the logistical problems of returning from so decayed a condition to the necessary perfection of the resurrected body” (221).
1229. -----. “Traducing the Soul: Donne’s Second Anniversary,” PMLA 121, no. 5: 1493–1508.

Maintains that “throughout his life Donne struggled to make sense of death” and that “although in his devotional writings he celebrates the ascension of the soul, he never abandons his conviction that the separation of body and soul is an unnatural division of the self” (1493). Points out that his understanding of death “as a difficult process for the soul as well as for the body runs counter to the basic tenets of English Protestantism, and that when Donne gives voice to this belief, he is particularly careful in its expression” (1493–94). Says that SecAn “comes closest to providing an explanation for why the soul feels so strong an attachment to the flesh it is meant to leave behind, an explanation that turns on an unorthodox account of the soul’s origin.” Discusses how in SecAn Donne “simultaneously rehearses and rejects the traditional wisdom of Western metaphysics about human dualism” and explains how the poem “borrows heavily from the Pauline notion of the body as the prison house for the soul.” Observes, however, that “the soul loves the body all the same” and, therefore, is reluctant to leave the body. Argues that “this is the disposition of the soul that Donne’s poem records, a disposition so unexpected in its violation of normative Christian belief that it has until now escaped our critical eye” (1494). Examines Donne’s belief in the corporeal origin of the soul and explains how SecAn “describes an unhappy and begrudging parting between soul and body,” which contrasts strikingly with the traditional Christian concept that “celebrates the soul’s liberation at the moment of death” (1497). Concludes that what Donne believed and what SecAn “overwhelmingly confirms,” is that “only the meeting of the immortal soul and the invulnerable body satisfies his deepest aspiration for the afterlife” (1506–07).


Discusses how Donne in his love poetry “often uses references to Catholic practices and rituals, including pilgrimage, to describe a lover’s falseness, or, at times, an aspiring courtier’s superficiality” and claims that “in doing so he displays the conventional English suspicion” of the “deceptive shows of Catholicism.” Stresses, however, how Donne “turns that suspicion from a grave Spenserian theological use to a playful satiric one” (110–11). Observes that “in love poems that describe not rejected but reciprocal passion, Donne subsumes the language of reverential pilgrimage, as well as language borrowed from transubstantial eucharistic celebration, to a religious celebration of eros” (111). Maintains that in these poems the Eucharist is “either thwarted or gloriously arrived at is erotic sacrament.” Argues, however, that in Donne’s divine poetry “flesh is no sacrament, but a thing that, in its decay, preaches its own insufficiency” and that the “poet’s body is not a vehicle for, and participant in redemption, but a mere map of the sacred, one which identifies the contours of a holy landscape, but also signifies that landscape’s distance from what can be spiritually approached and known” (112). Maintains that Donne’s sacred poems are “straightforward and even conventional in their condemnation of place or shrine pilgrimage and saints’ idolatry” (122) and that in them he “turns body to navigational chart through mediating the flesh in verse which, unlike his poems of idolatrous eros, divest that flesh of sacramental value” (131). Claims that by treating the body as a map, Donne “stresses its absolute separateness from God” (132).


Response to Katherine Duncan-Jones’s review of John Stubbs’s Donne: The Reformed Soul (2006). Points out that the variorum edition of Donne’s poetry (being published by Indiana University Press) has been underway by scholars not only from the United States but also from Canada, England, the Netherlands, and Japan for the past twenty years and is flourishing.

In Turkish. Examines Donne’s fascination with death, commenting on “how he attempts to domesticate it by considering every aspect of it” and “how he tries to convince himself that it is no worse than sleep or parting or dying on the stage.” Discusses how Donne writes poems or sermons about death “in order to re-channel and neutralize his fears and to minimize death” and concludes that Donne “chooses to believe that death is better than living” since it is “a way to be united with God” (161).


Discusses the symbolic uses of the circle and a cycling rhythm pattern in ValMourn, noting, in particular, how the compass image “explicitly demonstrates the ways in which a circle is representative of pure and spiritual love” (48). Compares and contrasts Donne’s use of the circle to Vaughan’s in “The World,” with Marvell’s in “The Definition of Love,” and with Herbert’s in “The Search.”


Reports that the National Portrait Gallery has started an appeal for funds (1.65 million pounds) to buy the Lothian portrait of Donne. Points out that the painting was originally given by Donne to Robert Ker, an ancestor of Lord Lothian, and remained in the family collection until it re-emerged in 1959. Notes that if the National Gallery is successful in obtaining the portrait, it would “become the focus of a new display in its Tudor Gallery alongside portraits of Ben Jonson, William Shakespeare and Michael Drayton, creating the most important group of early British author portraiture.”


In Chinese. Discusses the tension reflected in both the language and imagery of Donne’s erotic poems and maintains that this tension reflects the anxiety and conflicts in Donne’s “innermost heart” (abstract).


2nd edition: 2011

Pays homage to Donne by adapting or intermingling themes and lines from Donne’s poetry into her own original poems and by writing poems based on his poetry.


Points out that the code name for the first testing of the atomic bomb was “Trinity,” a name Oppenheimer chose based on HSBatter. Notes that at the time Oppenheimer “apparently had been contemplating” the sonnet (57).


Explores the diversity of the homiletical tradition of the Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by comparing and contrasting sermons on the Song of Songs by Donne, George Giff ord, and Richard Sibbes. Observes how Donne’s sermon is “highly crafted” (54), noting, for examples, how it differs from those by Giff ord and Sibbes in being shaped by “an external standard, rather than being contingent upon the scriptural text” and by the complexity and richness of its style (56). Notes how in his sermon Donne uses long sentences with many subclauses; employs much repetition and parallelism; and uses many extended metaphors and similes and other rhetorical and linguistic devices. Maintains that the sermons by Giff ord and Sibbes are clearly
“plainer in both style and language,” but argues that “the differences are not so much those of extremes as of different stages on a continuum, with significant overlap between them” (58). Discusses also how each of the preachers differs in his uses of scripture, the Church Fathers, and Latin and Greek quotations. Concludes that the distinctions commonly held by scholars between Anglican and Puritan preachers of the period “largely hold true” but that “nevertheless there is a greater degree of overlap than might be supposed from much of the literature” and that this overlap suggests that “at least in the early stages of its post-Reformation identity,” the Church of England was able to encompass a rather large “measure of diversity” (61).


Briefly comments on Donne’s response to contemporary drama. Comments on Amic, the Latin poem Donne contributed to Jonson’s Volpone in 1607, in which Donne “applauds the success of Jonson’s stupendous ambition to surpass the glory and moral power of ancient dramatic poetry” (125). Notes that “both his known dramatic allusions in English concern Tamburlaine,” specifically to the caging of Bajazeth in Calm and in a prose letter probably addressed to the Countess of Bedford. Claims that although these allusions “do not refer explicitly to Marlowe’s play,” Donne “must have been aware that many of his readers would make the connection immediately.” Notes that both allusions “re-cast Tamburlaine as a cruel, impersonal, and relentless force of nature rather than of heaven, one that confines and threatens the speaker” (49). Suggests, furthermore, that Donne’s allusions to Tamburlaine “may also have something to do with the challenges of achieving success in the world of patronage and preferment, a world that he did like to compare to the theatre” (49–50). Says Donne sees himself as “a victim of Tamburlaine who suffers and resists,” as one “oppressed by but unbowed by a Tamburlainian regime of society as well as weather” (50). Observes that in the 1590s “the theatre, lyric, and playgoers’ amorous practice animated one another” and suggests that this relationship comes to fruition in the Songs and Sonnets (133).


Maintains that, for Donne, “devotion and writing were inseparable” and that “[h]is belief in God was so profoundly word-centered that, in both his theology and his experience, the practice of religious contemplation and spiritual communion with God always and inevitably involved language.” Discusses, therefore, how he “felt called to use his own prodigious linguistic gifts for the purposes of religious devotion and instruction” (149), paying particular attention to the Holy Sonnets and Corona, his occasional meditations in verse, Devotions, and three hymns and “examining the relationship of writing and devotion” in these works (150). Comments on how Donne’s religious poetry “draws the reader into its passionate dialogues with God by means of outspoken wit, dynamic questioning, and an almost tangible sense of ‘Despair behind, and death before’” and “intrigues us with the continuing puzzle of Donne’s ecclesiastical allegiances” (155). Maintains that the “paradoxical and unstable qualities of Donne’s devotional writing are, ultimately, the key to its rhetorical power and its implicit hopefulness” (165).


In a study of “the presence of conversion as an intense experience and creative stimulus in a
wide range of early modern English texts” (86), comments on Goodf, Donne’s “extended poetic meditation on ‘turning’ to God” that focuses on “the crucifixion, source of the ‘endless day’ of salvation” (90). Points out how “[t]he passivity of individual existence, a basic premise of the trope of conversion,” is emphasized in Goodf, and notes how in this poem “full of turning objects—spheres, the earth, the soul—the persona at the centre turns away from the crucifixion,” but that “in the closing lines he claims that this anti-conversion is only a preparation for the eventual conversion” (91).


Catalogue of a series of original prints. Calls the series “a never ending work” like Corona. Praises Donne’s poems as “dazzling” and says that she has always read them as if Donne were “speaking so directly” to her and “to his God.” Admits she does not fully understand the poems but that she finds “deep connections with his use of imagery, his use of paradox, his obsessions with death and his ability to pay attention to both the small and the majestic.” Says: “I have aphorically imagined that John Donne has brought all of this to bear upon my landscapes of the north west.” The exhibition was held at Moree Plains Gallery Sept. 8 to Oct. 23, 2006. Catalogue by David Hobba.


An original poem with a reference to Donne.

1244. Xiong, Yi. [Harmony in variation—Deconstruction of the petrarchan sonnet by Donne’s poetry.] Journal of Huaihua University 25, no. 4: 117–18.

In Chinese. Comments on Donne’s originality in his treatment of the sonnet form, pointing out how he manipulates language, emotion, and sound to deconstruct the traditional Petrarch form.


In Chinese. Analyzes features of intermediacy in Donne and in his poetry from a postmodernist perspective by means of semiotics and the “literal-reading of New Criticism” in order “to make a creative survey of the postmodernity of Donne.” Maintains that by his wit and use of conceits Donne created a “particular metaphorical world,” in which “text pieces are knitted and then presented to readers.” Argues that Donne’s “spirit was in implosion, featured with intermediacy, namely, a great uncertainty.” (English summary)


Presents a general introduction to metaphysical poetry and to Donne’s love poems that includes Dr. Johnson’s and Dryden’s comments on metaphysical poetry (100–01), a discussion of the nature and function of Donne’s conceits with examples drawn from the poems (101–03), and Helen Gardner’s definition of metaphysical poetry (103). Discusses with examples three major strains in Donne’s love poetry—the passionate, cynical, anti-Petrarchism of his early poems; the Platonic posturing of his poems to high-born ladies; and the less-artificial, purer love poems that were perhaps addressed to his wife (104–06). Comments on and discusses examples of the dramatic quality of the love poems (106–10), notes the courtly tone of the verse letters and funeral elegies (110–11), and briefly surveys the religious poems (111–12). Discusses the “harmful” and the “beneficial” influence of Donne’s poetry on later poets and points out Browning’s admiration of Donne (113). Thereafter presents critical analyses of
and explanatory commentary on *GoodM, SGo, Under, SunRis*, and *Canon* (114–25). Concludes with two “important questions” followed by answers (125–32): (1) “Donne’s genius, temperament, and learning gave to his love poems certain qualities which immediately arrested attention” or “Illustrate the great variety of mood and tone in the love poems of Donne,” and (2) “Do you think that there are any elements of modernity in the poetry of John Donne?” or “Discuss the contemporary appeal of Donne’s poetry.”


In Chinese. Maintains that Donne’s love poetry is “deeply influenced” by the view that women should be subordinate to men. Points out that in many poems Donne challenges “women’s loyalty and constancy” and analyzes several poems, especially *Flea*, that reveal Donne’s male chauvinism (abstract).
2007


Presents a very brief introduction to Donne followed by Father and Annun—without further notes or commentary.


Discusses Donne’s use of scriptural metaphor in his poetry and prose in order to examine “the relations between the English Church and international Protestantism in the early 1620s.” Points out how by “[s]hifting between the historical, allegorical, and tropological senses of a scriptural text,” Donne was able to “make oblique allusion to domestic and foreign affairs” while at the same time “retaining rhetorical, political, and theological decorum” (71). Cites the diplomatic cipher Donne was given as an important clue to his involvement in international religious affairs. Comments on how Lam, HSShow, a 1622 letter to Goodyer, Christ, and a Candlemas sermon of 1622 reflect Donne’s concern for the international Protestant cause, especially the fall of the Palatine in 1622. Points out Donne’s need for discretion in preaching and observes that he “conspicuously eschews the apocalyptic fervour of polemics” (79) in his sermons. Concludes that “by attending to Donne’s discriminating, casuistic use of scriptural metaphor, it may be possible to go beyond seeing confessional and national identities as being formed primarily according to a priori factors of theological doctrine or political unrest” (82).


Briefly comments on Donne as a religious poet, calling him “the best practitioner of the metaphysical poetic style” (204). Reproduces five selections from the Holy Sonnets and Father—without notes or commentary (204–06)—and Goodf—with a brief introductory note (210–11).


Calls Sappho “the first unambiguously lesbian love poem in English” and says that “what forces it on our attention” is “the sheer unlikelihood that it should have been Donne who wrote it.” Maintains that the poem “obliges us to square its passionate utterance of female homosexual longing with a poet who is otherwise known—in the estimation of his modern readers no less than in that of his contemporaries—as a byword for phallic masculinity” (216). Contrasts Donne’s poem with those in the classical and humanistic tradition, pointing out that in Sappho “the whole emphasis is on non-penetrative sexuality and on the symmetry and equality of the two lovers, neither of whom seeks to dominate or subdue the other” (219). Surveys the attempts of critics to explain away or justify the poem so that Donne emerges with his reputation as an “aggressively heterosexual, self-assertive” male writer remains intact (224). Maintains that Sappho “causes consternation because, one way or another, it explodes the (ultimately self-serving) narcissistic and imaginary relation between the literary critic and the ‘manly’ Donne” by “offering what is, in effect, a parody of that relation” (227). Argues that “what the poem is really up to” is “nowhere more visible than in the refusals and disavowals to which it has given rise” (233). Presents a reading of the poem to show how it remains “true to its radical and deconstructive aims to the end” and concludes that it is “in destabilizing not only the phallic self-confidence of the traditional poetry of praise but [also] its ‘lesbian’ alternative to boot—that the
poem effects its most far-reaching deconstruction of the writing subject; an assault that has registered in the pained critical reception with which the poem has been met in the past, in both feminist and more ‘traditional’ accounts, and that will continue, most likely, to stir and discomfort the writing subject for some time to come” (253).


Discusses Adrienne Rich’s “A Valediction Forbidding Mourning” (1970) as a “re-vision” of Donne’s *ValMourn*, in which she announces her departure from “what she conceives of as the claims of male-dominated discourse on her poetic voice, a farewell to much, but not all that Donne’s poem, for her, invokes” (333). Comments also on the relationship between Rich’s poem and her 1971 essay, “When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision.” Compares the two poems and the two poets, noting that “[w]hen we bring these two accomplished poets together we discover not only what makes each unique” but also “what they, at certain points, seem to unconsciously share as poets in and across time.” Points out, in particular, how *ValMourn* “shares with Rich the need to part ways with conventional poetry” (343).


In Serbian. Briefly surveys the critical reception of Donne’s poetry in the English-speaking world from the seventeenth century to the present and also provides a survey of Donne’s reception in Serbia, noting that Donne is not adequately recognized among Serbians.


In the prologue (xi-xxxvii), presents a general introduction to metaphysical poetry and to the poetry of Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Crashaw, Marvell, Cowley, Carew, Suckling, and Lovelace. In “John Donne” (37–45), presents a brief introduction to Donne’s life and works (37), followed by Spanish translations of *Dissol*, *Dream*, *ElAut*, *HSMade*, and *HSDeath*. Concludes with an index.


Sketches “a conceptual framework to assist the science educator to explore the literary response to scientific ideas” (115). Points out that in the seventeenth century when “the new sciences began to assert their epistemological superiority over poetic ways of grasping truth,” the “literati stepped forward to defend their profession and mercilessly satirised what they saw as the pretensions and effrontery of the new philosophy” (116–17). Observes how in *FunEl* Donne ponders the significance of recently discovered new stars and how he points out that scientists do not agree. Notes Donne’s distrust of the new philosophy in the *Anniversaries*. Maintains that, “[i]n effect, Donne uses the cognitive dissonance provoked by discoveries in astronomy and cosmology to argue that science itself is limited” (123).


In “Songs and Sonnets” (139–41), briefly discusses how Donne “searches in his love lyrics for a vision of love that transcends time and chance by participating in the eternal, a love in which mutability and loss are impossible.”
Maintains that “we cannot entirely appreciate Donne's love lyrics until we appreciate the Christian culture from which he comes,” especially his Catholic background (139). Cites as examples GoodM, Ecst, Canon, Relic, Fun, and ValMourn. Stresses how in his love poems Donne puts fulfilled human love in a eucharistic context “to establish the eternal, immutable quality of human love” (140). Emphasizes how he “uses his Catholic inheritance to deny the Platonic claim that love is not a matter of the body but also to avoid the claim that all love is carnal and therefore transient” (141). In “Holy Sonnets” (141–45), comments on the influence of discursive meditation on the Holy Sonnets and maintains that the poems deal primarily with the four last things—death, judgment, heaven, and hell. Emphasizes again how the Catholic tradition informs the sonnets and stresses that although the language and thought in the Holy Sonnets express Donne’s “individual conflicts and spiritual longings,” we cannot fully appreciate his sonnets unless we see them “within the Christian tradition” that “fed his imagination and intellect” (144).


Discusses Donne’s views on Protestant iconoclasm as reflected in the sermons and in Cross and Goodf. In the first section, reviews Donne’s positions on the theory of divine right and political, theological, and, in particular “the nature of analogical relations that obtain between God and the secular magistrate.” Rejects the view that in the sermons Donne preaches an absolutist political theology. Drawing on the work of Giorgio Agamben and Eric Santner, suggests that Donne’s political theology “levels hierarchical distinctions between sovereign and subject” and stresses that “[e]very subject is exhorted to establish an interiorized ‘sovereign within’ as a first step toward imitating Christ’s virtue and elevating God.” Suggests that “[t]he establishment of such a metaphorized internal commonwealth opens up the possibility of self-worship, which in turn issues in a metaphoric ‘state of emergency,’ and the intervention of God’s ‘sovereign’ exceptionalism.” Maintains that “[s]ince such Godly intervention is ultimately contingent on the subject’s degree of backsliding—backsliding which is always tied to an exercise of creaturely free will—the outcome of this dialectical process is paradoxically to limit, or at least to make predictable, God’s otherwise arbitrary power to declare a state of exception in order to punish refractory sin.” In the second section, assesses Donne’s “more direct engagement with idolatr” (33) in Cross and Goodf. Maintains that “against the grain of Reformed iconophobia,” Donne’s speaker “believes that he can make satisfaction by representing himself as an embodied cross.” Notes that the “Slovenian-Lacanian explanation of such a move is that it represents Donne’s speaker’s inability to transfer from a state of ‘being’ to a state of ‘having’ the cross.” Observes that “[u]nable to symbolize adequately his goal of naming and satisfying God’s desire, the speaker remains at the level of imaginary captation, in which he, like the infans who has not yet acceded to the symbolic, desperately offers himself as a material means to fulfill God’s unsatisfiable desire.” Argues that if the movement of the political theology of the sermons indicates “a regression from the symbolic to the imaginary, the religious poems are more preoccupied with the difficulty of both superseding the imaginary in the absence of clearly established divine and paternal laws, and internalizing the very symbolic investitures that the sermons attempt to negate.” Maintains that “what ultimately brings together the more intensely psychological and devotional concerns of selected poems and the reconstructed political theology of the sermons is a shared tendency momentarily to disclose, but ultimately to cover over . . . God’s ‘surplus validity’—that excessive aspect of God that eludes symbolization according to conventional Reformed or Catholic denominational categories.” Says that “[o]nly in some of the Holy Sonnets, especially those sonnets concerned with the agape
and law dialectic, do we find Donne’s speakers directly encountering God’s desire, a phenomenon that will allow us to situate Donne’s lyrics in relation to the elusive Lacanian concept of the ‘non-all without exception’ (34).


Discusses “the rise of the astrological almanac and the consequent expansion of the significance of time and space” during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Maintains that “[a]lthough challenged by the rise of both empirical science and Calvinist theology, astrology had a remarkable currency and credibility in the early modern period.” Explains how “the development of the almanac—fuelled by advances in print technology and by a consequent increase in both literacy and reader demand—allowed astrology to be widely disseminated” (158) and claims that almanacs became “arguably the most popular books of the early modern period” (1259). Examines the wide variety and various uses of almanacs and the role alchemy played in the cultural and religious life of this period. Observes that although many Protestants rejected astrology, the majority of people did not see astrology as “incompatible with revealed religion” (1261). Comments on how Donne in *Devotions* “appropriates the astrological view of time and then attempts, somewhat unsuccessfully, to transcend it.” Notes that in “Meditation 14” Donne “alludes to the practice of casting a horoscope for a disease” but that ultimately he repudiates “time’s relevance in spiritual matters.” Points out, however, that Donne was not reluctant to adopt “the vocabulary of astrology” as “a means to understand his eternal soul” (1281).


Collection of 28 essays by individual authors. Although Donne is mentioned in several essays, only the following that contain extensive commentary on Donne and his works are included, each of which has been entered separately in this bibliography: Andrew Hadfield’s “Donne’s *Songs and Sonets* and Artistic Identity,” Andrew McRae’s “Satire and the Politics of Town,” and Achsah Guibbory’s “Donne’s Religious Poetry and the Trauma of Grace.” Contains also a preface (xi-xiii), a select chronology (xiv-xviii), and an introduction entitled “Reading Renaissance Poetry” (xix-xxiii) as well as notes on contributors (331–34) and an index (335–42).


Points out that although certain passages from *Devotions* have today “thoroughly entered the public consciousness,” such as “No Man is an Island” and “for whom the bell tolls,” *Devotions* is “far from widely read and is rarely taught even in courses on Renaissance literature” (365). Surveys the early and later critical reception of *Devotions*. Observes that the work was apparently popular in the seventeenth century since five editions were published during and soon after Donne’s lifetime, but points out that there is “very little contemporary comment” on the *Devotions*. Notes that after the 1638 edition, “no further editions were published for 200 years” (366). Cites the editions of John Sparrow (1923) and William Draper (1926), and John Hayward’s *Complete Poetry and Selected Prose* (1929) as having ushered in the twentieth-century revival of interest in *Devotions* and surveys the critical debate that has surrounded the work ever since.


Mentions Donne throughout, comparing and contrasting him with both his contemporaries and later poets. In Chapter 2, “From the Acces-
sion of James I to the Defenestration of Prague: March 1603 to May 1618” (33–118), comments on Donne’s life and surveys the major thematic and stylistic characteristics of both his secular and religious poetry. Points out that although primarily a coterie poet who circulated his poems in manuscript, Donne was undoubtedly “the most popular English poet from the 1590s until at least the middle of the seventeenth century.” States that Donne “substantially redefines English love poetry, moving past classical and Petrarchan models.” Maintains, however, that his influence is “more decisively evident on religious verse,” noting how “[s]ingle-handedly he revived devotional and meditational poetry in English, which had languished since the days of the late Middle English lyric” (96). In Chapter 3, “From the Defenestration of Prague to the Personal Rule: May 1618 to March 1629” (119–66), discusses Donne’s influence as a preacher and various features of his sermons. Cites “Deaths Duell” as his “most acclaimed sermon” and discusses it as “a fine example of Donne’s preaching art” (162). Comments also on Devotions, a work that shows “how challenging, both emotionally and intellectually, Donne’s prose really is” (163). Concludes with a bibliography (429–52) and an index (453–63).


Maintains that “[o]ne of the most striking and curiously important elements” in Cor2 is the address by the speaker to the Virgin in ll. 5–14 of the sonnet. Discusses how the speaker “creates a sacred tableau and then inserts himself into it as an agent—rather than as, say, a mere witness” (136) with the intention of bringing the reader “imaginarily into contact with the sacred.” Maintains that “[t]he problem would seem to be that in his trite lecturing of the implied reader and his impertinent—albeit celebratory—lecturing of the Virgin, Donne’s speaker is primarily staging himself.” Points out how he “flourishes his role as an ingeniously pious instructor in the reader’s face (not to say, by implication in the Virgin’s—lecturing her, that is, his representation of her, about her womb).” Concludes that “the center of attention” in these lines is “Donne’s persona, and hence Donne himself” (137).

1263. Craig, Heather. “Like John Donne, he was going into the ministry.” AntigR no. 150 (Summer): 95

An original poem.


Examines “the resources of poetry to act therapeutically on despair,” focusing primarily on the Anniversaries. Discusses how Donne explores in these poems “the transformative power of literature, especially the ways in which words were absorbed by, impressed onto or reflected in the bodies of those who produced and consumed them.” Maintains that although in some of his earlier poems Donne fulfills “the familiar cultural functions of elegy, working to heal the minds and bodies of the bereaved by sympathetically ventriloquising their grief,” in the Anniversaries he “departs radically from those conventions.” Observes that although the Anniversaries “sometimes aspire to comfort and cure,” Donne “repeatedly rebukes himself for failing to effect any such productive catharsis” and, in fact, stresses that “despair is inexpressible and consolation always incomplete.” Maintains also that in the poems Donne considers “how writing affects his own body, and forges new connections between literary voice and the frailties associated with despair” (74). Discusses contemporary views about grief, melancholy, and despair. Says that the death of Elizabeth Drury became for Donne an “opportunity to confront his own mortality and the perishability of mankind in general,” which he “links in surprising ways to the process of verse composition” (74–75). Argues, however, that he finally found the consolation that elud-
ed him in the *Anniversaries* only later, when he was writing *Devotions*. Suggests that there “the awareness of his own mortality enabled Donne to achieve a powerfully restorative, confessional voice” (75).


Presents a detailed bibliographical description of Folger Manuscript V.a.241, which contains Edmund Gosse’s copy of *Metem*, along with Lucian satirical dialogues, a fable, and an inserted satirical poem. Claims that the manuscript “can provide evidence, even if indirect, that at least one of Donne’s contemporaries read *Metempsychosis* as a political satire” (48). Maintains that “the coupling” of *Metem* in V.a.241 with Lucian satirical dialogues suggests that the compiler of the manuscript “classified the poem as satire” (55) and also that “the motif of a soul migrating through various bodies” links *Metem* with the Lucian dialogues and also with the concluding satirical fable in the manuscript. Argues that the major connection among *Metem*, the Lucian dialogues, the fable and the inserted satirical poem is “topical and thematic: the dangers posed by false flatterers” (60). From this evidence, maintains that Robert Cecil is most likely Donne’s major satirical target, but acknowledges that not all sections of *Metem* are specifically directed at Cecil since “general disgust with a court where one always fears sabotage and conspiracy appears to be peppered throughout the poem” (61). Concludes that by considering the various works that the compiler of V.a.241 “deliberately brought together in this manuscript book, works linked by genre, motif, and theme, we are given a window into the ‘single vision’ of a contemporary reader who interprets Donne’s complex poem as political satire” (68). In an appendix reproduces the prefatory argument and tale found in the manuscript. 5 plates.

1266. **Cummins, Owen E.** “John Donne, Catholicism, and the Eucharist.” *Emmanuel* 113, no. 6: 506–


Explains why 1611 was “one of the most pivotal years in the annals of astronomy” and comments on the conflict between those who defended recent astronomical discoveries and those in the Catholic Church who questioned and/or opposed them. Discusses how *Ignatius* is “a broadside against both the Jesuits and [Robert] Bellarmine.” Maintains that in *Ignatius* “the person of the Pope is thinly disguised as Lucifer himself, and his sidekick Ignatius is none other than Bellarmine.” Describes the encounter in Donne’s poem of Copernicus with Lucifer and Bellarmine in hell.

1268. **Dalrymple, Theodore.** “A Donne Deal.” *BMJ*
Very briefly comments on Donne's concept of disease, noting that he held that all disease and illness came about through man's original sin and continued on by man's intemperance and licentiousness. Says that Donne sees man as “a great self-destroyer.” Comments briefly on “Why Doth the Poxe So Much Affect to Undermine the Nose?”


Notes that the title of Martha Graham's ballet Deaths and Entrances (1943 and revived in 2005) comes from Dylan Thomas’s poem by the same name. Suggests that Thomas got his title from “Death’s Duell.”


In “John Donne (1572–1631)” (52–55), maintains that Donne “shows his knowledge of the classics in all of his writings,” noting that the Songs and Sonets evidence the influence of Ovid; that the Elegies and Satyres “follow classical forms”; and that the “self-assured and challenging address implicit in Donne’s tone,” which is “unmistakably his own,” is also “deeply indebted to the sophisticated burlesque spirit of epic forms in Ovid.” Discusses, in particular, how in SunRis Donne “rewrites” Ovid’s Amores 1.13 (52) and how in ElBed he “employs rhyming couplets as an English equivalent of the unrhymed but symmetrical elegiac couplets of Latin poetry” and “imitates, in his own accent, the style of the classical elegy” (53). Points out also how Ovid’s Amores 1.5 clearly serves as “an inspiration” for ElBed but maintains that Donne’s elegy is “more intellectual” than Ovid’s and that Donne’s speaker, unlike Ovid’s, is “as concerned to display himself (the erections of his imagination and his body) as his tempting beloved” (54). In other sections of the book, points out that Donne reflects in his poetry both the imagery and thinking of Lucretius’s De Rerum Natura, especially in HSDeath (324–327); Catullus’s Carmen 8 in Appar (334); and Propertius’s Elegies 2.15 in ElBed (412).


In Portuguese. Surveys Donne’s life and works. Comments, in particular, on Donne’s Catholic lineage and religious development. Discusses major characteristics of Donne’s poetic style, especially his uses of wit. Discusses Canon as a prime example of Donne’s love poetry, HS-Due as representative of his religious poetry, and passages from Devotions and “Death’s Duell” as examples of his prose. Briefly comments on Donne’s critical reception, especially in the twentieth century.


Presents a detailed bibliographical description of the 1654 copy of the second issue of Letters to Severall Persons of Honour now in the John Donne Collection at the Cushing Memorial Library at Texas A&M University. Points out that the volume is “especially valuable” because it was formerly owned by Rev. T. R. O’Flahertie and “contains his extensive annotations and glosses made for an edition of the letters he planned to bring out” (443). Presents an analysis of the annotations and glosses, offers a biographical sketch of O’Flahertie, discusses O’Flahertie’s extensive collection of Donne materials, and comments on his importance in Donne studies in the mid-nineteenth century. 18 figures.

Points out that Donne circulated the Epigrams in three different sequences according to the textual editors of The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne—the Early Sequence (9 poems), the Intermediate Sequence (20 poems), and the Later Sequence (16 poems). Discusses each of the sequences to show how Donne “kept tinkering with the sequences, exploring the new possibilities that opened up with each revision, deletion, addition, or rearrangement.” Observes that each of the epigrams is “concise and witty” and “loaded with irony, ambiguity, and intellectual freight” (335), but that, when considered in the context of the various sequences, each takes on a new and/or different meaning. Discusses, for instance, how Beggar, one of Donne’s most popular epigrams, “functions in various contexts,” thereby illustrating both “its versatility of meaning” and Donne’s wit in arranging the epigrams (345). Comments on the numerous and complex contextual effects in each of the sequences. Concludes that “whatever Donne’s intentions as a poet may have been, his activity as an editor of his own epigrams undoubtedly had an effect on their meaning” (377).


Includes selections or individual lines from the Songs and Sonnets, ll. 25–35 from ElBed, “The Benediction” from Eclog, Hero, Jug, CB, ll.183–90 from FirAn, Cor2, Cor7, HLSLittle, Annun, and ll. 1–22 from ElComp (15–47)—without notes or commentary. In “A Note on John Donne” (51–58), presents a brief critical introduction to the general characteristics of Donne’s secular and religious poems.


Contains a Spanish introduction to Donne’s life and works, especially to Biathanatos, and to Donne’s views on suicide entitled “John Donne y el suicidio” (7–34) by Fernando Colina and Mauricio Jalón, followed by a Spanish translation of Biathanatos (35–206). Concludes with notes (207–24) and a table of contents (225).


In “Prólogo” (13–23), reproduces Thomas de Quincey’s “On Suicide” (1823) translated into Spanish by Jerónimo Ledesma (13–19), and translations of Donne’s letters to Sir Edward Herbert (21), Sir Robert Ker (22–23), and Philip Herbert (24–25). Thereafter follows a Spanish translation of Biathanatos (27–221), a list of authors cited in the treatise (223–26), and an outline of the parts, distinctions, and sections of the book (227–67).


Translations into Hungarian by divers hands of the Songs and Sonnets (7–[86]), 9 of the Elegies (89–[109], Satz (113–[16]), the Holy Sonnets (119–42), Cross (143–44), Res (145), Goodf (146–47), MHSMary (148), Christ (149–50), Sickness (151–52), and Father ([153]), followed by an index of titles of poems in English (155–56) and in Hungarian (157–58). Translators include Vas István, Ferenez Gyöző, Orbán Ottó, Mezei Balázs, Kálnoky László, Molnár Imre, Jékely Zoltán, Károlyi Amy, Éörsi István, Kiss Zsuzsa, and Képes Géza. No notes or commentary.


Presents English texts and French translations of GoodM, SGo, SunRis, Triple, Anniv, four of
the Holy Sonnets, Christ, and Sickness.


Translates into Portuguese the “Meditations” from Devotions followed by the English text of each. Concludes with a brief survey of Donne’s life and works.


In the introduction (5-74), presents a biographical sketch of Donne and surveys the historical background of the period, followed by introductions to general characteristics of metaphysical poetry, especially Donne’s poetry. Comments on the Renaissance love lyric, both the tradition and innovations; presents introductions to Donne’s love poems, sacred poems, the Anniversaries, and “Death’s Duell”; and discusses the use of metrics, syntax, and uses of rhetoric in Donne’s poems. Presents a bibliography of editions (English and Italian) of Donne’s works and a list of critical studies of his poetry and prose (75-88), followed by a note on the text (89-93). Presents (with English and Italian translations on opposite pages) the Songs and Sonets (67-120), the FirAn (120-32), Corona (133-36), the Holy Sonnets (136-45), Cross (145-47), Res (147), Annun (148-49), Goodf (149-50), Sidney (150-52), Tilman (152-53), Christ (154-55), Sickness (155-56), and two versions of Father (156-57). In “A Note on the Texts of Donne’s Poems” (158-64), surveys the publication history of Donne’s poems, explains his choice of copy text and textual decisions, and especially comments on the work of the textual editors of The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne. Notes that since Donne is a manuscript poet, seldom was printed text selected over “a manuscript as copy text” and notes that spelling and, to a certain extent, punctuation have been modernized since “editions are not meant to be facsimiles and that editors should not hope to reproduce the scribal culture of an early age by reproducing every brevigraph, abbreviations or quaint spelling in the manuscript” (161). Explains also that a “distinctive feature” of the present edition involves “the spelling of elided words” (162). Hereafter follows a list of standardized abbreviations for seventeenth-century manuscripts, seventeenth-century editions, and selected modern editions of Donne’s poems. In “Textual Notes” (165-76), records substantive variants. In “Donne and Metaphysical Poets” (179-422) reproduces selections from Ben Jonson, Thomas Carew, Izaak


Intended for advanced students. In “John Donne in Context” (1–16), discusses the intellectual, religious, and social aspects of the world in which Donne lived. Comments on such issues in his poems as the importance of discovery and voyages and the uses of compasses and maps; of medical, scientific, and technical language; of anatomy and astronomy; and of the new philosophy and new learning. Discusses also the changes that occurred in religion during Donne’s lifetime. Comments on the uses of Neoplatonism and Petrarchism in his poetry and also the social setting of his poems. Thereafter reproduces 28 poems from the *Songs and Sonnets; ElPerf, ElPict, ElFatal, and ElBed;* 7 selections from the *Holy Sonnets;* and *Goodf,* *Christ,* *Sickness,* and *Father* (19–67), followed by notes on each of the poems (69–138). In “Interpretations” (139–77), presents brief discussions of the subject matter and themes in the poems, language issues, and selected critical issues—with suggested activities, discussion questions, and sample essay questions. Concludes with a chronology of Donne’s life and times [178]–[181], suggestions for further reading (182–83), and an index of titles and first lines (184–86).


Briefly discusses the compass image in *ValMourn* (ll. 25–36). Maintains that although “we admire the appositeness” of the image, we feel at the same time “the full force of its arbitrariness” and that “what we watch is less the lovers than the sheer brio by which the poet manages to pull various ill-assorted bits and pieces of
the world together, apparently against all odds” (93). Says that although the poem “tries to convince us that the lovers really are like a pair of compasses,” it nevertheless “rubs the disparity between them impudently in our faces and so persuades us into admiring its own deviously opportunistic wit” (93–94).


Surveys Donne’s knowledge of and interest in the law and stresses how “equity plays an important part in Donne’s Lincoln’s Inn sermons, both as an exegetical process and as a political concept” (128–29). Discusses in detail Donne’s sermon on Genesis 18:25 to show how it “illuminates habits of thought that operate throughout the Lincoln’s Inn sermons: a concern with the legal concept of equity and its significance for contemporary debates about the nature of prerogative justice; a persistent interest in exegetical processes of judgment—notably Augustinian charity—and the ways in which they can acquire or resist polemical significance; and an emergent notion of civic engagement, addressed to Donne’s legal audience and built on a joint foundation of equitable and charitable interpretation.” Comments on “the topical relevance” of Donne’s “preaching performance on Genesis 18:25 in the early seventeenth-century debate about the nature, possibilities, and limitations of equitable jurisdiction” (130). Discusses how the sermon shows Donne’s “active and principled participation in the political affairs of early Stuart England” and how “[h]is analysis of the possibilities and limitations of prerogative justice makes full use of his own and the audience’s legal expertise.” Shows how Donne “analogizes the languages of law, politics, hermeneutics, and ethics to formulate a powerful critique of the king’s claim to occupy the ultimate ‘seate of judgement.’” Maintains that Donne “insists on the crucial importance of discussing, debating, and ‘vexing’ the defining political issues of his day” (154). Concludes that the complexity and richness of Donne’s argument in the sermon arises from his “ability to find connections between languages that seem worlds apart; to bring them home to specific audiences and create a ‘nearnesse’ with them that allows for a uniquely effective communication of the homiletic message” (156).


Suggests that likely, when preaching, Donne was aware of the appeal of the theater for those in his congregation and that he responded primarily by adopting in his sermons theatrical modes and techniques to outdo the theater itself. Discusses, therefore, how Donne’s sermons are “indebted to theatrical practices of showing and enacting the return to life of persons and events otherwise long dead and gone.” Points out, in particular, how he “adapts the communicative system of the theater to the genre of the sermon in order to re-enact Christ’s sacrifice and resurrection” (2). States that in his sermons Donne implies that “the sacrament of the Eucharist is less significant for salvation than the process of conversion initiated through the sermon” (3) and examines in general Donne’s concept of conversion that he believes preaching brings about. Shows how Donne “not only imitates, but performs, re-enacts and brings to life the most important dogma of Christian dogma, namely that of God stooping so low as to become man and to take on a physical body in Christ, in whose person God and man, author and actor, coincide” (7–8). For responses, see: Edmund Miller’s “A Response to Margret Fetzer’s ‘Donne’s Sermons as Re-enactments of the Word’” in *Connotations* 19, nos. 1–3 (2009/2010): 9–13; and Anita Gilman Sherman’s “Donne’s Sermons as Re-enactments of the Word: A Response to Margret Fetzer” in *Connotations* 19, nos. 1–3 (2009/2010): 14–20.
For a reply by Fetzer to Miller and Sherman, see *Connotations* 20, nos. 2–3 (2010/2011): 221–27.


Examines the changing relationship of time, space, and motion during the Renaissance and explores the relationship between verbal texts and scientific concepts. Maintains that “[t]he whole purpose of Donne’s literary works is to imbue the natural cosmos with spirits of mysterious intuition.” Considers Donne to be “the ideal expositor of cosmic extension” (114). Surveys Donne’s knowledge of and response to the New Philosophy, especially as seen in the *FirAn*, and points out how he allows “the older vision of things to enter the picture even as he was showing his knowledge of the new.” Maintains that, “[t]his double mirror, this twinned antithetical knowledge, is what makes his work begin to possess a baroque combination of classical structure and external flux of surface.” Sees in Donne, therefore, “the drama of ideas, old and new colliding with each other,” and calls him “a hero for staying within the conflict and not pretending it is over when in fact it is not” (126). Praises Empson who “perceived that Donne’s fascination with cosmology, combining with a virtually Catholic theological training and an exceeding delight in unusual images as such, led the poet almost inevitably to beliefs bordering upon or, as the Church saw things, actually constituting heresy” (127). Comments on Donne’s “metaphysically tangled, apocryphal wit” and claims that “[a]mong all our greater earlier poets, Donne remains the most taxing to read, because when one tries to decode his metaphysical style . . . one has at least to think” (128).


Comments on the 2001 film version of Margaret Edson’s *Wit*, pointing out how the film “unflinchingly portrays the relationship of the intellectual, analytical life to illness and approaching death” and “suggests some insights into the tools that the intellectual life provides for framing and understanding these processes, as well as the limitations of these tools.” Points out how Professor Vivian Bearing “continues to contemplate Donne’s work, seeking its application to her own experience of cancer.” Observes that, before her approaching death, “Donne’s preoccupation with mortality and redemption” had been only “theoretical poetic concerns” for Vivian but that in her fatal illness her study of Donne prepares her for death.


Maintains that, like his poems, Donne’s sermons are “very dramatic in style” and that the preacher’s voice “seems to be inhabiting them” and makes “itself heard, wrapped in their pages and echoed in their carefully wrought out sound patterns” (29). Argues that the sermons can be read “both as homiletic writings and at the same time as self-mirroring comments upon themselves” and that “in them, orality and dramatisation go together with self-reflectivity.” Observes that “this link appears all the more clearly when Donne’s exegesis of the biblical texts gives pride of place to mankind’s separation from God and to the Minister’s voice as mediating instrument aimed at restoring a contact between them.” Notes that the purpose of this essay is “to explore how valid such a self-referential claim can be when it is made by written texts, which, if anything at all, are conspicuously voiceless” (3). Notes that although Donne does not devalue the sacraments, he does “very frequently stress that it is in the form of signs, in the Scriptures preached by his Ministers, that God mostly presents Himself to man” and thus the preacher “resorts to these sacred words in order to thread again the unravelled links between the congregation and God.” Discusses Donne’s sermon on Ezek.
33:32 (1618 or 1619) in which he “addresses the function of the Minister, whom he compares to God’s instrument” (32) as well as his sermon on Mat.9:13 (1626) in which he claims that “as soon as Christ’s call is uttered out loud by the preacher’s voice, it re-opens for man the perspective of being reunited to Him” (35). Claims that the very act of reading Donne’s written sermons will be heard “by the divine ear and thus seal again the alliance between man and God” and that “[t]his communion may be mediated by the written text precisely because it no longer results from the divine voice being reverberated to the congregation through the preacher’s, but the reader’s silent voice being received by God through the preacher’s silent text” (42).


Explains that a voiceprint is “insubstantial, composed of sound waves subject to time and pulsating across that most nebulous of elements, air” (295). Points out how Donne “responds—sympathetically, playfully, satirically, but respond he does—to notes previously sounded by Ovid, Propertius, Petrarch, Ronsard, Marlowe, the biblical psalmist, and Jeremiah, among others—interpreting and re-casting them as elements of his own highly distinctive vocal dramas which invariably retain something of his predecessors’ voiceprints.” Claims, in short, that Donne’s poetry “bears witness to a world of commingling voices that transcend time and space, ultimately bespeaking the urgency of the poet’s need to make disparate parts or experiences cohere” (296). Discusses primarily how Donne’s voiceprint can be found in the works of such diverse writers as Rudyard Kipling, Tennessee Williams, Allen Ginsberg, and Rabindranath Tagore, writers not usually thought of as influenced by Donne. Explores how “[t]he study of Donne’s influence upon these writers raises the question of how precisely influence can be determined or how accurately a voiceprint can be mapped” (297).

1292. Frost, Kate Gartner. Introduction to “Colloquium: Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions.” JDJ 26: 363–64.

Introduces a colloquium on Devotions held at the 2005 John Donne Society Conference. Presents a general introduction to the Devotions and its critical reception and to papers delivered by Brooks Conti, R. V. Young, Mary Papazian, and Helen Wilcox, each of which is entered separately in this bibliography. Laments that Devotions is not better known and maintains that “the modern practice of fragmentary anthologizing does not serve the Devotions well” and insists that “it must, to be grasped as a masterwork, be taken in its entirety, as with many great works a daunting task” (364).


A study guide for students taking the advanced level English literature examination. Comments on major characteristics of metaphysical poetry and illustrates them by commenting on examples from GoodM, SunRis, Anniv, Canon, ValMourn, and Noct. Compares and contrasts Donne with Herbert, Vaughan, and Marvell. Offers advice on writing examination essays.


States that “an apophatic mentality responds to what is missing, or invisible” and that its “implications for poetry can readily be seen in the contrast between an active, Adamic, cataphatic artistic impulse to name the visible world, and a meditative, apophatic impulse to proceed by indirection, evoking the invisible or the not quite conceivable” (19). Says that Donne “goes beyond rhetorical or conceptual play on the apophatic” when in NegLov he insists that “the greatest love cannot be portrayed because it cannot be named.” Paraphrases the argument of the poem and points out how in
the first nine lines Donne “names the positives that he does not seek” and is “happy to miss what he can know,” while in the second nine lines he is “more discursive in presenting his paradox (i.e., he uses no visual images at all), and ends by saying that which he pursues with the slowness of not knowing, he cannot miss.” Concludes that if the poem is taken “as a metaphor for spiritual life, too, then we can see how, beyond rhetorical devices, it participates . . . in the kind of thought that is called apophatic” by veiling “its treatment of God as a poem to a human beloved” in which “God is not named” (20).


In an essay exploring Milton’s “way of imagining—of construing and constructing—places and spaces in Paradise Lost (27), compares and contrasts Milton’s views on cosmology and the New Philosophy with those of Donne. Comments, in particular, on the anxiety the New Philosophy caused Donne as evidenced in the Anniversaries.


Points out how Donne, as a coterie poet immersed in the paradoxical culture of the Inns-of-Court, “always affected a gentlemanly disdain for belles-lettres,” was “critical of the triviality of contemporary literary tastes” (97), and “vilified fashionable poetic conventions as well as the senseless affectation of wit.” Says that Donne’s early poetry illustrates how he wished “to set himself apart from the professional poets writing for the city’s nouveaux riches, and the poetasters who fed the ‘corrupted’ court taste” (98). Discusses, in particular, Paradoxes, maintaining that they are “variations and amplifications on themes selected from and inspired by” Ortentio Lando’s Paradossi cioè sentenze fuori del comun parare (1543) and were written, in fact, “to outsmart and even to contradict Lando.” Regards Paradoxes as “neither conventional exercises in rhetorical agility nor wanton mockery of Elizabethan ‘aesthetics’” (100) but rather sees them as “linguistic exploration[s] of the human awareness that each truth has its equal and opposite truth” (100–01). Speaking of Donne’s poetry and prose in general, points out that “[t]he horizon of paradox, perfected throughout his life, spans from the philosophical love riddles of youth to the theological writings of maturity.” Calls Paradoxes the “hors d’oeuvre that express the same half-serious, half-ribald mood of the Songs and Sonnets, Elegies, and Satyres, with that outrageous coupling of apparent irreconcilables” known as conceits. Further maintains that Donne saw “in the incongruence of paradox a cognitive instrument and the key to a reformed Christian language” (101) and observes how finally his “juvenile taste for amorous conceits derived from religion and bordering on obscenity . . . gave way to the exploration of the paradox of God’s love, the Incarnation” (101–02).

Reviews:


Maintains that although Donne in his sermons does not actually tell parables in the manner Jesus did, he often uses “parabolic logic,” i.e., he employs “the same figurative technique and persuasive strategy” found in biblical parables (103). Discusses how frequently Donne “sets up the expectation of an analogical similarity only
to contradict expectations by shifting the proportional scale on which the analogy is based or by representing the image in a radically incongruous way.” Claims that this kind of imagery is like the logic of the biblical parables (105) and unlike simple analogy. Argues, therefore, that the influence of the parables “goes beyond the narrative formulae that we associate with parables proper or with the stock of allusions to biblical stories that infuse Christian literature” and shows how parabolic logic is “a figurative technique and persuasive strategy that a speaker may employ, whether in telling stories or in presenting images that function like their biblical counterparts” (109). Illustrates the point by an analysis of Donne's sermon on Psalm 38:2, showing how Donne “takes a parabolic approach, positing and then challenging the audience's expectations about both the image and the concept, 'teasing the mind into active thought,' and prompting the auditors to choose between mundane and spiritually committed points of view” (115). Surveys a variety of ways Donne employs both parabolic logic and imagery in the sermons, while acknowledging, however, that not all of the sermons employ such logic and that parabolic images do not always play a major role in the sermons. Believes that “[w]ith its emphasis on the disruption of ordinary images and situations and its call to commit to a rectified view of reality, parabolic logic accords with Donne's concept of how the preacher communicates spiritual insights to his audiences. Concludes that “[w]hile it is not the only technique that Donne uses to relate ordinary language to the divine, often appearing side-by-side with the logic of analogy, it occupies an important place within the taxonomy of linguistic practices that make Donne's sermons stand out as compelling literature” (125).


Maintains that Donne's religious lyrics are “deeply anxious” and that “[o]bsessed with sin, their speakers struggle for faith and seek assurance of God's love while exploring the problem of salvation.” Points out that Donne, like most Christians, “felt he was born guilty” as a result of original sin and, like all Christians, “was concerned with the salvation of his soul.” Argues, however, that there is “a depth to the anxieties expressed in the poems that must be understood not just in terms of Donne's own psychological makeup or as a general Christian condition but also in relation to the crisis over grace and salvation precipitated by the Protestant Reformation.” Discusses, therefore, how Donne's poems were shaped by “issues particular to post-Reformation, early seventeenth-century England” (229). Surveys various controversial theological issues of the day and comments, in particular, on Donne's anxiety about assurance of salvation, grace, predestination, faith and good works, the sacraments, and the identity of the true church of Christ as seen in Sat3, the Holy Sonnets, and the hymns. Discusses, in other words, how his “witty, imaginative, sometimes anguished” religious poems “express religious crisis, his own as well as the Reformation's.” Maintains that in Donne's poetry we see “faith and belief as a work in progress, not something possessed once and for all.” Claims that Donne's religious poems “constitute perhaps the greatest, most powerful wrestling with faith in the canon of English poetry” (238).


In Chinese. Briefly discusses Donne's uses of images in his love poems, especially his use of the compass, tear, and flea. Maintains that such imagery allows the reader to experience “the feelings of the poet” and obtain “a better understanding” of his poems. (English summary)

1301. Hadfield, Andrew. “Donne's Songs and Sonets and Artistic Identity,” in Early Modern English Po-
and that although his poems may give us glimpses of his life, “we should also realize that what we have probably bears a complicated, often tangential relationship to an external reality” (207). Stresses how Donne, like his English predecessors, “was conscious of belonging to a tradition of poetry” while, at the same time, he was “keen to forge an individual identity.” Observes that since the poems are “a series of dramatic monologues,” they “demand that the reader work out who is speaking, who is being addressed, and what this tells us about the poem in question”: in other words, “[t]he poetic voice takes center stage.” Discusses as illustrations *Flea*, *Twick*, *SunRis*, and *Canon* to show how the poems are “more subtle, witty, and personal than has often been realized” (208) and to show also that Donne’s “sense of his poetic identity in the *Songs and Sonets* is complicated and fraught with anxiety.” Warns that “[o]ur ability to read the different tones and modulations of the author’s voice is severely compromised by the fact that the volume was not clearly authorized” and by the fact that “we do not know how Donne regarded his poetry.” Concludes that although Donne’s poetry is “indeed characterized by his recognizable style,” this “does not mean that we have to read all the poems in the same way, or assume that a recognizable voice speaks a universal message” (215).


Examines Spenser’s “intertextual relationship” to *Metem*. Points out how Donne’s use of a modified Spenserian stanza in his satiric narrative “forges a link” with Spenser but acknowledges that “we do not know what part of Spenser Donne meant to evoke.” Proposes two possibilities: (1) *The Complaints (Mother Hubbards Tale and Visions of the Worlds Vanities)* and (2) *The Faerie Queene*, Book II (The Castle of Alma and Grill in the Bower of Bliss). Maintains that “[t]he portrayal of unrestrained sexual and predatory appetite” in *Metem* “retrospectively illuminates important aspects of Spenser’s medical depiction of the body, the senses, the mental faculties, and their interactions in the castle of the soul.” Argues that “reading Spenser through Donne allows us to understand both the philosophical foundations of Spenser’s representation of body-soul relations (Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Raleigh, La Primaudaye) and the ethical dimensions of his depictions of animals (in relation to Plutarch and Montaigne) and the animal or sensible soul” (257).


Discusses how Donne, by engaging with Pythagorean metempsychosis in *Metem*, “participates poetically in philosophical debates that preoccupied contemporary moral and natural philosophers” (55). Shows how in his poem Donne uses “the ideas of the tripartite soul and Pythagorean transmigration of souls to examine humanism’s darker side: if the vegetable and animal souls are not subsumed into the rational soul, but rather coexist with it, then the sovereignty over all living things that God supposedly conferred upon human be-
ings is called into question.” Maintains that in the poem the “transmigrating soul defines the human subject as constituted both by the intricate linkage between soma and psyche and, by extension, by a relationship with the environment that renders the body both permeable to it and also psychically contiguous with it” (55–56). Argues that Metem provides a portrait of the early modern psyche that presages Freud’s” and claims that “Donne’s vegetable and animal souls are as aggressive and propelled by sexual and survival instincts as Freud’s id” and that “their continued existence in the form of active vegetable and animal souls within the rational human is only precariously contained by the civilizing impulses of reason” (56).


In the preface ([xiii]-xxv), explains the genesis of this study and various stages in its development. Points out that its purpose is to explore “the process by which ‘Doctor Donne’ was transformed from a subject of hagiography: for some readers, into the irreverent and rebellious figure who was constructed at the fin de siècle out of images and voices in the satires, elegies, and more cynical lyrics; for others, into an exalted love poet who became the object of a cult in the century that followed; for many more readers than there had been for two hundred years, into a fascinating writer, who seemed a perpetual puzzle.” Attempts to show how “the word ‘Donne’ came at last to refer to a body of writing to which Walton’s narrative was increasingly irrelevant” as well as commenting on “forces of resistance to reviving Donne’s poetry, among them forces that embody ambivalence about and fascination with human sexuality” (xxiii). Comments on cultural and literary factors that contributed to the revival of interest in Donne’s poetry in the nineteenth century. In Chapter 1, “Introduction: The Variorum as a Window onto Cultural History” (1–14), discusses the importance of the on-going variorum edition of Donne’s poetry and sees the edition as “a window onto literary and cultural history rather than as a final arbiter that fixes meaning” (4). Discusses the importance of the Victorian era in the history of reading Donne’s poetry, especially the work of Victorian editors whose editions “contributed centrally to the transformation whereby Donne can be known again as a writer” (6). Points out how “during the first four decades of the nineteenth century Donne was known not as a writer but as the subject of Walton’s narrative” (12). In Chapter 2, “Doctor Donne” (15–45), observes that in the early nineteenth century there were “three overlapping interpretative communities in which Donne’s name had currency”: (1) “readers who, although they were familiar with Dr Donne from Pope’s satires and John-son’s Life of Cowley, dismissed his poetry without actually reading it”; (2) “admirers of Izaak Walton’s Lives”; and (3) “writers whom we now call Romantics, several of whom read Donne’s sermons and poems with pleasure.” Says that “in bringing out an edition of the Works in 1839 Henry Alford and John W. Parker sought to unite the interests of these three groups and to make available a more ample picture of the writer than any living person had glimpsed” (15). Discusses also the influence of Thomas Zouch’s edition of Walton’s Life (1796) on Donne’s nineteenth century reputation and points out how Wordsworth, for one, “generally thought of Donne in the religious and cultural terms that he came to associate with Walton’s Lives, rather than as a figure of importance in the history of English poetry” (25). In Chapter 3, “A Thinker and a Writer” (46–66), discusses the influence of Coleridge in the Donne revival, the emergence of interest in Donne’s prose works, and how Alford’s edition was “a stimulus to other publishers” (65). In Chapter 4, “Letters” (67–102), comments on the popularity and pre-eminence of Donne’s letters in prose and verse among Victorian readers that led to a renewed interest in his life and poetry. Comments on speculations and various prejudicial opinions about Donne’s Catholic heritage and examines the importance of the so-called Boston edition of the poems (1855) as well as the interest of Lowell, Emerson, Longfellow, Margaret Fuller, and others in the poems. Notes that
during the latter half of the nineteenth century “indications of interest in Donne’s poetry were pretty consistently marked by ambiguity about whether and to what extent the poems provided evidence of a secret life incompatible with Walton’s portrait” and that thus there was “considerable resistance to the project of reviving Donne’s poetry, and not a little ambivalence on the part of some of the revivers” (102). In Chapter 5, “Sensuous Things” (103–48), discusses the commentary, text, and canon in Grosart’s edition (1872–73) and how it led to a challenging of Walton’s pious biography. Comments also on the contributions of J. B. Lightfoot and William Minto to new perspectives on Donne’s life and work. Chapter 6, “Donne in the Hands of Biographers” (149–95), discusses the growing awareness of a need for a new biography of Donne. Comments on the importance of Jessopp’s entry on Donne in the DNB (1888) as well as his 1897 biographical study and on how Gosse’s Life and Letters (1899) “contributed significantly to a better understanding of Donne” (171). Discusses also important contributions made by the work of Leslie Stephen and Charles Eliot Norton. In Chapter 7, “Donne at Harvard” 196–233), discusses how Harvard played a unique role in the history of Donne studies and explores interrelated factors that contributed to “the unprecedented prominence conferred upon Donne at Harvard”; (1) the “living tradition in New England of considering Donne a major writer”; (2) the editing of Donne’s poetry by Lowell, Lowell’s daughter, and Charles Eliot Norton; (3) the extensive collection of Donne material by Norton; and (4) the presence of Russell Briggs, who by teaching Donne in his classes, made Harvard “the first place in the world where Donne’s writings were considered a substantial academic subject in their own right” (197). In Chapter 8, “A Subject Not Merely Academic” (234–70), surveys the presentation of Donne in English and American literary histories of the second half of the nineteenth century and points out how on both sides of the Atlantic it became “increasingly difficult to dismiss Donne as the head of a deviant movement that simply wore itself out” (237). Comments on how the study of Donne spread from Harvard to other American universities, noting that the first Ph.D. dissertation ever written on Donne was completed by Martin Grove Brumbaugh under the direction of Felix Schelling at the University of Pennsylvania in 1895. Observes, however, how many of “the most interesting developments” in Donne’s rising critical reputation “necessarily took place outside the classroom” (262), especially among late Victorian aesthetes and symbolist poets. Concludes that “the central argument” of this study is that “whereas in the first half of the nineteenth century, thanks largely to the great popularity of Walton’s Lives, the word ‘Donne’ was used principally to refer to a historical figure, an eloquent preacher from the time of King James I, during the Victorian period the word came increasingly to refer to the varied body of writings that this man left behind,” and that “[i]n the 1890s, as the love poetry in particular found many new readers, the number of alternative Donnes multiplied” (269–70). Contains a bibliography (271–92), acknowledgments (293–95), an index to Donne’s works (297–99), and a general index (301–315).

Reviews:


Although Donne and his works are mentioned throughout this handbook, only the following four chapters contain extended discussions of him and his writings, each of which is annotated separately in this bibliography: Yvonne Sherwood’s “Prophetic Literature,” Alastair Hunter’s “Psalms,” Helen Wilcox’s “Herbert and Donne,” and Alison Jasper’s “Body and Word.”

Comments on how the poetry of Donne, Gerard Manley Hopkins, and Robert Lowell is influenced by Catholicism by discussing a poem by each of the poets. Maintains that *HSRound* illustrates how Donne's imagination “remained, at least in part, a Catholic one” (2). Sees a tension between the “Protestant” sestet of the poem and the “Catholic” octave, noting how the latter contains “visual language” and other baroque features that contribute to its “Catholic feel” (3).


Discusses Donne's influence (or “voiceprint”) on the poetry of Paul Muldoon, Mark Jarman, Michael Symmons Roberts, Carl Phillips, Michael Longley, Brenda Hillman, and Kate Bingham. Points out that Donne seems to matter to contemporary poets “in ways that his contemporaries don't” (281).


Discusses how Donne's poetry mixes science and poetics, comparing “human emotional experience with astronomy, music, medicine, geography, as well as with Christian theology and neoplatonic philosophy, to demonstrate the universal harmony of all things in man and nature.” Notes how “[e]laborate correspondences or conceits were detailed through systematic sets of far-reaching metaphors spanning theology and the new science” (99). Observes how Donne in his poetry “established a distinct voice by veering off from then standard literary models” and notes how, particularly in his satires, he “often chose to imitate classical authors, such as Juvenal, rather than medieval satirists” (100). Maintains that although known today primarily as a metaphysical poet, Donne was also “a noted theological writer in prose” and discusses how “his prime self-translated text” is *Ignatius* (101) and how as a “bilingual text” *Ignatius* “helped secure Donne's status as a major Latinist” (102). Comments on both the Latin and English versions of Donne's treatise and shows how both aim at “Jesuitical thought as a new Tower of Babel that will end badly” (105). Maintains, furthermore, that “the fact that the infernal figures tend to speak in one voice, as though trying to reimpose the one *linguam* of ancient times, from the era before the tower was destroyed, allows Donne to suggest yet another preposterous aspect of their thought, and another retrograde motion” (105–06). Says that “the bilingual text itself, by speaking of these issues in two languages, tacitly refutes the ‘infernal’ conspiracy that seeks to silence dissent” (106).


Discusses “links” between Donne's life and his works. Maintains that Donne himself created “some of these links,” whereas others were formed “by readers willing to accept the possibility that fictional personae implicate the author in questions of authorial presence in the work of art” (107). Argues, in other words, that Donne's works are “explicitly framed by his life” (111). Comments, in particular, on how “[b]order-crossing and travel are dominant themes” in Donne's poetry and how it is informed by “his own travels and the early modern explosion of information about the New World and beyond.” Observes also that Donne's poems are “saturated by the idiom of mapmaking, the motif of conquest, and a trope for discovery” (112). Discusses as examples *Storm, Calm, Christ, ValWeep, ValMourn, Goodf, ElBed, GoodM*, and *Sickness*. Concludes that Donne's
“goal to contain and separate ‘Jack Donne’ from ‘Doctor Donne’ into different phases of his life proves only illusory” since his works—“metaphysical, sacred, and secular—all come to bear the imprint of his explorer mentality” (116).


Discusses the influence of the psalms and psalm translation on Donne, Herbert, Milton, and the Sidneys. Contrasts Donne and Herbert and points out that although Donne praises the Sidney psalms in Sidney, his specifically religious poetry is “too precisely focused on Christian themes to offer any direct echo of the psalms.” Maintains that Donne’s theology is “too Calvinist to be truly in harmony with the thought of the psalmists, who never—even in their bleakest moments—abandoned the hope that the individual might experience God’s mercy” (252). Claims that Donne “finds it hard to conceive of mercy while the psalmist’s verse is imbued with optimism, however sombre his crimes.” Cites Lam as Donne’s “one significant work of biblical translation” and says that perhaps this one work might be regarded as his “contribution to the genre of psalm translation.” Concludes that, in Donne, one finds “a clear respect” for the Sidney psalms, but with “little sign of emulation” (253).


In Japanese. In an analysis of Herbert’s “Love (III),” briefly compares Herbert’s views on love and sin with those of Donne.


Points out that although “the rhythms of much of Donne’s poetry were not well-suited to the music of his time,” they are to contemporary music. Maintains that Donne’s poems “integrate so many elements of typical modern music composition: mathematics, science, spontaneity, emotion, sensuality, complex rhythms, expressiveness, and the love of the contradictory, that one could say his writings are the products of a man making music.” Jarrett explains that his purpose in writing a three-act opera in German entitled John Donne (approximately two and a half hours in length) is an attempt “to find and bring out” the meaning of Donne’s poems “by revealing historical and psychological contexts and creating an entertaining work at the same time.” Comments on the libretto of the opera that focuses on three major periods of Donne’s life.


Discusses Donne’s view of the body, pointing out that although his uses of sensuality in his poetry “pays homage to the powerful appeal of embodied, emotive, and sexual existence,” he nevertheless expresses “fear of its potential to endanger a soul whose destiny, by God’s grace, transcends the present moment” (781). Notes that in Donne’s poetry we hear “a very Christian theological concern for the ‘communal body’ of Christ’s Church on earth in which the individual Christian must recognize his or her ‘mutual duties.’” Holds that this view “challenges the smoothing out, depletion, or reduction incipient in views of the body determined by the energies of the emergent capitalist ideology of the age” and that it “reaffirms a view of the body as a set of complex relationships determined as much by the Christian theological context of spiritual and communal values as by the freer play of material considerations.” Maintains that “[i]n the sensuality of language and the revealing imagery, especially of imprisonment” as well as of “Christian notions of atonement and redemption—Donne resists all attempts to dilute the fundamental irony and equivocation of Christian incarnation.” Says
that in Donne's poetry "the Christian is characterized as an anchorite, imprisoned in his own filth, or the unborn child, inhabiting prison/religious cells which are both body and womb"; yet, at the same time he "exults in his final deliverance from this prison, a deliverance granted by God through the incarnation" (782).


Points out the interrelationship of three controlling metaphors in “Meditation 17” of Devotions—"the tolling of the death bell, the activity of literary translation, and the mining of gold." Notes that although the first two have received some critical attention, the third "has received almost no discussion, even though it ties the other two together and is crucial for properly excavating and using the buried treasure of Donne's thought" (17). Focuses, therefore, on the metaphor of mining gold, which likely was influenced by St. Augustine's On Christian Doctrine, Book 2, in which he "defends the legitimacy of a religious appropriation of secular learning by citing a famous biblical example of the expropriation of Egyptian gold by the Israelites leaving Egypt." Points out "several direct verbal correspondences" between the last sentence in "Meditation 17" and St. Augustine's comments. Discusses how gold mining "involves both the hearing of the bell and understanding (translating) its meaning properly" (19). Concludes that, for Donne, "the tolling of a death knell may be understood literally to refer to the death of someone else, even though it 'be of no use to him'; but its real meaning can only be properly understood, its buried treasure ('as gold in a Mine') properly utilized, if someone hearing the bell translates its meaning ('digs out, and applies that gold') by perceiving it to be a warning of his or her own death" (20).


Discusses the religious conflict between Calvinistic doctrines of double predestination, limited atonement, and irresistibility of grace and the Catholic doctrine of the sacrament of penance in the Holy Sonnets, especially in HS-Made and HS-Black. Points out that this conflict can also be observed in Donne's sermons and other prose works and suggests that Donne seemingly never does fully resolve these tensions.


Cites HSBatter as an example of “the final major extension of the sonnet tradition” in Donne’s time (186). Observes that this sonnet “resuscitates the whole trope of the sonnet, not by playing within the rules of this entire system of romantic comparisons, but by modifying both its formal pattern and comparative argumentative structure in far more radical ways.” Points out that it does so “by challenging the rhythmic conventions of its predecessors by inverting the relationship between regularity and substitution” and “by repositioning the entire notion of comparison to function at a completely different discursive level.” Maintains that “[r]ather than invoking comparison as a trope within a single contained discourse . . . and deploying it repetitively as an internal element within the argumentative structure,” Donne in HSBatter “shifts the level of comparison to the level of the framing metaphors that form the constructive premise of the whole poem . . . by effecting a radically ‘inappropriate’ and blatantly transgressive linking of discursive tracks” that are “normally separated by institutional boundaries.” Holds that, by doing so, Donne “completes the process initiated by the decontextualizing properties of print . . . while developing as well the fundamental properties of metaphor to establish linkages across syntactic or logical
categories.” Maintains that Donne’s “tactics focus other currents of his period in a profound way” but they “also create, by standards of twentieth-century critics beginning with Eliot, a spectacular poetic success.” Concludes that “[w]hile allowing Donne to avoid the collapsed clichés of simple romantic love and ‘appropriate’ comparison,” this “maneuver extends the sonnet form through a much more radical transformation that others would find hard to follow” (187).


Presents a brief commentary on *HSDeath*, pointing out how it “plays upon key devices such as contradiction and opposition” and showing how Donne “dramatizes his theme” by personifying Death (161). Notes Donne’s use of spondaic rhythm, run-on lines, caesuras, simple language, unflattering comparisons, polysemous adverbs, oxymoron, and paradox. Maintains that Donne's sonnet is a “classic example of the way in which the sonnet may be reinvented to fit sundry purposes, such as, un-expectedly, the Christian idea of the resurrection of the dead” (162).


Discusses Donne's friendship with Lucy, Countess of Bedford, and his letters to and from her; his poems written for her or with her in mind as well as for her friends and relatives, especially Cecilia Bulstrode, Bridget Markham, and John Harrington; and his sermons. Traces the beginning and maturing of their friendship, explains how Donne sought and received her patronage, and examines the waning of their friendship as Donne found new patrons and entered the Church. Discusses also Donne's relationships with Ben Jonson, George Garrard, Robert Carr, Magdalen Herbert, Henry Wotton, Robert Drury, and others. Comments also on Donne’s involvement in the Somerset wedding.


In Korean. Discusses the critical debate about the interpretation of *Noct*, noting in particular the disagreement about “whether the poem finally sheds light on regeneration” or whether in the end “despair remains unsolved” (205). Presents an analysis of the poem.


Presents a brief introduction to Donne's life and poetry, reproduces four lines from Coleridge's “On Donne's Poetry,” a brief definition of “metaphysics,” and includes *SGo* with brief critical comments and *SunRis* with no comment. Lists as favorite poems *Break, HSDeath, Air, Ecst*, and *LovGrow*.

1323. Liu, Chien-Chi. [A dialogue between literature and medicine: Thanatological concerns and medical ethics in Margaret Edson's *Wit*.] *REAL* 11: 142–64.

In Chinese. Discusses ethical issues in thanatology and medical ethics in Margaret Edson's *Wit*. Comments on how the concepts of life and death in the *Holy Sonnets* influenced the play's protagonist, Vivian Bearing. (English summary)

1324. Liu, Fuli. [The metaphorical meaning of circle

In Chinese. Discusses the complexity of Donne’s metaphors, calling Donne’s style “fantastic.” In particular, analyzes the “metaphorical meaning” of circle imagery in Donne’s love poems. (English summary)

1325. Liu, Xiaoyu. [On John Donne’s use of space imagination in metaphysical conceits.] *Journal of Hefei University of Technology (Social Sciences)* 21, no. 5: 157–60.

In Chinese. Comments on Donne’s spatial imagination and, in particular, his subtle use of conceits involving concentric circles or spheres. Discusses briefly how such conceits figure forth Donne’s complex, often far-fetched meaning in his poems. (English summary)


In Chinese. Discusses the influence of the metaphysical poets on the development of English poetry and calls Donne “the forefather and important representative” of the movement (147). Surveys Donne’s life and the characteristics of his poetry. Illustrates these features by an analysis of the theme, language, and imagery of *Flea*. (English abstract)

1328. Lu, Yuming. [John Donne’s Reception in the West and in China]. *Comparative Literature in China* 69, no. 4: 110–20.

Surveys the reception of Donne’s poetry in the West and in China. Points out how Chinese critical interest in Donne began in the 1980s and how his poetry has continued to engage Chinese scholars and critics up to the present time. Observes that, because of their complexity, Donne’s poems have been given various and often contradictory readings. (English abstract)


Points out how in *SunRis* Donne insists that “the marriage bed is superior to courtly success, that a truer and larger world can be found in the bedroom than in the chambers of the great.” Maintains that such a reading “may be augmented by the recognition that the poem owes something to Spenser’s ‘Epithalamion,’ a poem whose themes are somewhat similar, though comparing marriage to the culture of Elizabeth’s rather than James’s court” (37). Points out similarities between the two poems, noting how both Donne and Spenser “carve out fine and private places which none the less relate strongly to the public world.” Notes that although Donne is often regarded as the poet who, in the words of Kenneth Gross, “did as much as anyone to un-write the Spenserian mode in English poetry,” it seems that Spenser’s poetry “could sometimes exercise a strong influence on him” (38).


Compares Donne and the Persian Sufi poet, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (1212–1273), as mystic poets. In the introduction (1–14), summarizes the contents of each of the five chapters. Points out
that although Donne and Rūmī differ in culture, religion, and language, there are striking similarities in their poetic themes and styles but that both poets are “unique in terms of their individualistic methods of approaching the Divine” (4). In Chapter 1, “The Context” (15–25), presents biographical sketches of both poets and notes how each deviates from the orthodoxy of their respective religions. In Chapter 2, “The Philosophical Fundamentals of Belief” ([27]-45), explores the origins of Islamic and Christian mysticism in order “to highlight the shared philosophical background and some common elements between the works of the two poets” and discusses “the philosophical nature of both mystics’ poetry as a significant bridge between the two” (6). Comments on how the poetry of both poets “reveals a mutual interest in, and intellectual preoccupation with, the same topics.” In Chapter 3, “Religious Obligation and Mystical Transcendence” ([47]-95), discusses common themes in both poets’ poetry and then “elucidates the essential differences in the treatment of these themes” that make the poetry of each “unique” (7). In Chapter 4, “The Intellectual Character of Their Work and Its Manifestation Therein” ([97]-138), highlights “the intellectual basis” of the devotional poetry of both poets and explores “its manifestations throughout their poetry.” Maintains that the intellectual character of the poetry of both poets is “a vital link” between them, a feature that “immediately differentiates them from other mystics” (10), yet points out that Donne’s poetry is more intellectual than Rūmī’s. In Chapter 5, “Figuring Love” ([139]-58), examines the allegorical nature of love in the poetry of both poets, noting, in particular, the differences in their use of “highly explicit erotic language and imagery” (13). In “Conclusion” ([159]-63), summarizes the argument of the study and stresses that “the secondary value attached to poetry by both Rūmī and Donne results from both poets’ intellectual preoccupation with the intense desire to define the self and to find union with the Divine” and thus for them both “poetry becomes a means to make philosophical ideas palpable to those who either do not understand the language of philosophy or else have no taste for it” (163). Concludes with a bibliography ([165]-70) and an index ([171]-81).


In Croatian. Presents an introduction to Donne’s life and poetry, especially commenting on the Holy Sonnets (91–92), followed by a translation of the Holy Sonnets into Croatian (93–96).


Observes that although readers of ElAut “have long admired the lyric’s novel celebration of a beautiful elder woman,” even “the most sympathetic find it awkward to negotiate what remains an essentially fractured performance” (36–37). Notes how “[u]ncomfortable suspicions linger” that ElAut “falters as an encomium gone awry amid its own earnest but risky strategies, or a sophisticated paradox whose cleverness cannot effectively redeem its crueler impulses.” Argues, however, that Donne’s intention in ElAut is “to force a confrontation with the very ambivalence afflicting our regard for old age,” which he “boldly dramatizes” in the poem (37). Discusses how ElAut “boldly anatomizes impulses that its persona at once challenges and betrays.” Through a detailed analysis of the poem shows how ElAut “enfolds a dual intention to console and chasten its audience with the prospect of time’s effect on sexuality, prestige, and the self-image grounded in these social experiences.” Observes how “the speaker’s contraventional gesture first holds out confidence that time need not diminish us—since even a woman (he intimates), whose appearance determines so much about her position in the masculinist world she inhabits, can continue to exert an allure into advanced years—only to terminate this hope in the terrifying caricature that he abruptly and impulsively sketches” (51–52). Maintains that the poem’s “chief dramatic effect” lies in the narrator’s “very inability to
sustain a complimentary sense of ‘reverence’ for long, as his endeavor of encomiastic persuasion or self-reinforcement cracks beneath the weight of disgust he cannot at last shirk.” Claims that “the speaker’s naked psychology takes center stage, exposing our deepest fears of the aged state we struggle to deny.” Explains how the closing lines of the poem “display both a recovered composure and a chastened perspective, available only through the poet’s frank confrontation, face to face, with his complicity in the gerontophobia he had set out to oppose” (52). Concludes that in ElAut Donne “engages and reconfigures, in candid terms, the gerontophobic urges that subtly and overtly plagued the sensibilities of his age, and our own” (54).


Points out that Ham is “one of the last poems” Donne wrote, that he “wrote it to order,” and that in the 1633 edition there appears a letter by Donne to Sir Robert Ker in which the poet “professes himself reluctant to have written the poem because of the difficulties that its subject presented” (1). Challenges the position of those who, on the basis of the letter to Ker, have considered Ham “a relatively inferior poem” since its author himself seemingly had misgivings about writing it (2). Argues instead that Donne’s “apology” for the poem is, in fact, “as artfully conceived as the poem itself” and that one must “be wary of applying what Donne says in the letter to our understanding of his attitude toward poetry in general, toward occasional poetry in particular, or toward writing poetry at a point in his life when his profession called on him to exercise his intellect and imagination chiefly in the writing of sermons.” Explains how “[p]articular details of the situation Donne addresses by writing the poem can be gathered from contemporary letters commenting on Hamilton’s death” (3) and how they “help us imagine what might have been the impulse of Ker’s act of commissioning the poem if not of Donne’s decision to oblige” (4). Discusses, in particular, how Donne addresses and disarms rumors that the rapid decay of Hamilton’s body may have been due to a dangerous disease or perhaps even foul play and also that on his deathbed he converted to Catholicism. Presents a detailed reading of the subtle images, allusions, and implications in Ham and shows how the poem “leads the reader to an important truth through the operations of an argument that is inspired by the rumors and speculations arising from the details of its subject’s life—that it is impious to think humans can divine how God is disposed to anyone from outward indications of a life or death” (32–33). Maintains that the poem “indirectly instructs the living not to engage in scandalous reflections on the condition of Hamilton’s soul” and finally makes “a sure-handed expression of hope the occasion to sympathize with an abiding sense of loss” (33).


Explains that medieval mystics put the word “ravish” “to spiritual use in their allegorical interpretations of the Song of Songs, which for them was the greatest expression of Christ the Bridegroom’s love for his bride, the human soul.” Points out that Donne, likewise, fuses the profane and the sacred in his use of “ravish” in HSDue, HSBatter, and HSSShe “with a different emphasis on each occasion.” Notes that in HSDue “the predominant meaning is that of physical force,” in HSBatter the meaning is both sexual and sacred, and in HSSShe “the word is associated with the explicitly spiritual notion of enrapture or ecstasy, as described by the mystics.” Argues that there is “some correspondence between the changing emphasis of the word in each of the three sonnets and the progression in spiritual awareness of the poet persona(e).” Claims that, read in the order they were most likely written, the three sonnets show “a movement from contrition, motivated by despair, toward an assurance of God’s grace, motivated by love for God.” Discusses each of the sonnets in the light of Augustinian and
Calvinist theology and medieval concepts of “the spiritual journey” (32).


An original poem that alludes to Donne.


Considers “the function of satiric writing within the early modern town” (217) and discusses “the urban environment, especially that of London, as unsettling and confusing, presenting myriad challenges to traditional moral codes” (217–18). Focuses on “roughly ten years from the late 1580s, during which satire became a popular yet highly controversial genre” (218). Maintains that although his poems are “in some respects unrepresentative of Elizabethan satire,” Donne “provides a valuable study of an author thinking his way through some of the implications of his chosen mode.” Claims that Donne’s poems are “remarkably self-reflective” and shows how he “weighs the value of different satiric traditions and works to situate satire afresh in his contemporary urban context” (223). Discusses, as an illustration, *Satt*, situating the poem “in a broadly social and cultural, as opposed to a more traditionally literary context” (223–24). Maintains that the poem takes “the form of a pedestrian satire, a type that would flourish through subsequent years,” a type that reassesses “the relation between the individual and civic space, in ways that challenge myths of order and community” (224). Shows how *Sat* “admits a tendency of language to transform apparently clear distinctions between good and bad into more arbitrary distinctions between differing interpretations of signs” and explains how the poem “acknowledges, however anxiously, that the city breaks down moral absolutes and politicizes acts of writing.” Concludes that *Sat* “usefully clarifies the political status of satire” and shows how satire during this period “participated in a critical reassessment of statecraft and morality” (226).


Reproduces and comments on an heretofore unpublished document distributed at a seminar given by Jacques Derrida in December 2002 entitled “La Bête et le souverain” in which Derrida translates and gives an explication du texte of ll. 3–4 of *HSMade* (“I runne to death, and death meets me as fast,/ And all my pleasures are like yesterday”). Derrida calls the lines sublime and infinite, but says he does not recall the exact poem in which the lines appear. Comments on the significance of Donne’s lines for Derrida as he reflects on death, time, and pleasure.


Discusses passages from *Biathanatos, Pseudo-Martyr*, verse epistles, letters, sermons, and selected poems, as well as Donne’s preparations for his own death to show that “[w]hen examined together as a topically coherent collection of verbal images and ideas,” Donne’s prose works “provide a justification, a defense, and a clarification of one of the most enduring themes of Donne’s spiritual life—martyrdom.” Discusses how the works “are governed by a strain of apologetics which addresses what we might call his own ‘passive suicide,’ but insist nonetheless that readers deem him a certified Christian martyr.” Shows how the prose works “constitute both a record of and a commentary upon Donne’s own passion and suffering—an apology both for a life governed by the macabre specter of martyrdom and for the works which helped him chronicle this life.” Claims that “[m]aintaining that his works will provide succor to those who experience them, Donne resolves, ironically, to assume for himself the
role of pseudo-martyr.” Says that throughout his life Donne “deemed himself a martyr” but that “his was a new, literary form of martyrdom,” in which “crafting imaginary versions of his own death served primarily to remove the previous excrescences of his ego which might have obstructed his path to glory.” Maintains that Donne’s prose works—“when studied psycho-biographically—testify not only to the regularity with which he entertained ideas of suicide, but also to his resilience in the face of dying.” Holds that the works are intended “to function finally as unqualified proof of Donne’s worthiness of martyrdom” even though he did not die a martyr’s death; thus “he uses the prose works to eulogize himself as if he had” (378).


Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne, commenting primarily on his Catholic heritage and its influence on his poetry. Claims, in fact, that his “formation in Elizabethan Catholicism coloured his entire life and work.” Points out how his poetry “draws upon the potent images, beliefs, and devotions of his family’s faith,” noting, however, that it “does not present a coherent Catholic vision.” Maintains that Donne’s Catholicism “ranges from playful metaphors to serious remembrance, consisting largely of unexpected resonances, fluid manoeuvrings, and transformed devotions, often presented in a spirit of restless enquiry” (217). Reproduces Relic, Cross, Cor, “Virgin Mary” from Lit, Goodf, a selection from FirAn, and Sickness—with notes.


Describes “a multidisciplinary effort” to create an electronic repository of Donne’s poems. Discusses “the work-fl ow” adopted and the “Web-based tools” developed for “maintaining a collection of transcriptions and images, a concordance of poems, a list of press variants, and a browsing interface that enables readers to access these materials.” Sees the project as a complement to The Variorum Edition of the Poems of John Donne that “shows how a traditional scholarly edition can be enhanced by resources made available by computers and the internet.” Notes that the initial volume in Digital Donne is the first edition of Donne’s poems (1633), which is “currently being augmented” with a copy of the second edition (1635) and a manuscript from St. Paul’s Cathedral in London. Notes how the digitalized pages of these volumes and of certain other manuscripts are “matched with transcriptions prepared for the Variorum to form the physical basis of the project” (411).


Comments on Margaret Edson’s Wit, both the original play and the later film, observing how for Professor Vivian Bearing, a dying cancer patient, Donne becomes “her weapon against death” and how she trusts that “her deep knowledge” of Donne “will sustain her.” Observes, however, that in Edson’s text “learned language proves inadequate” for Bearing and Donne’s poetry “stops being effective to provide her with answers” (46).


Observes how in the seventeenth century “religious writing of a meditative cast is a particularly conspicuous site of the new tendencies to pursue periodic composition while introducing aphoristic high points in units of discourse
that extend beyond the compass of a single sentence." Points out that Donne is "one of the most notable practitioners in this vein" (72) and notes that since he is "insistent regarding his personal loyalties and what he characterises as his providential placement within the Church of England, his prose style may bear witness to the resonances of periodic structure in the collects of the Book of Common Prayer, which would have left memory traces through regular recitation in public worship" (72–73). Maintains that "whatever the origins of his distinctive style, Donne adapts the dynamic of the expanded, internally accentuated period to the discovery and communication of God's ways in this world and beyond—this being the knowledge, and these the mental trajectories, now to be accommodated by this complexly capacious form." Discusses how in his Christmas sermon given at St. Paul's in 1624 Donne "proposes to correlate syntactic and semantic circuity with widening and deepening connotations of the sun as the image of sovereign divinity" (73).


Presents an appreciative critical analysis of HSShow. Calls the sonnet "provocative" and points out how its provocation is based on "the far-fetched nature of the conceit at its heart" (46).


Briefly comments on Donne’s religious background. Maintains that in Cross Donne challenges the Puritan objection to using the sign of the cross in the ceremony of baptism and notes his praise of the cross as a religious symbol. Comments also on Donne’s uses of irony, his concept of penance, and his desire for God’s love in the Holy Sonnets. Presents Italian translations by Daniela Sandid of Cross, HSMade, HSWhat, HSRound, HSDeath, HSBatter, and HSShow—without notes or glosses.


Explains that in the seventeenth century the word "spirit" "stood euphemistically for semen and erections." Discusses how Donne uses the euphemism for semen in both his early erotic poetry as well as in his later religious poetry and sermons. Points out that, going beyond the sexual language found in much Christian mystical writing, Donne “drew on renaissance ideas of metempsychosis which allowed him to view sperm as something physically connected with the spirit of a man, and potentially associated with the Holy Spirit itself.” Notes also that “[t]he reproductive potential of sperm was further associated with the creative power of the poet” and thus for the celibate Donne (after his wife’s death) poetry became “a substitute for sexual reproduction.” Considers the “ambiguous, playful, erotic spirit” of Donne’s secular and religious poetry and prose “in terms of the equally ambiguous, playful and erotic spirit of theological language” (233). Notes how, in Fare and Metem, for instance, Donne holds that orgasm causes not only post-coital sorrow but also “a physiological condition of spiritual and mental weakness” and could become “even a threat to a man’s life.” Observes that since, for Donne, “spirit” “meant sperm and sperm meant life,” a man, “[d]eprived of his spirits, of his generative and vital powers,” could come “close to death” (244). Concludes that Donne “knew how to mix together theology with poetry, and wonder with anarchy, and use language to seduce and transcend reason” and that “if the spirit involved in all this was the spirit of male orgasm, so be it” (256).


An historical novel set in seventeenth-century London in which Margaret (Pegge in the novel), one of Donne’s daughters, attempts to win the love of Izaak Walton, who, infatuated with her older sister, rejects her. In her obsessive desire to know the secret of love she collects her father’s poems and seeks to know the details of the love affair between her father and mother. In the novel both Donne and Anne More tell their love story. For an evaluation of the novel, see Margaret Maurer’s “Conceited Donne” in JDJ 28 (2009): 163–67.


Discusses Donne throughout this study of the development of a “culture of clubbing, urban sociability, and wit” that took place in the Inns of Court and certain London taverns in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Shows how “the convivial societies that emerged created rituals to define social identities and to engage in literary play and political discussion.” Argues that lawyer wits, including Donne, as well as John Hoskyns, Ben Jonson, Thomas Coryate, and others, “consciously reinvigorated humanist traditions of learned play” and shows how “[t]heir experiments with burlesque, banquet literature, parody, and satire resulted in a volatile yet creative dialogue between civility and license, and between pleasure and the violence of scurrilous words.” Discusses how these wits “inaugurated a mode of literary fellowship that shaped the history and literature of sociability in the seventeenth century” ([iii]). In Chapter 1, “Gentlemen lawyers at the Inns of Court” (10–34), discusses Donne’s association with the Inns of Court in the 1590s, his friendships with other witty young men there, and how his poems and paradoxes circulated among his friends. Comments especially on the verse epistles to male friends as well as Storm and Calm, noting how these poems “describe a complex social world in which individuals must constantly negotiate between their own necessities and conflicting social obligations and ideals” (20). Discusses also Satir, observing how from it one gets “the impression of a complex society in which it is frequently difficult to manage social obligations” (29). In Chapter 5, “Coryats Crudities (1611) and the sociability of print” (102–27), discusses how Donne’s Coryat is “a meditation on print publication, and ultimately, the humanist culture of the book” (124). In Chapter 7, “Afterlives of the wits” (153–77), points out factors that suggest that 1614 “marked the end of a phase of formal association” (155) among the gentlemen wits and comments on Donne’s career following his ordination.


In Japanese. Discusses the various uses of paradox in Donne’s secular and religious poems through a detailed analysis of words and expressions. Observes how Donne employs paradox rhetorically to challenge accepted or traditional ideas; to express skepticism, satire, and/or self-contradiction; and to describe the paradoxical spirit of his age. Divides the book as follows: Introduction: The Age of Donne, the Age of Paradox; Chapter 1: Paradox of Love: The Rhetoric of Paradox; Chapter 2: Paradox of the City: Paradox as Satire; Chapter 3: Paradox of Mannerism; Chapter 4: Paradox of the Modern Age: Paradoxical Skepticism; Chapter 5: Paradox of Death: Religious Paradox; Chapter 6: Paradox of Nothing; and a conclusion.


A catalogue of an exhibition of early printed books in the library of the Massachusetts Center for Renaissance Studies in Amherst, including a copy of Donne’s LXXX Sermons (1640). Presents a brief introduction to Donne’s life and works as well as a brief description of the
volume. Notes that the Center also owns a copy of Donne’s *Fifty Sermons* (1649).

1350. Papazian, Mary A. “‘No Man [and Nothing] is an Island’: Contexts for Donne’s ‘Meditation XVII.’” *JDJ* 26: 381–85.

Examines the personal, historical, and political contexts of the *Devotions*. Argues, in particular, how “the political context intimates why Donne would have been distressed at the time he fell into sickness, despite his own personal success and relative security” at the time and also holds that it shows “why he seems so ready to turn away from politics in this work.” Maintains that the *Devotions* was “a poignant and all too human response to the turn of events that had consumed his mind and imagination since 1619,” especially King James’s failure “to act aggressively in support and defense of the Palatine.” Notes that in *Devotions* Donne “never actually prays for physical recovery” but rather he “reveals his readiness to turn away from the active, earthly, political life as he longs not for physical recovery and further engagement in the world, but rather for the triumphant moment when his soul can join Christ in heaven,” a desire that is “never so powerfully expressed as in the seventeenth and eighteenth ‘Meditations’” (385).


Examines Donne’s poems concerning his naval adventures in the 1590s and analyzes “the ways in which they respond to the formal challenge of representing such experiences at a time when ‘travel writing’ was seeking generic definition.” Maintains that Donne’s “interest in the new geography, the growth of tourism, and the new perspective offered by maps and travel reports drew from him a wider set of meditations on travel experience.” Points out that apparently Donne “showed no interest in composing a conventional memoir or ‘relation’ of his own travels” but that “the convoluted and introspective manner in which he represented such experience in his poetry does not invalidate it as reportage as much as anticipate the subjective concerns with the psychology of the traveler in later examples of the genre” (85). Discusses, in particular, *Storm, Calm, Ship, Metem, ElWar, ElProg, Sat3, Sat5, GHerb, Christ, FirAn*, and *Goodf*, as well as selections from *Essays, Devotions*, and the sermons.


Discusses changes that have occurred in the anthologization of Donne’s poetry in the twentieth century. In order to situate the discussion “within a tradition of reading, transmitting and (mis)representing Donne,” briefly outlines “to what extent Donne’s poetry was transcribed in miscellanies of the seventeenth century as an indication of his contemporary reputation,” noting that the bawdy and sexually explicit poems were most frequently transcribed. Thereafter focuses primarily on a comparison of British and American anthologies that “were published ‘early’ in the twentieth century (up to 1972)” with “an equal number of anthologies published after 1990.” Points out, for instance, that both a “statistical analysis and a detailed case-study of the seven editions of *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* between 1962 and 2000 reveal changes in the representation of Donne that can be read as an attempt of finally integrating ‘Jack’ and ‘John’ Donne, and of acknowledging Donne’s ‘bawdiness’ both with regard to textual selection and editorial commentary” (10). From the analysis of anthologies, observes that “from the beginning of the century until well into the 1970s, anthologies tended to overemphasize the Holy Sonnets, particularly at the expense of the more bawdy pieces of Donne’s love poetry” but that “more recent anthologies clearly offer a more varied selection” of poems, including the bawdier ones. Points out that “the selection process in the anthologies printed up to the 1970s seems to have been at least partially determined by thoughts of moral acceptability,” whereas anthologies of the 1990s are “less prurient with
regard to Donne’s sexual imagery.” Concludes that, for modern readers, it is “precisely the variety of Donne’s poetry that makes it such a compelling and challenging read” and that “more recent anthologies are clearly designed to represent more of this variety” (21).


Discusses the influence of Donne on Anthony Hecht’s poetry. Reproduces Isaac Oliver’s portrait of Donne (1616) and a photo of Hecht and calls Hecht “Donne’s uncanny, latter-day look alike” (283). Maintains that Donne supplied the young Hecht with “a way of thinking in poetry, that is, with a way of structuring thought, rather than with a list of Donnean topics, conceits, phrases, and so forth” (291). Notes, in particular, how Donne helped Hecht “to organize in verse what was discontinuous in life” (293).


In a discussion to show why “joy and joylessness were of peculiar interest to early Protestant theology and the literature it influenced” (73), comments on Donne’s sermons in which he “sought to turn the tide of joylessness by presenting joy as biblically enjoined; as presumptive evidence of the individual’s anxiously sought favor with God; and finally, as crucial to the corporate life of the Church of England” (79). Points out that Donne “devotes five full sermons, and parts of several others, to the duty and prospect of joy.” Suggests two possible reasons why Donne the preacher was “so invested” in the notion of joy: (1) perhaps to allay his own anxiety and fear of damnation because of his apostasy from Catholicism, and (2) to answer “the growing self-perception and continental reputation of Englishmen as melancholic and even suicidal” (85). Maintains that Donne’s sermons on joy were aimed “not only to save the English from a general cheerlessness but also to keep them, more particularly, from theological bickering over God’s relation to man.” Observes that, for Donne, “joy is a Christian duty” (86). Shows also how Donne’s theology of joy is reflected in his ecclesiology in which he stresses that “inner joy and not external affiliation mark the true Christian” (87).


Discusses how *FirAn* chronicles “the world’s fragmentation and decay,” while *SecAn* “reverses this decay and seeks to reconstruct, so to speak, the universe by suggesting that its parts are bound together in ways that cannot be accounted for in empirical observation.” Maintains that Donne inserts a “pattern of planetary allusions in the poem to describe and so reconstruct a traditional, geocentric world-model” and “draws upon the Neoplatonic return of the soul, since it is a myth that affirms the integrity of knowledge in the cosmos and claims that the individual shares and reflects the greater laws of the universe, as is most fully figured in the last canto of Dante’s *Paradiso*, when he beholds the universal book of knowledge and his will is united with the love that moves the heavens and the stars.” Points out, however, that, unlike Dante, Donne in *SecAn* “does not enjoy the celestial vision or hear celestial music, but stands apart and observes the *extasis*.” Observes how Donne “points to the image of ’shee’ as a model for the soul’s progress, since ‘shee’ has completed her pilgrimage on earth and gloriously returned to heaven” (100). Says that “[r]ecurring images of her as wisdom, fortitude, and piety chart the itinerary of her own progress toward spiritual perfection” while Donne “remains at a distance as one who admires or aspires but cannot fully follow” (100–01). Maintains that *SecAn* figures forth “a complete universe, in which the secrets of nature and the planets could be interpreted, decoded, and understood, much like that of Dante and his medieval Neoplatonic tradition.” Insists, however, that Donne himself “is excluded from
the beatitude of Paradise and the completeness of knowledge that it promises" and that, "although unable to hear the rapture of celestial music and to comprehend its operations," Donne "remains an instrument summoning others toward it" (101).


Limited to 30 copies.

A hand-made “sculptural” or fold book that contains ll. 27–33 of *ElBed*. Unfolds gradually to reveal the text. Designed and printed by computer on very thin Japanese paper. Issued in a cardboard box lined with red satin and with a clear plastic circular cutout in the lid.


Maintaining that Donne’s conversion to Anglicanism was “ultimately sincere,” discusses the steps in his conversion by examining aspects of Donne’s life and by examining his religious writings, particularly his sermons (130). Suggests that the “first sign of Donne’s changing attitude” toward the Catholic Church was his entrance into the service of Sir Thomas Egerton since the job “required at least a formal acceptance of the Anglican Church and the Queen as its head,” although it is unclear exactly “to what extent that decision was supported by his religious considerations” (131). Surveys Donne’s early religious development, showing how his “religious maturation” was “a lengthy and complex process” (133). Comments on Donne’s open criticism of Catholicism in *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Ignatius*, and particularly in his sermons, in which he defends the via media approach to the question of the true Church. Maintains that, in time, Donne came to believe that, as an Anglican, “he was, substantially, a member of the same church—the universal Catholic Church to which all his great forebearers belonged” (136). Concludes that, once ordained, Donne was “fully committed to the service of his congregation” and “finally came to know God and the Church that he was ministering.” Maintains, therefore, that he “should not be seen as a conformist apostate” (141).


Suggests that “the real obsession in an artist’s life is with the work itself” and that “[t]he language is what sustains and revivifies and ultimately obsesses the artist—not emotional states and their grimy moral implications” (184). Briefly comments on Donne, calling him the “creator of some of the most potent and necessary love poems” and maintaining that we need to know “very little” about “his tempestuous erotic inclinations or arrangements.” Cites *ElFatal* (ll. 47–48) and *Air* (ll. 1–2), calling these lines “among the most treasurable in the language” (183).


Argues that “there exists in Donne’s avowedly Protestant writings a profound Catholic indebtedness, a rich mingling of two seemingly contradictory elements.” Maintains that although Donne was “consciously advocating the Protestant cause and preaching to members of the new church, the quality of his writings was deeply indebted to his Jesuit upbringing and, especially, to the Catholic manuals of medita-
tion on which he was reared” (178). Considers Donne’s “modes and patterns of thinking that remained implanted in his being” from his Catholic upbringing, “the continued presence of which constituted no theological contradiction to the creed he had espoused.” Maintains, in other words, that what emerges in his writings is “a fascinating duality, as Donne dedicates his writings to his Protestant beliefs while employing the thought processes he had developed in his Catholic youth” (184). Observes that “[w]here the Protestant manuals recommended meditation within the natural beauties of the countryside and encouraged in the meditator a conviction of personal salvation and joy,” Donne’s sermons and Devotions “owed to Loyola’s Spiritual Exercises and its progeny two opposite qualities—a withdrawal from the tangible world and vivid contemplation of his own threatened damnation.” Concludes that “[t]he importation into his sermons and devotions of qualities so alien to Protestant meditative practice, his extraterrestrial thought processes and his everpresent dread of the Day of Judgment, accounted in large part for their remarkable literary power” (211).

Reviews:


Discusses how writers such as Donne, Shakespeare, Bacon, and others responded to the intellectual and theological changes that occurred in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as a result of the Copernican revolution and the Protestant Reformation. Maintains that these writers, “although presenting to some extent different attitudes to the new discoveries, all have an apparent awareness of the expansion of the world but also, at some level, seem to deny the aspect of the unknown and attempt to rationalise the obscure” (48). Comments on Donne’s use of images of cosmology, geography, and cartography in his poetry, noting, in particular, his use of “the metaphor of the sun for the Son (of God),” as seen, for instance, in Goodf. Discusses in some detail how Donne uses “explorational imagery” in Devotions (53) and ElBed; comments on his presentation in HSLittle of “a universe disrupted from its medieval earth-centeredness” (54); and calls Sickness his “most elaborate and controversial poem on encountering nothingness, or the unknown” (57). Also comments on Donne’s metaphorical uses of voyages and discoveries both in his poems and sermons. Notes how, for Donne, “[t]he encountering of the unknown, whether in the form of cosmological or geographical exploration, seems to mean a relocation of the world as man knows it, and a rephrasing of the narration of the old reality.” (61).


Observes that in early seventeenth-century England “bloody martyrdom was no longer exclusively considered as something praiseworthy” (85). Points out that in Pseudo-Martyr Donne proposes to his Catholic readers “a different, more moderate and more private kind of martyrdom: the daily struggle to live as an upright Christian and loyal citizen amidst an atmosphere of moral corruption, worldly cares and tribulation” (85–86). Notes also that in “The Martyrs” in Lit Donne asks the martyrs to beg for a new kind of martyrdom that is “not rebellious denial of Obedience, but Charity,” a kind of “every-day martyrdom” (86).

Discusses Donne’s views on transubstantiation and the Eucharist. Observes that although as Dean of St. Paul’s and as an ex-Catholic he had “to tow a doctrinal line rejecting the [Catholic] doctrine of transubstantiation,” he was, nevertheless, “obsessed with communion,” alluding to communion even in his seduction poems (e.g., *Flea*). Maintains that, for Donne, “love-making recapitulates the union of God and man achieved in the incarnation and echoed in the Eucharist” and “is so redemptive that he even imagines making love beyond the grave.” Claims that Donne’s “attachment to the body is also strong enough for him to suggest that the angels should envy us for having bodies, rather than we them” (641). Stresses that “by fully embracing materiality, sexuality, and desire,” Donne “makes them the very medium of his transvaluation.” Contrasts Donne’s view with that of Milton, who views communion as “a feature of prelapsarian paradise,” and that of Herbert, “for whom communion will be achieved beyond this world—in an apocalyptic after-life” (642). Maintains that Donne believes that “we can achieve communion here and now in common love” (647).


Studies “the archaeological imagination in literature of early modern England” and “how writers in that era responded to the material traces of the recent and distant past: ancient bones and ruined abbeys, exotic mummies and enigmatic urns.” Explores chiefly “archaeological themes and motifs as they are manifested in poetry, drama, and prose of the period” (2). In Chapter 4, “Charnel Knowledge: Open Graves in Shakespeare and Donne” (107–50), contrasts Shakespeare and Donne concerning “the spiritual significance of and respect due to human remains” (114). Points out how Donne, unlike Shakespeare, “discovers a surprising spiritual value in the disturbance and circulation of human remains” (150). Discusses how Donne dwells, especially in his sermons, “in graphic and disconcerting detail on the countless indignities awaiting the corpse in the grave,” although “his vision of the body’s afterlife is fundamentally positive” (139). Notes that Donne focuses most often on “reduction of the body to dust” in order “to emphasize the wondrousness of what will take place on the Last Day” (140). Discusses how, for Donne, there is “something genuinely appealing about putrefaction, exhumation, and dissolution” in that “what happens to the body in and beyond the grave is not merely a necessary precondition for the miracle of resurrection, nor a corrective to worldly pride, but a fundamentally positive process whereby the isolated private body is brought in communion with others,” thereby illustrating “the holiness of the natural processes that follow death” (142). Observes how in his love poems as in the sermons the theme of the afterlife of the body intrigues Donne and discusses as examples *Fun and Relic*, poems in which Donne “embraces the prospects of exhumation and dissolution as ways of escaping isolation and immobility in the cold confinement of the tomb” (148). In Chapter 5, “‘Mummy is Become Merchandise’: Cannibals and Commodities in the Seventeenth Century” (151–74), discusses the various uses and understanding of mummy in the seventeenth century. Points out that mummy was sometimes associated with “witchcraft or the supernatural” and comments briefly on Donne’s use of the term in the conclusion of *LovAlch* in which, with “jocular misogyny” he views women in the sex act “as bodies pure and simple” (165) and “jostles with the equally misogynistic but darker idea of women as corpses possessed by supernatural forces” (166).


Discusses how Donne’s sermons are “a lens through which to understand his culture” and how they “reveal clearly the hotly contested matters of his day, and, paradoxically,
because they are in no way typical, they articulate the crises on which they comment in their most complex forms and expose the fault lines of their religious and political contexts.” Points out that, in Donne, one encounters “a passionate intellect, prompted by the crises threatening religion and state,” arguing for “moderation and negotiation between hard-line extremes” and confronting “the contentious temper of both the Renaissance and postmodern worlds.” Observes that “[t]hrough his emphasis on teaching the processes of moral decision-making rather than enforcing blind obedience or dogma, Donne links the most private arbiters—conscience—to the most public of media—the sermon” (433). Maintains that Donne’s sermons “present him as an ethical model of integrity and a force of cohesion in an institution—the English Church—that was fractured by religious debate and polemic.” Observes that while many other preachers of the time used sermons to express their extremist views, Donne “opted instead to moderate the heated religious and political debates of his day, and to do so without sacrificing conscience or integrity” (434). Concludes that Donne’s sermons are important “because of the way in which they practise what they preach” and because they “exemplify in its finest form what is at the core of any civilisation—the artful use of words to move people to right action” (441).


Notes the discovery in 1992 in the British Library of three manuscripts containing hitherto unrecorded copies of Donne’s sermons, the most important of which is a scribal presentation copy of Donne’s 1622 Gunpowder Plot sermon, corrected in Donne’s own hand, and published as John Donne’s 1622 Gunpowder Plot Sermon: A Parallel Text Edition (1996). Presents a bibliographical description and discussion of the other two manuscripts—Harley MS 6946 (H1), containing five sermons, and Harley MS 6356 (H2), containing two sermons. Discusses the textual significance and transmission of both manuscripts and shows how they “can tell us a great deal about the transmission of Donne’s sermons, gradually adding to the picture thought complete in the 1960s, and modified only slightly since then” (112–13). Points out that the manuscripts also “tell us something about the place of women, such as Anne Sadleir, as patrons and distributors of sermons.” Notes that H1 shows “both the circulation of high-profile occasional sermons (of which other manuscripts exists), and of two sermons connected to Donne in particular” and claims that “[i]t’s importance as the only manuscript devoted exclusively to sermons by Donne, and in texts that are close to the revised texts represented in the printed folios, is undeniable” (113). 5 Plates.


Examining “neohistoricism and criticism of it as an approach to some Renaissance prose,” notes “the current inattention to most of that prose.” Cites as an example the neglected genre of the character, noting that Donne wrote three prose characters that have received little critical attention. Suggests that literary critics “may be emboldened to read Donne’s life a bit differently once admitting his foray into character writing” (307).


Discusses how in Ignatius Donne “negotiates the difficult conjunction of ethics and aesthetics as these emerge from skepticism” and how it “enacts and condemns a skeptical aesthetic even as it tries to salvage a skeptical ethic from its blistering intellectual rampage” (226). Argues that “the crabbed, skeptical ethic” operating in Ignatius is “far more than a cagey piece of political ephemera.” Points out how in it Donne “wrestles with his personal demons” (227). Discusses how Donne, although perhaps
“inspired by contemporary satires of puffed up theologians,” was also influenced by “the skeptical models offered by Lucian and Erasmus” (229) but maintains that, although Ignatius “participates in a humanist tradition of Menippian satire, several features put it in a class of its own, not least Donne’s deployment of rhetorical devices symptomatic of skepticism” (231). Shows, in particular, how “the skeptical ethics of Ignatius are geared to communal concerns” and how it “stages the nightmare of individuality run amok, each ego proclaiming his own all-sufficient truth” (240). Maintains that Ignatius testifies to Donne’s conviction that “the process whereby groups choose is corrupt, with the weak as much as the strong accountable for specific failures” and yet “his satirical indictment of meetings as conclaves shows that at the back of his mind Donne is pondering an important question—what would heroic skeptical inquiry look like if conducted by a gathering of reasonable, dispassionate men?” (240–41).


Proposes to combine “a present-day appreciation for the psychology of skepticism with historical fidelity to early modern literary categories and religious contexts” (x) and to discuss Shakespeare and Donne in order to “deepen our understanding of the world they shared, as well as of the ethical and aesthetic implications of their work” (xi). In Chapter 2, “Forgetting Knowledge in Donne’s Anniversaries” (41–64), discusses how from his early life to its end skepticism “retained its powerful hold over Donne because it agreed with the dialectical temper of his mind” (49). In particular, “investigates Donne’s skepticism about memory in Anniversaries, arguing that the poems’ distinctive tone arises from the tension between the ostensible exemplarity of Elizabeth Drury and her countermonumental significance” (xii). Discusses how the two poems “enact the move from tragic skepticism to comic Fideism” (50) and shows how Donne’s “memorializing of Elizabeth Drury converges with his skepticism in ways that show the intertwining of a skeptical aesthetic with skeptical ethics” (51). Argues that in Anniversaries Donne “labors to forget the deplorable poisons of the sick world and endeavors to imagine a better place where his soul can aspire to live” and that Elizabeth Drury represents for him “the future regenerate state that Donne desires for his own soul.”

Observes how Donne “aspires to the perfect intimacy and total knowledge that Elizabeth Drury attains in his imagination” but since “this aspiration remains unfulfilled in this life,” he “must make do with imperfect knowledge that he would rather disown than own up to.” Concludes that “[h]is skeptical dilemma need not be seen as tragic.” Maintains that “[i]nsofar as it expresses itself in witty thought-experiments that explore the effects of skeptical strategies on commemorative art,” Anniversaries “want to have it both ways, setting in motion memory-work that offers itself as consolation, even as the poems question an aesthetic of consolation” (64). In Chapter 4, “Acknowledging the Past in Donne’s Ignatius His Conclave” (89–119), compares and contrasts the uses of skepticism in Ignatius and in Shakespeare’s The Winter’s Tale. Discusses how Donne in Ignatius “at once enacts and condemns a skeptical aesthetic even as he tries to salvage a skeptical ethic from its blistering, intellectual rampage” and how he “adopts a skeptical aesthetic in hopes of helping us to imagine a present free from the burdens of the past” (89). Presents a close reading of Ignatius that “examines skeptical strategies relating to point of view, framing, and genre” and argues that “the work’s polemical energy issues from Donne’s growing interest in three irenic discourses, those of conciliation, typology, and adiaphora.” Shows how “[a]s expressions of collective memory, these
three discourses militate against skepticism and tend generically toward a comic exemplarity” (92).

Reviews:


Examines Donne’s concept of “the centered, vocational person,” his “confident, unified sense of self integrated within a community of persons,” after first suggesting how “the unsettling elements” in his biography and temperament “come to be resolved within a unifying vocation serving the common good” (146). Maintains that “the Jobian conviction of sustained identity and the Pauline conception of vocation expressed throughout the sermons” are “later expressions of a psychology” that transmuted his earlier “psychology of loss, separation, and depression” into “gain.” Discusses “the development of this psychology in Donne’s representations of the self” by commenting on “the role of the feminine in Donne’s thought, then on the prose letters as intimacy yearning for community, and finally on the Pauline conception of vocation that centered his later years.” Notes that “the concept of the Jobian self ‘redintegrates’—to use one of Donne’s own terms—the broken fragments of his earlier experience” (152). Discusses how Donne “satisfied his amorousness, ambition, and covetousness in the priestly vocation” (180), primarily through his conformity to Christ, which “solved the problem of separation, annihilation, absence, and exclusion that were Donne’s birthright.” Points out, however, that “[a]lthough conformity did not dispel suffering and the anxiety of separation, it harnessed them through participation in the community” (184). Comments on the Pauline aspects of Donne’s priestly vocation as a preacher.


Suggests “potential analogies” (302) between Donne and the biblical prophets. Maintains that, Donne, like the prophets, “exposes the intrinsic mutability, fluidity, and plasticity of all things” and that he “undoes language to undermine names and identities: as Hosea undoes Ephraim, Donne undoes ‘Donne.’” Points out also that, like the prophets, “this mortification of human language, human power and human concept is intimately tied to a God who can ‘blast the State with a breath, melt a Church with a looke, moulder a world with a touch.’” Says that Donne and the prophets share an “‘unpoetic’ poetic quality.” Points out how in *Lit* Donne describes the prophetic poetics on which he models his own” (303).


Points out the prevalence of images of melted wax and seals in Renaissance literature. In light of Donne’s play on a wax image in his 1622/23 sermon “Jesus Wept” to refer to John Williams, Dean of Westminster and Keeper of the Great Seal, suggests that Donne’s image of “chafed wax” in l. 29 of *ElNat* may be an autobiographical reference. Notes that at the time of his marriage Donne was secretary to Sir Thomas Egerton, Keeper of the Great Seal, for whom he “chafed wax.”


Argues that “no notion of ‘metaphor’ can be detached from language and that, in fact, language is a key to the power of metaphor and
to the way the mind functions in its conscious and unconscious forms” (17). Discusses Ecst “to help demonstrate that there is no getting away from language, that a notion of cognitive functioning ‘apart’ from language is at best an attempt to avoid the fact of language, the predominance of which has been a predominant feature of twentieth-century thought” (17–18). Discusses how in Ecst Donne “prophetically indicates that meaning (spirit-mind) arises in a knotting of soul (unconscious desire) imbued by love with erotic energy that must use the body to arrive at language” (18). Claims that in Ecst “what was born in the inarticulate language of the soul is transferred into a higher order of nature by means of the body” and thus the body is “the location of a bearing across or transfer to a higher order, a meta-pherein, a literal metaphor.” Believes that “[a]lthough evidently not a cognitive linguist, Donne may be considered a meta-psychological poet,” i.e., “he created names for orders of experience, as does psychoanalysis, where the carrying of something inchoate (soul/the dialogue of one) through erotically imbued sensations on the body leads to language (spirit/mind) and to our humanity” (26).


Discusses the carrier system in early modern England and briefly mentions Donne’s references to the carrier in his letters from Mitcham to Henry Goodyer, who lived at Polesworth Hall in Warwickshire. Points out how Donne regularly wrote to Goodyer on Tuesday and how he made arrangements for the letters to reach Goodyer.


Discusses how HSWhat “recreates the traditional juxtaposition of rood and doom, even spatially, as the first line evoking the ‘worlds last night’ hangs over the invocation of ‘the Picture of Christ crucified’ in line 3.” Compares Donne’s poem with the defaced remains of the Doom painting in St. Peter’s Church, Wenhaston, Suffolk, claiming that, “[i]ke the ghost of the crucifix in the Doom painting, the crucifix in Donne’s sonnet is poised between image and iconoclasm, between material object and memory.” Argues, furthermore, that “[t]his ambivalence recalls Luther’s attitude toward
the crucifix,” noting how Luther “evoked an internal crucifix as an example to counter iconoclastic arguments.” Shows how a comparison of Luther’s crucifix “with that ‘marked in the heart’ in Donne’s sonnet sheds some light on this very complex sonnet” and also “helps us situate it in the center of the English iconoclastic controversy” (57). Maintains that Donne’s “ambivalent attitude toward religious imagery seems far removed from the hard line Calvinist stance, and closer to the more open attitude to images taken by the Lutheran church, which stemmed directly from Luther’s own equivocal position on the matter” (59). Presents an analysis of HSWhat to show that Donne’s image of the crucifix resembles Luther’s internal crucifix and explains that “[b]y establishing the Lutheran image of the internal crucifix in his heart,” the speaker of the sonnet “attempts to place all his faith in the salvatory power of the crucifixion, and in doing so blot out his fear of Judgment” but that ultimately the crucifixion “cannot totally erase the fear of the ‘world’s last night.’” Concludes that in HSWhat “even the potentially idolatrous ‘Picture of Christ crucified’ fails to assuage the speaker’s anxiety regarding Judgment” (71).


Introduces the following papers from the Texas A&M John Donne Collection: A Symposium and Exhibition held on April 6–7, 2006: Ernest W. Sullivan’s “Donne and Disbelief: The Early Prose”; Jeanne Shami’s “The Cultural Significance of Donne’s Sermons”; and Donald R. Dickson’s “T. R. O’Flaherty’s Copy of Donne’s Letters,” each of which has been separately entered in this bibliography. Points out that in December 2004 at a Sotheby’s auction Texas A&M University purchased a number of seventeenth-century volumes of Donne’s works that had been in the library of the late I. A. Shapiro along with approximately 70 sixteenth- and seventeenth-century works, “written in several languages and covering a wide variety of topics, that Donne alludes to, quotes from, or is known to have read.” Notes that these volumes, added to those already in the university’s collection, give Texas A&M University’s Cushing Memorial Library “one of the best Donne collections to be found anywhere” (420).


Points out that as a coterie, manuscript poet Donne himself “revised some of his poems over the course of time, some of them more than once,” and that “these revised versions circulated side by side with the originals, begetting strains of authentic variation within the surrounding sea of error.” Notes also that “[u]ntil fairly recently, the existence of these revisions has not been much discussed” (299). Presents as an example of Donne’s revisionary hand, a study of the artifactual record of Sat3 and shows how the “evolution of the poem through its early transmissional history” (302) indicates revisions made by Donne. Discusses also evidence of authorial revisions in Boulnar, EpEliz, Eclog, ElPerf, ElJeal, ElAut, ElBrac, ElProg, ElBed, Sappho, HSMin, and the Holy Sonnets. Uses the following principles to distinguish Donne’s revisions from scribal changes: (1) “a variant reading must represent a ‘genuine alternative,’” (2) “a reading must not be readily explicable as a scribal misreading or slip of the pen,” and (3) “a reading must appear authentic when viewed in the context of the poem’s transmissional history” (307).


Parts of Chapter 6 are reprinted from “Adding to the World: Colonial Adventure and Anxiety in the Writings of John Donne,” in The Arts of 17th-Century Science: Representations of the natural world in European and North American culture, ed. Claire Jowitt and Diane Watt, 217–31. Aldershot, Hants [Eng.] and Burling-
John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1996–2012

Contains a table of contents (vii), a list of illustrations (viii), acknowledgments (ix-x), a list of abbreviations (xiii-xiv), and a note on the text (xv). In the preface (xi-xii), notes that this study “examines how Donne’s distinctive, richly complex personality both reflected and challenged the peculiar habits of thought which dominated Elizabethan and Jacobean culture” and “aims to show how Donne’s England is often startlingly alien to us in its material circumstances, its beliefs and its social structure.” Maintains that “[t]o some degree Donne shares attitudes of gender, class, love, and even friendship which have since been forgotten, discredited or marginalised.” Points out, however, that one can recognize “how broadly modern notions of scientific enquiry, of selfhood and of secular philosophy were slowly arising from a still medieval religious mindset.”

Observes that Donne is today “the most popular Renaissance writer after Shakespeare,” owing in part “to his intellectual and creative openness.” Claims that “like many great writers, Donne is often able to at least partially re-create the world in the image of his own beliefs and hopes” (xi) and points out how “in his response to the religious and philosophical problems raised by the New World, and the New Philosophy of emergent science, he alternates between anxiety and excitement” (xi-xii).

In Chapter 1, “Introduction” (1–22), presents a survey of Donne’s life, his habits of thought, his religious background, and aspects of the society into which he was born and lived. Briefly surveys also “how different ages understood, or sometimes failed to understand, Donne’s poetry” (16). In Chapter 2, “Self” (23–55), examines Donne’s notion of self-hood and discusses how “certain of his poems offer us glimpses of a self-hood still waiting to be formally invented or acknowledged by society as a whole” (25). In this regard examines Donne’s anti-Petrarchism, noting, however, that some of his best poems, such as Air and Ecst, have Petrarchan elements in them. Discusses how Flea, Commun, Damp, Lov-Alch, LovDiet, and selections from the Elegies and Satyres reveal “the lineaments of a self at once radical and oppositional, actively defining its traits against tradition, inertia and the herd,” in which Donne “sets the rules rather than following them” (38).

In Chapter 3, “Men and Women” (56–93), discusses how Donne “both allies himself to and distances himself from women, and how male friendship, for the Renaissance, is at times as peculiarly intimate as heterosexual love” (55). Discusses Donne’s negative and positive attitude toward women in his love poems, especially in the Elegies, the verse epistles to both men and women, GoodM, SunRis, and Canon. In Chapter 4, “Belief and Sin” (94–122), reviews Donne’s often conflicting religious beliefs. Examines various “signs of a continuing instability and ambiguity resulting from Donne’s chequered religious history.” Discusses how “pervasive and influential sin was as a state of mind” for Donne, explores “the Protestant theology which not only encouraged but actively enforced, such minutely introspective faith,” and comments on “some of Donne’s most forceful and material images of sin,” primarily those in the Holy Sonnets, poems that “offer us a complex dramatization of Donne’s dualistic religious allegiance, his persistent insecurity, and his mutable, elusive sense of self” (98).

In Chapter 5, “New Philosophy” (123–53), discusses Donne’s attitude toward “new sciences,” especially anatomy and astronomy. Observes how Donne was “both attracted to anatomy for its powers of embodying and defining the mysterious” but was also “afraid that such analysis would too relentlessly hollow out the spiritual destiny of the human body.” Shows how dissection “had problematised not only existing material ideas, but also a whole long-established understanding of the human soul.” In this light, presents a detailed reading of Ecst and asks if the poem is “merely a poem about the unification of typically rarefied lovers, or is it, more broadly, also a covert attempt to re-unify a body and soul progressively severed by the insistent probing of the dissector’s scalpel” (127).

In Chapter 6, “The New World” (154–85), discusses Donne’s response to the New World discoveries, noting how in his sermons and poems these discoveries at times seemed “an exhilarating expansion of...
of mental and physical horizons” but at other times were “the source of fear, confusion, and even anger” (155). In Chapter 7, “Conclusion: ‘Glorious Annihilation’” (186–207), comments on Donne’s evolving views on suicide, bereavement, death, and eternal life, especially as seen in Noct, Biathanatos, and the sermons. Concludes with notes (208–39), a selective bibliography (240–42), and an index (243–51),

Reviews:
• Chanita Goodblatt in RenQ 60, no. 4 (2007): 1489–90.


Traces the impact of post-Vesalian anatomy on English literature, imagination, and culture in early modern England, considering such issues as vivisection, cannibalism, anatomical eroticism, autopsy, corpse medicine, dissection, and fetishism. Discusses how in his poetry and prose Donne presents “a compressed history of the shifting relations between anatomy and religion” (144). Comments on the prevalence of anatomical images in Donne’s works and points out how in such early poems as Damp, Leg, Fun, ValName, and Ecst Donne “allies himself with anatomy as a highly topical and authoritative form of demystifying endeavor” and how he is attracted to “an ingeniously contrived transitional zone, blurring the boundaries between matter and spirit.” Maintains that in many of his sermons Donne continues “to directly and precisely ‘embody’ religious feeling and beliefs in a very meaningful way” but that when he appears “to relinquish that material locus, he is doing so only with considerable reluctance, pressured by the tough intellectual integrity that marks all his writings, and which at times subtly challenges his religious faith.” Cites FirAn as “[o]ne of the clearest and most sustained examples of intellectual curiosity disrupting the accepted religious order of the cosmos” and calls the poem Donne’s “extended pathological autopsy of the terminally corrupted world” (149). Discusses four of Donne’s sermons in which one finds “a split between anatomy as human knowledge, and a supernatural truth broadly opposed to it” (150). Explains how finally Donne “asserts the religious body against that of the dissectors” (158).


Argues that, unlike Thomas More, his ancestor, who hoped to control audience response to his Utopia “by encoding paradoxical and ambiguous elements into his text,” Donne tried to control his audience and its response to Paradoxes and to Biathanatos “by restricting their manuscript circulation and by using ‘metacommentary’ in the form of letters to his readers calling attention to the paradoxical qualities of these works.” Maintains, however, that when these works were published after Donne’s death, “his now unrestricted audience no longer had access to his personal letters of metacommentary,” which resulted in “substantial confusion and ambiguity regarding Donne’s intended messages” (423). Points out that even recent scholars, who have access to the metacommentary for both Paradoxes and Biathanatos, “have struggled with disbelief in these works.” Holds that, although Donne and More “differed in their strategies for creating disbelief, they both created disbelief not to undercut the seriousness and legitimacy of their arguments but to create personal, plausible deniability for what even now would qualify as subversive ideas, ideas that most readers then and now would prefer to disbelieve.” Maintains, however, that both Donne and More “sincerely wanted to initiate intellectual debate over their propositions” (430).


Discusses the themes of reconciliation and forgiveness in Margaret Edson’s play, *Wit*. Briefly comments on Vivian Bearing’s explication of *HSMin*. Points out that the sonnet is “a complex plea for God’s mercy and forgiveness, spoken by one whose intellect cannot fully accept the possibility of such forgiveness.” Observes how, ironically, the audience “grasps that in Vivian’s third-person analysis of the poem, she really is talking about herself.” Notes how Vivian “teeters on the brink of forthrightly understanding her own need for reconciliation with God, death, and other human beings” but points out that the play “leaves open to interpretation the question of whether she ever fully resolves these issues” (216). Briefly comments on how other characters in the play (physicians, her graduate school mentor, her postdoctoral student) respond to Donne’s poetry.


Finds similarities between Shakespeare’s reference to the spirit of his father in *Hamlet* and Donne’s references in *Sat3* (ll. 4–15) and in *HSSouls* (ll. 1–4). Notes that, in Donne, “the spirit of his dead, Catholic father becomes a metonym for his father’s religion.” Points out also that “this reference to the past is accompanied, especially in the Satire, by anxiety about the eternal consequences of abandoning that religion that has served his father’s spirit so well” (15).


Presents “a history of philosophical, theological, and above all literary constructions of the idea of self-control (and indeed self-indulgence) in the period 1558 to 1680.” Traces three “movements essential to the story of moral psychology during this time”: (1) a decline of “an austerely rationalist model of self-governance, one centred on ideas of psychomachia and a hostility to the passions”; (2) “the growth of two alternative traditions, grounded in Augustinianism and a reinterpretation of Aristotle respectively, which revalued the affections as controlled but morally constructive forces, qualities to be harnessed, not eliminated”; and (3) “the emergence of a libertine ethic of indulgence” that is “preoccupied not with restraint but with sexual conquests, the cultivation of power, and a longing for constant motion” [1]. Throughout briefly mentions Donne and quotes from his sermons in which he acknowledges repeatedly the spiritual and rational worth of controlled and moderated passions. Points out, for example, that the main theme of Donne’s 1623 sermon on the text “Jesus Wept” is the “ethical value of holy affections” and notes Donne’s insistence that “Christ’s tears—and Christ’s emotions generally—were never uncontrolled” (163). Says that Donne maintains that it is the Christian’s duty “to foster holy affections within himself, to feel sorrow for men’s sins and a desire to avert human calamities” and that he “figures this growth of sensibility as an expansion of the self” and an explicit following of St. Augustine’s “moral instruction” (164).


Observes that Donne was in on the planning stages of Trinity Chapel in Lincoln’s Inn, that in 1618 or 1619 he not only preached a sermon at Lincoln’s Inn in support of the project but also laid the first stone of the Chapel and contributed to the cost of one of its stained glass windows, and that on 22 May 1623 he was invited to preach the sermon at the consecra-
Maintains that because of Donne’s “close involvement in the planning and construction” of the Chapel, “it is tempting to imagine that this building tells us at least something about Donne’s ideas about church design and liturgical practice” and “may also provide evidence for understanding Donne’s particular theological stance and his affiliation with one or another of the various theological parties within the Church of England in the early seventeenth century” (163–64). Presents detailed descriptions of the Chapel as it is today and as it was in Donne’s time and from manuscript evidence describes the dedication ceremony. Comments on Donne’s dedication sermon, observing how he spends “a great deal of time negotiating between different ideas of spirituality, different understandings of the meaning of buildings, of the various ministries of layfolk and priests and of bishops, of the role of holy spaces, even of worship itself, in the conduct of a Christian life” (218). In Appendix I (220–23), presents a transcription of Lincoln’s Inn MS. A1d 1/2/3 in the Saunderson Papers; in Appendix II, “The Consecration of Trinity Chapel, Lincoln’s Inn” (224–39), presents a translation into modern English of Latin portions of MS. Archives ref J1 A2 in the archives of Lincoln’s Inn as well as transcriptions of portions of the document that were written in English. 19 figures.


In Chinese. Discusses several adaptations or parodies of Marlowe’s “The Passionate Shepherd to His Love,” both in the seventeenth century and in the twentieth century, including *Bait*. Maintains that these works “form complex and rich intertextuality with the original poem.”

1388. West, William N. “Figures and Other Fictions in the Archive.” *ELN* 45, no. 1: 45–56.

Briefly comments on *The Courtier’s Library*, Donne’s satiric imaginary catalogue of useless books. Compares Donne’s catalogue with that of Rabelais in *Pantagruel*, noting that for both “[t]heir favorite metaphors for the writing process, like the topics they handle, are eating, drinking, and excreting.” Suggests that the “real targets” of their satires are “unconstrained and unordered production.” Notes that, in both catalogues, texts and other primary documents are conspicuously missing, whereas “they are full of commentaries, epitomes, and other redactions and digestions of thought” (48), i.e., they are “recognizably and culpably medieval in their contents” (48–49).


Argues that the “critical fortunes” of Donne and Herbert “over the centuries have been dependent not only on changes in literary taste but also on shifts in theological readings and devotional interests—and that the process of reading their work today can be greatly enriched by this awareness.” Divides the discussion into the following three parts, each of which is defined by a “chronological focus”: “the first locates Donne and Herbert in their seventeenth-century devotional cultures; the second examines the theological nature of later critical responses to their writings; and the third highlights the religious issues inherent in any interpretation of their poetry” (398). Points out that the first two sections focus on “the importance of theological controversies in the early reception of Herbert and Donne, and the continuing critical fascination with the poets’ devotional influences and allegiances,” while the third section examines “the experience of the modern reader who wishes to engage personally with the poems but is not a church historian or literary critic” (406). Observes that “in the early decades after the publication of their writings, Donne and Herbert inspired readings of a practical, devotional, and sometimes polemical nature”, that “in the
nineteenth and twentieth century their work gave rise to critical debates centring on the poets’ place in early modern doctrine and spirituality”; and that “the poems themselves embody and explore fundamental theological questions as experienced in the aesthetics of devotional verse” and that they “do so to such an extent that it is virtually impossible to respond to the poems without dealing with issues such as sin, redemption, and the language of spirituality.” Concludes that it is “fascinating to observe all three kinds of theological ‘use’ of the poets’ work continue to this day” (409).

1390. ———. “‘Was I not made to thinke?’: Teaching the Devotions and Donne’s Literary Practice.” JDJ 26: 387–99.

Discusses five basic questions often encountered when teaching the Devotions: (1) What are the Devotions? (2) Why is each meditation divided into three parts? (3) Why does Donne use so many metaphors and for what purpose? (4) Where is the volume as a whole leading? and (5) Why does Donne need be so contradictory? Shows how answering each of these questions “highlights the ways in which this text, far from being an exception to the main body of Donne’s work, can be used to clarify some of the fundamental aspects of his art” (389).


Discusses “the interaction between anatomy and meditation (understood as a method that brings an awareness of oneself and of God).” Examines, in the light of the history of medicine, “the importance of anatomical descriptions of the body for the evocation, awareness and control of affects in early modern meditation.” Shows how “anatomical mediation’ realizes a model of memory that recurs to the body and the imagination and at the same time implicitly problematises this relation.” Observes that, on the one hand, “the body as an imagined body is a stimulus for the evocation of affects” but that, on the other hand, “it serves as a reference point in order to bring under control the independent and potentially uncontrollable imagination thus evoked” (123). Analyzes Sickness as an illustration of this thesis, showing how the speaker in the poem, imagining his death, meditates on his body as a map.


Discusses Donne’s familial connection with the Heywood/Rastell branch of the Thomas More family and the pervading influence of More and the family inheritance on Donne’s life and works. Observes how “an acute awareness of the exclusivity of his ancestry coupled with a sense of the dangers it bequeathed is apparent in Donne’s oeuvre” (40). Comments, therefore, on Donne’s “general indebtedness to his Catholic upbringing” and also discusses “textual evidence of the extent to which Donne participates in discourses already established within the More family” (41), especially as reflected in Biathanatos, Pseudo-Martyr, Sat3, “Death’s Du ell,” and poems dealing with martyrology and relics. Maintains that while “brief reflections of a conjoined Catholic and Morean inheritance emerge and fade throughout Donne’s writings, he was successively to revisit one of the most compelling concerns for the later members of the family: the desire for retreat, enclosure and self-erasure” (44) and observes how throughout his works Donne debates “with the inevitability of death and with his ancestry” (45).


Surveys the increasing interest in Donne among Chinese scholars. Points out that since 1982 more than 100 essays and 3 books on
Donne have been published in Chinese and attributes this growing popularity to “the surge of translations of his works” (314). Cites 1999 as a “monumental” year for Chinese Donne studies with the publication of Fu Hao’s translation John Donne: Amorous and Divine Poems, “the first book of Donne’s works in Chinese” (317). Notes that only part of “Meditation XVII” from Devotions has as yet been translated. Notes that although Donne was first introduced briefly into China by such men as Harold Acton, Robert Winters, and especially William Empson, who taught at the University of Peking in the 1930s, Donne’s “entrance into China’s academic world had to wait until the 1980s,” when he was “reintroduced and eventually became a subject of academic inquiry.” Cites Professor Yang Zhouhan as one of the “most influential critics of Donne in this major revival” (318) and comments on his contributions. Notes that close reading “has always been one of the most important features of Donne scholarship in China” (319), that comparatist studies between Donne and Chinese poets are numerous, and that more recently studies based on contemporary literary theory have appeared. Cites as continuing problems “the lack of a translation of Donne’s complete works into Chinese, the absence of conversation among China’s many Donne scholars, and the difficulties of getting access to recent publications from outside China” (331).


1395. -----. “Theology, Doctrine, and Genre in Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions.” JDJ 26: 373–80. Calls Devotions a work of theological and doctrinal moderation, “a religious work that sets out not so much to expound doctrine as to exemplify the assimilation of doctrine by the soul of the devout Christian” (375). Maintains that although Devotions reflects Donne’s unique prose style and religious outlook, it is “not unusual in broad generic terms: it is a set of meditations designed to inspire sober reflection on the prospect of death leading to intense devotion to God.” Points out that in Devotions Donne stresses “mankind’s utter dependence on divine grace” but adds that he does so “not in a way that suggests a specifically Calvinistic orientation” (376). Claims rather that “the fundamental doctrine of the Devotions is common to a wide range of religious thinkers crossing confessional boundaries” (377). Maintains that Devotions “should be presented as an example of Donne’s rich, restless, and searching prose; as his unique generic innovation upon the conventions of meditation; and as a manifestation of his skillful navigation among the shoals of doctrinal and ecclesiastical controversy.” Holds that Devotions is “an analogue of what Donne thought that the Church of England should be: an institution that retained the strengths of Catholic humanism in an independent, local form attuned to the national aspirations of Reformation England.” Concludes that although Donne shows in Devotions “his awareness of the specific political issues of his time, even his anxiety over them, his contribution to these controversies is, finally, not very important.” Holds rather that Donne is “significant not as a Jacobean ecclesiastical politician, but as a writer with a powerful and deeply personal Christian vision” (380).

1396. Yu, Quao-Feng. [Review on the conceits used in “The Sun Rising”]. Sino-US English Teaching 4, no. 7: 46–49. In Chinese. Briefly surveys Donne’s life and major characteristics of metaphysical poetry and then analyzes the conceits and images in SunRis, commenting on how they express and reflect Donne’s emotions. (English abstract)

1397. Yun, Hai-Ying. [Protestant pretence in John Donne’s poetry]. Sino-US English Teaching 4, no. 4: 55–58. In Chinese. Holds that Donne abandoned his ancestral Catholic faith and became a Protes-
tant in order to avoid religious persecution and also in order to further his political ambitions. Claims, therefore, that Donne's poetry reveals much inner conflict and struggle and that the prevalence of skepticism, cynicism, anxiety, and repentance in his poems reflect his conflicted soul. Calls Donne's poetry, therefore, a poetry of Protestant pretence. (English abstract)

1398. Zhao, Lihong and Zhengshuan Li. [An exploration of the art of the circle in John Donne's poetry.] *Journal of Northwest University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)* 37, no. 6: 20–23.

In Chinese. Discusses how Donne's use of circle imagery is “subtle in thought, rich in imagination, and unique in imagery,” and is employed to highlight “the theme of perfection and eternity” and to reflect “the effective unity of thought and feeling, form and content” (20). (English abstract)
2008


Discusses Donne’s “long-standing interest in foreign affairs” and considers “its significance to his poetry and prose.” Points out that, in particular, internal evidence from the sermons suggests “the distinct contribution made to Donne's homiletic tact by his close knowledge of the protocols, principles, and rhetoric of international diplomacy—enriched by first-hand experience as chaplain to Viscount Doncaster’s 1619 embassy to Germany.” Agrees with those critics who hold that “the trope of ambassadorship holds a central place in the early modern cultural imagination of England” (187) and comments on the numerous metaphors and tropes of embassy or ambassadorship in Donne’s works. Divides the essay into four parts: (1) “provides a brief biographical sketch of Donne’s experience in international affairs prior to his departure for Germany in 1619”; (2) “places Donne’s 1619 sermons and their ambassadorial imagery in their immediate political and cultural contexts”; (3) “focuses on traits of diplomatic rhetoric (as categorized in contemporary manuals) discernible in Donne’s orations preached in international settings in the 1620s”; and (4) presents “a case study of Donne’s 1619 Heidelberg sermon” (190). Maintains that this study highlights “the cosmopolitan character of Donne’s social and professional circles”; shows the pervasiveness of diplomatic rhetoric in his sermons; indicates how the “[h]istorical reconstruction of the diplomatic contexts” of Donne's Heidelberg sermon “leads to a revision of earlier commentary” (215); explains how Donne's analogy “between ars praedicandi and ambassadorial rhetoric enables, to a greater degree than previously remarked upon, exegetical allusion to politics and international church affairs”; and makes clear how the “evangelical, pastoral, and political duties of the Christian minister are also illuminated by Donne's analogical exploitation of the rich permutations of the trope of ambassadorship.” Concludes that Donne's ambassadorial analogies “ample demonstrate” that “not only might experience have two simultaneous tropological meanings,” but also that “an ambassador might, at the same time, adopt the roles of herald, orator, and observer, just as a preacher might, without contradiction, act as divine mediator, spokesman, and spy” (216).


Examines Donne's “engagement in his religious prose with both pre- and post-Reformation canon law” and asks “on what grounds Donne distinguishes between pre- and post-Reformation canon law; and whether such distinctions might shed further light on broader questions of Donne’s churchmanship, such as his attitude to ecclesiastical discipline and religious conformity” (45). Surveys Donne's education in and knowledge of canon law. Discusses how in Pseudo-Martyr Donne “concludes that the canon law itself calls into question the moral authority of pope and priests in forbidding English Catholics from recognizing the supremacy of the king in temporal matters” and how in Essays, sermons, and other later works Donne “turns his attention, via numerous references to canon law, to the question of the relation between divine and human law” (53). Maintains that Donne's “central objection to pre-Reformation canon law is its elevation of noncanonical writings to a position of equal authority with the Bible” (54) and that he “censures canon law for being, like all positive laws, subject to alteration according to time and place” (55). Shows how Donne clearly distinguishes between “the canon law of Rome and the Code of Canons of the English Church,” rejecting the former as “papal and Tridentine
interpolations” that are “man-made rather than divinely inspired.” Maintains that in his controversy with the Catholic Church Donne’s “most frequent tactic is to use canon law against itself.” Concludes that Donne does not reject ecclesiastical law but seeks “to rediscover from church history the authentic tradition of canon law” (57).


Discusses how in his poetry Donne uses alchemical elements in both positive and negative ways. Observes that in certain love poems, such as LovAlch and Noct, hermetic words are used to express the speaker’s disappointment or despair in love, whereas in his meditative or religious poems, such as FirAn and Res, he praises the power of virtue and Christ’s love in alchemical terms. Points out that in such poems as Canon and NegLov alchemical codes seem to be hidden in order to manifest the mystery of love. Maintains that Donne’s uses of alchemical imagery reveal his interest in transformation or transmutation from nothing to something or from something to nothing and suggest how he chooses paradox to illustrate the enigma of love.


Discusses how Lullian mnemotectonics “allow Donne to shape his Holy Sonnet sequence as a version of purgatory” and examines “that purgatory in terms of certain alchemico-Lullian signs scattered throughout the sequence.” Observes how Donne’s frequent use of “mercurial tears and the hot sword”—as well as his less frequent use of “the warm breast”—conjures up the respective phantoms of false tears, cold swords, and inadequate intercession.” Shows how such signs as “coins, either imperfect or perfect (which is gold), the alembic (or prison), the four elements (earth, air, fire, and water), the chemical wedding (which occurs when male and female elements join in the alembic) help Donne articulate, by way of negative definition, what unity is” and that “geometrical shapes (such as Lull himself employed) help Donne express the same disunity/unity.” Maintains that these signs “allow those who have learned this kind of silent discourse to experience, vicariously, Donne’s quasi-Catholic fear of purgatory.” Observes, furthermore, that “[o]ther signs from other sources, some Egyptian—Heket, the frog midwife, for example, and Thoth, the Divine Physician—imply, respectively, grace assisting in the birth of the alchemical child and medicine triumphing over Death (or an otherwise failed opus)” (39). Agreeing with the authorial sequence of the Holy Sonnets established by the editors of the Donne Variorum Edition, argues that the sequence “represented by the manuscripts of Groups I and II (1633)” should be read as “two series of six each, forming something like a diptych, with each sonnet in the one half corresponding very closely to its counterpart in the other” (43). Proceeds to investigate “alchemico-Lullian signs” in the six sets of corresponding sonnets and shows how “these signs function within the schema of Lullian logic, illustrating principles of affirmation and negation, antecedence and consequence, possibility and impossibility, and contradiction” (52). Discusses how each of the sonnets “represents a coin to be paid to escape from purgatory” (85) but that “tensions between and among sonnets undermine any assurance” that Donne “has yet delivered the speaker from purgatory.” Maintains that, in fact, the speaker has created his own psychological purgatory by making counterfeit coins unfit for God’s treasury” (86).

Reviews:


Discusses “the mystical jouissance” in Donne’s sacred poetry and love lyrics with reference to Lacan’s “theory of desire, love and jouissance.” Shows, by means of detailed readings of texts, how Donne’s poetics “display these concepts in its eroticized melancholy, mystical love and ecstasy.” Argues, furthermore, that “identification of Donne’s poetry as metaphysical is an example of the repression of mystical literary discourse in Western culture” (6). Wishes to “demystify mysticism by deconstructing Donne’s metaphysical poetry and its theological, metaphysico-erotic and other subspecies.” Argues that “mystical experience, as both art and sinthome, gives access to various kinds of jouissance” and attempts “to expose the vicissitudes of mystical experience in Donne’s poetry, which like any other mystical literary discourse, brings desire, love, and jouissance into play.” Maintains that in Donne’s sacred poems “repressed desire and the symbolic law co-exist side by side” and that in the love lyrics “this bond falls apart, jouissance takes over his poetics.” Examines “several paradigms of jouissance and their literary contexts in Donne’s poetry, namely jouis-sense, the sinthome of the enigmas (where love is discussed in correlation with the erotic), a jouissance of ecstasy and a divine madness (feminine jouissance or the jouissance of the body), the jouissance of suffering, and phallic jouissance.” Takes on Lacan’s “attempt to feminize the entire mystical literary discourse by showing the paradoxes of his theory that lays down an empirical gender identity for jouissance beyond the phallic economy.” Argues that “the essence of mystical jouissance is the subject’s own bodily jouissance.” Concludes that “the various forms of these ecstatic and holy enjoyments of the mystical body symbolize the jouissance of the Other’s body” (118).

Reviews:


In Chinese. Briefly comments on Donne’s use of conceits in his poetry. Says that they are “fresh, philosophical, and everything [is] included” (63).


Discusses “the fashion for witty celebrations of ugly women in early seventeenth-century English literature.” Observes that although “apparently celebrating unconventional forms of beauty,” those texts that praise ugly women “more accurately elevate masculine forms of artistic agency at the expense of the female body, which continues to be identified with ugly matter,” but that in those texts in which ugliness is actually “celebrated,” the object is “to contain the potentially threatening nature of the ugly female body” (abstract). Briefly comments on ElAnag as Donne’s contribution to the genre. Also briefly comments on “That women ought to paint” in Paradoxes.


Points out that the mirror was “one of the most universal tropes, in all genres, from the thirteenth to mid-seventeenth century England” and “provided an analogy or symbol for virtually everything under and above the sun: time and eternity, nature and art, truth and subjectivity, earth and heaven, man and God.” Explains how this “obsession with the mirror as trope coincided with technological discoveries in glass-making and mirror-making that revo-
lutionized the history of science and art.” Focu-
ses primarily on uses of the Petrarchan trope
of the mirror, especially by English Renais-
sance poets, showing how “[b]y dramatizing
the interaction of male and female gaze,” they
“transform the monologic self-exploration
of the Petrarchan poet into an early modern
dialogue between the sexes” (240). Discusses
how it is in Donne’s “sexually consummated
yet still profoundly spiritual love poetry that
the Petrarchan mirror image trope receives its
ultimate transformation” (243), in such poems
as GoodM, Canon, ValName, and Sappho, in
which Donne radically refocuses the idola-
try and narcissism of the traditional Petrarch
poem. Shows how Donne and other poets of
his time revise the Petrarchan trope of the mir-
ror “to reflect erotic pleasure, initiate dialogue,
and precipitate change” (252) so that it “comes
to represent perspective, fluidity, interiority,
and self-reflection, a view of men, women, and
the world constantly evolving and dissolving as
the point of view shifts from one moment to
the next” (253).

Donne’s Rhymes,” in Thou sittest at another boke:
English Studies in Honour of Domenico Pezzini,
ed.
Giovanni Iamartino, Maria Luisa Maggioni, and Ro-
berta Facchinetti, 355–67. Monza, Italy: Polimetrica
International Scientific Publisher.

Based on a study of rhymes, points out how
Donne’s poems “exhibit the coexistence of a
very large host of different phonological vari-
ants” (355). Observes, for example, that Don-
ne’s poems “contain a large number of rhymes
based on the retention or reimposition of a sec-
dondary accent on syllables which today are to-
tally unaccented” (362) and notes how Donne
rhymes “love” with “prove,” “improve,” “move,”
and “remove” (365). Shows how this great vari-
ability “depended on the large number of con-
curring natural phonological processes at work
in late Middle English and in the early Modern
period” (366). Concludes that Donne’s “exploi-
tation of the available phonological variation
should be seen in the light of textual param-
eters (especially cohesion), since the use of
different variants in different contexts cannot
have been random” (367).

1408. Block, Alexandra Mills. “Eucharistic Semi-
otics and the Representational Formulas of Don-
ne’s Ambassadors,” in Renaissance Tropologies: The
Cultural Imagination in Early Modern England, ed.
Jeanne Shami, 169–85. (Medieval & Renaissance
Literary Studies, gen. ed. Albert C. Labriola.) Pitts-
burgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Points out that Donne’s texts “often connect the
figure of the ambassador to questions not just
of political and religious representation, but
also of literary expression and its challenges.”
Observes that, for Donne the writer, “the am-
bassador seems to encapsulate the difficulties of
representation—the elusiveness of an accurate,
reliable signifying relationship between two things.” Points out also that, “[f]raught with
abuse, ambassadorship allows Donne to ex-
plore the possibilities of representation as they
pertain directly to his own endeavors, not only
in the realm of religion—his own ministerial
representation of God—but also in the realm
of literature—his texts’ representation of tenor
by vehicle, of author to reader.” Maintains, in
other words, that “the figure of the ambassador
allows Donne to explore the viability of vari-
ous representational models, with particular
attention to how reliably the representative
stands for the represented” (170). Discusses
in the light of Donne’s understanding of and	
tropological uses of ambassadorship Tilman,
HWVenice, a sermon on 2 Corinthians 5:20,
and TWHence. Argues that “the models of lit-

erary representation Donne tests through his
ambassadors . . . are based on semiotic mod-
els developed by religious thinkers during the
lengthy controversy over the Eucharist” (180).

Donne and the Metaphysical Poets, 1–163. (Bloom’s
Michael G. Cornelius.) New York: Bloom’s Literary
Criticism.

Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne (1–2), followed by a selection of criticism on Donne and his works from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century divided into three sections: (1) Personal (17 selections), (2) General (34 selections), and (3) Works (10 selections) (50–163). In the introduction (xv–xix), maintains that these selections show that Donne's popularity "long preceded T. S. Eliot's belated discovery, which led on to the generous overevaluation by Eliotic critics such as Cleanth Brooks, Allen Tate, and R. P. Blackmur, who seemed to place Donne in Shakespeare's sublime company, while joining Eliot in the denigration of Milton and all the Romantics and Victorians." Claims that "in the twentieth century, balance has been restored" and agrees with Ben Jonson that Donne was "the best poet in the world for some things." States that "[t]he wonder of Donne's poetry is its unitary nature," in that his "early libertine lyrics" show "the same modes of wit and mastery of images that continue in his devotional verse." Praises Donne's wit as "an instrument of discovery and an avenue always to fresh invention" (xvi).


Discusses Drayton's criticism of and rivalry with Donne. Points out that, unlike Donne, Drayton was not a courtier, that he resented what he viewed as the elitism of those who circulated poetry in manuscript; that his "sense of social inferiority exacerbated his antipathy toward coterie poetry," and that, in particular, he resented Donne's friendship with the Gooderes and through them his connection with Lucy, Countess of Bedford" (50), whose patronage he sought. Summarizes Drayton's attempts to obtain patronage, especially that of the Countess of Bedford, as a means of throwing light on his relationship to Donne. Discusses also Donne's relationship with the Countess, noting that he wrote "the majority of his patronage poems" (57) for her and suggests that, because of his close friendship with Henry Goodyer, Donne may have been introduced to the Countess earlier than usually thought. Comments on Drayton's attacks on the injustice of the patronage system and coterie poets; his invective against Lucy, noting that in his revised 1619 folio he removed his earlier compliments and dedications to her; his attacks on the court and James; and his covert criticism of Donne. Suggests, for example, that Drayton's portrait of "Jay" in *Owle* (1604), a poet "who flatters courtiers and betrays the traditions of poetry" and who "prostitutes his poetic talent" (61) may refer to Donne. Cites other possible references to Donne and significant omissions of Donne in Drayton's later works.


Discusses methodological innovations in literary criticism that "might actually contribute to a better understanding of a specific poem." Looks in "two directions, the one attempting to enrich a poem's setting in its cultural context, the other attempting to complicate a poem's relation to its literary background." For the first, presents a reading of *ValMourn* "with the combination of attention to nonliterary texts contemporaneous with the poem and analysis of cultural bias that has characterized New Historical readings." For the second, reads Stevens's "Puella Parvula" as "a crisis lyric and battleground for the anxieties of influence elaborated by Harold Bloom." Concludes "by comparing the two modes of 'unknowing' that these methods invoke—Donne's culturally determined sense of female anatomy (his obliviousness to the fundamental difference between male and female genitalia, which we take for granted) and Stevens's repression of the human cry at the core of his interest in imagination." Concludes by acknowledging that "the great masters of older methodologies, here represented by John Freccero and Helen Vendler, may have more to tell us than any methodological innovation as such could hope to convey" (245).

Discusses the transactional nature of a set of 18 of Donne’s texts addressed to Lucy, the Countess of Bedford, in their male-female, client-patron relationship. Shows how this series of texts, together with associated documents, is “significant because it is weighty, often entertaining, and articulates many of the issues of client-patron reciprocity” (64–65). Points out that although the replies from the Countess are missing, the series is “well contextualized” by Donne’s correspondence with Henry Goodyer, who also “served the Bedford household, acted as factor for Donne,” and to whom Donne addressed a number of remarks about the Countess (65). Begins the survey by commenting on an early group of texts to the Countess that includes BedfReas, BedfRef, a prose letter of 1609, Twick, and BedfHon in which Donne expresses his desire “to come into her presence, followed by a consideration of how the contact might be maintained” (66). Discusses BedfTwi as a summing up of the first two years of contact with the Countess in which Donne indicates “the gap between the prominence of her place and his unsettledness” and expresses his “recurrent anxiety” that “memory might fade and with it the cumulative recognition of past gifts and services” (71). Next shows how in poems on the deaths of Cecilia Bulstrode and Lady Markham, young members of the Countess’s circle, Donne hopes to consolidate his relationship with his patroness. Comments on the “artful exaggeration” of BedfWrit in which Donne writes as a friend to the Countess, advising her to continue on as “the model of female courtly virtue” but reminding her that “she needs near her one more rooted in vice so as to connect with the world around her” (75). Discusses next several texts addressed to the Countess that articulate “an anxiety about losing a persuasive presence with her” and “the difficulties arising from the disapproval of Donne’s print publication of the Anniversaries” (76). Lastly, discusses the complexities of texts that involved the Countess’s brother, Sir John Harrington the younger, as “a fitting conclusion” to the survey of the series.


Maintains that the trope of “the defining [ideally the salvic] moment of illumination or choice” (45), a moment so powerful and profound that “it could transform life from errancy or stasis to heavenward mobility, imperception to perception, rancor or indifference to love, in the instant of a word,” can serve as a “useful interpretive model” (45–46) for reading Donne’s treatment of salvation in Devotions. Shows how the work, modelled in part on St. Augustine’s Confessions, “becomes a movement from sickness to health” and “becomes for Donne the rightly ordered translation of fear, regret, and inattention—modalities of the soul in tripartite time (future, past, and present)—into expectation, remembrance, and salvation.” Discusses two terms for the measurement and conceptualization of time in early modern England—“calculation and computation”—both of which are important as “a means of understanding the relationship between time and moment” (46). Presents a reading of Devotions to show Donne’s preoccupation with and understanding of time. Observes how Devotions “ends with apprehensions of the past and future lapsing into one another—a disjunction of the defining moment(s) of his journey—even as Donne’s unfolding of the salvific moment reveals the possibilities for unification with the divine, both despite and because of time” (62).

Points out that “the actual size of Donne’s library at his death remains unclear,” that “the schedule attached to his will that listed the books to be given to his friends is lost,” and that “we have no account of the number of books sold, with his plate, to benefit his heirs.” Notes that the list of 213 extant books in Keynes bibliography has been greatly augmented over the years to over 300. Observes that Walton in his *Life of Donne* and Henry King in his preface to Walton report that Donne was familiar with a great number of authors, King stating that in Donne’s sermon notes and other papers there are extracts from nearly 1500 authors. Maintains, however, that we cannot ascertain “the exact relationship” between these extracts and the books that Donne actually owned.

1415. ––––. “‘Hac ex consilio meo via progredieris’: Courtly Reading and Secretarial Mediation in Donne’s *The Courtier’s Library*.” *RenQ* 61, no. 3: 833–66.


Maintains that Donne’s *The Courtier’s Library* was probably written sometime between 1603 and 1611 and circulated in manuscript among Donne’s coterie before it was first published in 1650. Observes that Donne’s catalog of imaginary books was inspired by Rabelais’s satirical description of the Library of St. Victor in *Pantagruel* but that, whereas Rabelais “satirizes the scholastic learning associated with monasteries, Donne takes aim at the humanist methods adapted by secretaries to produce knowledge for courtly display” (833–34). Notes that Donne’s catalog not only “provides a parodic image of the Republic of Letters seen from the contemporary English perspective” but also attests to “the problematic displacement of the secretarial labor that undergirded the courtly display of learning” (834). Examines, therefore, “the material history of disembodied knowledge and its interaction with the cultural matrix in which it was produced, distributed, and consumed” and considers “the secretary’s problematic relationship with both the material he mediated for his master and the social position he occupied.” Taking into account Donne’s “secretarial career and his habits of reading, marginal annotation, and note-taking,” examines “the production of knowledge by secretaries for courtly display” and considers Donne’s own “difficult negotiation of his liminal and shifting positions in English gentle society—as courtier, as gentleman, and as secretary—and his struggle for preferment that might support his claim to any of these positions.” Proceeds by focusing on the preface to the catalog and “its portrayal of courtly reading, considering the use of humanist learning as a stepping-stone to courtly advancement”; next examines “the secretarial mediation of learning for courtiers in the context of Donne’s career and of the unstable politics of late Elizabethan and early Jacobean England”; and finally investigates “the relationship between satire, knowledge-making, and authority that Donne constructs in the *Catalogus*, and the alternative to these reductive forms of knowledge that he proposes to the friends in his coterie circle” (836). Maintains that *The Courtier’s Library* suggests that “learning as a marker of status is useless without a proper educational foundation” and that “it seeks to reinscribe the cultural superiority of humanist learning at a moment when its value as a path of advancement seemed to be uncertain” (856). In the appendix presents the Latin text of *The Courtier’s Library* and a new English translation (858–63), followed by a bibliography and footnotes.


Observes that in his sermons Donne “often assimilates the mission of the minister of God—especially in his calling as a preacher—to the mission and role of the Prophets of the Old Testament.” Maintains that “by adopting a pro-
phetic conception of the preacher’s mission, he not only follows biblical tradition but also [expresses] the desire for a return to scriptural sources and models initiated by the Reformation.” Considers, therefore, “some aspects of Donne’s propheticism in his sermons” and explores his “conception of the minister of God and preacher which he expounds from the pulpit as well as in his interpretation of Scripture and History” (243).


Maintains that Donne’s poetry “defies strict genre definition in order to put forward a concept of selfhood, sexuality and history that is formulated in part by a concern with mutability and that is deeply influenced by his own sense of self, place and time in early modern England.” Focuses primarily on Metem and Fare, “often considered to be the most profane, grotesque and, in terms of genre, problematic of Donne’s canon,” and argues that “these two enigmatic and seemingly cynical poems allude, riddlingly, to a notion of correspondence and union that the poet believed to exist prior to the biblical Fall into degenerating time.” Maintains that “this relation and tension between the spiritual and the profane, the transcendent and the historical, can be seen through close attention to the poems’ circular form and golden (coin and phoenix) imagery” (19). Contends, furthermore, that there is “a lack of closure in Donne’s poems, which is not only crucial to an appreciation of the linguistic play of his poetic wit, with all its ambiguities and tensions, but also to an understanding of Donne’s sense of self and time as unavoidably being in medias res, unfinished, always in process.” Discusses the form and spatial images in Metem to show how the “mixing of genre is the poem’s strength” (20) and how the poem becomes a riddle for the reader and “performs an ongoing social and spiritual tension” (21). Argues that Fare also “employs the riddle as sub-genre and also defies both linearity and closure” and shows how the final line of the poem “alludes to the notion of metamorphosis, death and rebirth” (22), in which “the speaker’s cynicism gives way to a renewed faith” (23).


Undertakes to bridge “the gap between contemporary theoretical texts of general economy and what might seem an unlikely place to look for it: early modern amatory lyric.” Argues that the distance between the views of George Bataille and other modern theorists and those of Donne or Shakespeare “may not be great at all,” both of whom “address the question or the risk of general economy, of expenditure and exorbitant loss, in amatory utterances and social-erotic explorations” (242). Discusses, in particular, Image, in which the speaker “constructs a shifting scene of presence and absence, loss and gain, precipitated by reference to coining or stamping value on a medal, an act that indears, and threatens as well in an amatory relationship strongly mediated by the language of economy” (248). Compares and contrasts the “political-elegiac economy” expressed in Donne’s poem (250) with that found in Shakespeare’s Sonnet 31. Maintains that the lyric poetry of Donne and Shakespeare that “deals with money and the economic in social and affective arenas crosses or imbricates amatory and economic discourses to construct early modern reflections on the power of money and exchange, reflections that address the links between monetary practices on the one hand and subject construction, social and sexual relationships on the other.” Concludes that “it is perhaps the point of crossing that lends such work its special social-erotic charge” (256).


Points out that “Psalme 137” is “the only poem present in all seven seventeenth-century printed collections” of Donne’s poems that is
“currently excluded from his canon” and challenges Grierson’s surmise in his 1912 edition of Donne’s poems that “Psalme 137” was “probably by Francis Davison” (603). Re-evaluates the authorship of “Psalme 137” by “reassessing manuscript proof that purportedly points to Davison as well as material evidence linking the poem to Donne.” Takes into account also “connections” between “Psalme 137” and Lam and re-examines the metrical form and style of the poem, “which formerly served as the basis for attribution of the poem.” Argues that although “these important elements substantiate Donne’s authorship, not Davison’s,” they are “secondary resources in the process of reevaluating ‘Psalme 137’ based primarily on extant material evidence.” Maintains that considering the poem as part of Donne’s canon “has the potential to alter our understanding of Donne as a verse translator and our interpretations of his other divine poems,” especially Lam (604). In an appendix (634–36), prints a transcription of “Psalme 137” from MS Add. 25707 in the British Library that includes “major verbal variants found in all known seventeenth-century manuscripts and printed versions of the text” (634).


Points out that, in spite of the Protestant distrust of images, Donne’s poetry shows “a strongly visual apprehension of the doctrines of Christianity and a strong desire to explore the religious landscape with the conceit of the eyes of faith.” Observes that in the Holy Sonnets, Cross, Annun, and Goodf Donne “vividly revisits the Crucifixion” and that “the idea of the spectacle underpins his devotional poetics” (100). Maintains, however, that in Donne “the techniques of meditation and the cultivation of spiritual vision are literary devices rather than devotional practices” and “are symptoms of a literary sensitivity to the power of images rather than of a devotional nostalgia for the vanished splendours of Catholic visuality.” Insists that “the theme of visuality” in Donne points to his “eclecticism” as a poet, not as a religious man, and “to the privileged position of poetry as a mode of religious discourse operating outside the partisan world of contemporary religious politics.” Claims that Donne attributes to poetry “the power to escape from abstract doctrine into the realm of true faith, and even true vision, since poetry, like the metaphorical language of the Bible, joins the image and the word, and contrives to do so without inviting quibbling analyses or etymological controversies.” Shows how in the Holy Sonnets, Corona, Goof, and in Donne’s other religious poems “the consistent assumption is that vision is an essential part of the relationship with an invisible God” (102) and observes how Donne concentrates particularly on the Crucifixion as “the central object of imaginative vision” (106). Observes that although Donne’s devotional poems refer to “the theological controversies surrounding them” and to the “religious politics” in which he was involved, “they also register a resistance to political currents and a desire to fence poetry off from other modes of religious discourse” (111–12). Concludes that the “speaking pictures” in Donne’s poems “were not declarations of doctrine, not statements of allegiance, but glimpses of the spiritual vision available to the poetic conscience, and images of the stories—or stories of images—that lay, still fresh and vital, at the heart of Christian history” (113).


Points out that “no writer in the English canon” received more attention from William Empson than Donne. Notes that Empson was “particularly courageous in taking on some of the most prominent Donne scholars” of his time and summarizes his “most cogent disagreements and his often startling readings of Donne” (147). Discusses, in particular, Empson’s anti-Christian position, his “theology” and notion
of separate planets, and his sometimes contemptuous attacks on the work of such scholars as Rosemond Tuve, Helen Gardner, and Frank Kermode. Observes that Empson "seems to have little reputation these days" and that his readings of Donne's poems "probably sound even more eccentric today than when he first wrote them" (150).


Compares Donne and Hooker. Points out that, for Donne, the Pauline letters were "the starting points for intensely personal and poetic sermons concerning the individual's relationship with God." Notes that, for him, "personal response to Scripture was not an individual experience but required (and was fulfilled by) the intermediation and interpretation of the church" (48). Analyzes Donne's sermon "Now in a Glass, Then Face to Face" delivered on Easter 1628 to illustrate how Donne saw the world "as God's creation, in which God's children can employ natural reason to apprehend His glory" (57). Concludes that Donne, as an Anglican, saw "faith as more than the relationship between the Scriptures and an individual" and also clearly recognized "the dangers inherent in unmediated, uninterpreted application of Scripture in daily life" (58).


Briefly comments on HS Round as a speech act and as a double prayer that "expresses contradictory wishes, the wish for immediate contact expressed in the octet of the sonnet, calling for the last judgment to come at once, and the canceling of that wish in the sestet by the speaker's request for more time to prepare his soul before he meets his maker face to face" (240). Points out how "the contrast of the two voices is insisted on by the prosody." Says that the poem dramatizes "the static condition of religious ambivalence" and that its artfulness "makes us feel that we are not so much reading a poem that enacts a change over time as witnessing a ritualistic performance of a religious dialogue" (241). Contrasts the poem with Marvell's "To His Coy Mistress" and Emily Dickinson's "These are the days when Birds come back."


Surveys Christian theology regarding pain from the late Middle Ages to the Reformation. Points out that the notion that pain "can be a useful spiritual tool, and a source of mystical insight and self-transformation, is part of a long tradition of Christian conceptions of pain," especially prevalent in medieval Christianity (64). Discusses how Reformation theologians "voiced strikingly different attitudes toward the spiritual meaning of pain," especially by rejecting the idea that "physical pain can in itself contribute to salvation" (66) and by claiming that pain is "only secondary" even in martyrdom (67). Observes, however, that Catholic views of pain "continued to stress the spiritual ‘productivity’ of pain" and that Catholics continued to regard self-inflicted pain as "a technique for contemplating the sufferings of Christ." Discusses how the various responses to pain fascinated Donne, who "repeatedly addressed questions of pain and salvation in his sermons, prose works, and poetry" (69). Comments on examples from the sermons, Devotions, Pseudo-Martyr, the Holy Sonnets, and Lit that show how Donne "felt drawn to both Catholic and Protestant models of pain but was also deeply sensitive to what he saw as the shortcomings of both." Maintains that Donne's writings on the theological meaning of pain show that his thinking was "consistently hybrid in nature" (77). Four illustrations.

Collection of 12 original essays. Each of the following 5 essays discusses Donne and have been entered separately in this bibliography: Hugh Adlington’s “‘No rule of our beleef’: John Donne and Canon Law”; Frances Cruickshank’s “The Speaking Picture: Visions and Images in the Poetry of John Donne and George Herbert”; Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen’s “In Thy Passion Slain: Donne, Herbert, and the Theology of Pain”; Richard Todd’s “Was Donne Really an Apostate?”; and Helen Wilcox’s “‘She on the hills’: Traces of Catholicism in Seventeenth-Century English Protestant Poetry.” In the introduction (1–6), the editors point out the purpose of the essays is to examine how “the literature of the first century after the Elizabethan Settlement dealt with issues of religious and cultural ambivalence” and to investigate how “pre-Reformation religious culture was addressed in a variety of literary texts dating from the period between 1560 and 1660” (2). Focuses on four thematic fields: Part 1 “investigates how literary texts addressed the notion of religious identity in early modern England”; Part 2 “is devoted to the theology of word and image, and to explorations of the word-image polarity in poetry”; Part 3 “examines the religious significance of geographical and spatial locations in early modern theatre”; and Part 4 “looks at how English culture after the Elizabethan Settlement dealt with the relations between the living and dead, and looks at post-Settlement attitudes towards physical remnants of the Catholic past” (3). Thereafter the editors briefly introduce each of the essays (3–6) and conclude with brief biographical sketches of each of the contributors (243–44).

1426. DiPasquale, Theresa. “Hearing the ‘harmonious chime’ in *ElBed* (l. 9) “helps to offset the speaker’s possessive rhetoric by treating the chime as the mistress’s messenger or surrogate voice, and by presenting his desire as a response to her summons”; it contributes to “the sacrilegious play on bed as temple” in l. 18 “by sounding an erotic call to prayer”; it “reverberates as a sexually charged passing bell, drawing attention to the delicious difference between a conventional *carpe diem* poem and Donne’s *erotic memento mori*; and it “hums, sotto voce, that the speaker’s desires will be fulfilled only when, in the fullness of time, the deity whose grace he seeks deigns to clothe herself in his flesh” (20). Discusses how “by conflating passing bell and boudoir chime, liturgical time and sexual timing” in *ElBed*, Donne “unites, as he often does, the sacred and the erotic” (24).


Discusses how Donne, Aemilia Lanyer, and John Milton “revised and renewed the Judeo-Christian tradition of the sacred feminine,” a tradition that “celebrates feminine archetypes of grace, virtue, and spiritual illumination” (1). Shows how each of the poets “engaged in literary projects that modify, expand upon, challenge, or rethink the natures of men and women, the duties and privileges of the female sex, and the essential role played by feminine powers and influences in healing the sin-forged rift between God and men” (1–2). Maintains that each of the poets “resists and modifies the strict Calvinistic belief that fallen Nature is radically depraved and unable to cooperate with grace” and that each counters “the Reformed theology’s tendency to diminish the role of the Blessed Virgin and of the sacred feminine broadly.” Holds that each of the poets “portrays the feminine as a reflection of the divine, and woman herself, at her best, as an agent of redemption or conduit of grace” and says that each “understands Christian poetics as serving a function analogous to that of Mary, who gave
birth to and nurtured God’s Word incarnate.” Maintains that Donne, Lanyer, and Milton are “exceptionally provocative in their approaches to sex and gender as aspects of the sacred” and that “a tone of intellectual and spiritual self-assurance and resistance to external authority is noticeably audible in all three, albeit in different keys and in the service of very different projects” (2). Undertakes “to enrich readers’ understanding of specific works by each poet through historically grounded and intertextually sensitive formal analysis” (4–5) and thinks that, by studying them in connection with one another, “we may appreciate more fully each writer’s unique poetic articulation of the sacred feminine: Donne’s portrayal of woman as sacrament, and of divine grace made present through female flesh and feminine virtue; Lanyer’s portrayal of woman as priest, and of divine grace transforming Nature herself; Milton’s portrayal of woman as an earthly type of heavenly Wisdom, and of divine grace proceeding from the ‘consummate virtue’ of a woman’s son” (5). In “Donne” (13–104), surveys Donne’s “shift, in the first two decades of the seventeenth century, away from the satirical, anti-Petrarchan and often misogynous themes of the elegies and epigrams” and contextualizes his “frequent focus, in works composed during the early Jacobean period, upon a reverent though always witty and intellectually daring exploration of what he once called ‘the Idea of a Woman.’” Focuses primarily on Annum, a poem that “envisions a cooperative threesome consisting of the speaker’s soul, the Virgin Mary, and the church, an earthly trinity through whom the masculine Trinity of heaven is revealed.” Points out how “the meditative calm and joy” in Annum “contrast sharply with the conflicted and uneasy tone” of HSShe and HSShow. Argues that HSShe is “a literary receptacle in which the poet channels the ambivalent sexual and spiritual longing he feels in the absence of a much-desired spouse” and that in HSShow Donne “grapples with the nature of nuptial love, though the spouse in question is Christ’s rather than the poet’s” (7). Shows how the sonnet reveals Donne’s “ongoing struggle with ecclesiastical and spiritual questions that are, for him, always gender questions as well.” Next discusses the Anniversaries, calling them Donne’s “monumental tribute to the sacred feminine.” Discusses how in these poems Donne “invites readers to acknowledge and celebrate the sacrament of woman and to compensate for the devastating effects of her absence by participating in poetry that is also intended to function sacramentally.” Maintains that this chapter as a whole makes clear that Donne’s images of the sacred feminine during this period “emerge from his general response to Jacobean theological and ecclesiastical conflict” (8), but that “rather than providing clear or definite answers to the poet’s questions about sexuality, religion, or spirituality, each of these images instead animates a poem that is itself ambiguous, open-ended, and committed to engaging readers in the production of meaning” (8–9). In “Lanyer” (105–213) and in “Milton” (215–309), compares and contrasts Donne’s view of the feminine with those of the two poets. In “Coda: Marian Poetics” (311–16), discusses how all three poets look to the Virgin Mary as “a model of sacred creativity” and how “Mary’s maternal work provides each writer with inspiration for his or her own poetic work.” Maintains that all three “have in common a deep affection for and commitment to that most exalted human embodiment of the sacred feminine: Mary, full of grace” (12). Concludes with notes (317–54), a bibliography (355–81), and an index (383–92).

Reviews:


Challenges the readings of ElBed by John Carey (1981), Thomas Greene (1989), and others and argues that the power of ElBed “does
not reside in its imagining of sex, as the 'pornographic' readings suggest," but rather "in its imagining of that imagining." Maintains that “it is focused not on the ‘striptease’ performed by the mistress but on the speaker’s feelings about all that his sexual encounter with the mistress might entail.” Claims that the poem “may have been conceived with an intent to arouse sexual desire but the poet is more interested in the speaker’s feelings about what might be involved in the satisfaction of that desire.” Suggests that “an indication of this is the extent to which the reader inhabits the mind of the speaker rather than the room in which the speaker finds himself, whose furnishing has little or no specificity.” Says that the speaker “may well be privately rehearsing to himself the means he will use to persuade his mistress to go to bed with him at some time soon, in this place or another—or he may not” (214). Maintains that there is “no evidence that the mistress is actually present” (214–15), nor that she has actually removed her clothes. Believes that “reading this poem, like witnessing a play, entails a constant guessing at motive, an endeavour to understand not so much the speaker’s words as the speaker himself” (215). Observes how ElBed “challenges twentieth and twenty-first century preconceptions and prejudice on the subject of sex” and that, therefore, those critics “seeking a vantage-point in morality often find it puzzling” (225). Argues that the poem should be considered “in the context of sixteenth-century English society and its literary culture.” Holds that it should be seen as “a poem of hesitations, doubts, wishes and fears” and maintains that its “tone of voice attempts to mediate between the man’s assumption of superiority and his acknowledgement of the mistress’s freedom to act (or not) as it pleases her.” Claims that this “complexity of tone” is not found in earlier English poetry (231).

---


In the foreword (vii-xii), presents an introduction to Donne’s life and work, especially to his sermons. Maintains that, as in his poems, Donne in his sermons remains “wrathful, artful, generous, vicious, brilliant, too clever for his own good; elegant, concise, ingenious, long-winded, crude, disgusting, paradoxical, morbid, supremely original and supremely inventive” (vii). Chooses to focus on Donne’s treatment of death in the sermons because “there is no other front rank writer in the English language who has thought, written and talked about the subject more” and also because, as in his poetry, Donne “has every angle covered—intellectual, spiritual, physical” (ix). Comments on Donne’s view of death, especially as revealed in the four reproduced sermons: An Easter Sermon, 18 March 1619 (3–19); A Lent Sermon, 20 February 1629 (21–43); A Lent Sermon, 12 February 1630 (45–62); and Death’s Duel, 25 February 1631 (63–83). Concludes with brief notes (85) and a biographical note on Donne (87–88).


In Vol. 1, in the introduction ([xiv]-xx), explains the textual principles governing the edition, the critical apparatus at the foot of each poem, the ordering of the poems, and the commen-
tary and glosses on individual poems and lines. Points out that the texts of the poems have been modernized in punctuation and spelling and presents a note on Donne's rhymes, followed by a list of abbreviations ([xxi]-[xxiii]). Thereafter presents the text of the epigrams (3–28), the verse epistles (29–120), the Songs and Sonnets (121–283), the Elegies ([285]-362), and the Satyres ([363]-459)—with headnotes, textual and explanatory notes, and glosses. In Vol. 2, following a list of abbreviations (x-xx), presents under “Religion” text of the Holy Sonnets (two versions), Cross, Corona, Lit, MHMary, Annun, Res, verses from Ignatius, Goodf, GHerb, Father, Sidney, Christ, Lam, and Sickness ([1]-154); presents under “Wedding Celebrations” the text of EpLin, EpEliz, and Eclog ([155–202; presents under “Verse Epistles to Patronesses” BedfTwi, BedfReas, MHPaper, BedfRef, BedfHon, HuntMan, BedfWrit, Carey, BedfCab, BedfDead, and Sal ([203]-68); presents under “Commemorations” BedfShe, Mark, BoulRec, BoulNar, Henry, Har, and Ham; presents under “The Anniversaries” “To the Praise of the Dead, and “The Anatomy” by Joseph Hall, FirAn, FunEl, “The Harbinger to the Progress” by Joseph Hall, and SecAn (349–462); presents under “Probable Attribution” “The Apotheosis of Ignatius Loyola” (with a translation) (465–66); presents under “Dubia” Sappho, “The Expostulation” by Nicholas Hare?, ElPart, “Julia,” “Sir Walter Aston to the Countess of Huntingdon,” Token, ElVar, and SelfL (469–511). Presents headnotes and textual and explanatory notes and glosses on the poems. Concludes with a bibliography (512–20) and an index of titles and first lines (521–29).

Reviews:
• Sebastian Verweij in Né-Q n.s. 59 (2012): 131–33.


Announces in the preface that the intention of this collection is “to illustrate Donne’s sublime inconstancy and in so doing encourage readers into that mental, emotional and indeed sensory agility a true reading of Donne requires.” Includes SGo, Under, SunRis, Anniv, Twick, Noct, Appar, ElPict, HSDeath, HSBatter, and Father—without notes or commentary.


Responding to many conflicting definitions and descriptions of lyric, explores “a range of its attributes without crisply positing a single characteristic, such as a trope, that could categorize all lyric poetry, or even all its versions in a particular period.” Maintains that “problems arising from attempts to distribute a signature characteristic to the mode” are “more foolhardy than brave” and thus, “rather than developing a single overarching thesis,” discusses “a series of interlocking arguments.” Argues for “the real though limited value of transhistorical definitions” of lyric “if inflected—and hence sometimes destabilized—historically” while, at the same time, defends “the decision to concentrate on a single era as one of several viable responses to the complexities variously manifest in those definitions” (3). Focuses primarily on English poetry written between 1500 and 1660 and devotes “one chapter each to four sites of commonplaces about lyric, that is, its audiences, its putative immediacy, its length, and its relationship to narrative” (13). Throughout comments on Donne’s poems as examples. Observes, for instance, how immediacy and distance interact in Ind, how Donne is fascinated by communication and miscommunication in his letters and poems, and how private meditation and liturgical form are blended in Lit.
Points out “the preoccupation with intruders” that characterizes many early modern English texts and maintains that “nowhere is that preoccupation more recurrent or more revealing” than in Donne’s poetry. Notes, for instance, how many of Donne’s love poems begin with intrusions and how “versions of invasion occur within the bodies, as it were, of many other texts” (241), such as Devotions and the sermons. Maintains that studying why and how Donne often refers “to invasions in general and invaded houses in particular” provides “new perspectives on familiar passages in his canon” and clarifies “his reactions to such issues as the engendering of sexual guilt and the relationship of public and private” and can also “illuminate more general problems ranging from the structures of narrative to the workings of our own critical practices to the anxieties that shape and . . . misshape certain public policies in the twenty-first century.” Observes that some of “the deepest anxieties” in Donne’s culture “pivoted on three related forms of domestic intrusion—burglary, the entrance of stepparents, and fire” and notes that “thievery in general and burglary in particular were arguably the most feared and most prototypical of all crimes in early modern England” (242). Discusses SunRis as the poem that “best introduces and encapsulates Donne’s engagement with the dynamics of invasion” (245). Believes that Donne’s preoccupation with invasion is related perhaps to experiences that occurred in his boyhood Catholicism and to his later fear of foreign invasions of various kinds. Explores also Donne’s preoccupation with “boundaries and borders” (251) and points out that, for Donne, “the world of love is always under threat, always liable to invasion and intrusion” (252).


Discusses Donne’s relationship with Ben Jonson. Comments on Amic, Donne’s Latin commendatory poem for the 1607 quarto of Volpone, and offers a prose translation of it. Notes that the poem “could easily be read as tactful support for Jonson in his confrontation with authority, including those recusancy charges” (39–40). Argues, in particular, that Metem “contributes significantly to the ‘metempsychosis’ entertainment in the play (1.2.1–61), a play-within-a-play which resonates throughout the wider drama” (44). Furthermore argues that “the key topical link between the two works” is their satirical object, Robert Cecil and his “perverse exploitation of religion . . . in pursuit of wealth and power” (47). Concludes that “Jonson’s use of a ‘metempsychosis’ show in Volpone is a conscious allusion to Donne’s poem on this theme, that he expects his initiate readers to recognize as much” and that “he further expects them to recognize Cecil as the key linking feature” (49).


Discusses the challenges of teaching Sidney to undergraduate students and explains why he begins his unit on Donne in a survey course with Sidney. Points out a number of ways in which the poem “allows students to better appreciate the thematic and rhetorical operations” of the poems that they will study later in the course (163–64). Discusses how he uses Sidney to show students how, in the seventeenth century, there was a pervasive poetic effort “to collapse divided and distinguished worlds into a unified whole” (173) and how he points out ways in which the poem highlights “the power of Donne’s drive to achieve coherence” (174).


Discusses how ValBook “deserves to be read as one of a number of poems in which the speaker’s utterance is intended to be performative” (26). Shows how the woman addressed in the poem “is, provocatively, both author and text, both a revelation which others require
for salvation and the guardian of that revelation, determining to whom it will be imparted” (27) and comments on how she “possesses the power both to preserve the speaker’s name and confirm the endurance of their love” (30), while “the verbally compulsive speaker proves, finally, to be but a humble petitioner.” Points out that although Donne repeatedly observes that writing “preserves the loss of memory,” in ValBook it is “the immediate speech act that proves more suggestively powerful than the written or printed word” (31).


Examines the extent to which Donne in Songs and Sonets and in his religious poems “relies on and exploits metaphorical patterns variously known as conceptual metaphors, root analogies or metaphor themes.” Explains “the theories of conceptual metaphor, of how metaphors inter-relate, and the lexical research which justifies the positing of particular conceptual metaphors or metaphor themes” and then proceeds “by showing how Donne was particularly interested in the mind–body relationship” and “by exploring how his poetry uses the RELATIONSHIP IS STABILITY versus EMOTION IS MOVEMENT, RELATIONSHIP IS PROXIMITY/COHESION versus FREEDOM IS SPACE TO MOVE and the symbolic threat to relationship/proximity in the literalised symbol of separation”; and (3) maintains that Donne “recognises the distortions of the metaphorical logic and is forced to abandon the metaphors, as when he gives up RELATIONSHIP IS TRANSACTION for RELATIONSHIP IS COHESION (unity), or insists on the symmetry of love denied by the metaphor LOVE IS HUNTING or LOVE IS EATING or BEING EATEN or manages to transform the destructiveness of LOVE IS FIRE through the myth of the Phoenix and the image of refining metals” (217). Concludes that, “[i]n any case, Donne’s poetry, especially his Songs and Sonets, does not depend for its success upon metaphorical consistency, but [rather on] dramatic insistence: metaphorical logic is abandoned in the demands to go on talking, thinking aloud and spinning new conceits” (218).

Woman’s Junior College 43: 133–50.


A resource book for teachers and their students in A-level courses in critical thinking. Contrasts the concluding lines of ValMourn (ll. 25–36) with the endings of three poems by Philip Larkin. Maintains that “[w]e know precisely what Donne means” and “his meaning will be the same as ours,” whereas, because of the “nebulousness” (78) of Larkin’s images, the meaning of his lines “may well be unique to each of us as an individual” (79). Comments also on the argument of Flea, calling the poem “[n]aughty, but clever” (80).


Presents an analysis of Lit to show that the poem is “far more intricate and interwoven than the church litanies on which it is based” (184). Argues that the poem is “not a litany, any more than Herbert’s ‘Church Porch’ is actually a porch.” Maintains rather that it is “a litany poem like those of Sidney, Herrick, and others, though it exploits the form and content of the litany more thoroughly than other examples of the genre.” Points out how Lit is “a far more intricate verbal structure than any liturgical text” and “is more carefully and tightly integrated into a unified work.” Observes that although it “includes many of the elements of the traditional litanies, Donne’s poem focuses not only on his spiritual and psychological needs but also on the particular problems of a poet writing religious verse, an issue very much at the nexus of the secular/profane divide.” Concludes that Lit “in its complex combination of aesthetic, psychological, spiritual, and theological concerns, resists classification as either sacred or secular” but that if the poem is “a poetic representation of Dr. Jack Donne, this seems entirely appropriate” (204).

1442. -----. “Upon Donne’s ‘Upon the translation of the Psalms.’” JDJ 27: 175–96.

Surveys the criticism on Sidney and focuses on “establishing a literary context for the poem, arguing that, rather than being an isolated occasional poem, it actually lies at the center of a small but significant sub-genre of poems about or introducing metrical Psalms, reflecting on the relationship between earthly, liturgical song, the music of the neo-Platonic spheres, and the divine music of the Christian heaven” (175). Discusses the “unrecognized strengths, complexities, [and] points of interest” in this much neglected poem and shows how it “fits meaningfully into literary or other contexts in ways that we haven’t noticed.” Points out, in particular, its “complex biblical allusions” (181), its “treatment of divine singing and music” (183), its complex puns on the words “translation” and “part” (184), and its “pervasive pattern of doubling and pairing.” Maintains that “[d]espite the singular occasion” of Sidney—“whether the death of Mary Sidney, Donne’s desire for preferment, or the need for a better singing psalter—the poem is not unique in its subject matter” (187), but rather “belongs to a literary sub-genre of lyric poems that similarly address the nature of Psalms and Psalm translation, the relationship between earthly and heavenly music, and the vocational dilemma of the religious poet” (187–88). Cites as an example Francis Davison’s The Poetical Rhapsody (1602) and notes that Davison’s translation of Psalm 137 was for a long time considered to be by Donne, was included in the 1633 edition of Donne’s poems, and that Lara Crowley recently argued that the poem is, in fact, by Donne (see above). Points out also a “literary-genealogical relationship” between Pembroke’s “To the Angell spirit,” Davison’s “An Introduction to the Translation of the Psalms,” and Sidney and suggests similarities with Milton’s “At a
Solemn Music” and his verse translations of the psalms. Concludes that Sidney “shares the verbal complexity and intellectual sophistication of Donne’s better known poems”; “offers a subtle exploration of aspects of religious poetry, including the importance of biblical models and the problems of translation”; “addresses large concerns about liturgy and the reformation of the Church, the place of poetry in that reformation, and the theology of sin and salvation”; and makes an important contribution “to a small but significant tradition of English poetry” (196).


Surveys the history of colloquia, beginning in 1988, that have been held at the annual conferences of the John Donne Society. Introduces the colloquium that took place at the 2007 conference on Sidney and comments on papers delivered on that occasion by Anne Lake Prescott, Raymond-Jean Frontain, Hannibal Hamlin, and Gary A. Stringer, each of which has been separately entered in this bibliography. Includes a list of all the colloquia and their topics from 1988 to 2008 (152).


Presents a close reading of ValName, examining the complexities of the poem’s theme and its elaborate uses of wordplay, paradox, and conceits.


Surveys the content and style of the 129 letters by Donne published by his son, John Donne, Jr., in Letters to Severall Persons of Honour (1651, rpt. 1654). Maintains that they reveal “the witty poet and preacher in many of his most significant styles and roles.” Notes that although many of the letters were tampered with by the editor or collector of the volume, they yet maintain an overall impression of the vitality of Donne’s mind. Points out how “attacks on the corruption of the court are balanced in the volume overall by its many meditative considerations”; how “the portrait here of Donne the family man and loving father and husband is set beside the clever writer who declared friendship to be his ‘second religion’”; and how “these revealing insights into his public and private self are balanced by letters affirming his life-long assertion that ‘There is no Virtue, but Religion.’” Observes also how “letters about the ongoing religious conflicts in Europe are followed often by newsless letters he called ‘ghosts’ and ‘apparitions,’ both examples of his epistolary art expressed in those dexterous conceits that characterize his vibrant poetry and prose.” Maintains that “this varied collection of Donne’s letters seems often, that is, to be framed to illustrate his understanding of that ancient and Renaissance adage, Stylus virum arguit: ‘Style argues the man’” (842).


Points out that critics often compare SSweet and ValMourn, poems in which the speaker says farewell to his mistress when about to leave on a voyage, but maintains that the two poems are actually “very different in their styles of persuasion.” Observes that SSweet “concentrates on the sea voyage” and that the speaker of the poem, “tenderly calming” his beloved, asserts his belief that their mutual love is such that it “would never permit a total separation.”
Believes that this kind of “naive reasoning” obviously is very unlike the “sharply paradoxical philosophy” expressed by the speaker in Val-Mourn. Argues that SSweet “finds a more appropriate counterpart” in ElFatal and discusses how the two poems are similar “not only in their intensity of emotion and unphilosophical reasoning” but also “in their shared connection” with the tale of Ceyx and Alcyone in Ovid’s Metamorphoses (ll. 410–748). Discusses various parallels and echoes between the two poems and Ovid’s tale and argues that the classical story “may be taken as the prototype of lovers’ separation on which Donne built his two seemingly very different valedictory poems.” Believes that Donne’s use of Ovid “indicates a deeper engagement with classical poetry” than most critics assume (677).


Argues that modern experiential poetry “shines most brilliantly when read, discussed and studied in relation to established artistic traditions” (37). Investigates this premise by commenting on an undergraduate course, entitled Anglo-American Metaphysical Poetic, taught by the author, in which students examined the trajectory of metaphysical poetry from Donne to Susan Howe. Discusses how Howe, like Donne, “depended on and broke free of tradition, thereby transfiguring literary influences that shaped her poetry.” Notes how the texts of both Howe and Donne share “an unmistakable attentiveness to: the elaboration upon (rather than the explanation of) a poetic conceit; rapid developments of comparisons between dissimilar ideas; sudden contrasts (without transitions) between ideas and images; simple language and difficult syntax; and intellectual passion shaped into a manifold of sensibility” (40).


In Chinese. Briefly discusses the imagery in SGo and Canon as examples of how Donne’s poetry resembles the poetry of T. S. Eliot and other twentieth-century poets. Suggests that, because of his modernist techniques, Donne has found a favorable reception among modern readers.


In Chinese. Briefly discusses Donne’s life and its influence on his poetry and analyzes Val-Mourn as representative of Donne’s poetic style, commenting, in particular, on the poem’s images and conceits.


Maintains that Donne’s love poetry reflects a struggle between reality and fantasy and that “the presence of playful images and arguments” becomes “even more fantastic, the more the poet is overwhelmed by the denials offered by the woman or [by] the reality of the world.” Says that, for Donne, fantasy is “a mixture of argument and inventiveness” that overcomes “the limits of reality.” Focuses primarily on how most of Donne’s love poems consist “not of general aspiration and terms of praise” but rather imply “the existence of a very specific situation, not only daybreak or the moments before the lovers make love but where the lovers themselves are given characters almost as they would be in a drama.” Maintains, moreover, that “this never-ending confrontation offers no solution, does not acclaim any winner,” but that it justifies “the uses of sheer wit and intelligence” in his love poems (113). Stresses how fantasy allows Donne “to liberate himself from the world of painful realities by making the objective subject to the purely personal” (119). Discusses a number of poems that illus-
trate the argument, particularly Flea, GoodM, SunRis, and the Anniversaries.


Maintains that “[t]he experience of life for Donne is one of incompletion, an imperfect, because imbalanced and unfined, mixture of desires and circumstances, fears and possibilities” and thus “being in-between for Donne is a reflection of the human condition, though his response to such a condition is not either/or, but both/and” (2). Suggests that Donne’s “imperfection” comes, in part, from “his habit toward proliferation and inclusion” (5) as seen in Essays in which he wishes “to balance his expansive and inclusive hermeneutic method ‘invincibly’ with his vision of the Church as a whole, neither Roman Catholic nor Protestant alone.” Discusses how his “alarity of thought is the type of imperfection” (6) that Donne presents also in Res and in BedfDead, poems that exhibit how Donne's work is characterized “by a pervasive and a profound rest-lessness,” which is, in part, “the distinguishing imperfection found in Donne, and a quality of mind that draws us to him” (9). Discusses also how Donne's “habit toward multiplying the conditions, and for expressing himself in conditionals, is the heuristic principle governing the Holy Sonnets” (11) as well as many of his sermons. Comments also on three prose letters Donne wrote to Goodyer to illustrate how Donne's mind is “free-ranging in the rhetorical and epistemological explorations of possible worlds.” Concludes that Donne “insists on and obsesses about” many “finely nuanced and paradoxical distinctions” that “open him to misinterpretation, including the mis-interpretation that he at times purposes” (19), but that it is his “imperfection” that “catches us, pulling us toward him and tripping us up”; in fact, it is “the flaw by which we know him” (20).


1453. Keenan, Siobham. Renaissance Literature. (Edinburgh Critical Guides to Literature, ed. Martin Halliwell and Andy Mousley.) Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. xxvii, 282p. Presents a concise introduction to English literature from 1558 to 1649, intended primarily for undergraduate students. Begins with “an overview of the original context in which English Renaissance literature was produced” and “a discussion of its contemporary and modern critical reception,” followed by chapters on drama, poetry and prose, each of which has a summary of its main points. Includes also advice on writing student essays, gives sample essay questions, offers a glossary of terms, and includes a guide to further reading and resources. In the conclusion (219–23), summarizes “some of the most significant developments in Renaissance literary culture” and “considers the future direction of Renaissance scholarship,” including “a discussion of research opportunities that may be especially useful to students devising undergraduate or graduate dissertation topics” (x-xi). Mentions Donne throughout. In “Poetry,” presents a general introduction to the major thematic and stylistic characteristics of the Songs and Sonets, with references to Donne's religious verse (173–77). In “Prose,” comments on various themes and stylistic features of Donne's sermons, noting the recent renewed interest in his prose. Also discusses the spiritual themes in and structure of Devotions (201–04). In “Student Resources,”
suggests as a topic the analysis and contextualization of same-sex desire in Renaissance literature that would consider, among other works, *Sappho* (229–32).


Argues that *Satyr II* has “a greater topical relevance to the emergence of the Anglo-American common-law tradition than literary and legal scholars have previously recognized.” Furthermore, argues that the villainous Coscus, the poet-turned-lawyer, in the poem may be Sir Edward Coke and that the two females referred to may be Queen Elizabeth. Shows how in *Satyr II* Donne attacks and mocks both of them “for their complicity in deploying an antiquated and backward-looking feudal ideal in order to lend prestige to the common law, to enrich the crown and its officers, and to frustrate the dynamic prospects of landholding gentry” (92). Discusses how *Satyr II* is “firmly engaged in important legal controversies from the early 1590s, specifically those concerning the calculated alignment of Coke’s antiquarian legal ideology and Elizabeth’s parsimonious fiscal feudalism.” Maintains that Donne emerges in this early poem as “a more astute, sophisticated, and skeptical observer of the law, as it was being practiced and institutionalized, than literary critics and legal historians have previously allowed” (94).


Argues that the four sermons that Donne preached on the conversion of St. Paul in 1625, 1628, 1629, and 1630 constitute his “most coherent thinking on the subject of conversion.” Shows how Donne “establishes what he calls a *via Pauli* that links Renaissance humanism’s rhetorically-oriented *via diversa* with the English church’s *via media.*” Observes that “what is most remarkable about these sermons” is that Donne “downplays the introspective psycho-spiritual newness of Paul’s conversion” and, instead, especially in the last three sermons, “demonstrates how Paul exploited the various identities, whether metaphorical, mistaken, or political, attributed to or claimed by him during the course of his apostolic ministry as recounted in the Acts of the Apostles.” Holds that Donne “insists that ‘occasional’ conversions—conversions like his own that prudently respond to changing rhetorical circumstances—do not taint a genuine spiritual calling, but necessarily accompany it” (75). Maintains that Donne has Paul “convert not from the Law to the Gospel or from the dead letter to the living spirit” but rather “from one legally-recognized social group to another” and that in these sermons “the Law is not abolished, nor is it interiorized” but rather “is made politically circumstantial, in fact made into the rhetorical circumstances or occasions that Donne shows Paul manipulating for his own advantage and for the advantage of the early church in its historical Greco-Roman context.” Concludes that “what gets converted in these sermons is not Paul or Donne, but the familiar Augustinian paradigm (which, it should be said, ill fits the events of Augustine’s *Confessions* of the single, dramatic, sincere conversion itself” (94).


Discusses Donne’s “method of attenuating, arresting, and suspending thought” (64) by commenting on his love poetry in the light of the political theories of the archconservative German jurist and staunch enemy of liberalism, Carl Schmitt. Observes that Schmitt’s views on the cessation of ordinary time, for instance,
is “one of the most familiar goals of Donne’s love poetry” (70), as seen in Lect and Noct, poems in which Donne “seeks to triumph over time by causing the cessation of normal time” (71). Discusses how in such poems as GoodM, Canon, and especially in Ecst “some of the basic philosophical and theological assumptions of Schmitt’s state of exception can be seen” (72). Maintains that the “states of exception” in Donne’s love poetry are attempts “to suspend—rather than violate or reform or transcend—the norm” (78). Presents a detailed reading of Ecst to show how the poem “enacts a pattern of sexual love which can yet survive the sating of desire, and stand beyond casualty and time.” Concludes that “the attentuation of the moment and the normalization of the exception” often converge in Donne’s love poetry (88).


Maintains that in his sermons Donne “exploits the way in which conscience is generally thought, in Reformation theology, to be an agency rather than an act,” i.e., that “conscience is a voice of judgment that speaks to us, rather than a rational process that is conducted by us.” Observes that, as Donne says, “It is not the depth, nor the wit, nor the eloquence of the Preacher that pierces us, but his nearnesse; that hee speaks to my conscience as though he had beene behind the hangings when I sinned, as though he had read the book of the day of Judgement already.” Points out that “the rhetorical force and spiritual meaningfulness of Donne’s nearness effect both rest on the Protestant view that conscience is an agency of judgment within the soul that produces knowledge of one’s actions, rather than being a name for such knowledge itself.” Maintains that Donne believes that the preacher “should pierce my conscience by speaking as though he were my conscience” and that, for Donne, “the power of fascination a preacher possesses is directly proportional to his ability to get auditors to feel as well as understand the shock of surprise attendant upon an encounter with one’s conscience as God’s witness within the soul” (631). Argues that Donne “shows rather than merely tells us about the nearness effect in his sermons and letters” and that he “conveys conscience as an ecstatic phenomenon that is crucial to both Jacobean pulpit oratory and the early modern experience of Protestant faith more generally.” Points out that “ecstatic” in this context, however, is not meant in a mystical sense but rather “refers to the way that conscience can feel other to me even if I don’t want it to, even if its speaking is not willed by me.” Holds that “in the Reformation context of sin and conscience informing Donne’s sermons, then, ecstatic experiences refer to phenomena that happen to me but feel as though they are somehow not proper to me as such.” Maintains that “because the ecstatic experience of hearing one’s conscience against one’s own intention is crucial to how Donne understands the role of preacher and the experience of faith per se, it informs both the rhetorical structure and thematic itinerary of many individual sermons, as well as some of Donne’s most compelling private letters” (632). Discusses a number of sermons and letters to show how they “not only enact but also thematicize” the “reflexive and potentially disturbing dimension of conscience” (643).


Argues that “the fundamental drama of the Holy Sonnets is characterized by the speaker’s terrifying recognition that repentance requires him to experience his lack of autonomy—to undergo a psychically violent process in which he comes to realize, existentially as well as cognitively, that in himself he is nothing.”
Maintains that “a key feature of this spiritual drama” is “the speaker’s appropriations of Petrarchism.” Discusses how Donne’s speaker in the Holy Sonnets “employs the language of Petrarchism—its vocabulary as well as its thematic topoi—not only as a way of trying to cope with fear of God’s judgment but also as a way of defending against anxiety over his own ontological and soteriological lack of self-sufficiency” (537). Holds that Donne’s “ambivalence over regeneration in the Holy Sonnets can only be fully grasped in the context of Donne’s parodies of Petrarchan solipsism in the Songs and Sonnets.” Shows, therefore, that in the Holy Sonnets “theologically mediated anxiety over the loss of autonomy is expressed in the very Petrarchan terms that Donne parodies in the Songs and Sonnets” (538).

Chapter 5, “Petrarchism and repentance in John Donne’s Holy Sonnets” (151–83), is a reprint of an essay with the same title in MP 105, no. 3 (2008): 535–69. In Chapter 6, “John Donne and the poetics of belatedness: Typology, trauma, and testimony in An Anatomy of the World” (184–215), argues that “what is most remarkable and least understood” about FirAn is how the poem “unfolds as a meditation on belatedness that puts on trial the redemptive power of Reformation typology and soteriology.” Points out that throughout FirAn the speaker “tries to recover the conditions for a godly sorrow rather than a desacralized despair by describing the world as belated in at least four key senses: (1) as having separated from purer origins and hence as historiically and ontologically belated” (184); (2) “as possibly past the time of justifying grace and hence as soteriologically late”; (3) “as in mourning for the death of a child and hence as psychologically belated in the sense that a father should not outlive his child”; and (4) as “literally belated . . . in the sense that Drury’s death occurs after the point at which the female beloved can function as a mediatrix conjoining earthly and heavenly orders” (184–85). Maintains that the speaker’s “near-despairing sense of belatedness involves a rigorous, at times even heretical, questioning of the recuperative power of sacred history, particularly as it gets configured in the post-Reformation context.” Observes that “what is intriguing about the poem’s treatment of typology is that it does not simply assume the validity or recuperative power of figural narrative”; but, “on the contrary, it submits typology to rigorous questioning by confronting the Pauline theme that faith is an affront to reason and experience” (185). Sees FirAn “as questioning the recuperative power of typological forms of historical narration, even as it seeks to enact the recuperative force of typology” and regards “this questioning of typology as a crucial feature of the poem’s power of fascination, its ability to enthrall readers with its depiction of the experience of traumatic loss.” Maintains, in other words, that “the relationship between Donne’s poem and Protestant traditions of typology is more dynamic and more vexed” than Barbara Lewalski’s 1973 reading of the poem suggests (186). Discusses how “the destabilizing effects of Reformation thought are a dynamic problem being enacted and grappled with” in FirAn and shows how “this process of working through the existential implications of doctrinal commitments takes place most often in the English Renaissance through the experience of grief”—and, in the case of FirAn, “a grief that registers in the strange modality of overliving and which is confirmed as both a source of and a proper matter for poetry” (211).

Discusses Donne’s use of coinage and alchemy in Canon, examining such terms as “dye,” “pat- terne,” “ruin’d fortune,” “wealth,” “the King’s reall, or his stamped face,” “the’Eagle and the dove,” and the “Phoenix” to show how these terms are linked to “coinage as a form of alchemy” (121). Contends that although “all of these terms, while deriving from alchemy, also pertain specifically to practices in the Lon-
don mint and in other English mints in the Tudor and Stuart eras, when both metal and monetary values were transmuted in the process of manufacturing and stamping coins” (120–21). Maintains that Canon becomes “a ‘richer’ poem when interpreted by reference to coingage, the form of alchemy practiced in the English mint.” Shows how in the poem the speaker “uses ideas from mintage to represent the loving interaction with his beloved, an interaction that is the proverbial ‘gold standard’ or ‘paterné’ by which other relationships are appraised as lesser, debased, counterfeit, or spurious.” Discusses how the speaker’s interaction with his beloved is “the ‘paterné’ that other lovers should strive to emulate in order to enhance the quality of their relationships.” Discusses how, “though woven into the larger texture of alchemical and avian imagery, coinage generates ironies in the poem, suggests the tonal range (gravity to levity), characterizes the speaker as fraudulent or true in representing his loving relationship, and emphasizes at least two altered states”: (1) that “the lover and his beloved purportedly are translated heavenward as saints,” and (2) that “lovers on earth strive to transmute lust into love” (129–30). Concludes that Canon “provides an example of a speaker who alters or transmutes, rhetorically, a base relationship into a precious one, a carnal union into a sanctified one” (130).

1461. ———. “Dangerous Liaisons: ‘Spider Love’ in John Donne’s ‘Twicknam Garden,’” in Renaissance Tropologies: The Cultural Imagination of Early Modern England, ed. Jeanne Shami, 219–28. (Medieval & Renaissance Literary Studies, gen. ed. Albert C. La- briola.) Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press. Explicates the term “spider love” in Twick by explaining its use and significance in Mary Wroth’s Urania (1621), a work contemporaneous with Donne’s poem; by discussing how “a clear-cut understanding of this crucial phrase provides new perspectives on the interaction of the speaker and the woman he visits”; and by suggesting how the phrase throws new light on Donne’s relationship with his patroness, Lucy, Countess of Bedford. Shows how Donne uses “spider love” “innovatively to suggest that the speaker is victimized by his own nature, which impels ongoing struggle,” and how, “[s]triving to gratify himself, he is self-entrapped by sensualism while continuously but unsuccessfully attempting to ensnare the lady who rejects his overtures.” Maintains that “the sensualism informing his nature and the irresistible appeal of the lady cause his anguish,” while the lady is “a woman to whom snares are transparent and temptations discernible, a woman not to be victimized” (225). Discusses how Donne’s purpose in Twick is to “express two relationships” with the Countess of Bedford—“the one sensual, the other sublime” and shows how spider love is “the pivotal image” (226) by which Donne, while denigrating himself for being unable to resist the sensual charms of the lady, glorifies and idealizes his patroness as virtuous. Concludes, therefore, that spider love in the poem “becomes a multivalent and witty compliment to the countess by an author who expresses his personal self under the protective guise of a poetic persona” (228).

1462. La Torre, Lauren. “Dar La Luz: Illuminating John Donne’s ‘A nocturnall upon S. Lucies day, Being the shortest day.’” JDJ 27: 103–20. Briefly surveys the debate about who is the subject of Noct and maintains that “at the heart” of the poem is a Spanish pun that is “essential to its wit, enriches our reading of the poem, and suggests the likelihood that the poem’s subject is Anne More” (104). Discusses Donne’s knowledge of Spanish and his gift for punning not only in English but also in other languages. Maintains that the “crucial wordplay” in Noct involves a Spanish phrase “dar la luz,” which is a Spanish expression for the verb “to give birth” but, when translated literally means “to give the light” (106). Maintains that in Noct Donne “reverses the process of birth described by the phrase dar la luz” and that, rather than “a movement from the darkness and death of the womb to light and life,” Noct “moves from life to darkness and death.” Holds that this “emotional trajectory” suggests “a des- spair that would be particularly appropriate if
he were mourning the loss of his beloved in a birth that yielded not new life, but death” (107). Notes that Anne More died giving birth to a still-born daughter on August 15, 1617. Shows how Donne plays on dar la luz to heighten “the ironic wit of the inverted birth and inverted light tropes,” to deepen and personalize “the alchemical imagery of the poem, which expresses an inverted alchemical process” (108), and to illuminate “the ironic uses” of the word “spirit” in the poem (112). Observes also how “strangely inverted creation/Creation images” in Noct are “particularly appropriate to an occasion when childbirth resulted in the loss of the beloved” (114) and how Donne links Anne with the Virgin Mary. Discusses how “under the trope of dar la luz, light, religion, the Virgin Mary, childbirth, and Anne More coalesce” (116). Points out also how Donne's wordplay on the Spanish phrase also highlights the speaker's "despondency as it conveys the speaker's anxiety that his behavior and feelings may be uxorious" (117) and the "reversal of rightful devotional energy" (177–18).


In Korean. Demonstrates how both Donne in his love poetry and Shakespeare in his sonnets rejected the Petrarchan convention of representing the male lover as one “who suffered agonies and sickness of body and spirit at the caprices of a woman who had power over him and was very cruel to him.” Points out how Donne parodied and satirized Neoplatonic poets and their views of love. Also finds “interrelations between love and politics” in the Songs and Sonets. Notes how Donne rejected the notion of serving women in a courtly fashion and rather offered “a different kind of service, which was clearly sexual,” thereby restoring “male dignity” and sovereignty by replacing servitude with mastery (438). Claims that in the “negative love poems” in the Songs and Sonets Donne attempts to subvert the rule of women and to “disrupt both court society and [the] English church which had a belief in hierarchical order within a strict framework of social uniformity, which was basically the result of the concept of honor.” Shows how the male speaker in Donne's love poems often attempts to free himself from the mastery of women (perhaps even of the Queen) by resorting to anti-Petrarchism (439).


In Chinese. Surveys and comments on twenty-first century Chinese studies of Donne and his works.


In Chinese. Discusses the literary and historical contexts of SGo, commenting on the poem's images, rhythms, and numeral symbols. (English abstract)


Focuses on the emergence of English personal essayistic prose in the seventeenth century and calls it “an innovative phenomenon in English literature.” Discusses how such prose manifests “psychologism, dramatism, intimacy, lyricism, analytical modality, imaginativeness and their complex interconnectedness” and how “this personal psychological prose” has “its roots in rhetoric” (146). Maintains that essayistic personal prose “is not a transcription of disjointed thoughts and emotions” but rather “is a system, the foundation of which is the process of a living mind, the depiction of the controversies of the inner world of man.” Cites Devotions
as an example of the sincere expression of “a living mind always subtle and introspective,” a work in which Donne “focuses attention on his mental and physical state, with absorbing interest in his psyche.” Maintains that in “this self-reflexive, mind-centered intellectual prose Donne questions the meaning of beingness” (150).


In Chinese. Discusses the morality of Donne’s love poems and sacred poems. Maintains that in the love poems Donne explores both sexual love and spiritual love and that he concludes finally that true love is a combination of both. Discusses how in the divine poems Donne wrestles with guilt and how he believes that a skeptical spirit is necessary to find truth. Calls Donne’s thinking a “kind of humane morality” (12) and finds his reasoning about religion, sexual desire, and art significant for poets today. (English abstract)


Presents a reading of *Sappho* that “differs from others because it chooses to think about what Sappho has to say for herself, and what role intertextuality plays in that” (311). Points out differences between Ovid’s Sappho poem (*Heroides* 15) and Donne’s and cites examples (“some fleeting and circumstantial, some more compelling”) of intertextuality between *Sappho* and Donne’s other poems (315). Maintains that the parallels between the poem and Donne’s other works are “deliberate and curiously aligned with the purposes of the poem” and suggests that “these inward-allusions might be best read as the products of a resourceful female speaker’s reading in—not quite within—the oeuvre of her poet” (311). Admits that this is “an unusual and somewhat deliberate reading” of *Sappho* “that, prompted by the curious nature of some of its characteristically Donne-esque touches, pursues its intertextuality with its own author’s work.” Maintains, however, that “rather than reading this as evidence of authorship—representatively Donne’s, or indeed apparently using the techniques of pastiche—it wonders what the fictional character may make of her author’s work.” Concludes that “the unusual nature of Sappho strengthens her position and her potential for disruptive creative autonomy in the reader’s interpretation” (315).


Investigates the “tensions between orthodoxy and intellectual play” in Donne’s understanding of angels. Discusses how “the verbal and intellectual play characterizing Donne’s use of Dionysian angelology and mysticism contrasts sharply with his views on the divine truths of scripture and the saving quality of grace,” thereby “reflecting *sola Scriptura* and *sola gratia* values” found consistently in his early and late poetry and in his prose (11). Discusses in some detail Donne’s complex and ambivalent use of angels in *Air* because “the ambiguities and critical controversies surrounding this poem are illustrative of the challenges in finding in Donne’s work a stable position on angels” (62). Argues that angels primarily “occupy in Donne’s universe” the “realm of ideas” and that they “are valued as symbolic representations of proper devotion rather than as literal mediators of divine mystery” (65). Surveys Donne’s thought on angels as “revealing his views on the church, first in his prose, specifically *Pseudo-Martyr* and the sermons”; then in his religious verse, “with especial emphasis on the ecclesiology” of *Saty* and *HSSouls*; and finally in “the engagement of Dionysian mysticism” in *SecAn* and elsewhere (65). Discusses how in
the sermons Donne “avoids Dionysian notions of celestial and ecclesiastical mediation and shows little regard for angelic ministrations more generally.” Points out Donne’s “adoption in some regards of Calvin’s interpretations of biblical angels” and discusses his general agreement with Reformed theology. Points out that although in his poems Donne evokes “the Dionysian traditions of angelology and mysticism, these are consistently rendered as unstable human ideas opposed to immediate expressions of divine will” (73) and are “associated with the human tendency to wander in the labyrinths of worldly error, intellectually inviting as they may be” (74).


Reads Satyrs, Donne’s dedicatory verse for Coryat’s Crudities, and RWThird in the light of a “broadened sense of the scope and flexibility of Horatian hexameter” and suggests “not only that all three of these poems are involved in an imitative relationship with key Horatian texts (and those of Persius) more complex and interesting than has previously been noted; but also that Donne uses Horace’s exploration of poetic and social choices (of genre, of subject, of address) to animate the religiously-inflected drama and narrative of his own ‘hexameter voice’” (22). Maintains that although all three poems are “distinct and unrelated works,” there is in each “evidence of an ongoing imitative relationship with Horatian hexameter verse (as well as that of Persius) of flexibility and importance: a relationship that makes the drama of the poet’s choice—of genre, of behavior, of religion—a drama rooted in, but ultimately extending beyond, Horace’s own versions of that dilemma” (47). Shows how in the three poems Donne “proclaims to hate with impartial equality ethical extremes of any sort, religious mania of either kind; both what is Christian and what is classical if it is ill-judged.” Maintains rather that Donne “gives his blessing to ‘meanes’: the mean known from Aristotle and from Horace, a classical moderation in all things” and that it is “this moderation that the (Christian) speaker ‘blesses’: not simply approves of, but religiously endorses.” Concludes that it is “the articulation of Horatian ‘meanes’—both modes and modulations—as a valid Christian choice in poetry as in life that animates Donne’s satires and epistles alike” (48).


Discusses the pervasive Renaissance trope of immortality through immortal art. Surveys “the main habits of thought that informed conceptions of immortality” at the time and argues that “the distinction between temporal and eternal existence operated strongly, especially when combined with a sense of the material nature of texts” (256). Demonstrates “the influence of these habits first on religious verse, where one would expect them to bear weight, and then on the less obvious case of secular verse that deal with the immortalizing power of poetry” (256–57). Discusses how Donne, for instance, in Devotions differentiates between “temporal locutions that preserve earthly recognition and divine authorship that ensures true immortality” (264–65) and notes how it is “God’s authorship Donne turns to when he associates immortality with writing” (265). Points out that “when early modern writers thought about the afterlife of their writing, they bore in mind distinctions between sublunary immortality bound by time, matter, and human audience, and immortality in the spiritual sense, transcending the material world and guaranteed only by God.” Discusses how several verse epistles and the Anniversaries “promise immortality to the women they celebrate, even as a religious conception of time conditions Donne’s development of the trope” and notes how in SecAn “the afterlife of Donne’s poetry is explicitly framed in terms of
future generations of readers stretching only to the Last Judgment” (267). Observes that in his secular poems of compliment Donne’s use of the immortality trope “even more clearly presumes a preservation of the verse that depends on future readers” (268) and imitators. Shows how the trope “oscillates between the poet’s sense that the poem depends on material form and human audience for survival, and the poet’s impression that from another perspective poems are not material in the way stones are, and are not subject to decay” (270). Shows how in *Canon* Donne “makes light-heartedly deflating use of the trope of poetic immortality” (273) and how its claims are “ironized by the gap between the limited immortality that can be gained by human art or accorded by human acclamation, and the true immortality granted only by God”; in fact, its “imaginings remain pleasing fantasies, not serious propositions” (274).


In Chinese. Using the technique of defamiliarization developed by Russian formalists, interprets Donne’s love poems. Maintains that this technique is useful in discovering the personal and artistic characteristics of Donne’s poems.


Considers how Donne’s “early secular poetry, with its vivid and powerful presentation of human physical love and desire (eros), might be reconciled as being contemporaneous with his perhaps equally early poetry of divine love (agape).” Discusses *Noct* and *HSShe* as representative of Donne’s secular and sacred poetry and approaches the problem by focusing “not on any purported transformation in Donne’s life” but rather on “a theory based on Aristotle’s concept of *mimesis* that lies behind his definition of tragedy and comedy” (159). Argues that although the speaker in *Noct* is “understandably heartbroken and in pain over the loss of a beloved,” it is the speaker’s “inability to recognize God’s encompassing and regenerative love that ultimately leaves him in despair;” whereas, in contrast, the speaker of *HSShe*, “despite grief and love as powerful” as that expressed in *Noct*, “nevertheless manages to find inner peace through God’s grace” (161). Through a detailed analysis of each poem, shows how in the suffering of the speaker in *Noct*, Donne “provides a vignette of human pain and misery, while in the triumph and confidence of the speaker in the sonnet, Donne presents the proper response to suffering, one that ultimately leads the speaker away from despair and on the path to comfort and hope through God’s merciful love” (177).


Surveys Donne’s critical reception through four stages—from his own day to the present. Points out that during the past 50 years Donne criticism “reveals and is exemplary of virtually every critical and theoretical approach one could identify—historicist and new historicist approaches, feminist criticism, biographical approaches, cultural materialist criticism, psychological and psychoanalytical critiques, etc.”—and that during the past 100 years Donne has “achieved and maintained a stature that makes the previous claim unsurprising.” Suggests that a “simpler answer to the question of how to determine what we think of Donne in the twentieth century” is “to consult the assessments made by John Roberts and appearing in, among other outlets, *John Donne Journal*” (856). Praises the work of the editors of the ongoing *Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne* for continuing to add “to our knowledge and understanding by filling in gaps and shading in historical transitions” (862), and holds that the detailed and extensive commentary in
these volumes, arranged chronologically, “offers the most convincing overall summary” of “what we think about Donne” (863).


Maintains that the early printing history of Donne’s collected poems was “largely shaped by his attitude toward printing itself.” Discusses how, throughout his life, Donne “preferred manuscript circulation to print publication” and how “that preference had significant consequences for the early dissemination of his poems, their posthumous publication, and their subsequent textual histories” (825). Notes that “nearly all of the few works of his that were printed in his lifetime were committed to the press at the urging of friends or in obedience to the king or a noble patron” and that “of those few that were printed, several were issued anonymously” (826). Explains Donne’s reasons for preferring manuscript circulation of his poems and points out how such transmission “allows for none of the overall, permanent control that an author can find in print” and how, “once the work leaves the physical possession of its author, it is open to virtually infinite non-authorial variation at the hands of selective, inattentive, or officious copyists” (829). Discusses the extensive “scribal tampering” found throughout Donne’s canon and points out that “no poetical manuscripts in his own hand survive” but only “some thirty major collections of his poetry in manuscript (though none containing the complete canon),” that were “transcribed by or for collectors of his verse at several removes from his now lost autograph copies and in several different and textually differing lines of transmission” (830). Discusses how the early publishers of Donne’s collected poems had available only “textually corrupt manuscript collections” on which to base their editions and points out that, up to 1995, “all significant editions” of Donne’s poems were “largely or exclusively based on one or more of the early editions.” Comments on how it is the goal of the editors of the on-going *Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne* to discover and restore “the authorial texts” of Donne’s poems, insofar as possible (831), and points out examples of the many textual cruxes that they encounter and aim to solve.


In Russian. Discusses how poets of the fin-de-siècle saw similarities between Donne and their own epoch and notes that T. S. Eliot called this recognition the “Huysmans Connection.” Examines to what extent such a connection is valid and how much of it was invented by critics, such as Eliot.


Presents a pedagogical report on undergraduate students’ “sometimes puzzled reactions” to *Sidney* and discusses how she explains aspects of the “cultural background” of the poem that might help students “grasp even more confidently some of the concepts and allusions that give the poem’s lines their resonance” (153). Points out how she deals with such issues as the students’ lack of familiarity with biblical literature and theology in general and their difficulty with some of the vocabulary and imagery of the poem, with issues of gender in it, with the nature of Renaissance psalmody and religious music, and with recognizing the poem’s genre and purpose.

Comments on the events surrounding Donne’s death in 1631 and suggests that nothing in his life was “quite as spectacular as his death” (528). Surveys Donne’s view of death and dying and contrasts it with twenty-first century perspectives. Briefly discusses how in *Devotions* Donne practiced the traditional *ars moriendi* and points out how he and his contemporaries “produced artistry out of their familiarity with death” (529).


Discusses how Donne takes the Eucharist “to the bedroom” and how even in his seduction poems he often “alludes to communion” (87). Maintains that Donne “explored the mystery of the sacrament that is based upon the Incarnation, passion, and resurrection—turning all into the mystery of making love” and that “in sexual love and the resurrection of the body,” he expresses “the same longing: for the union of bodies and souls.” Claims that “this longing is not for a miracle wrought by the Church but by desire—for love, the lover, and Lover,” a miracle that “enables the lover to live both in another body and beyond death.” Holds that, for Donne, “full love, fully given, achieves a kind of resurrection, hence, a kind of redemption” (88). Argues, therefore, that, for Donne, “physical lovemaking recapitulates the union of God and man” and that “so redemptive is lovemaking for Donne that he even imagines making love beyond the grave” (89). Reviews briefly Donne’s position on transubstantiation and points out how he “was eager to avoid questions about the manner in which God is made present in the Eucharist,” how he “advocates tolerance toward any doctrine concerning it,” and how, nevertheless, he “cannot resist offering his own reservations about transubstantiation” (90), even though in his love poetry he “alludes to the mystery and miracle of the Eucharist” (91). Discusses how in Donne’s works, “love is not only contemplative, spiritual, and abstract” but also it is “material and active” (102). Observes how “not only is Donne’s emphasis on erotic and spiritual yearning drawn from the Christian mystical tradition, but also many of Donne’s rhetorical devices are indebted to its language of ‘spiritual sense’: his resort to paradox and punning, to synaesthesia, and over and above the combination of sense, the joining of affect to intellect” (105). Maintains that “just as Donne displaces the impulses of union from the Eucharist onto marriage, so he defers the physical presence of God from the Eucharist to the resurrection” (111).


Reports that tenor Paul Groves accompanied by pianist Pedja Muzijevic gave “a dramatically expressive performance” of Benjamin Britten’s song cycle “Holy Sonnets of John Donne” (composed in 1945, following Britten’s visit to a German concentration camp). Notes that particularly impressive was Groves’s rendering of *HSDeath*.


In Chapter 2, “Persons in Play: Donne’s Body and the Humoral Actor” (56–88), explores Donne’s idea of “an utterly penetrable self—a self that initiates nothing without first receiving.” Examines primarily Donne’s religious poetry and prose “in the light of the prevalent Renaissance notion of an actor’s transforming engagement with his context.” Explains the importance of “the language of humoralism” (56) in understanding Donne’s conception of the self and looks at the ways in which he wrestles with “the implications of humoral discourse” (56–57). Focuses primarily on the body, or “more precisely on the psychophysiology that was humoral theory” and on “the ways it renders selfhood an interpersonal phenomenon” (57). Argues that Donne’s emphasis on
the body "does not evoke the self-contained, independent self that modern conceptions of the body can suggest" but rather shows how he "insists on a sense of selfhood that is never securely bounded, that even embraces its own penetration from without" and thus how "his physical treatment of selfhood incorporates the self with the body and the body with the rest of the world" (59). Holds, therefore, that Donne's "emphasis on the body is not a means of self-involvement or self-assertion" but rather "a way of representing the self's connection and even subjection to other bodies, souls, and persons—including the 'persons' of God" (60). Discusses how in his sermons, Devotions, and religious poetry Donne "embraces the anxieties of interdependence" (77), in which "the powerful need for connection with God is so often figured physically" (77–78). Maintains that Donne "is committed to an interpersonally participant selfhood—a sense that the root or cause or locus of one's self belongs in others"; that it is "the intense responsiveness of self to context—spiritual, sexual, social—that Donne registers in his exquisitely physical imagery"; and that "his best expression of it is the humoral patient—both distempered and cured by the process of penetration" (88). In Chapter 4, “‘Woman’s Constancy’: The Poetics of Consummation” (123–61), discusses how Donne's love poetry reflects a fascination with a "kind of projection that figures so prominently in the quelles des femmes," poetry that "frequently raises the idea of female inconstancy, and usually in the context of interpersonal projection." Maintains that Donne's "representations of projective process take it not as a useful strategy of subjective authority but as the sign of the impossibility of that authority." Holds that by "exposing the interpersonal embeddedness that underlies such projection," Donne's poetry "also exposes efforts to overcome that embeddedness." Claims, therefore, that by "straddling both sides of the issue at once, it has the quality of perversely celebrating the painful and difficult contingency of the self in love" (142). Maintains, therefore, that "inconstancy is never simply projected onto women in Donne's poems," but always it "becomes an issue for their speak-ers as well" and "often does so in a way that exposes the process of projection, which Donne not only critiques but also explores as a basic though problematic aspect of selfhood." Observes that "many of the love poems are about the question of which of the lovers is really unfaithful" and that "generally the blaming of women turns out to be only apparent" and that "at some point a more or less subtle implication of blame falls on the man" (143). Discusses also how in some poems "projection becomes a key element in Donne's analysis of selfhood as exchange" and that "what he often portrays in his speakers' projections is a sharing and even confusion between self and the other of affect, attitude, and awareness" (144). Maintains that, for Donne, "the imagination is in some ways not the poet's own, but the product of interaction with other bodies and minds" and that his poems "both insist on that interaction and recognize its costs" (151).


Discusses the historical context of Wing, especially the Dutch context of this "remarkable epigram" commemorating the death of Sir John Wingfield, an English officer, and his burial at Cádiz (393). Points out how Donne's "deceptively naive rhymes pay homage to the self-redemption of a revolted, disgraced traitor whose ultimate love of honor lost over base life turned Sir John's grave at Cádiz into an 'unsurpassable' monument to English chivalry." Calls Wing "not only the finest of all Donne's epigrams, but [also] by far the most elegant . . . the most moving" (399).

Compares Daniel Heinsius’ “Ad Cognominem Heinsium Jurisconsultum, e Peregrinatione Reducem” and Donne’s ElWar and points out that both poems contradict known facts about their author’s lives. Maintains that Donne’s poem, like that of Heinsius, is an “amusing, genteel fiction” based on the Horatian theme: “Honor extraordinary valor by portraying a speaking eidolon of its ignoble opposite” (241). Observes how both poems end on “the same ironic conceit defending the indefensible,” i.e., that “sweet licentiousness in base comfort at home, far preferable to noble combat, is good because it helps the war effort.” Holds that “[i]n northern Renaissance ‘love’ elegies like those of Heinsius and Donne, the line between them and the ‘Aristotelian’ mimesis Horace utilized in his dramatic satire is very, very thin” (242). Concludes that “[t]hey have everything to do with serious values that the poet and his audience believes” (243).


In Turkish. In a discussion of the evolution of attitudes about suicide in the history of Western thought, briefly comments on Donne’s view in Biathanatos.


Collection of 12 original essays. In the “Introduction: Renaissance Tropologies” (1–10), the editor explains that the essays “focus on the textual activity of major cultural tropes that enunciate and transform the cultural imagination on matters of love and power in the world, the body politic, and the rising sphere of personal life in early modern England” (1). Dedicates the volume in memory of Gale H. Carrithers, Jr., and reviews his contribution and those of his collaborator, James D. Hardy, Jr., to tropological studies of Renaissance culture. Points out that “[a]mong the many Renaissance cultural figures represented in this volume, Donne and his writings stand out for the inclusiveness and range of their generic reach, the variety of their rhetorical gestures, and the richness of their imagination” (6). Thereafter presents an introduction to each of the essays, including the following ones that discuss Donne, each of which has been separately entered in this bibliography: Eric C. Brown’s “Salvic Moments in John Donne’s Devotions upon Emergent Occasions”; Greg Kneidel’s “Donne and the State of Exception”; Jeanne Shami’s “Troping Religious Identity: Circumcision and Transubstantiation in Donne’s Sermons”; Alexandra Mills Block’s “Eucharistic Semiotics and the Representational Formulas of Donne’s Ambassadors”; Hugh Adlington’s “Donne and Diplomacy”; Albert C. Labriola’s “Dangerous Liaisons: ‘Spider Love’ in John Donne’s ‘Twicknam Garden’”; Ilona Bell’s “Mirror Tropes and Renaissance Poetry”; and Kate Narveson’s “The Ars Longa Trope in a Sublunary World.” Concludes with notes (309–63); a list of publications by Gale H. Carrithers, Jr. (365–66); brief biographies of the contributors (367–70); and an index (371–82).


Discusses rhetorical strategies Donne uses in his sermons “in turning public matters of ec-
clesiastical doctrine and ritual into personal matters of spirituality and sanctification by deploying ‘circumcision’ and ‘transubstantiation’—controversial terms fundamental to the religious identities of Jews, on the one hand, and Roman Catholics, on the other—as tropes” (89). Maintains that “[t]he poetics of spirituality that Donne creates through these tropic transformations reveals the sphere of his interpretive imagination: the stewardship over language as he turns his ‘erected wit’ into a spiritual means of moving his hearers to assume their true religious identities” (89–90). Argues that “Donne's success in exceeding the resources of language—his metaphorical imagination—is spiritually transformative precisely to the extent to which he can activate metaphor as both an epistemological tool for 'exploring the real' and an ontological instrument for 'access[ing] the field of the possible, thus expanding the 'real.'” Maintains that Donne “strains the linguistic boundaries of the controversial terms he employs (thus exploring the real),” and “in spiritual terms he shows the transformative possibilities figured by these processes (thus expanding the real)” (92). Discusses Donne’s understanding of and tropological uses of circumcision and transubstantiation in his sermons and explains how he redeems the terms for his Anglican congregation as “he absorbs them into his vision of the unique confessional and historical identity” of the Church of England and how the use of these terms “relates to the anti-Catholic thrust of both tropes in the sermons.” Points out that metaphor is “the fertile ground of Donne’s religious imagination and of his belief that real conversion takes place internally—in the heart—but, more importantly, is effected by and transformed into the language with which the heart’s knowledge is expressed” (116).


Discusses the similarities and differences between SecAn and Arthur C. Clarke’s 2001: A Space Odyssey. Points out how both works contain non-human intellectual figures (angels for Donne and monoliths for Clarke) and that the protagonists in each (Elizabeth’s soul and Bowman) have a role to save people involved in the political and spiritual conflicts of their time. Suggests that the major differences between the two are their cosmology (Donne’s is Ptolemaic while Clarke’s is Copernican) and that Donne relies on God while Clarke depends on science.


The 2008 Garnett Sedgewick Memorial Lecture with an introduction by Dennis Danielson (7–9). Surveys the appeal of Donne’s poetry in his own time and its “continuing importance to the witty poets of more recent times” (11). Points out that ironically “those poets who have come to be most clearly associated with Donne in our time—particularly Herbert, Crashaw, Vaughan, Marvell—were least imitative of him in his day, each developing a distinctive and individual voice,” whereas such poets as Cowley, Cleveland, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury, poets now justly ignored for the most part, were obvious imitators of Donne who “attempted to create verse like his” (13). Observes that although during the seventeenth century Donne’s “metaphysical wit provoked and inspired imitators, detractors, and expositors,” for the most part, “it fell out of fashion in the later seventeenth century—and for most of the next 200 years” (20) and was “rediscovered and reinvented” in the twentieth century, “largely through the pioneering efforts” of Grierson’s 1912 edition of Donne’s poems, followed by the “oracular judgements” of T. S. Eliot in his review of Grierson in 1921 (21). Claims that


Donne was “a ‘modernist’ in his time if we understand that elusive term to express a radical break with the past” (22) and comments on the use and misuse of the term “metaphysical poet” as applied to Donne. Maintains that, in the twentieth century “one of the most significant groups who were deeply influenced by the metaphysical-modernist Donne are the so-called and self-styled Fugitives” (23), namely Allen Tate, John Crowe Ransom, and Robert Penn Warren, and such later disciples of the group as Cleanth Brooks, Randall Jarrell, John Berryman, and Robert Lowell. Discusses poems by each of these poets “through whom and by whom Donne and the line of wit lived again” (35). Concludes with notes (37–40) and a biographical sketch of Stanwood (41–42).

Reviews:

Maintains that both the size of Donne’s art collection and the fact that at least two paintings may be by distinguished continental artists suggest that Donne was “a connoisseur of paintings, an impression that is supported by the (albeit few) references to painting to be found in Donne’s poetry” (67). Questions the position of those who think that, since his paintings were primarily religious, Donne may have valued them only for their theological subject matter rather than for their aesthetic qualities. Points out that in a number of his sermons, Donne employs “a variety of painting metaphors, which show not only his appreciation of painting but also his knowledge concerning specific painterly techniques” (68). Discusses how Donne in the sermons, in Goodf, and in the Holy Sonnets employs “his knowledge of art and painting to visualize and explain theological mysteries” (70). Shows how “the reciprocal gaze of the well-made picture is a simple and reassuring metaphor in the sermons” but how “in the poetry it opens up to reveal a wealth of anxiety.” Observes that “the internal galleries conjured up by Donne’s metaphor allow a new perspective on the quandary in which the sinful speaker of the Holy Sonnets finds himself.” Concludes that Donne’s “ownership of and attitude to actual images will remain a matter for speculation, particularly when considered in the light of seventeenth-century Calvinist attitudes to images,” but that “his painterly knowledge works to illuminate complex theological ideas, like the imago dei, by means of which he is able to design a whole gallery of ways of describing man’s relationship to God” (80).


Discusses the transmissional history of and significant textual variants in Sidney, with special attention to the text in the 1635 edition and in the O’Flahertie manuscript. Advances “a couple of speculative conclusions about how this history might affect our reading of the poem” (199). Presents reasons why the 1635 text is the “sole authoritative source for the poem,” which “prompts the conclusion that Donne likely never distributed more than a single copy of the poem—if, indeed, he distributed it at all.” Points out that since Sidney was not printed until 1635, either no copy was discovered when the first edition of 1633 was published or that perhaps it was “deliberately withheld from that volume” until after King James’s death out of respect for the king who had as an ideal “the producing of a new metrical version of the Psalter” (201). Conjectures
that Sidney was likely written around 1625 and that “it was intended (and probably written upon request) as preface to a projected edition, an edition that—perhaps because of Charles’s appointment of Alexander to complete James’s project, closed the window of opportunity—never materialized” (204). Notes that the title of Sidney is “formally elaborate and descriptive in the manner appropriate to the commendatory genre” (204). Six illustrations (206–11).


Introduces the second LiteratureC panel cluster from The Texas A&M John Donne Collection: A Symposium and Exhibition held on April 6–7, 2006. The cluster contains this introduction and three other essays, each of which has been entered separately in this bibliography: Ted-Larry Pebworth’s “Donne into Print: The Seventeenth-Century Collected Editions of Donne’s Poetry”; M. Thomas Hester’s “a mixed Parenthesis: John Donne’s Letters to Several Persons of Honour”; and Paul A. Parish’s “What We Think About Donne: A History of Donne Criticism in Twenty Minutes.” Points out that in December 2004 at a Sotheby’s auction Texas A&M University purchased a number of seventeenth-century volumes of Donne’s works that had been in the library of the late I. A. Shapiro along with approximately 70 sixteenth- and seventeenth-century works, “written in several languages and covering a wide variety of topics, that Donne alludes to, quotes from, or is known to have read” (822). Notes that these volumes, added to those already in the university’s collection, give Texas A&M University’s Cushing Memorial library “one of the best Donne collections to be found anywhere” (822–23).


Announces the sale at Christie’s on July 3, 2007 of a letter of condolence written in 1624 by Donne to Lady Kingsmill (Bridget White) the day after her husband’s death for $229,938.


Maintains that Donne, Herbert, and Vaughan consider the conscience as “only partly under their control” and that they are all “beady-eyed experts on failure.” Observes that each of the three—in spite of their “very different devotional backgrounds”—use “similar sets of trope to investigate problems: enigma, aposiopesis (breaking off), chiasmas, subjectio (asking then answering a question), and antanaclasis (repetition with a difference).” Holds that, “structured like a language,” the conscience for each of the three is “tortured, rewritten, read, and broken up to engineer a proper response.” Considering “the faculty as an uncomfortable extrusion of the divine into the everyday,” shows how “the rhetoric of conscience transforms Protestant into prosthetic poetics” and how “it moves between early modern theology, rhetoric, and aesthetic theory to give original, scholarly, and committed readings of the great metaphysical poets.” Discusses such topics as “boredom, torture, graffiti, tattoos, anthologizing, resentment, tears, dust, casuistry, and opportunism” (jacket). Comments on Donne’s views on and treatment of conscience in both his prose and poetry, especially in Devotions, the sermons, Corona, the Holy Sonnets, the hymns, Lit, and several of the love poems.

Reviews:


In part, a reply to A. S. Byatt’s “Observe the Neurons: Between, Above and Below” in TLS 5399 (22 Sept. 2006): 13–15. Claims that “the reign of Theory seems to be over” but that “unfortunately the habit of approaching literature from ideas assimilated uncritically from other disciplines, and of examining individual works through an inverted telescope, has not yet been kicked.” Challenges those critics who “invoke ‘neuroscience’ to assist them in their work of explication, interpretation, and appreciation.” Argues that neuroaesthetics is “wrong about literature, overstates the understanding that comes from neuroscience and represents a grotesquely reductionist attitude to humanity” (13). Claims that in Byatt’s reading of Donne’s poems “John Donne the poet is reduced to John Donne the brain and the latter to ‘Every-brain’” (314). Illustrates the point by challenging her reading of “wonderfully randy lines” in ElBed as “the operation of mirror neurons.” Concludes that “attempting to find an explanation of a sophisticated twentieth-century reader’s response to a sophisticated seventeenth-century poet in brain activity that is shared between humans and animals, and has been around for many millions of years, rather than in communities of minds that are unique to humans, seems perverse” (15).


Maintains that “the parting of the body and soul is the great subject of Donne’s writings” and that, “by understanding how he envisions this supreme separation, we learn something fundamental not only about his imaginative and psychic life—what he most feared and desired,” but also “we learn something fundamental about the complexity of saying good-bye in any of the circumstances of our own lives.” Maintains that Donne’s “lifelong brooding on these subjects teaches us something powerful about the act of parting” and, “above all, teaches us what it means to leave, or to be left behind.” Believes that “the centrality of the body and soul’s union, and Donne’s preoccupation with its inevitable rupture, has largely escaped our attention” (2) because “literary history has developed a particular bias against considering Donne as a poet with serious theological or philosophical interests” (2–3). Argues that although Donne “was not a metaphysician,” his writing “is fueled by a set of metaphysical questions and that these questions coalesce most persistently around the nature of the soul and its relation to the body.” Maintains that Donne’s “expression of his belief in the mutual necessity of body and soul, and his obsessive imagining of their parting, is the most continuous and abiding feature of his collected works” as well as lying behind “his most celebrated images” (5). Discusses why the relationships between the soul and the body “mattered so deeply to Donne” and how one can account for “his lifelong fascination with imagining both the moment they part and the prospect of their coming together again” (6). Points out that “the theories about the soul that engaged Donne most deeply were those that addressed the soul’s creation and immortality” (11) and holds that his “intellectual, devotional, and emotional life is shaped not only by his obsession with the soul’s immortality” but also that “it is shaped equally by his obsession with the body’s resurrection” (16). Discusses these issues of the body and soul in Donne’s letters (25–48), in the Songs and Sonnets (49–78), in the Anniversaries (79–105), in the Holy Sonnets (106–29), in Devotions (130–53), and in “Death’s Duell” (154–83). Concludes with notes (185–203) and an index (205–13).

Reviews:

1500. Todd, Richard. “Was Donne Really an Apos-

Considers the contemporary critical debate about whether or not Donne was an apostate, as John Carey held in John Donne: Life, Mind and Art (1982). Points out that, according to traditional teaching, an apostate is one who deliberately and completely abandons the Christian faith, whereas a heretic is one who denies one or more tenets of revealed religion. Maintains, therefore, that Carey was “ill-advised to think of Donne as an apostate” but that, “from the view of the Catholic Church which he left, Donne was certainly a heretic.” Places the issue in a larger context, maintaining that “it is vital that we abandon ‘either/or’ patterns of thinking, and make an attempt to understand, on its own terms, the complexity of religious thinking and practice as it has evolved between Donne’s time and our own.” Stresses that, as seen in his sermons and religious poetry, Donne after his ordination as an Anglican priest, retained much of the Catholic learning and devotion of his ancestors and of his religious upbringing. Thinks, however, that Carey “shows pretty convincingly how—and the ways in which—Donne was empowered by his heterodoxy” (43).


Discusses how Shakespeare’s Winter’s Tale and Walton’s Life of Dr. John Donne “exhibit a number of connections in relation to shifting categories of masculinity and the emotion of grief in the seventeenth century.” Notes that both of these works include “nightmarish visions experienced by grieving fathers or mothers bereft of their children.” Maintains that Walton “conveys his culture’s increasing tolerance of demonstrative mourning in bereaved men and women by fashioning a saintly figure with a heroic capacity for suffering, endurance, and articulating his grief” and suggests that “linking Donne’s prophetic vision of his wife, Anne More, with a dead child in her arms to those by St. Augustine and Monica reinforce[s] the ideal, saintly image he projects for his subject.” Points out that in his secular and sacred poems and in his sermons Donne “commonly yokes masculinity to positive displays of emotion.” Discusses how Walton “transforms Donne’s familial grief into a masculine, intellectual virtue” (177). Comments also on how Walton’s description of Donne’s “orchestration and performance of his artful death highlight the somewhat more individualized dimension of public and private mourning practices in the seventeenth century” (188). Concludes that Walton’s portrayal of Donne “as a scholar, hero, and saint who grieves for his family and whose death bereaves his many friends accentuates his and his culture’s admiration of emotional expressiveness in men” (190).


Discusses how three documents in the Archives of the Diocese of London and of Cambridge University “shed new light” on Donne’s ordination to the priesthood and “at once clarify and complicate our understanding of the events in early 1615 as a result of which Donne was, in rapid succession, made Deacon and Priest of the Church of England and awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity by Cambridge University.” Points out that Donne’s ordination “turns out to have been highly irregular” and that “proceeding at the direction of King James, it was in violation of the Canons of the Church of England and customary church practice.” Notes also that Donne’s ordination shows “more clearly the pivotal nature of James’s role in the shaping of Donne’s career in the ordained ministry and his ability as Supreme Governor of the Church of England to influence the behavior of church officials.” Observes, however, that the king’s efforts on Donne’s behalf “were
not without opposition,” and thus they provide us also with an occasion “to notice the limits of royal power in the early seventeenth century as well as the considerable scope of its operations” (81). Surveys the known facts about Donne’s ordination, his receiving an honorary doctorate from Cambridge, his early ecclesiastical appointments, his appointment as Royal Chaplain, and finally his appointment as Dean of St. Paul’s as well as various opinions of why Donne, after some delay, agreed to enter the priesthood. Points out that although R. C. Bald indicates that there is no existing record of Donne having received a degree, there is, in fact, in Volume E of Cambridge’s Grace Book a recording of Donne’s name as a recipient of a degree. Points out that the Liber Ordinatonium 1578–1628 indicates Donne was ordained on the same date as both deacon and priest in the chapel of the bishop’s palace. Comments also on an heretofore unknown letter from James to the officials of Cambridge University dated 17 December 1624 in which he apparently wishes to appease them for his former demands that Donne or others be given honorary degrees.


In Chinese. Based on a cultural and linguistic study of Flea, argues that the poem expresses a male-centered view of love that deprives women of the right to express their views. Arguing from the perspective of narratology, feminist theory, and the work of Michel Foucault, sees the poem as critical of Western culture. (English abstract)


Discusses the concern of Donne and other seventeenth-century poets with the issue of the durability of verse. Observes that belief in poetic durability can be traced back at least to the ancient Greeks (the aere perennius trope) and notes how seventeenth-century poets viewed this idea “with a new intensity, although this is expressed both as confidence that poetry lasts and as anxiety that it won’t” (199). Points out how in the seventeenth century poetry “shifted from something that was primarily imagined as performed to something that was understood as primarily written and read” and how poems, therefore, “seemed more concrete” than previously. Observes, however, that, “at the same time, the printing of pirated works and the conventions of coterie publication were
making individual poems perhaps more unstable than they had ever been before, involving them in a disturbing dialectic that combined idealized fixity as script with mobility of text in circulation.” Points out how in the seventeenth century “the metaphysics of voice familiar in earlier English lyric poetry is replaced by an ideology of durability” in which “the poet does not sing his song but inscribes it as text that will survive him.” Maintains, therefore, that “in this lapidary model of lyric, verse possesses an analogous documentary force that secures its meaning and fixes it unchangingly in time” (200). Observes, however, that during this period some writers “had misgivings about the durability of the monuments their peers picked as models of durability” and notes that early modern poets “frequently suggest that monuments are not particularly successful at preserving memories” (202).


Examines lingering traces of Catholicism in the devotional poetry of Protestant writers during the first half of the seventeenth century. Focuses on “two fundamental issues concerning the interpretation of early modern texts: the difficulty of assigning poetry to theological pigeonholes, both then and now, and the possibility of rethinking the function of devotional verse in seventeenth-century English culture.” Begins by surveying “the prevailing anti-Catholicism in England in this period” (10). Notes, for instance, how Donne in HSShow presents the Catholic Church as a “painted woman” whose object is to deceive and how he firmly rejects transubstantiation in his sermons. Discusses how recognizing traces of the Catholic past in early modern poets can help us “understand the nature of everyday devotional experience in the period” and help us understand that “the distinctions between different religious traditions, though apparently crystal clear to the polemics, were unclear, even murky, to most early modern believers” (15–16). Observes that Donne, like many of his contemporaries, was “often unsure” of certain doctrinal positions and, as in HSShow, asked for God’s help “in the perplexing business of knowing which was the true faith” (21). Maintains that just as early modern Protestant poets “could not limit their faith neatly within the bounds of either sacramental, feminized, and material Catholicism or biblical, predestined, and textual Protestantism, so neither should we modern readers fall into the trap of unnecessarily constraining the poets by the imposition of restrictive denominational labels of our own” (32–33).


Discusses Donne’s connection with the family of St. Thomas More through his mother, Elizabeth Heywood. Comments on Donne’s maternal grandparents (John and Joan Heywood), his Jesuit uncles (Ellis and Jasper Heywood), his mother and her husbands, and his brother (Henry), and his sisters, as well as on Anne More and his own children. Briefly surveys Donne’s life and presents a genealogical chart of the family.


Interprets the passage in Meditation 17 of Devotion about the tolling bell as saying that “what happens to other people affects the value of my own life.” Maintains that “life is absurd in a world of violence and coercion” and that “only if we create a stable and just world, a place not ruled by radical contingency, will life cease to be absurd.”

Discusses and illustrates “ways that ‘theological humanism’ provides methodological possibilities for scholars working in religion and literary studies” and suggests that “there is a need to investigate more humanistic methods of interpreting literature by exploring approaches that engage questions of sacred depth” (210). To illustrate these principles, presents an analysis of Margaret Edson’s *Wit* that is both theological and humanistic.


In Chinese. Discusses how Donne in *Good Mourn* transforms the traditional aubade into a metaphysical poem. Comments on how wit and the use of conceits enrich the poem and also provide insight into the natural philosophy of seventeenth-century metaphysical poetry.


Briefly surveys Donne’s life and discusses *Val-Weep* as representative of how Donne uses sound in his poetry. Comments on major characteristics of Donne’s poetry, especially his uses of argument, colloquial language, complex imagery, wit, and humor and on the influence of discursive meditation on Donne’s poems. Evaluates Donne’s contribution to the development of the lyric in his time and briefly compares and contrasts his life and poetry with that of Vaughan, Herbert, and Marvell.


In Chinese. Analyzes stylistic features of *Mourn* and comments on the poem’s wit, its uses of the conceit and paradox, and its combination of intelligence and passion. Calls the poem “one of the most representative works of English metaphysical poetry” (66). (English abstract)


Points out that Donne’s conversion to the Church of England “is often treated skeptically by scholars as mere ‘apostasy’ motivated by ambition, fear, or convenience” and that Crashaw’s conversion to Catholicism “is, similarly, often viewed as a result of external circumstances—the effect of dispossesion, poverty, and exile on a timid, ineffectual character.” Argues, however, that in a number of poems both men “emphasize, above all else, the necessity of Christians to choose with all sincerity what they most deeply believe about man’s relation to God.” Maintains, therefore, that both poets are “prophets of the nascent modern religious dispensation, when faith becomes, in a radically new fashion, a crucial matter of personal choice.” Holds that “the increased importance of individual decision, of which both poets were prophetic voices, ironically undermines to some extent the faithful submission to the divine will that they sought to maintain” (101).


In Chinese. Briefly surveys characteristics of Donne’s poetry, especially its uses of unusual conceits. Points out Donne’s originality and suggests that his images, themes, and uses of narrative are strikingly similar to those of modern poets.

An original poem addressed to Donne.


Notes that Donne’s will indicates that he had a painting of Mary Magdalene that hung in his “chamber” (135). Comments briefly on the reference to the Magdalene in Relic (ll. 17–18). Calls the poem a “genuinely moving piece of writing” (219) and suggests that perhaps Donne’s speaker is implying that “he becomes Christ-like in his lover’s presence, or, more evocatively, that he finds himself at a rare loss for words when it comes to proclaiming his lover’s transformative power” (220). Discusses Donne’s play on Magdalen Herbert’s name in MHMary and maintains that, in spite of the poem’s “wry humor,” it is “a marvelously synthetic manifestation of the topos, popularized by Southwell and his imitators, in which the subject of the poem is charged with the task of gathering, forever, memories of Christ’s life” and that the poem is a “superior example of the habit of posing pious women in the posture of the Magdalene.” Notes that “[t]o the saint’s collective attributes, Donne wanted to add Magdalen Herbert’s pious composure in a gesture that seems to erase all trace of the Magdalene’s prurient past.” Points out that Donne’s Magdalene is “a distinguished Protestant contemplative, recognized for her mind as well as her beauty” (92). Maintains that “[t]he affinity Donne finds between Magdalen Herbert and the Gospels’ sinner-saint is not as jarring as it might initially seem to be” since “the Magdalene’s legendary aristocratic parentage had made her a worthy patron for the nobility of the Middle Ages” (92–93).


Suggests as another possible source or physical analogue for the reference to a “bracelet of bright hair about the bone” in Relic (l.6) “the fact that hair and thread could be used interchangeably in the making of love-tokens or sewn items bespeaking affection” and that the speaker may be referring, in particular, to the making of “bone lace.” Points out that weavers in Donne’s time also “employed human hair taken from corpses” (160) and suggests that “the use of hair from a corpse to adorn a youthful beauty would have been a discordia concors not lost upon Donne, whose poetic attention so often returned to the mingled realities of love and death.” Notes that “[s]uch a skein of golden hair coiled on a bone bobbin to later beautify the living could easily be transposed to an image of similar hair encircling the wrist bone of the beloved dead.” Claims, furthermore, that “the term ‘bone lace’ seems suggested in the line by the presence of the word ‘bone’ itself, with ‘lace’ implied by reversing the ‘l’ and assonantal ‘a’ in ‘bracelet.’” Says that the bone imagery “may further extend to a pun on ‘stay’ (l. 11), in that the bracelet not only prompts the lovers’ ‘stay’ or brief moment together on Judgment Day but also, as an amorous ‘device’ (l. 9), supports or upholds their love through time as bone stays upheld and strengthened garments.” Concludes that “[g]iven the growing number of weavers in London in the first quarter of the seventeenth century who supplied lace for decorating elaborate finery (perhaps including his own clerical robes), it is not impossible for Donne to have known of gold or silver thread, or possibly strands of blonde or silver hair, wound like a bracelet on bone bobbins used for the making of bone lace” (161).


In Chapter 1, “Juggling John Donne’s Manliness” (31–55), discusses how Donne’s poetry
uses “the rhetoric of anatomy and cosmography to create a masculine world that is set at a safe distance from the body of Woman” and how he uses poetry “to construct a masculinity that is grounded in the dissected body of Woman and at the same time distanced from that body.” Pays particular attention to Donne’s “manipulation of early modern anatomical practices” in FirAn, in which he is “intent on realizing a new, better, more masculine world” (23). Maintains that Donne, however, recognizes that “his new world, and his masculine subjectivity” are “extremely vulnerable” because they are “predicated on the rotting flesh of a corpse.” Observes that, on the other hand, in such poems as ValMourn Donne employs “the rhetoric of Copernicanism to create a restructured model of the universe that is meant to shift man’s position from beneath the oppressive teleological Ptolemaic model to a godlike position in the celestial sphere of Copernicanism, where women are positioned as the fixed center around which men travel in a perfect circular orbit that is associated with the Divine.” Argues, however, that “here too, the cosmographical model Donne relies upon to secure his newly positioned subjectivity is unstable because it relies upon an ironic cosmic structure with conflicting centers and counterproductive motions.” In Chapter 2, “Dissecting John Donne’s Masculinity” (56–78), revisits the old divide between Jack and John Donne that his early readers “constructed in order to save Donne’s Divine meditations from his lyrical poetry.” Argues that “this carefully guarded boundary line was instrumental in bestowing on Donne the mantle of masculinity” and has allowed “the kind of queer reading practices” of some recent critics. Argues that these queer readings, however, also participate “in the construction of Donne’s masculinity, because they depend upon the polarization of the body of Woman and the figure of the sodomite that informs men’s subject position.” Through a reading of Donne’s poetry, demonstrates “the practice of a post-closet theory of subjectivity by arguing that Donne is queer not because his poetry indulges in its desire for the male body” but rather because “the masculinity Donne’s poetry articulates is a purely positional subjectivity that needs to be constantly resituated in the sphere of the erotic.” Maintains that these two chapters show how Donne and Donnean scholars “manipulate the body of Woman and the figure of the sodomite as objects in Donne’s subject formation” (24).


An English translation of Antoine Berman’s Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne (Paris: Gallimard, 1995). Contains a translator’s introduction (vii–xvii) that discusses Berman’s theoretical principles and practice of translation, comments on the principles used to translate Berman’s text, and presents a brief biographical sketch of Berman. Adds supplementary notes that complete the bibliographical material in the original French version. For a full annotation of Berman’s study, see Roberts3.

Reviews:

- Nathaniel Davis in French Forum 38, no. 3 (2013): 170–73.

Bigliazzi, Silvia. “L’amore negativo: John Donne e il desiderio del nulla,” in La retorica dell’eros: Figure del discorso amoroso nella letteratura europea moderna, ed. Stefano Manferlotti, 62–84. (Lingue e letterature Carocci, 103.) Roma: Carocci.

Surveys the wide range and complexity of Donne’s love poems from the fundamentally erotic and carnal to the ideal and spiritual. Comments on the various possible sources of his theory of love, noting, in particular, the influence of Renaissance theorists, especially Leone Ebreo and Ficino. Discusses, in particular, Donne’s fascination with the notion of “noth-
“negligence” or “negative love,” in which the lovers do not know what they truly desire but are, nonetheless, impelled by a blind impulse toward an unknown pole of attraction and desire and toward an eroticized Neoplatonic image of God. Observes that, for Donne, this “nulla” is an imaginary erotic impulse which has been freed from deliberate design and argument. Discusses this concept in Air, Dream, Image, NegLov, and Fare.


A play about Donne’s life—with 10 male parts and 4 female parts. Refers to and quotes from Donne’s works in a dramatic context. Described as a balance of satire, humor, and seriousness.


Compares and contrasts Donne and Herbert in their extensive use of biblical intertext and biblical typology as well as their uses of conceits and emblems. Discusses “Easter Wings” and “Prayer I” as examples of Herbert’s so-called “plain” style, which, in fact, is quite elaborate; and comments on *Goodf* and *HSRound* as examples of Donne’s highly ironic and paradoxical style. Says of Donne: “L’utilisation que son imagination fait de la Bible est puissante et convaincante, mais les conclusions qu’il en tire semblent quelque peu déconcertantes, voire énigmatiques.”


In a study of the lyric, comments on several of Donne’s poems as examples, in particular, *GoodM, Canon, ValMourn*, and *SunRis*. Points out how Donne’s lyrics have “the immediacy of a stage performance, with the urgency and authority of the speaking voice.” Observes that *Songs and Sonets* “contains a range of voices, presents no consistent poetic self or point of view, and favours contradiction over closure” (61). Says that although Donne “questions Petrarchism” (62), his love poetry could never “wholly break free from the Petrarchan conventions of court lyric” (66). Notes how “the tension between conviction and doubt, verbal violence and the dramatised self are common to both Donne’s amorous and religious poetry” (128). Points out how Donne’s religious poems “evoke an intimate relationship to God” but also involve “struggle and self-interrogation” (130).


One of three papers on Donne and June Wayne presented at the 2009 John Donne Society Conference. Discusses how Wayne’s 1958 stone lithograph in response to *Break* represents how Donne “dramatically re-wrote and re-gendered” the traditional aubade (or alba) and how it also reflects “the poem’s response to changes in early modern conceptions of science, economics, and human psychology” (editor, 174). Comments on how in the lithograph one witnesses “a cosmic image that renders the empirical nature of Donne’s poetry with remarkable insight and conceptual form” (202) and shows how the lithograph “makes transparent what might otherwise elude readers of Donne’s poem” (204). Discusses how *Break*, like the lithograph, “hovers, literally, between the physical and the spiritual, between the temporal and the timeless, and thus, significantly, between life and art.” Concludes that Donne’s poem and Wayne’s lithograph are “truly ‘open’ works of art, to be re-animated by their readers and viewers for all time” (205–06).

ment 1, Vol. 33: 11.

An original poem inspired by Noct.


Examines Donne’s “depictions of three sites of composition—the study, the highway, and the hearth” (68) and considers “the sorts of writing enabled by each.” Observes how “in all these places, Donne presents images of the writer wherein attention turns away from the body and its surroundings toward interior contemplation, constructed in terms of the faculties of imagination and memory” and claims that Donne “figures this attention as specific sorts of mental movement—in particular, the fidelity of memory and the fickleness of imagination—separated from, yet grounded in, the actions and situation of the body.” Uses “the interlinked motions of hawking as an organizing metaphor” for the discussion of Donne’s “images of presence and abstraction” and suggests that “the imbricated movements of falcon and falconer offer templates for the mental trajectories of both writer and reader.” Discusses several prose selections and verse epistles but focuses primarily on three poems that “thematize the act of composition”: (1) the description of the study in Sat1, (2) the “interior vision from horseback” in Goodf; and (3) the “leave taking and return home” in ValMourn (69). Argues that Donne’s “descriptions of the act of writing are important because they recuperate the contingencies of composition” and that when “read with attention these contingencies,” his poems “take on a reflexive depth that forces us to reconsider their relation to author and audience.” Concludes, that it is Donne’s “mobilization of those contingent circumstances as metaphor, however, that suggests their importance to his writing” (82).


Ranks Donne #33. Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and poetry. Says that “[u]ntil relatively recently, Donne’s unconventional style kept him from being considered one of English literature’s greatest poets” (124) but that his reputation is “now secure” and that he is considered to be “the epitome of the poet whose range and method comprehend the widest examination of human experience” (125).


Shows how Donne in his sermon to the Virginia Company (November 13, 1622), preached on the Acts of the Apostles (1.8), exhorts the members of the Company “not to look for personal wealth but to spread the Word of God, seeking spiritual rather than material gain.” Maintains that by “re-enacting the verbal gesture” of the biblical passage, Donne “was thus symbolically conferring on them the authority of Scripture and of the Holy Ghost, who, in Donne’s terms, ‘authorises Authoritie and gives power to strength itself.’” Discusses how Donne “justified the venture from both a spiritual and a material point of view” (69). Maintains that, “by conveying to the Company the spiritual power and authority to be witnesses of the true faith to the world, Donne ultimately justifies the colonisation of its ‘uttermost parts’—as well as some use of force” (70).


Translates into English Chapter 13 of his book Rabindranath O Paschatya Kabyalok (Kolkata,
India: Subornorekha Press, 2008). Discusses the contribution that Tagore made to the revival of interest in Donne and the other metaphysical poets in the Bengali world. Notes that in his Bengali novel _Shesher Kobita_ (1929), Tagore has his hero recite _Canon_ to his beloved, having seen a copy of Donne's poems on her table. Comments on how Tagore came to discover Donne and how Donne's erotic spirituality, in particular, appealed to Tagore. Points out how the _Holy Sonnets_ are echoed in Tagore's poems and maintains that “the similarity between the key ideas in Donne and Tagore are too striking to be accidental.” Observes, however, that perhaps both Donne and Tagore were influenced by “the erotically infused religious sensibility” of the eleventh-century Benedictine monk Peter Damian (36). Concludes that although Tagore's relationship with Donne's poetry is “easily documented,” his affinities with Peter Damian are “more a case of parallel mind sets” (40).


In Korean. Comments on how Donne's _Satires_ satirize the follies and vices of contemporary London and of the Court. Calls them “the first formal satires written in English” and notes their debt to and modification of Roman satire. Points out how all five poems are “concerned with presenting an idealistic defense of spiritual values against the encroachment of sixteenth-century materialism.” Maintains that these poems “have received little critical attention” and have been “underestimated” by critics and that only _Sat3_ “has been properly appreciated.” (From the abstract)


Rehearses the generally well-known Spanish elements in Donne's life and works. Acknowledges that previous critics and historians have pointed out most of the observations in this essay—“with the exception of little-known documents leading to an original theory concerning Donne's very early years with a possible residence in Spain” (168). Based on these documents, theorizes that before serving as a soldier in the Cadiz expedition in 1596, Donne “may have been at Cadiz for an extended period in the decade of the 1580s enrolled in a Jesuit college” (181) that took in English boys and trained them to be missionaries. Maintains that “it is probable” that Donne was “one of the sons of English Catholic families sent to the Jesuit college at Cadiz, possibly in 1587 when he was in his early teens.” Speculates further that if Donne were living in Spain before the Spanish Armada of 1588, he “would certainly have departed by 1587, after which it might have become dangerous to an English boy resident in Cadiz” (183). Concludes that perhaps Donne went on the military expedition in 1596 partly because of “a nostalgic desire to return to a place where he had been nurtured in the faith of his family” (184).


Introduces essays by D. Audell Shelburne, Raymond-Jean Frontain, Julie W. Yen, and Margaret Downs-Gamble presented at a colloquium on _ValBook_ held at the 2008 John Donne Society Conference. Observes that several of the contributors argue that _ValBook_ “presents the poem's female interlocutor as a woman with potentially greater agency than the women to be found elsewhere in Donne's verse—or in most love poetry of the period” (251). States that the four essays “testify to the richness” of _ValBook_ and to “the ample opportunities it affords for further study” (252).


Reviews a film on Donne by Simon Schama that aired on BBC2 on 26 May 2009 in which Schama and Fiona Shaw “showily unpicked” Donne's poems and then she “declaimed them in a high luvvie style.” Says the “real low point”
came when Shaw recited HSBatter “while jogging on a beach.” John Carey joined in the discussion.


Chapter 1, “Intonation and Meter” (13–36) is a reprint of “Intonation and Iambic Pentameter” in *PLL* 33 (1997): 392–421 (See Roberts4 for an annotation). In Chapter 3, “John Donne” (59–112), argues that Donne’s verse “was designed to be read metrically” and that “not to read it so is to miss a good deal of what the poetry does.” Maintains that Donne effected “the next great development in the use of iambic pentameter after Sidney.” Points out, however, that “not every one of Donne’s lines can be successfully scanned,” noting that he “experimented so radically that the occasional line cannot.” Maintains that “much more common,” however, are lines that can be “read metrically and in which the meter forces unexpected emphases where a reading for sense or syntax would not normally place them but where they suit Donne’s rhetorical purposes.” Holds that Donne’s “distinctive rhythms are his means of achieving an unprecedented range of expression” (59). Claims that, in comparison to Sidney, Donne “exercised a greater freedom in the way that he related syntax to meter and produced a wider range of intonation and a still greater intimacy.” Maintains that, especially in the *Songs and Sonets* and in the *Holy Sonnets*, “intonation enforces the sense that the text often conveys” and that, “with an unprecedented and seldom-copied range of intonations within a single poem,” Donne “sometimes produces the impression that he is responding to experience even as he describes it and in this way too realizes that sense of dramatic present for which he has always been noted” (60). Examines Donne’s various uses of iambic pentameter in the verse letters, the *Satyres*, the *Elegies*, the *Songs and Sonets*, and the *Divine Poems* to show how Donne “expanded iambic pentameter’s capacity for drama and expressive variety” (110) and to show how he “used intonation to create effects that have been frequently observed” (111).

Concludes that Donne “showed, as no previous and probably no subsequent poet did, the expressive possibilities of iambic verse, though some of his techniques were to be imitated by poets more committed than he to euphony” (112).


Maintains that “attempts to interpret” Sat3 and “to position it within the Satires as a whole” have often been “unduly schematic” and tend “to downplay or to ignore the evasions and inconsistencies that, in the third satire, follow upon the imperative, ‘Seek true religion’ (l. 43), as well as those associated throughout the other Satires with the diverse use of religious reference” (127). Claims that, often these attempts “give the impression” that Sat3, “while urging a quest at once laborious and labyrinthine, does so in terms that are themselves quite direct if not, of course, transparent.” States that furthermore they seem at times “to miss” or “to underestimate, the extent to which religion is played with or disingenuously evoked in the Satires surrounding the third satire” (127–28). Argues, therefore, that “an awareness” of Sat3’s “lack of straightforwardness in advocating the quest for ‘true religion’—whether the lack be through caution or duplicity—begins as soon as a reader tries to establish the *kind* of satire it is.” Suggests that the poem “may be better seen as akin to the *suasoria* than as a satire which is a deliberative oration and observes how “its deliberative design connects in some ways with Quintillian’s description of the form.” Believes, therefore, that Sat3 “should perhaps be regarded less as a statement made by Donne about himself than as an exercise setting out a case for—entertaining—a challenging possibility.” Maintains that Donne “may well have been acting out and not just entertaining the notion of what his speaker urges upon the readers” and that the poem “may therefore be, in part, an
elaborately stylized autobiographical moment.”
Says that, in any event, the poem “presents a
case, a proposal to be evaluated,” and that “[i]ts
status as a proposal, the articulation of an al-
most unconstrained possibility, would seem
consonant with the poem’s avoidance of sectar-
ian affiliation and thus with the often divergent
and contradictory uses of religious reference
in the other Satires” (128). Points out that, “in
presenting his case, Donne’s speaker advocates
a religious quest which is outlined in terms that
carefully ignore relevant, and major theologi-
cal conflicts of the sixteenth century” (128–29).
Argues that the speaker “advocates, as regards
the pursuit of religious truth, inquiry into the
authority of Church and State—namely, into
the authorities of churches and states to define
and to command religious belief—yet in doing
so he at once affirms and denies the power of
cultural memory, through which such an in-
vestigation would (he suggests) need chiefly
to be conducted.” Claims that in Sat3 Donne’s
speaker “sets out a problematic case for the
Church Militant’s atomistic re-formation”
(129). Discusses how, in those satires “framing
Sat3, Donne’s speaker “primarily uses the
sacred to arrogate power” and points out how
he “proposes (through an equivocally delibera-
tive rhetoric) the re-examination of almost all
then-contemporary authority connected with the sacred” (149).

1537. Cox, Catherine I. “Re-Creating Zeal in Don-
ne’s ‘The First Sermon after Our Dispersion, by the

Discusses Donne’s sermon given at St. Dun-
stan-in-the-West on 15 January 1625, follow-
ing the subsidence of the recent plague that
had ravished the city, in which he hoped to
“transform sickness into healing” and “the heat
of tribulation into a powerful and loving zeal”
(150), Notes that, like other Protestants of the
time, Donne believed that “God had sent the
plague to warn his people against sinning and
to renew their zeal for his Word” (150–51), but
that, unlike most other preachers and writers
of the time who “emphasized the fear of God’s
destructive power,” Donne “appealed to his
parishioners to trust in God’s promise of en-
during love.” Maintains that Donne’s emphasis
on love rather than wrath in his conception of
Christian zeal, was an expression of “his yearn-
ing for unity,” a habit of mind he developed
following his “numerous experiences of isola-
tion.” Believes that at this time, “following his
seclusion in Chelsea during the London pesti-
ence, a separation that would have intensified
his desire for community, Donne forges a more
compassionate and empowering concept of
zeal than he has formerly articulated.” Claims
that Donne's rhetorical aim in his sermon is
“to journey spiritually to retrieve the soul's
original relationship with God, reviving, even
in the shadow of death, a burning love of true
worship.” Maintains that, “fired by the crises of
plague and political strife, Donne distinguishes
his conception of zeal as an impassioned,
creative love and seeks, by re-igniting zeal in
his own and his parishioners’ hearts to fortify
the Church against all divisive and insidious
threats” (151). Explains why Donne selected
zeal as the subject of his sermon, comments on
his theological understanding of zeal, and ana-
lyzes the theme and structure of the sermon.
Discusses how Donne in the sermon offered
to his parishioners “authentic consolation and
a path for enriching and strengthening their
lives” by stressing “the significance of the soul’s
trials, the engagement of memory, understand-
ing, and will in experiencing and holding fast
to God’s mercy, and the powerful transforma-
tion possible by the soul’s union with the Tri-
inity” (163).

1538. Daybell, James. “Material Meanings and the
Social Signs of Manuscript Letters in Early Modern

Discusses “the physical features and character-
stics of early modern manuscript letters—pa-
per, ink, handwriting, physical layout, signa-
tures, seals and fastenings—paying attention
to the significant meanings generated by such
material forms.” Is concerned “more with the
kinds of analysis traditionally associated with
codicology, palaeography, sigilography and
diplomats than with what might be termed
social materiality.” Argues that “material readings must reside alongside and complement literary, stylistic, linguistic, historical and more recent gender-based approaches to letters in order to understand more fully the culture, practices and social signs of early modern letter-writing” (647). Surveys recent scholarship on the materiality of letters. Mentions Donne as a letter writer briefly and notes, for instance, that, in writing to his estranged father-in-law, Donne “employed deferential tropes in seeking a rapprochement after his clandestine marriage” and that he “sought to underline his contrition in this series of letters by signing his name in the bottom right hand corner of the letter, a departure from his normal signing practice” (656). Points out also that in sealing his letters, Donne used at least three different seals: “a sheaf of snakes, a wolf rampant surrounded by a sheaf of snakes, and, after his ordination in 1615, a seal of Christ crucified on an anchor.” Points out that a fourth, a seal of “a heraldic antelope passant crined,” appears on a letter written from John Danvers house and suggests that Donne may simply have borrowed it “for the purpose of sealing” (660).


Contains the Songs and Sonnets (9–53), the Elegies (54–83), the Satyres including Coryat (83–99), the epigrams (99–102), Metem (102–52), the verse letters (52–159), the Anniversaries (160–71), the Epitaphs (172–98), the funeral elegies (198–214), the Divine Poems (214–40), and the Latin poems and translations (241–55)—without notes or commentary.


Translates into Russian Songs and Sonnets (7–54); Elegies, including “Julia” and “A Tale of a Citizen and His Wife” (55–86); Epitaphs (87–100); Epigrams (101–04); Satyres with Coryat (105–23); Metem (124–40); Verse Letters (141–85); Epices and Obsequies (186–202); Anniversaries (203–32); Corona (233–35); Holy Sonnets (236–43); MHHMary (244); Lit (244–52); Cross (252–53); Res (254); Annun (254–55); Goodf (255–56); Tilman (257–58); Sidney (245–59); Lam (260–71); Christ (271–72); Sickness (272–73); Father (273); the Latin poems (274–76); and a selection of translations by previous translators (279–99). Translates also into Russian Izaak Walton’s Life of Dr. John Donne (300–412). Concludes with a list of modern editions of Donne’s poems and prose (413–14); notes on each of the poems (414–53); notes on Walton’s Life (554–57); a chronology of Donne’s life (558–59); a list of illustrations (560); and a table of contents (561–66).


Translates into German (with English texts on the opposite page) ElJeal, ELAnag, EIChange, ELPict, ElServe, and ElBed—with notes and brief commentaries on each poem.


In the foreword, entitled “Der schräge Schatten der Melancholie” (7–[24]), Wolfgang Held presents a biographical sketch of Donne and a general introduction to his works, noting the shaping influence of melancholy on his life and works. Thereafter follows German translations by Held of 15 poems from the Songs and Sonnets, 3 of the Elegies, and 3 selections from the Holy Sonnets (with English texts on opposite pages) (26–89), followed by brief notes on the poems (91–92). Includes an essay by Madeline Mary Duff, entitled “Zu John Donnes Alchemie” (95–[105], that comments briefly on Donn’s life and surveys major characteristics of his poetic style, especially his uses of wit, paradox, argument, and the conceit as well as his metrical
experimentation. Notes the tension in Donne's poetry between the body and the soul. Concludes with an index of poems.


In Chinese. In the preface (3–4) explains the purpose of the translation and hopes it will be of comfort for those who suffered the effects of an earthquake in China in 2008. Presents a general introduction to Donne's life and to Devotions (3–14), followed by a Chinese translation of Devotions (3–206), an index (207), a chronology (209–14), and notes (215–18), in which the translator explains the difficulties of translating Devotions into Chinese.

Reviews:


Presents a brief introduction to Donne's life and to the Holy Sonnets, followed by English texts of the Holy Sonnets (according to Grier son's ordering) and French translations and notes.


Translates into Spanish WomCon, Flea, Expir, Compu, and Appar (with parallel English texts)—with a very brief introduction.


In the introduction (5–84), presents a biographical sketch of Donne and surveys the historical background of the period, followed by introductions to general characteristics of metaphysical poetry, especially Donne's poetry; to the Renaissance love lyric, both the tradition and innovations, especially Donne's love poems; and to Donne's Elegies, epigrams, Satyres, verse epistles, sacred poetry, the Anniversaries, and “Death's Duell”; and comments on metrics, syntax, and use of rhetoric in Donne's poems. Contains a note on the text (85–88) and a bibliography of editions (English and Italian) and critical studies of Donne's works (89–102). Presents (with English and Italian translations on opposite pages) the Songs and Sonnets that includes a general introduction to the collection, a short introduction to each of the poems, and glosses and notes on each poem (105–449), followed by the Elegies along with Sappho, BoulNar, BoulRec, and BedfCab (451–623); the epigrams (625–39); the Satyres (643–721); the verse epistles (723–823); the Divine Poems (825–1003); FirAn and FunEl (1005–55), each of which is preceded by an introduction and contains glosses and notes on individual words and lines. Presents an Italian translation of “Death's Duell” (1057–1119). Concludes with a table of contents (1121–26).


General study guide to Donne's life and poetry (secular and religious) and his prose. Comments on such issues as Donne's use of space, the social and political criticism in his works, and his critical reception and influence. (From advertisement)

One of four essays presented at a colloquium on *ValBook* held at the 2008 John Donne Society Conference. Compares two versions of *ValBook*—”Valediction of the Book” (Add. MS 5778 in the Cambridge University Library) and “Valediction to his booke” (1633 edition of the poems). Maintains that the first “relegates the female to passive subjectivity,” while the second “relinquishes patriarchal authority and promotes mutuality, equality, and a kind of divine mystery to the power that intellectual communion affords.” Suggests that “the philosophical divergence observable in these two versions may be distinct revisions by John Donne” and hopes that, if this is true, the 1633 version is Donne’s “final thoughts on the subject” (285). Maintains furthermore that “if, as the manuscript variant insists, his ‘deare Love’ is nothing more than a Muse, then this verse does little more than a thousand other hyperbolic panegyrics to patrons; it promises a woman immortality through masculine, poetic finesse” but that, “if, instead the woman addressed is the active, female subject found in the 1633 *Poems*, we may with some assurance identify her” (286). Based on manuscript and historical evidence and subtle references in Donne’s verse and prose letters, argues that the poem was, in fact, likely addressed to the Countess of Bedford. See also essays by D. Audell Shelburne, Raymond-Jean Frontain, and Julie W. Yen in this bibliography.


Comments on major characteristics of metaphysical poems on love, such as use of ordinary speech, puns, paradoxes, conceits, unusual metaphors and images, dramatic argumentation, surprise, etc. Presents a brief paraphrase and analysis of *ValMourn* as an example of metaphysical poems on love. Says that such poems highlight the notion that true love “will not change with time and space” (52).


Discusses Donne’s association with Ben Jonson and, in particular, with *Volpone*, noting that Donne wrote the second commendatory poem, *Amic*, in the 1607 quarto; and, more importantly, argues that *Metem* “contributes significantly to the ‘metempsychosis’ entertainment in the play (I.2.1–61), a play-within-a-play which resonates throughout the wider drama.” Points out that Donne and Jonson were “particularly close” during the early years of James I’s reign and suggests that “religious politics was one issue that drove them together” (146). Discusses *Amic*, noting how in his poem Donne “characterizes the age as uniquely vicious” and points to Jonson’s art as “a vehicle for delivering people from it” (147). Traces the influence of *Metem* on the “metempsychosis show” in *Volpone* and argues that Robert Cecil and his “perverse exploitation of religion . . . in pursuit of wealth and power” (150) is satirized in both works. Concludes that Jonson’s use of the show in *Volpone* is “a conscious allusion” to *Metem* that he “expects his initiate readers to recognize,” and that he further “expects them to recognize Cecil as the key linking feature” (115).


Chapter 3 is a revised version of an essay by the same title that first appeared in *HLQ* 69, no. 1 (2006): 47–66.

In Chapter 1, “The Literary and Political Activity of Manuscript Verse Collectors” (1–32), discusses how manuscript verse collectors in the early modern period mixed together in their collections courtly love poems and paro-
dies of courtly love. Argues that, “by routinely countering or complementing love poetry with erotic or obscene verse, manuscript verse collectors arguably formed an unrecognized poetry genre.” Calls this genre “anti-courtly love poetry” (5) and observes how collectors of Donne’s poems “played a major role in forming this genre,” thereby making Donne “the most popular poet in early modern literary manuscripts” (6). Points out also how the collectors “placed poems on affairs of state, or poetic libels, in particularly compelling relationships with anti-courtly love poems, variously relating the genre to a range of political scandals,” thus helping to define the genre of “verse libel” also (8). Surveys some of the ways collectors “constructed and compiled their miscellanies” (15) and comments on the results of recontextualizing the poems in their collections. Maintains that the recent acknowledgment of the popularity of libels in verse miscellanies calls for “a corresponding reconsideration of the politics of the canonical poems that surround them.” In Chapter 2, “The Politics of Courtly and Anti-Courtly Love Poetry in the Hands of Collectors” (33–66), discusses the work of an anonymous seventeenth-century collector who related ElBed to a libel on, and a love lyric by, Ralegh, thereby presenting Donne’s elegy as “a parody not simply of Ralegh, but specifically of the love lyrics that Ralegh had employed for political purposes at the Elizabethan court.” Shows how another collector, on the other hand, found poems by Ralegh and Donne “to be perfectly compatible” and thus “presented the two poets as exemplary authors of complementary poems” (30). In Chapter 3, “‘Love-song weeds, and Satyrique thornes’: Anti-Courtly Love Poetry and Somerset Libels” (67–92), comments on the recontextualization of Donne’s anti-Petrarchan poems that were intermingled in manuscript verse miscellanies with verse libels concerning the Thomas Overbury scandal, thereby giving Donne’s poems unintended political and religious meanings. Holds that Donne could hardly have been pleased to see his erotic love poems used against his friend and patron. In Chapter 4, “The Spanish Match and the History of Sexuality” (93–131), deals with libels resulting from Prince Charles’s proposed marriage to Maria Anna of Spain, the so-called Spanish Match, as well as those concerning the possible sexual relationship between the Duke of Buckingham and James I. Notes how several verse collectors juxtaposed ElBed with these libels. In Chapter 5, “Verse Collectors and Buckingham’s Assassination” (132–61), describes how collectors mixed Donne’s anti-courtly love poems and those of others with poems on the assassination of Buckingham. Concludes that “in the hands of and books of these collectors, anti-courtly love poetry became caught up in the religious and political polarization that would ultimately constitute an early step toward the English civil wars” (32). In “Epilogue: Redeploying Anti-Courtly Love Poetry Against the Protectorate” (162–72), studies the first printed books that included Donne’s anti-love poems that the Stationer’s Company had prohibited when the first edition of Donne’s collected poems was published in 1633. Comments on a number of later collectors who politicized anti-courtly love poetry “for their own purposes” (32). Appendix 1: “Selected Verse Texts” (173–206), presents full texts of some of the poems discussed in the study; and in Appendix 2: “Manuscript Descriptions” (207–80), presents a bibliographical description of manuscripts consulted in this study. Concludes with an index of manuscripts cited (281–85), a list of printed works cited (287–99), and a general index (301–06).

Reviews:

• Carlo M. Bajetta in N&Q n.s. 57 (2010): 584–86.


Reprint from MLN 72, no. 2 (1957): 93–95. (See Roberts for an annotation.)

Points out how in the Holy Sonnets Donne “abandons the gentle and modest voice with which previous poets addressed God and instead demands God’s salvation” as he “ob sesses over his own mortality and eventual death” and yet “acknowledges that death is but a path to God’s grace, a way of renewal and rebirth” (125). Maintains that “the distinguishing characteristic” of the Holy Sonnets is “not that their author sought God but rather that he sought him using such unique and unusual language” (130). Briefly contrasts Donne and Herbert as religious lyricists. Concludes that, for Donne, “the paradoxes and contradictions inherent in the Holy Sonnets and in life itself are the only way to establish a fruitful relationship with God,” noting that, “when thought of in that context, the association of death and joy becomes understandable.” Claims that Donne “can only experience joy when he feels fear of God’s wrath—not because joy and fear are the same thing, but because fearing God means that God is an active presence in his life who guides his renewal and rebirth and affords at least the possibility of joy” (133).


Claims that although the Holy Sonnets are the best-known and most loved of all religious sonnet sequences, the earliest example of such a sequence is a collection of 26 sonnets entitled A Meditation of a Penitent Sinner (1560) by Anne Vaughan Lock. Maintains that Lock’s sonnets are “not only highly successful in their own right,” but also that they “foreshadow” the Holy Sonnets in “theme, style, techniques, intensity, and also in their fundamentally Calvinist theology.” Suggests that, in fact, they are “so similar” that it is possible that Donne had read Lock’s sequence and was influenced by it (99). Reads Donne and Lock side-by-side, pointing out both similarities and differences, noting the distinctive features of each of the sequences, and showing how both poets were writing in the same meditative tradition. Observes that “the most striking similarity” of both sequences is their “dark, gloomy, anxious, and even (at times) almost despairing emphasis on the deep-seated sinfulness of their speakers” (100). Points out specific parallels between the two sequences, such as the use of repetition, complicated syntax, use of a similar vocabulary, etc. Notes that the key difference between the two sonneteers is that Lock is “less inventive” than Donne: “her language, tones, and attitudes are less diverse than his”; she (more than Donne) “runs the risk of sounding monotonous”; and the tone of her poems “tends to be weaker and more self-pitying” than Donne’s (103). Discusses HS Batter as a prime example of a poem that “recalls the tone, mood, attitudes, and even the particular phrasing of Lock’s work” (108), and reflects as well Lock’s “extreme intensity, which often seems to border on despair.” In spite of the similarities between the two poets, finds Donne “the more interesting poet” (109)—“more adventurous, inventive, and talented” (112).


Discusses how Donne’s sermon to the Virginia Company, preached on 13 November 1622 “throws Donne’s abstractions about the redemptive value of work in stark contrast with the realities of labor required to run the joint-stock operation.” Observes how “the contradictions between Donne’s humane admonition to charity toward the Indians and his legal justification for colonization cause him to formulate increasingly complex metaphorical relationships among trade, travel, and religious conversion.” Discusses, in particular, how in the sermon Donne’s “argument for redeeming the failed colonial venture centers on labor as a metaphysical conceit” (72). Sees the sermon,
then, as “the contradictory effort of a religious man trying to persuade imperialists that adopting a humane attitude toward a native population is the best way to foster an economic structure of deepening exploitation” (78).

Shows how the sermon presents “a method for commodifying a transatlantic labor force” that “encodes a specifically Protestant set of cultural cues, if not necessarily a distinct Protestant theology” (79). Believes that although Donne’s compassion for the Indians was “exceptional for his time,” his attitude “does not exculpate him from complicity with imperialistic attitudes” (84). Discusses how “intervening on behalf of a humanitarian cause—the effort to prevent retributive violence against indigenous people—Donne indirectly voiced the theoretical basis for future forms of enslavement in the New World.” Maintains that “his connection between spiritual regeneration and financial productivity provided the link needed to justify the commodification of labor” and that by his “displacement of aggression” away from the Indians and onto the London poor, we can see “the actual implications of his thought for the history of the colonies.” Holds that “treating labor as a metaphor that, like the souls of converts, could be transferred as property, Donne ventured a metaphysical transport entirely in keeping with the policies of the Company’s faltering leadership” (99).


In Portuguese. Discusses Donne’s witty uses of metaphors in the Satyres and comments on how these poems reflect “the diverse types of metaphors” that were “appropriate and common” in Renaissance satire. Maintains that, by examining “selected verses” from the poems, “it is possible to note the witty and technical use the poet makes of the places of invention previously authorized for the satiric genre” and to observe “how he manages to imitate the Latin satirists,” while, at the same time, is able to “diversify the elocution and the witty conceits” (204).


In Portuguese. Points out that Donne’s religious poetry is still not well-known in Brazil because it has not been often translated into Portuguese. Points out, however, Alfonso Félix de Sousa’s translation of Corona in 1983. Explains the need for a new translation of the sequence and points out some of the formal difficulties that a translator of Donne encounters in his work. Also comments on “the peculiarities” of Donne’s poetry in general and, in particular, of Corona (45). Presents Portuguese translations of the sonnets with notes and commentary on each one.

1559. Flynn, Dennis. “‘Only in Obedience’ to Whom?—The Identity of a Donne Correspondent.” LitCompass 6, no. 2: 424–34.

Points out that work in progress on the forthcoming Oxford edition of Donne’s letters confirms that 15 of the letters in the Burley manuscript are by Donne, that “most of the addressees have been established,” and that “most of them have been dated within a period of about five years, in the late 1590s and the early 1600s.” Points out interesting features of several of these letters and suggests that “the most interesting” are those addressed to Anne More before their marriage (425). Argues that the letter beginning “Only in obedience,” thought to have been addressed to Henry Wotton, was, in fact, probably addressed to Sir Henry Goodere. (This essay is part of a panel discussion on the forthcoming Oxford edition of Donne’s letters. See below also essays by Margaret Maurer, M. Thomas Hester, and Ernest W. Sullivan, II.)


Compares and contrasts Leonard Cohen and Donne as love poets. Observes that Cohen’s poetry “employs personae whose egoism and self-consciousness are reminiscent of Donne’s self-
centred lovers.” Maintains that “the variability of these personae—ranging from comically impudent Lotharios to wounded suitors—frustrates attempts to discover a consistent philosophy of love in Donne and Cohen’s poetry” but that a comparative study of the two poets and their modes of expression can lead to “a fuller understanding of each poet’s conception of love.” Suggests that both poets envision love as “a transcendent combination of divine love and secular experience” (43). Discusses how both “articulate a fascination with a transgressive sensuality in which the spirit is awakened as the flesh is aroused” (45). Cites as primary examples of this love Cohen’s “Credo” and “You Have the Lovers” and Donne’s *Ecst* and *Canon*, poems that erase “the boundaries between the sacred and the profane.” Maintains, however, that “what ultimately distinguishes” the two poets is that Donne was “a man of the spirit who could not wrest himself from the grasp of the fleshly, material world,” whereas Cohen is “a man of the flesh who cannot wrest himself from thoughts of the spiritual.” Concludes that “their complementary depictions of spiritual and material yearnings provide us a valuable means of understanding their similar models of transgressive love, and a fascinating basis for contemplating the force and resonance of an idea so powerful that it unites a Renaissance cleric and a twentieth-century Canadian troubadour” (62).


One of four essays presented at a colloquium on *ValBook* held at the 2008 annual John Donne Society meeting. Reads *ValBook* as a performative poem in which the speaker’s “conflation of speech, writing, and possibly even print . . . proves a deliberate maneuver to ensure that a powerful but silent interlocutor accords him a sign of his election” (264). Observes that the governing conceit of the poem is how women are “instructional patterns or texts to be read by the less fortunate in love or by the still-to-be-perfected in virtue” (265). Discusses how the woman addressed in *ValBook* “possesses the power both to preserve the speaker’s name and to confirm the endurance of their love”; thus “the silent, unnamed She proves all-powerful, while—despite his bravura—the verbally compulsive speaker proves, finally, to be but a humble petitioner” (273). Concludes that it is “the immediate speech act that proves more suggestively powerful than the written or printed word” (273–74) and that at the end of the poem “the reader, like the speaker, waits to learn whether she will deign to deliver the word by which her will can be known and done” (274). See also essays by D. Audell Shelburne, Julie W. Yen, and Margaret Downs-Gamble.


Study guide for HSC students of Advanced English. In the first section, presents a close analysis of *HSDeath*, *HSScene*, *HSRound*, *HSMin*, *Sickness*, *ValMourn*, *Appar*, *Relic*, and *SunRis*, followed by questions; in the second section, analyzes Margaret Edson’s *W;t*; and in the third section, compares Donne’s poems and the play. Concludes with a model essay. (From information supplied by the author.)


Discusses “the role of aporia as a rhetorical instrument that is used in religious sermons in
order to manipulate the audience so as to convince them of a truth derived from the textual evidence of the Bible by means of the negation or questioning of the message, by creating doubt in the listeners, or by acknowledging the impossibility of trespassing the borders of reason and of explaining the inexpressible through language.” Maintains that many sermons are “aporetic in structure, using doubt and negation as rhetorical instruments in order to ascertain a point” but that, in fact, this device “allows the speaker to eliminate any doubt in the mind of the hearers by establishing the contradiction in the text as an insolvable condition, relying thus on Faith as the only possible way to truth” (100). Illustrates this thesis by commenting on major characteristics of Donne’s sermons, such as their poetical and rhetorical features, and by emphasizing that, for Donne, the sermon is “a communal, inclusive, dramatic exercise, a performance where the preacher is the only one who speaks” but who is “continually addressing the audience and requiring of them to take an active part in the function.” Maintains, therefore, that Donne “uses, among other devices, compelling rhythms and lexical repetition that pursue an emotional and dramatic effect” (103), and especially stresses how he employs manipulative aporia. Discusses the sermon “Of Human Marriage and the Marriage of the Soul with Christ: A Wedding Sermon” (1621) to illustrate how Donne presents “an exegetical and aporetical interpretation” of a biblical text. Shows how, in trying to prove the indissolubility of marriage, he paradoxically makes clear the impossibility of defining “the eternal nature of marriage” (111).


Places Donne as a plague writer in the context of the “fatal and memorable” year 1625 and correlates “the epidemic crisis in London with a transformative personal crisis for Donne, occasioned by his own near-fatal illness two years before.” In particular, discusses Donne’s “engagement with disease—his own, London’s, and the world’s”—in Devotions, the 1625 edition of Anniversaries, and his plague sermon preached at St. Dunstan’s on 15 January 1626. Maintains that Donne believes that sickness is a result of original sin and that outbreaks of the plague simply reflect an acceleration of the world’s decline. Shows how in both the Devotions and the sermon Donne “will understand God’s plague writing as a process of ‘translation’” (192). Explains how, for Donne, “translation” was “an especially rich and subtle figure” (206).


Briefly discusses the imagistic metaphor in ll. 1–4 of Ecst, maintaining that “a cognitive assessment of figures and grounds can reveal the poem’s complexity” (463).


Discusses ways in which the scientific treatises and biblical commentaries of a twelfth-century Spanish Jew, Abraham Ibn Ezra, “became relevant” to Donne (18). Notes Donne’s reference to Ezra’s biblical commentaries in his 1630 Lenten sermon on Job 16.17–19 and in two other sermons. Observes that Donne “carefully takes into account the knowledge and authority of the Jewish exegetical tradition” (20). Also compares Ezra’s poem “A Cloak” with ValMourn, showing their “shared use of conceit” (21).


Surveys the life and academic struggles of Evelyn Mary Spearing Simpson and her scholarly
work on Donne. Points out how Simpson’s life “records the biography of a woman scholar from the first half of the twentieth century, whose life so resolutely and passionately intersected with women’s struggles for intellectual emancipation, the first World War and the editorial re-conceptualization of the early modern English canon” (277). Presents a bibliography of Evelyn Simpson’s works (281–83).


Discusses and publishes an heretofore unpublished typescript manuscript entitled “Donne and the Elizabethan Stage” by Evelyn Simpson that was likely written sometime between 1942 and the mid-1950s. Maintains that the essay “provides a snapshot of the state of Donnean biographical, critical and editorial scholarship on the cusp of the mid- to late-twentieth-century development” and makes one “aware of the particular scholarly situation within which Simpson worked.” Comments, in particular, on Simpson’s “distinctive contribution to Donne’s involvement with Elizabethan drama” (70). Presents the essay with notes (69–91), in which Simpson cites numerous references to plays and to the theater in Donne’s poems and sermons and comments on his friendship with Ben Jonson. Also surveys Simpson’s life and her scholarly and editorial work.


Briefly compares and contrasts “Deaths Dull” with John Dunton’s “Essay upon his own funeral.”


Discusses the complex relationship between an author’s life and his work. Points out how often readers “make assumptions about Donne, based on the strong, masculine and overtly sexual style of his erotic poetry.” Observes that Donne’s love poetry used to be highly admired but that more recently it has “fallen out of favour because he is now often perceived to have been a lecherous and misogynist young writer.” Wonders “how much of these judgements depend on our using what we think we know about his life to read his poetry” or “what we think we then know about his poetry to read his life, as well as also making problematic assumptions about the readership in order to read the work” (186). Discusses **Twick**, **Flea**, and **ValMourn** as examples of how critics have entwined Donne’s life and poetry, thereby affecting their reading of his poems and also influencing his personal and critical reputation.


Discusses Donne’s use of iambic pentameter. Maintains that although Donne’s metrical practice is “famous for being among the laxest within the entire tradition of the English iambic pentameter,” it is “actually systemic” (41). Observes that although his practice “may be extreme within the English tradition,” it is “not outside it: in it strong syllables of lexical words come to be governed by the same basic kind of conditions that for Shakespeare govern those of postlexical prosodic structures” (48). Points out that for Donne “strong syllables of lexical words are treated one way, while those of nonlexical words and phrases are treated another way.” Contrasts and compares Donne to Shakespeare and says that the difference be-
tween the two is that for Shakespeare “postlexical prosodic structure is subject to a more relaxed constraint than lexical stress is, while for Donne it is not subject to any” (52).


Fictionalized account of the passionate and forbidden love affair between Anne More and John Donne.


An original poem based on Donne’s famous statement that “No Man is an Island” in Devotions.


Explores how “the rhetorical strategy of serio-ludere (‘playing seriously’)” was one device used by Renaissance writers to deal with the then prevalent “dualistic, virtually Manichean perception of language: its capacities to improve social organizations and potentially reinstate humanity’s divinity, and its potentials to sow discord and dissolve further the restoration of such a bond” (17–18). Maintains that, for Renaissance writers, serio-ludere became “a means of registering the struggle for knowledge in an environment which they accepted was replete with paradox and contradiction.” Discusses how in Donne’s poetry the device is used “to underpin the dilemma about how humanity might connect with the divine” (18). Discusses Goodf as an example, noting how the poem is “typically ingenious, passionate and apparently sincere.” Observes, however, that “the cleverness invested in the poetic argument also insinuates a contrivance that subverts the narrator’s attempt to reassure himself that his westward motion is other than what he fears: a movement towards death and damnation” (23). Points out how “the narrator’s poetic argument and employment of devotional rhetoric are revealed as a linguistic mask, yet, crucially, a mask the poem has carefully allowed the attentive reader to witness” (25–26). Shows how Donne’s use of serio-ludere “acts to maintain some sense of language’s potentials for reaching higher understanding by displacing any definitive conclusions about poetic eloquence onto further negotiations.” Maintains further that by revealing “the poetic narrator’s limitations,” the poem “retains the promise of eloquentia as tantalisingly achievable to less naive, less disturbed inquirers after truth—language remains potentially a genuine means to look on Christ” (26).


Discusses Donne’s life and major characteristics of his poetry and comments on his influence on modern and contemporary poets, such as Hart Crane, Carl Phillips, and Kimiko Hahn. Suggests that this talk could be entitled, in the words of the song writer Van Morrissey, “Rave on John Donne, Rave On.”


Reports on three events held at the 2009 John Donne Society Conference: (1) a performance of Benjamin Britten’s musical settings of the Holy Sonnets by Christopher Swanson and Lisa Kinzer (with visual images) and also briefly surveys recent scholarship on Britten’s settings; (2) comments on a panel discussion on Jane Wayne’s lithographs of the Songs and Sonnets; and (3) comments on a talk by X. J. Kennedy on his reading of Donne and cites examples of Kennedy’s poems that reflect Donne’s influence.

Suggests one approach to the problem of establishing the canon of Donne’s letters by reviewing two of Donne’s letters (“To the Lady G,” first printed in 1635) and an unsigned, unaddressed, and undated letter beginning “I promise a iourney” (in the Burley manuscript). Points out that Donne called them his “apparitions, and ghosts” letters and that both seem to lack “any internal data beyond their style that would identify them as Donne’s.” Argues, however, that “an examination of the approach of both nineteenth- and twentieth-century readings of the first letter provides an example of how we can determine Donne’s authorship of the second letter through particular attention to the style of these two representative letters” (413). (This essay is part of a panel cluster on the forthcoming Oxford edition of Donne’s letters. See also essays by Margaret Maurer, Dennis Flynn, and Ernest W. Sullivan, II.)


Presents an introduction to essays on June Wayne’s stone and zinc lithographic interpretations of Donne’s love poems by Helen B. Brooks, Jonathan F. S. Post, and Paul A. Parrish, papers read at the 2009 John Donne Society Conference, each of which has been entered separately in this bibliography. In addition, comments on a fourth essay by Ann Hurley, who extends her commentary on the three papers and who, in collaboration with the visual artist Jebah Baum, discusses the technical aspects of Wayne’s lithographic art, presents a methodology for interpreting the Wayne/Donne connection, and demonstrates the methodology by detailed analyses of specific lithographs and poems. Reproduces eleven photos of the lithographs (175–96).


Discusses the direct or indirect influence of Catullus’s epigrammatic love lyrics on Donne’s love poetry and sacred poems. Maintains that Catullus’s poems provided Donne with “not so much a source as a pattern or, more accurately, a paradoxical amatory and poetic problem to which some of Donne’s poems offer a significant response” (34). Suggests that, “while reiterating Catullus’s vexed portraits of sexual love’s limitations as well as the overwhelming promise of transcendence it seems to be, or seems to offer, Donne appropriates the language of an incarnate ‘impossible love’ to portray in some of his sermonic poems just what Catullus’s powerful plaints of desire strove to name” (38). Points out, however, that whereas Catullus’s poems “mainly portray sexual love’s betrayal of our ‘immortal longings’—and the codes of Roman aristocratic behavior he cherishes—some of Donne’s lyrics record a sexual love that seems as if it is a fulfillment of that ‘desire for more’” (39). Discusses, in particular, Relic, Ecst, Flea, and Canon, noting how Canon “most fully dramatizes the ways in which Donne answers Catullus’s plea for ‘An impossible love’” (43). Comments also on how the “pattern of the wit of sexuality” in the love poems appears also in the Holy Sonnets, EtAD, and the hymns in which Donne “admits that his exalted sexual love is analogous—in the root sense of the word as ‘resembling the logos or origin’—to the ultimate love” and that “it depends on it and strains to give way to it wholly” (46), while, at the same time, he expresses his “desire for more,” a desire that perhaps refers to his continuing love for his dead wife.


In Korean. Contrasts the changing attitudes toward death as reflected in the works of Donne, Marlowe, Emily Dickinson, and D. H. Lawrence. Maintains that modern poets view death as something acceptable, even beautiful, whereas the earlier poets see it as dreadful and fearful. Claims that English Renaissance po-
ems “are occupied with the will to live, which is also called ‘eros’,” whereas modern English poems “are packed with the will to die, that is ‘thanatos.’” (From the abstract)


Briefly praises Devotions as one of the finest examples of a patient’s view of illness. Suggests Donne’s work has “an immediacy that demolishes time, reaching across the centuries to present-day patients and, presumably, beyond” (194). Suggests that Devotions reminds us that “to attempt, as the neurosciences have been doing in recent years, to reduce illness and the mental states associated with illness to biology and mere brain processes, is to lose sight of what it means to be human.” Believes that “writing in a pre-Cartesian age, before the advent of such reductionist, mechanistic explanations, Donne saw this clearly” (195).


Discusses Donne’s use of two “intertwined themes” in Curse and “variations he carries out on them, which provide a basis for interpreting the poem” (72): (1) his use of Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice, and (2) “the state’s use of judicial torture” against Catholics. Comments specifically on how the stock proverb “confess and die” is “emblematic of the ambiguity” of Donne’s poem (73) and also how it “encompasses the realities faced by Catholic priests and laity” at the time (74).


Points out that an adequate response to the three essays presented on June Wayne’s lithographic illustrations of Donne’s love poems at the 2009 John Donne Society Conference was limited both by time and by a “lack of knowl-

edge about lithography and, additionally, by the need for a mode of inquiry that would more fully unlock the intriguing conjunction of verbal and visual artists.” Proposes, therefore, in collaboration with Jebah Baum, an artist and literary scholar, to explore ways better to understand lithographic art and to develop a methodology for “looking at Wayne and Donne together rather than from a side by side perspective” (227). Labels this methodology “reverse ekphrasis,” i.e., “the use of visual properties to convey the temporality of verbal art.” Divides the essay into two parts: (1) a discussion by Baum of the technicalities of Wayne’s use of lithography; and (2) remarks by Hurley on reverse ekphrasis “as it pertains specifically to the Wayne/Donne livre d’artiste” (1959), commenting on the relationship between specific poems and lithographs. Thereafter both scholars “come together in an exploration of a more ambitious reflection on the subtleties of this collaboration between visual and verbal arts that engages the essence of artistic representation” (228). Concludes that Donne and Wayne “merge within this livre d’artiste—to offer us a fascinating insight into the power and challenge of combining words and images into one thoroughly engaging, and fully demanding, experience of the power of art” (250).


Compares Lam and Francisco de Quevedo’s Lágrimas de Jeremías castellans. Discusses how the text of Jeremiah likely appealed to both poets in the light of the historical and religious situation at the time as well as because of crises in their personal lives. Focuses, however, “not on questions of political or personal crisis, nor on the affirmations of religious orthodoxy,” but rather concentrates on how both poets shared a “spiritual formation involving Jesuit meditational techniques.” Observes, in particular, how Jesuit meditational practice “features a special focus on sensorial imagery,” the “same type of
acute sensorial imagery” found in both Donne and Quevedo’s “reworkings of Lamentations” (34–35). Points out also how Jesuit spirituality “may be observed in the language” of both poets, and notes how they “invoke the five bodily senses to bring a forceful physical immediacy to their poetry” (35). Claims, in fact, that “these two poets’ respective portrait of Israel’s grief could hardly be more sensorial or more vivid” (37). Maintains that, paradoxically, Donne produced a “more Catholic” rendition of Jeremiah than did Quevedo. Concludes that it is “one of the great ironies of literary history that the hyperorthodox Quevedo was superseded in this effort by none other than an avowed Protestant.” Thinks that “what this really shows is simply the undeniable messiness, the lack of clear distinctions between practitioners of the two religions during this period of intense sectarian strife” (39).


Compares the love poetry of Khaquani Shirvani (1120–1190), a Persian poet, to Donne’s love poems. Maintains that, despite differences in time, place, and culture, similarities in their views on women can be observed between the two poets. Discusses these commonalities in the poems of each. (From the abstract)


In Chinese. Maintains that the religious elements in Donne’s love lyrics reflect the various struggles that Donne had with faith and belief. Divides the poems into three groups—poems expressing sexual passion, poems about love and marriage, and memorial poems. (From the abstract)


In Korean. Discusses how Donne in his sermons used metaphysical conceits and how he dealt with the contemporary theological controversy about grace waged by Calvinists and Arminians. Says that Donne’s sermons and theology reflect “a moderate approach” to the views of both sides of the issue. (From the abstract)


Examines Donne’s “ambiguous understanding” of prayer book worship and discusses “the ideas he drew from both John Whitgift and Richard Hooker,” thereby bringing into relief “a liturgical theology in the process of evolution.” Argues that, “if Donne can be recognized as representative of conformists in the early Stuart church,” then “the evolutionary nature of his theology allows for a less sharp and less dramatic portrait of the rise of ritualism in the 1620s, and, perhaps, a different way of looking at the origins of Laudianism” (223). Discusses how Donne participated in “the breakdown of the establishment’s golden prayer book mean” (224).


Points out that Biathanatos is “debatably the first work in English to excuse self-slaughter” and notes how it became “the focus of later commentators’ distaste” (217). Observes that the work was published in 1644 during “a mild suicide epidemic in Puritan circles and that Donne “cannot have fully anticipated the extent to which his argument would prove agreeable to its new civil-war-torn context.” Discusses how Donne’s method in Biathanatos “employs paradox as part of his relativist agenda, playing one commentator against another, view against view, so as effectively to flatten the terms and efface the universalist objectivity of
Scripture, quoting Puritan commentators in a profusion of theoretical concord and discord” (218). Shows how “this confusion and profusion becomes, in a sense, the legitimation for Biathanatos.” Summarizes Donne’s central argument and explains how he “locates his argument biblically, within the terms of Christianity” (219). Points out how Biathanatos was “principally responsible,” after 1644, for “an explosion of anti-suicide commentaries, sermons, and lectures, many of which attempt to unpick his logic, some of which dismiss his arguments, but all of which Donne, in his preface, proclaims himself invulnerable to” (221).


An original poem that mentions Donne.


In Korean. Explores Donne’s concept of nothingness in Noct and maintains that, for him, spiritual awareness comes by uniting the mind with nothingness. Examines the rhyme scheme, meter, stanzaic structure, and, in particular, the conceits of the poem to show how these are “basic” to the poem’s “paradox of a positive force underlying and growing out of the negative.” Explains how the conceits “move from a negative definition of the poet’s mind to a ritualistic and fruitful unification with nothingness.” (From the abstract)


Explores the profound change that occurred in the seventeenth century in the depiction of the body and of the erotic as they are represented in English literature of the period. Although Donne and his poetry are mentioned through-out the study, primarily two chapters focus on how in his love poetry he theologized the erotic and the body and how in his religious poems he imaginatively longed for an erotic encounter with the androgynous Christ. In “Zwischen Maskulinität und homosexuellem ‘coming out’: Donne und Traherne” (65–74), applies such contemporary sexual terminology as “coming out” to early modern religious poetry. Reads Carew’s elegy on Donne as a reconstruction of the past that relates creativity to sexual climax and points out how in the elegy the poetic rape of Donne’s fellow poets and their feminization are expressed in images of liquids and melting. Claims that in his own poetry Donne transfers the semantics of rape to the lyrical “I” as seen in HSBatter, a poem in which physical submission and a homoerotic component are embedded in an analogy of erectio and resurrectio, which results in homoerotic passivity as well as a feminization of the speaker. Suggests also that such a reading shows the interdependence of faith/inspiration and rape as a manifestation of amor divinus. In “Der bisexuelle Christus: Über ein kontroverses Leitmotiv im erotischen Diskurs des Barock” (81–93), regards the poet as a sponsa Dei or a homoerotic catamite. Discusses how Christ foregrounds the concept of homo eroticus and suggests that the persona in the poem feels affection as well as jealously in his relationship with Christ. Links this idea to the literary tradition of Petrarchism and to various theological discourses that result in seeing Christ as androgynous. Regards the homoerotic unio mystica with Christ as expressive of the baroque correspondence of amor eroticus and amor divinus that has often been read against the background of the changed political and economic situation in seventeenth-century England. Prefers to link this correspondence to the Middle Ages, which thus makes it an essential part of religious thinking.

In Chinese. Presents a Freudian analysis of Donne's poems. Maintains that the poet's libido is the major impulse behind his art and life but that finally, with the help of his superego, he realizes salvation. (From the abstract)


Discusses how Renaissance poets “used circularity as a medium for thinking through certain problems in connection with the life of the soul.” Regards the circle as a “master-trope for early modern mappings of the self” (13) that “provides a means of analyzing, understanding, and asserting what later came to be called subjectivity” (13–14). Notes that, in fact, “circularity became a favorite mode of imagining the mind in possession of itself.” Observes, however, that “the manner in which Wyatt, Sidney, Donne, Vaughan, Marvell, and others employ it in their poetry enables them to point out the distressing limitations, indeed aporias, of the self-reflecting figurations of consciousness and an autonomous subject richly endowed with imagination, which later periods would regard as the foundations of literary creativity as well as philosophical system-building.” Focuses on Neoplatonism because it “furnished a language as well as a framework of terms and topics particularly suitable” for articulating Renaissance subjectivity (14). Discusses how “figures of circularity acquire a central function” in Donne’s poetry (30), especially in *Sidney*, a text which not only stages “multiple transcendences in interlocking circles, between heaven, spheres, and earth, angelic and human as well as temporal and eternal worlds, past inspirations and the praise of God in time and worlds to come” and “also mediates between private and common prayer, public and individual religious discourse, single and communal voices, traditional and innovative, spontaneous and received poetry” (32).


Following a general survey of love poetry from the 6th to the 17th century, maintains that in Donne’s poetry the sublime nature of love is expressed more perfectly than in any previous poet. Discusses Donne’s treatment of love in *Lect*, *GoodM*, *Ecst*, and *ValMourn*. Calls *ValMourn* a perfect poem and discusses how the image of the compass in its conclusion is a perfect metaphor for what true love is.


Observes that *Devotions* is “unique in early modern writing as an artistically shaped, personal account of sickness composed in its immediate aftermath and tracking its onset, progress, crisis, and subsidence.” Maintains that although its devotions are “acts of worship,” it is clear that “physical experience is at the centre of Donne’s text” (323). Discusses how Donne views sickness as “the result of sin, as a form of correction from God, and also as a spiritually beneficial process, a view which is typical of mainstream Protestant (and indeed Catholic) thinking.” Maintains, therefore, that, for Donne, “physical suffering forms part of an essential spiritual process” and that, for him, “the two are inseparable” (324). Explains how Donne’s treatment of pain “reveals important aspects of his attitude toward medicine and sickness, as well as his theological outlook, while his metaphorical representation of personal suffering shows a deliberately unconventional method of expressing and shaping physical experience” (324–25). Presents an analysis of Donne’s view of the nature of pain as seen in *Devotions*, focusing on “his language of physical suffering” and on how “broader religious and medical meanings collect around
his expressions of pain” (326). Observes how throughout his text Donne’s metaphors for his physical suffering “convey a sense of constriction, oppression and suffocation” (329) and comments, in particular, on his use of the image of pressing to express his powerlessness. Discusses also how Donne uses concepts and terms from Galenic medicine, especially the notion of vapours, in describing his suffering. Explains how water, especially flooding water, is a “major current” of imagery in Devotions, noting how “water signifies all kinds of affliction for Donne” (338).


Surveys chronologically T. S. Eliot’s intellectual and spiritual evolution. Points out how in “Whispers of Immortality” (published in 1918) Eliot was “struggling to craft new poetry” in the style of Donne (82). Notes that Eliot praised Donne for “a quality of sensuous thought, or of thinking through the senses, or of the senses thinking” (83) and that he spent several years trying to explain what he meant. Points out that Eliot was especially impressed by the image of “a bracelet of bright hair about the bone” in Relic as well as by the vivid figures of speech, and the uses of analogy and repetition in Donne’s sermons. Comments also on Eliot’s changing views toward Donne and his poetry and suggests that much of his criticism of Donne is also “self-criticism” (84).


In this secondary school textbook, presents a line-by-line, stanza-by-stanza analysis of GoodM (260–69). Concludes that the poem maintains that the love of the speaker and his beloved “will last forever as long as they make sure their love is equal” (265).


Introduces essays by Dennis Flynn, M. Thomas Hester, and Ernest W. Sullivan, II, editors of the forthcoming Oxford edition of Donne’s letters, that were presented at the 2008 John Donne Society Conference (each of which has been included separately in this bibliography). States that the essays show certain “lines of inquiry this long-awaited edition will pursue.” Maintains that each of the essays “puts forward a significant theoretical point or two to ponder” and each is “rich in surprising, incidental details that shed fascinating new light on the particular letters they discuss.” Believes that the new edition “will certainly challenge much of our thinking about Donne in many respects” (408).


Response to Mary Novik’s Conceit: A Novel (Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 2007). Likens the novel to the meaning of the word “conceit” as “fanciful notion” (163).


Maintains that Donne “wrote about the Bible as though it were a poem” and notes how “[i]n his sermons, biblical scholarship turns frequently into a marvelous exercise of practical criticism” (189). Points out that Donne “had small Hebrew and less Greek” and that although he “defended vernacular translations of Scripture,” he most often quotes the Latin Vulgate translation, “the Bible of his childhood,” and does not write “biblical English.” Comments on the biblical elements (sound effects, images, style) in Donne’s prose, especially in Devotions: “Donne hears the Bible as a poem,” and, in Devotions, “turns it into a dramatic one” (191).


Discusses Donne’s military career and his views on war, noting how he “drew extensively on images of war in his sermons and poems.” Maintains that, for Donne, war is “a consummate terror that must be avoided” but that it is also “a focal point for a country and its citizens, a testing ground for personal valor, and a means of learning true humility not easily replaced in peacetime” (102). Discusses how the emblematic and meditative traditions are ways to understand better this paradox. Suggests that the function of his “terrifying images of war” is not so much “to frighten people away from seeking involvement in foreign conflict” but rather is intended “to stimulate the dangerous emotion of fear so that it may be overcome” (106) and to call attention to “human powerlessness in the face of dangerous contradictions,” to remind his audience that “zeal and honor are essential to spiritual strength,” and to direct his audience’s “capacity for zeal and honor away from any earthly response to war (fear, recklessness, etc.) and toward conformity with the will of God” (107–08). Examines Donne’s complicated and often internally conflicted treatment of war in *HSBatter*, “The Tale of a Citizen and His Wife,” *Wall*, *Wing*, and *ElWar*, and especially in *Calm* and *Storm*. Concludes that Donne’s war poetry requires the reader “to reflect on human weakness and vanity, the agony of a mind that seeks conflict because it cannot be at peace with itself, the frailty of the human body and the machinery by which it extends itself, the frippery that is war, and the prison that is peace.” Says it also “asks the reader not to praise living people and rejoice in their courage but to look upon war as the product of a complex of human flaws and despair” (124).


In a collection of 12 broadsheets. An original poem in imitation of *Goodf*.


In response to Fetzer’s essay (*Connotations* 17, no. 1 [2007/2008]: 1–13), points out Donne’s familiarity with theatrical performances and his many personal connections with the public theater and with playwrights and actors. Observes how Donne often uses theatrical images in his sermons, although he does not make “specific allusions to particular plays or theatrical details” (11). In support of this claim, cites examples from several sermons. Maintains, however, that these theatrical allusions “do not suggest advocacy of the theater,” that they “do not even plead tolerance,” and that they sometimes occur in contexts describing disreputable behavior.” Maintains that they “indicate an expectation on his part that his listeners would be familiar with the theater and understand allusive images drawn from it” (13).


Maintains that Donne “never wrote or preached war sermons as such” but that “[h]is interest lied primarily in the metaphoric reference to the theme of war as the embodiment of divine punishment against sin.” Discusses how in a number of his sermons preached between 1615 and 1615 Donne “highlighted the ongoing contest between war and peace, using
as scriptural references several wars depicted in the Old Testament” and “particularly drew from the prophetic books where Isaiah (13:34) or Ezechiel (38–39) for instance depicted war as the final contest between good and evil announcing the coming of a messianic figure,” thereby emphasizing “the terrifying nature of warfare as a deadly process” and dwelling on “the theological dimension of the threat of war made to David interpreting it as the expression of God’s scourge intended for sinful men” (55).

Observes how, in several of his sermons, Donne “strove to depict as vividly as possible the never-ending human war against the supreme enemy, that is sin” (59) as well as “the fight of the believer against temptation and death,” exhorting sinners “to behave as a warrior shielded with the words of God” (62). Maintains that Donne’s purpose in the sermons was “to exhort his congregation to repentance and faith in the promise of a better future for those who lived in faith and followed Christ’s example” (66). Concludes that over a period of twenty years Donne’s sermons “harped upon the idea that the wars fought by devout Christians should be continuous and fierce for they were inner wars against evil” (67).


Maintains that Donne’s conversion from Catholicism to Protestantism “seems to have been sincere” and “was certainly final” (71) but that this “does not preclude an ongoing interest in confessional change as a subject of speculation, an object of representation, and as...a model for expression” seen most clearly in his religious poems. Suggests that Donne, although stable in his own “devotional loyalties,” was “imaginatively compelled by movement between Christian churches because, in considering and describing this movement, he finds an ideal way to combine devotional certainty with spiritual inscrutability, conviction with concealment” (72). Points out that Donne did not leave a detailed account of his own conversion and that all we have are a few autobiographical comments at the beginning of Pseudo-Martyr, comments in which he “consistently avoids unequivocal statements of the truth or persuasiveness of Protestant doctrine, or of the tenets of his own belief” but rather “offers statements of seemingly calculated inconclusiveness” (80). Suggests that “the confessional equivocations” in Pseudo-Martyr “echo the ambiguous devotional language” of Lit, written about the same time (81). Discusses Sat3 as “the earliest and in some ways clearest example” of Donne’s poetical approach “to religious choice and change” (82) but that here too he avoids “any final denomination” (91) and implies that “religious choices are, finally, best, or only articulated obliquely” (91–92). Maintains that the “lack of precision and specificity” makes Donne’s devotional lyrics “a powerful expression of one of his most deeply held beliefs: that it is a Christian’s obligation first to seek out the ‘truth,’ and then to keep that truth from view” (95). Discusses Christ as “the latest, murkiest, and most moving of Donne’s poetic evocations of devotional mutability” (99). Concludes that Donne “insists on conversion as the source of individual spiritual authenticity” but that “by enfolding that truth in the ‘middle nature’ of verse, in the twilight of trope,” he also “asserts his belief that the truth, once found, must remain hidden for each of us, and from all of us” (104).

Reviews:

• Alex Davis in MLR 106, no. 3 (2011): 855–56.

1610. Najbauer, Noémi M. “‘We’ll build in sonnets pretty rooms’: Mnemotechnic and John Donne’s La Corona.” Ars Aeterna 1, no. 2: 94–102.

Presents a mnemotechnical reading of Corona, maintaining that the art of memory is “an illuminating way of reading” Donne’s sonnet cycle (94). Observes that “[t]hough aware of the fallen nature of memory, Donne insisted that remembering God’s mercies throughout salvational history will shape our present and decide our future.” Discusses, therefore, how
“mnemotechnic becomes an aid to devotion” in *Corona* (102).


Observes that Essays “contain no discussion about preparation for the ministry” but that, “in fact, there is a strong internal evidence that in writing the work, Donne thought of himself as a layman venturing into exegesis” (1–2). Reads Essays, therefore, in this light, situating the work “in the context of devotional writing by other lay gentlemen” of the time. Maintains that doing so is “not to call into question that he was contemplating the ministry” but that it does, however, “show that however distinctive the workings of his mind and pen, Donne’s pre-ordination interest in religious topics fits established patterns and his decision about a church career reflects a mix of pragmatism and religious commitment that was not unusual among gentlemen who negotiated the demands of secular and sacred in early Stuart London.” Holds that in Essays Donne claims “the authority not of the insider, whether clergy or lay, but of one who speaks, like the apostle Paul, with the authority of personal study and hard-won experience” (4). Points out how Donne’s theological views reflect “what it meant to be a well-educated and well-born layman: such a man might well have a learned acquaintance with religious matters; that interest might derive from piety but also might also have secular motives; such a person was technically a private man, with no public standing to speak; but he might well be more learned (and better born) than his parish minister” (7). Discusses how Essays “fits comfortably within the literary culture of lay gentlemen, participating in shared conventions of genre, method, topic, and voice” (11). Observes that Donne “nowhere in the Essays directly deliberates about his own clerical vocation” and that if we did not know about his “imminent ordination,” Essays “could as easily be seen as the scriptural expositions of a gentleman amateur” (26). Concludes that whether or not Donne “was using the Essays to explore his vocation for ministry in the institutional church,” he “does finally imagine himself into a sort of role that transcends the lay/clerical distinction, thereby offering an original, ingenious solution to the problem of the status of lay meditations” (29).


Discusses the use of epitaphic material by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers. Points out that in *Noct* Donne calls himself an epitaph and claims that this is “one of the most ingenious metaphorical applications of the word in the period, in that it inverts the normal association of an epitaph marking a dead body by proclaiming a living body already an epitaph” (12). Notes Donne’s use of it again in *Para*. Calls the long section on Donne’s “funeral, burial, statue and memorial verse” in Walton’s *Lives* “the most ‘poetic’ epitaph” in his volume (107).


Examines “modes of textual sociability” (98) in Donne’s epistolary poems to his male friends. Observes how these poems are “directed towards exploring and imagining forms of communal male creativity, the much-desired yet conflicted and intense creative contracts between men within the literary environment fostered by the Inns of Court.” Explains how the poems are “highly self-conscious studies of friendship,” in which Donne expresses “not simply friendship, but its promises, pledges and bonds” (100). Maintains that Donne’s “experiments with the idiom of friendship in his verses addressed to friends suggests the
ways in which this language both arises out of and imagines quite specific writing practices and environments: those of the literary life of groups of people involved in manuscript exchange and circulation” (102). Comments specifically on *ILRoll* and on poems addressed to Rowland and Thomas Woodward.


Briefly comments on Donne’s references to biblical women in his sermons, especially Deborah, Hannah, and Miriam. Observes how Donne “aligns Deborah’s voice with God’s own and presents her as a record of sacred loyalties” and uses her song “to incite his parishioner’s devotion” (92). Records Donne’s great admiration for Hannah and how he views her behavior as “an example of extreme devotion” and elevates her “to the status on par with the Apostles” because of her “endurance of shame” (54), aligning her with the humble Protestant clergy in contrast to corrupt Catholic priests. Points out how Donne substitutes the name Mary for Miriam, which is “supported by biblical texts.” Notes also that “this interpretation provides a more respectable Old Testament source for those Protestant Marys who had likely been named for a Catholic queen” (14).


In Korean. Maintains that for most Korean students unfamiliar with the Bible and Christianity, the religious poems of Donne and Herbert are difficult to understand not only because they require an understanding of the poems’ complex syntax, diction, and metaphysical conceits but also because of “the deeply biblical images, metaphors, and allusions.” Discusses, as an example, the Christian concept of salvation and how Donne and Herbert differ in their understanding of this fundamental concept. Maintains that, for Donne, “salvation does not seem to be a free gift” but rather “is something of which he is not sure until the last moment of his life,” whereas, for Herbert, salvation “is something he approaches with certainty.” Believes that an explanation of this basic Christian concept helps students to understand better the religious poetry of the seventeenth century. (From the abstract)


One of three essays on Donne and June Wayne presented at the 2009 John Donne Society Conference. Discusses Wayne’s several lithographic representations of *SunRis* and shows how the lithographs, though different, are “responsive to the imagery at the heart” of Donne’s poem (225). Shows how the lithographs capture the “hyperbolic unworldliness” of *SunRis* (221) and “put the lovers front, center, and above” everything else (226).


1618. Parsons, Charles H. “Holy Sonnets of John Donne; Winter Words; Purcell Realizations; Folksong Arrangements.” *American Record Guide* 72, no. 5: 77.

Reviews piano music releases composed by Benjamin Britten and performed by Mark Padmore and Roger Vignoles, including the *Holy Sonnets*.

Points out that *Ecst* is generally considered Donne's most subtle and sophisticated argument concerning the metaphysics of love. Discusses how in the poem Donne argues that the body is indispensable to the soul in its attempts to achieve the Neoplatonic ideal of the total merger of the two lovers. Presents an analysis of the poem in the light of its intricate argument. Notes that often there an element of amusement in Donne's treatment of love.


Briefly comments on the professionalization of literary study in recent years by comparing Cleanth Brooks's *The Well Wrought Urn* (1947) and Ramie Targoff's *John Donne, Body and Soul* (2008). Maintains that Brooks “wrote for a mixed audience—academics, students, the general reader—and his book makes you want to read Donne, or read more Donne, or re-read Donne with greater understanding,” whereas Targoff “writes for other scholars of early modern English literature”; thus “unless one has esoteric religious and philosophical interests, the experience of reading her book will not quicken one's interest in reading Donne's poetry.” Concludes that “literary studies have become professionalized in the sense of becoming closed to outsiders” (850).


One of three essays on Donne and June Wayne presented at the 2009 John Donne Society Conference. Discusses the art of lithography and, in particular, Wayne's role in “resuscitating lithography as a serious art form” (209). Comments on the variety, wit, exuberance, and depth of her illustrations of Donne's love poems in *John Donne Songs & Sonets livre d'artist* (1959). Points out how Wayne's lithographs are “inwardly infused, strong, striking responses to an image or an idea often at the heart of Donne's lyric” (216).


Unfavorably reviews a film on Donne by Simon Schama that aired on BBC2 on 26 May 2009 in which Schama and Fiona Shaw, along with John Carey, read and discussed Donne's poetry. Points out how, “like almost all attempts to make television out of poetry, this one also had some wilfully silly aspects.” Comments also on C. H. Sisson's “A Letter to John Donne” from the early 1960s in which Sisson records Donne's “presence at Sevenoaks in 1617, when he preached at the church and was entertained at Knole” (6).


Maintains that although some modern critics see the *Holy Sonnets* as “tokens of Donne's depressing and anxiety-prone religion and have tried to diagnose Donne with various mental illnesses or religious delusions” (31), Donne himself regarded his religious melancholy as “potentially redemptive” (33–34) and saw it as “mixed with joy and hope” (34). Surveys various views on and understanding of melancholy in the early modern period, noting how modern critics “have focused largely on the negative aspects of this ambiguous phenomenon” (35). Points out how Donne distinguishes between “a productive, potentially redemptive melancholy, and a negative, corrupting melancholy” and claims that, for him, “the task of determining whether his melancholy is redemptive or destructive is generally quite vexing” (39). Maintains that Donne often seeks emotional suffering because of his desire to follow “a tradition that goes back to the Church Fathers and even to Christ himself” (44); because he believes that “fear and sadness are useful for leading the sinner to repentance” (45); and because he sees fear and joy as “inextricably intertwined” and holds that “if one cultivates
a healthy amount of either, one cannot lack the other.” Points out that Donne explains that “suffering itself is not the aim and goal in his religious devotion” but rather that he “seeks what emerges from suffering” (47). Maintains that, for Donne, “the path to glory is not a continual sadness” but that he sees how “unhappiness can lead the soul to an awareness that he needs God’s grace.” For him, “grief is only the first step in a long journey towards heaven—towards emotional comfort, glory, joy, and peace.” Believes that the Holy Sonnets “represent that first step” (51).


Briefly discusses the indebtedness of the Satyres to Persius. Observes how in the five poems Donne “explores three interrelated topics: how he should write Christian satire, and how he should live an effective Christian life both inwardly and in dealing with the world(s) around him.” Notes that, as a Christian, Donne “learns to acknowledge his own sinful failures, to accept God’s grace and forgiveness, and to persevere in life’s struggles without losing either heart or soul; he learns to hate the sin but love the sinner.” Points out that Donne’s “Christian beliefs and loyalties are tested to the bone by the Catholic-Protestant split” and “hence the special tightrope-walking intensity” in Sat3, his poem that “comes closest to Persius in style and thought” (2). Maintains that, like Persius, Donne in the Satyres “plays brilliantly with the different voices that he dramatizes,” noting how “much of the mimicry and fun emerges as we read them aloud” (3). Believes that, knowing Donne’s life and later works, it is uncertain just how seriously one can take his seeming “struggle for integrity” in the Satyres (4).


Applies “the concept of anamorphosis to the logical structures” of two of Donne’s poems, thereby extending “the concept of anamorphosis from the visual peculiarity of an obscured image whose revelation requires finding an eccentric point of view to the epistemological process experienced by the viewer.” Maintains that “even in the absence of explicit references to perspective, seeing, or painting, a text may nevertheless operate according to the rules of anamorphic logic and rhetoric.” Presents a detailed analysis of the “complex argument” of Ecst and the “sparking drama” of MHPaper (abstract) to show how in Donne’s poetry “anamorphosis operates on a subtle level that involves not only imagery but also the logic of the poet’s thought and often the course of the readers’ interpretation, both inside and outside the text.” Maintains that in Ecst “the anamorphic duality is recollected and narrated,” whereas in MHPaper it is “enacted and explicated.” Explains how in Ecst “the logical structure of the poetic argument may evoke or follow the mechanism of an anamorphic experience” and how the verse letter “takes the translation of an anamorphic experience from visual to verbal even further because, as a text, this poem displays a distinctive self-awareness that is crucial to the poem’s fantastical plot and that is analogous to the visual makeup of anamorphosis” (153).


A biography of Donne, based on Bald (1970), divided into 11 chapters. In the last chapter, “A mine of rich and pregnant fancy: Afterlife” (135–39) presents a brief survey of Donne’s reputation as a poet from his own time to the present day. Cites Helen Gardner, R. C. Bald, and John Carey as major figures in twentieth-century Donnean scholarship and suggests that interest in Donne “shows no signs of abating” (139). Concludes with a list of Donne’s works that are quoted in the study and used “to throw light” on Donne’s life (140–41); a short list of further reading suggestions (142); and a
biographical note on the author (143).


Illustrates how Donne, as a preacher, “unites the parishioner, awakened by the use of the vernacular languages and activated by the ‘common’ prayer, with the preacher of the new religion, in a communicational dyad of hearing and speaking” and how he “compares notes about God with a congregation which is still to some extent moving from the context of the ‘old’ religion (that is, Catholicism) to the ‘new’ Protestant faith.” Examines how Donne “presents his arguments,” and, in particular, looks at “his delicate re-creation of a sense of God’s providence, even in the face of political, religious and cosmological challenges to the older view of a stable universe” (152). Maintains that Donne, “by intervening in the chain of cultural memory, redefines some of the familiar concepts and metaphors of the old religion within the new, Reformed context” (152–53). Supports this thesis by discussing four of Donne’s Christmas sermons, in which he is “especially concerned with the reception of God’s word—and the verbalization of faith” (155). Discusses how Donne employs “his rhetoric and his metaphorical language to both illustrate and facilitate the conceptual changes required of the believer in order to encompass the new religion” and how he uses “familiar language and concepts, but redefines them in the new ontological framework” (165).


Maintains that Donne “includes in his writing an element of allegorical fiction, building on the themes of legends and on narratives of men of magic and power—or in pursuit thereof—in order to show his own struggle against human weakness.” Argues that “on one level of his narration, Donne assumes the role of a lover, or of a Prospero, in order to rule the world with words (magic).” Observes, however, that Donne can only do this “as a kind of role-play” since “as a man—especially as a man of the Church—he cannot usurp the power that ultimately belongs to God” (164). Holds, in other words, that “by creating an alternative level of reading, Donne (re-)negotiates his own position in the universe” and that “by maintaining the allegorical framework, particularly in his writings on his near-death experience, Donne creates an illusory world in which he can reach into, and make sense of, his inner chaos” (164–65). Believes that “through the manifestations of this created world, then, Donne adds another layer of experience—and truth—to the narrative of death, surrender and loss of soul.” Discusses how “in his texts, while pursing (hidden) knowledge to control the world, Donne recurrently employs the metaphorical framework of exploration, mapping, cosmology and science on his pursuit of the world beyond the borders of the physical universe” (165) and how he uses exploration “as metaphor for the control over his own soul as well as the new world as a setting for his power struggle with God” (166). Points out how Donne compares his struggles to those of Job. Illustrates these observations by discussing Devotions, HSLittle, Res, Goodf and Sickness, showing how finally “the fictional Donne of the poetry and the Devotions, like Prospero, surrenders his (imagined) powers and remains face-to-face with his God” (178).


Maintains that the experience of death can be a moral educator. Discusses, as an example, “Meditation XVII” from Devotions. Believes that the meditation “inculcates a profound
moral lesson—we all share a similar hour with the grim reaper, and in standing with all who face it, we embolden humanity to affirm the value and worth of being human.”


Discusses how “the complex imbrication of soul and body articulated at length in early modern physiology” makes possible “a world where bodies could be imagined to speak and think, where blood could be characterised as eloquent.” Shows how “this metaphoric stance, which seems like the epitome of poetic fancy, derives at least in part from a particular set of physiological assumptions that Donne inherits, and invests with breathtaking vitality.” Notes how throughout his life Donne was “fascinated and troubled by the relationship between bodies and souls” (145). Observes how Donne “sometimes used aspects of contemporary body-soul theory with irreverent precision, turning their philosophical perplexities into a dialectical pretext for erotic seduction” and how he also “used the anxious installation of a core self within the gregarious and vulnerable material of sentient, passionate flesh to produce poetry endowed with unique dramatic immediacy and carnal urgency.” Discusses Donne’s “evolving attitude” to pre-Cartesian physiology (146) as reflected especially in Paradoxes; SecAn; and several poems from Songs and Sonnets, especially Air and Triple. Maintains that Donne’s “particularly aggressive and ingenious take on this physiology betrays the decidedly physical underpinnings of an aesthetic that would come to be called metaphysical poetry” and also that it is “one of the central sources of the deep and abiding pleasure of reading Donne” (157).


Points out that, for Donne, having an immortal soul is good, but that it also exposes one to sin, citing HWKiss (ll. 39–42) and HSMin (ll. 1–4) as examples. Notes that although Donne regards man as superior to beasts, he sees the
distinction as somewhat ambiguous.


Argues that Donne’s sermon on Psalm 6:6–7, preached before Charles I in 1628 on the Saturday before Palm Sunday, is “influenced by its occasion and suggests a political intentionality” in it (58). Maintains that although the sermon “may be counsel” for the people in Donne’s audience, one must remember that the king was “part of that audience” and that the sermon is “specifically delivered before the king, and it is 1628,” a time when there was “much afoot politically for the king to acknowledge, over which to humiliate himself, to correct his pride, to act as a ‘King over Subjects’” (65). Comments on the political maneuvers of Charles before and at this time and suggests, therefore, that Donne in his sermon is suggesting “to this autocratic king a confession of ‘sins’ to God at this most special of religious times [Passion Week], though humiliation be exposed, though deprecation be involved, though repentance for one’s past actions be shown” (65).


One of four essays presented on *ValBook* at a colloquium held at the 2008 John Donne Society Conference. Offers “some observations and tentative conclusions” (251) about the text of *ValBook*, having collated 35 texts of the poem, including 24 manuscripts and 7 seventeenth-century printed editions. Lists and comments on a number of “interesting and potentially significant variants,” suggests “some possible implications,” and concludes with “a brief discussion of possible copy texts” (256). Believes that manuscript DT1 (Trinity College, Dublin) is the most likely choice for the copy text of the poem but looks forward “to seeing what the editors of the *Variorum* do with the poem” (261). See also essays by Raymond-Jean Frontain, Julie W. Yen, and Margaret Downs-Gamble.


In response to Fetzer’s essay (Connotations 17, no. 1 [2007–2008]: 1–13), expresses reservations about Fetzer’s comments on “the experiential affect of audiences at a theater or in church” and her view concerning the trope of “exemplarity” (14). Distinguishes between typology and exemplarity and maintains that Donne is “doing more than offering himself as a consoling exemplar, at once God’s representative and an ordinary sinner”; rather he is “appealing to the typological imagination of his auditor, inviting them to see themselves as providentially interpellated.” Shows how “the idea of providential interpellation encouraged by typological tropes differs from Fetzer’s notion of theatrical re-enactment” (18). Wonders also “how appreciation of the materiality of Donne’s voice might affect Fetzer’s analysis of his theatricality” (19) and perhaps supplement and support her analysis of Donne’s sermons as “re-enactments of the Word” (20).


Maintains that Donne and the Prophets “seem to share an aesthetics of exaggeration, turbulence, immensity, grandeur, misshapen forms, distorted perspectives, sudden angles, shock and trompe l’oeil effects,” or, in other words, “the aesthetics of the baroque” (126). Believes that it is a “disrespect for the decorum of the ‘is’ and ‘is like’ that seems to make Donne most like the Prophets.” Points out how the prophetic corpus contains many “metaphysical conceits” (129) and how prophetic literature, like Donne’s poetry, “actively seeks out a poet-
ics of violation” in which “language goes astray, sense is violated, and fidelity to logic is broken” (130). Observes also that Donne’s poetry, like the writings of the Prophets, “combines God and sex and perversions/abnormalities of the body” (131), how in both “the vulnerability of the body coalesces around the central figure of the violated female body” (132), and how both exercise a “masculine persuasive force” (134). Discusses also how the Prophets and Donne “split identity and security and send meaning ricocheting in all directions in ingenious tricks of language” (135). Holds that “the concept of the ‘metaphysical’ conceit and the strange Donne-Prophets analogy can help us to articulate the logic of prophetic literature as a particular aesthetic bound to a particular theology: an understanding of the divine as that made elusively manifest in radical contortions of the word” (139–40).


In Korean. Comments on how in his love poems Donne uses imagery from the new science and the geography of his time to describe love and passion, such as the telescope, compass, magnet, etc., and how he rejects the idealism of Petrarchism and persuades women addressed in his poems with logical discourse. Points out that his language is colloquial and like dialogues from a drama. Suggests that such imagery and language made Donne an attractive model for modern poets. (From the abstract)


In the “Introduction” ([ix]-xxxii), mentions Donne’s appreciative comments on the translation in Sidney and suggests that his poems were influenced by it. Reproduces Sidney ([3]-4) and, in an explanatory note ([287], comments briefly on Donne’s poem.


Comments briefly on HSDeath, calling the sonnet “a masterpiece of technique” and noting how its verse form is “handled effortlessly and compacts a great deal of meaning into a short space” (83). Maintains that there is “intelligence and emotion at work here, but the intelligence, and the craftsmanship that manifests it, are entirely at the service of feelings that drive the poem.” Claims that the sonnet “works because of the shared understanding that most readers will have of the cultural and religious context, even if they do not actually share the same belief system” (84).


Proposes “to isolate the psychological contexts” of the Holy Sonnets “by relating them to the early modern discourse on the passions.” Maintains that in order to understand “the pathos” of the poems, one needs “to consider the advice on how to handle violent emotions in such treatises as Thomas Wright’s The Passions of the Minde in Generall (1604) and Edward Reynolds’s A Treatise of the Passions and Faculties of the Soule of Man (1640)” (159). Discusses how the Holy Sonnets “reflect not only on the problem of passion” but also “on the problem of representing passion.” Points out how in Donne’s time, there was “a widespread belief” that emotional outbursts “could not only disturb one’s peace of mind but could also cause outbreaks of disease in the body.” Suggests, therefore, that, because of the expression of such excessive emotion in the Holy Sonnets, reading them “put the reader at risk” (160). Observes that, from a contemporary point of view, even if Donne “was inflicting pain on his readers for their own good,” he was still
“gambling with their health, since it was generally considered far more dangerous to give free vent to one’s tears and fears than to repress them.” Concludes that “whether or not Donne intended his poems to have such a disturbing effect, the fact remains that they do have the power to shake the reader’s nerves” (188).


Discusses the prevalence of the uses of green in literary works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, noting Donne’s playful use of green in *Commun* and in *EpEliz*.


Surveys the development of and new trends in devotional poetry in England following the Protestant Reformation and suggests that this poetry, in fact, gave birth to modern poetry. Maintains that the influence of the Reformation not only had a profound influence on the religious sensibility of the poets of the time but also brought about an enrichment of poetic language. Discusses how English reformation poetry focuses on the individual as a temple of the Holy Spirit and how it is greatly shaped by the Bible as the Word of God. Claims that it was not until the seventeenth century that the influence of the Reformation appears in English devotional poetry, citing, in particular the metaphysical poets as examples. Briefly mentions Donne throughout as an example of the new poetry, stressing the subjectivity of his poems and prose.


Notes that the purpose of this study is to assist students in their understanding of set texts on the HSC Advanced English syllabus for 2009 and subsequent years. Divides the section on Donne into two parts: (1) presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne followed by critical commentary and questions on *HSDeath, HSScene, HSRound, HSMin, Sickness*, *ValMourn, Appar, Relic*, and *SunRis* (119–25), and (2) presents an analysis of Margaret Edson’s *W;t* and suggests connections between the play and Donne’s poems, focusing primarily on the nature of wit (125–29).


Argues that Donne’s epigram *Martial* is not only an attack on Matthew Raderus, a Jesuit priest who bowdlerized Martial’s epigrams but also “encapsulates the attacks” Donne made in *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Ignatius* against the Jesuits in general for “overstepping the bounds of religion and meddling in politics” and that furthermore l. 3 is a “veiled” rebuke of the English monarchy and its abuse of religion (93). Comments on the “complex interplay” between the two “halves” of *Martial* that allows Donne “to take aim at more than one target” and, at the same time, “makes it impossible for the reader to identify any one of these targets with certainty” (101). Illustrates the point by discussing various possibilities for identifying the reference to “Katherine” in the last line of the epigram and suggests that very likely it refers to King James. Believes that “the ridicule of Raderus, and the Jesuits, deflects the blow against the English monarch” and that “the use of the name Katherine complicates and even covers over any critique of James” but that “the satire of the new king and his royal court is no less present” (112). Concludes, therefore, that *Martial* “appears to be Donne’s initial blow in a critique of James and his court that would not cease even with the publication of his more celebrated and seemingly pro-monarchical works of 1610 [*Pseudo-martyr*] and 1611 [*Ignatius*]” (113). In Appendix 1 (114–15), presents “a table of the poems and verses from D. R. Shackleton Bailey’s *M. Valerii Martianis Epigrammata* (Stuttgardt: Teubner, 1990) that are not found in Matthew Raderus’s *M. Valeriis Martianis Epi-
grammaton Libri XIV (Ingolstadt: Adam Sartorius, 1602)” (114); and in Appendix 2 (116–18), offers a sampling of poems not found in Rade- rus’s M. Valeriis Martialis Epigrammaton Libri XVI with prose translations.


In Chinese. Argues that the Holy Sonnets are “rooted in” the Penitential Psalms and notes, for example, how HSBatter can be read as “a variant” on Psalm 102. Discusses common elements between the Holy Sonnets and the Penitential Psalms and suggests how Donne’s expression of his feelings, thoughts, and problems in the sonnets is influenced by the psalms. Notes also a similarity between the sequential pattern of the Holy Sonnets and that of the Penitential Psalms. (From the abstract)


Points out difficulties in producing a good edition of Donne’s letters—“one that establishes the canon, dates, recipients, and texts that accurately represent what Donne wrote.” Examines “the texts of the two letters that survive in holograph as well as in various seventeenth-century printings (letters to Edward Herbert and Lady Kingsmill) as well as one to the Duke of Buckingham that survives in holograph and in nineteenth-century transcriptions and printings” to show “how editorial intervention and physical degradation have so compromised the texts of some of the letters in Donne’s Letters to Severall Persons of Honour (1651) and A Collection of Letters, Made by Sir Tobie Mathews (1660) and even in the holograph to Buckingham that the surviving texts (including their dates and recipients) of nearly all of Donne’s letters is problematical.” Points out that “the evidence shows that the changes to the originals would not have been recoverable had these few holographs not survived.” Concludes, therefore, that any edition of Donne’s letters “will have to attend to risk assessment as well as to the traditional features of an edition” (433). (This essay is part of a panel cluster on the forthcoming Oxford edition of Donne’s letters. See also essays by Dennis Flynn, Margaret Maurer, and M. Thomas Hester.)


Unfavorably reviews a film on Donne by Simon Schama that aired on BBC2 on 26 May 2009 in which Schama and Fiona Shaw, along with John Carey, read and discussed Donne’s poetry.


Presents a close reading of four of the Holy Sonnets in the light of contemporary meditational practices, especially those popularized by The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola and by Meditations on the Life of Christ by Johannes de Caulibus. Shows how each of the sonnets is, in fact, a poetic record of meditative prayer and discusses the interdependence of poetry and meditation.


Points out that HSDeath may owe something to “An Exhortation against the Fear of Death” (sometimes attributed to Thomas Cranmer) in the Anglican Book of Homilies (first published in 1574). In the sermon, death is said to be not dreadful and mighty and should not be feared. Notes that “similarity of subject matter might make occasional similarity of expression unremarkable” but that “the cumulative evidence suggests the parallels may not be accidental.” Observes that “the eloquent parallel passages
are so closely concentrated in the first part of this sermon that Donne could have been struck by them as a cluster which he could develop more tersely and tellingly for his own purposes” (76).


Briefly surveys the development of love poetry, especially during the Renaissance, and comments on how Donne in the Songs and Sonnets “adds further richness” to the genre. Points out how Donne considers “varied degrees of love” and how he often protests against “medieval artifices” and replaces Petrarchan sentimentality with “urgent persuasiveness of passion” (28). Maintains that, through “modulations of moods,” Donne explores “the truth of lust and love” and often attempts to “transcend sex” in order to achieve the “wholeness of fleshly consummation where the corporeal and the intellectual become one” (28–29). Claims that “this specific feature raises him and the 'lover' in his poetry from the level of a sensualist to the level of a mystic.” Points out, however, that sometimes Donne can be “quite unromantic” and can take delight in mocking “the Petrarchan doctrine of eternal faithfulness.” Calls Val-Mourn a poem of “remarkable sincerity” (29), praises Flea for its artful persuasiveness, and maintains that the “surprising authenticity of emotion” in Donne's poems makes them “perennially enjoyable” (30). Concludes that Donne is “an impulsive poet whose erudition and wit come in harmony with his feelings” (31).


Comments on Donne's preoccupation with death in his poetry and prose. Discusses how Donne is for Grace Jantzen, especially in her book Becoming Divine (1988), “the epitome of the masculinist symbolic she describes and seeks to disrupt,” not only because of “his thorough preoccupation with death” but “in other ways too.” Maintains that Donne's poetry and sermons “profoundly bear out” Jantzen's belief that Western theology and tradition are “obsessed with death and other worlds, a violent obsession that is interwoven with a masculinist drive for mastery” (57). Admits, however, that she is “also captured by Donne's passion and the way he struggles to understand himself and his relation to God and Jesus Christ.” Holds that Donne is “one of the greatest theorists of desire to write in English” and that, therefore, “he repays scrutiny as such.” Examines “selected extracts from Donne's work to illustrate how he would be well within Jantzen's sights as confirming and extending the Western masculinist symbolic—in three different areas: his writing about love, sex, and women; his preoccupation with death; his concern for the soul and anticipation of the after-life” (58). Concludes, however, that reading Donne stimulated her—“intellectually, spiritually and physically—to become divine, in ways other to that proposed by Jantzen” but acknowledges she “continues to be challenged and stimulated by Becoming Divine” (68).


Discusses the rise and transformation of the English elegy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a result of England's protracted transition from Catholicism to Protestantism. Contrasts the Renaissance elegy with the medieval English elegy. Maintains that elegies “began to proliferate as Protestant reformers worked to root out vestiges” of the Catholic practice of intercession for the dead and prayers to the saints. Observes, in other words, how elegies “acted as substitutes for prayers for the dead and to the saints” and “took over the social functions, although not the eschatological functions, of Catholic forms and practices rejected by Protestantism” (446). Briefly comments on the elegies on Donne attached to the first edition of his poems, especially Carew's
elegy, pointing out how it concludes with an epitaph, a classical precedent, that replaces the traditional Catholic petitionary ending and how apostrophe replaces endolopeia. Also briefly comments on Donne’s view of saints as reflected in the Anniversaries. Concludes that the rise of the elegy in Renaissance England “constitutes a collective poetic phenomenon of imposing proportions, a phenomenon whose exemplars include some of the finest and most interesting poems of the age” (458–59) and that, in fact, the development of the Renaissance elegy was “one of the major literary consequences of the English Reformation and it was shaped in fundamental ways by religious struggles over death and the dead” (459).


Briefly comments on Storm and Calm, noting how in each poem Donne “expresses the accidents of war in a mixture of military and philosophical registers.” Points out that Storm was “popular with contemporary readers eager for its glamorous combination of eyewitness account and vigorous, ‘masculine’ verse style found in the rhythmical strength and daring of its syntax” (103). Observes how Calm “lingers over the details of intense tropical heat which turned Donne’s swimming comrades into ‘parboyl’d wretches’” (104).


Discusses the prevalence of sighs and tears in Donne’s poetry and shows how “several paradoxes and problems attend these expressions.” Argues that Donne’s “acute understanding of the potential duplicity of female weeping helps to mark his poetry as superior” and that “his ‘fresh inventions’ on the theme amount to another sort of costly signal—they evince an intellect correlating to high mating fitness” (331). Points out that “since most crying is consciously uncontrollable and therefore genuine, it usually betokens real pain; hence, the ability to fake it is a premium skill.” Observes that typically in Donne’s poetry it is women “who dissemble” (332). Comments on Donne’s uses of tears and sighs in Sappho, ValWeep, LovInf, Twick, ElNat, ElPerf, and Canon. Compares Donne to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, noting how both were “well-versed in Spanish literature, attracted and repelled by court, deeply yet idiosyncratically Christian, and baroque iconoclasts” (338).


Presents an introduction to Donne’s life and works, surveys his critical reputation, and comments on general characteristics of his poetry. Analyzes four poems: ValMourn, calling it “not only one of Donne’s most popular works but also one of his most representative” (707); Flea, calling the ingenuity of the poem “remarkable” (708); HSBatter, noting Donne’s uses of paradox and argumentative wit; and Sickness, observing how it reflects the wide range of Donne’s intellectual interests. Concludes with a brief summary, a selected bibliography, and discussion questions.


In Chinese. Observes how Donne’s love poems fall into two conflicting categories: those that are positive and those that are negative about love. Relates Donne’s contradictory concept of love to his change in religion from Catholic to Anglican, from a libertine to a respected clergyman, and also to the many frustrations in his life.

1657. Yamamoto, Chizuko. [The Worldliness of the

Considers whether or not Donne had freed himself from worldly love when he composed his religious poems. Maintains that Donne found it impossible to rid himself completely of sensual love, even after his ordination to the priesthood, but that he prayed that it would somehow be purified by God's “fiery zeal.”


One of four essays on ValBook presented at a colloquium held at the 2008 John Donne Society Conference. Discusses approaches to teaching ValBook in an undergraduate course. Presents a stanza-by-stanza interpretation of the poem, pointing out major critical issues and relating the poem to the lives of the students. See also essays by D. Audell Shelburne, Raymond-Jean Frontain, and Margaret Downs-Gamble.


Argues that the “characteristic tension” in Donne’s poetry “arises from a man with a Catholic imagination who is striving to reinvent religious truth on his own terms” and that it is “in this respect that his treatment of religion is analogous to, as well as intertwined with, his treatment of erotic love,” a love which moves from “something essentially social and feudal to something private and modern” (65). Observes how Donne writes poems that are “both irreverent and risqué parodies of Christian devotion and also solemn celebrations of ideal love” (68). Finds in the Holy Sonnets Donne’s remaining uncertainty and his “doubts, or at least his ambivalence about the nature of the Church and his place in it.” Maintains that, to the end, Donne “seems not to have found a wholly satisfying answer to the crisis of author-


Discusses how the images used by Donne in HSDoDeath and Herbert in “Death” “contribute to the idea that death is not an end of life but a middle stage between the life on Earth and the everlasting life when people are brought back to the creator” (535). Observes that Donne in his poem “insults death” and “wants to tell it clearly that his life is in his hands” and that “when death comes he will remain calm because there is nothing fearful” since “people are stronger than death because they will live forever while death dies.” Points out that Herbert, however, is “not so radical when talking about death” and uses images to show how death “was before and after the death of Christ,” thus seeing death as “something pleasant and peaceful after the
sacrifice of Christ” that engenders “respect for death.” Concludes, therefore, that both poets “did not fear death because they believed in the concept of an afterlife” but that each of them in his own way used images of death “to show that there is no reason to fear” (537).


In Chinese. Maintains that the biblical influence on Donne’s love poems has been underrated and argues that an awareness of this influence is important in understanding his love poetry. Points out how, in many of his love poems, Donne seeks a combination of sexual and spiritual love. Believes that Donne’s “uniqueness lies in his intense analysis of his spiritual experience—the desire to be purged of sinfulness and the longing to defeat mortality by God’s grace and mercy.” Claims, therefore, that Donne’s “eagerness to become holy is the brightest element of his love poems” (266). (From the abstract)


In Chinese. Briefly comments on Donne’s uses of wit in his love poetry as seen in his conceits, dramatic arguments, and themes. Maintains that through his ingenuity Donne combines passion and thought. Comments on lines from *ValMourn, Flea, SunRis,* and *Canon.* Notes that Donne provides the reader with “a kaleidoscope of love, through which the varieties and complexities of love are presented from different points of view” (245).


In Chinese. Using the theory of “defamiliarization” of the Russian theorist, Victor Shklovsky, analyzes *SunRis,* showing the successful use of conceits and unconventional images in the poem. Comments on the social background of metaphysical love poems. (From the abstract)


In Chinese. Maintains that *Ecst* is a “genuine” metaphysical poem in which Donne “elucidates his metaphysics of love.” Points out how in the poem Donne considers the relationship between the body and the soul and concludes that ideal love is both physical and spiritual. Notes that although Donne uses the Neoplatonic concept of ecstasy, his view of love in *Ecst* is quite different from that held by Neoplatonists generally. Suggests also a connection between Donne’s metaphysics of love and the theory of the Great Chain of Being (56). (From the abstract)

Presents a general introduction to metaphysical poetry and to Donne poetry divided into 8 chapters, preceded by two prefaces: (1) An introduction (45–60); (2) Donne and the Metaphysical Tradition (61–87); (3) Donne in the Seventeenth Century (88–99); (4) Donne and Dr. Johnson (100–07); (5) The Eclipse of the Metaphysical Tradition (108–20); (6) The Twentieth Century Donne Criticism (121–39); (7) Donne Criticism Down the Ages: An Overview (140–47); and (8) Postscript: Feminism and John Donne (148–210). Concludes with an appendix and bibliography. (Unable to locate a copy of this book.)


Discusses the “figurative and historical legacies” of St. Paul’s outcry “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” (174) in Donne, Spenser, and Milton. Discusses Donne’s engagement with the text in his sermons, showing how in them “the effects of sin are specifically, vividly imagined in bodily terms to the extent that the body itself, rather than sin, momentarily becomes focal” (177). Observes that in Donne’s sermons “the Pauline inextricability of sin, death, and the body is evident” and that “this engulfing involvement is anatomical and physiological, structural and functional: in a word, it is quite visceral” (176).


Maintains that Donne wrote SGo “to a tune he knew, not one he composed himself,” and notes that the poem was set to music in the seventeenth century and since then by several modern composers, including William Flanagan, Bernard George Stevens, and Lee Hoiby. Points out that it is generally thought that Donne wrote his love poems before he was thirty years old and that, if one accepts Theodore Redpath’s dating, SGo was likely composed before Donne met Anne More in 1598. Says that, unlike many of Donne’s love poems, SGo “is not difficult to understand” (235) and points out Donne’s uses of “a range of unusual images, his witty and argumentative approach to his theme, and his sudden turns of thought” (236). Presents a biographical sketch of Donne, a copy of the text, and a short list of media adaptations of the poem followed by a stanza-by-stanza summary of it, a discussion of its themes (inconstancy of women, misogyny), and comments on the prosody of the poem (trochaic tetrameter) and on its quest and journey motifs. Briefly comments on the historical context in which the poem was written and on the nature of metaphysical poetry in general. Thereafter offers a critical overview of SGo followed by a critical discussion of the poem by Bryan Aubrey that takes into account Donne’s life and the misogynist views found in Elizabethan literature in general. Presents a critical analysis of SGo by R. V. Young (taken from “Love, Poetry, and John Donne in the Love Poetry of John Donne,” in Renascence 52, no. 4 [2000]: 251–73) that discusses Donne’s uses of wit and irony in the poem, as well as literary, philosophical, and religious influences on Donne and the poem’s critical reception. Compares SGo to other poems by Donne, especially ElBrac, SunRis, and Dream. The entry also lists suggested further readings and suggested literary exercises for students.

1668. Anonby, David. “The Sacred Pain of Peni-

Says that the *Holy Sonnets* are “among the most fascinating and resonant works of Christian devotional poetry” (87) and claims that Donne’s “complex theological identity as apostate Catholic, Arminian doubter, and Calvinist self-critic finds expression in the *Holy Sonnets*, which cohere in the theme of repentance.” Explains how “each of these three traditions at once fuels and consoles Donne’s anxiety about the state of his soul.” Argues that “the dominating theme of the *Holy Sonnets*—repentance—splinters into various theological shards as Donne desperately struggles to attain the assurance of salvation” (88). Observes also how in these poems “spirituality and sexuality are quite comfortable bedfellows” and how “often their union issues in repentance” (90). Explains why the “Christological dimensions of the theology of the *Holy Sonnets* are essential to understanding Donne’s theme of repentance” (91). Maintains that the sonnets “do not simply represent a problem of theology or a problem of psychology” but rather “both of these concerns are in large measure a response to the ever-pressing problems of pain” and that, “in addition to crystallizing his theology, Donne’s sufferings prompt him to repent.” Theorizes that although Donne’s “penchant for pain” might come from a “melancholic frame of mind,” it is also possible that it “may betray a courageous willingness to be conformed to the image of our suffering Saviour” (94).


Notes that these “meditations” (now revised) on devotional poetry were given originally during four successive Lenten Evensong services at St. George’s Round Church in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Points out that the aim was “not so much to explain the poems, or to chart their place in the history of ideas or of theology, or to abstract a meaning or a moral from each poem, or to mine the poem for evidence of the poet’s biography or personality, or to educe a set of moral or spiritual equations such that the gloss would replace the poem and the poem itself could be discarded” (89–90) but rather the intention was to have the congregation experience the poems and to become “possessed” by them (90). Compares and contrasts *HSBatter* and *HSRound* as devotional poems. Suggests that the conclusion to *HSBatter* “seems to represent a kind of extreme Calvinism” in which “the heart or soul is utterly depraved, incapable of any good action, waiting only for God’s extreme make-over.” Points out, in particular, the “violent paradoxes” in the sonnet and its “conspicuous wit” (92). Maintains that *HSRound* is “even more violent, energetic, and commanding” (93) but calls the poem “a brilliant achievement, packing an apocalypse into the small, neatly ordered room of a sonnet—a virtuoso performance, with Donne as conductor or maestro, exhibiting all the sprezzatura, the chutzpah, the wit that made him famous.” Observes, however, that the concluding 6 lines of *HSRound* are “among the most profound that Donne ever wrote” and are “certainly among his quieter and calmer lines,” eschewing “the pyrotechnics of wit” and resisting “the impulse (ancient as well as modern) for a quick fix, for an Apocalypse—Now!” Maintains that in *HSRound* Donne seeks “something less Calvinistic” than in *HSBatter* and something more like “the Anglican via media” (94). Sees *HSRound*, with its focus on repentance, as “a poem fully appropriate to the penitential season of Lent” (95). Discusses also *Goodf*, noting how it “sets up an equation between traveling (or being a pilgrim) and the state of one’s beliefs” as the speaker meditates vividly on the Crucifixion (98). Comments on the poem’s use of scientific analogies, vivid imagery, and witty argumentation and explores its devotional and theological underpinnings. Compares and contrasts Donne’s poems with those of Ben Jonson, J. V. Cunningham, Helen Pinkerton, and George Herbert.

Briefly compares Donne and Elizabeth I as poets. Maintains that Donne was “certainly familiar with Elizabeth’s self-representations and probably knew her more widely circulated poems, though he would not have had access to her private love lyrics.” Thinks that “it is unlikely that Elizabeth knew Donne’s love poems.” Points out how in both poets “the political is eroticized and the erotic politicized” and how both “mock the stale tropes of Petrarchism.” Observes, furthermore, that Donne’s “poems of reciprocal love express the kind of ‘mutual liking’ Elizabeth actively sought in her marriage negotiations,” citing *ValBook* and *LovDeity* as examples. Suggests that Elizabeth’s “difficult, qualified, self-correcting, figurative language, which left her options open and her meaning open to interpretation, finds its counterpart in Donne’s love poems” (25), citing as an example *Anniv*.


Argues that *ElProg* is “an instructive document not only for the history of literature but also for the history of sexuality, which combines a body of ideological assumptions with a set of rules for practice.” Discusses how in the poem Donne’s “exploration of the female body comprises a remarkably progressive polemic against some of the period’s most powerful scientific claims, social norms, and sexual prohibitions” (46). Maintains that *ElProg* is “a satire, but its barbed wit is not, as critics assume, directed against women”; rather “it is directed at male writers who were threatened by the idea that women could experience sexual pleasure without having intercourse with men, or getting pregnant, or sacrificing their long preserved virginity” (67). Explains how in the poem Donne argues for the advantages of oral sex for both females and males. Through a detailed reading of the poem, shows how *ElProg* “exposes the ‘error’ foisted upon Donne’s contemporaries not only by law and religion but also by anatomy and medicine which joined forces to suppress sexual practices that did not lead to the officially sanctioned ‘right true end of love,’ conception and procreation” (76).


Explores Donne’s textual strategies and his subtle uses of ambiguity in the verse epistles to his various patronesses, especially the Countess of Bedford, in order to mask his impatience with the required bond of gratitude expected of him as he sought to achieve preferment at court. Explains Donne’s ingenuity in subverting the culturally accepted stylistic rules expected of a servant-poet that are found in manuals on letter-writing. Maintains that Donne, thereby, reshaped the traditional view of gratitude as a virtue into a “financial bond” that deprived the poet of his liberty. (From the abstract)


In the introduction (1–8), the editor maintains that Dr. Johnson’s discussion of the metaphysical poets is “still the most adequate we possess, despite the perpetual Donne revivals which go on continuously, from Coleridge to Arthur Symons in the nineteenth century, and endlessly in our own” (1) and claims that he “finds more wit in Shelley of *The Triumph of Life* than in Donne.” Maintains that Donne “seems now as archaic as Spenser, and as specialized as Ben Jonson.” Says that the essays reprinted in this volume “manifest a serious attempt to appreciate the school of Donne on a basis very different from the one that extends from Eliot to Kermode” (8). Thereafter follows 9 previously published essays, 3 of which specifically discuss Donne: Donald Ramsay Robert’s “The Death Wish of John Donne” in *PMLA* 62 (1947):
Presents a brief introduction to metaphysical poetry in general and to Donne's poetry in particular and then discusses how and why she teaches the *Holy Sonnets* to Slovenian secondary school students. Comments specifically on HSSBlack and HSShow as examples.


Surveys the general characteristics of the Roman love elegy and comments on its popularity and reception in the Renaissance. Maintains that Petrarch provided “the dominant model for Renaissance love poetry in Western Europe at least up to the end of the sixteenth century” and that “it is the model that inescapably conditions the reception and especially the imitation of Roman love elegy” (157). Comments on Donne’s anti-Petrarchism and the influence of the Roman elegists, especially Ovid and Propertius, on his early love poetry. Says that Donne’s *Elegies* “collectively constitute the closest thing in English to a vernacular recreation of the classical genre” (163).


Deals wittily with Donne as a lawyer. Calls him a “failed lawyer” and names the following five reasons why Donne “just wasn’t meant to be a lawyer” (31): (1) "If he’d written legal briefs, not poems, people centuries later wouldn’t have borrowed his phrases for book titles," (2) “Donne hated law school” (32), (3) “Donne wrote his best love poems during law school” (32–33), (4) “Donne messed up his first and only law job by pursuing a scandalous marriage” (33), and (5) “Donne’s powers of persuasion left his father-in-law unmoved” (33–34). Mentions that...
Donne’s legal training did “come in handy” when he was Dean of St. Paul’s since there “he was called upon to make various judgments on ecclesiastical law” (34).


Comments on the use of SGo in Neil Gaiman’s fairy tale novel Stardust. Suggests that “the strategic placement” of line 9 of the poem at the beginning of the work “suggests the meta-fictional intent of the tale, questioning the perspective from which the typical postmodern reader views the fantastic quest.” Says that the implicit question posed is whether the present day reader “can overcome any more successfully than Donne could in the seventeenth century a culturally entrenched cynicism for idealistic pilgrimages and female chastity” (216). Maintains that Stardust “offers a mirror image from a feminist perspective of Donne’s masculine quest for the faithless woman, one that displays the virtues of sentiment rather than sentimentalism.” Observes that Donne’s speaker “begins in innocence and ends in cynicism and sophistication” whereas Stardust’s “valorization of the innocent, symbolized by its protagonist, Tristran Thorn, is complicated by its definition of innocence not just as an innate emotional connectedness, but as faith or belief in the text of the fairy tale rather than in the more conventional religious or epic authority” (219).


In Serbo-Croatian. Examines four female persona poems (ConfL, Break, Sappho, and SelfL) in order to ascertain “the degree in which they conform to or differ from the patterns of Donne’s erotology within the larger body of his (male persona) poetry.” Maintains that such an analysis reveals that “erotological implications in these poems are mainly slightly modified attitudes of Donne’s male persona poems, or extreme and half serious alternatives to the erotological positions of the male persona poems.” Concludes, therefore, that “their importance is by no means ground breaking inasmuch as they do not offer enough to justify a full-scale refocusing of Donne’s erotology.” Claims that “their significance rather lies in the fact that they do add some special colour and variety to Donne’s heterogeneous approach to the theme of love” (85). (From the abstract)


Discusses how HSBatter (76–79) is typical of Donne’s “dramatic self-presentation, his stormy openings, and his dramatic reversals” and also shows him to be “a poet accustomed to confidence, and to emotional extremes, striving for a humility that—as he acknowledges—he cannot quite find” (76). Discusses the structure and rhyme scheme of the poem, its dramatic elements, and its repetition of key words. Also comments on HSVex (80–83). Observes that in this poem Donne may be reflecting on his later years but that he also alludes to his Catholic heritage, as he “looks back over his changing religious positions.” Suggests that the octave sounds not only Elizabethan, “as none of the other Holy Sonnets do,” but also sounds Petrarchan. Maintains that in the sonnet Donne “tells us that he is constantly changing, but that he is paradoxically always inconstant, since his temper, his confidence, and even his beliefs change when he would rather have them stay put” (81). Comments on the uses of paradox in the sonnet and how “from the aureate terms in the sestet,” the poet descends to “Anglo-saxon monosyllables” in the octave (84).


Discusses how Sir Herbert Grierson influenced modernist poetry. Maintains that he “not only transformed the understanding of seventeenth-century literature, and raised Donne from an eccentric minor poet to one of
the major poets of the language, but made the ‘metaphysical’ fundamental to modern poetics as well.” Notes how Grierson described Donne’s poetry as dramatic and passionate, as exploring “profound psychological insights,” and as creating a “new philosophy of love.” Claims that with the publication of Grierson’s edition of Donne’s poems in 1912, Donne “became effectively the first ‘modern’ poet” (14). Discusses the influence of Grierson’s Donne on W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, G. Gregory Smith, Christopher Murray Grieve, and Hugh MacDiarmid. Also comments on how Grierson praised Byron and put him “in the line of Donne.” Agrees with Rosamund Turner, who in 1943, suggested that no “introduction to a scholarly edition of an early English poet ever had a more marked influence upon contemporary criticism of contemporaries than Grierson’s of Donne had on ours” (15).


After surveying the major concepts and principles of so-called “New Historicism,” presents a reading of ValMourn using this approach. Calls the poem one of Donne’s “most celebrated and most significant poems” in which he “declares, quite ingeniously, his ideal of spiritual love which transcends the ordinary and inferior love of others that is based on mere physicality.” Discusses “the historical, cultural, and biographical circumstances that surrounded and motivated the composition of the poem” and also surveys and evaluates earlier critical studies of it. Explores how the poem is informed by and uses “the discourses of religion, science, love, sexuality, space and time and the circulation of power implicit in the compass imagery, [and] the metaphysical conceit” (169). Maintains that an examination of these various discourses that shaped ValMourn “from the religious and scientific discourses to the fusion of discourses of spirituality and sexuality)” allows the poem “to speak so much about the culture in which it was written” (180).


In Korean. Explores the issue of the presence, the absence, and the problem of representation in the Songs and Sonets. Surveys Lect, Noct, Air, and ValName as examples. Discusses how in Lect and Noct Donne deals with shadows and absence and how in ValName the speaker’s name etched on a window keeps him there even when he is absent and serves as a talisman to prevent another lover from supplanting him. (From the abstract)


Points out two extracts from FirAn that appear in Thomas Adams’s The Black Devil (1615) and Englands Sickness (1615).


Discusses two sermons Donne preached to the court of Charles I in 1626, the first “on Tuesday, 18 April, nine days after Easter Sunday, to the king and his courtiers” (163) and the second, “twelve days later, on Sunday, 30 April, to the king’s household ‘below stairs.’” Focuses on “the evidence provided by these sermons of his careful attention to the nature and perceived needs of his auditories” and hopes to show that if “we attend carefully to, and take seriously, the degree to which Donne tailored his preaching to his congregation, some of the confusion over apparently mixed messages offered by his sermons may be resolved.” Argues that reading the sermons “as speaking to and of the royal court (rather than in the light of concurrent parliamentary debates, for instance), shows Donne treating different elements of that court as distinct bodies with individuated concerns and very specific pastoral needs.” By “drawing out the differences between Donne’s
performances for these two congregations," shows that "these sermons are both concerned with the avoidance of doctrinal controversy and with the elevation of the preacher's ability to offer consolation." Claims that, "in Donne's eyes, both congregations needed, above all, to be advised how to conduct themselves, and to be led toward hope of salvation rather than fear of possible damnation" (164). Examines the immediate context in which both sermons were delivered as well as their argumentative structure and theological content, and stresses how Donne addresses the particular pastoral needs of the two related congregations.


An original poem in response to SunRis.


Presents a general introduction to Donne's life and works, calling Donne “one of the premier Christian writers, or any writer for that matter, of the early modern period” (295).


Analyzes in Sidney's Astrophil and Stella, Shakespeare's Sonnets, and Donne's Songs and Sonets the concept of masculine eros in all its explicit and implicit manifestations and also discusses the representation of physical desire in these collections, highlighting the variety of meanings these concepts had in English culture and in the mindset of the age. Examines also many of the linguistic, literary, and cultural aspects that emerge at different levels of textual interpretations from the comparison of the most diverse points of view on both topics. States that the main goal of this study is to explain how the literary treatment of love and the erotic treatment of language come together in the lyrical subjectivism of the three poets. Starts the analysis by examining the conventions of the Petrarchan lyric and of the Elizabethan sonnet, seen as the specific literary institutions wherein traditionally the experience of the love poet—whether real or fictional—was “distilled,” epitomized, and enclosed. Next explores the nature of the literary language of the three poets as well as the behaviors, attitudes, and rituals that the coeval code of love provided to the poet. Focuses attention, in particular, on the masculine exhibitionism, the verbal seductiveness, and the obscene language of the three poets as juxtaposed to the refined language of aesthetic Platonism and its praise of idealized beauty and the aspiration of the poet to achieve a kind of concupiscientia animae of his beloved. Analyzes also the issue of the ethics of love and the ritual of courtship in the three collections and discusses the social, historical, political, ethical, and religious aspects that emerge (with more or less relevance) from the texts—with the purpose of defining also the meta-textual contents and the extra-textual world of any single poem. Maintains that, starting from a study of the literary canon provides a comprehensive analysis of the issue from a point of view that goes far beyond the study of the canon itself. Also discusses the position and the relationship between the suitor in the poem and the desired beloved in the presence of a virtual listener/reader and defines the symmetry and sense of the roles they perform within the text, i.e., the self-representation of the poet, the profile of the beloved (conceived as the ideal subject of physical desire), and the voyeurism of the reader. Concludes by demonstrating how the three poets were able, with modern intuition and innovative minds, to adapt the canon of the sonnet and of the lyrical poem that the Petrarchan tradition had institutionalized and codified in more and more rigid forms throughout the centuries to their own personal and artistic requirements, each of them achieving in diverse ways extremely
original and relevant outcomes both from the formal and from the semantic point of view. Maintains that, by overcoming the restrictions imposed by the literary genre and by breaking its schemes with deliberate and free intents, the three poets succeeded in revitalizing and strengthening the genre and in expanding its perspectives and potentialities, thus making it more realistic and credible and definitely more interesting and closer to the experience of their contemporary as well as their future readers. (Edited summary provided by the author.)

Reviews:


Argues that “cognitive studies of metaphor, analogy, and conceptual change can help us shed light on early modern English literary texts and also on the culture in which they were produced, providing new insights into the epistemological changes that accompanied, and made possible, the ‘scientific revolution’ of the seventeenth century” (103). Discusses how “the epistemological shift that accompanied the rise of the new sciences in the seventeenth century . . . did not bring to an end the use of analogy for scientific thought but rather gave rise to a change in the nature and uses of analogy in that context.” Believes that “this change, in turn, sheds light on what has traditionally been called the ‘metaphysical imagery’ used by seventeenth-century writers such as John Donne” (111). Illustrates this point by discussing the compass image in ValMourn as “an example of the newer style of structural analogy” (112), noting how in the poem Donne “focuses on the process of creating an analogue relationship between visible and invisible, material and immaterial.” Points out how the speaker in ValMourn “wittily applauds the disjunction between experiential reality and an invisible spiritual reality that lies beyond it.” Says that the compasses “are shown in the act of drawing a circle” and that “it is this process rather than the circle itself that conveys the structural relation.” Acknowledges that Donne at times relies on “the older system of analogy” but believes that “his most striking ‘metaphysical’ images participate in the new epistemology” (114).


This volume of ShY was published as a book by Mellen Press in 2010.

Maintains that in the Holy Sonnets Donne “seeks to find a transcendent unification of body and soul through the promise of God” but that he finds himself “stuck in an earthly body with the challenge of moving toward wholeness from a position which his own theology and culture mandate as fragmented.” Sees in the Holy Sonnets, however, Donne’s attempt to yoke “the soul as closely as he can to the body, such that the body might be, by association, capable of deflecting some of the anxiety that accompanies the temporal nature of its existence.” Offers a reading of the Holy Sonnets that stresses “not only the cultural anxiety accompanying Donne’s figuration of the body/soul division” but also “a sensuous redoubling of that anxiety in his return of the soul to the domain of the physical” (425). Argues that, in such a reading, the soul in the Holy Sonnets “is not drawn as a prisoner within the body” but rather “as a figure of wholeness calculated to compensate for bodily uncertainty” (425–26). Maintains that these poems “offer an argument for the interworkings of body and soul,” in which “the soul’s work is in fact very deliberately conceived as paralleling the work of the body,” thus suggesting that “the human body possesses a kind of immortal creativity” (426). Uses Lacan’s theory of “the three registers of the human psyche—the imaginary, the symbolic and the real”—to explain “the structurally complex layering of physicality and spirituality” in the Holy Sonnets (427) and maintains that this approach allows us to see Donne “negotiating the precariously
vulnerable position of the desire for mastery of body and soul” (438).


Discusses the extant manuscript versions of Res and surveys the debate over whether the poem (based on its title and Latin end tag) is unfinished or whether Donne is wittily saying that man’s resurrection is incomplete until the second coming. Notes that neither the title nor the tag appear in all extant manuscript versions but both are found in all seventeenth-century printed editions. Argues that the text of Res found in WN1 (Dolau Cothi ms. 6748), now in the National Library of Wales, “likely represents the extant version” of the poem “closest to Donne’s Lost Original Holograph” (194). Presents an edited text of Res based on WN1 but “with two verbal emendations and some necessary, though minor, punctuation changes,” and with the Latin tag deleted. Holds that this edited text “provides a reasonable approximation of the poem Donne composed—completed or not—based on analysis of extant manuscript copies and early printed versions” (196). In Appendix 1, lists variants from the newly edited version of the poem (197). In Appendix 2, presents “an approximate stemma” for Res “based on extant manuscript and printed evidence” (198).


In “Introduction: Poetry Versus Materialism” (1–14), stresses that for Donne and Herbert “verse mattered as a laden and privileged mode of religious discourse” and that both poets “arrive repeatedly at the recognition of verse as irreducibly important” (1). Proposes in this study to “move towards a marriage of historicism and formalism” and thereby to “reject the binary opposition between poetics and materialism” (2) found in many recent studies and “to restore vigour to poetic reading without disaffirming material attachment” (3). Points out similarities between Donne and Herbert but comments on how they are “different poets stylistically” (10). Maintains that both “together brought into being the religious lyric as an enduring literary event” (11) and briefly reviews the critical reception afforded both. Intends, through a close analysis of poems, “both as products of particular lives and cultures and as objects with spatial and verbal particularities,” to recover “the verticality of verse, lately pulled down by materialistic gravity,” and to capture “something of the glitter and thrust of verse in action, lately sheathed in the scabbard of historicist curation.” In Chapter 1, “The Soul in Paraphrase: Writing and Reading the Religious Lyric” (15–39), discusses “the poets’ complex ambivalence to questions of poetic originality, authenticity, survival, intervention and fragmentation, all questions that belong to the vertical plane of literary study.” Observes how their poems “are riddled with reflexive hesitations and renunciations” but that “these are not rhetorical neuroses.” Claims that “rather than destabilizing or defeating the intention, these visible problematics are simply part of a new kind of literary consciousness that invites the reader to participate knowingly in the poetry’s operation.” Maintains that, “ultimately, confessional narratives that sardonically undermine the performance of wholeness are what saves this poetry from being culturally strategic” and that authenticates “its fiction of transcendence,” thereby rendering readers “willing objects of its rhyme.” In Chapter 2, “Taking Figures: Metaphor and Theology in Religious Poetry” (41–63), “moves from the condition of poetry to its intrinsic mode by examining the poets’ importation of metaphor as the cornerstone of Christian poetics” and also their investment in a metaphoric database as the constitutive (not the ornamental) mode of both religious and poetic thinking.” Discusses how, “without doubting its historicity,” writers and theologians of the time recognize “the metaphoric character of the Bible” (12) and points out how metaphor becomes “a way of reading and of writing that recognizes the interdependence of form and matter.” In Chapter 3, “Green Matter
and the Figure of the Garden” (65–92), “extends the discussion of how poetry uses metaphor to appropriate matter through formalization to focus on the metaphor of growth and greenness.” Observes how “organic imagery permeates the poets’ discourse of spiritual and creative growth” and how it “culminates in the figure of the Renaissance garden as an image of spiritual enclosure and artistic cultivation.” Explains how poetry as art is “the privileged agent by which devotional and imaginative ‘natures’ are given fruitful expression,” how in the garden image “religious, secular, literary and aesthetic significance converge and proliferate,” and how the poets “gather these significations in fragrant, formal arrangement.” In Chapter 4, “The Poetics of the Eucharist: Poetry that Matters” (93–112), “pursues metaphor to the higher plane of sacrament” and examines the poets’ approaches to the Eucharist “as the ultimate and central expression of how matter is animated by poetry.” Comments on how “sacramentalism underlies their literary communion” and how “sacramental dramas take place between the poet and the reader and between the poet and the absent presence of God.” Claims that, in the Eucharist, “poetics interfere in the cultivation of matter” and how in the figure of the Eucharist “verse and matter coincide to trigger literary histories and devotional encounters” that “finally transform the material through the cultivation of significance into an effective—and affective—vehicle of transcendence” (13). In “Conclusion” (113–18), summarizes the basic argument of the study and re-emphasizes how reading the poetry of Donne and Herbert is “an exposure to intellectual agility, linguistic facility and perhaps what is now most important, religious ambivalence” and that if their poems are read “not merely as artifacts but as arguments, they provide a model for internalizing and complicating theological data, for processing religious precepts in subtle, literate and humanizing ways” (118). Concludes with works cited (119–26) and an index (127–34).

Reviews:
- Syrithe Pugh in *ZAA* 60, no. 4 (2012): 403–06.
- Sophie Read in *SČen* 27, no. 2 (2012): 234–35.


Suggests that in a passage that describes Gatsby’s body on a floating air mattress in his swimming pool in *The Great Gatsby* F. Scott Fitzgerald is alluding to the compass conceit in *ValMourn.* Points out in a note that Fitzgerald would have read Donne’s poem during his first semester at Princeton; again in 1916, when he took a course in Renaissance literature in his junior year, a course he repeated the next year; and perhaps even as early as 1914 under the influence of his Princeton friend John Peale Bishop, who, according to Matthew J. Bruccoli, “provided Fitzgerald with intensive tutoring in poetry” (57).


Finds “an intriguing conjunction between Donne’s use of clothing imagery and his use of chronometric language, including references to units of time and images of devices that measure it.” Suggests that Donne “often links the transcendence of time with the removal of garments, associating liberating aeternality with the process of undressing.” Discusses specifically how Donne “links the language of clothing and the language of time in three very different poems dealing with sexual love” (33), namely, *ElBed,* *SunRis,* and *EpEliz,* “poems that bring together “time and clothing in order to portray erotic love, in all its naked glory, as not time-bound, but aeviternal” (34).

1696. *Dodds, Lara.* “poore Donne was out’: Reading and Writing Donne in the Works of Margaret Cavendish.” *JDJ* 29: 133–74.

Argues that Margaret Cavendish’s poetry, particularly her poem “A World in an Eare-ringe,” gives “a new perspective on what might be de-
scribed as the problem of reading Donne” (134) and also offers “a significant and unexplored opportunity to examine an important early stage in the development of Donne’s complex and contradictory reputation” (135–36). Maintains, in fact, that “a recognition of Cavendish as a reader of Donne is essential for our appreciation of Cavendish as a poet as well as for our understanding of Donne’s legacy and reputation in the mid-seventeenth century.” Discusses Cavendish’s quotations, allusions, and poetic adaptations of Donne’s poetry and maintains that “a study of her reading Donne and writing Donne-inspired verse reveals a woman actively and self-consciously in conversation with the literary tradition” of her time. In the first section of the essay examines “the literary practices of Cavendish’s family, the gendered conditions of authorship in seventeenth-century England, and the material circumstances of reading and writing, that influenced Margaret Cavendish’s reading of John Donne’s poetry” (137). In the second section of the essay, discusses, as a case study, the relationship between Cavendish’s “A World in an Eare-ringe” and Donne’s FirAn, pointing out how Donne’s “challenging poetic response to the fundamental transformations of a worldview threatened by early modern natural philosophy” inspired Cavendish’s “reworking of the traditional functions of the symbolic feminine in erotic and religious verse” (139). Believes that Cavendish’s various responses to Donne offer “a more nuanced view of what women may have found in the verse designed for their seduction, imitation, instruction, or exclusion” (172).


In “Presentación” (11–15), briefly discusses Donne’s life and poetry and introduces the edition, followed by the Songs and Sonets (with English texts and Spanish translations on opposite pages) (18–187) without notes or commentary. Concludes with an index (190–93).


Reproduces (without notes or commentary) 35 poems from Songs and Sonets, 5 elegies, 2 epithalamia, Sat3, 3 verse letters, MHHMary, 15 of the Holy Sonnets, and 6 other poems from Divine Poems, followed by a chronology of Donne’s life and times.


Presents a general introduction to Donne’s life and to his poetry and prose (9–19), followed by translations into Norwegian of the following with English texts on opposite pages: 23 selections from the Songs and Sonets (20–81), ElAut and ElBed (82–89), selections from FirAn (90–93), 6 selections from the Holy Sonnets (94–105), Meditations XVI and XVII from Devotions (106–113), “Death’s Duell” (114–23), Res (124–25), and Sickness (126–27). Concludes with notes on individual works (128–33); an afterword by Jakob Lothe, who comments on Donne’s position in European literature, and surveys his critical reputation (134–42); and a bibliography (143).


Collection of 11 essays by individual authors (1–220). Brian Blackley presents a brief introduction to Donne’s life and works (63–64), calling Donne “perhaps the most innovative and sometimes outrageous poet of the era” (63); Lara M. Crowley briefly comments on the manuscript culture of the seventeenth century (78–79), citing Donne as “the period’s
most popular manuscript poet,” and also presents a brief definition of metaphysical poetry (80–81); Matthew Steggle offers a close reading of *Flea* that is entered separately in this bibliography (86–90), James Hirsh comments on Stanley Fish’s 1972 treatment of Donne in *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth Century Literature* (108–14) and Barbara Lewalski’s 1979 discussion of Donne in *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (116–21); Nancy Mohrlock Bunker and James S. Baumlim refer briefly to Donne in their comments on elegy (136), Ignatian meditation (139), Protestant poetics (143), and Wit (146); Bruce Boehrer mentions Donne in his survey of recent changes in the canon (170–83); and Albert C. Labriola comments on new historicist and gay studies of Donne’s poetry (211–12, 217). Contains also a glossary of critical and theoretical terminology by Laura Schechter (221–24); an appendix: teaching, curriculum, and learning by Julie Sutherland (225—available only on-line); notes on contributors (227–29); notes on the essays (230–41); an annotated bibliography by Jonathan Wright (242–57); and an index (259–68).


Claims that Donne is “the first English man of letters who took equal care of his epistolary correspondence in prose and in verse.” Examines Donne’s “metacommunicative reflection on the act of writing” and points out “the freedom and creativity he shows in interpreting the lesson of Greek-Latin rhetoric and of Medieval and Renaissance theorists.” Maintains that “in his linguistic inventiveness and strong emotional characterization of his subject matter, the sender as—in his own words—a ‘Referendarie for news’ aims to build up a ‘middle style’, chiefly in prose, transcending the classical division of the three styles, in order to enhance the role of the letter as an ‘image of the soul’ and as a neutral semantic field, ready to host in its paper medium the sender’s and receiver’s ‘mingling of soules’” (389). (From the abstract)


Discusses how in *Devotions* Donne “intermingles devotional with physical, in particular, dietary and digestive experience” (143). Examines the work “against a background of early modern concepts of eating and digestion” and explores “the ways in which the structure” of *Devotions* can be seen “to mirror and reflect on the Eucharistic consumption and digestion of bread and wine” (145). Points out that, “wondering where exactly he may have gone wrong, either or both in terms of his physical and moral health, Donne’s speaker draws heavily on a dietary vocabulary” (146). Discusses how “the characteristic intermingling of digestion and devotion, of eating habits and moral discipline, of excrements and sins, of purgation and confession” in *Devotions* also “extends to the idea of Holy Communion,” which is seen as “the potent medicine to be administered after the patient’s physicians have arrived at a diagnosis on the basis of the sick man’s indigested matter and have consequently subjected him to a thorough purging process in the course of which all corrupted matter yet infesting the patient’s body ought to have come to light.” Argues that in *Devotions* “not only are there numerous the-
matic correlations between devotion and digestion in general” but also that “the structure of each individual devotion . . . parallels the digestive process” (154). Maintains that in Devotions digestion and devotion “are more thoroughly intertwined with one another than the idea of metaphor accounts for” and that this relationship in the work “is unique precisely in that one cannot disentangle the two concepts from one another, let alone identify the one as the other’s tenor or vehicle respectively” (161).


In “Introduction—Beginning Donne” (1–23), states that the aim of this study is “to read Donne’s texts as performances,” paying “less attention to the underlying ‘meaning’ of each text than to the ways in which Donne’s writing performs, creates and communicates.” Concentrates, therefore, “on how what is said is articulated, transmitted, effected and received” rather than on “the conceptual content of some of Donne’s writings” (2). Explains how “a theory of performance and performativity offers both valuable and historically valid insights into the communicative conditions of early modern literature” and, in particular, how they concern Donne’s poetry and prose (13). In Chapter 1, “Pulpit Performances—Sermons” (25–76), discusses how, for Donne, the 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.” Maintains that “what is particular in Donne’s preaching is the way in which it adapts the communicative system of the theatre to the genre of the sermon” (26) and illustrates this concept by analyzing three sermons. Also explores “the differences between sermon and sacrament while at the same time drawing attention to the ways in which reformed homiletics echo the practices of ritual” (29). Points out how Donne’s sermons are theatrical “not only in as far as they strive for sensual vividness” but, more importantly, by the way in which “they employ the theatre’s communicative situation.” Observes that since they “do not present their audiences with actual characters on a stage, they are theatrical in a more rhetorical sense” (46). Examines also how “the en-actment or acting out of the sermon is the result of a cooperation between the preacher’s persona as ‘director’ and the congregation members as surrogate actors and simultaneous audience” (58). In Chapter 2, “Promethean and protean performances—Worldly poems” (27–137), discusses “the ways in which Donne’s poems employ language performatively” and analyzes “their Promethean dimension,” i.e., how they are engaged in “the creation of world, truth and self.” Shows how these “Promethean processes of world-creating and truth-creating are all undertaken by a speaker’s voice, whose self comes into being through poetry, evolving through what it is saying and, by implication, doing.” Claims, furthermore, that the poems are also “protean” in that “their speakers change shape by taking on ever new parts and roles” (80). Points out also the important role the audience plays in Donne’s poetry and notes how “the interplay between internal and external communicative systems can be quite complex, as the illocutionary force of the speaker’s words can, but need not, coincide with the poem’s perlocutionary effect” (81). Explores “how the theatrical acts of Donne’s various speakers are reflective of their contemporary listeners or readers and how audiences might have responded to them” (100). Concludes that Donne’s poems “include a considerable variety of theatrical transformations and role-play, and depending on genre and audience, the rhetorical and theatrical goals of individual poems may differ” (134). Chapter 3, “Passionate performances—Poems erotic and divine” (138–84), compares Donne’s “religiously erotic poems” to his “erotically religious poems” (138) and regards love as passion as constituting “the most striking connection” between the two (151). Cites numerous examples of “the parallels between the passionate performances of Donne’s erotic and divine poems” (164) as well as differences, such as how “the devotion
of Donne’s religious poetry takes place more privately between God and the self” (170). Reads the *Holy Sonnets* as “auto-theatrical” from a “denominational neutral” point of view (171) and compares and contrasts the theatrical strategies in the sermons, the *Songs and Sonnets*, and the *Holy Sonnets*. In Chapter 4, “Patronage performances—Letters” (185–224), analyzes aspects of performances in Donne’s prose letters, showing how their strategies are typical of Donne. Notes that the letters are “reminiscent of Donne’s commendatory poetry, owing to the sometimes more, sometimes less indirect pleas for patronage, which seem to have occupied their writing” (187). Discusses how Donne’s letters “oscillate between material needs and the invaluable and ‘immaterial’ concerns of friendship” (188). Sees them as “performances and exercises in self-fashioning” (189) and shows how letters and homilies are “two genres that cohabit peacefully since both are concerned with securing the communion of writer and addressee, either in this world or the next” (223). In Chapter 5, “(Inter)Personal performances—Devotions” (225–70), discusses how the *Devotions* “rehearse practices of communication and communion similar to those of Donne’s letters” (226). Maintains that in the *Devotions* “the speaker hopes to enjoy communion with God and be part of him—and through the Devotions, Donne meant to enable this communion for his readers, by creating a communion between them and himself” (259). Presents also a contrastive analysis between Donne’s verse letters and prose letters, noting how typically Donne engages in prose to maintain a relationship and how in verse he strives “to establish that connection in the first place.” Makes “a similar argument” in comparing the *Holy Sonnets* with the *Devotions* (266). In “Conclusion—Being Don(n)e” (271–75), summarizes the argument of the whole study and of the individual chapters. Concludes with a bibliography (276–306) and an index (307–17).

Reviews:


- Daniel Starza Smith in *TLS* (1 Apr. 2011): 405–06.
- Syrithe Pugh in *ZAA* 60, no. 4 (2011): 403–06.


Discusses the extent to which Donne’s secular and sacred poetry “may be said to distinguish themselves from one another with regard to their performative dimensions.” Argues that Donne’s poetry is performative in “two senses”: (1) “in that it employs the power of words to do rather than merely say something,” and (2) “in as far as the communicative situation of most of what Donne has written is theatrical” (189), i.e. “it is marked by role-play as well as by the interplay of an internal communicative system” (189–90). Begins with a detailed reading of *Curse*, which introduces “these two dimensions of Donne’s performativity.” Next examines examples from Donne’s sacred poetry, in which “this same kind of theatricality becomes problematic, due to a ‘theatrical impasse’” that is “not in principle related to the subject of religion.” Argues that it is the “lack of an external audience that is responsible for the shift” in the *Holy Sonnets* “from theatrical (role)playfulness towards a more meditative and thus, more ‘solo’ and ritualistic mode of communication” (190). Maintains, therefore, that a reading of Donne’s sacred poetry “in the exact same vein as all his other writings would needs be inadequate” and points out some of “the relative differences” between his erotic and sacred poetry (195). Stresses, in other words, that Donne’s sermons and erotic poetry use language performatively in “a full theatrical sense, as they were written and performed for an audience other than the self” but that the *Holy Sonnets* “appear to have been intended more as solo performances” and “show no signs of having been intended for broad readership” (202).
Reviews:


Maintains that “the power of a Donne lyric—its particular energy—derives paradoxically from its heightened awareness of its ultimate impotency.” Claims, in other words, that “when they are done, so many of Donne’s poems are not done, for their speakers still hope for more.” Argues that the reader’s uncertainty about whether the Latin end tag (*Desunt caetera*) attached to *Res* “represents Donne’s own hope of eventual resurrection, or an early reader/editor’s statement of textual expectancy, only highlights the nature of human incompleteness inscribed within the poem” (201). Focuses on three interrelated tropes in the poem: “soul of the whole,” “the fatigue of the sun” (203), and the “hypothetical witness who may or may not understand the significance of what he or she has been vouchsafed to see” (205) in order to argue that the subject of *Res* is “what cannot be put into words, the soul’s life once it is released from the body.” Calls this “a brilliant maneuver, and one thoroughly Donnean, to advertise that something is lacking in a poem that purports to celebrate the source of ‘all,’” and notes that “the very last phrase of the fragment proper is of the whole.” Concludes that *Res* “reminds us that, in Donne, there is always something more” (206).

1707. Frost, Kate Gartner. “‘Bedded and bedrid’: Severall Steps in Our Sicknes.” *JDJ* 29: 1–16.

Presents a “personal reading” of *Devotions* to show how Donne’s book informed her own “response to a catastrophic personal illness.” Discusses how Donne’s “public book of devotion” became her “private book of devotions” (1) and how, because of her illness, she began reading *Devotions* “in a new light—through the eyes of one who, like Donne, was experiencing her own emergent occasion” (2). Comments on the nature of Donne’s illness in 1623 and how in *Devotions* he records his “knowl-

edgeable confrontation with the onset of the illness, its progress, treatment, crisis and recovery, as well as the fear of possible relapse” (4). Compares and contrasts Donne’s experiences and her own with physicians and treatments. Discusses her lifelong scholarly approach to the *Devotions* in the light of Augustinian poetics and how more recently her perception of *Devotions* “as a medievally rooted and numerologically ordered spiritual autobiography has expanded” so that she now sees how Donne’s book “can truly fit within the framework of a modern case” and “can function as a book of personal devotions” (16).


Comments on the influence of the rhetorical theory and praxis of St. Augustine on Donne’s Christmas sermons. Observes how, like St. Augustine, Donne in his sermons delight “not only in theological mystery but also in metaphysical word-play” and notes also how his wit “becomes an allusive epistemological act,” in which he “discovers a kernel of meaning deep within the husk of the word” (110). Maintains that it is “the mysteries of humbled Majesty and suffering God” that call forth Donne’s “greatest eloquence.” Points out that, for Donne, “this pain and this indignity—so inimical to worldly values and so offensive to human complacency—are the very point of the Incarnation.” Holds that Donne’s Christmas sermons present “a veritable catalogue of Augustinian motifs: liturgical time, Christ’s dual nature, eternal generation, double Advent and double birth; his humbled Majesty, the signs at the cradle of his suffering and death, and even his Eucharistic identity” (111).

Discusses how “the insistent opening line” of *HSBatter* is “critical” to Donne’s “strained efforts to breach the gap between man and God, a feat that the poem accomplishes through the use of illicit grammatical structures and an incongruous militaristic lexicon.” In other words, shows how the sonnet “grammatically renders its thematic content of separation and connectivity by means of its very form” (156). Explains how “through indispensable tools of grammatical gymnastics and paradoxical logic,” the poem “asserts that celestial divinity can be made visible through the illumination it graciously casts around the benighted souls of earth-bound humanity when their orbits miraculously align in the course of salvation” (158).


In the introduction (3–20), maintains that “of all the great Christian poets in the British tradition, none is so joyfully and provocatively contradictory as John Donne” (3) and stresses his mastery of both secular and religious poetry. Observes that Donne “was not a saint, and he knew it” but that his recognition of this fact “animates, enlarges, and humanizes his religious poetry in remarkable ways” (5). Presents a biographical sketch of Donne, followed by a discussion of the major characteristics of his poems, both secular and sacred, especially their colloquial style, argumentative structure, and uses of the metaphysical conceit. Comments on how in his love poems Donne uses religious ideas “in astonishing and amusing ways” (15) and argues that there are “no more harrowing Christian poems in English than Donne’s Holy Sonnets” (17), poems in which he “faces his guilty terror in contemplating his own mortality and the repellant features of his naked psyche” (17–18). Thereafter presents a selection of Donne’s love poems and religious poems (21–44)—without notes or commentary. Concludes with a list of group discussion questions and suggestions for further reading.


Discusses how reading nightly the *Holy Sonnets* following the early death of his father helped him as a college student to recover from his grief and near despair. Comments on the source and profundity of Donne’s melancholy and says, “I felt certain that few other writers or poets in history could have given voice to the tumult turning inside me the way John Donne was” (32). States that he began to see Donne “not just [as] a brother but [as] a comrade who knew my guilt, grief, and quandary precisely” (33).


Discusses possible homoerotic overtones in Carew’s “An Elegie upon the death of the Deane of Pauls, Dr. John Donne.” Suggests that Carew’s eulogy “equivocates between wishing to assume the form of masculinity that it associates with Donne’s mastery (of poetry, of women) and wishing to be in the position of the woman so mastered” (499). Maintains that the homoerotics of the elegy “represents one possible way in which literary history and the restitution of loss that is the work of mourning gets figured in such poems” (500).


Portions of Chapter 1 & 2 are from “‘Tav’ to the Cross: John Donne’s Protestant Exegesis” in *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation*, ed. Mary Arshagouni Papazian, 221–46. De-

Contains acknowledgments (ix–x) and a note on the texts (xi–xii). In the introduction (1–10), indicates that the aim of this study is “to authenticate Donne as a Christian Hebraist by elucidating the exegetical strategies that make him a participant in this intellectual and religious movement” in Reformation England (2). Maintains that, in order to understand Donne’s use of the Hebrew Bible, one must examine “the complex Jewish exegetical tradition,” as well as “its direct and indirect Christian transmission,” and that in order to understand Donne’s “biblical hermeneutics” one must address “the textual and religious polemic, both intra-Christian and Jewish-Christian, which is foregrounded in biblical exegesis.” Intends this study to show “a flexible understanding of exegetical connections, reflecting the intertwined character of both Jewish and Christian exegetical projects.” Believes also that this study demonstrates Mikhail Bakhtin’s “heteroglot conception” of the world by “juxtaposing, confronting and comparing various exegetical and scholarly voices” (2–3). Maintains that Donne’s link to the scholarly tradition of Christian Hebraism can be best seen in his sermons on the Penitential and Prebend Psalms, which, “as homiletic, liturgical and exegetical texts . . . provide a remarkable opportunity for studying Donne’s utilization of biblical and interpretive sources within a specific ecclesiastical context” (9–10). States that the emphasis in this study is on Donne’s “interpretive and homiletic use of Hebrew terms as an essential part of his development of a clearly defined, integrated sermon series, most particularly focusing on those terms clustered around a central meaning” (10). In Chapter 1: “Christian Hebraism: Sources and Strategies” (11–46), comments on Donne’s knowledge of Hebrew and his “use of the various tools of Christian Hebraist scholarship,” such as dictionaries, commentaries, and polyglot bibles (25). Observes that while Donne possessed “a basic, lexical grasp of the Hebrew language,” he learned “the more sophisticated semantic nuances of Jewish medieval exegesis from the intermediate Christian Hebraist sources cited so abundantly throughout his sermons.” Analyzes four “paradigmatic sermon passages” in order “to trace Donne’s developing use of exegetical sources—from the negligible citation of such sources to their explicit use within a complex, multilingual system of intertextuality” (26). In Chapter 2, “The Penitential Psalm 6: Notes and Margins” (49–75), discusses how in his sermons on this psalm Donne reveals his scholarly knowledge of the Hebrew bible and Hebrew language as well as his familiarity with and use of Christian commentary and contemporary bibles. In Chapter 3, “The Penitential Psalm 32: The Sacred Philology of Sin” (77–107), examines Donne’s exegetical strategies in his eight sermons on Psalm 32 and comments on his complex uses of “sacred philology” (81) in order to open up alternative possibilities of meaning and nuances of a particular word or text. Maintains that Donne often “marshals the various meanings of the biblical text in order to mark out its relevance and lesson within the specific doctrinal debates and religious polemics of the English church” (106). Contrasts Donne with Lancelot Andewes as metaphysical preachers. In Chapter 4: “The Literal Sense: Moralized Grammar” (111–69), discusses the exegetical manifesto of Abraham Ibn Ezra as an important resource for Donne and other European scholars in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and points out how its “emphasis on a rational, grammatical reading” provided a “highly useful strategy, particularly of value for Reformation exegesis in its attempt to recover the literal sense of the biblical text” (115–16). Observes how during this period the Bible “is reconceived as a text that evokes an interpretive process whose indispensable literal read-
ing subsequently transforms into a figurative meaning of religious and theological consequence, specifically through the knowledge and use of Hebrew grammar” (116). Discusses, therefore, Donne’s uses of Hebrew grammar in his sermons. In Chapter 5, “The Literal Sense: Genesis” (139–69), discusses how Donne as a preacher “is predominantly concerned in his exegetical and homiletic works with utilizing the literal interpretation of biblical events, particularly the creation narrative, to preserve their historical credibility against the dangers besetting it from both sides of the hermeneutic process,” i.e., from both “expansive, unqualified allegorical interpretation” and from rational explanations (140) and shows how Donne adapts the literal sense of Genesis “to occasion, audience, and historical moment” (146). Maintains that, “as he navigates his way through his times and circumstances, Donne as Christian Hebraist adapts the Jewish exegetical tradition to his immediate theological and political concerns” (169). In an appendix (171–75), reproduces Hebrew and Aramaic texts, followed by notes (177–211), a bibliography (212–36), and an index (237–44).

Reviews:


States that the main aim of this study is to “highlight the close affinity” of I. A. Richards’s critical theory and empirical practice with “the Gestalt theory of psychology” (427). In the second part of this essay, discusses Richards’s study of HSRound in Practical Criticism (1929, 1963) as a means of understanding his method of practical criticism and as an example of Donne studies and literary criticism at the time. In particular, examines Richards’s technique in relation to “contemporary psychology” (390), in particular Gestalt psychology. Discusses how Richards’s study generated a number of responses from both psychologists and literary critics and compares Richards’s study to experiments by several later critics, including those conducted by the authors themselves. In the third part of this essay, discusses experimental studies of metaphor in Bait conducted by the authors over a four-year period using the Gestalt-interaction theory of metaphor, which “describes metaphor comprehension as an art of perpetual and semantic restructuring, where a metaphor is an emergent whole, created by an interaction between its primary and secondary subjects” (415). Proposes three alternative readings of Bait resulting from responses gathered from their reading pool.


Argues that there is an autobiographical core in Donne’s poems and cites ElBed and Storm as examples. Thereafter addresses the difficulties faced by German translators who, in recent editions of Donne’s poetry, tend to diverge from the wording of the original text and rather adhere to leitmotifs. Advises the reader not to begin with the Songs and Sonets but rather with Paradoxes, a work that presents a good introduction to Donne’s wit and formal brilliancy while also giving an insight into his libertinism and melancholy. Next examines Donne’s conversion, both religious and literary, and comments on how in his poetry he moves away from sexual love to a kind of religious mysti-
cal eros. Concludes by seeing a link between metapsychical poetry and modern poetry, as reflected, for instance, in the work of T. S. Eliot. Maintains that Donne’s poetry continues to influence contemporary artists.


As a teaching aid for introducing students in a tenth grade class of British literature to the sonnet, describes playing a recording of Benjamin Britten’s The Holy Sonnets of John Donne. Points out how “even those with only limited knowledge of the art music tradition respond[ed] immediately to these songs” (119). Comments particularly on HSSighs as an example of his teaching method.

1718. Greteman, Blaine. “‘All this seed pearl’: John Donne and Bodily Presence.” Coll. 37, no. 3: 26–42.

Argues that Donne’s “engagement with bodies forms a consistent creative thread from his earliest paradoxes and witty poetic performances to his final, brooding meditations and sermons” and that “physical bodies are at the core of Donne’s most striking poetic moments, representing a range of human emotions and experiences.” Observes further that, in Donne, “bodies share important qualities with metals, liquids, and crystals” and that they “imbue his poetry and prose with a dazzling imagistic density.” Says that Donne “even insists on bodily presence in poems and sermons that contemplate the nature and state of the soul.” Maintains that his notion of the “dependence of the soul upon the body” was somewhat “orthodox” at the time because it seemingly “privileges the flesh over the spirit” and also because it might imply that “the soul may not be immortal and can reasonably expect to die with the body.” Acknowledges, however, that, later in life as a clergyman, Donne accepted the Christian idea that the soul leaves the body at death. Claims, however, that in all of Donne’s writings “the junction of the body and soul is a terrific place of imaginative free play, an invisible boundary where spiritual essence blends into material substance and seeming opposites are joined” (27). After surveying Donne’s often conflicted understanding of and uses of the relationship between the body and soul in his poetry and prose, concludes that, “on earth, the body remained important to Donne because it was the way we apprehended the soul and communicated with the world” and, “in heaven, it remained important, at least in part, because its union with the soul was a perfection which could rectify earthly failures, allowing him to keep his identity intact while asserting his presence at the very throne of God” (40).


Discusses how, in Donne's poetry, “playfulness with language, delight in sudden reversals of perspective and the discovery in the everyday metaphors which transform our understanding, leads to the deepest perspective shift of all, the movement from our own vision and gazing to the transfiguring gaze that God casts on us” (104). Observes how Donne’s “intellect and imagination delighted in double visions and multiple meanings” and how he “was fascinated by the representation of one thing within and through another, by the correspondences between inner and outer worlds, by the shifts in perspective and dimension which could be produced by moving suddenly, by means of metaphor, between the many worlds of his intellect and imagination.” Maintains that “emotional, imaginative, sexual and spiritual insights are all integrated and interlinked in Donne in a way that is perhaps unequalled in any other writer.” In this light, discusses how Donne’s “playful but concentrated fascination with representation and mapping extends through both his love poetry and his devotional poetry” (105) by analyzing GoodM, SunRis,
Sickness, and Goodf. Compares and contrasts Donne and Herbert and maintains that in both poets “their engagement with God who meets them in Christ is not simply a matter of private devotion but becomes the essential key to their perception of themselves and the world” (124).


Points out that many men and women in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who often viewed themselves as physical, social, or spiritual exiles found consolation in the treatment of sorrow and hope in the Bible, especially in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, in Psalm 137, and in various biblical narratives and prophecies about the Babylonian captivity. Discusses how these biblical precedents provided an authoritative precedent for contemporary suffering and justified it in terms of the divine plan and salvational history. Cites *Lam* as an example. Notes that Donne’s verse paraphrase cannot be connected definitely with a specific event or occasion. Suggests, in fact, that *Lam* “may have been written more in the spirit of Augustine than Jeremiah” (74) and that Donne probably “was translating from literary as well as religious motives,” trying, as it were, “to capture in English verse the conceived excellence of Hebrew poetry” (75). Observes also that the only other biblical paraphrase sometimes attributed to Donne is “a version of the other great Old Testament poem of exile, Psalm 137” (75–76). Comments also on two of Donne’s sermons on Lamentations. Maintains that in both *Lam* and the sermons Donne may be reflecting on his own personal suffering, such as the death of his wife, or more generally simply on human suffering in general and on how all Christians in this life are, in the Augustinian sense, “strangers in a strange land” (78).


Discusses how gender and sexuality shaped the way that English poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries related to people and to the material world. Although there are no extended discussions of Donne, many examples are drawn from his poems. For instance, notes how the hair bracelet as a love token in *Fun* supports the Petrarchan notion that the female is the captive of the male lover; how in *GoodM* the speaker “intermingles” his body parts with those of his beloved “by representing them as mirroring each other” (44); how the speaker in *Jeat* “analyzes the material qualities of his love token—a cheap ring made of brittle stuff—to represent his beloved as disloyal and unchaste” (104); and how in *ElBed* the beloved is portrayed as the speaker’s real estate. Observes that gift poems by Donne “often express anxiety about unequal exchanges—always to the disadvantage of the male lover” and that his speakers often “playfully worry that love will take far more than it gives” (81).


Throughout this collection of 82 essays by individual authors, Donne is mentioned frequently; however, only those essays that contain extensive discussion of his work have been included in this bibliography. The following essays are reprinted (with minor revisions) from *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000): Elizabeth Clarke’s “Religious Verse” (II, 382–97); Germaine Greer’s “John Donne’s Nineteenth Elegy” (II, 317–25); Diana E. Henderson’s “Love Poetry” (II, 249–63); John Lyon’s “The Critical Essay” (II, 204–13); and Robin Robbins’s “Poets, Friends, and Patrons: Donne and his Circle; Ben and his Tribe” (I, 221–47). The following are new inclusions, each of which has been included separately in this bibliography: Feisal G. Mohamed’s


Comments on the religious and psychological aspects of martyrdom and stigmatization in the Christian tradition. Suggests that although Donne in Devotions does not deal specifically with stigmata but “only with the medical symptoms of a deadly illness,” he perceives “mystically in the emergence of death in his body the signs of the cross.” Furthermore, says that the “notorious sensuality” of Donne's poetry “does not simply emancipate the pleasures of this world but transforms a mystical discourse, whose interiorizing force had found in stigmatization its privileged experience” and that “a more and more dubious model of expression, this experience would suffer from the same distortions of literalization as the future realm of aesthetics” (61).


Introduces a colloquium on Res held at the 2010 John Donne Society Conference. Presents a brief introduction to the poem and its critical reception and comments on papers delivered by Lara M. Crowley, Raymond-Jean Frontain, and Kirsten Stirling, each of which is included in this bibliography. Notes that “[w]e don’t often read the poem, rarely write about it, and rarely teach it” and yet “it intrigues” us (181). Observes that “certainly the discussion that followed the presentations suggests that the poem may well appear on some syllabi in the near future” and notes that most questions after the presentations “circled around” the poem’s title and Latin end tag (182).


Suggests how to teach Donne's prose to undergraduates. Maintains that in his sacred prose works Donne is “a self-consciously social wooer of souls” and discusses how he “creates the illusion of that ‘spontaneous overflow of . . . feelings’ prized by both some nonconformists of his own day and later generations of Romantics.” Claims that, as in his poetry, “intensely relational ‘amorous . . . metaphors’ of dependence and devotion also distinguish Donne's prose style” and maintains that “his imagination relies on the metaphoricity of affection, especially as a sign of spiritual communion and community” (224). Comments on how Donne's mind is also “pedantically intricate and mercurial, simultaneously exhilarating and exhausting.” Explains, however, how his “tortured but loving dissection (of soul, of self, to text) are often a key element in the Donnean speaker’s projects of creating social discourse” (225) and believes that his prose, “with its self-consciousness about occasion, about patronage, and about social forms, can give us a much clearer sense of his deep concern with how to be a social, a communal, individual.” Maintains that his prose is “intensely personal and very political at the same time.” Elaborates on this concept by discussing Devotions, a work that expresses “his intense desire to generate a spiritually communal world even at the brink of a solitary death” (226). Observes how a number of Donne's sermons also are intended “to generate communal response and interaction” (229), citing, in particular, "Deaths Duell" and sermons addressed to the Virginia Company, as well as other works that elucidate Donne's "social individualism." Concludes that Donne's prose "constitutes such a major part of his literary output and was so significant to his reputation in his lifetime and in succeeding centuries
that it would be a grave misrepresentation of his writing to ignore it” (233)


First published online in 2009.

Argues that throughout most of his life, but especially during his illness in 1623, Donne feared self-annihilation at the moment of death. Identifies this fear primarily as “a fear of a temporal blackout of the self” between the death of the body and the final resurrection at the end of time. Maintains that Donne held that “the self is the result of the combination of the body and the soul” and that although “the soul can survive the body’s dissolution, the self cannot.” Holds that as a way “to counter this fear of the self’s temporal disappearance,” Donne attempts “to inscribe himself” in *Devotions* by “assuming the posture of an anatomist to distance himself from his physical body” in order “to capture the observations of his body in a text using a corporeal register.” Says that Donne “preserves this textual encoding of himself by addressing God as the main audience” in *Devotions*, believing that “when God reads the text, the content of the text (Donne’s self) becomes archived in the eternally stable mind of God.” Claims, therefore, that ultimately Donne regards his authorship of *Devotions* as an “imitation of God’s own activity.” Maintains, furthermore, that Donne “sees God’s nature, his ‘core self,’ as a system of eternally preserved propositions” and views “God’s activity in creation as an act of copious literary expression using an alphabet of physical things that are used not for their own endurance qua physical entities” but rather “for their ability to figuratively reveal God’s self, which stands beyond and above them.” Believes, therefore, that Donne “imitates this nature and activity in his act of writing the *Devotions.*” (From the abstract).


In a survey of preaching in early modern England, comments on Donne throughout. Notes that until recently Donne’s sermons were “studied chiefly for the light they could shed on the poems” but that they “now are increasingly coming to be the focus of interest in their own right, and regarded as crucial for an understanding of Donne’s politics” (3). Points out that often the audience would interrupt his Paul’s Cross sermons, expressing their approval or disapproval, and observes how sermons during this time “were addressed to the emotions, as well as to the intellect, and were designed not merely to impart doctrinal information but [also] to elicit an affective response from the audience, with the help of voice, gesture and all the other rhetorical skills at the preacher’s command” (11). Comments on Donne’s various methods for preparing his sermons, sometimes writing them out and at other times simply making notes and observes that he occasionally made two versions of the same sermon. Notes also that, as with his poems, Donne “took some pains to control the manuscript circulation of his sermons” (137). Observes that Donne revised many of his sermons for the press and attempted thereby “to create new texts which give readers the illusion of being listeners” (161). Points out that Donne “was widely admired by his contemporaries for his use of gesture” while preaching. Stresses that the written or printed texts that have survived “may differ from the sermon originally delivered.” Cites, as an example, Donne’s November 1622 sermon on the Gunpowder Plot that, when revised, was “more politically outspoken” than the sermon he delivered at Paul’s Cross (293).

Briefly comments on *Annun* in which Donne “seizes upon a rare confluence of feast day and fast day in the liturgical calendar” in 1608 in order “to make the paradox of grace both ‘verbally and theologically explicit’” (17). Notes how “the body of Christ in the Eucharist for the Feast of the Annunciation, real and present in the consecrated Host, is absent, of course, from the altar on Good Friday.” Maintains that “this dialectic of presence and absence . . . describes the course of salvation ‘full circle.’” Comments on how in the poem the Virgin Mary “becomes the emblem of the whole salvation story” (18).


In Serbian. Analyzes the circle imagery in *Annun* and *Goodf*, noting how the circle, because of its having no beginning and no end, symbolizes God and the perfection of God’s plan for the salvation of man and of all creation. Maintains that in *Annun* Donne sees the feasts of the Annunciation and Good Friday occurring on the same day in 1608 as representing the “confirmation of the perfection and ‘roundness’ of God’s plan” for man’s salvation. Says that in *Goodf* he represents man’s approach to God as gradual and resembling a circle and discusses how the crucifixion “stands in the centre of this process of conversion,” driving it “to its completion.” (From the abstract).


Presents an introduction to Donne and his poetry for a juvenile audience that includes a brief biographical sketch and a paraphrase of *Flea*. Comments briefly on the poem’s prosody and its uses of wit and the dramatic monologue. Reproduces *HSDeath* and *SGo* without comment. Notes the “acute perceptions and precise wit” found in Donne’s secular poetry appear also in his sacred poetry (70). Suggests that students begin their study of Donne with the *Songs and Sonnets* followed by the *Holy Sonnets*.

### 1731. Jones, L. Bellee. “‘If I must example bee’: Donne’s Petrarchan Heart as *Speculum Amicitiae*,” in *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse*, ed. Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge, 707–25. (Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture, 6.) Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Explores the concept of male friendship in the *Songs and Sonnets* by focusing on *Broken*, *Leg*, *Mess*, and *Blos*, poems that employ “images of the heart, particularly those having to do with the Petrarchan trope of exchanged hearts.” Maintains that, for Donne, as for Petrarch, Cicero, and Montaigne, the exchange of hearts is “more properly completed within the context of male friendship, a mutual homosocial bond, than in amorous heterosexual relationships.” Observes that, “according to classical and modern friendship texts, women either do not have proper hearts, or do not understand the proper workings of the heart, or both” and thus suggest that “men and their hearts would be better served through friendships with other men, leaving off amorous pursuit entirely” (710). Discusses how “the maltreatment of hearts at the hands of Love and women” in the four selected poems places them “within the realm of friendship texts” (716) and make it clear that “men would do better to leave women and their defective hearts aside and seek constancy where it can be found: in male friendship” (720). Points out that, although the poems are about relationships with women, they are, in fact, addressed primarily to a male coterie audience, with Donne serving as “an authority figure, a dispenser of advice and warnings” (723). Concludes that in *Blos* Donne maintains that “in putting friendship first, men put their own well being first” and that in that poem, as well as in *Leg*, *Mess*, and *Broken*, he “implores
his readers, through images of exchanged hearts” and “other Petrarchan imagery” to do likewise (725).


Surveys the “historical development and function of bourgeois love in English poetry” by examining poems by Donne, Robert Browning, and D. H. Lawrence. Focuses on “ways the concepts of identity and intimacy have changed over the centuries.” (From ad.)


Maintains that in England during the early modern period “reading the scriptures as interpretative of contemporary political turmoil is pervasive” and that there is “common ground in the reading strategies at work” (492). Discusses “the hermeneutics by which Old Testament figures are transposed typologically onto both the New Testament and contemporary politics” and, in particular, traces the ways in which biblical rulers served “as a nuanced and adaptable language to voice complaints about oppression and deprivation as much as rebellion and usurpation.” Shows how typology was “a productive, troublesome, and astonishingly versatile tool in the arsenal of early modern readers” (493). To show how Old Testament kings “provided both a model for chastising rebellion and, in other hands, the primary mandate for and language of protest,” explores various typological readings about dividing of the Solomonic kingdom into “the Israel of Jeroboam and the Judah of Rehoboam” (498), including mention of Donne’s references in his sermons.


Believes that Marvell was likely influenced by Donne’s poetry, especially his love poems. As an example, traces possible indications of Donne’s influence in “The Definition of Love,” noting how both Marvell’s poem and Ecst “lament the role of Fate in the frustration of the lovers” (4). Observes, however, that in his poem Marvell accepts “the Platonic doctrine that elevates spiritual love above physical love, an idea lost on Donne.” Discusses how in Donne’s poem the speaker “believes that the lovers’ bodies have every hope of eventually uniting” but that in Marvell’s poem the speaker “shares no such hope” (5). Says that in “The Definition of Love” the reader is “never told if gender plays a role in Fate’s jealousy: she could be jealous of the narrator’s loving a man she wants for herself or she could be jealous of the narrator’s loving a lady other than Fate” or maybe she is jealous of a male-male love. Believes, therefore, that a reader is “free to pick an interpretation conducive to the reader’s own taste” (12). Explains also Marvell’s use of the image of the planisphere in his poem, an image found in ValWeep. Concludes that “the Donnean flavor” that “reverberates” through “The Definition of Love” is “a Donnean sense that has been Marvellized, filtered through the later poet’s own frustration in love and carried as the only definition of love, not as a suggested single definition of love.” Points out how in Marvell’s poem “a frustrated poet must make do with an amorous situation that cannot be consummated: he takes it to the stratosphere and declares it perfect” (14).


Discusses Joseph Brodsky’s treatment of the heroic couplet in his translations of Storm and Mark.

Situates Milton historically by comparing his writings with those of Donne. Notes that Milton and Donne “have not yet been comparatively studied across their careers as casuistical authors” even though “in their juvenalia both practiced a form of debate or equivocation that evolved into casuistry in their mature writings.” Points out that Milton’s Prolusions and Donne’s Paradoxes are “precisely the youthful ventures into certain topics that recur in their later works.” Comments on how both poets “use the same ideas,” such as the process of regeneration (345). Maintains that “when the theology of Donne and Milton are comparatively studied in their prose works, not merely in their poetry, then the overlay of coverage by the two authors is remarkable.” Notes that Donne’s Essays, Devotions, and Sermons and Milton’s De Doctrina Christiana “engage many of the same topics” and cites as an example similarities in their Trinitarian theology and their use of “economical metaphors to recount the inestimable value of the Son’s bloodshed.” Observes that both “portray a thinking, speaking, and possible deity” and that both “derive their understanding of an anthropomorphic and anthropopathic deity from their analysis of scripture” (346). Suggests that “the methods of rational theology or apologetics of the two come to the fore” especially in Donne’s sermons and Milton’s De Doctrina Christiana (347).


In Korean. Maintains that in some of the Holy Sonnets the speakers, recognizing that they are very sinful, ask God for grace not because they fear death itself but rather because they fear they will be separated from God forever; but that, when God seems to remain silent, they experience a kind of despair. Observes that this experience of God’s silence or absence is dealt with often in Christian literature, which typically assures man that, even in spiritual darkness, God is there, ready to help, and that perhaps He allows the pain so that man can more fully understand his human limitations. Discusses the relationship between enlightenment and darkness as found in the “sūyatā” of Buddhism and suggests that the Holy Sonnets be considered in the light of this tradition. Holds that the feeling of the absence of God may be “a sign that God is actually at work reordering the life of the speaker” (194) and that, by experiencing spiritual darkness, he can reach spiritual enlightenment. (From the abstract)


In Korean. Discusses the pervading sense of anxiety in the early seventeenth century caused, in part, by the emergence of the new science and the breakdown of traditional ways of viewing the world and suggests that this anxiety caused in the poets of the time a kind of agoraphobia and a desire to enclose themselves in limited spaces. Speculates that Donne may have suffered this psychological trauma as a result of his brother’s martyrdom, his experience of poverty in his early life, and results of the aftermath of his secret marriage. Claims that after being denied success in social life, Donne “became confined to his little room and experienced difficulty traveling from this safe place.” Says that, furthermore, his anxiety and fear were “often compounded by a fear of social embarrassment, as the agoraphobic fears the onset of a panic attack and [of] appearing distraught in public.” (From the abstract)

Comments on Donne’s intimacy with members of the Herbert family—Magdalen Herbert, John Danvers, William Herbert, Philip Herbert, and, of course, George Herbert. Suggests that Donne was “likely aware of Herbert’s final movements toward the priesthood” and may have suggested to William and Philip that “they should support their kinsman in his decision to enter the priesthood” (143).


Discusses how the circle image in Donne’s poetry is “a metaphor of ecological harmony” and how it “illustrates the concepts of modern ecology”—both “ecological holism and ecological harmony.” (From the abstract)

1741. Li, Zhengshuan and Yunhua Li. [The Knowledge of Old and New Science: An Important Source of Donne’s Metaphysical Thinking and Defamiliarized Expression.] Foreign Literature Studies/Wai Guo Wen Xue Yan Jiu 32: No. 3 [143]: 52–58.

In Chinese. Maintains that Donne’s interest in and knowledge of science provided him with an “endless source for his creation of poetry.” Points out that Donne derives his imagery from both traditional Ptolemaic cosmology and from the new cosmological discoveries. Says that he was inspired by the geographical discoveries of the time and yet, “deeply rooted in his mind,” are ideas drawn from alchemy and the theory of elements. Discusses how Donne’s mastery of both old and new science provided him with “a large amount of novel and philosophical images that contribute to his poetry’s uniqueness and meaningfulness.” Analyzes Donne’s employment of scientific knowledge in his poems and comments on how scientific images are used to express affection (p. 52). (From the abstract.)


Considers how Renaissance and seventeenth-century poets employed Neoplatonic concepts of circularity as a means for thinking about and analyzing problems related to the life of the soul and comments on how “figures of circularity, together with the strategy of translating the impossible into another mode,” plays “an important role” in Donne’s poetry (55). Discusses, in particular, how Donne in Sidney employs “a highly artful version” of kataphasis and how the “central, circular figure” in the poem “can be analyzed both as an extended prosopopoeia and as a series of parentheses or multiple embeddings” (56) and how it “stages multiple transcendences in interlocking circles.” Observes how Donne in the poem also “manages to transform Neoplatonic circularity from a discursive framework functioning as vehicle for meanings different from itself into autoreferentiality presented in the extended and involved conceit of choir, organ and multiple harmonies created by many voices.” Maintains that Sidney “elegantly mediates between private and common prayer, public and individual religious discourse, single and communal voices, traditional and innovative, spontaneous and received poetry.” Claims that as Donne “squares the circle of inventing yet another way of praising God,” he “alerts us to his own poetic sophistication while articulating aspects of his confessional politics” (58). Claims that his project, at the same time, “is ingeniously realised in the overlapping circles which, while structuring the praise of his eminent predecessors, mirror the poet’s own efforts «in sense translativa»” (59).


Surveys recent criticism on Donne’s three marriage sermons, noting that, for the most part, it has not focused on the sermons as sermons and has “tended to be guided by very modern
assumptions about what a marriage sermon should be: that it should praise the couple and should praise marriage itself, particularly companionate marriage" (18). Cites sources to show that "celebrating marriage was not the preacher's primary aim at an early seventeenth-century wedding" but rather the sermons "were perceived to be instruction rather than praise and celebration" (19). Points out, however, that Donne is "relatively mild in his orthodox reminders that marriage is a remedy against burning, and that celibacy is, for the rare few, a positive choice equal in value to married life," although he "does include misogynist clichés about the woman being a helper rather than a head and about Eve being responsible for the fall," as well as "one rather mean aside that women have souls but implies that those souls must be less pure than men's because they are not suited for priestly service" (20–21). Examines Donne's marriage sermons by focusing "not only on literary analysis and theological sources, but on what might be called preacherly techniques that are only realized in the interaction between a preacher and his audience." Argues, in particular, that "injecting humor into these sermons enables Donne to pass off otherwise objectionable arguments" and "to equivocate over aspects of marriage doctrine likely to anger his auditory" (21). Comments on examples of Donne's use of humor in the three sermons and maintains that they are "especially problematic as evidence that Donne held a particular, coherent theology of marriage in the 1620s." Points out that these sermons are "not typical of printed sermons about marriage of the period" but holds that from them "we may be able to overhear the laughter that bound together preacher and congregation, and enabled Donne to use humor to mitigate or negotiate the seemingly strict gender roles of the period" (32).
Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne, followed by a survey of the major characteristics of his poetry and of his prose. Says that Donne is "often considered the greatest love poet in the English language" and that his religious poetry, prose works, and sermons are "ranked among the best in the 17th century" (89).


Comments on Michael Symmons Roberts's original poem “To John Donne,” which is based on ElBed and which appeared in Corpus (London: Cape, 2004): 39–40. In his poem Roberts "laments the loss of wonder" that in Donne's ElBed "enlivens the speaker's praise of his mistress's body" and "deplores a reduction of that body to private property." Points out how Roberts's poem "stirred up controversy because of what is mistakenly perceived as its anti-science message" but argues by comparing the poem with ElBed that Roberts's "real target is not, however, scientific knowledge but the private and commercial uses of that knowledge" (144). Discusses how in his poem Roberts deals with "exploitation" and "a perversion of love" that he "exposes by twisting Donne's metaphors" found in ElBed (146).


Maintains that Donne's poetry "makes continual efforts to repress the whole idea of procreation, making sex an end in itself," and that he "tries to persuade himself, his audience and his female addressees that sex can be free of consequences." Suggests that this view "reflects a habit of mind that persisted throughout his poetic career and that even leaves traces in his sermons" and that it is "only when he writes for publication—in the Anniversaries—that he uses the common trope of poems as children." Observes that whereas Sidney, Spenser and Shakespeare "used ideas of paternity to impose unity on their works, Donne sees reproduction as compromising the integrity of the self" and that, for him, love is "a zero-sum game which cannot create anything new." Discusses how Donne "quite consistently denies and ironizes generativity," questions "the value of reproduction," and challenges "the idea of marital sex as the best way of connecting the private and the public spheres" (160). Contrasts and compares Donne's view with those of Spenser, Sidney, Shakespeare, and Jonson. Suggests that Donne "values the non-reproductive because it allows sex to be perpetual and valuable for itself rather than its products" and that he values barrenness because it "proves that the relationship with the woman is more than sexual, and is rarified to the point of being angelic" (166). Points out how "thoughts of his children seemed always to give Donne a sense of doom rather than the sense of hope that is more typical of his contemporaries" and that "death in fact is frequently a more positive idea than birth for Donne" (173). Concludes that, for Donne and for many of his followers, "a unified self can only be found by denying paternity, both biological and poetic" (186).

Reviews:

• Oliver Harris in TLS (29 Apr. 2011): 24.


Briefly comments on Donne's funeral sermon for Sir William Cokayne. Calls it "one of the most famous sermons ever delivered." Points out how Donne vividly describes in the sermon "the challenge of retaining concentration during prayer" (21).

Briefly comments on Donne's paradoxical wit in Annun. Says that “complex and contradictory thinking thrilled John Donne like the exercise of libido” (219).


Explores views on religious liberty in the works of Donne and Milton. Maintains that, in Donne, one finds a kind of “liberal view of toleration” in which he emphasizes “the separation of religious worship and political obedience.” Discusses how his view of religious liberty “emerges most fully” in Pseudo-Martyr, noting that it is “his first published work of any length” (290). Maintains that the treatise, in a spirit of ecumenism, “separates itself from more vitriolic controversialism” of the time (291) and “extends an olive branch to the individual believer” while, at the same time, it “heaps scorn” upon the Pope and the Jesuits (292). Discusses how Donne’s defense of the Oath of Allegiance “appeals to the nationalist sentiment valuing preservation of peace in the realm” and how “it also subtly adjusts James’s pretensions to spiritual authority over his subjects as it adjusts the Pope’s pretensions to temporal authority” (293). Observes that in Pseudo-Martyr, as in Sat3, Donne emphasizes the importance of individual conscience and suggests that “it is the role of the monarch to govern externals in a way that it does not impinge upon a subject’s conscience and that it is the role of the divines to attend to the spiritual state of the laity without interfering in civil affairs.” Shows that Donne’s argument “both extends an opportunity to recusants to lead an unencumbered life of obedience to the state” but that it also “forces upon them a change in beliefs that some would see as central to religious identity” (294). In discussing Milton, points out that he is “quite clearly an advocate of liberty of conscience who becomes increasingly hostile over his career to state involvement in matters of religion” (290).


Argues that “more than any other poet of the Early Modern Age,” Donne “presents his texts as events, performances, that is, in which the speaker of the poem—or the poet—acts out a role in a specific situation with an addressee whom he seeks to persuade, impress, or use as a witness.” Maintains that, “the high degree of performativity,” especially as seen in Donne’s love poems, “derives from three qualities”: (1) “the strong rhetorical character” of the poems, as seen in “the frequent use of the address to a ‘you’” and in “a great intensity of argument and persuasion, with surprising shifts of position and paradoxical reversals,” e.g. Wom-Con; (2) the presentation of a “dramatic scene, which may include action, even though the basically monological mode” is “never transcended,” e.g. Flea; and (3) “the notorious subjectivity of Donne’s poetry, its frequent focus on the ‘I,’ that is never solipsistic, since the speaker lays bare his soul in front of an audience, so that self-scrutiny tends to assume the character of self-exposure or self-exhibition.” Maintains that, therefore, “the rigorous self-representation conducted in a stunning series of self-definitions” is “characteristically related to an audience,” e.g. Noct (173). Maintains that in each of the three poems analyzed it is “the deviation from normative rhetoric” that “gives the text its performance thrust.” Discusses how in WomCon “rhetorical sermo cinatio (‘counter-fait representation’) is transformed so as to give us only the speaker’s version of the woman’s argument instead of her own words—a strategy which turns the poems into a solo performance.” Points out how Flea is also “a solo per-
formance” that “exhibits the speaker’s capacity for paradox and inversion of argument” (185). Explains how in Noct also, “with its pattern of negative self-definitions, possesses a rhetorical structure” (185–86) that is “embedded in a performative context, that of a diagnosis and exhibition of the self in front of an audience.” Concludes by briefly discussing Para, noting how the poem ends “with images of the self as an epitaph and tomb and a dead man speaking,” thus exhibiting “its character as a performance in the sense of self-presentation and self-exposure”; Donne in the poem “is performing what he is arguing” (186).

1753. Murphy, Tim. “Sub-Zero.” Quadrant 54, no. 4: 59.

An original poem that mentions Donne.


Points out that throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England the term “conversion” often meant a movement from one branch of Christianity to another, especially moves by individuals between Catholicism and Protestantism. Maintains that these conversions “not only provided a subject for early modern devotional poets, but also found its formal analogue in the turns and tropes of poetic language” and that “these various engagements with conversion finally helped to produce a body of English devotional poetry characterised by unprecedented psychological depth and formal complexity” (408). Observes that much devotional poetry written by Protestants “presents a corrupt human speaker who longs for the divine grace that he does not, and indeed, cannot deserve,” whereas much of Catholic poetry of the period “reflects a newly strengthened sacramental theology that reasserts the place of human will and works in the process of justification” (411). Notes that a number of important early modern English poets converted to or from Catholicism during their lifetime, including, of course, Donne. Maintains that much of Donne’s religious poetry “addresses the subject of religious choice and change” (415). Briefly discusses, as examples, Sat3 and HSShow, poems in which “true religion is defined not by its doctrinal tenets, but by the process by which the convert arrives at it” (417).

Review:


1755. Nan, Fang and Li-me Luan. [Interpretation of the Sun Image in John Donne’s Poetry.] Foreign Language and Literature 26, No. 3: 19–21.

In Chinese. Discusses how Donne uses sun imagery to explore the nature of love in both his love poetry and his sacred poems. Maintains that such images reflect Donne’s view of the eternal nature of love and serve as symbols of his complex religious sensibility and outlook.


In Japanese. Points out that in 1609 2 observations were made by mathematicians, Thomas Harriot and Galileo, that contradicted the principles of Aristotelian cosmology and that suggested the possibility of an infinite universe. Observes that in 1610 Galileo published Sidereus Nuncius and that Donne published FirAn, in which Donne recognizes the corruption of the traditional world brought about by the New Science and complains about the breakdown of the old cosmological harmony. Maintains, however, that, in using images and concepts of the new cosmology in his poem, Donne does not necessarily manifest his scientific ideas but rather his philosophical ideas, although we cannot rule out his interest in the
New Science.


Translates into Spanish selected parts of Ignatius.


In Dutch. In “Abecedarium op het werk van Kees Verheul” (5[–73), Otten pays tribute to Kees Verheul and his work, saying that Kees was his guide as Virgil was Dante’s. In “Poetic Passion: Over mijn leermeester Clay Hunt” (75[–157) Kees pays homage to Clay Hunt, who, in 1957, was his teacher at Williams College. In “Clay Hunt: Donnes ‘Lofzang tot God, Mijn God, tijden Mijn Ziekte’” (157[–191), following the English text of the poem, is a Dutch translation of Hunt’s reading of Sickness from Donne’s Poetry: Essays in Literary Analysis (1954), pp. 96–117. Concludes with a list of works by Otten (192) and by Verheul (193) and a Schrijverslijst (195[–204]).


Discusses Donne’s effect on Octavio Paz’s poems and essays, which he sees primarily as a confluence of ideas rather than influence. Comments on Paz’s creative theory of translation and his translations of Donne’s poems, noting how the two poets share a common understanding of poetry as an instrument of knowledge and poetics as an epistemology. Focuses primarily on Donne’s love poems, especially ElBed, Ecst, and Relic, and discusses how the two poets approach love from different perspectives—from purely sexual eroticism to mystical love.


Maintains that Devotions is “unique as a devotional work because it is not a devotional method in itself for readers to use in the hopes of achieving their own spiritual recovery” but rather it is “an application of a method that its author never articulates.” Sees the work as “profoundly logocentric, idiosyncratic, and particular in a manner that contemporary, popularly used Jesuit and Protestant devotional exercises were not” (329). Argues that “in his neglecting to provide his readers with just such a method, Donne may be resisting not merely a convention of early modern devotional writing,” but rather may be avoiding “a theology of language that would locate spiritual recovery in words—the supposed physical embodiment of prayerful petition and meditative focus—and not in prayer itself” (329–30). Contrasts and compares the methodology of Devotions with those found in St. Ignatius’s Spiritual Exercises and in Joseph Hall’s The Art of Divine Meditation. While acknowledging some influence of both Catholic and Protestant devotional manuals on Donne’s work, maintains that, unlike the works of St. Ignatius and Hall, Devotions is “entirely an instance of a method applied, an example of an individual following a devotional program, which the careful structuring of spiritual despair and recovery into twenty-three stations is intended to demonstrate, though Donne never articulates how.” Concludes, therefore, that Devotions is “not a work that advocates or promotes a specific or unique devotional method or that purports to be a method on its own” but rather it is “a narrative, a self-account of a method applied, and one to which readers are invited to bear witness or experience,” and, thus, it “testifies to the importance of understanding the significant place applied devotional literature in the early seventeenth century occupies in the history of English literature” (336).

1761. Post, Jonathan. “Seventeenth-century poetry

Maintains that Donne and Jonson were “the two most original and influential poets writing in the earlier seventeenth century” and that “they were recognized as such by many, although not all, of their peers” (192). Compares and contrasts the two poets and their poetry and highlights how they distanced themselves from their Elizabethan predecessors. Claims that both “might well be counted England’s first modern poets” (194). Presents biographical sketches of Donne and Jonson and discusses the major features of the poetry of each, primarily by a series of contrasts to show how they “differed significantly from each other in almost every way then imaginable in verse” (196). Stresses Donne’s use of the conceit, paradox, word play, hyperbolic expression, wit, eroticism, and metrical experimentation. Comments on the influence of both poets on other seventeenth-century poets, such as Aemelia Lanyer, Herrick, Marvell, Carew, Henry King, and Drummond.


Discusses “how closely aesthetics and cosmology can inform each other” (212) and maintains that Donne’s poetry “offers particularly fruitful territory for exploring how cosmology was playfully transformed to express early modern concerns.” Observes that Donne is “one of the first poets to confront the intellectual problems of a modern world and its contradictory fascination with the priority of self on the one hand and the enormity of a vacuous cosmos on the other.” Points out that “while probing early modern questions of identity and world view, he often invokes medieval tropes to represent these problems, as though these symbolic terms from a former era provided him a familiar and understood vocabulary for articulating the perplexing array of new conflicts shaping the emerging modern experience.” Cites the Anniversaries as Donne’s “most recognized example” of his “poetic experimentation in cosmology,” noting how the “distinctive modern character of the cosmos” described in the Anniversaries “becomes striking when compared with a medieval example of creation poetics” (217). Discusses also how the Songs and Sonnets “offer several overlooked examples” of Donne’s “poetic experimentation with Neoplatonic cosmology” (218) and how in these poems “the apparatus of scholastic terms is transformed into a set of poetic motifs furnishing Donne’s private, poetic universe” (220). Discusses Air, Noct, ValMourn, and LovGrow as examples of how Donne “recreates a Neoplatonic universe centered upon a radically individualized perspective.” Concludes that by “transforming a metaphysical system into poetic conceits,” Donne’s love poetry “retunes the world harmony to express the dynamic quality of the lovers’ interanimated universe” and that by “playfully testing, distorting, and reconfiguring the proportions of Neoplatonic cosmology,” his poems “share in the experimental spirit of early modern science and aesthetics, which together generated the creative plenty and fearful infinity of a limitless universe” (235).


In Portuguese. Discusses the theory of creative or iconic translation as defined by Haroldo de Campos, a Brazilian poet and essayist, and illustrates the application of his theory with an example of a translation of an excerpt from Expir made by Augusto de Campo (1968).

1764. Ralph, Laura. “‘Why are we by all creatures waited on?’: Situating John Donne and George Herbert in Early Modern Ecological Discourse.” EarlyES 3, no pagination.

Observes that although both Donne and Herbert exhibit “the influence of a traditional Thomistic worldview in which humanity is clearly situated at the pinnacle of creation,
Donne wrestles with the implications of human sinfulness and theories of the ‘new philosophy,’ while Herbert responds to such challenges with a reassertion of this order.” Maintains, therefore, that, in contrast to Herbert, “whose poetic treatment of nature serves as a reiteration of the existing framework, Donne’s philosophically inclined mode of thought enables him to interrogate the order of being and, thus, to emerge as an ecologically conscious early modern poet.” Claims that, “in short, Herbert’s devotional subjectivity is one of answers, while Donne’s is one of questions.” Argues that although Donne “does not engage the genres and topics typically associated with the so-called ‘green’ poets, his poetry portrays a philosophical awareness that often considers deeply humanity’s place in relation to the natural realm” and stresses how it expresses, in particular, a keen interest in the discoveries of the “new science” that “would eventually overthrow anthropocentric understandings of the cosmos.” Cites examples primarily from the Anniversaries and from the Holy Sonnets. Suggests, also, how Donne’s “ecological sensibility” is “similar” to that of Vaughan.


Argues that HSSouls, Donne’s sonnet on the death of his father, “pinpoints a complicating factor in filial mourning: the tendency to deify the departed parent.” Observes that Donne struggles “to distinguish God from his other heavenly father.” Notes that, “[i]f resolved, this crisis of differentiation can lead the mourner towards spiritual maturity—towards a more solid sense of being simultaneously a child of God and an adult.” Shows how HSSoul “reaches the appropriate distinction, affirming that God (and not father) knows best,” but that “it seems to arrive there through desperation rather than development.” Explores, therefore, “the sonnet’s depiction of (true) grief,” taking into account that, according to the Variorum Edition of the Holy Sonnets, there are “two distinct authorial versions of the unconvincing closing gesture” of the poem. Maintains that the revised conclusion “clarifies the logic by which Donne moves from idolizing his invisible father to repentance before God,” noting that “[t]his progress, however, still feels forced.” Believes that “the work of mourning traps Donne between human familial and spiritual identities” (100).


1767. Robson, Lynn. “‘We’ll build in sonnets pretty rooms’: Early Modern Literary Studies, the ‘Spatial Turn’ and Ecocriticism.” LiteratureC 7, no. 12: 1062–76.

Discusses the growing interest of modern literary critics in notions of space, which has been called the “spatial turn,” and points out how it shares many of the concerns of modern ecocriticism. Maintains that although it has been “notoriously suggested” that Donne’s poetry
lacks an awareness of visual beauty and gives little sense of the natural world, nevertheless, his poems display an acute consciousness of space and are suffused with restless explorations of body and soul-scapes as evidenced, for example, by his use of metaphors of travel, exploration and mapping, depicting consciousness of new worlds and an acute sense of humans’ position within a re-drawn cosmos. Holds that Donne is, in fact, acutely aware of the sensible, imaginative and textual environment he inhabits and claims that “he seeks to understand it as he heads inevitably for the grave which is the only space which he is certain he will occupy.” Maintains, therefore, that “in his concern with textual, literary, cultural, social, physical, spiritual, global, and cosmic spaces,” Donne “shows himself the very model of an early modern man” (1063). Comments on how stanza 3 of Canon links early modern literature to ideas of space (1062).


Regards Donne as “a superb but limited poet” (115). Presents an interpretation of Canon based on two questions: (1) “What would John Donne, Anglican priest, think of canonization?” and (2) “What would the same man even in his alter-ego phase of ‘Jack’ Donne have thought of the transcendent love ascribed to the poem by most modern critics?” (115–16). Concludes that “the answer to both these questions . . . is not very much” (116). Believes that “the kind of transcendent love ascribed to the speaker and his silent mate in this poem is a figment of the twentieth-century imagination” (118), that Donne is “being ironic” in Canon, and that the poem is actually about “sexual love” (119). Challenges the usual interpretations of the images and conceits in the poem and finds it finally as simply “a triumph of Donne’s ability to realize the aberrant fantasies of human love” (131). Concludes that critics have been “wayward” in canonizing Donne “for all the wrong reasons” and that they have “rightly canonized this poem but not for well-wrought reasons” (132).


Points out Paul Muldoon’s borrowing of Donne’s l.8 in Triple in his long poem “Sillyhow Stride: In Memory of Warren Zevon” in Horse Latitudes (2006). Points out that this is only one of twenty or more lines that Muldoon quotes in his poems from Donne. Observes how Muldoon “places Donne’s verse in a longer clause, and (often) in a longer line, both preserving and undoing the original metre” (151). Points out how the poem is a dialogue with Donne.

1770. Sanchez, Reuben. “‘first the Burden, and then the Ease’: Donne and the Art of Convitere in Four Texts.” EIRC 36, no. 1: 119–48.

Discusses how Donne “attended to his own spiritual welfare and that of others” and also how “his conception of conversion—the turn toward God—developed over time.” Examines the concept of convitere in Lam, Goodf, a sermon on Lamentation 3:1, and a letter to his mother about the death of her daughter. Discusses how the two poems illustrate Donne’s “desire to turn toward God, as well as his desire to turn the reader toward God” and that the two prose selections show “his desire to ensure the turn of his auditors (his congregation and his mother) toward God.” Maintains also that by examining these four texts “we may also trace Donne’s developing understanding of and appreciation for artes concionandi, the art of making sermons” (119). Holds that Donne’s paraphrase of Lam “enabled him to understand and appreciate the central, homiletic lesson of that biblical text: the value of consolation to a grieving nation, or congregation, or individual” (120). Discusses how in both Lam and Goodf Donne “recognizes that God turns the individual” but that “the individual must first request or desire the turn” (124) and how he focuses in both on “the speaker’s own turn or conversion, his own spiritual welfare,” whereas in the sermon and the letter to his mother Donne “uses the same biblical tropes to address the turn, the
conversion, of others, and therefore their spiritual welfare” (129).


Examines how Sophocles in Oedipus Rex, Shakespeare in Hamlet, and Donne in “Meditation XVII” in Devotions address death. Maintains that each “presents a phenomenological understanding of death that highlights inescapable aspects about dying as humans” and explains “the implications of their aesthetic expressions for developing an ethic that would help order life in the face of the experience of death” (18). Points out Donne’s preoccupation with death in all of his poetry and prose but focuses primarily on the “Meditation XVII” in Devotions, comparing and contrasting his view of death with those of Sophocles and Shakespeare. Observes that, for Donne, “in the experience of death, we learn a profound lesson about humanity: we share the fates of all toward death, and, instead of becoming disillusioned about life’s moral purpose or despairing about the canceling effect of death upon this purpose, we see in the connectedness with others God’s grace ‘translating’ our lives into an eternal purpose.” Maintains that Donne believes that “death teaches of divine grace” and that God “translates our lives into a story larger than our particular lives.” Claims that, for Donne, therefore, “death is not the final and despairing conclusion of a person’s life” and that he maintains that “we experience God’s grace in identifying with the humanity of the dead because we know that God raises all into a glorious resurrection” (27). Concludes that Donne presents “an ethic of compassion” that holds that “the end of life does not end the value of our humanity” (31).


Discusses the aesthetics of violation. Briefly compares Donne with the biblical prophets because both seem “to share a predilection for ‘baroque,’ counterintuitive metaphorical conjunctions-disjunctions and for what could be thought of as a poetics of force.” Points out that Donne and the prophets “concur that women (actual and metaphorical) are ‘safeliest when with one man manned’” and that both frequently portray the poet “as slicing through oppositional surrounding voices.” Points out that in his sermons Donne, as Dean of St. Paul’s, “was prone to highlight the stranger figures in the prophetic corpus” (102).


Maintains that throughout Donne’s poetry and prose there are “moments of intense skepticism about the soul’s capacity to know itself coupled with implicit invitations to acquire self-knowledge” and that “the paradoxical treatment of self-knowledge is nowhere more apparent” than in the Anniversaries. Observes that, although the two poems were written to praise the dead Elizabeth Drury, Donne “uses the occasion to inquire into the broader questions of what constitutes a praiseworthy life, and a proper cognitive and affective stance towards death” (313). Says that “in this inquiry, Donne gives us two sharply conflicting accounts of self-knowledge: one in which the whole project is dismissed as being quite useless (because hopeless), and another in which it is promised as a virtue essential to ‘what thou shalt bee’ in heaven” (313–14). Finds in SecAn an accommodation of each of these arguments. Argues that the poem “may be read as both a portrait of resistance to the parting of body and soul in death, as well as an account of the soul’s achievement and growth in self-knowledge through the same event.” Maintains that “the topoi of the transient ‘in-mate soule’” (the soul as temporary lodger) in FirAn (l. 6) is “of central importance in this context, and, varying
sharply between the two poems, pertains to the longstanding theological debate concerning the tension between what Calvin called "our natural aversion to leaving this life" and the normative Christian desire for heaven.” Discusses “the notion of self-knowledge beyond the self,” briefly compares and contrasts Donne and Joseph Hall on the issue, and discusses the depiction of the ‘in-mate soule’ in FirAn “before proceeding to a longer account” of it in SecAn (315). Explains how Donne conflates in SecAn “the respective plights of the inmate soul and the active soul that he took pains to separate” in FirAn and how “the inertia of the former and the activity of the latter become two ontological moments within the trajectory of one soul (which extends through life and death) rather than two different sorts of soul belonging to different persons” as in FirAn (322).


Discusses the question of the correlation between the influence of Donne and of Derzhavin on Joseph Brodsky’s poetry. (From the abstract)


Examines how “an older, pre-Reformation longing to maintain some sense of communion with the dead returns and takes shape specifically in Donne’s Songs and Sonets.” Discusses how "the representations of the dead in these poems address and wrestle with many of the issues still being debated as Protestants struggled to find consensus about the proper way to view the dead.” Points out that it is “usually assumed that genuine religious concerns about death are obscured in the Songs and Sonets by the humorous and erotic tone of these love lyrics” (95). Argues that “a careful reading of these poems, however, in relation to the continuing debate about the status of the dead in post-Reformation England demonstrates that Donne’s repeated attempts to resist death’s separating force are shaped by an anxiety about the widening spiritual gap distanci ng Protestants from the dead” and that, moreover, “while the Catholic references in the Songs and Sonets are often whimsical and do not officially prove that Donne embraced the faith in which he was raised, it is important to note that his poems draw on the power of saints, relics, and older burial practices during a period in which these traditional forms of remembrance were being forgotten and completely eliminated from the English church” (94–96). Before discussing the Songs and Sonets examines “how the status of the dead was articulated in the broader religious discourse of the period” (96) and how it is dealt with by Donne in HSShe, a poem that “exposes the general cultural anxiety with sterner elements of reformed teaching on the dead.” Maintains that, in contrast, the Songs and Sonets “develop a more positive and daring response to these problems” and, while confronting “the barriers separating the living and the dead but with a greater willingness to question reformed regulations,” they “re-imagine forms of connection with the dead that Protestant reformers were working to eliminate.” Shows how “saints, relics, intercession, and other Catholic rituals have a strange, recurring presence in the Songs and Sonets and serve an important function by creating points of contact between the living and dead” (101). Discusses as examples Canon, ValMourn, ValName, Relic, and Noct.


Explains how to engage in close reading of a poem, using Flea as an example. Points out the need to gloss unfamiliar words, to visualize the poem’s scene and its dramatic action, to para-
phrase its argument, to think about the poem as an unfolding story, and to consider the implications of its three-part structure. Suggests how the poem can be viewed as a dramatic monologue in which Donne creates a character and puts him “in a situation where he does not have everything his own way.” Adds that *Flea* is “a particularly good test case for this, with its preposterous set-up; the action progressing through the speaker’s speech; and so on” (90).


Compares *Res* to paintings on the subject of resurrection. Maintains that whether the poem’s “imperfection” is “a deliberate decision or an inability to come to terms with the theme, the poem enacts the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of contemplating the Resurrection of Christ.” Holds that the “successive metaphors” of *Res* “express the impossibility of capturing the moment of the Resurrection, as does the unfinished quality of the whole poem” (208). Points out that in *Res* Donne “does not narrate the moment of Resurrection, nor the apparition of the resurrected Christ” but rather focuses on “the moment of discovery that begins the story in all four gospels, and which was illustrated in early Resurrection images: the discovery of absence, of the empty tomb” (212–13). Observes that, like Fra Angelico’s fresco in the Convento di San Marco in Florence, Donne’s speaker “approaches the empty tomb, and then attempts to illustrate (in words) what the absence means.” Maintains that, in order to do that, Donne employs three figures: (1) an “opening invocation of the sun, with its inherent associations with the son of God”; (2) an alchemical metaphor; and (3) a “metaphor of the soul parting from the body” (213). Holds that “such metaphors resemble the choice made by painters of the Resurrection to show Christ ethereally floating in the air, rather than solidly feet on the ground.” Says that metaphor, though inadequate, “is essential, because it seems we can only see or imagine Christ’s body if we describe it as something else.” Maintains, therefore, that in *Res* Donne creates in his imagination “three imperfect images of the sight he is missing” (216). Concludes that “comparison with painting can provide a slightly different angle of access to the poem, particularly in the classroom, reminding students that texts can be read spatially too” (216–17).


In Chinese. Discusses Donne’s treatment of death in his poetry, noting how it reflects his religious views. Points out that Donne does not always have answers but that he keeps looking for them. Briefly compares Donne’s attitude toward death with other poets.


Maintains that although Donne throughout his lifetime was very interested in “the concept of heresy” and “made important and distinctive uses of the concept,” it would be wrong to depict him as “an almost heretic” as some critics have done, thereby underestimating “the powerful centripetal force to which he subjected every religious influence that acted upon him.” Argues that Donne viewed heresy, in fact, as “a powerful concept that could be used as an instrument of inclusion and not exclusion, unification and not division.” States that this study focuses on his use of the concept “in the years immediately following the accession to the throne of Charles I” during which time he used the concept “as a part of a wider call for moderation, and a rejection of any ecclesiological shift in the direction desired by the avant-garde conformists” (113). Discusses how, “repeatedly, in sermons preached before the king, Donne emphasized an understanding of heresy that stressed the importance of accom-
modation and toleration within the English Church,” while, at the same time, he “engaged in anti-Catholic polemic as he transposes internal religious debate to external religious difference” (113–114). Claims that “in a shrewd rhetorical move,” Donne “emphasizes the Roman Catholic church’s use of the rhetoric of heresy making her the perfect contrast to the irenic accommodation” that he “clearly wishes the new king to espouse” (114). After surveying Donne’s wider interest in heresy, focuses on the later sermons to show how “in interesting and troubled times in the experience of the English church, Donne seems to have felt no need to respond to controversy with a hardening of positions and a reduction of tolerance.” Observes that although “this use of heresy is not the sum total of Donne’s approach to the issue,” the paradigm established in these important sermons “is representative of a very major element of his interest, and indicative of the dominant stress in his ecclesiology” (126). Points out that “an impatience with the polemical use of heresy and related terms, an emphasis on fundamentals that makes any heresy rather difficult, and an accommodation and even irenic attitude toward his fellow Christians are hallmarks of Donne’s wider treatment of intra-church, and even at times of inter-church controversy” (126).


In Chapter 1, “Introduction: Renaissance Genres in Their Social Contexts” (1–31), explains that this study “explores the social dimensions of early modern genres on the basis of the relationship among poetics, rhetoric and the Renaissance doctrines of imitation” and that it does so by considering Donne’s poetry as “a representative example.” Observes that the study discusses the issue not only by analyzing the Satyres, the Anniversaries, and the verse letters but also by analyzing “anonymous records of the circulation of Donne’s poetry in selected manuscripts.” Maintains that “genre in the early modern period was a much more fluid, socially-determined category of meaning more actualized in reception than often assumed” and thus early modern genres “were interdependent with dominant cultural attitudes toward reading, writing, collecting data and classifying knowledge.” Points out that this study, therefore, is as much “about reading habits as it is about genre” and also that it considers “common late-twentieth century academic assumptions about early modern genres” in order to show that “those assumptions, just like in the earlier period, reflect dominant cultural and epistemological attitudes towards reading, writing, collecting data and classifying knowledge” (1). In Chapter 2, “Renaissance Rhetoric, the Culture of Imitation, and Genres: Toward an Early Modern Theory of Reading” (33–73), establishes “the context of a social understanding of genre and the claim that genre in the Renaissance often depended on reception rather than only on intention.” Analyzes certain “socio-cultural forces that shaped seventeenth-century reading habits” and looks at “the presence of rhetoric in pedagogical practice, oral residues in the practice of reading, and common techniques of composition and storing of information.” Offers “a preliminary formulation for the social dimension of genre in the period with an emphasis on reception and an argument for a widespread existence of a socially-oriented sense of literary decorum.” Argues that, “when understood in the context of rhetoric, forms of imitation provide a basis for something that approaches a Renaissance theory of reading” (21). Chapter 3, “Material Records of Reader Appropriation and the Uncertain Boundaries of Early Modern Genres” (75–104), examines “material records from manuscript sources to illustrate the appropriative habit of reading and the consequent understanding of genre as a social category depending on reception” (21–22). Traces manuscript records showing the circulation of Donne’s poetry compiled around 1630 and shows that “the dominant generic frame of one poetic text was fixed in the moment/context of appropriation.” Points out that Air, Leg, Broken, and ElAnag, for example, “circulated and were frequently recorded under the title
‘elegie.’ Maintains, therefore, that “in terms of the poems’ inner form . . . genre functions as a fluid category largely determined by reception” and that there is “little evidence that the matter of their genre is an inherent category, something linguistically and semantically inscribed into the text itself” (22). In Chapter 4, “Donne’s Verse Epistles and the Contexts of Genre” (105–58); Chapter 5, “Donne’s An Anatomy of the World as a Sermon in Verse” (159–22); and Chapter 6, “Generic Function in Donne’s Satire” (223–66), shows how these poems are “multireferential when it comes to genre.” Maintains that “when examined not only in relation to their primary or intended audience, but also in relation to secondary circles of readers and different receiving contexts, their generic framework is revealed to be much more flexible and varied than often assumed.” Argues that these chapters “call into question established generic notions” and “demonstrate the premise that genre is a social, rather than only a formal category with regard to texts that have been read traditionally only in relation to one of their generic framework, their occasion or topical nature” (23). In Chapter 7, “Some Final Remarks on Appropriative Reading and Genre” (267–73), observes that the approach to texts discussed in this study “changed very gradually, as the technology of print and its implications for the understanding of texts began to constitute a norm” but that, “as late as the second half of the seventeenth century, however, the commonplace technique in the reading of poetry and the reader’s role as both scribe and author was carried onto printed texts,” which explains “such actions as the apparent liberties many printers took with the texts they were printing” (267). Cites examples of editorial interference in the publication of Donne’s poetry and claims that “the history of editing Donne, in fact, represents a concerted effort to undo or repair the breaches or reinterpretations caused through the appropriative reading of Donne’s poems” (268). Concludes with 10 plates, a bibliography (275–311), and an index (313–21).


Maintains that in his poetry Donne expresses “the spirit of the age, in particular, the strain of the withdrawing old world and its emotional stability, as well as a tremulous fear of the yet unfathomed new cosmos staring at him with a mindless impersonal gaze” (117). Surveys critical commentary on Donne’s love poetry and comments on its major features and on the philosophy of love that it reflects. Points out, for instance, “its power to unify the disparate experiences of body and mind” (121) and how it seems to emerge “as a speech out of the middle of a moving action” (122). Says that Donne the lover emerges in his poems as “an honest and passionate seeker of a wholesome synthesis of the total experience of love beyond the need of morals and convention to qualify its essence” and thus his love poetry is “an experiment in as much as it is a revolt against and a flagrant disregard of convention and sobriety which appear hypocritical to him” (129). Maintains that Donne’s love poetry “is not about Love as a philosophical concept” but rather “is the record of his loving and his private discussions on his intensely passionate and frustrated experience” and claims that it “deviates sharply from other love-poetry for its significant refusal to recognize any external motive for loving save his insistent need to be united in flesh and will.” Sees Donne as “experimenting with human love” as a step to a transcendent or divine love (153). Suggests that “the essence of love, whether of woman or of God, is the same to Donne” (156). Discusses also Donne’s view of and witty uses of time. Throughout compares and contrasts Donne and Shakespeare in their treatment of love and time.


Reviews the DVD release of “Simon Schama’s John Donne,” a 2009 BBC television produc-
tion in which Schama, Fiona Shaw, and John Carey discuss the life and poetry of Donne.


Discusses how Sickness “reveals how Donne, terrified at the actuality of death, adopts as his first strategy an attempt to deny as much as possible a truly binocular view, emphasizing instead a stereoscopic assimilation of the fearful unknown reaches of death to the known dimensions of life.” Points out how in the poem Donne’s sickroom “becomes, by this will to similarity, an antechamber to God’s holy room; his present music is, he says, the same as the music he will play, or become, in heaven; and what he here enacts in thought, he will in heaven carry out in action.” Observes how “his assimilations then become geographical ones: by comparing his body to a flat map, he makes his West his East, his death his resurrection, and his journey to the afterlife a project comparable to the earthly journeys of famous travelers.” Maintains that “even when Donne turns away from these witty coercive analogies to engage in direct prayer, he is intent on a form of metaphorical religious assimilation, conflating the place of joy (Paradise) with the place of pain (Calvary), metamorphosing one crown (Christ’s crown of thorns) into another (his own crown of salvation), assuring himself that one bodily fluid (the sweat of Adam’s brow, reproduced by his own fever) will be redeemed by another such fluid (Christ’s blood)” (13). Maintains that these “palpable stylistic efforts to fuse into a single image each set of opposite states is made in the interest of obscuring the enormous difference between sickness and God’s room, death and eternal life, earthly journeys and spiritual ones, preaching in public and praying on one’s deathbed.” Says that the “strategy of denial of difference” in this “conspicuously assimilative poem” ends only in the poem’s last line (14), in which Donne finally admits that “being thrown down into death must precede being raised into immortality” (15). Maintains that also in Father, as in Sick-


Intended as a guide for students. Points out how Donne “intermixes the sacred and the profane” in his religious poetry and how his “imaginative engagement with religious doctrine is often surprising and can be confrontational, while the imagery and semantic field employed in his devotional poetry can also be disturbingly physical” (141). Discusses Corona, noting that “the emphasis on liturgy, the rosary-like circle of sonnets, and the lingering praise of the Virgin Mary clearly demarcate the work as focused through the lens of Catholic devotions.” Points out, however, also the influence of Revelations in the sequence, the use of imagery drawn from The Book of Common Prayer (143), and even hints of Calvinism. Comments briefly also on the rhyme scheme in Corona.

1785. Winkelman, Michael A. “Post-Coital Tristesse, Prolactin, and Donne’s ‘Farewell to love.’” JDJ 29: 77–95.

Examines “one central dilemma for Donne: the mind/body problem in matters of love” by focusing on Fare. Argues that “understanding the effects of prolactin on the sex drive reveals the real underlying physiological basis for the situation delineated in the poem” (78).
Furthermore, maintains that like MRI’s or X-rays used to diagnose bodily ailments, insights drawn from evolutionary psychology, cognition, and neuroscience now afford us a clearer view of Donne’s standout achievement in this and other poetical dispatches on a wide range of ‘amorous paine.’” Sees the speaker in *Fare* as reflecting on “a certain psycho-somatic concern” stemming from “regrettable incidents” in his earlier life and regards the poem as “in many ways a very sophisticated example of erudita libido” (79). Observes how in the poem the speaker “reflects on how unsatisfying sexual consummation for men turns out to be” (80) and holds that Donne is not expressing a “misogynistic revulsion against sex and love” but rather simply recognizes “an innate biochemical basis for sometimes feeling bad after getting off” (85). Through a reading of *Fare* explains Donne’s “anatomization of post-coital tristesse” and sees the poem as “a case where Donne has again successfully mapped the emotional and physiological states he was describing” (94). Claims that Donne’s “linkage of the physical and mental—integrated Aristotelian hylomorphism rather than Cartesian duality—and their biological causation marks him as a very clear-sighted magister amoris naturalis.” Concludes that Donne’s ideas about eroticism in *Fare* are “far from mainstream” and sees Donne as “something of a protoscientist” and *Fare* as an example of his “intellectual adventuring” (95).


In Japanese. Presents an analysis of *HSSHe*. Maintains that the depression that Donne felt at the death of his wife led him to contemplate more deeply his relationship with God and to examine more closely his own spiritual state. Suggests that God revealed His love for him and allowed him to live as a preacher with Anne’s love within him and, therefore, to survive the loss of his wife.


In Chinese. Maintains that loyalty and betrayal are the two main themes in Donne’s love poetry and argues that this contradictory view of love has deep religious roots that stem from Donne’s personal experience with betrayal and conversion in his religious life. Sees in the love poetry a movement from purely sexual love to holy love. (From the abstract).
2011


Reprint. First appears as a single publication by the Latimer Trust in 2006.


Comments on the international interest in Donne, “the nature of scholarly exchange and collaboration in Donne studies, the principal organizations that facilitate this exchange, and the value of the international scholarly community as a research tool” (89). Comments on the John Donne Society, JDJ, and other journals that regularly publish essays on Donne. Notes, in particular, the activity in Donne studies in Western Europe, Japan, China, and other Asian countries. Observes that, “internationally, connections between researchers are promoted by well-established conferences, visiting fellowships and scholarship schemes, and international publishing projects” (94), noting, in particular, the importance of the John Donne Society Conference held annually in February.


Surveys the debate among critics over the nature and extent of Donne’s social, professional, ecclesiastical, spiritual, and literary ambitions. Comments primarily on the Anniversaries, the verse letters, Eclog, Pseudo-Martyr, and the sermons. In the first section (719–28), presents a survey of “the debate over Donne’s motives, paying particular attention to influential interventions by Edmund Gosse (1899), R. C. Bald (1970), and John Carey (1981).” Examines “the salient critical assumptions—epistemological, methodological, and political—underlying competing strands of thought,” while also “locating such preoccupations within their historical and dialectical contexts.” In the second section (728–31), discusses possible “future directions in the study of this topic” and “includes a review of Donne’s own references to ambition in his poetry and prose.” Suggests that this latter aspect has been “almost wholly neglected in previous commentary” (719). Maintains that in his writings Donne praises and disparages ambition, “finding it worthy or insidious according to circumstance,” a view that “accords not only with the wider literary usage of the concept in Donne’s lifetime but also with the broad traditions of classical and Christian attitudes informing that usage” (729).


Discusses the nature of preaching at the Inns of Court that may “serve as a lens by which to examine the role played by religion in the broader cultural life of the Inns of Court” and also “how that role may have changed between c. 1570 (when preachers were first installed on a permanent basis) and c.1640 (when the political situation had begun to depress attendance at the Inns)” (51). Comments on Donne’s appointment as Divinity Reader at Lincoln’s Inn (1616–1622). Points out three aspects of Donne’s preaching style: (1) “the significant part played by philology in his biblical exegesis, something that distinguishes him from other permanent Inns of Courts preachers, and that links him with the so-called metaphysical preaching style of court divines such as Lancelot Andrewes and Joseph Hall”; (2) the profusion of legal
terms and allusions in his sermons; and (3) “his shrewd appreciation of the common lawyer’s professional mental dexterity, juggling hypotheses, putting cases, batting suits back and forth between proponens and respondens, able to remain in dialectical suspension until the verdict is reached” (62). Maintains that Donne recognizes “the spiritual redundancy in such a purely speculative engagement with religion” (62–63) and urges his auditory “to climb higher, firing their affections as well as their intellects.” Notes evidence to show that both students and benchers “cherished” Donne’s “scintillating oratory” even when “they might demur on points of doctrine or church politics” (63). Briefly comments on Donne’s sermon preached at The Temple on Esther 4: 16.


A student study guide. Comments briefly on several major characteristics of Donne’s secular and religious poetry, such as colloquial diction, frank expressions of desire, elaborate images and conceits, violent intensity, and interest in religion, noting, in particular, the use of erotic images to imagine one’s relationship with God. Cites HSBatter as an example.


Collection of 15 essays by individual authors who comment on “the artistic and intellectual patronage of the Inns of Court and their influence on religion, politics, education, rhetoric, and culture from the fifteenth through the early eighteenth centuries” (3). Mentions Donne throughout, but four of the essays deal with him in some detail: Hugh Aldington’s “Gospel, law and ars praedicandi at the Inns of Court, c.1570–c.1640” (51–74); Emma Rhatigan’s “‘The sinful history of mine own youth’: John Donne preaches at Lincoln’s Inn” (90–106); Tarnya Cooper’s “Professional pride and personal agendas: portraits of judges, lawyers, and members of the Inns of Court, 1560–1630” (157–78); and Sarah Knight’s “Literature and drama at the early modern Inns of Court” (217–22), each of which has been separately entered in this bibliography.


Speculates on the idea of the secular body “as the site of sensibilities and convictions” and on “the ways in which it may or may not be distinguished from the ‘religious body,’” paying “special attention to pain because it directs us to the human body as a finite organism” and considering also “what relevance the secular body might have for secularism as a political system, particularly as a precondition for democratic life” (657). As an illustration, briefly comments on how in Devotions Donne “reflects on faith and the body through the image of the microcosm” (663). Suggests how Donne’s “theological uncertainties led him to agonize over the possibility that the rupture between body and soul at death might not be healed at resurrection” and “to wonder anxiously whether in being given a new sinless body at resurrection, his soul would be united with his own familiar body.” Maintains that, in fact, Donne’s faith “gave him the confidence that he, John Donne, would be present—his body and soul as one beside Christ in heaven” (664).


Presents “an overview of court politics and its scabrous counterpoint in the political public sphere from the death of Cecil in 1612 until the
ascendancy of Buckingham in 1616–17,” thereby supplying helpful background for those interested in this “crucial phase” of Donne’s career, “when he drew closer to the court in search of a patron who could procure him office in—or the chance to serve—church and state.” Outlines “the multiple centres of power and the complex articulation of influence at the Jacobean court”; describes “major individual groups, united by interest and ideology,” that competed for influence and power; discusses “the persistent political problems facing the court in the early 1610s”; and comments on “some of the tumultuous events that followed Cecil’s death” (538). Points out the many contacts Donne had with both English and Scots at court at the time of Cecil’s death, persons who occupied “different places on the contemporary ideological spectrum” (544). Discusses, in particular, Donne’s connection to Lucy Russell, Robert Ker, and the Howards.

1797. Bigliazzi, Silvia. “‘Me to mee; thee, my halfe, my all, my more’: L’Io e l’altró del femminile nella poesia di John Donne,” in De claris mulieribus: Figure e storie femminili nella tradizione europea, ed. Laura Bandiera and Diego Saglia, 109–30. (Ereditá di Babele, 8.) Parma, Italy: Monte Universitá Parma.

Seeks out stories and female figures in Donne’s love poetry that suggest alternative voices and viewpoints to his openly masculine dialectic and seductive/erotic language. Argues that in those poems in which the speaker is female, such as in Break, ConfL, and Sappho, Donne, rather than constructing stable female identities, exalts the beauty of the body and praises sensual pleasure exactly as he does in those poems in which the speaker is a male. Maintains, however, that in female counter-discourse an erotic and imaginative impulse comes out intentionally challenging those laws conceived by men—the false cultural constructions imposed on women in contrast to the reasonable prescriptions of Nature’s laws. Notes that Donne places women on Nature’s side rather than on the culture’s side. Discusses how in Break an unnamed woman takes the floor and, with an eroticism rich in ambiguities and contradic-

tions, expresses desires and thoughts that are alternative to those of her beloved male. Maintains that in the female speakers in ConfL and Sappho—in the first case a woman recalling the Ovidian Myrrha; and in the second case, Sappho, reshaped according to the classical model handed down from Greek and Roman culture—display two erotic paradigms developed earlier by Donne, i.e., loving inconstancy and the unity of two lovers. Points out that in these two poems various erotic codes and profane/sacred registers are wittily woven together that give rise to a metaphysical hieroglyph that leads to (in various ways and with various aims) the interdependence between the two female lovers and their physical/spiritual interpenetration. Says that Sappho exhibits an unprecedented female homoeroticism in the lyrical tradition of the time, endorses the unity of the two female lovers in terms of perfect symmetry, and develops the idea of the likeness between women as a criterion of a perfectly attained love, a kind of immortal and sterile monad of absolute pleasure. Explores the interplay in the poem among Self, the Same, and the female Other as well as the suffering loneliness of a woman who claims her right to love another same Self.


Argues that, “no longer invested in the synchronism of the doctrine of real presence, or in the icons and relics that purported to figure Christ, early modern humanists embraced absence in place of presence, past in place of present.” Observes how Protestant theology, “specifically Calvin’s reinterpretation of the Eucharist, similarly revises the early modern understanding of time.” Maintains that this revision is “complicated and even challenged” in Donne’s poetry. Shows how “by eroticizing the sacrament,” as seen in ValName and Relic, Donne “reworks the relationship between abstinence and eros, absence and presence, and diachronicity and synchronicity that had been created by the schism within Christianity.” Maintains that these poems also illustrate
Donne’s “critique of Reformation temporality as contained within the very successive temporal mode that aims to disavow it” (390). (From the abstract)


Review of Mary Papazian’s The Sacred and Profane in English Renaissance Literature (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008).


Argues that because of “the information revolution triggered by the printing press, the advent of modern science, Reformation theology, overseas exploration, the rise of global capitalism, and the technological take-off of the West, European societies gained an unprecedented capacity to explain, admire, and exploit the environment.” Analyzes a range of early modern works “to expose how they document, sanction, and resist these developments” (6). Has no extended discussion of Donne but briefly mentions as illustrations FirAn, Twick, HSMin, and especially Metem.


Translates from Russian into German Brodsky’s “The Great Elegy for John Donne,” an original 208-line poem written in 1963.


In the introduction (1–3), explains that this study discusses the influence of St. Ignatius Loyola on some of the poetical and theological works written by Donne before his ordination in 1615. In Chapter 1, “John Donne Criticism and the Ignatian Legacy” (5–20), surveys “arguments for and against the possibility of an Ignatian influence on Donne’s works by critics of the last century and a half” (2), noting the important contributions to the debate by such critics as T. S. Eliot, Louis Martz, Helen Gardner, Barbara Lewalski, John Carey, and others. Points out that by 1986 most critics “were rejecting, diluting or ignoring the effect of Ignatian spirituality on Donne” and that “the last decade of the twentieth century witnessed even more frequent attempts, by academics, to appropriate Donne’s religious affiliation and to define his theology at the expense of spiritual formation” (17). In Chapter 2, “Discretion and Ignatius’s Spiritual Exercises in Donne’s Time” (21–68), explains how “the idea and practice of discretion circulated among sixteenth-century Catholics” and how “facets of the Catholic tradition of discretion merged in Ignatius’s Spiritual Exercises” (21). Surveys also various adaptations of the Jesuit book in England during the sixteenth century and explains why and how Protestants also used and adapted the exercises. Offers support for the claim that Donne was quite familiar with the Spiritual Exercises and other books inspired by it and that he was fully aware of the Catholic tradition of discernment (22). In Chapter 3, “Mental Prayer, Discretion and Donne’s Early Religious Poems” (69–110), offers evidence of Donne’s “familiarity with the method, framework and dynamics” of the Spiritual Exercises, as well as “with the Ignatian sense of discretion and discernment” as seen in the Holy Sonnets, Corona, Lit, and Cross (70). In Chapter 4, “Essays in Divinity, Discretion and the Spiritual Exercises” (111–47), discusses similarities between Essays and the Exercises by focusing on “the formative role of discretion” in the Essays and then by focusing on Donne’s “method and themes of meditation, comparing them with relevant points and directions given by Ignatius in his Spiritual Exercises” and also in “early Jesuit commentaries on them.” Considers “the concluding prayers of the Essays in the light of Ignatian petitions and colloquies” (111). In Chapter 5, “Donne’s Biblical Exegesis”

Noting that Everard Guilpin’s place in the literary world of his day “emerges largely through the perspective of his peers,” comments on his interaction with Donne. In particular, discusses how in his verse letter EG Donne represents Guilpin as a friend and as fellow poet and “implicitly as one involved in the mutual exchange of work” (64). Points out also echoes of Donne’s Sat1 in Guilpin’s Skialetheia.


Mentions Donne and cites his poems as examples throughout this study intended to help college and university students “become better readers of sixteenth-century poetry” (1). In “Voice: From Plain Eloquence to Metaphysical Sublime” (141–62), discusses how in the late 1590’s Donne responded to the “sublime eloquence” of Spenser with “a new aesthetic” (159), i.e., metaphysical poetry. Outlines the
basic characteristics of metaphysical poetry, noting how it “topples the idealizing rhetoric of Petrarchism” and celebrates “the joys (and frustrations) of intimacy.” Maintains that Donne’s most important contribution to English love poetry is “his depiction of a thoughtfully intimate mutuality between the sexes” (160) and that his major contribution to English poetry overall is “his invention of a voice—a poetic style of character—that uses the metaphysical to alter the flow of English verse: from the ornate style of Petrarchism, which eloquently represents the male’s detachment from the female, to a new metaphysical style, which eloquently charts bodily intimacy” (160–61). Notes that “only Donne takes us into the secret recess of the bedroom, and keeps us there.” Discusses, as an example, Ecst, in which Donne explores “the spiritual value of sexual intimacy,” and suggests how the poem is “original in both voice and thought,” and maintains that what is “most original is Donne’s metaphysical representation of rapture” (161). In “Donne and the End of Sixteenth-Century Poetry” (280–87), states that “no one epitomizes the new spirit of late sixteenth-century poetry more than Donne” and discusses Canon as “one of the great love poems in the language” and as “an example of retrospective poetry” (284). Says that Canon “outlines a new erotic poetic,” in which Donne “uses the metaphor of teaching to instruct his mistress in the mysteries of love” (285). Discusses how Donne “helps close the sixteenth century and open the seventeenth” and thus “gives voice to the form of modern English poetry” (287).


Considers the complex state of religious allegiance in England during the years following the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559 and argues that “the idea that the English nation was an exclusively Protestant construct is a piece of national mythology” (372). Discusses how the Elizabethan Settlement was “a less than wholly successful compromise” and how “it was challenged from opposite sides of the fence” (373). Maintains that “we are forced to admit that in any more than a formal sense the Reformation, as the Protestantization of a nation accustomed to the old ways and beliefs, had in 1559 hardly begun” (375–76) and that the Reformation “took time to get properly underway.” Says that “it was in the mid-Elizabethan years, the 1570s especially, that Protestantism began to make significant headway in the localities and in hearts and minds.” Observes, however, that by 1600 England was “an anti-Catholic nation,” or at least “a nation that increasingly defined and constructed itself in contradistinction to Catholicism” (376). Discusses how Donne, as a young man, was greatly concerned about the mounting anti-Catholicism of the time and comments on his Catholic heritage. Maintains that “his ultra-Catholic genes and inheritance are not in doubt” but that “how far he made them his own is subject to interpretation” (382).


Discusses how early modern Protestant writers “from across the doctrinal spectrum” employ “the language or imagery of mechanical automation to characterize hypocrites, heretics, and others they consider beyond the pale” (95). Suggests that “the most obvious reason for the negative depiction of automata in Protestant polemics is the association of these devices
with Catholicism” (96). Points out that Donne in *Devotions* “toys with the idea that human beings might be analogous to clockwork figures with God’s grace as their spring” (98–99), but that he rejects the metaphor because he believed that, if applied to human beings, it “would let them off the hook for their own sinful actions.” Discusses, in particular, how and why the figure of the automaton was “such a popular polemical weapon to Protestant writers to wield against their sectarian opponents” (99) and notes that even those “who do not use the precise vocabulary of machinery, automation, or puppetry often describe false religiosity in terms that conjure up visions of animate but insentient bodies,” as Donne does in a 1626 sermon in which he criticizes those whose prayer involves “outward motions from which the heart and mind remain disengaged” (102).


Discusses and reproduces a copy of the Lothian portrait of Donne. Maintains that “as a portrait, Donne’s painted likeness, does something quite original which anticipates portraiture of a later date.” Observes that “he appears in a feigned oval—one of the earliest uses of this format recorded—which provides the illusion of a darkened oval window.” Notes also that in the portrait Donne strikes “a highly self-conscious pose playing an obviously adopted role rather than presenting a carefully observed outward conventional likeness.” Points out how Donne “places himself in a position where he cannot be clearly observed” and that “the resulting dramatic effect has more in common with stagecraft than with conventional portraiture at this date.” Thinks it is possible that the portrait had “some private purpose” and perhaps “was originally painted for a lover or close friend” (173).


Several essays mention Donne. See below especially Helen Wilcox’s “Sacred desire, forms of belief in the sonnet in early modern Britain,” pp. 145–65.


Discusses how the archival research on manuscripts of Donne works by recent scholars has “broadened our understanding of matters such as scribal publication, manuscript compilation, circulation of texts, and scribal variants.” Maintains that such research has extended “beyond the important goals of establishing informed texts” to include “their likely periods of composition, and (in some cases) the sequences in which they circulated” as well as informing such issues as Donne’s “attitudes towards print and patronage” (35). Suggests practical ways for researchers to deal with manuscripts and their repositories and comments on the many online and printed guides now available to assist archival research. Holds that “archival research can alter modern conceptions of early modern writers, canons, texts, and contexts” and notes that “the wealth of surviving manuscript copies of Donne’s works presents exceptional opportunities to study the nature of textual transmission” (42).

Discusses the publication history of *Paradoxes* that culminated in Helen Peters’s edition in 1980 and discusses the various problems and limitations of this edition. In particular, comments on six prose pieces that Peters relegated to dubia: “A Defence of Womens Inconstancy,” “That Virginity is a Vertue,” “Newes from the very Country,” “Character of a Dunce,” “The Description of a Scot at first sight,” and “An Essaie of Valour.” Argues on the basis of recent print and manuscript evidence that “we should restore most, perhaps all, of these satiric pieces to Donne’s canon” (36). Points out that “seventeenth-century readers—like nearly all subsequent readers—attributed these prose works to Donne.” Announces her forthcoming edition of *Juvenalia* for the John Donne Society’s Digital Text Project and expresses hope that “this new edition will place all of Donne’s short prose works more firmly onto the critical map for early modern studies” (49).


Argues that *Sat3* provides “an early sketch of the poetic, rhetorical, and hermeneutic approach to divinity that later came to epitomize Donne’s sermons and devotional writings” (79–80). Recognizes an Erasmian spirit in the poem in that Donne “projects a form of patristic-humanistic theological learning based in the literary arts.” Maintains that, “rather than encouraging a sectarian habit of thinking or resorting to the philosophical method of the schools,” Donne, like Erasmus, “encourages his reader to follow in the way of ‘all the Fathers,’ fashioning a persona who not only recommends the careful study of patristic writings, but who also envisions and partly models the lively interpretive-inventive process by which early teachers and preachers within the church participated in ‘true religion’” (80). Presents a close reading of *Sat3* to show that the speaker of the poem “not only defends against a sectarian spirit in his quest for ‘true religion,’” but that he also “advocates a distinctly patristic-humanistic approach to this end.” Claims that “such an approach anticipates the style of Donne’s sermons and devotional writings” in general and that it suggests “a common outlook and sensibility” between Donne and the speaker of *Sat3*. Holds that although a theologian, Donne definitely was not a schoolman, and maintains that he “did far more than simply repeat the doctrines set forth by Roman or Reformed camps.” Believes that Donne’s divinity develops out of “an idiosyncratic blend of ideas and authors” and is thus difficult to define “too precisely” (96). Points out that Donne “seeks to understand and appreciate texts of tradition and authority in their original contexts while inventing (i.e. discovering) them anew for himself and others within a present community of faith” (96–97) and that he “manages to be innovative and existentially relevant precisely at points where he is most attentive to and appreciative of ancient texts” (97).


Comments on “the strengths, shortcomings, and significance of some fundamental research tools for Donne studies both in print and online.” Maintains that “the most valuable tool in Donne studies to appear in the past twenty-five years” is the variorum edition of Donne’s poems and explains why (81). Also calls the *DigitalDonne* project “a powerful research tool” for the study of manuscripts and early editions of Donne’s poetry (85) and discusses its unique features. Observes that Geoffrey Keynes’s bibliography (1914, expanded in 1932, 1958, and 1973) and Ernest W. Sullivan’s *The Influence of John Donne: His Uncollected Seventeenth-Century Printed Verse* (1993) are “indispensable for the bibliographical history of Donne” and cites John R. Roberts’s *John Donne: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism* (1973, 1982, 2004, [2010, 2013]) as “the starting point for serious students of the critical tradition of Donne studies” (85). Comments on the usefulness and limitations of Combs and Sul-


Surveys the controversial issue of misogyny in Donne’s poetry and prose and discusses how the subject has had “an enduring focus of critical inquiry in Donne studies” (680). Comments on how in his works Donne or a speaker expresses at times a “deep-seated contempt of females” (679), while at other times he or a speaker praises women and shows respect for them. Maintains, therefore, that “the question of misogyny in Donne’s writings cannot, in short, be easily resolved.” Points out that “no single proof-text can answer the question of whether Donne revered women, reviled them, or judged them on a case-by-case basis.” Notes, furthermore, that “no commentary explicitly describing Donne’s attitude towards women is extant from the period of his own lifetime” (683).


In the “Author’s Preface: Translations and Transferences” (iii–vi), Nierva explains in English the difficulties encountered in translating 52 of Donne’s poems into Bikol, a Philippine dialect. In “Introduction: Concordia Discors” (vii–xvi), Aureus explains in English his love of the Bikol language and of Donne’s poetry and of his admiration of Nierva’s translation, calling it “a tour de force of translation” (xv) and claiming “this is not a translation: this is John Donne writing in Bikol” (xvi). Thereafter follows translations in Bikol of 11 selections from the *Songs and Sonnets* (1–22), 4 of the *Elegies* with “Julia” (23–33), the *Corona* with MHMary (35–46), the *Holy Sonnets* (47–67), and five selections from the *Divine Poems* with Sidney (69–98)—without notes or commentary. Concludes with an index of first lines of the translations in Bikol (100–01) and in English (102–03) and acknowledgments (104–05).


In Chinese. Begins with a recommendation of the translation by Prof. Yu Kwang-chong, who says that this edition is an important contribution to Donne studies in Chinese (3–4). In the preface (5–8), the translator indicates what led him to be interested in Donne and laments the lack of translations of Donne’s poetry in Chinese, which is followed by acknowledgments (9–12). Part 1: Presents a biographical sketch of Donne (13–23); gives an overview of Donne’s poems; and presents a list of titles (23–25); comments on the date and composition of the *Elegies* (25–34); discusses the classical and Renaissance elegiac traditions (34–41); comments
on the distinctive style of the *Elegies* (41–88); surveys several European translations of the poems and comments on the challenges of translating the *Elegies* into Chinese (89–103); points out Donne’s presence in music and movies (103–13); and offers concluding remarks and explains why “Julia” has been excluded from this edition (113–14). Part II: Translates the *Elegies* into Chinese (with accompanying English texts) with explanatory footnotes (3–230), including *Sappho* and “A Tale of a Citizen and His Wife.” Presents a bibliography (231–69) that includes modern editions of Donne’s works, a list of English and Chinese works cited in the edition, a list of modern Donne studies in English, and a reference guide to videos and songs from 1973–2010. Concludes with a chronology of Donne’s life (271–75); a discussion of how Ketil Bjornstad set Donne’s poems to music in his 1990 album “The Shadow” (277–79) and includes a CD of the songs; and a further brief comment on the problems inherent in translating a foreign language into Chinese (281–86).

Reviews:


Translates into German 25 of the *Songs and Sonets*, 5 of the *Elegies*, and *HSBatter* (along with English texts). (Information obtained on the internet.)


Translates into German (with English texts on opposite pages) *GoodM, SunRis, LovGrow, Canon, ValBook, ValWeep, ValMourn*, and *SSweet*—with brief commentaries.


Translates into French *Paradoxes* with footnotes (7–70), based on Helen Peters’s edition (1980), followed by an afterword by the translator (71–75) that comments on the composition and publication history of the *Paradoxes & Problems*, on Donne’s life, and on the history and development of the genres. Concludes with an index (77–78).


Presents a one-page introduction to Donne’s poetry followed by a translation of the *Songs and Sonets* into Spanish (with English texts on the opposite pages). Contains an index but no notes or commentary.


Discusses Donne’s “attraction to narrative” in the *Songs and Sonets* and in doing so explores “questions about the relationship between narrative and form.” Explores the “figuring of form,” and in particular, “narrative form itself as a figure” (58). Explains how Donne’s love poems illustrate “how and why the forms of narrative attract a poet whose reservations and even resistance to so many types of structure, from metrical pattern to political authority, has been extensively documented.” Discusses how the *Songs and Sonets* “incorporate many narratives and do so in ways that make us think further about the lyric and narrative modes, about song, and about the effects of the material conditions or dissemination on their author.” Maintains that “incorporation of narrative . . . is impelled both by the familiar but potent links between storytelling and agency or control” and “by the less predictable ways storytelling in many forms actually threatens the power of the teller” (60). Suggests that Donne “attempts to counter this . . . by subjecting the narratives of other storytellers to the
perils he fears overshadow his own tales” and, thereby, “demonstrates how limited an analysis of tales that focused only on agency and power would be” (60–61). Finds the “most intriguing instance of modal interplay” in Ind (61), a lyric that “encourages us to substitute for the widespread assumptions that lyric and narrative normatively impede each other, the recognition that instead one often impels the other” (62). Maintains that “the overarching reason for the narrativity” of the Songs and Sonets is that “the act of telling stories both generates and figures one of Donne’s central preoccupations, power, and more specifically the agency manifest in controlling both events and listeners” (63). Discusses examples to illustrate that “the link between telling a story and acquiring power is evident structurally and thematically throughout the Songs and Sonets” (65). Holds that “by telling stories about what has happened, by regulating the stories others tell, by substituting rival stories for those an antagonist proffers, and by turning stories about what may not happen into stories about what will happen, Donne uses narration to control the demons on the edges of his singularly edgy poems.” Observes also that although “narrativity can signal and establish the speaker’s power,” it “can also unsettle that power and agency so closely associated with it.” Discusses examples that show how “in many of Donne’s stories, his potency as author and that of the diegetic storyteller within the poem are undermined, and the workings of narrative are hence redefined to include peril as well as promise” (66). Discusses how Donne’s poems “sometimes translate futurity into certainty” but at other times “they draw attention to stories that may not come to pass” (68). Comments also on storytelling’s ambivalent connection to song. Insists that Donne was “attracted to narrativity precisely because it figures and explores conflicting models of power and hence is attractive to a poet who speaks and thinks a syntax of disjunctive conjunctions like or” and who “delights in telling stories and telling stories about doing so or failing to do so, because those operations play out the tension between agency and its discontents that interests him in so many ways.” Maintains that Donne’s concern “is not merely to assert but also to explore and evaluate poetic, masculine, and masculinist agency” (72).


Discusses the metaphysical conceit “in the rhetorical language and taxonomy used by its first practitioners,” i.e., by examining early modern definitions of metaphor, especially “the trope which was chiefly associated with ideas of the remote similitude, catachresis, defined by a seventeenth-century handbook as consisting of ‘abused or far-fetched incongruous speeches’” (395). Points out that catachresis appears in early modern accounts most often as “a vice or stylistic transgression” (396), but shows how in ElComp, for instance, catachresis, “precisely because it is seen as transgressive, far-fetched, remote and indecorous, comes into its own when the poetic occasion demands” it. Discusses how “the outlandish comparisons of catachresis” are “essential building blocks” in Donne’s valediction poems. Comments especially on the conceits in ValWeep and ValMourn and explains why catachrestic imagery is “crucial” to these poems. Claims that, for Donne, “a relationship under threat can be ‘strengthened’ precisely through obscurity” and that “fidelity and commitment can be re-affirmed and emotional connec- tions re-imagined as part of a journey across the rhetorical map—by a reader willing to go the distance with a remote catachresis” (399). Discusses how the valediction poems “represent an extreme manifestation of the crisis of fidelity rehearsed in the Songs and Sonets as a whole” (410) and claims that, for Donne, “the travels and travails of the mind were every-
thing,” especially as a means “to re-create love’s emotions through strenuous intellectual activity” (412–13). Observes that the far-fetched conceit, “as early modern thinkers recognize, is the register of desperation, uniquely suited to capturing extremities of feeling” (413). Surveys sixteenth- and seventeenth-century handbooks on composition and logic from which Donne may likely have found discussions of catachresis and comments also on the uses of catachresis in Devotions.


In the “Introduction” (1–22), explains that this study is about how Donne “read, absorbed, and re-worked” the writings of St. Augustine (2). Notes that there are more than 1,000 “acknowledged references to Augustine” in Donne's prose works composed between 1607 and 1631—from 61 different Augustinian texts. Observes that in Donne's sermons Augustine “outstrips any other non-scriptural source by, on average, three to one” and that “of the 160 extant sermons, only five do not mention Augustine at all.” Maintains this study is “the first sustained account of Donne's reading habits of the books he consulted in his search of Augustinian material” as well as “of the intellectual precepts and procedures that guided him in collecting, digesting, and re-presenting Augustine's texts in his own work” (3). Points out that this study “investigates, in the broadest sense, the influence of one author's philosophy of reading and interpretation upon another” and thus is a study in the history of ideas (10). Notes that the works of Augustine “do not travel directly from fifth-century Africa to seventeenth-century England, but undergo various stages of medieval and early modern redaction until they arrive at their destination” (11). Observes, therefore, that in this book one “will encounter a broad range of Augustinian personae and impersonations, those which Donne would have known and imagined, as well as those which he himself fabricated.” Argues that, for Donne, “the most important version of Augustine was not the saint, the convert, the theologian of grace, or the professional divine, but Augustine the reader and interpreter of texts.” Maintains that Donne used Augustine “primarily as a model for exegesis and argument” that offered him “theories of reading and exemplary exegetical application.” Observes that the opening chapters discuss “the breadth and range of Donne's Augustinian reading,” considering “how many (and which) of Augustine's works Donne cited” and “whether he consulted the original Augustinian texts or intermediary sources,” and “how he dealt with these different types of patristic resource.” Examines also “which editions he used; what mechanics of quotation are deployed; and what underlying scholarly and philosophical principles inform Donne's citations procedures.” Surveys, therefore, “a broad spectrum of Augustinian texts and a panoply of textual intermediaries” (21). Chapter 1, “How Donne Read Augustine” (23–64) and Chapter 2, “Augustinian Case Studies” (65–104) combine “quantitative and empirical source study with a survey of Donne's citational methods and practices.” In Chapter 3, “Ascending Humility: Augustinian Hermeneutics in the Essays in Divinity” (105–35), discusses Augustine’s “approach to interpretation.” In Chapter 4, “The Bad Physician: Casuistry and Augustinian Charity in Biathanatos” (137–62), shows how in Biathanatos Donne “repudiates Augustine's philosophy of reading and problematizes the discourse of which sustains early modern casuistical thought.” In Chapter 5, “Medicinall Concoctions: Equity and Charity in the Lincoln's Inn Sermons” (163–203), explains how in sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn in 1620, “Augustinian charity is camouflaged as equity” and how Donne “uses both terms to debate the terms of prerogative justice.” In Chapter 6, “Keeping the Peace: Donne, Augustine, and the Crisis of 1629” (185–203), comments on how Donne in a Whitsunday sermon of 1629 “mobilizes Augustine's interpretation of Genesis 1:2 to reframe the repressive Laudian rhetoric of political acquiescence as a vision of transcendental
peace.” In Chapter 7, “‘The evidence of things not seen’: Donne, Augustine, and the Beatific Vision” (205–24), discusses how Donne in a set of Easter and Candlemas sermons “invokes Augustine’s ideas of eternal beatitude to envisage the end of the hermeneutic journey begun in the Essays in Divinity” and how he “imagines a return to God which transforms mediated communication into direct, intuitive vision, and interpretation into unmediated communion” (22). In “Conclusion” (225–31), observes that the sermons are “the most remarkable textual monument to Donne’s Augustinian reading” and holds that through his preaching one can see Donne’s “changing relationship with Augustine’s thought as well as his continuous and acknowledged spiritual debt” (226). Points out how “the most crucial changes in Donne’s use of Augustine occur along biographical or chronological lines” (227). Maintains that Donne “relied on Augustine’s reading rules throughout his career: the language of faith and charity anchors his moral, political, and religious thought,” but that, above all, he saw in Augustine “the sustaining force of (inter)textual fictions, the power of interpretation to reimagine the flow of time” (231). Concludes with an appendix (233–34) that lists works by Augustine cited by Donne; bibliography of primary sources and secondary works (235–57); and an index (259–67).

Reviews:


Examines Eclog and EpEliz as examples of Donne’s “continuing exploration of the cognitive and imaginative significance of space and place” (123–24). Focuses on “an overlooked common element” in the two poems—“the pervasive use of spatial imagery that mirrors the physical and spiritual transformations attending each marriage” and examines how these “celebratory marriage offerings experiment with the capacity of spaces and places to reflect social and psychological realities.” Argues that Donne’s “lifelong intellectual and imaginative preoccupation” with “the shape of space” informs “the formal and thematic structures of Donne’s epithalamions to the point where they are not only commemorations of how marriage can anchor universal structures” but also are “meditations on how the structure of space shapes human life and thought” (124). Maintains that in these poems Donne “does not simply celebrate marriage as a reaffirmation of universal hierarchies” but that he also “invents new universes to figure forth the different marriages that restore and anchor them.” Draws on “seventeenth-century astronomical theories that so intrigued Donne for their potential as images of spiritual and mental conditions” and also on “current theories of how constructions of space and place inform human experience” (125). Discusses how reading these two poems in the light of spatial theory “sheds light on the depth of Donne’s imaginative preoccupation with space, place, and cosmography” (127). Holds that spatial systems in these courtly epithalamions are “not easily identifiable as Ptolemaic or Copernican” but rather are “Donnean systems, with their own nature, coherence, and consequences” and that by examining how Donne “utilizes spaces and places through the original space systems of these poems,” one is able to arrive at “a more nuanced understanding of the generic innovations” of these poems and that “by tracing out the worlds they contain,” one can discover “new dimensions of the poems themselves” (128). Analyzes both poems to show how Donne’s “creation of new spatial systems to explain and contain these two court marriages reveal[s] not only the different ways marriage can affect the world” but also “the capacity of the epithalamion genre to delineate the relationship between the structure
of reality and human experience of that reality in both literary and spatial terms.” Concludes that the two poems “become meditations on the many ways small places, be they marriage beds or poems, can shape universes” (155).


Notes that “the connection between Donne and Browne has not, as yet, been firmly established on empirical grounds” and that, “unless or until further evidence comes to light, the historical connection between the two authors therefore seems to reach a dead end in conjecture.” Maintains, however, that “the similarity of conceit and diction in two key passages,” one from Meditation XIV in Devotions and the other from Browne’s Christian Morals, “strongly suggests” that Browne had read Donne’s text and remembered it when he wrote his final work (378).


Discusses how “the relative stability of the early years of Jacobean court politics ended in 1610–12, and was followed by a period of intensified factional fighting and alliance-building as rivals jostled for power and place” (566) and comments on how “into this increasingly polarized politics came John Donne in a renewed and belated search for preferment, first secular and then ecclesiastical.” Points out how Donne was “something of an outsider at court” and how at this time his thoughts “were turning towards a career in the church.” Comments on James’s insistence that Donne be ordained and examines “just how much James had promised, and exactly what Donne’s career prospects were on ordination” (568). Points out that Donne is “the only man in his reign to become a chaplain-in-ordinary within weeks of his ordination” (570). Comments on the rather fierce religious factionalism of the period and notes that Donne, for the most part, avoided being drawn into it. Traces Donne’s ecclesiastical career from his ordination in 1615 to his appointment as Dean of St. Paul’s in 1621.


Surveys what is known of Donne’s education. Points out that “little is recorded about Donne’s education before the age of 12” but that various comments by Donne himself suggest that most likely his early teachers were Catholic missionary priests (408). Suggests that one such may have been his mother’s older brother, Jasper Heywood, a Jesuit, who “came into the life of Donne’s family in the summer of 1581, when the boy was 9 years old” (409). Discusses Donne’s matriculation at Hart Hall, Oxford, in 1584, when he was 12 years old, and his departure from Oxford. Presents evidence that suggests Donne was in Antwerp in the spring of 1585 based on the discovery of a translation of some Latin epigrams signed J. D. Observes that “archival records yield no trace of Donne’s activities between the spring of 1585 and his admittance to Thavies Inn in the spring of 1591” and that “there is nothing to suggest that he ever returned to Oxford after Michaelmas term 1584” (421). Notes that “the capstone of Donne’s formal educational experience was the period he spent enrolled in law schools,” first Thavies Inn and then Lincoln’s Inn in 1592 (422).


Examines Donne’s Catholic heritage and family background. Comments on Thomas More
and his circle; William Rastell; John Heywood, Donne’s grandfather; Ellis and Jasper Heywood, Donne’s Jesuit uncles; Elizabeth Heywood, his mother; John Donne, his father; and others who opposed the Tudor reform of the Church. Notes that there is very little information on Donne’s early years. Maintains, however, that Donne’s personality “stemmed from a family experience that influenced virtually everything he wrote” and that one should “connect Donne’s birth and early years, as well as his subsequent life and writings, to his family’s religious persecution, imprisonment, exile, and death” (394).


Discusses Donne’s travels on the continent in 1605–06 and his earliest publications. Maintains that “these activities must be understood in the context of events with large political implications,” in particular, the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and especially the promulgation in 1606 of the Oath of Allegiance, noting the serious problems it caused some of Donne’s friends, especially Toby Matthew and Ben Jonson, as well as the fall from favor of Henry Percy, “the most significant supporter of toleration for Catholicism early in the Jacobean reign.” In addition to Donne’s travels, comments also on the travels of Matthew and other of Donne’s friends. Argues that Donne’s Latin letter to Henry Goodere was written in 1605, not in 1611 “as has long been thought.” Points out how the letter “introduced Goodere to a significant change in Donne’s attitude towards those manuscript writings he had earlier put into circulation” (506). Discusses the significance of Donne’s commendatory poem published in the first edition of Jonson’s Volpone and comments on Matthew’s conversion to Catholicism as background to Pseudo-Martyr and Ignatius, works in which Donne expresses “both his support of the oath as compatible with Catholic faith and his opposition to the Jesuits” (507). Observes that, “unsparing in his condemnation of Trent, the Jesuits, and papal claims of temporal jurisdiction, having travelled to Venice and returned in 1606, and having begun to publish his writings as a controversialist, Donne nevertheless remained to some extent a member of the religion he was born into” (522).


Suggests that Donne may have known Anne More before he came to work for Thomas Egerton in late 1597, perhaps at the Pyrford estate of Francis Wolley, the stepson of the Lord Keeper. Maintains that Pyrford was “a place where Donne and Anne spent time together, if not before, then surely after his employment by Egerton began.” Describes the wedding of the two, pointing out how it was “carefully planned, not a reckless adventure of love” (472). Notes that for two months after the wedding Donne and Anne “kept their marriage secret” before announcing it to George More, Anne’s father (473). Comments on Egerton’s dismissal of Donne from his employment, Donne’s short imprisonment, and the legal issues concerning the marriage. Discusses the personality and education of Anne More and the couple’s early married life at Pyrford.


Reviews The Oxford Handbook of John Donne, ed. Jeanne Shami, Dennis Flynn, and M. Thomas Hester; The Complete Poems of John Donne, ed. Robin Robbins; and The Eye of the Eagle by Francesca Bugliani Knox. Presents also a brief biography of Donne, noting, in particular, his debt to his Catholic heritage. For a reply, see David Colclough’s “John Donne” in TLS 5655 (19 Aug.): 6.

1835. Frontain, Raymond-Jean. “Donne, Salvation,

Argues that the speaker of a Donne text “characteristically anticipates and never actually experiences the delivery of either sexual satisfaction or the assurance of religious salvation” (4). Maintains that it is Donne’s “pained need for a sign of his election” that “accounts for his characteristic orality.” Says that Donne “habitually creates an aural zone in which language possesses the potential to accord the speaker the deliverance that he so anxiously seeks” and that “the only way of breaking the petitioner’s impasse” is by means of “a verbal maneuver that Donne discovered in the Bible,” i.e., “by the speaker’s approaching ‘with holy importunity, with a pious impudencie’ either God or the woman who dispenses grace.” Maintains that it is “this search for oral delivery through the biblical dynamic of dabar (this is the word as action) that accounts for the most provocative” and most “characteristic feature of closure in Donne’s poems” (5). Observes that Donne spent “the better part of his literary life attempting to negotiate between the extremes of speech and print.” Maintains that “in the attempt to sustain an oral dynamic in an age increasingly identified with print, Donne values and images writing as a substitute for speech” (6) and that “only in the final stage of his career did Donne discover in the sermon the opportunity for unmediated oral engagement.” Cites *Lit* as “the most telling poetic text in this regard” and shows how it “demonstrates that the critical moment in a Donne poem occurs when the speaker pauses in hopes of having elicited a reply from his interlocutor and in effect—like the biblical petitioners whose deliverance is secured within the biblical text—making salvation happen” (7). Believes that Donne’s “resistance to print is actually a resistance to closure” since “print forestalls the possibility of the interlocutor’s reply or of the community’s spontaneous ejaculation” (24–25). Discusses how *Lit* is “the most extraordinary of Donne’s performative speech acts” and claims it is his “most assured attempt to use the oral dimension of poetry in order to make something happen” (25).


Discusses Rabindranath Tagore’s introduction to and interest in Donne’s poetry and points out that he was responsible for popularizing Donne in India. Comments on Tagore’s use of the *Songs and Sonnets* in his 1929 novel *Shesh-er Kobita* (in English *The Last Ode*). Suggests how the novel “holds a pivotal place in Tagore’s career” and how it was “an important means by which Donne was introduced to twentieth-century Indian audiences.” Maintains that “an analysis of the Donnean philosophy of love” in the novel permits us “to supplement the existing narrative of the mid-twentieth century ‘Donne Revival’” (48). Comments on references to or possible allusions to Donne’s poems and cites typically Donnean ideas and attitudes in the novel. Claims that what Donne offers Tagore is “a model for a new kind of language” to express “an intimacy that transcends pedestrian social and business relationships” (55). Concludes that it is “difficult to recover how Tagore may have read, or, even misread Donne,” but that “what may be asserted with qualification” is that the main male character’s use of *Canon* in the novel “helped popularize Donne’s love lyrics among twentieth-century Indian readers” (60).

1837. ––––. “since that I may know’: Donne and the Biblical Basis of Sexual Knowledge.” *JDJ* 30: 157–71.

Surveys scholarly opinion on Donne’s knowledge of Hebrew and argues that the phrase “since that I may know” (*ElBed*, l. 43) “depends upon Donne’s appreciation of the multiple meanings of the Hebrew verb *yada*, that is, most importantly, to know by seeing and to have sexual intercourse with” (160). Observes that, for Donne, this verb “hints at an intimacy between two people that surpasses rational understanding,” thereby suggesting “a familiarity so deep that it borders on one person’s sharing or, even, subsuming his or her partner’s identity.” Maintains that the verb implies that sexual intercourse is “the ultimate means by which one person can fully know and be known by
another” (162) and suggests that perhaps this biblical verb “caught Donne's attention as he struggled to identify, and sometimes to collapse, the boundaries between the sacred and the profane, between the erotic and spiritual experience” (163). Discusses Donne's use of the biblical meaning of “to know” in a number of his poems, both erotic and sacred, to show that “the biblical associations of the verb 'to know' carry for Donne a wealth of associations that extend from the bawdy to a profound guarantee regarding the very foundation of human existence” (170). Concludes that, “ultimately, Donne's desire to know and, finally, to be known hopes to subsume the beloved into the lover and the creature into the Creator” and “aspires to an absolute union that is beyond the power of human tongue to tell” (171).


Argues that Donne employs “particularly secular language to portray the sacramentality of sex.” Discusses in detail the concept of love in *Flea, Ecst, Air*, and several of the *Holy Sonnets*, especially *HSWhat*, to explain how these poems show Donne's “predominantly physical language as he explores the heavenly nature of the human condition of love” (3). Concludes that in both his secular and sacred poems Donne emphasizes that “love consists of an intertwining of both the body and the soul” and that, “through both sexual union as well as spiritual union, two lovers embark together on a journey in love connected with the divine, and accompanied all along the way with God’s love” (33).


Describes Donne's illness in 1623 and his recovery and points out how in *Devotions* he “offers an intimate look into the anxiety and vulnerability he experienced” and how he seems at times “nearly frantic to resolve the spiritual doubts that plague him.” Focuses, however, not on the theology of *Devotions* but rather examines “the relevance Donne's text has for early seventeenth-century discussions of science, particularly Bacon's narrative of restoring Adamic mastery over Nature” (40). Examines how in *Devotions* Donne “rejects the historiography Bacon envisions of intellectual development and amelioration of humanity's present state.” Discusses how in *Devotions* Donne “constructs two narratives through which he reads his physicians' diagnosis and treatment of his body: one that adheres to and one that undermines the tale of humanity recovering Edenic dominance over Nature through experimentalism” (41). Maintains that, on one hand, Donne “depicts his physicians as engaging in a struggle to overcome his body's resistance to their efforts” and argues that this narrative “reflects a Baconian epistemology” that “finds Nature adverse to his project of restoring humanity to Adamic mastery,” a struggle that “becomes a drama of resistance and conquest” (41). Holds that, on the other hand, Donne “simultaneously offers an anti-Baconian narrative that positions his physicians in a contingent position to the body” and sees his body “as complicit with their efforts.” Argues, therefore, that “in place of the Baconian scene of the heroic scientist forcing the recalcitrant Nature into submitting to his will and confessing its secrets, Donne reimagines the drama being enacted between his physicians and his diseased body as predicated on human submission and Nature's willingness.” Shows how Donne then “abstracts outward from his own experience to generalize on the state of humanity and Nature” and “challenges the prospect of recovering Adamic control of the natural world that Bacon holds out as the promise of the new science” (42). Discusses also Donne's rejection of torture in his Easter sermon of 1625 and observes that in the sermon, as in *Devotions*, Donne focuses again on “the issue of coercion to produce truth.” Concludes that in his writings Donne “offers a considered rebuttal to
Bacon’s pretense to Adamic mastery over the natural world through coercion” (59).


Discusses the importance of education, especially of courtiers and the gentry, in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. Surveys the educational theories of the time, the curricula, and various opportunities for learning. Maintains that Donne’s education, in many ways, “represents a template of the conventional paths open to young Elizabethans” and that his “journey from private tutoring in the schoolroom to Oxford and the Inns of Court, punctuated by continental travel, mirrors the experiences of Wotton, of the Bacon brothers.” Observes, however, that Donne’s education was “shaped by his Catholicism” and that, “for an ambitious youth, Catholicism made the educational process, deemed so integral by contemporaries to social advancement and a public career, a much more complicated, difficult, and even potentially dangerous experience” (407).


Explores the theological content of and use of blunt, paradoxical language in HSBatter. Explains how the speaker in the sonnet asks God to release him from the bonds of slavery to sin and to give him a new heart. Claims that the answer to the speaker’s freedom is Christ, “the light that will cut through his darkness,” who “was pierced so that we could be made whole, scourged so that we could be healed” (93).


Discusses the intrigues, speculations, shifting alliances, corruption, and uncertainty that characterized the late Elizabethan court. Comments on the political career of Thomas Egerton, who was appointed Lord Keeper in 1596, and Donne’s role as a member of his secretariat. Points out that letter writing was “a vital business of court life” and that “it is possible that Donne played some junior role in managing Egerton’s correspondence networks” (466). Discusses how Donne also “maintained an active letter-writing network of his own” (467) and how he was able to keep himself free from the factional allegiances surrounding the Essex affair.


Discusses how in Flea, ValMourn, and HSDeath Donne uses the subject of death “as a tool to mock events of a relatively serious nature, such as consensual sex between two people, a man leaving home, and even to mock death itself.” Maintains that by means of hyperbole, personification and similes Donne “provides the reader with the view that seemingly serious events such as typically-tabooed sex are not necessarily as serious as people often portray them to be, through an understanding of death and what occurs afterwards” (104). States that Donne mocks death primarily “to ease the hardships of life challenges by breaking down the hardest life challenge: death,” which he is able to do “because of his understanding of death and its greater meaning” (106).

1845. Grossman, Marshall. The Seventeenth-Centu-
Briefly discusses Donne throughout this survey of English literature of the seventeenth century and cites Donne’s poetry as examples. For instance, comments on Donne’s Catholicism and his search for true religion, his views on astronomy and on cosmology, and his lament for the loss of coherence as a result of the emergence of the New Science, his circulating his works in manuscript, and his being a coterie poet who relied on patrons, and his influence on contemporary and later poets. In “John Donne (1572–1631)” (270–77), comments briefly on Donne’s critical reputation and on his life and discusses general characteristics of his secular and religious poetry and prose writings.


Observes that Donne has been called “the greatest love-poet in the English language” but shows how “this category does not adequately describe either the variety or the complexity of his poetry.” Comments on how Donne and his poetry were “products of their time” (104) and yet how “most of his poetic explorations and discoveries concern not the external world, but the more circumscribed, yet significant world of intimate, personal experience” (104–05). Presents a biographical sketch followed by an overall survey of the major characteristics of the *Elegies*, *Satyres*, verse letters, *Anniversaries*, *Songs and Sonets*, and his devotional poetry. Comments on Donne’s rejection of Petrarchism; his “distinctly masculine, sometimes misogynist point of view”; his uses of wit and “equivocal, densely figurative language” (108); and his satirical spirit and relentless search for truth. Discusses Donne as a coterie poet dependent on patronage and surveys his views on love, sex, religion, and spirituality. Maintains that in Donne’s secular poetry and in his sacred poems “we see a mind continually at work, trying to capture and figure out the significance of experiences that are always about to slip away” (119).


Points out that we do not know exactly when Donne “conformed” to the Church of England and notes how biographers and others have speculated about his motives for conversion. Observes also that, although “we can never know what he ‘really’ believed,” that “has not stopped scholars from trying to determine that belief and label him” (665). Surveys Donne’s own comments on religion in his letters, sermons, *Essays*, and *Pseudo-Martyr* and maintains that these works contain Donne’s “most explicit statements” about his religious beliefs (665). Warns, however, that “we need to be careful how we interpret Donne’s statements about religion in these texts” because “some are public, even polemical, and are shaped by political and historical contingencies” (667). Discusses how “the debate about Donne’s religion—and to what extent he might be said to have embraced the Church of England, conformed, or remained somehow still Catholic—has affected how different scholars read Donne’s religious prose” (668). Surveys the views on Donne’s religion by Walton, Helen Gardner, R. C. Bald, John Carey, Dennis Flynn, Jeanne Shami, Tom Cain, and others to illustrate the yet unsettled debate about Donne’s religious beliefs and his reasons for conforming. Comments also on Donne’s preoccupation with faithfulness, truth, change, and conversion in his poetry but again warns that it is “precarious to link Donne’s poetry directly to his religious trajectory” (674). Suggests that in Donne’s poetry, both erotic and sacred, we find “an emphasis on seeking, on process, and a corresponding suspicion of rigidity and divisive dogma” that “might be seen as variations” on
his ideas found in his prose works. Maintains that Donne’s own writing, therefore, “calls into question the rigid assumptions that might lie behind such terms as ‘apostate’ or even ‘convert’” (677).


Discusses how tropes are employed in literary discourse “to express the ineffable” and suggests that tropes themselves “can be seen as forms of deliberate, strategic silence: giving shape to something they cannot name.” Maintains that, “at one level, silence functions as a metaphor for the ineffable—silence as the source domain of the image and ineffability as the target domain.” Says that “since silence, conceived as a type of negativity or absence, cannot be represented directly, it is in turn represented either metonymically or metaphorically, thus moving from the source to the target domain to create a double-layered system” (78). Argues, therefore, that “silence figures ineffability, and that the metaphorical representations and explorations of silence in turn impart meaning” (79). Discusses Ecst as an example of a poem that shows how silence “figures the ineffable—love’s mysteries” (80) and how “rather than relying on the traditional topos of ineffability that words are too weak to express the intensity of feelings adequately,” Donne’s poem illustrates how “silence figures a higher eloquence elsewhere, where language is illocutionary.” Discusses how the poem “manages to vindicate heterosexual love, presumably in the form of Protestant companionate marriage, and clear it from all charges of impurity.” Concludes that it does so “on the strength of both religious and scientific authority, at the same time hiding love in a private emotional space” (81).


Comments on England’s intermittent war with Spain between 1585 and 1604, including the Portugal expedition, the defeat of the Spanish Armada and its aftermath, the Cadiz expedition, and the Islands Voyage. Surveys the military and political successes and conflicts of Robert Devereux, the second Earl of Essex. Although Donne participated in the Cadiz expedition and the Islands Voyage, he is not discussed in the essay.


Briefly comments on anti-urban comments in the Satyres, in particular in Sat4, noting how the poet is “crucifyingly bored by the flâneur-types whom the chance interactions of the urban environment force him to encounter.” Sees in the Satyres a “brand of metropolitan angst” (70).


Points out that Donne’s love poems were written and circulated one by one and were not gathered under the title of Songs and Sonnets until the second edition of 1635, in which they were placed first in that volume. Surveys the critical reputation of the poems and notes that for more than two centuries they “were rarely referred to as if they constituted a distinct genre” (181). Discusses the problem of how to label the poems generically, observing, for example, that none of the poems are, in modern terms, sonnets. Discusses how calling the poems Songs and Sonnets “signalled sophisticated readers to notice the unstable relation between the poet
and his speakers and the innovations that Donne had wrought in the tradition” (189). Comments on how the poems both participate in and differ from the love poetry of Donne’s predecessors both in form and content. Discusses Canon to show how “this particular poem has either powerfully inhibited or greatly facilitated reading Donne’s love lyrics more generally” (193). Discusses the variety of forms in the poems and observes that there are “more than forty stanza forms” in the collection. Maintains that this great formal variety “helps to keep the subject from seeming routine and stale” and that “avoiding standard forms and devising a different form for each particular performance are aspects of making love seem continually new” (197). Shows also how, in addition to depending upon “poetic form and metaphysical conceits to foster an overall effect, a love lyric by Donne often draws upon a powerful and memorable close to create an impact for which the various preceding lines are understood, retroactively, to have been but a preparation” (198). Points out that possibly some of Donne’s love lyrics were, in fact, written for or sent to actual people although no specific addressee is mentioned. Holds that most of the poems can be read as dramatic monologues. Suggests reasons why Donne may have thought of these poems as a group but points out that he himself did not arrange them in the order found in the 1635 edition. Concludes that in the Songs and Sonets one finds “some of the most remarkable pieces” that Donne “ever wrote” and suggests that perhaps he foresaw that “readers would enjoy negotiating the difficulties inherent in trying to fit his love poems into conventional categories” (205).


Surveys major political crises and issues of the Stuart dynasty during the 1620s, such as the Bohemian Crisis of 1618–1621, the Spanish Match and the “Blessed Revolution” of 1622–24, and the War of 1624–1626. Discusses how these events had serious repercussions on the Church of England. Maintains that to the end of his life Donne believed that “the survival of English Protestantism was threatened by Catholic enemies at home and on the continent” (616), but that, when it came to specific political issues he “did not aspire to mould or lead public opinion—probably more from choice than fear—except when that role was thrust upon him.” Believes that “it is hard to be definitive about Donne’s views on diplomacy.” Notes that Donne was “always an intelligent and well-informed commentator but his cautious approach stands in contrast to that of his less literary-minded but more politically ambitious counterpart, John Williams, Dean of Westminster” (617). Points out that in his sermons in the 1620s Donne expresses “his misgivings about Calvinism,” that he “rarely discussed soteriology,” and that he “declined to identify the Pope as the Antichrist,” as did many of his contemporaries, “reserving his bile for the Council of Trent” (624). Concludes that “the troubles the Stuart dynasty encountered during the 1620s arose because many English subjects regarded religion, politics, and diplomacy as intimately related topics” (631).


Discusses the Jack-John issue both as Donne himself saw his life and as “literary history has fashioned and refashioned it.” Notes that Walton in his Life repudiated Jack and focuses on the converted John (734); that in the first edition of his poems in 1633 Donne is presented as both Jack and John but with John “possibly keeping a vigilant eye on Jack”; that throughout the mid-seventeenth century “both Donnes remain in play”; but that towards the end of the century and during the eighteenth century and much of the nineteenth century both love poet and divine are “less prominent” as Donne was considered primarily as a sati-
rist and as a not very good poet (735). Comments on how by the middle of the nineteenth century “the conception of Donne as two in one” slowly emerged and discusses the important role Coleridge and A. B. Grosart played in presenting a unified Donne (736). Considers the issue of whether in his poems Donne himself or an imagined persona is speaking, noting how he was “a master ventriloquist” and how he could “imagine himself as other, to be other to himself, and yet self-same” (739). In “Coda: Walt Whitman, Fernando Pessoa, Robert Schumann, and Bob Dylan Have the Last Word” (741–42), claims that these artists, like Donne, lived with divided selves. As further evidence that the Jack-John split remains alive today, cites Mary Clive’s 1966 novelistic biography entitled Jack and the Doctor and Mary Novik’s 2007 novel Conceit, in which she structures her understanding of Donne “around the duality.” Concludes that “certainly there were distinct Donnes” but that “they inhabited one Donne” (742).


 Discusses in the light of recent biographical discoveries and conjectures the equivocal casuistry and the verbal and rhetorical inventiveness of Donne’s arrogant letter of 1602 to his father-in-law, Sir George More, in which he defends his marriage. Claims that the letter “reveals more” about Donne than has been previously thought and also explains Sir George’s wrathful and vehement response to it (87). Points out how the letter’s “impertinent tone of familiarity and stoic stance of aloof superiority” make clear Donne’s refusal to entertain any further opposition to his marriage (92). Suggests how the Marshall engraving and the Lothian portrait can provide apt glosses on Donne’s attitude in the letter (95).


 Points out that Donne’s epigrams were his earliest poems and notes that copies of his early Latin epigrams have been lost and that only Jasper Mayne’s English translation of them exists. Discusses how Donne’s English epigrams are “instructive microcosms of his poetic achievement” since “the character of the epigram is mixed into all Donne’s genres, often comprising the pointed jest and final turns in his poems.” Notes that Ben Jonson considered Donne “the best English epigrammist” (105). Maintains that Donne is “always a revisionist poet, an innovative artist who modifies whatever he borrows, whose imitations are so original that it is difficult to discern their subtext or model, when there is one.” Shows how Donne “revised, rearranged, and modified” his epigrams, thereby “creating three distinct sequences of poems” (106). Discusses Donne’s familiarity with both the Greek, Latin, and English epigrammatic traditions. Comments on the likely influence on Donne of Thomas More’s Epigrammata (1518) and the 600 English epigrams of his grandfather John Heywood (Workes, 1562). Comments on the rhetorical and verbal strategies and main stylistic characteristics of several of the epigrams, especially Ship, Disinher, Hero, Pyr, and Ralph and regards Wing as “perhaps the best introduction to the complex (and complicating) generic manipulation and surprise on which Donne’s reputation was founded and reached its fullest achievement” (212).


 Discusses how some critics have seen in Donne’s second letter to his father-in-law, dated 11 February 1601, following his clandestine marriage to Anne More, a “more abject and penitential tone” than in his earlier bold and somewhat arrogant letter to him of 3 February 1601 (65). Points out that, when the two letters were sent, Donne already knew that his suit in the Court of Audience concerning the validity of his marriage was being considered and “probably expected judgment in his favor.” Argues that, in fact, the second letter was written by
the same bold and unchastened Donne who, “though perhaps surprised by the severity of the responses of his father-in-law and his employer, was not ‘changed’ by his new circumstances” but that he did want to assuage the anger of Sir George More (67). Explains the “elaborate religious conceit” that frames the second letter (68) and the subtlety of its argument, characterized by “complexly obscure analogies and sophistic rhetorical turns of casuistry.” Shows how “what starts out as the conscience-stricken meditative confessional plea/defense of an outcast soul imprisoned by his own ‘fawlt’ who is beyond redeeming turns again into an attack on those who have rumored Donne’s ‘loving a Corrupt Religion’ and his having malice and contempt for his ‘divine father,’ which then turns again into a warning that the speaker shall surely perish if the addressee does not impute in Donne the virtue of penitence, which is then described as the conduct that ‘may’ assure the addressee’s not suffering the misery and sickness that have led the speaker to his present state of penitence” (72).

Comments on Sir George’s negative response both to the content of the letter and to the “conceited, overly elaborate, baroque extravagance” of its style (73). Observes that the relationship between Sir George and Donne, which the second letter “only further estranged,” would “take years to repair” (74). In an appendix (77–78), reproduces the second letter.


An original poem that mentions Donne.


Maintains that throughout his writing career Donne was concerned with “the pressures of memory and the limits of human achievement” and was “continually haunted by the prospect of his unrealised potential and prolonged social ostracisation” as he “linger year after year on the margins of a society in which he sought advancement” (165). Points out Donne’s concern about how his life and his work would be remembered in future generations, noting that he “remained under no illusion concerning how unwieldy, contrary and morally corrosive the promptings of memory might prove” (167). Discusses how Donne’s meditations on memory, both in his poetry and prose, “demonstrate a thorough knowledge of secular and Christian literature upon the subject” and “a determination to uncover memory’s links with the human construction of spiritual and erotic mythologies of belonging.” Observes that “while his secular verse attends to the textual scaffolding that erotic memory requires, in his devotional prose and poetic writings the promptings of memory frequently lead his poetic voices into anguished responses of loss, self-loathing, cultural revulsion, and contrition” (34). Points out that in his sermons Donne argues that memory frequently is “a stimulus to self-knowledge” but that too much focus on past sin may “betray the unwary Christian.” Observes that Donne asserts, therefore, that “the narratives of memory must be strategically edited in order to amplify their powers of instruction and to keep sinfulness and despair at bay” (178). Maintains that while the influence of Augustine, Cicero and Aquinas “are clearly identifiable in Donne’s discussions of memory, his thinking can be seen to respond to the work of an enormous range of strategic figures” (181). Claims that Donne’s “secular and religious textual voices continue to excite and seduce his audiences with their rapid alternation between potentially contradictory lines of enquiry” since, for Donne, “memory is seen to unmask all the contrary motions of sinful desire to which the self is subject” and also “to excite a reserved sense of spiritual commitment” (188). Holds that the “radically diverse nature of critical responses” to Donne’s treatment of memory by modern scholars “in many ways pays tribute to the rich complexity of his enquiries over a number of decades.” Says that in both his secular and religious writing Donne
may be seen to propose “a kind of counter-memory: a meditative power that allows the mind to forsake the debilitating conditions of temporality and to contemplate anew questions of human epistemology and spiritual ontology” (189). Suggests that “it may just be that Donne's acute anxieties over the cultural threats of forgetfulness, loss and erasure are the very things which ultimately ensured his survival among later generations” (190).


An original play first presented at Wilton's Music Hall on 2 June 2011 and produced by Jericho House and Wilton's Music Hall. Presents a list and brief biographies of the cast and notes the music played during the performance, followed by an introduction by the author, who states that the action of the play takes place in 1611; announces that the play is “about faith, sex and the translation of the Bible”; and that it “centers around John Donne and his parallel roles as the first English translator of Galileo, accomplice in the translation of the Song of Solomon and as the most popular songwriter of the English court” (3). In addition to Donne, the following characters appear in the play: Anne More, the Countess of Bedford, Magdalen Herbert, Henry Wotton, Lancelot Andrews, John Layfield, King James I, Alfonso Ferrabosco, and Esther, the maidservant of the Countess of Bedford.

Reviews:


Questions whether or not Donne had “a coherent understanding of the meaning and value of privacy” and finds that for Donne “privacy is an experience that embodies the spirit of contradiction at every turn” (1). Observes that, for him, writing is “a way of capturing what is valuable in the experience of privacy” (4). Points out how in his poems of intimacy Donne gives private space “something close to absolute value” but that often he found his own private life “a bit of a trial” (8). Discusses in detail Donne's often used metaphor of pregnancy and maintains that for Donne pregnancy is “the perfect liminal state and therefore the perfect metaphysical conceit,” “a place where two become one” (14). Examines Donne's often complex private relationships with others and with God. Concludes that there is “no final word to be said about privacy in Donne's writings,” i.e., no final word that “would not immediately have to be resituated as provisional, and that would very likely be vulnerable to contradiction by something that Donne wrote somewhere else” (19). Maintains that these contradictions arise from Donne's “subtle understanding of how and why privacy satisfies us,” a “state of being that we all yearn for but, having achieved it, we long to share it with others or another” and thus we will find it pleasing “only if we are able to exercise some control over” it (20).


Surveys the historical situation in England following the death of James I. Observes that although the accession of Charles I in 1625 was “a critical turning-point” in political and religious affairs, “many familiar faces and features of Jacobean court culture still lingered on, not least Donne himself, whose continuing prominence as one of the stars of the court preaching rota, was a visible symbol of continuity between the two reigns.” Points out that by the time of Donne's death in 1631, “the new pattern of politics was by no means clear” and “it may have been the continuities rather than the differences that stood out” (632). Notes that even Donne, who, “with his court connections was well placed to know what was going on, seems to have had considerable difficulty in gauging the temper of the times” as evidenced by “several embarrassing missteps” in several of his later court sermons (633). Comments on the “often heav-
ily coded” political language in Donne’s court sermons as well as on his response to the shifting and controversial religious policies of the time in which he “repeatedly directs his audiences away from unnecessary speculation on the mysteries of predestination and urges them towards a more practical form of religion solidly grounded on the evidence of good works” (642). Claims that in his later sermons Donne aligned himself with “a moderate Calvinism that would have been acceptable to Laud while still remaining within the bounds of Reformed orthodoxy” (644). Discusses also how both Calvinists and Catholics appropriated Donne “for their own purposes.” Concludes that Donne “did not negotiate the transition to the reign of Charles I entirely smoothly or seamlessly” and that the sermons preached in his later years “often betray a mood of ambivalence, looking back to the reign of James as well as forward to the political and religious changes of the 1630s” (645).


In an examination of the role of the speech act of invitation in early modern English poetry, discusses the “intertwining roles of pastoral, invitation, and love” in Bait, Donne’s reply to Marlowe’s “Passionate Shepherd to His Love.” Points out that although Donne begins his poem with an invitation to love that seems as if it “will establish the same relationship to the land and community” found in Marlowe’s poem, it belies that expectation “by doing away with the classical pastoral setting” and “by shifting the poem to a scene of private fishing rather than communal shepherding.” Maintains, therefore, that, “whereas the opening line indicates that the beloved will come with him to be his love, the implications of ownership are reversed in the final lines, when the speaker admits that it is he who is caught by her” (56). Fold.] English 21 24, no. 1: 85–111.

In Korean. Argues that Donne’s poems “can be said to be closely related to Leibnitz’s ‘Monad’ philosophy” as well as to the works of the “neobaroque philosopher” Gilles Deleuze since they all share a “baroque mentality and sensibility.” (From the abstract)


Discusses the development of the essay and its major characteristics from Montaigne to the time of Donne. Comments on English essayists who were contemporaries of Donne, especially William Cornwallis, the first English essayist in the tradition begun by Montaigne. Focuses on Donne’s Essays (1651), calling it, in spite of the uncertainty about the precise date of its composition, “one of the earliest examples of the genre in English.” Notes that “none of the early essayists, except for Donne, makes Christian religion the matter and the style, the object and the wit” of his work. Calls Essays “a work of biblical hermeneutics” (268), which, therefore, raises some doubt about whether the work really belongs to the genre tradition that Montaigne created. Observes that there has been relatively little scholarship on Essays and that, “among those who have written on it there is little agreement about the intention and accomplishment of the work” (269). Discusses the content and sceptical style of Essays in which Donne “urges the church to abandon its sectarian divisiveness and instead be shaped by a propagating dialogue consisting not only of words, but also of the intercourse of charitable practices.” Concludes that “there is no question that Donne, pushing hard as he does against the tradition, challenges our conceptions and expectations of the essay” and that “by doing so, however, he reinvents the genre even as he practices the idiosyncratic scepticism of his exegesis” (272).

1863. Hyun, Joo Yoo. [John Donne and Monad, the

Describes the busk as “a flat piece of hard substance—ivory, bone, metal, wood, or whalebone—between a foot and two feet in length, worn down a channel stitched into the front of a woman’s corset and tied in place with a lace in order to stiffen and flatten her torso” and, in some instances, used to hide pregnancy. Notes that it was removed at night and was “often inscribed with visual designs and written emblems, composed for the lady who wore it and—in theory if not in practice—for her eyes only.” Discusses how the busk is central to ElBed. Points out how in this visual striptease, “when all the woman’s disposable coverings are discarded in favor of her naked body,” Donne still “has time to cast an envious eye” on the busk, which he envies because not only is it “always close to his mistress’s body” but also because it is “a prosthesis longer and harder than his own ‘yard’” (86). Suggests that Donne imagines the busk as a possible “rival” and as “a substitute for him” (92).


In Korean. Discusses the conflict between Calvinists and Arminians over the issues of grace and free will in the 1620s. Maintains that, borrowing from St. Augustine, Donne “labeled humanity as massa damnata” regarding the sinful nature of mankind. Argues that, although Donne held doctrinal positions associated with both groups, in his sermons he “firmly upheld” the Calvinist doctrine of “total depravity” and of “humanity’s inability to contribute to the process of salvation.” (From the abstract)


In Korean. Observes that many readers are bothered by the lack of “a satisfying conclusion to the anxiety, doubt, and despair” found in the Holy Sonnets, as well as by the sonnets’ lack of “joy and assurance of salvation.” Argues that the lack of resolution in the sonnets is “a reflection of Donne’s belief in the assurance of salvation based on the imputed righteousness afforded to humanity” by the Christ’s death. Holds that, seen in this light, the Holy Sonnets reflect Donne’s belief that “salvation is wholly determined by God.” Observes that the “anxiety, doubt, and despair” that Donne expresses in the sonnets are absent in the sermons, which reflect “the Calvinist doctrine of the perseverance of the saints.” (From the abstract)


Surveys the generic conventions of the classical verse satire as seen in the works of Juvenal, Horace, and Persius and then shows “the freshness of Donne’s reception of his classical models by contrasting his Satires with those of other classicizing Elizabethan formal verse satirists” (122), especially Thomas Wyatt, John Marston, Everard Guilpin, Thomas Middleton, and Joseph Hall. Observes that Donne’s “ars satirica is not articulated in lurid, programmatic detail and must be inferred from his poems themselves.” Discusses both the style and thematic content of Donne’s five poems, pointing out their unique features and stressing his “fresh treatment of his classical models” as well as “his departure from contemporary practice” (128). Points out, for example, that Donne is “not glib or self-congratulatory about the conventional association of satire and violence” and that he often introduces in his satires “philosophical or religious principles that mitigate the satiric disdain he voices” (129). Comments on the “elusive satiric persona” Donne creates in the Satyres (131) and on how each of the poems “features the pursuit of something, a something usually embodied in or personified by a woman” (132).

Reviews Jonathan Holmes's play about Donne entitled *Into Thy Hands* that was performed at London's Wilton Music Hall from 31 May 2011 to 2 July 2011 and was published by Methuen Music Drama in the same year. Commends Holmes for “his efforts to bring Donne into the modern theater” (173) but laments how the play’s “relationship to history is often troubling—at best distracting, at worst sloppy and misleading” (174). Finds most objectionable Holmes’s portrayals of the Countess of Bedford and of Lancelot Andrewes. Says the play “works best when Holmes invokes history to communicate something perennial and perhaps harder to express in a modern context,” in particular, its “exploration of the relationships between human beings and God” (176).


Discusses *Sat1* as “a revealing window on to the distinctive world of the early modern Inns.” Says that Donne wrote it while he was a student at Lincoln’s Inn during the early 1590s and discusses how he “carefully locates the poem within its institutional context, representing the Inns—as did many of his contemporaries—both as privileged institutions associated with the venerable laws by which civic order is maintained, and as a convenient pied-à-terre for hedonistic spirits eager to indulge in the social excess available to them in London.” Suggests that *Sat1* “illuminates” both of these “overlapping worlds” (217). Points out how the satire shows “a keen attention to the human variety of late Elizabethan London” and how the speaker of the poem becomes “a kind of reluctant tour guide to the various contexts inhabited by young men at the Inns” (218). Notes that Donne employs “legal terms throughout his poem, which would resonate with his Lincoln’s readers” and points out that such “subtle play with legal discourse is a consistent feature of literature and drama produced at the Inns” (219). Maintains that although *Sat1* is based on Horace’s *Satire I, 9*, Donne “reinvents a well-known classical model as something topical and new, a flourish typical of Inns *imitatio*” (220).


Discusses Donne’s military career as a gentleman volunteer in the service of the Earl of Essex in 1596–1597 that involved the Cadiz Expedition and the Islands Voyage. Points out that although he was a soldier, Donne spent most of his time on a ship and thus his references to the expeditions “emphasize life at sea and maritime warfare, not assaults overland” (424). Comments on the 1591 portrait of Donne by Wiliam Marshall in which he appears as a swordsman and speculates on his possible motives for going on the expeditions, several of which Donne himself indicates in *Calm*. Suggests that possibly he wrote his epigram *Ship* having observed the burning of the Spanish flagship, *San Felipe*, in the harbor of Cadiz and that he wrote his epigram *Wing* to commemorate the hero of the raid, Sir John Wingfield. Comments also on *Storm* and a prose letter dated August 1597 that recount his experiences during the Islands Voyage and discusses his epigram *Cales* and a letter he wrote to Rowland Woodwood in which he expresses his disappointment that a plan to raid the Spanish settlements in South America did not materialize. Observes that “though Donne’s military experiences were limited, his accounts of such service, whether in prose or poetry, are graphically descriptive, rich with near-journalistic detail” (433). Comments on Donne’s attitude toward war in *ElWar*, noting how the elegy “drives home the point that war slays men, whereas lovemaking begets them.” Suggests that “Donne’s military career, though brief, may have impelled him towards a safer
life as a civil servant while making him keenly aware that war and its aftermath do inform affairs at court and incite political intrigue" (414).


Observes that scattered throughout Donne’s poems, sermons, and letters one finds “brief remarks about poetry” but that he does not offer any “formal critical commentary” and, therefore, from this “piecemeal disclosure one must infer or interpret” what his poetics may have been (704). Maintains that Donne’s own comments “highlight three topics—style, wit, and prosody—and their interrelationship” and that these topics “provide the framework in which to chart Donne’s literary reputation in three major stages: his own era, the eighteenth century, and the nineteenth century to the present” (708). Surveys comments on Donne’s style, wit, and prosody by Ben Jonson and by elegists after Donne’s death, especially Henry King, Izaak Walton, Thomas Carew, and Jasper Mayne. Points out that the numerous seventeenth-century elegies that praise Donne “imply that his poems were unique among English authors” and that, “while citing his iconoclastic style of composition, singular wit, and irregular prosody, the elegists note that Donne’s talent is not only singular but also inimitable” (710). Notes that those seventeenth-century poets who admired him “stopped short of his extravagant style, wit, and prosody” and rather “practised restraint, thereby acknowledging Donne’s uniqueness while tempering his influence on them” (710–11). Surveys next the “radical change of outlook on Donne’s poetry” that occurred later in the seventeenth century and continued in the eighteenth century (711) as seen in the unfavorable criticism of Dryden, Pope, and Dr. Johnson. Observes how Donne “remained in the shadows for almost a century” until Coleridge brought him once more “to the forefront of admiration” (713) and “contravened” eighteenth-century opinion “by redefining alleged vices as corresponding virtues” (714). Comments on the positive response to Donne by Thomas De Quincey, Robert Browning, and A. B. Grosart in the nineteenth century. Surveys then Donne’s growing reputation in the twentieth century following the publication of Grierson’s edition of Donne’s poems in 1912. Suggests that “the most influential twentieth-century critic” of Donne was T. S. Eliot, who claimed that Donne’s “unified sensibility was attuned to the modern era” and notes how after Eliot “the style, wit, and prosody in Donne’s poetry were adapted in modern and postmodern eras” (716). Discusses how Donne is “an abiding presence and influence not merely in literature but in the arts and culture of our era” (717).


In Korean. Comments on T. S. Eliot’s understanding of two types of Christian mysticism: ontological—classical mysticism and psychological—romantic mysticism. Observes how Eliot came to regard Dante as representative of the first and Donne as an example of the second. Points out how Eliot came to see Dante, not simply as a religious poet “faithful to his own mysticism,” but also as “the paradigmatic figure” representing Eliot’s concept of unified sensibility. Observes how Donne, “once eulogized as a representative of unified sensibility,” was later “degraded” into a precursor of the dissociation of sensibility. Notes that Eliot held that Donne’s dissociation resulted from his embracing psychological–romantic mysticism that began with Plotinus and was later developed by Eckhardt, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Teresa of Avila, and St. John of the Cross. Says that Eliot’s reading of Ecst, with its “dualistic view of soul and body,” convinced him of Donne’s “disintegrated sensibility.” (From the abstract)

In Korean. Discusses Donne’s view of women in his poetry and briefly surveys recent critical opinion on the topic. Argues that Donne rejects Petrarchism because he thinks it “robs woman of her true, human beauty and of her true virtue” and that it also reduces the male lover to “a submissive and hopeless suitor.” Maintains that Donne believes that such a distorted view “hinders true love or communion” between lovers and, therefore, he is for gender-equality and for a more realistic understanding of human nature. Points out that Donne in his love poetry also rejects the idea that the soul is superior to the body (94). (From the abstract)


In Korean. Points out similarities in theme and dramatic structure between Donne and the twentieth-century Korean poet Han Yong-Un by comparing the Holy Sonnets to Han’s “The Silence of Lover.” Explains the relationship between spiritual darkness and enlightenment in both works in terms of “sunyata” of Buddhism, in which “darkness and spiritual suffering can paradoxically be a way leading to salvation and hope.” (From the abstract)


Reports that Dean Rader, an English professor at the University of San Francisco, conducted a survey on the web site of The San Francisco Chronicle to discover the 10 best poets and notes that Donne appeared on the list.


Surveys Donne’s later years, from his return from the Synod of Dort in 1620 until his death in 1631. Comments on how, in spite of having various well-placed patrons and friends, Donne’s “progress to the Deanery of St. Paul’s was decidedly wayward” (602) and did not occur until November 1621. Discusses Donne’s responsibilities as Dean and how, as Dean, he was involved in a number of other activities, such as his honorary membership in the Virginia Company and his defense of James’s Directions for Preachers. Observes that the Deanery gave Donne “a handsome financial base such as he had probably never known.” Points out, however, that his final years were marred by “severe bouts of illness.” Discusses, in particular, an illness in 1623 that lasted for several months and that “brought him to the edge of death.” Observes how this “life-threatening experience also drove Donne to intense literary activity,” citing as examples Devotions, letters, and many sermons (607). Comments on the “extraordinary breadth” of Donne’s social activities and wide ranging friendships (609) and on his ever expanding commitments, duties, and honors. Claims that Donne’s “greatest achievement in his final years was the forging of an extraordinarily complex” kind of churchmanship (613), one in which he “devoted himself to fashioning a theology for his church that would allow it to embrace the broadest range of Protestant believers” (614).


In Chinese. Reviews scholarly research on Donne’s poetry and suggests some new perspectives in Donne studies. Following Chapter 1 (1–87) that presents a survey of English Renaissance poets, including Donne, with several examples of his poetry (46–54), and also a discussion of the political and cultural background of the period, five chapters are devoted to Donne’s thought and art. In Chapter 2 (88–110), surveys non-Chinese research on Donne, including modern editions, critical and historical studies, and bibliographical and biographical publications. In Chapter 3 (111–33),
discusses major characteristics of metaphysical poetry and of Donne's poems, especially Donne's use of unconventional or unusual metaphors. In particular, comments on ValMourn as an example. In Chapter 4 (134–64), discusses Donne's view of the world, his response to the new science, and his uses of the material world in his poems. In Chapter 5 (165–201), discusses the creative thought in Donne's poems and their deconstructionist tendencies. Comments also on the dramatic elements and elaborate uses of paradox in them. Presents analyses of Canon and Flea as examples and comments on Donne's dualistic view of women in his poems. In Chapter 6 (202–54), examines Donne's poetics and his uses of circular and numerological imagery. Comments on SGo as an example.

Reviews:


In Chinese. Discusses Donne's playful use of numbers in his poetry that reflects his proficiency in both the theory and practice of numerology. Points out how Donne employs numbers as symbols that reflect his subtle thoughts. Suggests that Donne uses numbers not only to express his poetic themes but that he even foretells certain modern ecological views by his use of numbers.


Comments on the changing readership and critical reputation of Donne's poetry from the seventeenth century to the present. Explores, in particular, the making and shaping of Grier-son's 1912 edition of Donne's poems and discusses how the edition “decisively reshaped Donne for the twentieth century.” Maintains that the edition was “made and conceived within what was, on the one hand, a continu-
ing manuscript culture and, on the other, the developing institutional and intellectual culture of a new subject: university English” (453). Discusses how “this making and relocation of Donne in 1912 was itself remade and relocated over the later years of the [twentieth] century.” Maintains that “subsequent understandings of Donne and his works, in manuscript and print, and by different audiences, are necessary elements of the poet we read today.” Discusses how Donne's poems “in many ways establish the terms in which subsequent readers and writers respond to them”; maintains that “although later responses very often remain within a poetic or conceptual space established by Donne's writing, they may very well run counter to, or mis-recognise aspects of the poems from which they depart, giving a new direction or emphasis to the older texts.” Holds that “debates about the kind of poet Donne is, or might be, have always formed the conditions within which readers first encounter his poems” and that “those debates have always partly at least been about whether Donne is a poet of manuscript or of print” (454). Explains how Gries-son's edition “changed the Donne that readers read” after 1912 (461); surveys how Donne's reputation has changed in recent years; and shows how his audience shifted away “from a readership of the few and towards a readership of the many” (466). Comments on how Gries-son's Donne, “made within, and designed for, the universities became a Donne beyond them, with a reach and a readership spread out over the twentieth century, and reaching now into the twenty-first” (477).


Discusses Donne's “own interpretive comments (whether straightforward or enigmatic) on the perils of verbal performance relating to authority, the reader, and the author.” Focuses primarily on Donne's letters, the Elegies, Saty, and the preface to Pseudo-Martyr to examine “how an apprehension of danger conditioned
Donne’s speech and writing.” Divides the argument into two parts: (1) a focus on “threats from authorities” and (2) on “threats that accrue from the dialogic relation of writer and reader” (744). Discusses how Donne’s Catholic upbringing “taught him lessons about communication, both tacit and explicit,” and that “among them must have been the art and the appropriate occasions for standing mute and also some of the consequences of silence” (745). Points out, for instance, that Donne’s correspondence shows his familiarity with “the elaborate techniques for secret writing used by Jesuits” and his overall awareness of the dangers inherent in correspondence. Discusses how Donne’s letters and poems clearly indicate that he had “internalized” these “early lessons in epistolary caution, making it a reflex to be guarded about sensitive content” (747). Shows how, in Sat4, for instance, “the speech inhibition that must have been associated with Donne’s Catholic minority positioning and tutelage is brilliantly turned to use to create an unorthodox satirical persona” (748) and cites other examples of how Donne’s early background contributed to his literary art, not only “to the complexity of rhetorical strategies” but also “to the choice and handling of subject matter” (751). Maintains that, in addition to his concern about dangers from political and religious authorities, Donne also worried about being misinterpreted by his readers or being injurious to them, citing, as an example, his various comments on Biathanatos. Maintains that, “in trying to understand the risky dynamic that Donne takes communication to be, it may be a mistake to separate out writer and author” since he is “almost invariably anatomizing a two-way interaction that can, in surprising ways, expose the vulnerability of both parties” (753). Cites, as an example, the preface to the reader in Pseudo-Martyr. Maintains that “to grasp the full complexity” of Donne’s works, it is “imperative that we understand how apprehension of danger conditioned their production” (755).


Discusses “the dual nature of literary communication as representing fictional identities and interactions, while at the same time, constituting definitions of self and other in the communication between real authors and readers.” Employs the theory of communication developed by Watzlawick, Bavelas, and Jackson in 1967. To illustrate the theory, comments on the “rhetorical fireworks of absurd brilliance or brilliant absurdity” in Flea that appears as “both the speaker’s and the author’s invention.” Observes that the manner Donne chooses “to impress the reader” is by showing “the failure of the speaker’s rhetoric to impress the addressee.” Maintains that “the definition of self” that Donne puts forward is “that of a man of the world who was at once clever with words and willing to expose or satirize the limited benefits of verbal cleverness” (342).


Discusses the uses of science in the love poetry of Donne and of the late nineteenth-century poet Constance Naden. Explains that these two poets were selected to illustrate the blending of science and poetry in their respective periods because of their similarities, especially the playful way they both deal with emerging scientific ideas. Comments specifically on their similar uses of alchemy, chemistry, anatomy, botany, astronomy, geographical optics, magnetism, mathematics, and syllogistic logic. Observes how both poets, while figuratively using scientific ideas, maintain “both a serious and comic tone” in their love poems (39). Notes, in particular, Donne’s uses of wit. Maintains that the poetry of both Donne and Naden “captures the impact respectively of Copernicus and his contemporaries on the one hand and Darwin and his contemporaries on the other” and notes how their poetry “records the popular skepticism toward new scientific discoveries” that occurred in their lifetimes (49).

Maintains that of all the early seventeenth-century poets Donne was perhaps the "most keenly interested" in early modern science, but that, at the same time, he was "deeply conflicted" about it, especially about the new astronomy. Observes, therefore, that, from work to work, his "responses to the new science varied." Shows how in Ignatius Donne's satire "extends from his main target—the Jesuits and the culture of Catholicism in general—to include the new science" (116). Discusses also how FirAn reflects Donne's response to the new science, a poem in which he comments on its "destructive nature" and its "many destabilizing discoveries" and on how it is "the harbinger of increasing chaos" that leads to fragmentation and disintegration of a "previously whole and coherent and meaningful universe" (122). Discusses, in particular, Devotions and "the method by which Donne's embodied experience is made to signify as generalized and exemplary within the practice of the new science writing." Comments on Devotions in relation to early modern autobiography and the questions of materialism. Analyzes a group of three meditations in Devotions that illustrate Donne's "successful negotiation of the 'problem' of embodiment and exemplary experience through a theorization of the tolling of bells." Also examines Devotions "from the perspective of what in many ways constitutes its opposite—and antagonistic—resolution to the questions of embodiment, experience and knowledge." Argues also that René Descartes offers "a challenge to the Devotions in his establishment of the (philosophical) dualism that Donne works so assiduously to pre-empt" (125).


Oberves that most of Donne's prose letters "survived through the agency of others"; that 38 are "preserved in his hand"; and that the remainder "were transcribed in manuscripts or committed to print within decades after his death." Warns that many of Donne's letters show "all too clearly the hazard of assuming that any biographical information they might convey can be understood without attention to the nuances of language, style, and thought." Maintains that most of them "owe their preservation to the elegant intimacy of their design" and notes that the first of Donne's letters published "appeared in a context of emphasizing their art" (348). Surveys the publication history of the letters from their appearance in the 1633 edition of Donne's poems to the forthcoming Oxford edition; comments on the development of the familiar prose letter as a literary genre by Renaissance humanists; and discusses the major characteristics of Donne's letters, both their content and style, as well as his various correspondents. Comments on Donne's anxiety about his letters "being mistaken, misconstrued, shared unwisely, or intercepted" (354) and on how they "differ in tone, reflecting a distinctive relationship with each correspondent" (355). Maintains that Donne's letters are "so finely constructed" and "intimate so much that is rich and interesting about his life, and his other writing, that it is easy to regret the
loss of the many others that he must have written” but points out that Donne expressed to Goodere his desire that they should be burned (366).


Points out that Donne, as a coterie poet, addressed his verse letters to specific persons and that they “vary widely in length (from twelve to 130 lines), somewhat less widely in form (tensyllable lines and simple rhyme patterns—couplets, triplets, quatrains predominate).” Notes also that they “frequently take as their subject the communicative act itself, often in the context of the writer’s concern that he or his correspondent lives virtuously.” Suggests that Donne’s verse letters “stand between the lyric poetry, on which his reputation still largely rests and none of which he published, and the great occasional writings that he did publish” (206), such as the *Anniversaries* and *Devotions*. Observes that, based on the number that have survived, Donne seems to have written more verse letters “than any other early modern English writer” and notes that his “only surviving holograph poem” is a verse letter (207). Surveys the development of the verse letter as a genre and comments on how Donne’s poems are like and differ from contemporary models. Comments on the content and style of the poems as well as the various persons addressed and, in some cases, their responses.


Discusses Donne’s appointment as secretary to Sir Thomas Egerton and maintains that Donne’s specific duties “remain unknown.” Points out, however, that, whatever they were, Donne “probably did gain some experience at court, experience he almost certainly lacked up to that time” (452). Maintains, however, that Donne “remained a courtier’s servant, not a courtier in his own right,” and suggests that, therefore, it is “understandable that he maintained his outsider’s contempt for the institution.” Observes that, “instead of hobnobbing with courtiers during his years in Egerton’s service,” Donne’s letters in prose and verse suggest that he “maintained and extended his friendships with Inns of Court gentlemen,” such as Henry Wotton, Christopher and Samuel Brooke, Thomas Woodward, Henry Goodere, and others. Comments especially on his friendship with William Cornwallis (454). Discusses also Donne’s meeting of Anne More, Egerton’s niece by marriage, their elopement and marriage, and the aftermath, including Donne’s dismissal from Egerton’s service.


Maintains that, “next to ordination itself, nothing shaped Donne’s clerical career more than his status as chaplain-in-ordinary to Kings James and Charles.” Points out that “ordination and royal chaplaincy were, uniquely in the period, coeval for Donne” and that “the latter was the platform from which he emerged as a preacher of national status and fame” (554). Comments on Donne’s friends and counsellors who preceded and followed him as royal chaplain and how his appointment “catapulted him not into foreign territory so much as into an office he had already observed closely as both spectator and friend” (556). Surveys the various duties of his office, the main one, of course, being preaching. Points out that Donne was “the epitome of what King James looked for in a chaplain-in-ordinary”—a brilliant “religious rhetorician”—and discusses how, because of the king’s favor, Donne “went from laity to clergy, from no degree to doctorate, from unemployment to royal chaplain in no more than a few weeks” (558–59). Surveys several of the
court sermons that Donne preached for various audiences and occasions, noting, in particular, his annual Lenten sermons, calling them "some of his most memorable pulpit performances" (562). Concludes with comments on "Death's Duell."


Maintains that early modern sermons were "radically occasional pieces of performed writing, contingent upon the contexts in and for which they were delivered" and that they "suffer, in turn, from any interpretive engagement that does not attend carefully to the circumstances outside the remaining textual artifact that moulded and shaped it ab origine" (213–14). Presents a case study of Donne's sermon "Preached at the Funerals of Sir William Cokayne, Knight, Alderman of London, December 12, 1626" that "combines historical research with close formal analysis." Holds that this sermon "recommends itself because its subject and occasion can be so richly documented" and because it "has earned accolades as one of Donne's finest." Maintains that "the key" to the following approach is "the moment of the sermon's delivery—imagining Donne delivering it before the mourners gathered in the choir of St. Paul's Cathedral in 1626" and tracing "the drama of how a sermon actually unfolded in delivery with the preacher's strategic deployment of structural parallelisms; highs and lows of emotion wrought by shifts in tone, syntax, and diction; and the often gradual evolution of argument." First presents "contextual details about the setting and dramatis persona in the pageant of Cokayne's funerals that contained Donne's sermon." Proposes to show how every piece of this information "illuminates the sophistication of Donne's rhetorical, pastoral, and political engagement with this context" (214). Comments in detail on the text of the sermon, the deceased, the preacher, the place and occasion, the mourners, the cathedral, the chosen scriptural texts, the divisions of the sermon, and the evolution of the sermon's argument.


Contains 25 essays on various aspects of the early modern sermon by individual authors in which Donne's sermons and Donne the preacher are often cited. Peter McCullough's "Preaching and Context: John Donne's Sermon at the Funerals of Sir William Cokayne" is the only essay devoted entirely to Donne, and it has been entered separately in this bibliography. In the preface (xiv–xvi), the editors explain that the volume is intended to provide "both a comprehensive guide to the key rhetorical, ecclesiological, and historical precepts essential to study of early modern sermons" as well as "a wide-ranging essay collection illustrating the principal trends in recent research." The volume is divided into 5 main sections: Composition; Delivery; Reception; Sermons in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales; and 2 sections on English sermons (1500–1660 and 1660–1720), followed by a number of documentary appendices; a selected bibliography, and an index (xiv). Comments on Donne's views on the importance of preaching and on how he regards his sermons as performances; notes his rather theatrical use of the hourglass when preaching; briefly discusses his defense of James I's Directions for Preachers; and comments on the influence of women patronesses on his sermons.


Observes Donne's "voice print" in Seamus Heaney's "Chanson d'Aventure" (2010), which begins with an epigram from ll. 71–72 of Ecst. Discusses how "these lines—and Donne's larger definition of a soulful love inclusive of the
body—furnish Heaney with a means to speak powerfully about his relationship with his wife at a time when mortality threatened the dissolution of their connection and even his fundamental ability to feel his wife's presence” (198). Notes also how Heaney alludes to *Ecst* in “Glanmore Sonnet X” (1979). Points out that Heaney implicitly agrees with those critics who read Donne's poem as a “celebration of the sacredness of sexual love” (202). Shows how Heaney's use of Donne is “distinctive from that of other contemporary poets” (208).


Observes that *Triple* “characterizes the lines of a poem (especially their breaking and turning) as a contrivance for taking away pain, of which love supplies such an abundance” (164).


Observes that in a number of manuscripts *Break* “is accompanied by or incorporated into” “Stay, O Sweet, and do not Rise,” a non-canonical poem, first printed in John Dowland's songbook *A Pilgrime Solace* in 1612. It often appears as “a one stanza poem, either as a separate entity, or as the first stanza of some versions” of Donne’s poem (111). Points out that in the manuscripts “Stay, O Sweet” appears in “one-, two-, and three-stanza versions, both as a separate poem and combined with” *Break*. Explores “the intersections between these two poems” and examines “the ways in which the text” of Donne’s poem “changes when intermixed with ‘Stay, O Sweet.’” Notes that “Stay, O Sweet” was first printed with *Break* in the 1669 edition of Donne's poems as a four-stanza version of *Break* with the first stanza of “Stay, O Sweet” as the first stanza of Donne’s poem (112). Argues that there is convincing evidence that the two poems are not by the same poet and explains why it is generally accepted that “Stay, O Sweet” is not Donne's poem. Discusses those manuscripts in which the two poems are combined or appear as separate entities and shows how the “intersections” of “Stay, O Sweet” with *Break* “supply an important link in tracing the complex transmissional history of Donne’s poem” (125).


Discusses Donne's uses of metaphors drawn from geometry and cosmology as well as his uses of the concept of microcosm and macrocosm in the *Songs and Sonets* and in the *Devoctions*. Comments on the influence on Donne's poetry of the New Philosophy as well as his adherence to the Ptolemaic world view. Speculates on the potential influence and effect Newtonian gravity might have had on Donne's writings.


Observes that although the succession of James I “seemed to offer new hope to all those who had felt marginalized in the latter years of the previous regime” (483), in fact, “as with any new regime, hopes soon fell far short of the reality” and for many the early reign was “a series of hopes faded, of a revolution that did not happen.” Notes that, at first, Donne “made little initial attempt to gain the favour of the new regime” and “did not attend the new court” (484). Surveys the king's many problems with Parliament, with finances, and especially in matters of religious conformity and tolerance. Discusses how James's accession “inaugurated a golden age of theological controversy.” Comments, in particular, on James’s dealing with Catholics and his issuance of the Oath of Allegiance. Observes that *Pseudo-Martyr* (1609),
in support of the oath, was Donne’s “first published piece of extended writing” (487). Maintains that although Donne was “undoubtedly anxious for preferment at this time” and “can hardly have been unaware of the king’s overwhelming concern with the matter of the Oath of Allegiance” (492), in writing *Pseudo-Martyr*, he also may have had a genuine desire to help Catholics avoid persecution. Holds that Donne’s expression in his treatise of a “vague sense of a broader unifying Christian identity, combined with hostility toward the Pope’s supremacy, the Jesuits, and the superstitions and exclusive claims of the Roman Catholic religion, were views that were compatible with a broad swathe of Jacobean churchmanship, embracing avant-garde conformists and Calvinist conformists alike.” Maintains that most of all, Donne’s views “chimed in closely with the attitudes of the king himself.” Notes that it was not until the following decade that Donne’s relationship with the king “would flourish” but points out that “a happy conjuncture between his own instincts and the political and religious rhetorics and realities of James’s regime was already evident and would ensure a successful career for Donne in due course” (494).

1897. Narveson, Kate. “The devotion,” in The Oxford Handbook of John Donne, ed. Jeanne Shami, Dennis Flynn, and M. Thomas Hester, 308–17. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. Notes that a “devotion” in the seventeenth century “generally consisted of meditation and prayer” and that, although it had “no stable referent in terms of form,” devotional writing “had developed a number of characteristic features.” Points out, for instance, that “its structure reflected the purpose of meditation,” which was “to awaken the heart to sin, repentance, and desire for God,” thereby unfolding “the spiritual implications of a topic to fervently held responses” (308). Surveys the characteristics of meditative modes at the time, both Catholic and Protestant. Observes that devotions in Renaissance England “had forebears reaching back to St. Augustine as well as a flourishing immediate family, with varied offspring linked by common familial traits.” Cites *Devotions* as a “remarkable” example and comments on how Donne “reinvents the genre, giving it an unprecedented intellectual and emotional intensity” (311). Discusses the structure, affective style, and the uses of autobiography and scripture in *Devotions* and comments on the various spiritual traditions and devotional modes and genres that inform the work. Shows how Donne’s “innovations in the devotional genre can be seen as the product of a hermeneutic far more sophisticated than is usual in devotional works” (315) and explains how, “within each Devotion, Donne’s hermeneutic proceeds in stages engaged in the sequence of Meditation, Expostulation, and Prayer.” Sees the Expostulations as Donne’s “unique contribution to devotional writing, in which he developed an intermediate stage to represent the soul seeking to resolve the problems raised in the Meditations” (316) and points out that the final prayers in each “provide a closure that is effective in literary as well as devotional terms, giving each Devotion a unity that is Donne’s final contribution to the genre” (317).

1898. Netzley, Ryan. “Loving Fear: Affirmative Anxiety in John Donne’s Divine Poems,” in Reading, Desire, and the Eucharist in Early Modern Religious Poetry, 106–48. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press. Maintains that in Donne’s religious poems “anxiety, and even fear, are not a reaction to an utterly inaccessible fulfillment or an infinitely deferred end,” but rather “stand as the very devotional dispositions that one should desire” (106). Observes that fear in these poems is not “a reaction against an impending threat, God’s withdrawal or punishment, for example, and anxiety is not, properly speaking, tension” (106–07) because Donne’s poetry “transmutes those passions not only so that devotees do not seek to escape them, but also so that they do not consider tension or anxiety itself as a mark of or prelude to pleasure and assurance.” Discusses how the Holy Sonnets present “an affirmative anxiety, one not bound to the affirmation of tension or release, that responds
to sacramental immanence and, in turn, provides an alternative to critical work that presents Donne's religious verse as motivated by irremediable lack and absence." Discusses also how these poems "ultimately reject the temptation to treat God as absent and instead affirm an anxiety that does not seek to be assuaged." Claims that by "affirming anxiety, Donne does not optimistically or resentfully tether affliction to reward, treating suffering and the anxiety that attends it as evidence of salvation" and that in Donne's poetry "it testifies to the uselessness of ends, of organizing one's devotional life with an eye toward a sort of telos." Observes that Donne regards the Eucharist "as a means of training devotees to respond to an already existing divine presence" and that he sees the sacrament as "a means of transmuting a petty tension or doubt into an affirmative, instead of a defensive, devotional response"; thus the "sacramental presence becomes a means of altering the basic contours of anxiety about the future or absence into an attentive response to an immanent divinity" (107). Discusses how the Holy Sonnets do not reflect "a conservative fear of self-annihilation" but rather show "the value of anxiety transmuted." Holds that these poems "disavow consolation not because of an inconsolable idiosyncrasy or pyrrhonist scepticism" but rather because "anxiety as defence is incompatible with love" (108).

Reviews:
- Lara Dodds in *JEMCS* 12, no. 3 (2012): 150–53.
- Darryl Gless in *SQ* 63, no. 4: 585–87.


Reviews that one of the main “interpretive problems” that critics have with *Noct* is that of “nothingness” and points out how they have “consistently explained this nothingness within an alchemical context.” Argues that, in addition to that tradition, Donne “simultaneously” is using the word “nothingness” also within “the context of Dionysian negative theology,” which is a “tradition of apophatic neoplatonic theology” that “maintains that nothing can be predicated of God” (352) and that “the best language can do is to articulate paradoxes, whose logical possibilities point to that which cannot ‘be’: God is spoken of as a dark radiance, an absent presence, a death that is life, a nothing that is all things.” Points out that in this radically transcendent view of God, the soul “must leave aside everything that is temporal and physical, emptying herself of all that is worldly until she reaches a joyful union with her bridegroom in heaven.” Maintains that although Donne “remains in darkness at the last line of the poem, it is a much different darkness from the despair in which he begins the poem.” Claims that “without overt theological references to God or the soul,” Donne suggests throughout Noct that “this final darkness is the nothingness that denotes a soul’s union with her divine beloved.” Argues, therefore, that “the alchemical context is unmistakably present” but that “it creates a dilemma that is solved only by adding the additional context of apophatic theology” (353). Shows how by using both traditions that “have ‘nothingness’ at their center, Donne can speak of the deepest experience of love with his signature wit.” Concludes that in Noct “nothingness” is actually “the goal, as it is in Dionysian theology,” and that it is “in the darkness that signifies a mystical union with God himself that Donne finds the language to express the inexpressible, the union with his earthly lover” (362).


Discusses Donne primarily in two chapters, although he is mentioned throughout. In Chapter 4: “Divine Matter and the Cannibal Dilemma: The Faerie Queene and Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions” (89–128), discusses how in Spenser’s poem “the savage consump-
tion of flesh and blood in the Errour episode graphically demonstrates the anti-papal propagandist linking of Catholicism with cannibalism and barbarism” and is, “in the end, about a Protestant appetite struggling to fully distance itself from Eucharistic eating,” whereas Donne in Devotions offers “an alternative perspective on the Catholic Eucharist, one that is expressed as a profound alimentary longing” and as “a deep residual hunger for Christ’s body.” Suggests that Devotions “reveals an appetite so deeply deprived of Eucharistic nourishment that the boundaries between medical and spiritual consumption of corpses become blurred” (92). Maintains that in Donne “the door to the presence of Christ in the Catholic Eucharist remains partly open” and that his position on “the real nature of the sacrament is never fully declared.” Argues that this is especially true in Devotions, in which Donne “repeatedly evades any direct declaration of desire for divine matter, while at the same time expresses a deep nostalgia for the body of Christ in a complex medical argument that ultimately fixes on mummy as food for the ailing body” (115). Claims that in Devotions Donne “brings together his fascination with the human body and medicine more vividly than in any of his other works” and that it reflects his “uncertainty” over the Real Presence that “creates epistemological and ontological anxieties that the text attempts to negotiate.” Maintains that Donne’s “obsessive focus on his most intimate bodily experiences of suffering yields knowledge of the suffering of the soul” and that “bodily corruption reveals spiritual corruption” that “calls for powerful medical intervention, both secular and divine.” Points out, however, that “the distinction that the Devotions attempts to make between secular and divine medicine is increasingly difficult to sustain” (119) and that “the possibility of the medical corpse as an alimentary replacement for the body of Christ becomes compelling when Donne's anxious desire for a special kind of Eucharistic matter and the ingestible corpse remedy prescribed for him in the final stages of his illness converge” (119–20). In Chapter 5, “The Fille Vierge as Pharmakon: Othello and the Anniversaries” (127–59), maintains that in the Anniversaries “masculine anxiety and female chastity” are “prevailing themes” (130) and that they reveal a “kind of fixation—manifested as intense spiritual and physical desire—that deploys the idea of the chaste female body.” Points out that in the Anniversaries there is “no actual body; rather, the virginal Elizabeth Drury is imagined as already fragmented and distilled into Paracelsian mummy” and that “she becomes in death the lingering trace of the vital source that her body contained in life: a barely definable essence, co-opted for Donne’s poetic project of promoting himself as the sole author on whose writings the recuperation of the spiritually sick world depends.” Maintains, however, that in the Anniversaries “the eroticized virginal quintessence is sublimated into the pages of the poems to form a Eucharistic healing offering for the ailing masculine soul.” Observes that, in this way, women in Donne are “metaphorically defused, preserved in an innocent—and therefore non-threatening—state of chastity,” thereby “forming a powerful pharmacological arsenal of sexual purity to be ingested in the service of cultural (read masculine) well-being” (131). Claims that the Anniversaries “encapsulate how early modern writers eagerly seized upon the imagery produced by medicinal cannibalism in order to respond to the broader set of ideological concerns, particularly as they relate to medicine, economics, sexuality, and identity” (158).

Reviews:


Discusses anti-Jesuit texts from 1555 to 1618 and briefly comments on Donne’s contribution in Ignatius.

Discusses the influence of NegLov on Harmonium, a choral work by John Adams, a contemporary American composer, and comments on the singing of HSBatter at the end of Act 1 of his opera Doctor Atomic by an actor playing J. Robert Oppenheimer. Shows how in the choral work NegLov “provides the impetus for movement and form” and how in the opera Donne’s sonnet “reveals better than any other single moment in the production the depth of Oppenheimer’s anguished state” (189).


Discusses Octavio Paz’s theory of creative translation by analyzing his translations of ElBed and Anniv and by pointing out the relationship between Paz’s translations of Donne and his own poetry.


Presents an interview that Pomerazew had with Brodsky in London in 1981 about writing his poem “Great Elegy to John Donne.” Brodsky says that he first came across Donne through Hemingway’s title For Whom the Bell Tolls at a time when Donne was almost unknown in the Soviet Union and first read Donne’s poetry in a Modern Library Edition in 1964 sent to him while he was in prison. Brodsky said he wrote his poem on Donne in 1962 when he knew very little about Donne. Brodsky also discusses his views as a translator of Donne’s poems, what he learned from reading Donne’s poems, and his admiration for Donne’s ability to translate the eternal to the transient. Brodsky comments also on the difficulties in trying to explain Donne to a Russian audience.


Discusses Metem, The Courtier’s Library, Ignatius, verse letters mocking Thomas Coryate, and several “characters” or essays to show how these texts, although each has “its own character, agenda, and context,” is related to Menippean satire (158). Defines Menippean satire as “salty, jumbled, cynical, and proud of it” and as a satiric mode that “loves to collect, attract, heap up, include, stuff, toss in” and consists of “pictures, shaped poems, giants, staves of music, dream visions, macaronics, send-ups, sestiquipedalian neologisms, puns, embedded tales, dinner parties, reversals of inside and outside, shifts in gender, jokes, debates, animal combinations, snarky marginal commentary, or silly footnotes.” Points out that Menippean satire is “usually degrading, but usually so as to trip up the haughty who deserve it,” and that “its send-ups of a constricting and exclusive erudition paradoxically require a learned reader to savour them fully” (159). Maintains that although Donne “never wrote a fully Menippean satire, the genre commanded his attention and his imagination” (160). Concludes that the works above suggest that “when Donne was thinking beyond traditional verse satire, keeping one eye on the Menippea and another on the censors, he could be clever but serious” (179).


Notes that although the paradox “has flourished from time to time since the classical period,” it enjoyed “significant popularity” in England at the turn of the seventeenth century. Describes how it developed “in two related traditions: the mock encomium and the argument against received opinion” (149). Observes that in the “tradition of Erasmian humanism, rhetorically dissimulating in arguments against received opinion, Donne wrote twelve Paradoxes, all but two by the mid-1590s.” Discusses a letter to a friend with enclosed copies of his
Paradoxes in which Donne asked him not to allow anyone to transcribe them and explains why he wrote them (150). Points out how, for the most part, critics have treated the Paradoxes with “censure or neglect, often characterizing them as trivial, coarse, or enigmatic” or simply have passed over them in silence. Suggests that this negative critical evaluation has resulted from “a failure to situate these writings in the coterie context for which they were originally designed and performed, or written and circulated” (151). Points out how the Paradoxes were written for “a hand-picked audience that was both exclusive and known to the author” who “capitalizes on his nearness to his audience and his audience’s nearness to him.” Notes how “dangerous social conditions” at the time motivated the need for “obscurity and concealment” (152).


Discusses how ElProg and ElBrac “reveal the reconceptualisation of economic value spurred by Renaissance colonialism” (98). Argues that the “transformation in what constitutes the nature of (economic) value, partially spurred by colonial venturing, permeates Donne’s erotic poetry” and “provides the matrix” within which ElProg “locates gender and colonialism in relationship to one another.” Maintains that Donne “reverses the moral hierarchy, making the once-essential ‘virtues’ of the metallic substance merely incidental” and claims that “true value” results from a desire that only gold’s use as an instrument of exchange can provoke.” Shows how ElProg this inversion “provides the basic structure informing, first, the analogy between gold and woman, and, subsequently, the descriptions of colonial voyaging over the female body” (146). Comments on how ElProg “mockingly invokes . . . an exhaustive cosmic calculation as it elaborates upon the outrageous relationship between gold and the beloved.” Observes that the poem argues that what satisfies male desire “lies within the female body, just as gold remains buried within the earth” (145) and that the desirability of the
woman “depends upon the sexual availability that is embodied as the ‘centrique part.’” Shows how in the elegy “the reversal enacted in the poem’s treatment of gold and woman subsequently envelops the analogy between the woman’s body and the to-be-colonised spaces sought by European explorers” (147). Explains also how “the early modern map plays a critical role” in the poem (148). Maintains that Donne’s erotic poetry, “by changing the nature of value, commodification and circulation of precious metals” undermines “existing social arrangements.” Cites ElBrac as an example in which money is linked to religion and politics.


In a discussion of analogy, briefly comments on ll. 14–18 of Relic in which the speaker compares his mistress to Mary Magdalen and himself to Christ, on ll. 12–13 of Flea in which he says the flea is their marriage bed and marriage temple, and on ll. 1–4 of Air in which he compares his mistress to an angel. Observes that “the exaggerations and implausibility of these comparisons raises the suspicion that these analogies must be ironical or satirical and that therefore their redemptive effects are dubious, however tempting it might be to accept them at face value” (110).


Responses by 50 celebrities who received letters from 5th grade students to the question: What is your favorite poem? David Read selects HSBatter because of “its powerful expression of God’s grace—so different from so much sloppy, religious verse” (69).


Reprints an excerpt from Reeve’s essay “Reading Maps” that appeared in So Rich a Tapestry: The Sister Arts and Cultural Studies, ed. Ann Hurley and Kate Greenspan (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1995), pp. 285–314. Points out that the seventeenth century “abounds in the association of maps and texts” and says that it is in Donne’s poetry and sermons that “references to the literary dimension of mapmaking are the most common and most learned.” Discusses as an example ValMourn, in which the reference to “obliquely runne” (l.34) is “a translation of a contemporary issue in both mapmaking and navigation, the cursus obliquus or loxodrome,” and points out how the whole poem is based on “the metaphor of the oblique course” (333).


Argues that, when he accepted his appointment as preacher at Lincoln’s Inn in 1616, Donne, keenly aware of his less than pious student days, “did not ignore or gloss over his youth” but rather “deliberately used his own biography to bridge the gap between the secular and spiritual to confront his Lincoln’s Inn auditor.” Notes that, in a sense, in preaching to the students, Donne was “effectively addressing
the figures of his past self” (90) and points out that likely the students would have been “sensitive to his past” (91). Observes that Donne’s “references to his past life and, in particular, his former literary identity are a defining characteristic of the Lincoln’s Inn sermons.” Discusses how “rather than rejecting his past, Donne always emphasizes the manner in which the secular and the spiritual can be brought together,” thereby “encouraging the students in the congregation to follow his own religious journey of conversion” (92). Notes Donne’s typically “gentle, non-confrontational tone with his congregation” (94) and how he urges the students “to take their wit and learning and use them to advance the Kingdom of God, rather than earthly concerns” as he had done by switching from satirist to preacher (95). Points out that Donne “demonstrates how this should be done through the use of rhetorical ingenuity within his sermons.” Comments on “the same stylistic fascination with puns, verbal acrobatics, and rhetorical showmanship is apparent in Donne’s sermons as it is in his early poetry and prose” (96). Surveys also the thematic content and rhetorical strategies found in the Lincoln’s Inn sermons. Concludes that in them there is “no denial of the apparent contradictions in his biography, nor any awkward efforts at self-justification” but rather there is “a deliberate attempt to employ and indeed, perform, the discontinuities of his life in order to engage the particular congregation before him” (103).


Discusses Donne’s extensive connections with Lincoln’s Inn prior to his appointment as preacher there in the first years of his ordained ministry. Comments on the preaching tradition at Lincoln’s Inn and how Donne fit into it, noting that when he was appointed in 1616, Donne’s “theological reputation was such that the benchers did not see him as out of place in the evangelical preaching tradition they had hitherto maintained at Lincoln’s Inn” (579). Discusses Donne’s specific duties as preacher and the makeup of his auditory. Notes that 22 of his sermons are extant, with 3 more “for which a strong case can be made for their having been preached at Lincoln’s Inn” (579). Comments on how the sermons “tended to form parts of a series” (579–80) and were “usually dedicated to a particular biblical text or a logical biblical unit.” Points out also that they are “always notable for their sensitivity to the specific occasion and location of preaching” and are shaped and adapted to “the particular congregation before him.” Observes that Donne was also “adept at drawing on his legal knowledge to address the lawyers” in his congregation and often “sought out biblical texts with a particularly legal theme.” Maintains that Donne’s concerns as preacher, however, were not “limited to the specific social and vocational preoccupations of his congregation” but were also focused on “the tensions and strains that characterized international relations in Europe during James’s reign” (581). Comments on his involvement as chaplain to the Doncaster embassy and surveys various religious and political issues of the time that Donne addressed in his sermons, such as the king’s changing policy on toleration for English Catholics and the building of the new chapel. Concludes that Donne’s tenure at Lincoln’s Inn was “clearly crucial in terms of the development of both his religious and political identity” and “seems also to have been a personally rewarding period, in which Donne was able to exercise his ministry amid a congregation to whom he was bound not only by his role as a preacher, but also by the ties of friendship, and a shared institutional past” (588).


Discusses the influence on Donne’s Holy Sonnets of Luther’s “erotic understanding of faith” as found in the Elizabethan translation of his Commentarie on the epistle to the Galatians (1575), in which the reformer states that
by faith man is “coupled” with God more intimately than a man is coupled with his wife and becomes “a man more than a man.” Furthermore points out how Luther holds that this intimacy turns “man into Christ” and that, therefore, when a man dies one can say God dies (343). Discusses how “this vulnerable deity—this intimacy with an Other—transforms early modern identity” (345) and informs the Holy Sonnets. In particular, shows how the sonnets reflect Luther’s concept of “a dying deity, a God who willingly abandons himself to otherness in order to redeem humanity” by his Passion. Says that in the sonnets the speaker “finds himself enacting the same process, suffering his own damnation in order to experience—in the fullest sense—intimacy with the One who mediates his justification” (359). Comments also on how the Holy Sonnets “offer multiple glimpses of the eroticism of the Passion” (365).


Observes that James I was “as enthusiastic about exploiting the press” as Donne was “ambivalent about print publication” (89). Contrasts, therefore, the ways in which Donne and the king regarded print and manuscript publication and examines “the important role the king played in Donne’s relationship with the press” (90). Points out that James was “sensitive to the advantages of manuscript in certain cases” but that, “where his concern was to inspire reverence in his readers,” he turned “to print, not manuscript,” whereas Donne held that reverence was “more usually associated with manuscript” (91). Maintains that Donne believed that the printed book “fails to command the respect of its owner and is subject to decay,” whereas a manuscript “will be revered and protected by its owner”; therefore, “it is manuscript not print that more effectively preserves writing” (93). Points out also that, for Donne, the printed book is impersonal and may also limit an author’s “authorial possession and control” over his work since once it goes to the printer, it is “literally and metaphorically out of its author’s hands.” Observes, however, that Donne was “affected by royal enthusiasm for print” and suggests that, in a sense, the king “initiated Donne into the world of print” by commissioning him to write and publish Pseudo-Martyr (95). Notes, however, that this work, in a sense, “blurs the boundaries between manuscript and print by inviting the reader to ‘amend’ the printed text ‘with his pen’” (97). Concludes that for Donne the manuscript “enabled a more personal transaction within which the work could enter into the possession of its reader, while print depersonalized the work, separating it from both author and reader, even as it exposed the author to irreverent responses beyond his control,” whereas, for James, “while willing to use manuscript circulation in certain cases, seems to have preferred print publication for the most part because he did not want his works to be possessed—personalised, annotated, reinterpreted—by his readers” and “thought that printed texts could inspire reverence” (100).


Presents a brief biography of Donne, interspersed with selections from Donne’s poems, that relies primarily on R. C. Bald’s John Donne: A Life (1970).

Reviews:


Discusses how the Anniversaries are “completely different” from Donne’s other funeral poems and the difficulty of identifying their genre (277). Notes that there are no earlier poems exactly like these nor have there been later examples. Maintains that the Anniversaries “may justly be considered Donne’s generic
innovation: a great structure comprising allusions to, adaptations of, and borrowings from the repertoire of literary modes available from antiquity to his own time." Insists, however, that "above any such considerations is the force of Donne's intellectual theological energy striving to make sense of things, outdoing any classical precedent." Points out that Donne's repertoire also "included materials not considered then as literary, or purely literary in an aesthetic sense, such as liturgical and ecclesiastical forms" (279). Discusses several examples of critical commentary on the poems to show how they have always provoked "great critical interest, ingenuity, disagreement—sometimes acrimonious—and a bewildering array of propositions" concerning their "generic lineaments" (279–80). Claims that the Anniversaries exhibit to the fullest Donne's "unparalleled wit and invention" and may rightly be seen as the "finest long poems written in English between The Faerie Queene and Paradise Lost" (284).


Defines the "controversial treatise" as "a serviceable genre since antiquity" that "disputes any body of knowledge for which there exists a more or less acknowledged orthodoxy: scientific, philosophical, theological, political, ethical, and so on." Notes that it "flourishes where competing bodies of belief confront each other" (247) and that "its fundamental characteristic is to demonstrate superior, corrective knowledge, or belief, and to denigrate flawed or misleading understanding" (247–48). Adds that its tone "can register everything from the satirical jeer through the quietly reasonable to the irenical embrace." Discusses Pseudo-Martyr as an example, its argument, tone, and rhetorical strategies, in which the main issue is "the papal claim of supremacy, specifically the power to depose heretical rulers and, necessarily, the authority to determine what is and what is not heresy" (251). Cites Erasmus and Thomas More as "the most potent" influences on Donne's treatise (250). Comments on the religious and political tensions during James's reign, particularly those arising from the Oath of Allegiance controversy and shows the role Pseudo-Martyr played in defending the Oath and in attempting "to deliver his former co-religionists from a crippling, life-threatening restraint" (262). Maintains that Pseudo-Martyr "became a sure foundation for all Donne's later religious thinking, underlying much of the thought of the Sermons" (263).


Discusses "the psychic mobility with which ingegno was consistently linked" in the Renaissance and especially "its frequent identification with those volatile spirits that were centrally important in both Aristotelian/Galenic humoral psychology and in the Neoplatonic and hermetic traditions of natural magic." In discussing "the close relationship between genius, spirits, and creativity," examines Marsilio Ficino’s De Vita and Antonio Persio’s Trattato dell’Ingegno dell’Uomo in order to lay the groundwork for a discussion of poetics in Campanello and Donne. Examines also "the perspectives on poetic utterance formulated in Campanella’s Poetica and Donne’s Anniversaries" (79). Argues that both poets "situate poetry somewhere between the conventional alternatives of Aristotelian imitation and divine inspiration by identifying the creative activity or psychic mobility of ‘ingegno’ as, to some degree, the subject itself of poetic utterance" (79–80). Discusses how in the Anniversaries Donne
provides an “intense and sustained reflection on poetry’s powers” that “are closely linked to his perception of the world in these poems in terms of spirits and vitality” (88). Maintains that in these poems Donne does not question “the objective claims” of the New Philosophy, but that what most concerns him is “the isolated and morally impoverished sensibility that it yields” (89). Says that his major concern is that “the cosmos is no longer viewed as a living, organic, and therefore divinely constituted whole.” Shows how Elizabeth Drury’s role in the Anniversaries serves as “the link between earth and heaven” (91) and how “the act of poetic making becomes an individually willed participation in the vitality which is God’s continued gift to us.” Claims that what Donne “dis-covers, through the inventive activity that produces his poem, is the redemptive creative energy that makes such invention possible” (92).


Presents a brief biographical sketch of Donne and comments on three “books” that influenced his writings—Revelation, the Bible, and the Book of Nature. Sees language as a a link between God, the World, and human beings and, against this background, regards Devotions as evidence of a communicative action of God that creates a communicative relationship with man. Discusses the occasion and structure of Devotions and reads the work as Donne’s spiritual attempt to understand his own life in the context of God’s communicative relationship with him. Regards the tripartite structure of the work as linked with the three “books” mentioned above. Accordingly, views the Meditations as an interpretation of the Book of Nature, the Expostulations as its transference to the Bible and its interpretation, and the concluding Prayers as a turn to God and, thus, a communicative act with Him. Illustrates this concept by presenting an interpretation of Meditation 19.


Discusses Donne’s decision to take orders in the Church of England in 1615. Notes that “no decision in Donne’s life has generated such divergent accounts of his situation—economic, personal, political, social, religious, or spiritual—or raised as many questions about his motivations and inner life” (523). Comments on how in the period 1607–1615 Donne “was uncertain about many things in his life: his ability to maintain his growing family; his ability to prove useful to his society; the form that his service or usefulness would take; his health” (523–24) and discusses how “all these factors are crucial for understanding his decision to take orders” (524). Reviews the impact of Walton’s biography and the evidence of Donne’s early letters to friends, relatives, and patrons on scholarly discussion of Donne’s motives in seeking ecclesiastical preferment. Cites an especially interesting and moving letter Donne wrote to his mother that shows his “inner world and reveals a depth of wisdom, affection, duty, and sensitivity that belies the view that his decision to take orders was marked solely by ambition or despair,” and that does not “support the view that Donne had at last converted to Protestantism, if that meant rejecting the religion into which he had been born.” Points out that, in the letter, Donne “speaks confidently of his mother’s faith” (535) and that, although he often later criticized the beliefs of the Catholic Church, “it is likely that in 1616 Donne and his mother shared the same religion, if not the same church, and that Donne’s courage in making his profession divinity enabled a career choice not only tolerated but approved by his
closest family members” (536).


Discusses the publication history and critical reception of Donne's sermons and maintains that one should read them “because they were important to him” and were “the culmination of his intellectual life, the repository of his moral and political thought, and, at their best, his finest literary creations” (318) and also “because they were important cultural events that established his considerable contemporary reputation as a preacher in his own day.” Maintains, furthermore, that the sermons are “a lens through which to understand his culture, not because they are representative but because they are unique,” and because they “reveal clearly the hotly contested matters of his day, articulate the crises on which they comment in their most complex forms, and expose the fault-lines of their religious and political contexts” (319). Discusses how Donne's sermons “stand out for their inclusive reach, their accommodating rhetorical gestures, and their imaginative interpretive strategies” and shows how they “present him as an ethical model of integrity and a force of cohesion” in the Church of England that, at the time, “was fractured by religious debate and polemic” (320). Comments on the influence of St. Augustine and Erasmus on Donne's sermons and discusses how sermons were “the mass media” in Donne's day, “satisfying appetites for news, entertainment, social interaction, politics, and, of course, religious edification” (323). Surveys Donne's concept of what a sermon should be and what it is “ought to avoid or transcend doctrinal wrangling.” Examines Donne's “strategies of biblical interpretation,” especially “his skill in applying biblical texts to particular audiences on particular occasions” (327). Suggests that “the most impressive feature” of the sermons is Donne’s “rhetorical skill: the dramatic, performance-driven oral intensity” of his sermons and “their dazzling rhetorical sophistication and variety” (332), which can be seen “in the variety of his tropes, images, and figurative devices as well as in his supple, evocative rhythms” (333–34). Observes that one of Donne's most effective rhetorical strategies is to conclude his sermons “by contrasting worldly perspectives (even the most enlightened) with the heavenly, eternal perspective in a move that inspires his hearers with desire for that eternity” (336). Discusses three sermons “to exemplify the rhetorical, doctrinal, and political pressures brought to bear on Donne's sermons on particular occasions and Donne's characteristic responses to these pressures” (337). Contrasts the sermons with Donne's love poetry, noting how the sermons are “more accommodating” than his poems (346). Concludes that the sermons “illustrate his most sustained and creative engagement with a literary genre” (347).


Contains 43 essays by individual scholars, each of which has been entered separately in this bibliography. In the General Introduction (1–6), Shami, Hester, and Flynn explain that the handbook is “intended as a source of directions, a guard against misdirections, and an indicator of new directions” and “is not intended as a mere summary of existing knowledge” but rather “reveals critical patterns of literary and historical work” on Donne's poetry and prose and “the new directions that these patterns have enabled or obstructed.” Maintain that “in several respects it breaks new ground even while it introduces scholars to the history of Donne studies, providing conceptual tools to orient and unfold Donne scholarship.” Briefly survey the contents in each of the four parts of the handbook. In the introduction of “Part I: Research Resources in Donne Studies and Why They Matter” (9–11), Shami points out that this part of the handbook emphasizes its “heuristic and practical orientation” by looking at “prevailing assumptions and reviewing or
introducing students and researchers to some of the specialized scholarly tools available for Donne studies.” Notes that the chapters in this section “provide a brief evaluation and description of the scholarly strengths, shortcomings, and significance of each resource, focusing on a balanced evaluation of the opportunities and the hazards each offers” (9). Comments briefly on the contents of each of the chapters, such as, Donne as a manuscript author, his early readership, continuing archival research and its opportunities, the problems of textual transmission and editing, essential scholarly tools for scholars, and the international scholarly community engaged in Donne studies. In the introduction of “Part II: Donne’s Genres” (99–104), Heather Dubrow and Hester comment on 19 essays on the major genres in which Donne wrote. Maintain that “studying Donne generically casts new light on issues central to his major writings and to Donne studies in general” and is also “a key for unlocking the complexities of the poems and prose works per se.” Maintain that, in addition to elucidating individual poems, the essays in this part “reveal many larger, overreaching issues about Donne’s work” (99). Point out, furthermore, how the organization of the essays in this part encourages one “to adopt new perspectives on questions that extend far beyond John Donne’s own canon” (100). Discusses how Donne’s “approach to genre is typically self-conscious and reflexive” and how “he draws attention to his forms” and how he “writes about them as well as writing in them” (101). Comments also on Donne’s “extraordinarily eclectic approach to his literary genres” (102) and how he often “plays genres or their fragments against each other in the same text.” Also points out how, “given the range of genres in which Donne writes, his decision not to engage in others is revealing” (103) and comments on how he “establishes continuing and multivocal dialogues between and among Petrarchan possibilities and rebuttals of them.” Concludes that “studying how and why he writes generically can help shape the way we ourselves see John Donne’s worlds” (104). In the introduction to “Part III: Biographical and Historical Contexts” (365–70), Flynn and Shami comment on 22 essays, in which biographers and historians discuss “what is known about Donne’s life” and show how Donne’s life and writings “epitomized and affected important controversial issues of his day,” thereby “bringing to bear on Donne studies some of the most stimulating and creative ideas developed in recent decades by historians of early modern England” (365). In the introduction of “Part IV: Problems of Literary Interpretation that have been Traditionally and Generally Important in Donne Studies” (661–63), Flynn comments on seven essays that examine “major critical debates affecting the reception of Donne from the seventeenth century to the twenty-first century” (661). Notes that the object of these essays is “to give a historical overview of Donne’s reception” and to pose questions “without necessarily resolving them.” Notes, furthermore, that Part IV “is generally intended to present various conjectures and refutations, not to establish a consensus about Donne by refuting influential points of view the editors or authors consider erroneous” (662). Points out that the essays deal with the following issues: Donne and apostasy; Women and possible misogyny in his writings; Donne’s views on absolutism; issues about style, wit, and prosody in his poetry; Donne’s political, social, and ecclesiastical ambitions; the John and Jack Donne debate; and the question of whether Donne’s writings in part or in whole are dangerous. Concludes with an extensive bibliography (756–812) and four indexes (conceptual tools, personal names, place names, and individual works discussed) (813–45).

Reviews:
• Anon. ContempR 293 (Sept. 2011): 396.

Discusses how Donne “used his consciousness of mortality and his own deathbed to forge bonds with family, friends, and mankind in general” (646). Comments on Donne’s treatment of death in both his love poetry and sacred verse as well as in his prose. Notes the effect on him of deaths in his family and among his friends. Discusses Donne’s intense preparation for his own death. Examines the theme, rhetorical stratagem, and language of “Death’s Duell,” preached at a time “when Donne’s final illness was leaving its marks on his body” (650). Comments on Walton’s description of Donne’s death. Says that Donne “demonstrates the Christian hope that death should not be an end in itself, but a journey towards a new beginning” and believes that “few can have been as concerned as he was to give directions to future voyagers” (657).


Summarizes the critical debate on the question of Donne’s absolutism and argues that the issue “remains a live question because the definition of absolutism remains a live question.” Discusses what Stuart absolutism was, noting that “existing scholarship points to the existence of three historically distinct conceptualizations of absolute power” (692): “Bodinian (indivisible sovereignty, principally legislative); governmental (the medieval gubernaculum/jurisdictio distinction);” and “casuistical absolutism” (696). Defines and discusses each of these concepts and how they can be seen in Donne’s later prose works, focusing primarily on Pseudo-Martyr and the sermons. Observes how Pseudo-Martyr “flirts with Bodinian absolutism” but that “this was an anti-papal work, a genre conducive to high-flown royalism” and how in the sermons there is “a consistent strain of governmental absolutism, a position that, although becoming increasingly contentious, had been Tudor orthodoxy and was still widely accepted.” Notes that Donne’s position on “casuistical absolutism, the terrain on which the constitutional struggles of the Caroline era were fought, is less clear” (702). Points out how in his works Donne’s “evasiveness with regard to absolutism is typical of Stuart divines, who almost never detail the implications of their divine-right theories or how they bear upon the conundrums of law and prerogative.” Maintains, therefore, that there is “nothing particularly Donnean” about Donne’s often ambiguous statements about royal prerogative (703).


Points out that today Renaissance epithalamions “appear distinctly odd” and that Donne’s seem “odder than most” and strike us as “conventional and impersonal.” Notes that epithalamions were written mostly for the weddings of social and economic superiors from whom poets “sought patronage.” Observes that although the tradition of wedding poems “reaches back to biblical and classical literature” and flourished on the Continent in sixteenth-century Italy and France, the vogue of the epithalamic tradition began in England with Spenser’s “Epithalamion” (1595). Points out how the poems “were modelled on classical epithalamions, especially Catullus 61” and usually celebrate “a significant communal event rather than depicting a marriage of true minds” (298). Discusses how Donne’s three wedding songs “exhibit the general characteristics of the Renaissance epithalamion,” noting that none of them “celebrates the marriage of a close friend or family member.” Points out how they are “organized chronologically through the events of the wedding day” and are “narrated from the point of view of the poet-speaker who presents himself as a member of the community celebrating the wedding.” Points out also how Donne also transforms the generic conventions, often
mocking them, as in *EpLin*. Discusses the occasion, the poetic and rhetorical strategies, imagery, the political sensitivity and social tact, and originality of Donne’s wedding poems and shows how he “uses a fashionable genre to fulfill its traditional function of celebrating the intersection of the personal and the communal event as he bends conventional forms to register the disjunctions and difficulties of merging the individual into the collective in his own social, financial, and political world.” Admits that these poems are not among Donne’s “most popular or moving poems” but rather are, nevertheless, “fascinating instances of his characteristic concerns and poetic strategies” (307).


Argues that the poetry in Donne’s sermons is “not found in sudden flashes of heightened imagery, conspicuous patterns of sound, or unique turns of phrase” but rather is found in “the use Donne made of homiletic form” (403). Suggests that those sermons one finds most pleasurable to read today “reveal the poet’s touch in his use of traditional homiletic *dispositio*.” Examines, therefore, Donne’s uses of and his understanding of rhetoric as reflected in the sermons (411). Presents as an example a detailed rhetorical analysis of Donne’s sermon preached on 18 April 1619 in anticipation of his departure to the Continent. Contends also that Donne’s “own hermeneutic [practice] warrants our search for his ideas about creativity.” Maintains that Donne “began to share in writing the sonnets in his early twenties” (37). Comments on characteristics of Donne’s life and poetry that are reflected in the sonnets and sees the influence of Dante, scholasticism, and mysticism in Donne’s poems and in Shakespeare’s sonnets.


Discusses a series of letters between John Donne the Younger and Edward, Second Viscount Conway and Killultagh, a major seventeenth-century book collector, and presents biographical sketches of both men. Attempts “to salvage” Donne junior “from the common view that he was simply a scoundrel or libertine” by examining “previously unpublished manuscript material and making new arguments about the younger Donne’s printed works.” Reproduces and discusses four autograph letters by Donne the Younger not previously printed, partial transcripts of two others, and several extracts from other documents that shed light on Donne junior’s “role as an agent, a newsgatherer and a supplicant for patronage.” Discusses how his position as a client of Conway, “circulating manuscripts, books and luxury goods, helps explain the workings of late Renaissance patronage and gift-culture.” Maintains that Donne junior was also a “witty coterie poet” and “presents evidence about the circumstances surrounding the publication of William Davenant’s *Gondibert*, and the reaction it caused among John Denham’s circle.” Suggests the possibility of the role Donne junior played in the circulation of intelligence during the Civil War among the Royalists by means of employing “apparently innocuous comments about birds, doctors and court gossip” (538).


Argues that Donne and Thomas Sackville co-authored Shakespeare’s sonnets. Presents a biographical sketch of both poets and finds similarities in their personal lives, in their theological views, and in their poetry. Maintains that Donne “began to share in writing the sonnets in his early twenties” (37). Comments on characteristics of Donne’s life and poetry that are reflected in the sonnets and sees the influence of Dante, scholasticism, and mysticism in Donne’s poems and in Shakespeare’s sonnets.


Discusses King James's international politics and policies. Points out that, like the king, Donne had an “intense concern for events beyond England's borders,” that he “counted several diplomats among his friends,” and that he himself “aspired to a diplomatic career before his ordination in 1615.” Observes how, after his ordination, as a preacher, his “horizons remained European, since many religious issues transcended national boundaries.” Proposes, therefore, “to situate English religious politics within a wider European environment” during the 1610s and 1620s (589). Stresses how the king “played different religious factions and foreign states against each other” and, in particular, how he “remained wary of potential Catholic adversaries abroad and Catholic conspiracies within his own dominion” (590). Notes that, as a result of the international controversy over the Oath of Allegiance, Donne wrote Pseudo-Martyr and Ignatius, defending the king and displaying his “talent for religious controversy” (591). Discusses how soon after Donne's ordination “rifts partly rooted in European religious politics . . . began to widen within the English Church” (594) and how Donne attempted to heal these divisions. Comments on his appointment as chaplain to James Hay, Viscount of Doncaster, most likely “because of his prior involvement in diplomacy” and because of “his reputation as an astute thinker and able preacher with evangelical sympathies” (597). Discusses Donne's accompanying Doncaster on his diplomatic mission to the Continent. Maintains that, after his return to England in 1620, Donne “felt distressed at the directions royal policies had taken” but explains how “by temperament and training he remained enough of a European diplomat to realize that growing divisions among British Protestants and shrill attacks on the King's behavior would only play into the hands of Spain and British Catholics, church papists, and anti-Calvinists” who wanted “to dilute the evangelical character of the English Church.” Observes how in the 1620s Donne, as “preacher and ecclesiastical politician,” strove “simultaneously to resist the growth of Roman Catholicism in England and to preserve a middle ground on which British and European evangelicals might remain united against their common foe.” Calls Donne “a moderate evangelical royalist: a clergyman who believed in a strong Protestant monarchy and an inclusive Reformed ecclesiology and theology capable of facilitating the broadest possible alliance against Spain and Rome” (599).


Discusses how Joseph Brodsky's translations of the English metaphysical poets into Russian was an important influence on the metaphysical style of his own poetry. (From the abstract)


Comments on the death of Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, on 24 May 1612 and on Donne's attitude toward him both before and at the time of his death. Points out that some scholars “have linked the rise of Donne's fortunes to the decline in power of the Cecils” and notes that there were “a number of connections between Donne and rivals of the Cecils,” in particular, the Earl of Essex, Raleigh, and the Howards. Suggests that Donne's negative attitude in his early years toward Cecil was likely “colored by his membership in a political faction opposed to the Earl.” In the first section of the essay, discusses, therefore, Donne's connections with Cecil's rivals for power and with the Earl himself and points out that it is “not easy to link Donne and his friends with any single political grouping.” Says that “it is arguable that Donne sided against Cecil politically because the poet endorsed liberal views on questions of religion and church-state relations” but suggests that “the evidence is open to another interpreta-
tion,” one “which de-emphasizes the political and religious differences between the poet and the lord.” In the second section, examines Donne’s and Cecil’s ideas “on church-state relations and Catholicism, concluding that they agreed more than they differed.” Notes that the key documents in this discussion are *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Ignatius* and Cecil’s *Answere to Certaine Scandalous Papers* (496). Believes that Donne’s “failure to acquire office in the early years of James’s reign stemmed not from Salisbury’s hostility, or from connections with rivals of Cecil” but more likely “from memories of his unorthodox marriage and his subsequent dismissal by Lord Keeper Egerton” (500). Maintains that any hostility Donne had for Cecil was not from “personal animus or factional commitment” but, more likely, from their differences on “key matters of principle” (501). Contrasts, in particular, how Donne’s “more liberal and tolerant” position on English Catholics in *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Ignatius* differs from Cecil’s view expressed in his *Answere* and in his actions, both of which make clear his stance as “an implacable foe of Catholicism” (504). Concludes, however, that “whatever differences of principle may have divided Donne and Cecil at the time of *Metem* in 1601, a decade or so later they were both voicing similar ideas on church-state relations” (505).


Praises Donne and Herbert for capturing “the actual operations and motions of the human mind” (31). Compares and contrasts Herbert’s “The Collar” and *HSBatter* as poems that “focus more closely on the inner spiritual life and psychology of the sinful man, and less on matters of dogma.” Points out that both poems are “deeply personal and frankly confessional” and both capture “the mind and intense emotions of a fallen man of faith, actively wrestling with temptation.” Observes, however, that Herbert “finally succeeds,” whereas for Donne “success is elusive” (32). Comments on how the “array of paradoxes” in *HSBatter* “startles us at first” but that upon closer examination “they reflect quite orthodox doctrine.” Concludes that “paradox, irony, and oxymoron all constitute the impossible union or juxtaposition of conceptual opposites” but “they all seek intellectually to put into words the ineffable nature of religious commitment” (37).


Examines *ValMourn* and Marvell’s “A Dialogue Between Soul and Body” as examples of the way religious thought and doctrine permeated poems in the seventeenth century. Points out how Donne’s poem, using Christian doctrine “in clever and imaginative ways” (47), portrays the union of lovers as transcending the corporeal, thereby becoming “a more perfect union, abstracted as it is from the immediate, the tangible, the visible” (43).


Maintains that, if one defines liturgical poetry strictly, then “none of Donne’s poems qualify for the category since none were actually part of the church liturgy” but points out that they do “contain indirect reference to scriptural passages and many features that could be identified as liturgical—primarily, a concern with commemorative action and with the collective, congregational voice” (233). Notes that many critics have suggested that Donne’s sacred verse “draws on both the Catholic liturgy and the liturgy of the Church of England”; thus, they “might best be called ‘para-liturgical’: related to church liturgy but going beyond it” (234). Points out the popularity of translations of the psalms during the Renaissance and discusses how psalms are “the paradigmatic example of liturgical poetry,” because “they manage to be
both individual and collective, both voicing the experiences of a first-person speaker and endlessly applicable to the experience of the congregation” (234–35). Notes, however, that Donne’s “contribution to the culture of biblical translation is fairly minimal compared with many of his near-contemporaries—limited, as far as we know, to his Lam,” but discusses how in his poem Sidney he “lays out his beliefs regarding ideal liturgical poetry and practice” (235). Comments on the scholarly debate of whether or not Lit can be considered a liturgical poem. Discusses how Donne’s uses of wit in his religious poems “need not be an impediment to considering his poems liturgically,” but rather maintains that “it connects him to a long tradition of medieval hymnody with its roots in Augustine” (237). Discusses the uses of wit in Annun, which, like Goodf, is based on the liturgical calendar. Comments on three hymns Donne wrote after his ordination—Christ, Sickness, and Father, noting the problem of classifying them generically as hymns. Says that Father, however, is “in one way the most liturgical of Donne’s works” since he requested that it be set to music and sung at the Evening Service (240). Concludes that Donne’s religious verse “contains until the end a struggle between the individual and the collective voice” (241).


Argues that an examination of Donne’s presentation of the astronomers in Ignatius provides “an insight into the complex narratorial frameworks that Donne employs.” Discusses how, in addition to the recognized “foolhardy narrator” of the work, there is also “a further, authorial, voice which acts to satirize the narrator’s views” (52). Maintains that such a study will also “advance and refine the current understanding of Donne’s presentation of the new philosophy” and will “contribute to the debate on whether Ignatius provides us with an insight into Donne’s personal conception of astronomical science.” Attempts “to distinguish the multiplicity of Donne’s dissenting voices within Ignatius, something that has hitherto not previously been examined.” Holds that recognizing “an authorial voice as present within the work, in addition to the readily discussed narratorial voice,” shows “the relationship between these two narrative frameworks” (53) and that “ultimately Donne’s narrative persona can be seen to be part of the fiction of his satire, whereby the authorial voice provides the reader with a framework that creates the boundaries within which the narratorial voice acts” (53–54). Believes that, when seen in this way, the structure of Ignatius “becomes far more complicated, and considerably more nuanced, than it has previously been credited to be” (54). Suggests how Donne’s metanarrative in Ignatius “offers a pointed and astute critique of the state of early modern astronomical writing” (62). Concludes that Donne’s satire is “not merely a satire drawn from his reading of other people’s works, nor is it a mere satire on his narratorial persona’s failed understanding of its ‘reading,” but that also it“offers the reader the opportunity to become involved in multiple critical narratives whereby Donne’s understanding of his own authorship of Ignatius (and the inherent boundaries between the author, narrator, and reader) informs the critique that he makes of his personal scientific reading” (63).


Lists the volume and variety of Donne’s writings and describes how he disseminated them in print, orally, and in manuscript. Points out that the recent emphasis on Donne’s participation in the manuscript culture of his time “has tended to make us forget how much of his work he actually published.” Notes that “during his lifetime Donne published in print about 42 per cent of the 3,849 pages of prose he had written” and that, “if we include the normal mode of ‘publishing’ sermons—proclaiming them orally in a public forum—this figure is close to 75 per cent.” Observes that “what remained unpublished at his death, disseminated
only in manuscript, were *Biathanatos*, the short prose, *Essays in Divinity*, the Letters, and most of the poems* (13), which, for various reasons, both personal and political, he thought “inappropriate for general scrutiny” (14). Discusses various possible reasons why Donne refused to publish the bulk of his poetry, such as a “gentlemanly disdain for the role of the poet” (15) and because of the “venerable status” of manuscripts at the time (16). Discusses also how “the strictness of Donne’s efforts to control the manuscript circulation of individual poems and even whole genres undoubtedly varied according to differences in subject matter, purpose, and intended audience” and points out how “his attitude toward such dissemination must also have fluctuated over time.” Observes, however, that, in spite of his efforts, his poems “eventually became widely known among his contemporaries . . . in ever-expanding circles of manuscript dissemination” (18) and comments on the problems that later textual editors and scholars encounter as a result of this “unregulated proliferation of Donne’s poems within manuscript circles” (20). Cites examples of how “copyists inevitably misread their predecessor’s handwriting, made slips of the pen, lost track of their place in the copy-text, decided to ‘improve’ the poem as they transcribed it, or found themselves baffled by the sheer difficulty that Donne’s poetry sometimes presents,” all of which “pose enormous challenges for anyone wishing to separate what Donne wrote from the scribal changes imposed upon it” (23). Points out also that whatever “meta-commentary” that might have surrounded the original distribution of Donne’s poems—“whether in the form of written remarks, oral comments, or merely understandings implicit in the relationships Donne had with his various recipients—is also now lost” and suggests that “part of the ongoing challenge for modern readers is to reconstruct these contexts as far as possible” (25).


Discusses three phases of editing Donne’s poems: (1) “the period 1633–69, in which the publisher John Marriot and his immediate successors, using such manuscripts as they were able to lay hands on, took on the initial challenge of publishing a comprehensive collection of Donne’s poems”; (2) the middle period in which “editors from Jacob Tonson in 1719 to J. R. Lowell in 1855 produced a series of editions based on the seventeenth-century editions (and on each other)”; and (3) a final phase, “beginning with Alexander Grosart in 1872 and continuing to the present time, in which editors—while still largely dependent on the efforts of their predecessors—have sporadically reverted to manuscript material in their attempts to improve the received text and establish the canon of Donne’s verse” (43). Comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the editions. Discusses the seven editions and issues by seventeenth-century editors as well as several others by pre-1872 editors. Comments in more detail on editions by Alexander B. Grosart, Herbert Grierson, Helen Gardner, Wesley Milgate, Frank Manley, Roger E. Bennett, John T. Shawcross, A. J. Smith, Theodore Redpath, and C. A. Patrides, and, more briefly, on recent editions by John Carey, Ilona Bell, A. L. Clements, and Donald R. Dickson.


Discusses how identification of Donne’s seventeenth-century readers “provides important information about the nature of Donne’s poetry as well as its role in early modern culture.” Points out that our conception that his readers were, for the most part, “persons of great intellectual and aesthetic sophistication” has been largely shaped by literary critics, both past and recent (26). Agrees that some of Donne’s readers did fit this description but that “some did
not” and holds that these “have the most interesting implications for our understanding of the role of Donne's verse in early modern culture” (27). Lists those who are known or who were very likely readers of Donne's poems, including poets, owners of manuscripts, recipients of his letters, those given presentation copies, printers, editors, etc. Observes that recent scholarship reveals two important facts: “(1) Donne's readers during his lifetime were not limited to those with access to manuscripts (Donne's friends and the elite); and (2) Donne's audience had not disappeared by the time of the Restoration, suggesting a wider and more enduring appeal of his poetry” (29). Points out also as examples of Donne's popularity several early musical settings of the poems, several early foreign translations, and the use of his poems by fellow poets. Suggests that the most interesting result of identifying Donne's early readers is “the completely unexpected audience for Donne that may be inferred from the works produced by Donne's readers/authors and the unexpected ways in which that audience read Donne.” Discusses, as an example, how Donne's poetry had “a huge readership among the barely literate, who appreciated his wit and who adapted Donne's witty lines into their own voice” or who “adapted his wit to improving their own verbal facility” (31). Shows how Donne's writings “had commercial, social and personal value for a great diversity of readers during the entire century.” Notes that most of Donne's seventeenth-century readers were attracted by his wit and showed less interest in his religious poems.


Points out that, until the twentieth century, most textual scholarship on Donne's works has focused on his poetry. Briefly discusses how scholarly editions “are created” (65) and notes how, in addition to “reliable and accurate texts,” these editions “provide scholarly commentary on the contents of the text,” thereby presenting information required “to interpret the text intelligently.” Maintains that recent scholarship has shown “the complexity of the problems facing those who would construct scholarly editions of Donne's various prose works” and that “the present state of work on these editions shows that different theoretical and practical approaches have been, and will be, required to produce reliable and accurate texts.” Surveys the scholarly success or failure of the following notable editions of Donne's prose works: Pseudo Martyr (1993), ed. Anthony Raspa; Ignatius (1969), ed. T. S. Healy; and Sermons (1954–62), ed. George Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson, as well as the forthcoming edition sponsored by Oxford University Press; Devotions (1923), ed. John Sparrow; (1975), ed. Anthony Raspa; Paradoxes (1980), ed. Helen Peters; Biathanatos (1982), ed. Michael Rudick and M. Pabst Battin; (1984), ed. Ernest W. Sullivan, II; Catalogus Librorum (1930), ed. Evelyn Simpson; rpt. Piers Brown (2008); Essays (1982), ed. Evelyn Simpson; (2001), ed. Anthony Raspa; and Letters, ed. Edmund Gosse (1899); ed. M. Thomas Hester (1977), ed. P. M. Oliver (2002), as well as the forthcoming edition sponsored by Oxford University Press. Concludes that scholarly editions of Donne's prose “suffer from the vagaries of any human intellectual endeavour” and that “there will always be disagreements over what textual theory or methodology will produce the most reliable texts” (79). Holds, furthermore, that “the incredible complexity and detail of the texts and artefacts on which they are inscribed will inevitably result in human error” (79–80). Maintains, however, that scholars and students “should seek out and treasure scholarly editions” because “any reader who wants to understand any literary work has to start with its scholarly edition” (80).


Discusses how Donne in Biathanatos used the “inherent ambiguity” of the paradox,
“the restriction of his audience to a coterie,” and “manuscript metacommentary” in order “to create a rhetorical strategy that gave him enough plausible deniability to expand the reach of the witty paradox into a controversial, intellectually serious, and extended analysis of the ethical, legal, and theological implications of suicide” (153). Points out that critics often compare Donne’s treatise to Thomas More’s Utopia but shows the differences between the “rhetorical strategies” of the two works, noting how More, because he published his work, “had to incorporate the elements of his rhetorical strategy for creating disbelief into the work itself,” whereas Donne “attempted to guide reader response by restricting circulation of Biathanatos in manuscript to personal friends” and, as long as he was alive, provided metacommentary on “how the work should be read.” Notes examples that suggest that Biathanatos contains “some elements that could arguably undercut its veracity and thereby create disbelief” but that they are “not as pervasive as in Utopia” (154). Comments on two letters Donne wrote that show “his strategy of restricting circulation” of his treatise and that illustrate how he provided metacommentary on it (155). Observes that, when the work was published by John Donne, Jr., in 1647, all of Donne’s strategies “utterly failed” and notes that, even today, some scholars who have access to Donne’s metacommentary “struggle with disbelief in its arguments,” some reading it as a joke and others regarding it as “a serious, though limited defence of suicide” (156). Believes that both More and Donne, in spite of their “elaborate strategies of disbelief,” ultimately “wanted to initiate intellectual debate over their paradoxical propositions” (157).


 Defines “epiceds” as poems “generally spoken over a body that has not yet been buried” and “obsequies” as those “spoken later and tend to emphasize consolation rather than lament.” Notes that the Epicleses and Obsequies are among Donne’s “least read and appreciated work,” often seen as “strained exercises in flat-tery, clumsy attempts to win patronage, and unedifying expressions of the poet’s personal anxieties about death.” Maintains, however, that they are “distinguished by their rhetorical agility, and their innovativeness” and are “characteristically Donnean in their imaginative leaps, restless thought, disturbing images, ingenious ideas, and powerful accents.” Points out that they also show Donne’s “persistent awareness of his audience and occasion and his bold transformation of the traditional English elegy,” poems in which he “pioneers the development of a new kind of funeral elegy and a new rhetoric of grief” (286). Notes that after the publication of the Anniversaries, Donne became “a reluctant elegist, apparently moved to write Funeral Elegies only in order to please patrons or to capture the attention of prospective patrons” (286–87). Claims that “his only surviving poems that seem occasioned by deep personal loss are the Latin Epitaph for his wife and the Holy Sonnet HSShe” (287). Observes how Donne’s funeral poems go “far beyond” those of his contemporaries in exploring “large theological questions,” how they “typically speak in a communal voice and mourn the deceased as an exemplar rather than an individual” (288), and how they are “coterie performances carefully tailored to particular circumstances” (289). Discusses each of the seven poems generally considered as his Epicleses and Obsequies, commenting on their occasion, content, wit, and rhetorical strategies. Concludes that in these poems Donne “imaginatively fulfilled the obligations of the patronage system even as he created works that transcend their occasion” and that “by imposing” on them “his own distinct idiom, he considerably expanded the traditional English elegy” (297).

Discusses three kinds of love in Donne's poetry—physical, cynical, and ideal. Comments on *Flea* and *SunRis* as representative of Donne's treatment of physical love. Maintains that in *Flea* the speaker does not enjoy physical love, whereas in *SunRis* he takes delight in sex. Suggests that from these two examples one can see Donne's attitude in general toward marriage and sex. Discusses *SGo* and *WomCon* as reflecting Donne's cynicism toward love and women. Regards *ValMourn* as an example of his view of ideal or true love and suggests that it was addressed to Anne More. Concludes that, for Donne, ideal love is both physical and spiritual—a union of two bodies and two souls. Maintains that, for Donne, love is a mystery, like religion, and, therefore, he had conflicting feelings about it.


In Japanese. Discusses how many of Donne’s poems, both amorous and religious, proceed from a mystical viewpoint. In an introductory chapter, defines the differences between magical, mystical, and sacramental signs, discussing in particular the Eucharist as a representative model. In Chapter 1, “Magical and Mystical Thinking in Donne’s Love Poems,” discusses magical images in *ValWeep*, the magical/mystical image in *Flea*, and the sacramental image in *Ecst*, arguing that magical images are gradually replaced with mystical images to express the spiritual unity of love. In Chapter 2, “Fundamental Ideas in Donne’s Religious Writings,” surveys Protestant and Anglican conceptions of the Eucharist and the tradition of the art of meditation and the emblem, highlighting the influence of Joseph Hall on Donne. In Chapter 3, “Donne’s Early Religious Poems,” analyzes *Cross* and *Annun* in terms of religious paradox and *Goodf* in terms of grace. In Chapter 4, “The Holy Sonnets and Grace,” discusses *HSDue*, *HSBlack*, *HSMin*, *HSPart*, *HSLittle*, and *HSBatter*, in terms of Donne’s religious use of love analogy, referring to relevant passages in the *Sermons*. Also clarifies the image structure of *HSVex*, which is based on the analogy of the medical process of ague. In Chapter 5, “Sacred Hermeneutics—*Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*, 1624,” analyzes the imagery structure of this devotional work and shows that it is an attempt to interpret the process of Donne’s disease as a religious text for salvation. In Chapter 6, “Donne’s Religious Standpoint,” outlines aspects of Donne’s Protestantism, especially referring to Calvinism and Armenianism. In Chapter 7, “Donne’s Spiritual State of Mind in His Last Years,” comments on Donne’s strong desire for union with Christ as expressed in *Christ*, *Sickness*, and *Father*, noting especially how the last presents both the poem and Donne himself in his sickness as a sacramental text. (Edited version supplied by author.)


Argues that Donne’s writing “springs in no small part from a lifelong experience of visceral abjection” and that, “unable to control his body in reality, he constructed a textual corpus on the page where he could fantasize omnipotence and rehearse abjection.” Believes that “sensations of helplessness” provided “the material and motivation for Donne’s poetry, as much in the earlier verse as in the *Anniversaries* and the *Holy Sonnets*” (99). Observes that Donne “does not write of paradise, or heaven, and rarely of Christ: he wrote—again and again—of his own decidedly mortal body.” Points out how “the question of the union of body and soul worried Donne—as it had worried Augustine—throughout his life” (100). Observes how Donne in some of his poems “fantasizes a state where the soul exercises monarchical will over the body” but that in other poems “the relationship is abruptly reversed” and “the body controls the soul” (102). Maintains that “the ontological priority of Donne’s body over his soul” should be “our epistemological guideline in reading his verse” because “we will uncover the wellsprings of his poetic talent not in the poetic and intellectual tradition as such, but in the points where the tradition coincides with Donne’s own feeling body.”
Traces “one such instance of Donne’s powerful usage of the traditional trope of the body as vessel” in Storm (105). Argues that “transposing his visceral body into a textual body allowed Donne to grasp back control, albeit temporarily,” and thus although “the social and natural world were indifferent or hostile,” he could “in the little room of a sonnet,” “at least for a while, create an alternative cosmos” (121).


Discusses the origin and development of the dramatic monologue, beginning with Aristophanes’ dramatic use of parabasis and prosopeia; evolving in the satirical works of Horace, Juvenal, and Ovid; and developing further in Donne’s poems, in which the reader is viewed as a silent auditor. Cites as examples Flea and SunR. Comments on Donne’s influence on Browning and claims that Browning’s most original contribution to the genre was the use of a “monopolylogue,” i.e., “a speech containing various voices uttered by only one speaker” (51).


Shows how the on-going Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne that was begun in the early 1980s “has placed the editing of Donne’s poems on a new foundation” (56) by discussing the major aims and methodology of the edition. Notes, for example, that, unlike most earlier editors, the Variorum editors choose “manuscript copy-texts for most of the poems” and explains how the “choice of copy-text is the product of a painstaking analysis of both the print and manuscript evidence based on collation of every early exemplar of a given poem” (57). Points out that each of the volumes “is designed as a stand-alone entity that contains all the methodological and bibliographical information necessary to make its contents intelligible” (59) and explains how biographical, historical, textual, and bibliographical information is handled in the edition. Observes that “two distinctive, almost unique, features of the Variorum, made possible by the exhaustive accumulation of textual data and the employment of enhanced analytical methods, are the identification of authorial sequences of poems and—in cases where the differences are sufficient to justify such a procedure—the presentation of multiple authorial or bibliographically significant versions of poems and sequences” (60). Mentions how the edition has benefited from recent developments in computer technology and from governmental financial support. Comments on the current state of the edition, volumes published and those underway, and notes that the Variorum’s “aims and achievements have generally, but not invariably, been met with approbation.” Maintains that, in spite of a few “demurrals,” it is “indisputable that the Variorum has reinvented the editing of Donne’s poetry” (62).


Discusses briefly how Donne in Libro indicates his preference for handwritten books rather than printed books. Points out that the epigraph of this verse epistle explains the occasion of the poem: Donne had loaned a printed book to his friend whose children had torn it up, but a transcript of the book was made and sent to Donne. Notes how Donne lauds manuscript books over printed ones and how he observes that manuscripts are “often held in greater reverence than printed work” (262).

1951. Waller, Gary. “Multiple Madonnas: traces and transformations in the seventeenth century,” in The
Discusses Donne’s mariology, noting that references in his poetry to the Virgin Mary are “generally cautious,” with the exception of *Goodf*, in which, according to some critics, she is given the role of co-redemptrix that “was characteristic of Catholic devotion” (190). Notes also that, according to Maureen Sabine, in the Anniversaries Donne perhaps is “wrestling with his childhood reverence for the Virgin.” Notes that Donne kept in his study at St. Paul’s a picture of Mary and observes that, “though he denounced the Catholic belief in Mary’s intercessory role in some of his sermons, there is a recurring and often wistful mariological strain that surfaces in his writings” (191). Points out that Elizabeth Hodgson suggests that “the recurring pattern of Woman as mother, daughter, and bride” in his works is also perhaps “aspects of the orthodox image of the Virgin” (192). Maintains that in his love poetry Donne “can breezily play with the mutual sainthood of lovers, half mocking the concept but also taking it very seriously as a discourse to try to capture some of the wonderment of love and articulate the uniqueness as ‘saints’ of love in a world where sainthood has lost its intercessory powers” (193). Holds that Donne’s contradictions reflect the “broader contradictions in English society about the place of the Virgin and female experience in general” (194).


Discusses Donne’s “intense but chaste friendship” with Magdalen Herbert (270), a friendship that “predated his marriage, and lasted longer, and was of an intimacy throughout that reached extraordinary depth” (272). Comments on *MHPaper, ElAut, MHMary*, several letters, his funeral sermon for Mrs. Herbert, and especially *Relic* as evidence of his continuing and passionate love for this older lady. Points out details in the Lothian portrait that may hint at Mrs. Herbert, especially the bracelet he is wearing in the portrait, which may be “the bracelet of bright hair about the bone” mentioned in *Relic*. Suggests that Donne’s identification of Mrs. Herbert with Mary Magdalen (and thus himself with Christ) enabled his passion “to be sublimated and intensified.” Discusses how in the relationship “desire is sublimated and sustained by art” and “is also shaped and formed by religious sensibility,” thereby turning it “to sublime, rather than base, ends” (275). Believes that the importance of this relationship “has more often than not been underevaluated and misunderstood” and that, in fact, Mrs. Herbert was “a profoundly formative influence upon John Donne’s progression from a young man, confused about religion, to a theologian of imagination and gravitas” (277).


Begins by commenting on “A Meditation of a Penitent Sinner” (1560), written by Anne Lok, “the earliest known sonnet sequence in English, preceding the outburst of secular sequences by at least twenty years” (146). Surveys the history of the early modern religious sonnet, arguing that these poems are “interesting in their own right and for the questions they raise concerning the emergence of the sonnet sequence in English, the use and appropriateness of the genre in the service of sacred argument, and the gendering of authors and their personalities.” Considers also “the form and contexts of religious sonnets, including religious allegiance and the cultural significance of poetic tradition” (147). Calls Donne “the most famous and inspired early modern religious sonneteer in English” and notes how poets preceding him in this genre influenced him (159). Observes how, in the *Holy Sonnets*, one can observe “the tormented anxiety of sinfulness, the analytical meditation on metaphysical issues,
and the probing interrogation of God and the soul” (159–60). Comments on several of the Holy Sonnets, especially HSVex.


Argues that examining Jet “in light of its literary precursor and in light of cognitive science” can help us understand Donne’s “mindset—his ideas about aesthetics, his creativity, and his underlying feelings” (74). Points out that Jet was written as a witty, parodic response to Sir John Davies’ sonnet “Upon sending her a Gold Ring, with this Posie Pure, and Endless,” published in A Poetical Rhapsody (1602). Discusses how Donne’s “impatience or dissatisfaction” with Davies’ poem is “bolstered by investigations into the intricate neurological steps involved in normal remembering, thinking, comparing, evaluating, and reading” (76). Presents a critical analysis of Jet and contrasts it with Davies’ sonnet. Discusses how “drawing on various sites in his cerebrum—declarative memories stored as ‘engram,’ the associative cortex for conscious thought, and dedicated distributed modes for managing language in the left hemisphere—Donne built his poem” (79). Points out that Donne and Davies knew each other and that Jet may have been shaped in part also by Donne’s possible jealousy or envy of Davies and thus his poem perhaps “not only offers an aesthetic critique, but also serves as a bitter verbal volley, an encoded lament about the caprices of fickle fortune” (89).


Briefly reviews criticism of Flea in China and presents a reading of the poem employing the readers’ response theory of Wolfgang Iser. Explores “the readers’ active roles in complementing, completing and recreating the textual meaning, and differentiating the implied reader and the actual reader of the poem as well as attempting to fulfill the construction of the reading cognitive model through the interpretation of the conceit of the flea” (213).


In Chinese. Discusses the critical concept of defamiliarization proposed by the Russian formalist critic, Viktor Shklovsky. Illustrates the idea by discussing Donne’s metaphysical thought in Paradoxes. (From the abstract)


Surveys and evaluates the critical interest in Donne’s poetry in the twentieth century and focuses primarily on Donne’s modernity, a topic that has received relatively little attention by Chinese critics. Discusses those aspects of
Donne's poetry that have attracted both modern poets and readers and make him seem modern, such as his complex uses of language, metaphor, and conceit; his major themes; his rejection of tradition; and his attitude toward life, love, and death.


In Chinese. Discusses Donne's philosophical understanding of the universe, marriage, and religion in his poetry that seems similar to the utopian concept of “datong thought,” an ancient Chinese philosophical view found in Confucian texts that sees great unity and great harmony in all creation.


Notes that the term “elegy” usually refers to a mourning poem but states that there is “virtually nothing else in English with the same title comparable to Donne's Elegies.” Maintains that his Elegies with “their erotic themes and ironic tone, often sliding into satire, are comprehensible only if his models among classical poets and their neo-Latin imitators during the Renaissance are taken into account” (134). Shows how, when seen in this literary context, Donne's innovative contribution to the genre emerges. Surveys, therefore, the Roman and neo-Latin love elegists and cites the Flemish poet Joannes Secundus as the neo-Latin elegist “who most nearly suggests a possible model” for Donne's Elegies (135) and cites Christopher Marlowe's translation of Ovid's Amores as the “most obvious” English model. Maintains, however, that having examined these possible models, one is struck by the originality of Donne's poems and discusses how “taken as a whole they are unique” (136) and how they “explore a variety of attitudes towards love, as well as a diverse array of erotic situations and problems” (137). Comments also on textual evidence that suggests that the Elegies form a specific set of twelve poems with additional ones excluded from the set for various reasons. Observes how “adapting classical conventions to the issues and concerns of his own time, Donne exemplifies the essence of humanist imitation, which is always an aspiration to emulate and even surpass, rather than merely to copy” (142) and believes that “the core” of Donne's originality is “precisely the convergence of classical elegiac convention with a vividly concrete realization of the political and religious circumstances of late Elizabethan England as apprehended by a sensibility rendered exceptionally acute both by nature and heritage” (145). Discusses also how Donne's treatment of love in these poems is “often quite ingeniously witty, but also cynical and not infrequently even crude” (143) and how it is “in part a literary rebellion against Petrarchan and Neoplatonic idealizations of feminine beauty and sexual attraction” (146). Noting that one must not confuse Donne necessarily with the speaker of a poem, comments on the question of misogyny in the Elegies. Concludes that Donne's erotic Elegies are “unique in the elegiac tradition in the variety of characters and attitudes they portray, and in the immediacy and realism of situations they evoke” (148).


Points out how “the same kind of images and conceits that shape the imaginative world of the love poems form the fabric and texture of Donne's dramatization of religious experi-
ence” and that it is in his religious sonnets that “this ironic convergence of sacred and profane is most acute” (218). Maintains that Donne “provides an especially marked example of the strain between sacred and profane love that emerges during an era of heightened Christian consciousness” and that, therefore, his religious sonnets may be best understood as “a series of responses to the spiritual turbulence generated not only by the clash of competing Protestant and Catholic Reformations, but also by the inner turmoil of erotic passion.” Believes that Donne’s “deft manipulation of the expectations associated with generic conventions may indeed be regarded as a chief constituent of these poems’ unique and enduring significance.” Calls the Holy Sonnets “the pulsing heart of Donne’s religious poetry” but discusses how Corona is also “a finely wrought meditation” that “prepares the way” for the Holy Sonnets. Comments on the debate about the proper order and dating of the sonnets and on the critical debate about their Protestant or Catholic “doctrinal orientation” (219). Discusses how in each of the sonnets Donne “manages an ironic reinvention of the Petrarchan love sonnet through which sexual desire is subsumed by the formidable love of God” (228) and how even the parody of Petrarchan sonnet form “conveys an element of the poet’s ironic wit by its very form” (230). Concludes that the Holy Sonnets are “certainly among the treasures of devotional poetry in the English language” and that Corona also “manifests an undeniable poetic power” and that both “provide a fascinating window upon the religious life of the Jacobean era.” Adds that, above all, “what must be acknowledged about Donne’s religious sonnets is their capacity to engage the mind and imagination and to surprise, even startle, the sensibilities after repeated readings as surely as his secular poetry” (232).


In Korean. Comments on how the Holy Sonnets “dramatize the whole cycle of human salvation, justification, sanctification and glorification.” Maintains that Donne’s “personal battle” against evil, the flesh, and the world reflected in the poems serves to inspire and challenge Christian readers. (From the abstract)


Compares and contrasts Donne and Saadi Shiragi, a thirteenth-century Persian poet, in their uses of paradox in their works and shows how paradox was central to both poets in their exploration of contradictions in human behavior and thought. Comments on how Donne’s “style and manner in creating paradoxes, the death paradox in particular, are eccentrically individual” (37). As an example, presents a critical reading of HSDeath.


Discusses Donne’s Christian view of death as expressed in the Holy Sonnets. Notes how he often personifies death as a means of diminishing its power and highlighting its weakness. Comments on how Donne views Christ’s death as his hope of defeating death and his guarantee of salvation.
2012


Adds 27 volumes (13 of which are tracts bound together in a single volume) to the already known lists of books that belonged to Donne, thus bringing the total to 292 volumes. Notes that of the new additions 15 are in Latin, 10 in French, 1 in Italian, and 1 an Italian-Latin dictionary. Points out that 4 of these books are cited in *Biathanatos* and *Pseudo-Martyr*, 2 are cited in *Ignatius*, and that a copy of Horace gives us “a rare glimpse” of Donne’s study of classical poetry and poetics. Says the remaining 22 titles “provide evidence of Donne’s interests in civil law, contemporary European history, current affairs and statecraft” (55). Presents an annotated listing of 27 works.


In Portuguese. After a general introduction to Donne’s life and works, especially his poetry, discusses Donne’s critical reception in Brazil. Cites José Garcez Ghirardi’s *John Donne e a Critica Brasileira três momentos, três olhares* (2000) as the best introduction to Donne’s work and reception in Brazil. Discusses his principles of translation and comments on the difficulties in translating Donne into Portuguese. Aims to keep as much as possible the rhyme and rhythm of Donne’s poems, but acknowledges the difficulty of capturing Donne’s wit and rhetorical ingenuity in a foreign language. Translates into Portuguese *Ecst* and *LovGrow* as well as five epigrams—*SelfAc*, *Licent*, *Beggar*, *Klock*, and *Ship*.


In “Prelude: On Reading Rhetorically” (xi–xliii), explains that this study focuses on rhetorical analyses of the works of Shakespeare, Donne, and Milton and maintains that, when “read in sequence, their works mark distinctive stages in the Weberian *Entzaubergung*” (xi). Proposes to show how Donne’s lyrics appropriate “the speech acts of Catholic sacramentalism” in order “to describe a private ‘religion of Love,’ over which the poet-lover presides as officiant” or rather to demonstrate that “some lyrics present the poet as Love’s Priest, there being as many personae as there are rhetorics and as many rhetorics as there are theologies” (xii). Identifies four such personae: “Love’s Priest,” “Love’s Apostle,” “Love’s Atheist,” and “Love’s Reformer” and points out how the following analysis of the *Songs and Sonets* “will describe these personae” and “their contrasting theologies of language” (xii–xiii). Discusses “rhetorical criticism within the conversations of contemporary theory” (xxii) and comments on four archetypes underlining Renaissance discourse: “sophism, skepticism, incarnationalism, and transcendence,” each of which “combines a theory of language with an ontology (more radically stated an onto-theology), a psychology, and an epistemology.” Notes that “in any discourse, one or other of these –ologies may dominate, giving each text its distinctive rhetorical character” (xxiii). Points out that “readers unfamiliar with the vocabulary of historical rhetoric” will find “brief working definitions with each first-use” of a term (xl). Although mentioned throughout, three chapters are devoted specifically to Donne. In Chapter 4, “The Donnean Doubting-Game” (77–90), observes that although Donne was an expert in controversial thinking, he lamented in his sermons “the fact of religious controversy and the disputatiousness that it generates” (79), but points out, however, how Donne’s own internal, often guilt-stricken wrestling with himself over matters of faith plays an important role in his poetry. Maintains that “an overarching theme of the *Songs and Sonets* is fidelity, faithfulness, faith” and that “the collection’s shifting attitudes toward love make corresponding shifts in its theologies of language.” Suggests that “the most controversial is the poet’s play with Catholic incarnationalism” and discusses...
how in many of his poems Donne’s “lyric love-making patterns itself upon the speech acts of priestly sacrament and devotional practice” (80). Analyzes several love poems “as rhetorical performances whose theologies of language alternatively sustain, complicate, test, and ironize the poet’s amorous/devotional claims” (83) as he assumes the various roles of Love’s priest, Love’s apostate, Love’s atheist, and Love’s reformer. In Chapter 5, “Love’s Atheist: Reading Donne’s ‘Communitie’” (91–110), expands an essay entitled “Reading Donne’s ‘Communitie’” (EIRC 32, no. 1 [2006]: 25–50). In Chapter 6, “‘The Token’ among Donne’s Songs and Sonets” (111–35), reprints material from “Donne’s ‘The Token’: A Lesson in Fashion(ing) of Canon” (CE 59 [1997]: 257–76).


Considers the possibility that Shakespeare’s “The Phoenix and Turtle” may have influenced Canon, especially lines 19–27. Argues that, in fact, there is “a line of metaphysical wit—centred on the paradigm of ideal love as a union of incorporate selves—that links Shakespeare’s poetry to Marston’s and Donne’s as part of a late Elizabethan struggle to create a new sense of lyric wonder through the provocative application of theological categories to profane love” (166). Suggests also that Donne’s poem, like those of Shakespeare and Marston, “is indebted, even if only indirectly through theirs, to [Robert] Chester’s Love’s Martyr” (174). Examines Donne’s witty use of the eagle and the dove and the phoenix riddle in Canon. Maintains that “a truly provocative element of poetic theology” in Canon is “its yoking of the phoenix with sexual intercourse and the resurrected Christ” (175). Holds that in both Shakespeare’s and Donne’s poems there is “a paradoxical union of levity and seriousness that is due in part to their shared interests in creating personal rituals dedicated to the veneration of mutual love and in using a language influenced by Catholic practices” (185). Briefly comments also on Donne’s use of the phoenix riddle in EpEliz and surveys critical commentary on Canon.


Maintains that, whether “the objects of desire and repulsion” in ElComp “turn out to be two women or just one, the distinction between the two figures is not one of polar extremes as has been previously understood.” Argues that the poem’s “more precise distinction is the clever way in which Donne deploys provocative imagery not to create a contrast between very good and very bad, but to create a comparison between two similar objects—one very bad; the other, even worse.” Shows how “almost every line describing the good mistress contains a poetic device that compromises the speaker’s professed praise” (168). Cites as an example, the reference to Muskatts (l. 2), which can be understood as a possible scatological pun, referring to prostitutes. Points out how in the first six lines of the poem Donne “initiates a game in which the speaker’s seeming praise of the good mistress camouflages dispraise to the point of insult,” a “hidden criticism” that reveals Donne’s “clever critique of the idealized Petrarchan female in that a desirable woman is not being contrasted with an undesirable woman, but, rather, two women are being compared who differ not in kind but degree” (169). Suggests, therefore, that ElComp can be appreciated “not as a masterful treatment of balanced contrasts but rather as a series of verbal manipulations, to compare varying levels of disgust under the guise of supposed praise” (171).


Reproduces HSDeath and presents an original
music score of the poem.


Discusses BedfCab as an example of Donne’s “extraordinary, flexible play with epistolary form” (37). Suggests reasons for the various bizarre versions of the poem found in both manuscript collections and early printed editions. Observes that such textual chaos perhaps explains why Donne feared “letting playful-ironic coterie verse out to wider readerships” who lacked “the social context and the signifiers embodied in the material form of the text.” Shows how BedfCab is “idiosyncratically resourceful and builds on earlier exchanges” between Donne and the Countess of Bedford (40). Maintains that these exchanges are “the most important patronage exchanges in Donne’s oeuvre” and that “their significance is best appreciated by reading them as a set” (42). Points out that “the study of epistolary texts is often hampered because of missing material evidence” and “can be skewed by the forms in which texts have survived” (43).


An introduction to a special issue of SEL on editing Stuart poetry. Surveys recent developments and challenges in textual editing, such as the importance of manuscript evidence and circulation. Says that the essays in the volume “imaginatively exploit the transformations in textual theory and editorial practice to foreground the malleability and particularity of early modern manuscript poetry and to expose the inadequacy of print-based concepts of textuality, authorship, and editing for interpreting it.” Mentions the essay by Richard Todd and Helen Wilcox on editing Donne and Herbert that appears in the volume. Notes that both editors argue how “single-author editions ‘grant a historical sensitivity to the lives of the poets, and to the contested editorial legacy of their seventeenth-century collections in manuscript or print’ and retain a necessary emphasis on ‘the importance of the situated and particular voice to our understanding of early modern literature and culture’” (9).


Explains why Relic is one of Donne’s most mysterious poems and how it “defies the bounds of explanation that apply to other poems” (175). Presents a reading of the poem that examines various different critical interpretations of it. Maintains that the Relic “presents a mystery all its own: ecstatic and canny, recursive and revelatory, chaste and sexy all at once” and that the reader, when he completes reading this poem, feels that he will never understand fully the unique love expressed in it. Concludes that “we have only the poem, the relic of the poet’s words; they are all we can know, and it is the measure of his talents that their mystery remains alive, and enticing long past his death, in a time so far from his own” (151).


Explains how, “in responding to the legal and political pressures that catalyzed the debate on equivocation, writers both Protestant and Catholic struggled to develop theories of thinking and reading that bridge religious treatises, literary works, and the individual conscience” (133). Examines both Protestant and Catholic doctrines concerning equivocation and discusses how “the questions of allegiances and textual interpretation generated by the debates
over equivocation run parallel to early modern considerations of counsel and *arcana imperii,* particularly in the works of Francis Bacon and Donne. Argues that equivocation is “not just a theological expediency deployed in a particular moment of religious crisis” but rather is “an important component of a much larger early modern concern, both religious and secular” (134). Discusses how Donne’s “complex working through of the relationship between equivocation and royal authority,” especially in *Pseudo-Martyr* and *Ignatius,* “reveals a deep concern with how the liberty of thought—and the power to both disguise and penetrate the inner workings of the mind—characterize the possession and maintenance of political authority in early modern England” (143). Discusses how in *Ignatius* Donne presents mental reservation “not as a defensive mechanism for harried Roman Catholics” but rather as a part of a larger Jesuit program to wrest control of royal minds—and by extension royal authority—from their rightful possessors” (145).


Discusses Rabindranath Tagore’s uses of Donne poetry in his 1929 novel *Shesher Kobita,* a rather daring novel at the time which critically addresses the way in which love was expressed at the time in Bengal by Tagore and others. Points out how the novel “unfolds an inner story that shows Tagore trying to create a new love poetry and freeing himself from Romantic-Victorian poetry, his long-time preference” (303). Maintains that, in fact, the novel is “not about a young pair’s failed love affair” so much as it is “about how Tagore in his late, but ever fresh, career embarked on viewing love from a hitherto unexplored angle in his poetry” (304). Observes several “intimate and generic ties that the novel shares with Donne’s poetry” but stresses how “the Donnean discourse” in *Shesher Kobita* is “also self-reflexive in terms of how it reveals exactly what Tagore was experimenting with in this poetic novel” (305). Discusses the impression Donne’s love poetry had on Tagore’s poetry, i.e., “one of situating love in an inner space, as a form of mystical worship” (317).


In Korean. Discusses Donne’s portrayal of male desire and sexual fantasy toward women in the *Elegies.* Comments on images of war and politics in the poems. Challenges the notion that Donne should be labelled a misogynist.


In Korean. Presents “a revisionist reading” of *Metem.* Maintains that most critics categorize the poem as a satire, “paying disproportionate attention to the poem’s possible socio-political resonances.” Argues that what is often missed is Donne’s “play with literary form and his spiritual inquiry into how to accommodate the itinerant soul.” Maintains that a “combined attention to the poem’s search for the right form and righteous host helps to recuperate Donne’s interest in sacramental transformation.” Suggests, furthermore, that the printing history of the poem “alerts us to its connection with Donne’s divine poems,” especially *Corona* and the *Holy Sonnets.* Concludes that *Metem* “forms a meaningful sequence that suggests Donne’s personal progress of the soul and his serious undertaking of poetry-writing as sacramental devotion.” (From the abstract)


Observes that Robert Browning’s *Christmas-Eve* and *Easter-Day* are exceptional works in his canon and argues that they can be read as exercises in religious meditation and were perhaps influenced by Browning’s appreciation of Donne. Presents a reading of both poems as
points of meditation.


Points out that although the personal and textual relationship between the preacher Thomas Adams (1583–1652) and Donne has been noticed, what has not been noticed is that Adams “read Donne’s sermons, as well as his poems, and that he made use of them in his own writing” (96), especially in his Commentary, or, exposition upon the divine second epistle generall, written by the blessed apostle St. Peter (1633). Cites examples of Adams’ borrowings from Donne and discusses how he uses them. Notes that “sometimes he barely adjusts Donne’s words” or “merely adds a short phrase” but at other times he makes “more substantial alterations,” such as rearranging clauses. Maintains that Adams “probably had numerous opportunities to encounter Donne,” especially after Donne became Dean of St. Paul’s (100).


Examines Donne’s practice of citation in his sermons. Notes that although Donne was aware of the problem of misquoting, he also regarded “scrupulous quotation” as pedantic (574) and that sometimes he used precise citation for ironic or playful purposes (576). Points out that often Donne’s citations are imprecise, caused perhaps by “an unreliable intermediary source,” from “using one’s own incorrect notes, or sheer laziness,” and, on occasion, used deliberately for a purpose (577). Maintains that most interesting are those times when “no source whatever is indicated” and observes that Donne “was not shy of mining sources and presenting their findings as his own.” Discusses, as an example, two such “silences” or “concealed allusions” in his sermon of 15 April 1628, that show Donne’s “sermon strategies at a sensitive moment in the reign of Charles I” (578). Shows how Donne’s “silent act of quotation” in the sermon “works subtly to critique royal policy, courtly values, and the ecclesiological and doctrinal preferences of the anti-Calvinist faction in the English Church” (572).


In an historical survey of the verse epistle, calls Donne “perhaps the most important early modern writer of verse letters” and comments on how he “remade the form in several different ways.” Cites HWKiss as Donne’s “most famous letter.”


An original poem that mentions Donne.


Argues that, unlike Ben Jonson, “who closely identified with the printed word,” Donne is “often thought to have shown no interest in the idea of literary property.” Argues that this assumption “does not account for the visceral metaphors, such as authorial cannibalism, that Donne applied to the circulation of his poems in manuscript.” By means of a close reading of Sat2, which “situates his concerns for misappropriation in a legal context,” argues that not only was Donne “in a better position than his contemporaries to appreciate the needs for authorial control” but also that because of “his training in law” Donne was “also better to articulate an inchoate conception of proprietary authorship” (103). Discusses how “manuscript circulation offered Donne possibilities for safeguarding his literary property every bit as equal to (and as problematic as) those available to Jonson in print” (107).

Discusses “the social as well as the seemingly private spaces of London in order to ground Donne’s poetry” and, “more broadly, the creative act, in the lived realities of the metropolis, rather than in the literary traditions, or even the political and intellectual developments, of early modern London.” Points out, however, that “these realms are not mutually exclusive, or even easily separable” (419). Proposes in this essay “to situate poetry, and particularly the lyric,” in “the complex, often messy experiences of life in early modern London” in an attempt “to comprehend the manifold yet elusive encounters between the individual imagination and the external world, between subjectivity and materiality, between poetry and the quotidian” (420). Argues that “the dynamic” between a “desire for distance from the city” and “a fascinated engagement with the rush of the urban everyday” animates “many of the movements and metaphors of Donne’s poetry.” Analyzes “the very distinct worlds of Donne’s satires and his love lyrics” but observes, however, that “both genres, as Donne employs them, register an immersion in the details of urban experience.” Maintains that both the Satyres and the Songs and Sonnets “ultimately arose out of the same ambiance and perceptual experiences of the crowded and heterogeneous metropolis” and holds that the love poems are “as much about the spatial realities of everyday life as they are about desire.” Examines Donne’s poems, therefore, “as the effective processing of the details of living in suburban and urban London in the late sixteenth century” (421).


Describes the Holgate Miscellany in the Rare Book Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library. Presents in the edition only materials transcribed in the first half of the seventeenth century, probably by William Holgate (1590–post-1614). Among the 184 entries, there are 16 poems by Donne along with “When myne heart was mine owne, and not by vows,” attributed to him by the scribe. Included are ElBed, Twick, WomCon, Expir, Witch, Fever, Leg, ElPerf, ElAnag, Christ, Storm, Cross, SGo, Mark, ElBrac, and Break. Presents brief notes on each of the poems.


Discusses Donne’s uses of “traditional rhetorical teachings on amplification and its related manoeuvres” in his sermons in order to show how he employs “various passions for his rhetorical purposes.” Considers “the important dynamic existing between the precise rhetorical construction of an object’s value and the precise kind of passionate feeling one should have towards it.” Argues that Donne “attempts to generate, transmute, and transfer the emotional responses of his audience toward his sermons’ particular subjects by employing the amplificatory techniques that are most useful for getting at the contents of memory directly as well as those that carefully shape the cognitive reconstruction of such contexts” (452). In the analysis of Donne’s “emotion-rhetoric” relies principally upon Thomistic typology and explanation of human passion because of “its immense general influence on renaissance thinking about the passions” and also because “its structure provides a helpful indication of how Donne’s rhetoric approaches his emotional contexts” (453). Examines Donne’s “amplificatory skills in the emotional context of two of his sermons”: (1) on Job 13:15, preached to the Countess of Bedford in 1620, and (2) on Hosea 2:19, preached at the wedding of Margaret Washington and Robert Sandys in 1621 (455–56). Maintains that “the rhetorical purpose of Donne’s preaching” is “in large part the construction of community” (466).

1989. De Smith, Bob. "Reading the Order of Don-

Discusses what is known about the order of the Holy Sonnets and explores “how we can use that knowledge to read and teach the poems effectively” (79). Comments also on various interpretative challenges in addition to their ordering, such as whether or not the poems are personal or simply artistic structures, how they relate to the meditative tradition, and whether they reflect a Catholic or Protestant sensibility. Focuses, however, on the significance of the ordering of the sonnets, while acknowledging that they can read profitably as discrete entities. Maintains that the sonnets are “about sanctification—about the path of the believer—and not about achieving salvation” (86) and that they “invite us to see connection, development, and order but in a fluid reprogrammable way” (88). Holds that Donne's various orderings of the poems “are meaningful, especially as a call for us to read, and perhaps create, sets of poems” (89). Concludes that, “paying attention to the various orderings we find in Donne's manuscripts and early editions may help us read the poems imaginatively and creatively” (90).


Discusses “the meaning of physical suffering” in the works of Donne and Alabaster, in particular, examining how their poetry “represents the suffering Christ, and the possible human ways of engaging with that suffering.” Observes how both poets also “explore the nature and meaning of human suffering” and how in their poetry “human and divine interact.” Notes how both poets participated in and transformed “a long tradition of Passion poetry in English” that stretches back to the Middle Ages. Comments on a number of the tropes and characteristics of that tradition” (89). Discusses briefly the meaning of suffering in Donne's sermons, Pseudo-Martyr, and Biathanatos in order to provide a context for a discussion of his religious poetry in which he “repeatedly addresses issues of physical anguish, redemption and participation in the pains of Christ” and “explores the same uncertainties that characterize his sermons.” Maintains, however, that in the poems Donne “confronts different models of pain in a more explicit manner, and with a stronger urgency” (106), as seen primarily in the Holy Sonnets, Lit, Cross, and Goodf. Maintains that both in his prose works and poetry Donne “felt drawn to both Catholic and Reformed models of pain, but was also deeply sensitive to what he saw as the shortcomings of both.” Observes that, in his reflections on human and divine pain, Donne “transformed the tradition of Passion poetry” and that “in his hands, it became a site for an often anxious reflection on the human ability to engage with Christ's sufferings, and on the ability of that suffering to transform human pain.” Concludes that Donne's poetry of suffering conveys “a combined sense of spiritual and poetic deadlock,” in that his speakers “long for a form of union with the suffering Christ which they simultaneously see as an impossibility, and which cannot, moreover, be realized in the verbal universe of poetry” (113).


Discusses Donne's fascination with timepieces and comments on his uses of them in his poetry and prose. Finds particularly interesting his comparison of “human beings to timepieces only to insist that these chronometric creatures have the potential to escape temporal limitations.” Suggests that these timepiece tropes “articulate the poet's idiosyncratic understanding of time's relationship to eternity and to the intermediate state of being that the scholastics dubbed 'aevidernity,' the atemporal state of angels and disembodied souls” (226). Maintains that an examination of “these paradoxically atemporal timepieces provides new insight into the much-discussed topic of
time and eternity in Donne’s works” and especially helps to explain how Donne “juggles time, trying to redress the imbalance between the shortness of the present and the length of eternity” (227). Discusses how Donne “looks to affirm the angel-like, aeviternal existence of the redeemed human body/soul not as strictly atemporal but as an experience of time transfigured” and illustrates his portrait of transfigured time by commenting on his sermon on the death of Magdalene Herbert, FunEl, and several of the Songs and Sonets. Discusses how Donne’s “most complex explorations of how time and aeviternity meet in the experience of eros” is Lect, a poem that “works by combining the functions of chronometer and aeviternometer” (241).


Contains a chronology (xix–xxii) and an introduction (xxiii–liii), which includes a survey of Donne’s critical reception, a discussion of the major characteristics of his poetry and prose, and a biographical sketch of the poet. Observes that “there is little danger that Donne’s poems will perish for not being understood: it is above all their complexity and difficulty that make them so compelling and endlessly fascinating” (lxix). Presents suggestions for further reading, including modern editions, reference guides, biographies, and critical studies (lvi–lxiv), followed by notes on the texts (lx–lxiv). Presents the texts: *Songs and Sonnets* (3–59), the *Epigrams* (59–63), the *Elegies* (63–94), the Holy Sonnets, SecAn, and Goodf interspersed among them (with no notes or commentary).


In “Introduction: All Done: The Completeness of the Dean” (ix–xxvii), comments on Donne’s early critical reputation and his life and marriage, noting especially the influence of his Catholic heritage on his life and poetry, as well as the theatre and Richard Hooker. Discusses and evaluates various major characteristics of Donne’s poetry, such as his uses of wit, conceits, puns, wordplay in general, and his “in-your-face” tone. Says that, “punning to the end,” Donne’s “last words were, “Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done.”” (xxvii). Thereafter follow the texts of the *Songs and Sonnets*, with the *Elegies*, *Holy Sonnets*, SecAn, and Goodf interspersed among them (with no notes or commentary).


In a discussion of Protestant patristic strategies in the early seventeenth century, points out that “to reclaim the Fathers, and above all Augustine, for their cause, Protestant controversialists frequently relied on a highly flexible—and at times deliberately ambiguous—notion of historical or contextual interpretation.” Observes that patristic pronouncements were “routinely qualified or discounted entirely through reference to rhetorical or controversial contexts” (215). Cites as an example Donne’s theology of grace.


Discusses the establishment of Jamestown by the Virginia Company in 1606. Points out that originally the Company regarded its mission as twofold: “self-interested in its mercantile
dimensions, but altruistic in its religious and political ones” as seen in its 1610 declaration (127), in which it affirms its obligation “to subordinate worldly to spiritual goals.” Observes, however, that “this rhetorical posture changed dramatically after 22 March 1622, when 347 Jamestown settlers were killed in a surprise Powhatan attack.” Comments on how this tragedy “occasioned an aboutface in English representation of the natives,” (128) as well as a change “in the conceptual role played by temporality and efficiency in English colonial rhetoric and rationale” (129). Discusses Donne’s sermon to the Company on 13 November 1622, calling it “the first” and “best-known response” to the massacre (130), in which he “advises temporal delay, alongside moderation of the passions, especially the desire for revenge,” and “preaches a middle way between colonial ambition and spiritual humility.” Maintains that Donne’s avoidance of the word “temperance” in the sermon “attests to temperance’s new complicity in the forms of colonial trade and primitive accumulation that, to Donne’s mind, compete with the Virginia Company’s religious mandate” (131). Discusses Donne’s sermon as “a model of moderation” (132) and points out how in the sermon Donne “suggests a via media between evangelical and mercantile motives for English colonialism by insisting that Virginia Company adventurers need not choose between the two” (144).

Reviews:

• Robert Matz in RenQ 65, no. 3 (2012): 931–32.


An earlier version of “John Donne, Christopher Brooke, and Temperate Revenge in 1622 Jamestown” in Colonial Virtue: The Mobility of Temperance in Renaissance England (above).


ture 34, no. 1: 31–35.

In Portuguese. Examines “the rhetorical configuration” of Walton’s Life of Dr. John Donne, “examining its loci of invention in agreement with its genre.” Considering Walton’s text “as a portrait belonging to the encomastic genre,” presents “a poetical-rhetorical analysis of the text’s structure and elements with an approach that historicizes the uses, functions and purposes of a ‘portrait’ in the European courts of the 17th century.” Points to “a notorious distinction in the structure, historical understanding and normative usage of a ‘portrait’ as compared to the modern ‘biography.’” In conclusion, “shows that the semantic and temporal gap determines adjustments to the critical reading, such as the awareness of rhetorical elements in the structure and composition of the text in agreement to the necessities and requirements of its genre, current at the time of its production” (31). (From the abstract)


Describes “the economy of literary interpretation” as “the ratio between textual details from various phonetic, syntactic and semantic levels, and explicit or implicit assumptions we use in order to explain these details.” Adds that an economic interpretation is “one that succeeds in explaining many textual details while using only a few, simple assumptions,” whereas an uneconomical interpretation “develops a complicated set of assumptions to explain only a few textual details” (32). As an example, inter-
interprets the first two stanzas of ValMourn—first using economical interpretation (the “standard” reading) followed by four noneconomical interpretations in order to show how the first is preferable.


Surveys Sir Henry Goodere’s difficult and unsuccessful court career from 1603 to 1610 and shows how it “can serve as support for a new and more precise understanding of the series of letters Donne wrote to him during these years.” Observes that, in particular, Donne’s relationship with Lucy, Countess of Bedford, “at first through Goodere, but gradually more and more independent of Goodere’s mediation, appears ultimately to have made Donne an intermediary between Goodere and Bedford instead of Goodere the intermediary between Bedford and Donne” (82).


Presents a general, brief introduction to *Devotions* for medical personnel. Calls the work a “medical classic” that “gives a fascinating insight into the medical views” of the seventeenth century. Comments on the medical procedures described in *Devotions* and calls the work a “prototype of a survival narrative” (36).


Argues that although Donne “did not leave any theoretical commentary on his poems nor on the poetical choices that presided over their composition,” his “act of poetic creation, that is to say the definition and enactment of poetic principles, does appear indirectly, as an underlying trace, in some self-referential poems.” By means of close readings, intends “to show how, through two fictional screens, the self-reflexive, metapoetic comments” in *NegLov*, *Will*, and *Under* “translate at a further remove into remarks whereby the act of writing reflects upon its own features.” Maintains that the fact is that “they revolve around a void core or essential ‘nothing’ which in turn becomes a mode of self-definition for the texts” and holds that “the act of composition at work in them is central to all three poems.” Observes that this study “intends to underline the playfulness with which the texts and the act of writing ironically confess their ‘nothingness.’”


Discusses two different modes of closure in Donne’s poems: (1) the postponing of closure, in which the poem ends “variously in a playful or desperately importunate manner that is intended to provoke an unseen interlocutor to speak or, more importantly, to act”; and (2) a type that “imitates the action of the ‘metaphorically God’ addressed in the *Devotions*” and “presents a world that is as complete as the petitioner’s world in the first group of poems is incomplete” and are “acts of reading in which the speaker demonstrates his deepening understanding of God’s highly figurative revelation” and in which there is a “completing of a circle” and “a recognition of the sacrality of the world” (177). Discusses *ElBed* and *Goodf* as examples of the first type, and discusses *Corona*, *Canon*, *Cross*, *Sidney*, and, in particular, *Annun* as examples of the second type. Calls *Annun* “the most engaging, and yet inexplicably the least discussed” of the second type (179). Shows how in the poem “first and last concur” allowing the speaker “to see from first to last within the fullness of time” (180).


Discusses “the role that liturgical texts played
in shaping the English sense of spiritual and national identity” in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Maintains that “the formulations of spiritual community found in the vernacular liturgies were at least as important to English religious life as the language of vernacular bibles—if not more important” (8). Examines, in particular, how the liturgical poetics of the Book of Common Prayer influenced contemporary writers and produced “new ways of thinking and writing about spiritual community.” Focuses on two texts: “the words of administration in the rubric for the Holy Communion” and “the prayers at the graveside in the Order for the Burial of the Dead” as texts that “throw particularly strong light upon some of the ways in which English liturgical texts were designed to shape the very communities in which they were performed” (9). Shows how “the semantic excess in the Holy Communion rubric” had “the capacity to produce communal mystical experiences in the midst of theological division” and how “the rhetorical absences at work in the graveside prayers” resisted “the production of otherworldly experience in the congregation of mourners” (14). Discusses, as an example, the devotional and liturgical elements in Corona, calling the sequence the “crowning achievement” of Donne’s devotional poetics. Comments on how Donne offers “a common devotional ground which was designed to allow and, perhaps even encourage, a mystical union of private Christian devotion that could exist alongside the public unity of worship that ought to have existed in the celebration of the liturgy and the sacrament of the Eucharist.” Suggests that “this devotional union is driven by a rhetoric of limited openness, of theological multivocality, and of mystical excess” that “resembles, in an amplified form, the rhetoric” of the eucharistic formulae in the Book of Common Prayer (28). Shows how the openness of sequence “provides an entry point for a broad community of readers, both those interested in emphasizing the power of grace-inspired works to win heavenly glory and those more interested in emphasizing preparation for one’s soul for the saving activity which only God can perform.” Points out examples of how Donne embeds in the poems “theological irresolutions,” “theological oppositions,” and “rhetorical indeterminacy” (31) in order “to confound his audiences’ logical sensibilities and transcend them.” Maintains that Corona “is designed to encourage readerly experiences that burst the boundaries of the creedral definitions and divisions that so vexed Donne” and to form a “devotional community which exceeds the confessional boundaries of Donne’s England” (34).


Discusses the influence of Persius and Juvenal on Donne as a satirist and calls his Satyres “the most innovative” of those written by his contemporaries. Observes that the Satyres “show awareness of ancient precursors” but that they “assimilate what they use to something personal and contemporary.” Cites Sat4 as Donne’s “one semi-formal imitation of a Roman satire, a reworking of Horace” (396). Claims that it is Donne who “brings Persius into play as a model for English satire” and that he was actually addressed as Persius by a contemporary. Points out that “the elements that Donne introduced to satire in apparent emulation of Persius, such as metrical roughness, were then absorbed within a very few years into the more Juvenalian mode that became the fashion.” Describes Persianic features in Sat3 and in Sat5. Maintains that “it remains an unanswered question whether as a satirist Donne profited more from Persius, Juvenal, or Horace” but that, in any event, “what he learned he transformed” (398). Notes that of all the Elizabethan satirists who were influenced by Persius and Juvenal “only Donne is today a ‘household name’” (401).


Introduces Donne and his critics to Russian readers and compares Donne to the nineteenth-century Russian poet Afanasy Fet. Discusses how Donne challenged the poetical tradition of his time and created a new foundation for English poetry. Calls Donne a brilliant innovator and thinks that he is second to nobody, except Shakespeare and Chaucer. Points out similarities between Donne's poetry and that of such later poets as William Blake and T. S. Eliot. Presents a biographical sketch of Donne that emphasizes his religious background and spiritual development. Acknowledges that Donne's poetry is often difficult, complicated, and obscure. Analyzes several portraits of Donne and suggests that they illustrate various phases of Donne's life. Says also that in them, as in his poetry, Donne wears many masks. Observes that, although Donne is often called an Elizabethan or Renaissance poet, he was actually far ahead of his time and expressed views closer to those of the next generation. Briefly compares Donne to the melancholic Hamlet, and comments on the old Jack- John controversy. Thereafter surveys Donne's poetry from the 1590's to the last decade of his life and maintains that it does not easily fit into common categories of style. Observes that later in the seventeenth century Donne's poetry was considered somewhat old-fashioned as interest in neoclassicism arose. Points out that Donne became popular again beginning in the nineteenth century and comments on his critical reputation in the twentieth century.


Discusses the seventeenth-century understanding of the relationship of the body to the soul by examining what was believed at the time to be a (later discovered nonexistent) small structure in the brain, the rete mirabile, that scientists held was the place where the soul and the body converged. Comments on how the rete mirabile (so-called “the wonderful knot”) “found utility both as a physical marker for the locatable soul and as a metaphor for the complex interaction between material and immaterial” (239). Analyzes Ecst to show how Donne employs the metaphor of the knot. Maintains that in the poem Donne argues that the souls of the lovers who have gone out from their bodies must “descend into their bodies again and be subtly knotted together” in order “to achieve true ecstasy” (259). Observes that “it is only via the coupling of the coupled souls with their bodies that the true union comes about” and thus the subtle knot “not only ‘makes us man’ by uniting immaterial and material substances” but also it “renders the union of the lovers in broader metaphorical terms.” Maintains that Donne argues in Ecst that just as “spirits knit the individual knot binding body and soul,” so likewise “love conjoins the bodies and souls of the lovers” (261). Explains why Donne's subtle knot can be understood as expressing metaphorically the rete mirabile and reads Donne's poem “as expressing a desire for and an uncertainty about the ultimate existence of such an anatomical structure” (263).


Surveys possible reasons for the 1559 ban on satire by Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, and Bishop of London, Richard Bancroft, who apparently regarded satire as “a threat to their moral authority” and attempted “to reassert control over literary production and thereby maintain their position as arbiters of moral behavior.” Observes that the ban “ultimately failed, however, in part due to satire’s flexibility as a genre” (139). Comments on characteristics of Donne’s formal satires, especially their indebtedness to Roman satirists, and observes how Donne wrote them for and shared them in manuscript with a group of his peers in order “to demonstrate his abilities as a poet and also to represent himself through his poetry” (134). Briefly comments on Sat1, in which Donne “displays himself as a model Inns of Court man” and on Sat3 as a testimonial “to
the ability of satire to provide a more careful consideration of the complexities involved in the active pursuit of personal salvation and the corruptive influence of earthly power than could be accommodated by the literature of moral exempla” of the time (134–35).


Argues that “writers in the 1590s saw Spenser’s Mother Hubberds Tale as an unsafe stylistic model for satire” but that the Bishops’ Ban of 1599, “by censoring primarily works modeled on Juvenal, made Spenser seem a more acceptable model for satires written afterwards” (290). Contrasts as satirists Middleton, who printed his works, and Donne, who circulated his poems in manuscript, and notes the difference between Middleton’s use of Spenserianisms in his satires and Donne’s use in his. Points out that, unlike Middleton, Donne, “unconcerned with outright censorship,” had “the freedom simply to explore contemporary trends in his satirical writings.” Maintains that the Spenserianism of Metem, “coupled with its absence” in the Satyres, suggests that Donne “may simply be following a fad” (305).


Explores “the ways in which relational ambiguity mediates the experience of God” and suggests that Donne’s erotic verse “offers important resources in the search for ways to attend to divine disclosures within the absences and impossibilities of erotic relationality” (79). Presents readings of GoodM and Noct, pointing out how, for the speakers of these poems, “eros becomes a space of deeply counterexperiential yet profoundly revelatory impossibility in which interpersonal attunement and alienation, closeness and distance, grow in direct proportion.” Discusses how “co-inherence and co-intensification of absence and presence in the relation with the beloved becomes the site for an attestation of the experience of the absent-present God.” Maintains that Donne’s poetry “does not so much describe interpersonal impossibility from without as enact it from within, thereby inviting interpreters into intuitive and performative understandings of ways in which eros’s aporiae mediate the experience of the divine” (81). Observes that Donne’s erotic poetry “opens up space in which to attend to the theological significance of interpersonal impossibility in a way many contemporary relational theologies do not” (81–82). Argues how in GoodM “the possible-impossible experience of eros becomes the occasion for a subtle but poignant naming of the possible-impossible experience of the divine” (83) and claims that the poem presents “both the ecstatic and the agonistic elements of love in a way that makes both of these dimensions important, even intrinsic, to the theological meaning of eros” (88). Discusses how Noct is one of Donne’s “most poignant expressions of the experience of divine absence” (90) and how its “complex interplay of form and content is a nuanced, erotic rendering of Holy Saturday in which the experiences of annihilating absence and uncanny hope are both co-constitutive and co-intensifying” (96).


In Farsi. Compares the love poems of Donne with those of the thirteenth-century Persian poet, Molana Jalal-din Mohammad Balkhi (known to English-speakers as Rumi). Believes that today people “need real love and affection more than before,” the kind of love expressed by these two poets. (From the abstract)


Points out that there are more than 4,000 known Donne manuscripts and notes that this “astounding number” attests “not only to his
widespread appeal” in his own time but also “to the nature of textual circulation in Renaissance England.” Discusses manuscript call number FPR 2247.E37 in the Rutgers University Library, simply titled “Elegy,” but commonly known as ElProg. Notes that the manuscript contains a second unnamed poem, sometimes attributed to Matthew Mainwaring (1561–1652), entitled “Sonett.” Argues that the juxtaposition of the two poems “provides important insights into the circulation of Donne’s work in manuscript poetic anthologies” (94). Observes that “what seems important to the creator of the Rutgers Donne manuscript and the verse miscellany is not form, style, or authorship” but rather “the potential for illicit amusement which their shared thematic contents might have brought.” Furthermore, uses the Rutgers manuscript to explore further the intersections of print and manuscript miscellanies and the various uses to which they put Donne’s poetry” (95).


Observes that the fate of the body after death “becomes the centre of gravity” in Donne’s last sermon (64). Maintains that Donne’s insistence in the sermon on the power of God to redeem mankind from death “reads as legalistic prose, its images common and even a bit vague,” and that they “certainly pale beside his imaginative rendering of decomposition” of the body (66). Furthermore, observes that the “vivid grotesquery of the vermiculation passage” at the sermon’s beginning “is matched only by the final passage of the sermon, in which Donne lingers over details of Christ’s crucified body” (67), a description that “echoes the vermicular passage” (67–68). Points out how in each case Donne’s language “becomes vibrantly corporeal, confronting the reader with a theatricality that forces our awareness of what’s being described as an object in itself rather than a sign pointing to some meaning beyond itself” (68).


In Korean. Discusses Donne’s “paradoxical and reversal strategy” in his early love poems. Observes that most of the poems Donne wrote while studying at Lincoln’s Inn are “cynical and epigrammatic about woman’s fidelity and inconstancy” and were written for a sophisticated and witty audience of Inns gentlemen who could read between the lines. (From the abstract)


Discusses the major episodes in Metem in detail “showing how the ring structure shapes an interdisciplinary reading” of the poem and also “showing how the ring structure helps to situ ate the poem in the historical aftermath of the 1599 ‘Bishop’s Ban’ of satire.” Suggests that “the poem’s hermeneutical complexities may be Donne’s very personal response to this attempt to discipline bodies and texts” (213). Discusses principally the architectural metaphors in the poem, discussing how “the ring structure’s extended symmetry is signaled throughout the
The poem in striking syntactical and emblematic terms by repeated images of doubling, oscillation, and reversal” (216). Explains how the comparisons in the poem “often consider the powers of textuality to communicate and shape knowledge, to reconcile disciplines, and to constrain interpretation” (223). Analyzes “two sets of paired transmigration” that use “similar interdisciplinary and intertextual methods” to deepen the paradox in *Metem*: “the first centered on the comparison of the sparrow and the whale as Judeo-Christian symbols of divinity, and the second centered on the Christian concepts of the Fall, original sin, and incarnation.” Shows how the final sequence of comparisons, “that of the opening epic invocation with the closing ape-seduction and gestation of Themech,” may help to place *Metem* in “an immediate historical context of state censorship, clarifying the meaning of the ring structure’s hermeneutical acrobatics” (232). Concludes by showing also how the ring structure “may help situate” *Metem* “in Donne’s life near its titular date, 16 August 1601” (248).


In Turkish. Compares *Triple, Twick, and Lov-Exch* with the 5th, 20th, and 33rd ghazels in the Turkçe Divân of the Turkish poet Fuzûlî. Comments on how the two poets depict love and observes that both consider love as “something painful” and the beloved “as someone who constantly tortures the lover.” Examines, in particular, the “perplexing, disparate, and shocking images” that both poets use to describe “the nature of love.” Says that both poets also finally “sanctify the concept of love in their poems.” (From the abstract)


Comments on a sequence of 45 love sonnets that Joy Davidman wrote to C. S. Lewis that “offers stunning evidence of Davidman’s spiritual struggles with regard to her feelings for Lewis; her sense of God’s working on her selfish, demanding, love-starved life; and her increasingly mounting frustrations with Lewis for keeping her at arm’s length emotionally and physically.” Maintains that the dramatic, conversational tone of her sonnets reminds one of Donne’s *Songs and Sonets*, and especially the *Holy Sonnets* (79). Cites examples from Davidman’s sonnets to illustrate how “the central, unifying device” of the poems is “an arresting, provocative, and sharply penetrating voice” that is “reminiscent of Donne’s” (92).


Discusses “the work performed by money” in *ElBrac* and *ElProg* and reads each poem “in terms of its speaker’s erotic engagements with the world of matter, transacted in conceits of coinage.” Maintains that “the desirous relationship between body and world traced by Donne’s coins is one of an endless spending, without hope of either exhaustion or recompense—yet violently fearful of both exhaustion and recompense.” Observes Donne’s “ironical fascination” (186) with the gold coin called “the angel” and how he used it as “a way to talk directly about the extraordinariness of money.” Calls “the angel” “the most charismatic product of the English mint” and comments on its rich symbolism (189). Presents a detailed analysis of *ElBrac* to show how it gave Donne the opportunity to exercise his prodigious wit. Observes how the poem is in fact “not about monetary exchange at all, which is remarkable, considering that coins are all the speaker wants to talk about” (193). Considers *ElProg* as a poem that “thoroughly enacts” the central thesis of this study: “that in early modernity, people and money shared certain ontological conditions” (200). Discusses how the irony that “pervades” *ElProg* focuses on “the topos of inversion” and comments on how the speaker wittily “asserts throughout the poem that the
most effective way to love a woman is not from the face down” but rather “up from the feet” (200–01).

Reviews:


In Korean. Discusses Donne’s paradoxical, ambivalent, and non-traditional view of suicide and suggests reasons why the book was not published until after his death. Suggests also that Biathanatos “can also be read as implicating Donne’s political desire” in that in the book he rejects his Catholic faith and “becomes an apostate,” thus making preferment possible. (From the abstract)


In Korean. Explores the subject of Donne’s comment that “no man is an island” (i.e., brotherhood) in Buddhism and in the movie About a Boy, adapted from a novel by Nick Hornby. (From the abstract)


Examines the extensive parish records and related materials that shed light on Donne’s relationships and activities in the parish of St. Dunstan’s in the West, in particular, at the start of his tenure as Vicar. Notes that Donne “was induced into the living by the Archdeacon of London on 15 March [1623]” (3) and that “by June Donne had already begun to win the affections of influential members of the parish” (5), especially the support and friendship of Thomas Ravenscroft. Points out that the parishioners awarded Donne with “a generous salary” most likely because of his “eager participation in parish affairs upon becoming Vicar” (7). Explains that Donne “assumed the pulpit at St. Dunstan’s at an exceptionally volatile moment in the nation’s history” (8) and discusses how Donne addressed these issues from the pulpit, especially his assuring his congregation of his allegiance and conformity to the Church of England. Comments on Donne’s engagement in various activities of the parish and his interaction with its members, especially the churchwardens and vestrymen. Points out, however, that Donne’s “engagement with the parish during the first half of 1625 was interrupted by other obligations and sickness” and that the death of James I in March “initiated a period of intense involvement with the court” (28). Observes also how the extensive parish records provide us with additional information on “those to whom Donne preached and ministered” (43). Concludes, therefore, that these records “provide an unusually rich sense of Donne’s concerns, experiences, and associations within the parish” and points out how “previously unreported references significantly expand and enhance our knowledge of his activities” (59).


In Chinese. Maintains that Donne was keenly interested in nature, especially in the relationship between nature and mankind. Comments on how Donne uses images of plants and animals in his poems to express his attitude toward life. Says that Donne often lets persons “exchange or switch with animals and plants to illustrate the idea that human kind, animals and plants possess a connective, equal and symbiotic relationship.” Maintains that Donne had an “ecological outlook” that gives his poems an “extraordinary charm” (48). (From the abstract)

In Chinese. Maintains that, unlike Elizabethan poets who praised lovers’ fidelity, Donne wrote about unfaithfulness in some of his love poems. Suggests that Donne’s sensibility about the instability of the world and the tensions in his religious convictions contributed to his theme of unfaithfulness.


Discusses how the abrupt shift from the present tense in the first two stanzas of Ind to the simple past at the beginning of the third stanza has the effect of making us feel that this is “the weightiest moment in the poem” and “asks us to focus our attention less on what the poem says than on the dramatic act of saying it.” Maintains that this shift in tense “similarly forces us to sharpen our relationship to the poem as a dramatic utterance, an event that happens as we hear” (59).


Maintains that Donne’s comments in Essays on the scriptural account of the beginning of time and history in Genesis and Exodus have an “apologetic agenda,” that is, not only to justify his ordination to the Anglican priesthood but also to speak against “sectarian religion” (165) and “to establish a unified front within Christendom against alternative accounts of time presented by pagan annals” (166). Points out that Donne numbered Chinese antiquity among the “profane histories” that challenged scripture (167) and “situates Donne’s allusion to Chinese annals within the context of the chronological controversy” that began with the publication of González Mendoza’s The History of Great and Mighty Kingdom of China (1585) (168). Argues that Mendoza’s account and Joseph Scalinger’s response to it, along with the Chaldean and Egyptian antiquities, “played an indispensable part in motivating Donne’s exegesis of Genesis and Exodus” in Essays (170). Discusses how “what was at stake in the Renaissance controversy over chronology was the primacy both of the biblical timeline and the Adamic lineage” (175) and observes how Donne’s comments reflect “the undisputed priority enjoyed by scriptural chronology in the Renaissance” (180).


Discusses Donne’s conflicted religious identity and conversion and notes that “the most salient fact in the hunt for definitive signs of Donne’s conversion” is “the absence of first-person testimony” (49). Discusses, however, how Donne’s public life “is framed” by two statements of “his religious allegiance”—Pseudo-Martyr and Devotions. Maintains that these two works show “a way of thinking about the self that is in its own terms as rigorously reflective and rhetorical an investigation of the self” as anything by St. Augustine (50). Shows how Pseudo-Martyr is “a bravura act of monarchial allegiance, which bespeaks of a converted self while refusing to narrate a conversion” (51) and how it is, in a sense, Donne’s own Oath of Allegiance and his “leave taking of Catholicism.” Maintains that Devotions “neatly brought to an end the public life that Pseudo-Martyr inaugurated” and that, if Pseudo-Martyr was “carefully staged to showcase a resolute self,” Devotions “took that self to be fully representative of all Christian selves” (58) and “laid out Donne’s vision of ecclesiology, idiosyncratic and comprehensive in equal measure” (62). Explains, therefore, how both works “accepted the organic unity of a body politic over that of the church” and how Donne “paradoxically thereby became the last literary spokesperson in the century of the hegemonic established church” (27). Maintains that, if Donne “did not oblige the state with a conversion statement as such, his published works nevertheless displayed a
converted self” (72).


Briefly comments on Donne’s understanding of idolatry as an improper attachment to persons or things, i.e., “the displacement of worship of and attention to God onto creatures” and “the ‘inordinate’ attention to worldly things.” Observes that love-idolatry was “especially troubling because it took an emotion that should be directed toward God and redirected it to a creature.” Points out that Donne refers to love idolatry in two of the Holy Sonnets, HSWhat and HSSighs, in which he calls “his own attachment to women idolatry” (37). Points out that many English Protestant polemicists maintained that “women were more inclined than men to idolatry and that they seduced their men into the practice” and notes that in one of his sermons Donne says that a Catholic woman who instructs children in religion is “a menace because she furthers idolatry” (38).


Discusses British Library, Additional MS, 25707, the so-called Skipwith manuscript, which contains “a relatively early collection” of 60 poems by Donne. Points out how the whole anthology is “interesting in its own right” and shows how it sheds light on “the socio-literary transmission of poetic texts in the period” and on “the relationships of various authors represented in the anthology.” Places this collection “in its social and geographical contexts” and examines some of its “interesting material features,” treating it as “a particularly interesting example of the personal anthologizing of poetry in the period” (185). Describes the contents of the manuscript, including the poems of Donne by different hands. Explains how the large number of Donne’s poems in the manuscript is “related to social networking.” Observes that “in both London and Leicestershire, Sir William Skipwith, and later his son Henry, had contacts with individuals close to Donne and Donne’s coterie, especially Sir Henry Goodyer.” Also explains why it is not surprising that in the manuscript Donne’s poems are mixed in with those of his contemporaries and associates, such as Francis Beaumont, Nicolas Hare, Henry Wotton, and Henry Goodyer. Notes that most of Donne’s poems “carried with them a politically oppositional charge” and that most of them “spoke stylistically to a generation of independent-minded and politically involved men” (199). Maintains that “the texts preserved in this collection, including many rare or unique poems that do not appear in any other surviving document from the period, were connected to complex processes of social networking” (202) and that “such documents are the material traces of social transactions, geographical movements and the general cultural cross-currents of the age” (203).


Discusses poems in Sloane MS 1446, a seventeenth-century poetical miscellany. Notes that there are no poems by Donne in the collection but points out that several of the poems reflect Donne’s possible influence. Observes, for example, that three of the poems in the anthology are on the subject of parting, “one of Donne’s favorite topics” (240). Says that it is “somewhat surprising, given the popularity of Donne’s verse in Christ Church collections,
that this compilation does not include any of his poems” (244–45).


In a study of how sixteenth-century English writers regarded and represented old age in their works, comments on Donne’s views as seen in Antiq and ElAut. Points out Donne’s sardonic view of an antiquarian and his wife in Antiq in which, in old age, “the lover comes to look upon his previous object of affection as (at best) a grotesque artifact worthy of inclusion in his museum, itself representative of a pathetic desire to recover and reconstruct a now remote past.” Maintains that “this early epigram’s concern for the disengagements threatened by time’s physical effects would itself mature to preoccupy much of Donne’s verse” and is “symptomatic of a prevailing impulse to de-eroticize old age” and to make a “scurrilous indictment of aged sexuality” (102). Discusses ElAut, in which Donne suggests, however, that “age may actually refine intimacies,” as perhaps an attempt to reverse his claims about declining beauty of women in Antiq. Calls the poem, however, “an essentially fractured performance” and points out how it “falters as an encomium gone awry amid its own earnest but risky strategies, or as a sophistic paradox whose cleverness cannot effectively redeem its crueler impulses” (125). Surveys the divided critical response to the poem. Maintains that in ElAut Donne “deploys his considerable verbal talents to counter the gerontophobic prejudice he shares with those whom he would challenge” and that thus “the persona’s ultimate engagement with his own shortcomings completes a rich psychological drama that marks the elegy as one of Donne’s most sophisticated accomplishments” (127). Discusses how in ElAut Donne “candidly engages and reconfigures in his elegy the gerontophobic urges that subtly and overtly plagued the sensibilities of his day, and of our own” (235).


Discusses how Donne in Triple examines the problem of “the effect that the potential to be set to music has on written or printed poetry” (283) and maintains that the poem is “about a key aspect of lyric representation: the capacity of the poem to contain (and, in the conceit, to deflect) the pain of the emotional turmoil of the poet” (283–84). Comments on how “the ironic condemnation of poetry” in stanza one of the poem “turns into a similar condemnation of music,” and that “what we end up with is the little wisdom—it is enough—of the published, read, but unsung poet” (285). Argues that Donne’s “concern about music—that the musician’s intent to show his own art rather than contain the poet’s pain will alter the original poem’s capacity to represent—is well founded” and demonstrates “how far-reaching Donne’s point about the relationship between poetry and music is by considering an example that crosses temporal boundaries—Benjamin Britten’s The Holy Sonnets of John Donne.” Argues that since Donne “demonstrates acute awareness of the role of sound in poetic meaning, it is valuable to consider the extent to which Britten is able to preserve, recreate, or represent that role musically.” Maintains that Britten is not completely successful but explains how “his attempt reveals a great deal about the relationship of poetry and music” and also “allows us to postulate a kind of musical reading—a readerly song-setting—that would preserve linguistic meaning . . . by allowing the fundamental difference between music and poetry.” Concludes by suggesting how Donne’s “resistance to song-setting is comparable to the modern problem of word-music relation as explored by Arnold Schoenberg and his philosophical admirers” (286).

Analyzes and contrasts the diction in Jonson’s “Song to Celia” with that in *Canon*. Observes that although both poems deal with love, “the words the poets adopt to express this theme are quite different from each other” (222). Explains how the two poems differ also in the type of love presented—“implicit spiritual love” in Jonson’s poem and “passionate physical love” in Donne’s. Says that Jonson “conveys a love that can make us feel peaceful, divine, quiet and elegant,” whereas Donne presents a kind of love that is “rough, urgent, crazy and free of all inhibitions.” Concludes that Jonson’s poem “sounds like a stream running around the beautiful scenery quietly and harmlessly,” but that Donne’s poem “sounds like a fire blazing the whole world violently and destructively” (223).


Discusses how the Paul’s Cross Sermons from 1558 to 1642 “constitute a valuable source for the study of early modern religion and religious controversy” and that “the number of politically sensitive sermons” have made them an important source for scholars writing on politics of the period (1). Mentions Donne throughout but has no extended discussion of him or his sermons.


Discusses Donne’s use of the art of memory in his sermons by beginning with a review of “the birth, codification and subsequent flourishing—in Donne’s day—of the art of memory,” followed by “reflections on the form in which he may have encountered this ancient craft.” Discusses also “the place and importance of memory in the Anglican preaching tradition” and analyzes Donne’s “use of mental spaces made public to foreground the structure of his sermons,” as well as “a variety of striking metaphors” that are related to the emblem tradition and “are placed within these structural units with the aim of making his message more memorable” (74). Claims that Donne’s “most explicit” use of the art of memory “occurs when he uses specifically architectural metaphors to establish the structure” of his sermons in his congregation’s memory. Discusses first “simple spatial metaphors” that Donne uses to structure his sermons, followed by his “most explicit and complex use of the architectural mnemonic” (83). Says that “the most common metaphor Donne employs to convey the structure of his sermons is that of a tree, with its roots, branches and nourishing fruits” (84). Cites, however, other spatial metaphors drawn from maps, water fountains, rivers, clocks, houses, rooms, etc. and discusses how Donne’s “most explicit use of the architectural mnemonic” is found in his undated sermon on Luke 23–24 entitled “Preached to the Nobility,” in which he uses a palace “to reflect the layout of the sermon” (87). Comments also on how the “masterfully contrived images” in his sermons resemble emblems (90) and how they are used as teaching tools. Maintains that, in fact, “the entire world in all its concreteness and physical vibrancy is for Donne a treasure-house of images” (96). Concludes that Donne’s “bold use” of the art of memory is “certainly characteristic of his creative turn of mind and deep commitment to memory” and “provides a sturdy framework simultaneously ancient and new within which to encounter some of the most memorable prose of the seventeenth century” (98–99).

2035. Nelson, Brent. “Pleasure for Our Sense, Health for Our Hearts: Inferring Pronuntiatio and Actio from the Text of John Donne’s Second Prebend Sermon,” in *Listening Up, Writing Down, and...*
Explores “the possibility of inferring features of performance from a Renaissance text whose rhetorical power relied heavily on the dynamics of personal, oral delivery.” Maintains that “an analysis of rhetorical features for indications of delivery in the context of contemporary ideas about preaching and oratory is the only accessible route to imagining the oral performance of rhetorical texts in the Renaissance.” Holds that, “assuming a decorous delivery according to rhetorical standards of Donne’s time, we should be able to infer some characteristics of delivery appropriate to the subject matter, structure, and style of any given utterance.” Begins by examining “ideas about delivery in Donne’s time, and in relation to Donne specifically, drawing on contemporary comments on his preaching to glean clues about what characteristics of rhetorical delivery one might expect to find traced in the structure and elocutionary features of a text.” Next “extracts from these some basic principles of correlation between emotional and ideational content and some probable features of Donne’s pronuntiatio.” Then “applies these principles to an analysis of Donne’s use of rhetorical schemes and structures to match the changing emotional tone and formal operation of his second prebend sermon” (178). Points out, however, that the printed sermon texts are “not identical to the texts that Donne originally preached” but believes that they bear “close though not perfect resemblance” to what Donne actually preached (179). Says that the object of this exercise of inferring performance from printed texts is “to encourage an imaginative reading of the sermons that places the printed texts in a context of oral and manual performance” and also “to suggest some principles for directing this imagination.” Claims that, for Donne, “decisions about delivery would have followed first from the demands of the sermon’s principle of invention;” in the case of the second prebend sermon, “the idea of the weight of present suffering and affliction as an impetus to desire relief in the present based on the hope of eternal glory.” Points out how in the sermon “two distinct modes of discourse—the exhortative and the instructive—serve this objective, the former involving a stirring of emotion, the latter a methodical demonstration” (194). Observes how “within the exhortative mode, structural and stylistic schemes suggest patterns of emphasis in tone, pitch, volume, and pace that might produce an appropriate matching of sound to sense, first initiating the congregation into the weight of suffering in the present, and then, in the end, releasing them in the levity of hope in the promise of future glory, radiating in an inchoation of joy in the present moment of the sermon’s benediction” (194–95).


Discusses three sermons that Donne preached at St. Paul’s that illustrate his “extraordinary skill” as a preacher. Maintains that “insufficient attention has been paid to Donne’s physical voice,” while modern critical efforts to depict him as “a performer” have often obscured his “self-presentation” in his sermons as “a contrite sinner who fully shares the sinful nature of his auditors.” Discusses how, in his Christmas Day sermon of 1621, Donne “positions himself as a moderate, sacramental Protestant”; how in his second Prebend sermon in 1626, he “urges his listeners to take comfort in the holy joy of the Holy Spirit and thus to anticipate the joy of heaven”; and how, in his funeral sermon for Sir William Cokayne of 1626, he “ponders the resurrection of Lazarus and proclaims the joyful resurrection of the dead in Christ” (50). Suggests that Donne’s pulpit voice was “eclectic and idiosyncratic, variously prophetic, Augustinian, humanistic, rhetorical, liturgical, and ceremonial, and perhaps even Arminian or semi-Pelagian.” Laments that Donne’s actual pulpit voice is lost to us but maintains that the printed texts we have “retain enough of the power, rhythm, imagery, distinctive style, and evangelical zeal of the preacher to allow us to imagine the power of their original delivery” (57).

Maintains that the worship service conducted in Trinity Chapel of Lincoln’s Inn on Thursday, 22 May 1623 is “the single most thoroughly documented worship service held in England between the Elizabethan Settlement of religion and the outbreak of the English Civil War.” Observes that there is “visual evidence as well as numerous written records, both official and unofficial, which together shed a great deal of light on what Trinity Chapel looked like in its original configuration as well as what happened during this worship service inaugurating religious use of Lincoln’s Inn’s worship space.” Points out further that “included in these documents are lists of who participated in the service, where the participants stood, kneeled, or sat, and when—as well as what—they said and did, and to some extent to what they thought about what was happening at the time and in the days and weeks that followed” (113). Argues that “this material demonstrates that by 1623 the Book of Common Prayer was sufficiently familiar, customary, and expected in worship by Englishfolk that its use in the consecration of Trinity Chapel was fluid and coherent” and that “the newly-constructed building was designed to accommodate its particular spatial requirements.” Discusses “the kinds of information contained in the various documents” (114), such as the floor plan of the chapel, the design of the building, the seating, the order of the worship service, and the sermon, which was preached by Donne on John 10: 22 and 23. Points out how in his sermon Donne “makes clear that his subject is ‘dedication’ in both its meaning specific to the occasion and its more general sense as a way of understanding life committed to particular goals and values.” Notes also that Donne also makes it clear that he is present at Trinity Chapel, “both to participate in this service of consecration (by preaching the sermon) and to comment on the significance of the service (though the content of this sermon)” (133).


Presents a brief introduction to Donne and his work and comments on the wordplay in \textit{Flea}. Suggests the possibility that the poem may be addressed by a woman to a woman. Thereafter follows rather lurid cartoon illustrations of the poem based on this assumption.


Original poem that mentions Donne.


Briefly comments on Empson’s calling Donne “a space man” in his 1957 essay in \textit{KR} and how he regarded Donne’s view as being in defiance of Christian doctrine and ultimately subversive. Observes that “a reading that failed to take Donne’s interest in speculative astronomy seriously was, according to Empson, one that risked allowing his love poems to appear merely smutty” (166).


Points out that although Donne never endorsed supralapsarianism, in some of his sermons he is “willing to take comfort in decrees God made before the act of creation (if not before the decree of creation).” Considers “what purposes this pre-creation period might have served for Donne, both theologically and rhetorically,” and what value there is “in pondering a state \textit{ante principium}.” Explores, as a case study, a passage in a 1628 sermon on St. Stephen, in which Donne’s aim is “to accentuate divine freedom” and to show that “God’s long
span of pre-creation happiness” makes clear that “he did not need to make the world” and that “the same principle applies to the creation of Donne’s listeners,” i.e., that “each individual’s beginning reflects a divine choice, a choice felt more keenly when one is reminded that it could have been otherwise” (25). Points out furthermore that Donne holds that, at birth, “God places a person quite deliberately into a calling” and “into a particular historical moment” in order “to infuse” in his congregation “purpose” (26). Discusses how in his St. Stephen homily Donne claims that God “deliberately sends each person into the world at a specific historical moment rather than another” and that “this historical moment, in turn, acquires its significance from all preceding moments”; thus, “as with the creation of the world, so with the birth of the individual: these momentous beginnings have a past.” Comments on how Donne sees “divine purpose in the historical and geographical circumstances of his birth” (33). Also compares Donne’s views on time and creation with those of St. Augustine.


Explains to students the pervading influence of Petrarchism and Anti-Petrarchism on the early modern English lyric. Cites as an example of “Post-Petrarchism” SunRis, contrasting its theme and style with those of Spenser. Points out that in SunRis the speaker “places himself on the level of his beloved” and wittily tells the sun that “the world’s treasure lies with him in bed” and that he and his beloved “now rule the universe” (67). Stresses Donne’s use of wit and hyperbole.


Maintains that EtSp afforded Donne “the opportunity to have the last word (literally graven in stone)” on his “ill-fated decision” to marry Anne More without her father’s consent. Argues that Donne’s epitaph on Anne “can be read as an attempt to depict their secret marriage as an act which, paradoxically, reinforced rather than subverted prevailing cultural assumptions regarding matrimony in the Jacobean period” (94). Points out that in the epitaph Donne depicts Anne as being “well-read” and also having been “well-read” by him. Observes that in the Elizabethan Homily on the State of Matrimony (1563), which Donne and his contemporaries knew well, a husband is urged to “read” or “to study” his wife, thereby learning her unique qualities. Maintains that Anne’s epitaph being in Latin, the language of theology, law, the Church, and ecclesiastical courts, lends “an air of gravitas and authority to Donne’s implicit claim to have been the type of diligent, model husband envisaged by the Homily, rather than a rash, irresponsible, young man inveighing a naive and innocent young girl into a clandestine marriage.” Believes that the epitaph reflects not only a posthumous celebration of Anne’s virtues but also a continuation of Donne’s “long campaign of self-vindication.” Holds that “by alluding to the state-sanctioned Homily of the State of Matrimony, in a Latin epitaph, in a church setting, Donne used the formal trappings of Anglicanism to create a public image of himself and Anne as a responsible and devoted couple,” thus making them “personifications of Anglican conjugal orthodoxy” (95).


Disagrees with those critics who regard Goodf as a “devotional triumph” that ends with “a healthy and necessary act of radical submission to the will and grace of God” and that announces the speaker’s “total dependence on His purifying correction.” Argues that critics are often led “away from the poem” itself by “using sermons, traditions, or perhaps personal beliefs” in order “to assert things about the poem that simply don’t appear there” (264) and that they hold ideas that run counter “to what makes Donne
so fascinating as a devotional writer: the profound and perpetual tension between acquiescence and resistance, submission and assertion, gratitude and resentment, humility and egoism” (265). Suggests that perhaps in Goodf “the conflict with which the poem begins is a real one, not a misrecognition of providence for sinful waywardness;” that perhaps “in the poem’s directional and devotional logic, west is not,” as some have suggested, “really east after all;” and that perhaps rather than letting go of “self-centered individualism” and “intellectual jugglery,” as others have suggested, the speaker holds on to both (266). Focuses on a possible misreading of l. 37 in the poem and argues that a misreading of the poem results from “a missed direction in that line, a turn that is not, and cannot be, what it seems” (269) but rather is “a trope,” a “kind of literal trope, a tropical contortion which plays with the buried letter of its own turning, hinting at its own diversion from straightforwardness” (277–78). Argues that perhaps the last six lines of Goodf “are not decisive evidence of spiritual submission and renewal” but rather are “just the speaker saying what he thinks we, and Christ, want to hear” (278). Holds that “seeing this turning and thus this poem as a self-justifying rationalization of the speaker’s devotional failure” does not necessarily undermine it as “one of the great Christian poems in English.” Believes that “a successful resolution” in the poem would not be “the quintessential Donncean approach to the struggles of faith” (279). Concludes that this reading “does not destroy, nor perhaps even diminish the astounding greatness of this poem, though it certainly reconceives it in a much darker tone” (281).


Discusses reasons why Donne continues to be popular with readers. Cites Donne’s use of metaphorical conceits, his wit, his blending of sensual and spiritual love, his passionate intimacy with God, his ability to create dramatic situations and taste for realism, his skillful uses of language and prosody, and his intellectual playfulness and complexity. Gives examples of these characteristics drawn from a wide range of the poems.


Presents a general overview of the stylistic features of metaphysical poetry and of Donne’s poetry in particular, such as the interplay of levity and sincerity; far-fetched imagery and conceits; shocking uses of puns, paradoxes, wit, and logic; and the employment of intricate rhythm, realism, and obscurity. Points out that the term “metaphysical” “actually refers to style rather than subject matter” (447). Refers to Donne as “both the pioneer and chief spokesman of metaphysical poetry” (449) and says that he is “highly appraised all over the globe for his fantastic intellectual aptitude in describing the varied states of emotion and action of human beings” (451).


In a discussion of *The Sea Voyage* by John Fletcher and Philip Massinger (first performed at the Globe Theatre in 1622), a play that engages with “a particular set of economic debates in the 1620s concerning English overseas trade and the negotiation of the terms of worth, valuation, and exchange” (7), comments on how in *ElProg* we have “the ultimate literalization of the mercantilist argument” (15) of the time. Shows how Donne “playfully takes the mercantilist perspective to its logical extreme” and how he “revels in the new modes of significa-
tion resulting from English commercial expansion and its transition to a colonial economy” (16). Points out how in *ElProg* Donne suggests that “just as money in the new mercantilist schema derives worth from its circulation and exchange,” so likewise “the female body (metonymically invoked through the female genitilia) has value insofar as it is available for intercourse.” Maintains, therefore, that a woman’s “worth and value” are not to be found in her beauty, wealth, or virtue—all “superficial qualities”—but in her vagina (15).


Argues that Donne and the biblical Prophets “seem to share an aesthetics of exaggeration, turbulance, immensity, grandeur, misshapen forms, distorted perspectives, sudden angles, shock and trompe l’oeil effects: the aesthetics of the baroque” (285). Points out that one characteristic of baroque architecture is “a sense of shock, achieved through impossible angles and unexpected corners” and that “similarly Donne’s poetry makes sudden swerves around conceptual corners.” Maintains that it is “disrepect for decorum that seems to make Donne most like the Prophets” (288) and stresses how both seek out a “poetics of violation” (289).

Points out also how Donne’s poetry, like that of the Prophets, “combines God and sex and perversion/abnormalities of the body” (290) and how it “feels profoundly the insecurities and vacillations of being human and seeks to make itself felt by exploiting and foregrounding the vulnerabilities of the flesh and the brain” (291). Discusses how Donne and the Prophets “send meaning ricocheting in all directions,” invent “ingenious tricks of language” (295), and engage in a kind of “literary pyrotechnics” (296).


Presents a diplomatic edition of all the known surviving poetry of Sir Henry Goodere in print and manuscript. Observes that Goodere “frequently adapted lines from Donne’s letters and poems” and that “various ‘Donnean’ metaphysical effects can be detected among his lines,” and, “more significantly, his verse and prose relies at several points on specific, identifiable borrowings from Donne’s own writings.” Suggests, therefore, that Goodere’s works “testify to Donne’s earliest influence.” Observes, furthermore, that “since Goodere’s source material included Donne’s own manuscripts, his borrowings and adaptations represent witness, however altered, of now-lost authorial holographs.” Points out that Goodere used Sir Edward Conway as “a conduit for sending his verses to more influential patrons,” which explains why so many of Goodere’s poems are found in the Conway Papers (100). Thereafter lists the sources, the poems with known dates, the poems without known dates, and literary manuscripts transcribed in Goodere’s hand, but not reproduced here, as well as an explanation of the editorial conventions of the edition. Presents the texts of 14 poems with textual notes.


Compares Donne and Jonathan Swift as poets who write about “nudity and the comedy of sexuality” and points out how both poets are “skeptical towards sentimentality and traditions of love poetry which aim to erase the awkward realities of jealousy, physical decline and corporeal disappointment” (189). Maintains that Swift was very likely influenced by Donne, citing several examples of similarities between the works of the two poets. Points out, for example, that Donne’s reference in *ValMourn* to lovers as “two twin compasses” is
like Swift's comment on the brothers Peter and Jack in *A Tale of the Tub*. Also compares *ElBed* with Swift's "*A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed,*" but observes that although Donne's elegy is "erotically charged," while Swift's poem "is viciously parodic, both poems share a firm rejection of the etherealised version of romantic love" (190). Contrasts Donne's "tough intellectual ardor" with Swift's "unflinching vehemence" (191).


Discusses "the importance of the concept of *arcana imperii* in James I’s view of kingship" and shows how "this carefully cultivated royal opacity was of a piece with James' absolutism and his firm commitment to *jure divino* monarchy." Considers the use of the concept of *arcana imperii* in Donne's works and, in particular, examines the role that the concept that is "so centrally connected to the wider doctrine of *jure divino* plays in Donne's thought" (169). Maintains that such an examination "provides further light on the vexed but vital question of Donne's political and religious allegiances" (170) and surveys present scholarship on the issue. Discusses Donne's use of the concept in five sermons, noting that although "his use of the concept varies in nuance, it always serves to foreground the importance of Scripture and the value of the individual engagement with that body of revelation." Concludes that "in the context of a wider religio-political discussion, that Donne should use such a loaded term and should use it in such a way, must arrest our attention and cannot but inform our understanding of the wider debate about his commitment to absolutism" (182).


Presents a biographical sketch of Donne, surveys the major characteristics of his poetry and prose, and examines and evaluates his critical reputation over the centuries. Discusses, citing many examples, Donne's lifelong search for permanence, his fear of inconstancy, and his preoccupation with death and the afterlife as seen not only in his love poems but also in his religious writings. Praises Donne's poems as highly dramatic performances, highlights their sense of immediacy and psychological realism, discusses how he uses his poems to provide change or resolution within himself, and stresses the tremendous vivacity and sense of urgency in the poems.


Discusses the often mixed message that sixteenth-century English preachers and churchmen gave their congregations about whether or not spouses would be united in heaven. Points out that in his sermons "the most that Donne can offer his listeners" is "an assurance" that "although Christ does not affirm, he also does not deny the possibility that we shall have knowledge of one another in heaven" (22).


Contrasts the problems confronting editors of Donne's poems and Herbert's poems. Points out that there are 4000–5000 known manuscript copies of the approximately 225 poems of Donne, with "1 to 70 surviving exemplars for a given poem" (187), whereas there are only 2 extant manuscripts of Herbert's *The Temple*. Maintains that this contrast indicates that "producing single-author editions from surviving corpora entails very different methodological challenges" (188). Notes how Donne and Herbert "present contrasting cases at every stage of their lives and afterlives: in the origi-
nal dissemination of their work in manuscript or print, in the nature of the evidence for their popularity in the seventeenth century and in the methodological challenges they pose for their modern editors.” Uses the contrasts between the two poets as “a way of tracking some of the different issues in editorial practice and the responses of that practice to textual theories and discoveries as it has shifted from the sixteenth to the twenty-first century” (189). Comments on the history of editing Donne’s poems by surveying the editorial practice of the editors of six of the printed editions of his poems during the seventeenth century as well as the often-eclectic editorial principles of editors of nineteenth- and twentieth-century editions. Discusses the methodology and editorial principles of the on-going Variorum edition that privileges manuscript over printed texts and that attempts “to reconstruct the textual history of Donne poems” (196). Maintains that Donne’s canon is “easily one of the most difficult examples of textual transmission that any editor will encounter” (197).


In Chinese. Discusses Donne’s view of love in his poetry from three perspectives: his contradictory attitude of compliment and condemnation of his mistress, his humanistic understanding of love in which he demands exclusivity in the relationship and open discussion of sexual love, and his uses of abstract imagery that reflects a serious and philosophical approach to love. (From the abstract)


In Chinese. Briefly discusses how the compass image in ValMourn expresses the harmony between spiritual and physical love and how it figures forth the concept that temporal love can become eternal love. (From the abstract)


Discusses what is known of the life and works of Donne’s friend, Rowland Woodward, and says that “there is none of Donne’s friends of whom we would gladly know more than of Rowland Woodward” (59). Suggests that Donne may have introduced Woodward to Henry Wotton, who engaged Woodward as his secretary during his time in Venice. Attaches a list of books owned by Woodward, which includes a copy of Pseudo-Martyr (1610).


Explores Donne’s use of paradox in both his love poetry and his sacred poetry and suggests these paradoxes probably “are influenced by his frustrated life” and by the “unstable society” in which he lived. Discusses how Donne’s love poems “vary in their attitude toward love and women” (288). Cites GoodM and ValMourn as examples of Donne’s valuation of spiritual or perfect mutual love and cites LovAlch and SGo as examples of purely sexual love. Says that the majority of Donne’s religious poems “express his sense of sin and despair, and uncertainty about salvation,” as reflected most vividly in the Holy Sonnets. Cites Sickness as an exception, a poem in which Donne “gives a vivid vision of the process of going to Paradise” as a result of his being “part of the community of saints.” Concludes that both his love poetry and religious poetry “reveal Donne’s paradoxical views” and maintains that these views are a result of his life being “full of contraries and frustration” (289).

2060. Yeo, Jayme M. “Converting England: Mysticism, Nationalism, and Symbolism in the Poetry of John Donne,” in The Turn of the Soul: Represen-
Observes that although “the word ‘conversion,’ especially in literary studies, almost uniformly signals an internal choice, a drama that, although staged against the backdrop of political and theological change, is played out largely in the realm of the individual,” the word also can be applied “at the national level” (177). Discusses how “the conversion of early modern England, from Catholicism to Anglican Protestantism, can, therefore, be understood and analyzed as a national event” (178). Maintains that in order to bring about a national conversion, England had to adapt “the ideological structures that had their roots in Catholic tradition” to “a Protestant worldview” and that “this need created a symbolic campaign to rehабilitate the images and texts that had traditionally upheld Catholicism and adapt them to a newly-Protestant England” (178–79). Observes, furthermore, that “imaginative literature provided a space in which to translate the philosophies of Protestant apologetics and polemics into affective language, allowing people to connect on an emotional, intuitive level with the idea of a nation whose formerly Catholic practices and symbols now had Protestant valences.” Examines how Donne’s poetry “carried on this project begun in the sixteenth century, instilling Catholic symbolism with Protestant meaning as a way of imagining England’s conversion on the large scale” (179). Focuses on three poems to show how “each highlights a different aspect of this symbolic project.” Discusses how Val Weep “reveals the centrality of the mystical union in reimagining these crumbling representations of the nation” and how it “utilizes coins not as problematic symbols of economic prosperity” but as “tools that enable union between lovers.” Discusses how El Brac “highlights nationalism by using Catholic symbols within Protestant patriotism” and how it “focuses on Michael the Archangel, an image that English coinage inherited from Catholic iconography, as an ideal figure for the Protestant nation.” Discusses how Sickness “expresses the hope that the religious and national cohesion of England might one day extend to the world at large” and claims that the poem “overlaps images drawn from the Catholic T-O maps with newer, more geographically accurate references to imagine a union between God and the world that goes beyond doctrinal boundaries” (180). Concludes, however, that Donne’s poetry “envisions an impossible conversion to a non-existent religion, to a Church of England that would be forever in the making” but that, nevertheless, his poetry “offers an imaginative alternative” (196).


In Chinese. Maintains that Donne’s poetry is characterized by the use of defamiliarization of both language and form, thus reflecting his unique ways of thinking, and is reflected in the impersonality of his poems, his uses of the conceit, the blending of the sacred and secular, and the combination of thought and feeling. (From the abstract)


In Korean. Discusses how Donne in Fir An “features the recurrent motifs of mortality and decay embedded in both the world and human beings.” Maintains that Donne’s view of “the limitations and degeneracy” in mankind is apparent in his portrayal of man’s “nothingness”
and his “loss of spiritual vigor and integrity.”
(From the abstract)


In Korean. Discusses how *SecAn* presents Donne's overall view of death, immortality, and the afterlife and, in particular, how it embodies "the transmigration of the soul" after death.
(From the abstract)


In Korean. Discusses Donne's paradoxical attitude toward death and the afterlife in his poetry and prose, but, in particular, how he explores the issue in *SecAn*. (From the internet)

2066. Yu-Peng, L.I.N. ["One Text and Multiple Theory": An Approach to Teaching Theories in English and American Literature.] *Journal of Hefei University of Technology (Social Sciences)* 26, no. 1: 98–103.

In Chinese. Introduces Chinese undergraduate students of English and American literature to the methodology of literary theory, showing how one can approach a work from different theoretical perspectives. Illustrates the point by a detailed discussion of *Flea* from six different perspectives.


Observes that, because of cultural differences, Chinese students studying English literature have difficulty understanding the texts. Suggests four important aspects of English culture that students should study intensively: the language itself, Christianity, traditional cosmology, and Greek myths and customs. Cites, as an example, *ValMourn* (ll. 9–12), where Donne uses the Ptolemaic system of the universe to describe the departure of lovers.


In Chinese. Describes the witty battle between the speaker of *Flea* and the woman addressed and suggests that the poem "symbolizes the hedonist thought prevailing in Europe" during Donne's time. Claims that the poem is "actually the internalization of two different moral ideologies latent in John Donne himself." (From the abstract)


Discusses several major characteristics of Donne's poetry, especially its wit, and illustrates them by an analysis of *SGo*.


Discusses Marlowe’s "The Passionate Shepherd," Raleigh's "The Nymph's Reply to the Shepherd," and Donne's *Bait* to show how "the pastoral mode incorporates the aesthetics of courtiership with a discourse of a different social register, that of vernacular humanism, and an emphasis on frugality and thrift." Maintains that, in these poems, "the pastoral genre attempts to reinvent a courtly culture based on landed property, shielded from the corrupting influence of global trade and the moral dissolution of the city," but that Donne's poem uses the pastoral "to make a critique not only of the intrigues of the court, but also of the very desire to dominate nature that defines the uses of the pastoral genre from that period" (123). Calls *Bait* "the more interesting and complex"
of the three poems (127). Points out how Donne “voices distinct suspicion of the pastoral innocence and ‘landed’ certainty” assumed in Marlowe’s poem (127–28), and that, like Raleigh, he points out there are new pleasures to be enjoyed that “render the pastoral and its promise of security untenable.” Says that Bait “collapses the pastoral theme borrowed from Marlowe into a piscatorial river realm of baits and fishes where uncertainty and mutability are represented not simply as an external threat but rather as a logic internal to and inherent in this world” and that in his poem courtiers are allegorized “as a school of fish who suddenly find themselves in the position of bait and prey,” which reveals the “incapacitating dependency that underlies courtly patronage” (128). Discusses how in Bait Donne “teases out the inherent forms of dependence and possession that still underlie any pursuit of patronage and privilege” and how he “insists on a type of knowledge and subjectivity that is obtained not by distancing oneself from passions and objects of desire but rather through merging with them and coming to see the world through them” (129).
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Sidney-Pembroke Psalter, 37, 40, 383, 620, 785, 938, 1028, 1102, 1204, 1311, 1436, 1442, 1479, 1494, 1638
Simpson, Evelyn Mary Spearing, 1568, 1942
Sisson, C. H., 1622
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Strojan, Marjan, 1075
Stubbs, John, 1113, 1141, 1162, 1231, 1270, 1394
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